# ET-WISC and ET-CTS 2017 Teleconference (meeting planning) – Final Report

Date: 19 July 2017

Time: 10:00 UTC

Location: WebEx

**Attendance**

Chair: Mattéo DELL’ACQUA

Secretary: Jeremy TANDY

Ilona GLASER, Rémy GIRAUD, Kenji TSUNODA, Mark FRANCIS

**Apologies**

Xiang LI

**Agenda**

1. Agree priorities and outcomes for the meeting;
2. Agree overall duration & number of (funded) participants - these are linked concerns as more of one means less of the other;
3. Agree whether TT-GISC is to be held adjacent to the joint meeting, and if so, what duration is required;
4. Agree rough meeting structure - do we need parallel sessions, if so for what topics and for how long; and
5. Recommend a range of dates within which the joint-meeting (& possible TT-GISC) may occur.

**Notes (Type: A**ction**, I**nformation**, D**ecision**)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No.  | **Description**  | **Who**  | **When**  | **Type**  |
| 1. **1.**
 | **Agree priorities and outcomes for the meeting**  |   |   |   |
| 1.1  | Mattéo described the objective to present information at the proposed CBS TECO, March 2018, in preparation for EC-70 and then Cg.For ICT-ISS there were six elements to focus on:1. WIS2.0 implementation plan & the organisation that needs to be set up
2. Information Management (WIS Part C) with associated updates to the Manual on WIS to be approved by CBS
3. Aviation data formats (not relevant to today's discussion);
4. Interoperability between WIS and ICAO SWIM
5. Security and cyber security - really important that CBS approve the security response procedures for WIS
6. Certification and audit of WIS centres

Jeremy filtered out those relating to the responsibilities of ET-WISC and ET-CTS:1. WIS2.0 implementation plan ... in relation to the 'Cache in the cloud' activity and the 'EduGain / EduRoam' pilot for authenticating academic users
2. WIS security and incident response procedure
3. Certification and audit - ET-CAC needs the new audit criteria & principles to be defined by ET-WISC as the 'system owner' of WIS

Jeremy also noted the requests from CBS to operationalise the WIS Monitoring (extending this to DCPCs and NCs) and to improve the engagement between GISCs and their affiliated WIS Centres.Although the operationalisation of WIS Monitoring is unlikely to require to result in strategic changes that would need consideration by Cg, any related changes to regulatory materials would need approval by EC-70 and, therefore, may be considered for prioritisation.Rémy queried whether the WIS monitoring would be ready in time for presentation at CBS TECO given the speed of progress to date.Rémy suggested that the EduGAIN / EduROAM pilot should not be considered as a high-priority as it is just one mechanism that could be used to managed federated identity. As such it is a useful study but is not essential (WIS has lived without federated identity management for quite some time already).Mattéo agreed, adding that it is important that we do not miss an key element relating to the WIS2.0 strategy. Otherwise, we will need to wait for another four-years for the next Cg. Rémy agreed, indicating that federated identity management is clearly part of the WIS 2.0 strategy, but the EduGAIN / EduROAM pilot is working at a level of detail that is not necessary for a decision by Cg.Mattéo noted that the certification and audit process is changing. The objective is to provide a more generic process that is applicable to auditing any kind of WMO Centre, into which criteria for specific types of Centre can be incorporated.Furthermore, there is a need to complete the interim audit of GISCs.ET-WISC need to provide the key elements and criteria for audit and certification of WIS Centres both for the pending interim audits and the future, more generic auditing procedure. |   |   | I |
| 1.2  | Mattéo noted that the question regarding the connectivity of GISCs via the WIS Core Network and RMDCN needs to be resolved, indicating clearly how GISCs shall be interconnected.Rémy indicated that the situation is a bit messy at the moment and that it is essential that a practical solution is defined that can be readily achieved.Jeremy referenced Resolution 7 (EC-69) which is relevant to the question regarding GISC interconnectivity. The resolution requests CBS to review further the proposed amendments to the Manual on the Global Telecommunication System Part 1 and Attachments I-2 and I-3 as specified in Annex 2 to Recommendation 18 (CBS‑16). |   |   | I  |
| 1.3 | Mattéo noted that after CBS TECO, March 2018, there will still be a few months to progress the work ahead of Cg. Accordingly, we will need to plan regular meetings during 2018 and ensure that the work continues.Given that the proposed joint ET-CTS / ET-WISC meeting will focus only on priority topics, Rémy was keen to understand how the lower-priority work of ET-CTS and ET-WISC would get done during 2018.Mattéo indicated that it is his assumption that *normal* ET-CTS and ET-WISC meetings would be scheduled in 2018 in order to progress these works, pending confirmation of the available budget.  |  |  | I |
| 1.4 | Mattéo DELL’ACQUA to check the budget allocation for meetings of OPAG-ISS Expert Teams during 2018.  | Mattéo | 08SEP | A |
| 1.5 | Jeremy cross referenced the list of proposed priorities with her preferences that provided by Xiang ahead of the meeting:* Cache in the cloud
* Security and incident management – covering (i) the WIS cyber security incident response procedure, and (ii) information for WIS centres reporting cyber security events (*noting that ET-WISC will prepare a draft*)
* Operationalising WIS monitoring – (i) starting operation of the WIS Common Dashboards (WCD), (ii) extending WIS monitoring to DCPCs and NCs, and (iii) implementation of the Quarterly Reporting and Incident Reporting at GISCs.

In her email, Xiang noted that the requirements for GISC monitoring and reporting include Real-time Operation Monitoring, Quarterly Reporting and Incident Reporting. Real-time Operation Monitoring has been covered by WCD. But, the implementation of Quarterly Reporting and Incident Reporting is still in an early stage. She suggests that the meeting discusses the implementation plan for these two requirements.Jeremy noted that Xiang’s preferences are aligned with those discussed earlier- albeit providing an extra level of detail.  |  |  | I |
| 1.6 | Jeremy summarised the discussed priorities for the joint meeting:1. Cache in the cloud;
2. Cyber security incident response and event reporting – taking a wider view of cyber security including preventative measures, monitoring etc.;
3. Certification and audit criteria for WIS Centres – looking at both the future audit procedure and the current interim audit for GISCs,
4. Operationalising of WIS monitoring; and
5. GISC Core Network and GISC interconnectivity.

All meeting participants confirmed that they were content with these priorities.  |  |  | D |
| 1.7 | Kenji noted the need to move the WCD interim guidance into the Guide to WIS. |  |  | I |
| 1.8 | Kenji asked for more information about progress of the Cache in the Cloud activity.Rémy provided an invitation URL to enable access to the Cache in the Cloud Trello board:<https://trello.com/invite/b/JXMqsxFw/6e3a93874b3cacd623618197a1ba0d62/cache-in-through-the-cloud>  |  |  | I |
| 1. **2.**
 | **Agree overall duration & number of (funded) participant** |   |   |   |
| 1. 2.1
 | Jeremy indicated that a budget of CHF50,000 was available for the joint meeting; meaning that there was budget for 17 funded experts for 5 days or 20 funded experts for 4 days.5-days would be the practical limit for the duration of the meeting given that any requirement to provide DSA spanning a weekend would have a serious negative impact on the number of experts that could be funded to participate.Hosting the meeting in Geneva means that there would be no cost for Secretariat participation. |  |  | I |
| 1. 2.2
 | Rémy asked the practical question regarding whether there is a procedure to reduce the number of participants so that not all Core members from both teams need to be invite. Considering the subset of topic to be addressed, inviting only contributors to those would be preferable and would save some budget.Jeremy noted that Dave THOMAS has said that experts would be invited based on their ability to contribute to particular topics.Mattéo confirmed that as a focused meeting rather than a full meeting of the ETs, participation would be based on the ability to contribute to the meeting topics rather than role within the Expert Team. |  |  |  |
| 2.3 | Rémy GIRAUD and Xiang LI, with support from their Co-chairs to prepare a list of experts who are best able to contribute to the topics of the joint meeting.Note that Mattéo DELL’ACQUA will require funding to participate in at least part of the joint meeting (subsequently agreed as the final two-days). | Xiang, Rémy  | 04AUG | A |
| 2.4 | Mark indicated his preference for a smaller number of people over 5-days - to allow time to get the work done. He adds the caveat that 5-days will be sufficient time so long as the adequate preparation is completed prior to the meeting.All agree that 5-days is the appropriate duration for the meeting, with budget to invite 17 participants.  |  |  | D |
| **3.** | **Agree whether TT-GISC is to be held adjacent to the joint meeting, and if so, what duration is required** |  |  |  |
| 3.1 | Kenji indicated that he anticipates only one day to discuss the TT-GISC concerns that are not covered by the priority topics listed earlier.Kenji confirmed his preference to hold the TT-GISC meeting during or adjacent to this joint meeting. |  |  | D |
| **4.** | **Agree rough meeting structure - do we need parallel sessions, if so for what topics and for how long** |  |  |  |
| 4.1 | Rémy proposed the following outline structure for the meeting:* (Day 1) Parallel sessions: ‘Cache in the Cloud’ and TT-GISC
* (Days 2-3) Parallel sessions: ET-WISC (including TT-GISC participants) and ET-CTS
* (Days 4-5) Plenary session – focusing on preparations for CBS TECO.
 |  |  | D |
| 4.2 | Kenji noted that following the completion of the ET-WISC parallel session at the end of Day 3, some un-funded members of TT-GISC may choose to depart.  |  |  | I |
| 4.3 | Mattéo noted the need to ensure that ET-WISC is not overly focused on GISC issues; ensuring that the concerns of data providers (NCs and DCPCs) are also covered. Jeremy TANDY to ensure that at least some of the experts funded to participate in the joint meeting are able to cover Data Centre issues. | Jeremy | 11AUG | A |
| **5.** | **Recommend a range of dates within which the joint-meeting (& possible TT-GISC) may occur** |  |  |  |
| 5.1 | The following meeting dates were proposed – taking account of Mattéo’s need to plan for other OPAG-ISS meetings:* Joint ET-CTS / ET-WISC: 13-17NOV2017
* TT-eWIS: either 21-23NOV2017 or 22-24NOV2017
* ICT-ISS: 11-15DEC2017
 |  |  | D |