

**Report**  
**of the second meeting of the Cloud Selected Industry Group -**  
**– Service level agreements expert subgroup held on 16<sup>st</sup> of April 2013**

**Participants:**

Ken Ducatel, EC, DG Cnect, chair

Agnieszka Wodecka, EC, DG Cnect, minutes

Joe Butler, Intel

Nick Hyner, Dell

Ali Parvin, Dell

Peter Gray, Cloudsigma

Guillaume Jahan, Numergy

Claudia Riffer, Deutsche Telekom AG

Jonathan Sage, IBM

Alexandre Steiner, Numergy

Nicky Stewart, Skyscapecloud

Christine Giraudon, Salesforce

Jordan Janeczko, ATOS

Mick Symonds, ATOS

Charlotte Thornby, Oracle

Stephanie Finck, Cabinet DN

Peter Witsenbrug, Intug

Marnix Dekker, Enisa

Joseph Alhadeff, Oracle

Samantha Hardaway, Oracle

## Meeting report:

### 1) Opening of the meeting and introductory remarks

Ken Ducatel opened the meeting. Agnieszka Wodecka reported from the last meeting and proposed to the group to prepare the guidelines on the basis of the already existing guides on service level agreements such as the Recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Public Working Group - Contracts and SLA or the Cloud Standards Customer Council - Practical Guide to Cloud Service Level Agreements

Ken Ducatel underlined that the scope of the meeting is to agree on a basic checklist, a decision path and a common terminology. He highlighted that there should be some output on SLAs by Mid-June in order to present the deliverables to the ECP steering board in early July.

### 2) Focus of the work

The discussion was based on the tree issues paper:

a) **Atos (Jordan Janeczko)** presented a **checklist of SLAs**:

1. Availability of the service to the user
2. Problem Resolution times
3. Backup and Disaster Recovery
4. Data Location
5. Auditability
6. Penalties
7. Monitoring
8. Suspension of Service
9. Certification and Compliance
10. Carbon Footprint Metrics
11. Data privacy conditions
12. Security Capabilities
13. Interoperability

The discussion on the presented paper emphasised:

- the issue of defining the terms used in the checklist.
- need to include the penalties in the list since the checklist is not there to penalize the cloud provider.
- the difference between security capabilities and contractual commitments on security.

An excel table has been prepared in order to identify the **items that should be included in the checklist**.

During the first voting, it was agreed that availability of the service to the user, problem resolution times, reporting and security capabilities should be **included in the checklist**

**(green)**. Data location, auditability, penalties, suspension of services, certification and compliance, carbon footprint, data location were called out of the SLAs (red).

In the second voting, it was agreed that other checklist items, e.g. data location, backup and disaster recovery, auditability and penalties (e.g. vouchers), carbon footprint metrics and interoperability is not part of an SLA but should be **further discussed (yellow)**. An example of limitation that needs further discussion is the suspension of service.

According to some participants, some items, such as backup and disaster recovery, should be modified.

**b) Intel (Joe Butler) presented a list of attributes to be defined in the SLAs.**

The presentation included the example from a FP7 call on machine-readable SLAs and the presentation of the "SLA where".

The discussion on the presented paper emphasised:

- the problem how to build a machine-readable attribute. Ken Ducatel said that in the FP7, some projects focused on machine-readable SLA. A workshop will be organized to bring together project participants.

Further step could be to merge a work on checklist of SLAs (Jordan Janeczko, EuroCloud) and on list of attributes (Joe Butler, Intel).

**c) Dell (Nick Hymer) presented a SLAs flowchart.**

In his opinion a flowchart is a tool that can help vendors and customers accelerate their decisions before signing the cloud contract. In particular, the flowchart can help customer understand what type of service they need.

Since the flowchart proved to be a particularly complex matter, it was agreed that Dell (Nick Hymer), Intel (Joe Butler) and EuroCloud (Jordan Janeczko) will bring forward the work on the flowchart. The work will focus on the type of data, the type of business and the offer of the service.

**3) Conclusions and next steps:**

The participants agree that:

- 1) The excel file with the checklist will be circulated soon. The table will be **open for comments by Friday the 19<sup>th</sup> of April**. EuroCloud (Jordan Janeczko) will gather all the inputs and prepare the final version of the checklist.
- 2) A **conference call** with the participants in order to comment and agree on the final version of the checklist will be organized.
- 3) The **flowchart discussion** will be held in parallel.
- 4) The **next meeting** will take place in mid-May, in time to have deliverables by the end of June. This should allow the SLA group needs to be able to deliver and to present a set of drafts in June for presentation to the ECP Steering Board on 4 July.