

NMI Integration Testbed
Summary of Year 1 Annual Site Reports and Status
M.F.Yafchak, 10/17/02

This report provides a summary of activities for NMI Integration Testbed sites under sub-contract to SURA. These sites include:

Sponsored sites - The University of Alabama at Birmingham, the University of Florida, Texas Advanced Computing Center at the University of Texas at Austin, the University of Virginia

Un-sponsored sites - The University of Alabama in Huntsville, Florida State University, Georgia State University, the University of Michigan

The time period covered is from initial contract signing (varies with each site) through the end of the first NMI project year, 8/31/02. Input was taken directly from annual reports as submitted by each site and from related records and documentation as kept by the NMI Testbed Manager.

Testbed Site Reporting Process for Year 1

Site contracts cover a period of roughly three years, from the time of signing through August 31, 2004. Annual reports support the continuation of the existing contracts versus a renewal.

The period of activity for Testbed sites this first "year" has actually been approximately 3 months. Because of this abbreviated time period, performance evaluation for the first year is not extending beyond this report and the subsequent approval of the SURA PI. In the second and third years, when site activities will have spanned a full 12 months each time, it will be pertinent to involve the larger NMI project team and the SURA NMI Advisory Group in performance evaluation, though final approval would remain with the SURA PI.

Sites were asked to submit their annual report per the description in the site contract, including expenditures for Year 1 and a proposed budget for Year 2 where applicable (sponsored sites only). Reports were requested in hard copy format and are on file in the SURA DC office.

The due date for the first annual report was 8/31/02 however this deadline was left flexible through mid-October due to the fact that many critical Testbed activities were taking place in parallel. These other activities were directly related to the sites' preparation and evaluation of NMI Release 1 and it would have adversely impacted the NMI overall to further strain already-limited resources.

Testbed Site Activity Summary

Testbed sites as a whole have completed the following activities within the reporting period:

- All sites attended the Testbed Kickoff in June and regular monthly meetings since that time.
- All sites are active on the primary Testbed listserv. Four sites (GSU, UAB, UAH, UMich) have also subscribed to a newly created listserv to host intra-Testbed technical discussions.

- All sites provided site summaries for the NMI Testbed Web site and other feedback as needed throughout the development of the site. (See <http://www.nsf-middleware.org/testbed>. Site summaries are located under About the Testbed.)
- All sites completed Testbed Site Integration Plans by the end of July. These plans identify and track site contacts, resources being applied, project integration, enterprise integration, local awareness activities and any planned expansion of site capabilities.
- All site representatives have individual accounts on the Testbed Working Web site and access material there as needed for participation. No one is currently making use of his/her permissions to publish his or her own information to the site.
- To varying degrees and as applicable to their project activities, all sites committed to evaluate specific components in NMI Release 1. Views of R1 evaluation by component and by site are included as Attachment A. Of 101 committed reports, 61 were completed as of the writing of this report. The shortages and delays experienced in the completion of final R1 evaluation reports can be attributed to the following factors:
 - delays in final contract signing caused several sites to be unable to commit the resources necessary in time to do the work;
 - key startup processes were taking place in parallel with the designated evaluation period, requiring sites to divide limited time and resources across all necessary tasks;
 - due to a security concern, NMI GRID components were temporarily unavailable for two weeks at a key time in the test cycle.
- Release 1 evaluation is now over and Testbed sites are assessing their commitments to the evaluation of Release 2, due to be released at end of October 2002.
- During this reporting period, all sites have worked with researchers and enterprise architects at their institutions to integrate at least two research or institutional projects with their NMI evaluation process. Sites are actively working to expand these project sets, as evidenced in their Testbed Site Integration Plans. Some notable characteristics of the current project set are:
 - A total of twenty-six institutional projects and applications have agreed to participate in NMI component integration and evaluation.
 - Ten of the above projects are targeting increased global access to their existing or planned advanced scientific grids (including the emerging TeraGrid) through the use of NMI Globus.
 - Five of the eight sites are actively implementing enterprise scale directories which will include centralized authentication and a broad set of integrated applications
 - Active PKI efforts are underway, from the immediate exercise of NMI "PKI Lite" to more rigorous examination necessary to evolve PKI in support of HIPAA/FERPA compliance.
 - New collaborative tools are being developed and explored, such as click-to-dial desktop video conferencing and directory-enabled group calendaring.

Testbed Site Summary Report, Attachment A:
NMI Release 1 Evaluation - View by Site & View by Component

(As of 10/16/02)

View by Site: Cyan shading = Final report received

	UAB	UAH	UFL	FSU	GSU	U Mich	TACC	UVA
Globus	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y
Condor-G	n	y	y	n	n	y	y	y
NWS	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
KX.509/G	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
KX.509	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y
CPM	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y
Pubcookie	y	n	y	y	n	n	n	n
eduOrg 1.0	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
CommObject	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	n
eduPerson 1.5	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
Practices in Directory Groups	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
LDAP Recipe 2.0	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y
Metadirectory Practices	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Shibboleth Architecture v5	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
Campus Certificate Policy	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
Lightweight Campus CP	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
Sample Acct Mgmt Policy	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y
Certificate Profile Registry	n	n	n	y	n	y	y	y

View by component*:

Component	Being tested by:
Globus	UAH, UFL, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA, USC*
Condor-G	UAH, UFL, UMich, TACC, UVA, USC
NWS	UAH, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA, USC
KX.509/G	UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA USC
KX.509	UFL, FSU, UMich, TACC, UVA USC
CPM	GSU, UMich, UVA
Pubcookie	UAB, UFL, FSU, USC
eduOrg 1.0	UAB, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA, USC

commObject	UAB, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich
eduPerson 1.5	UAB, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA, USC
Practices in Directory Groups	UAB, UAH, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
LDAP Recipe 2.0	UAB, UAH, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
Metadirectory Practices	UAH, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC
Shibboleth Architecture v5	UAB, UFL, FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
Campus Certificate Policy	FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
Lightweight Campus CP	FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
Sample Acct Mgmt Policy	FSU, GSU, UMich, TACC, UVA
Certificate Profile Registry	FSU, UMich, TACC, UVA

*The University of Southern California (USC) has also requested to participate in R1 testing and has informally joined in Testbed communications to support this.