An overview of Fed4FIRE testbeds – and beyond? Or: how to categorize and map all testbeds?

Lucas Nussbaum

lucas.nussbaum@loria.fr

Universite de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria, LORIA, F-54000 Nancy, France



GEFI 2019

Problem statement

- Many testbeds available, with diverse features and capabilities
- Challenging for prospective users to understand which testbeds match their needs
 - Many experimenters just ignore that our testbeds could help them!
- Consequences:
 - Experimenters using sub-optimal solutions
 - Additional testbeds being built → duplication of efforts Side note: this is not necessarily bad:
 - ★ Explore different (better?) solutions to the same problem

★ Explore reproducibility of experiments in various environments But that requires knowing about the alternatives

How can we (as a community) solve this?

Two different but related problems

Description of resources inside testbeds: problem mostly solved

hardware_type_info RSpec extension (supported by jFed)¹

And attempts at processing using ontologies²

 JSON-based description of resources for cloud testbeds (Grid'5000, Chameleon), and tools to explore this data³

Description of testbeds

- Much harder problem
- Several attempts in the past (e.g. FI-XIFI EU project, ended in 2015; testbed categories filters in jFed)
- Open issue: no good current overview

¹https://doc.ilabt.imec.be/jfed-documentation-5.9/amdevelopers#advertisement-rspec-extension-hardware-information ²Alexander Willner et al. "Using Semantic Web Technologies to Query and Manage Information within Federated Cyber-Infrastructures". In: *Data* 2 (2017), page 21.

³David Margery et al. "Resources Description, Selection, Reservation and Verification on a Large-scale Testbed". In: *TRIDENTCOM 2014*.

- Inspiration: Wikipedia comparison pages
- Start small, get something done, iterate
 - Perfect is the enemy of good
 - Surveys of fast-moving targets are difficult to maintain
 - ★ Trade-off with level of detail

What we should do (2): testbeds categories

Proposed plan:

Identify testbeds categories based on typical target experiments

(First attempt:)

- Cloud and HPC
 - Test software stacks, usually distributed, at scale, on servers with bare metal deployment capability, controllable network, etc.
- Internet-scale networking and SDN
 - Nodes deployed in various sites, manageable network equipment, netFPGAs, etc.
- Wireless
 - ★ Nodes (often controllable) that can communicate over various protocols, SDR devices, etc.
- Federations and other kinds of testbeds aggregates

What we should do (3): features per categories

② For each category, identify the main distinguishing features

Example: Wireless testbeds

- Environment: Anechoic chamber, Indoor, Outdoor
- Hardware (and configurability): embedded PC with Linux, microcontrollers, USRPs (SDR)
- Supported protocols

Also more general features, such as:

- Supported experiment management protocols (SFA?) and tools
- Access and usage policy
- Health level / TRL

Example: Fed4FIRE and FIT (20 testbeds)

- Cloud and HPC: Virtual Wall (+ Tengu), Grid'5000, ExoGENI@UvA
- Internet-scale networking and SDN: OFELIA I2CAT island, PL-LAB, GTS, PlanetLab Europe

► Wireless:

Name	Hardware	Environment	Typical protocols	Configurability
IRIS	20x USRP N210	Indoor	5G, any (SDR)	
LOG-a-TEC	VESNA sensor nodes (ARM Cortex M3)	Outdoor	6LoWPAN, ZigBee	
NETMODE	embedded PCs	Indoor + roof	Wi-Fi	
PerformLTE / Triangle	LTE equipement: eNodeB, UE, emulators	Indoor	4G / LTE	
Smart Santander		outdoor	802.15.4	access to collected data only
w-iLAB.t	embedded PCs, USRPs, spec- trum scanners	Indoor (utility room + offices)	Wi-Fi, 802.15.4, BT	bare-metal access
CityLab	embedded PCs	Outdoor (city)	Wi-Fi, 802.15.4, BT, LORA	bare-metal access
Portable Wireless Testbeds	embedded PCs with several wireless NICs	depends	Wi-Fi, 802.15.4	bare-metal access
NITOS	embedded PCs, USRPs, spec- trum scanners	indoor and outdoor	Wi-Fi, WIMAX, LTE	
FIT IoT-Lab	Microcontrollers (MSP430, STM32), emb. PCs, mobile robots	Several indoor de- ployments (dedicated rooms or offices)	802.15.4. some BLE	bare metal access
FIT CortexLab	29 x USRP N2932, Nutaq Pi- coSDR	Anechoic chamber	any (SDR)	
FIT R2Lab	Nitos X50, USRP B210, USRP N210, USRP 2, and USRP 1, LimeSDR, smartphones	Anechoic chamber	Wi-Fi, any (SDR)	bare metal access



- Refine categories and features
- Correct information (together with testbeds owners)
- Extended to other testbeds (and maybe identify other categories)
- Publish
- Maintain over time

Interested in contributing? Talk to me or email me! lucas.nussbaum@loria.fr

Backup slides

Ontologies and Fed4FIRE

Live version on http://lod.fed4fire.eu/ or http://193.191.148.159/





