



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL CONNECT
E.2, Software & Services, Cloud

Minutes - Cloud Select Industry Group on Service Level Agreements

17th January 2014 - European Commission, Avenue de Beaulieu 25 LT02, 1160 Brussels

Participants:

Francisco Medeiros – European Commission, DG CONNECT

Agnieszka Wodecka – European Commission, DG CONNECT

Felix Schäfer – European Commission, DG CONNECT

Kristian Billeskov – Gartner Consulting

Jordan Janeczko – ATOS

Jonathan Sage – IBM

Michael Symonds – ATOS

Francisco Mingorance – Amazon Web Services

Nicky Stewart – Skyscape Cloud Services

Charlotte Thornby – Oracle

Arthur van der Wees – Arthur's Legal B.V.

Oliver Zigan – I.T.E.N.O.S. GmbH

Matthew McDermott – Access Partnership

Stéphanie Finck – Salesforce

Patrick Van Eecke – DLA Piper UK LLP

Ali Parvin – Dell

Samantha Hardaway – Oracle

Mark Lange – Microsoft

Gerard Lecina – Dassault System

Jürgen Mahnke – SAP

Joseph Alhadeff – Oracle

Conference Call:

Cristie Gallihawk – Gartner Consulting

Chris Kappler – PwC

Dimitra Liveri – ENISA

Jesus Luba – Cloud Security Alliance

Joe Butler – Intel

Key Actions:

- DG CONNECT will circulate the minutes of the last meeting of the European Cloud Partnership (November 2013).
- The deadline for written comments to the last draft of Gartner Consulting's report is Tuesday, the 21st January 2014. Gartner will finish the work on incorporating these remarks within a week (28th January 2014).
- The next meeting of the C-SIG on SLAs will take place on Tuesday, the 11th February 2014.
- Joseph Alhadeff (Oracle), Chris Kappler (PwC), Michael Symonds (ATOS), Arthur van der Wees (Arthur's Legal B.V.) and Ali Parvin (Dell) will present a first draft of the flowchart (agreed deliverable) by the end of January 2014.
- Jordan Janeczko (ATOS), Charlotte Thornby (Oracle) and Joe Butler (Intel) will work on the SLA templates (agreed deliverable): the aim is to create a mapping and work on a gap analysis of the existing intermediary results and the Gartner report.

Francisco Medeiros, Deputy Head of Unit at DG Connect (E2, Software and Services, Cloud) welcomed the participants and opened the meeting, presenting the agenda as Gartner Consulting presenting their revised report on Service Level Agreements (SLAs), followed by a discussion in the Cloud Computing Select Industry Group (C-SIG) on the latest version of Gartner's report and on the future work of the group.

Kristian Billeskov (Gartner) presented Gartner's work principles for their report. These include taking a pragmatic approach with the aim of removing barriers to adoption, basing recommendations on solutions already observable in the market today, focusing on good practice instead of best practice solutions. The checklists in the report have been based on Gartner's client contacts when procuring cloud services; target values for quantitative SLAs are balanced values from analysed contracts. Gartner Consulting concentrated on commercial SLAs in contrast to engineering SLAs, meaning that the orientation was not based on different architectures employed by providers. Mr Billeskov did however point out that some offers in the market mean commercial risks to providers using architecture that does not allow the SLAs offered.

Joseph Alhadeff (Oracle) remarked that he was unsure about the specific measurement ranges provided in the report as this went contrary to the agreed understanding of the group that the result of their work should give orientation to customers without defining model terms. He also criticised that the differences between contract and SLA items were not included.

Jonathan Sage (IBM) added that the aim of the document should be to give guidance to public sector cloud procurers and SMEs cloud users and therefore the focus had to be on critical issues rather than on defined value ranges.

Mr Alhadeff added that ranges were difficult to put down generally as they would need to be seen in a negotiation context. The same ranges could have differing relevance for customers depending on questions like mission criticality of cloud services. He furthermore added that it was problematic that the document did not address differences between public, private and hybrid cloud solutions. Seeing the great variety in offers, Mr Alhadeff proposed to rather employ a framework approach, using the “highlights” of Gartner’s work.

Kristian Billeskov said that Gartner had observed a lot of different strategies in contracts and therefore tried to provide an overview of relevant points, to make it easier for users. He added that Gartner was happy to clarify the focus of the document and target it more on the end user. Mr Billeskov said that he felt the approach from the C-SIG to commenting the report had been very constructive and that all remarks were approached systematically. He said that although the structure and general approach would not be changed, Gartner was consistently incorporating feedback.

Ali Parvin (Dell) asked whether it would be possible to receive a clean version and a summary of changes in order to better follow which comments had been taken on board.

Francisco Mingorance (Amazon Web Services) said that he saw significant process over the different versions reviewed up until then and that he appreciated the inclusion of comments. He added that the written process was important and that points of agreement in the C-SIG should be re-submitted, even though Gartner had not included them in the first rounds, in order to underline their importance.

Samantha Hardaway (Oracle) asked to receive more details on the research process including the methodology and sources used.

Cristie Gallihawk (Gartner Consulting) agreed that more methodological information was needed, but added that there had to be a balance, in order not to overwhelm end users reading the document.

Mr Billeskov added that more details on sources would be possible, but that this would not be down to a company basis. Answering to a comment by Jonathan Sage, Mr Billeskov assured that the report was not based on any one-on-one discussion with companies and that there was a clear distinction between Gartner’s team for this report and their client contacts.

Michael Symonds (ATOS) said that the report should focus on process barriers on cloud adoption instead on content barriers, as the latter were context dependant.

Jonathan Sage (IBM) asked how long the report would be, adding that a 60-page-paper would not make it accessible for users.

Charlotte Thornby (Oracle) asked how the document would be published and whether it was intended to be a consensus document in need of C-SIG endorsement. Agnieszka Wodecka (DG CONNECT) said that the document was a Gartner Consulting report for the Commission, not a C-SIG document. It was intended as a basis for future work in the C-SIG however. Francisco Medeiros added that the C-SIG was at the same time an important source of input for Gartner. Mrs Thornby asked how this fitted with the initial aim of industry recommendations as end result of the C-SIG. Francisco Medeiros answered that a report by Gartner that reached consensus was obviously the ideal situation, but that the report was an additional product. Jordan Janeczko (ATOS) reminded that the relation of the report to the C-SIG group had been discussed at the

last meeting and that it had to be seen as an external input into their work, with a different scope, but with the intention to speed up the C-SIG's discussions.

Kristian Billeskov (Gartner Consulting) subsequently presented issues that Gartner considered as important for discussion in the group. One of these was the focus on public cloud offers as Gartner assumed that private cloud offers would only need a subset of these provisions. Additionally, Gartner set up the report as differentiating cloud service types as the underlying engineering architecture offered different possibilities to provide availability and should therefore differ, although this could currently not be observed in the market. Cristie Gallihawk added that there was the consideration to bring some of the SLA provisions back into a general section if they were common to all types.

Jürgen Mahnke (SAP) answered that a differentiation of service types, including the values of quantitative provisions, was necessary, as SaaS providers were currently challenged on the levels of IaaS values and would have to provide this due to unnecessary commercial pressure. Mr Symonds agreed that a differentiation by service type was a good approach.

Joseph Alhadeff (Oracle) asked whether the C-SIG could have access to the comments list used by Gartner and whether a document allowing inline comments would be possible to facilitate commenting and the follow-up of Gartner's reactions. Cristie Gallihawk said that the latter was unfortunately not possible due to internal rules in Gartner, but that a list of comments made and their implementation by Gartner would be provided for the next draft.

Samantha Hardaway (Oracle) remarked that the distinction of "required" and "preferred" in the checklists was not clear and that the language of the report should be re-worked. Cristie Gallihawk replied that this would be changed. Nicky Stewart (Skyscape Cloud Services) added that "required" was not a clear formulation as it was not clear, where these requirements come from.

Jonathan Sage (IBM) said that the aim for the next revision should be an increased usability of the report for customers (cloud users). In order to achieve this, redundancies should be reduced, common structures summarized and cut, and the ranges for up-stack services should be re-examined.

Mark Lange (Microsoft) remarked that Gartner's report paralleled issues addressed by ISO/IEC 19086 and that the final report should be reviewed against the work by ISO/IEC and be used as an input into the discussion in that forum. Cristie Gallihawk judged the convergence of these two processes as a positive sign.

Joseph Alhadeff voiced his concern that the report would include aspects that were not SLA topics, as this would create wrong expectations with customers. He furthermore remarked that there were structural issues due to the fact that often one cloud service would feed into another, leading to cloud providers being cloud users as well.

Jordan Janeczko said that the Gartner report was the key to the other deliverables of the C-SIG and that the group should proceed with these. Mr Alhadeff agreed, saying that it would be good to map Gartner's work to the deliverables planned. He added that more intensive, parallel work on the flowchart would be good as this was not covered by Gartner's work.

Joseph Alhadeff, Chris Kappler, Michael Symonds, Arthur van der Wees and Ali Parvin agreed to work on and present a first draft of the flowchart at the end of January 2014.

Jordan Janeczko insisted that work on the templates should be furthered as well. He said the last results were already fairly advanced with the main problem being the

wanted level of granularity. He considered that using the Gartner report, this first deliverable could be presented for the next meeting and before the next meeting of the European Cloud Partnership Steering Board. Joseph Alhadeff said that he wanted to make sure the understanding of "templates" was common in the group and not equal to "model terms". Ali Parvin (Dell) said that the deliverables should not be rushed on now and that it would be important to also include the last comments made on the templates in summer. Joseph Alhadeff proposed that for the next meeting the existing work on templates should be mapped to the Gartner report including an analysis of still existing gaps. Like this, the work could be brought forward without promising a too quick delivery. Jordan Janeczko, Charlotte Thornby and Joe Butler (Intel) agreed to work on such a mapping.

Joseph Alhadeff (Oracle) asked DG CONNECT to set up a better coordination between the different Cloud Select Industry Groups in order to deliver results that fit together and avoid contradictions. The perception is that different groups are working separately without any coordination.

Stephanie Finck (Salesforce) asked DG CONNECT to circulate the minutes of the last meeting of the ECP Steering Board in November 2013. She indicated that the minutes of the November meeting of the ECP Steering Board are not available online.

The C-SIG participants agreed to schedule the next meeting for 11th February 2014. The group asked for future meetings to be scheduled earlier than the last ones (for example starting at 13.00 and avoiding Monday mornings and Friday afternoons) and to be announced longer in advance.