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What’s Fog Computing?
What is fog computing?

**System-Level**
from Things to the Edge, and over the Core to the Cloud, spanning multiple protocol layers (works over and inside wireless and wireline networks)

**Architecture**
for distributing, orchestrating, managing, securing resources and services (not just placing servers, computing resources, apps, or small clouds at the edges)

**Horizontal**
Supports multiple industries (not limited to any specific industry, network type, or application domain)

**Cloud-to-Thing Continuum**
Distributes resources and services to anywhere along the continuum (not just at the edges)
Converged Cloud/Fog platforms and services (not just isolated edge computing devices / apps)

A system-level horizontal architecture that distributes computing, storage, and networking closer to users, and anywhere along the Cloud-to-Thing continuum.
Why Fog?
It’s necessary to run IoT, 5G and AI applications.
## Selected fog scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Cases</th>
<th>Traffic Congestion</th>
<th>Video Surveillance</th>
<th>Smart Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem</strong></td>
<td>$160B cost of traffic delays in US alone</td>
<td>Cloud doesn’t scale to support wide-scale surveillance (highways, cities, airports, etc.); rapid security decisions must be made on location</td>
<td>Safety, security, energy efficiency and comfort in buildings is an ongoing concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Solutions developed in silos hinder information sharing; data sources are bandwidth intensive and complex</td>
<td>HD cameras generate terabytes of data per day</td>
<td>Telemetry data is sent from thousands of sensors simultaneously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fog Technology</strong></td>
<td>Fog computing ensures sharing of data from vehicles and along roadways</td>
<td>Fog nodes intelligently partition video processing between cameras and cloud, enabling real-time, latency sensitive analytics</td>
<td>Fog computing creates smart, connected spaces; fog nodes for individual rooms can perform all monitoring and response functions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why fog? Beyond necessary, it enables growth through new business models

Reshape the Industry Landscape

Create Disruptive New Service Models

Integrate and Converge Cloud–Fog Services

Enable Rapid Development and Deployment of Fog Systems and Applications

Routers, switches, application servers, and storage servers converge into unified fog nodes

Players of all sizes, not just massive cloud operators, build/operate fogs and offer fog services → “WiFi Model” and the rise of local/regional fog ecosystems and operators?

For a business to function as a cohesive whole, cloud and fog will converge into one common infrastructure for integrated and unified cloud and fog services: development, deployment, monitoring, management, security, ...

Rapid deployment of localized applications → shifting from “build the cloud and see what services we can put on it” to “find what customers want and quickly put together a fog for them”
To work, fog computing must have universal interoperability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCP/IP</th>
<th>WWW</th>
<th>Fog Computing and OpenFog Consortium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A standard and universal framework to distribute packets</td>
<td>A standard and universal framework to access files anywhere</td>
<td>A standard and universal framework to distribute resources and services and manage, pool, orchestrate, and secure these distributed resources and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was it necessary to create a TCP/IP-for-wireless telecom? a TCP/IP-for-wired? a TCP/IP-for-enterprise? ... **NO**

Was it necessary to develop a HTTP-for-wireless? a HTTP-for-wired? a HTTP-for-enterprise? ... **NO**

Is it necessary to develop a fog-like system for 5G? another for wired telecom? another for enterprises? another for smart city? another for manufacturing? ... **NO**
OpenFog Consortium
Building this necessary interoperability of fog-enabled applications requires a collaborative approach.

Proprietary or single vendor solutions slows down adoption and innovation.

An open architecture will:

- Provide a robust new platform for product development
- Increased quality and innovation through competition in the open environment
- Lead to a vibrant, growing supplier ecosystem
- Accelerate market adoption
- Lower system costs
OpenFog mission

Mission Statement: To drive industry and academic leadership in fog computing architecture, testbed development, and a variety of interoperability and composability deliverables that seamlessly leverage cloud and edge architectures to enable end-to-end IoT scenarios.
OpenFog Consortium
A growing, global ecosystem of fog experts

Founders

ARM
Dell
Microsoft
CISCO
Intel
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Contributing Members

AT&T
FOXCONN
HITACHI
SAKURA internet
ZTE

57 members strong, headquartered in 15 countries as of May 2017
OpenFog Consortium goals

Technology
Develop, Solve, Identify & Create

Innovation
Foster, Initiate, Provide & Influence

Education
Gain, Promote, Evangelize & Educate
Organizational structure

Board of Directors
Officers: President, Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary

Marketing Committee
Technical Committee
Social Impact Committee
Americas Committee
Greater China Region Committee
Japan Committee
European Committee
Affiliation Committee

Management (AMS)

Architecture Framework WG
SW Infrastructure WG
Communications WG
Security WG
Manageability WG
Liaisons WG
Testbed WG

Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Chair(s)
Japan Region Committee

- **Deputy Liaison**: Jeff Fedders
- **Tech Liaison-Seat**: Niki Agata
- **Marketing-Seat**: ABBA Lab
  - Orchestrates Marketing Activities
- **Government-Seat**: Host Annual Fog Event
  - Conduit to Local Governments
  - Conduit to Global Initiatives / Activities
- **Academic-Seat**: Represents
  - Academic / University
  - Projects
- **Innovators-Seat**: Represents
  - Innovators / Makers
- **Tech-Leads**: Lead technical agenda
  - Incl. collaboration with global team

- **Host/Fund Operational Model**
  - Assist Initiatives
  - Voice of the Regional Committee
  - Leads Committee Meetings
  - Co-Conduit to BoD
- **R-Director Chair**: Masahiro Shimohori
- **Tech-Seat**
  - Imai Toshihiro
- **Government Seat**: Osamu Ogasahara
  - Local Consortia
  - Japan IoT R&D, Standards, Ventures and Policies
- **Innovators Seat**: Innovators / Makers
- **Architecture Framework Leads**
- **SW Infrastructure Leads**
- **Communication Leads**
- **Security Leads**
- **Manageability Leads**
- **Testbed Champ**

---

**Voice of the Regional Committee**
Leads Committee Meetings
Co-Conduit to BoD

**R-Director Chair**
Host/Fund Operational Model
Assist Initiatives

**Tech-Seat**

**Tech-Leads**
Lead technical agenda
Incl. collaboration with global team

---

**Liaison to Regional Standards Bodies**

**ABBA Lab**
Niki Agata

**OpenFog**

**Japan Region Committee**

**OpenFog**

**IoT Acceleration Consortium**

**SAKURA Internet**
Osamu Ogasahara

---
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Japan Country Team: Priority Focus Areas

**Use-Cases**
- Transportation
- Industrial

**Regional Collaboration**
- Local Consortia
- Government

**Testbeds**
- Work-in-progress

- Focused use cases of regional interest
  - Car Share
  - Connected Smart Factory

- Affiliation with IoT Acceleration Consortium (more than 28,000 members) backed by METI and MIC

- Works in alignment to the OpenFog global Testbed Workgroup & Technical Committee
OpenFog Reference Architecture

www.OpenFogConsortium.org/RA
Unified framework & roadmap to help software developers and system architects create the first generation of open fog computing systems develop compute, network, storage and control technologies for the cloud-to-things continuum.

First step in creating standards to enable interoperability in IoT, 5G, Artificial Intelligence and other complex data and network intensive applications.

Creates a common language for fog computing and will help unify the edge/fog ecosystem under a single, interoperable, testable set of hardware and software standards.
Key pillars of the OpenFog architecture framework

The pillars describe requirements to every part of the fog supply chain: component manufacturers, system vendors, software providers, application developers.

- Security
  - Trust
  - Attestation
  - Privacy
- Scalability
  - Localized command, control & processing
  - Orchestration & Analytics
  - Avoidance of network taxes
- Open
  - Resource visibility & control
  - White box decision making
  - Interop & Data normalization
- Autonomy
  - Flexible
  - Cognition & agility
  - Value of data
- RAS
  - Reliability
  - Availability
  - Serviceability
- Agility
  - Tactical & strategic decision making
  - Data to wisdom
- Hierarchy
  - Fully cloud enabled
  - Computational & System
  - Autonomy at all levels
- Programmability
  - Programmable SW/HW
  - Virtualization & multi-tenant
  - App Fluidity
Architecture description with perspectives
Architecture description with perspectives

- **Software View**
  - Node Management (IB) & Software Backplane
  - Hardware Virtualization
  - Security

- **System View**
  - TSN, TCC, Comms, ...
  - FPGA, GPU, ...
  - Hardware Platform infrastructure

- **Node View**
A closer look at fog nodes

- They form a mesh to provide load balancing, resilience, fault tolerance, and minimization of cloud communication.
- They communicate laterally (peer to peer, east to west) and communicate up and down (north to south).
- Are able to discover, trust, and utilize the services of another node in order to sustain reliability-availability-serviceability.

Fog nodes in a Smart City: Buildings, neighborhoods & regions are connected to provide an infrastructure that may be optimized for service delivery.
Security Workgroup
Overview
Reference Architecture Contributions
Node Security

- **Node Security** is the basis of Fog Security
  - A **Hardware Root-of-Trust** is the foundation
  - **Physical Security** needs to be considered for all deployments
- Trusted hardware executes **immutable trusted firmware**
- Extends the **Chain-of-Trust** through instantiation of components
Network Security Aspect

- **Communications Security**
  - All communications run through TCP/UDP/IP stack
  - Node-to-Cloud
    - WS* / REST over TLS
  - Node-to-Node
    - HTTP over TLS
    - COAP over DTLS
  - Node-to-Device
    - IP Adaptation
      - WLAN/WPAN: 6LowPAN
      - PLC: PRIME IPv6 SSCS
      - Automation: CIP EtherNet/IP

- **Services Security**
  - NFV Security Appliances
  - SDN Service Provisioning
Data Security Aspect

- **Data in Use**
  - Data in memory undergoing processing
    - Encrypted Memory

- **Data at Rest**
  - Data in storage
    - Full Disk Encryption
    - File / Database Protection

- **Data in Motion/Transit**
  - Data exchanged via (virtual) interfaces
    - Communication Security
    - Content Security
A Base Set of Standardized Crypto Functions must be supported by all Fog Nodes to ensure interoperability.

- An initial base list was selected from FIPS 140-2 spec.;
- A complete list including regional standardized functions from Europe, China, Japan, ... will soon be created.

Based Set must be updated regularly.

- NIST Recommendation for Transitioning the Use of Crypto Algorithms and Key Lengths will be followed;
- Subsequent revision will include transition approaches work for regional crypto functions.

Compliance does not guarantee security!

- Crypto Functions selected for fog components should be appropriate for their use and in agreement with stakeholder’s threat assessment.

Formal Validation of Crypto Modules is left as an option to vendors.
New Work & Taskforces
Security Requirement Taskforce

Mission statement

The mission of the Security Requirement TF is to define sets of requirements that has to express the fundamental security (and in the future evaluation) requirements for an OpenFog compliant (in the future certified) node and system. As a reminder, this work shall support both brown and green field implementations.

The requirements will be split into 3 sets, each one covering a specific domain of the OpenFog architecture:

• Node Security
• Network/Communication Security
• Service Management

* We refer to a network of virtual or physical entities within the Fog.

Strategy

The strategy is define on a 2 phases basis.

1. Compliancy program: In a first phase, the group will focus on the delivery of an OF security compliancy program. A security compliancy program consists of guidelines on security functional requirements for an OF node and system to promote a good level of security.

2. Certification program: In its second phase, the group will then focus on delivering a certification program. A certification program consists of precise security functional and evaluation requirements for an OF node and system to assure a measurable level of insurance of security.
As the plan is eventually to obtain a certification program in place, the compliancy phase methodology shall be delivering content that will fully compatible for the certification phase.

The Common Criteria methodology has been identified as a viable method to build a Security Certification. Thus the following CC compatible documents will be produced in the 1st phase for each OF domain listed previously:

- **TOE: Target of evaluation**, defining the product or system that is the subject of the evaluation
- **PP: Protection Profile**, defining the following Security points:
  - Problem definition (Threats, assumption, …)
  - Objectives (ex. protected storage, comm …)
  - Functional Requirements (protecting the TOE in the context of the Problem definition to ensure Objectives)

**Deliveries and reporting**

The deliveries of the group are defined by the methodology and so consist of:

- **TOE** for the 3 domains
- **PP** for the 3 domains
- **Planning** for the Sec WG

* Dependent on reference architecture formal definition progress.
Security MVIs

- Security MVIs
  - Must be described in such that they allow for both innovation and diversity in the solutions provided by different vendors and products, both now and in the future.
  - The MVIs will trace the Security MVIs from power-on until the full system is instantiated.

- A Functional Description of Security MVIs is required
  - Requires a description of how the other system components utilize them.
  - The functional requirements need to be expressed in such a way that they are testable.

- OpenFog systems
  - The components chosen must interoperate with the rest of Fog Computing infrastructure.

- Security MVIs
  - First pass: Will describe the hardware features minimally needed in order to provide a secure base for fog nodes.
  - The Second pass: will define Security MVIs in terms of functions/services from a software perspective
Smart Objects for an OpenFog Architecture:
SW Infrastructure WG – Task Group

Jeff Sedayao, Eve M. Schooler
Intel IoTG
May, 2017
What are Smart Objects?

Why do we care about Smart Objects?

Smart Object Landscape

Smart Object Issues

Task Group Charter
What’s a Smart Object?

• Smart Object: An object that describes its own possible interactions [1]
  • Objects can be physical, e.g., sensor, computing device, wearables
  • Objects can be cyber, e.g., data, executable code, apps, services, clouds

• A Smart object’s description and metadata need to be stored and maintained somewhere

• A Smart Object Framework includes ways to describe, identify, and interact with smart objects

Q. How do you turn on a light bulb?
A. Get a description of how to interact with the light bulb and then turn it on in accordance with the description
Why do we care about Smart Objects?

- Without some form of self-description, IoT object interaction must be built into application logic
  - Code must be added for new object types
  - A problem that really exists [2]
- A Smart object approach promises a way to quickly build and maintain applications
- Commonly cited needs:
  - Data interoperability
  - Service, object, and SW composition

Reduce time and cost to develop, deploy, and maintain IoT applications

You shouldn’t have to hardcode the logic of turning on each different kind of light bulb or each different light bulb vendor
Smart Object Landscape

• Standards bodies and alliances: e.g.,

- W3C Semantic Web
- Open Connectivity Foundation
- NIST Cyberphysical Systems Initiative - Data Interoperability WG
- IETF/IAB Workshop on Semantic Interoperability
- NSF-Intel ICN-WEN program (Information Centric Networking in the Wireless Edge Network)

• Intel recent History...

- NIST Cyberphysical Systems Initiative - Data Interoperability WG
- IETF/IAB Workshop on Semantic Interoperability
- NSF-Intel ICN-WEN program
Smart Object Issues

• Frameworks:
  • Standards: So many to choose from!
  • Ontologies: Even more to choose from!
  • Interoperability: What form of interoperability (syntactic, semantics, object, etc.)?
  • How to develop distributed IoT services using metadata?

• Discoverability at scale
• Naming, Lineage and Access
• Semantic Interoperability – does setting a light bulb to “on” give you usable light?
  • Maybe not if lumens output is set really low
  • Maybe if light bulb only has two output levels – off or some set amount of lumens

• Security

Q. Can you turn on a light bulb?
A. Maybe:
  • if you use the right standard and
  • if you use the right ontology
  • or if you have a bridge to another framework and semantics match
  • If you can discover the light bulb
  • If you can address the light bulb
  • If you have permission
Charter

• Assess the Smart Objects landscape and contribute to a living survey
  • Highlight the most relevant models and frameworks
  • Identify commonalities, taxonomies, gaps

• Capture minimal/optimal requirements for Fog-inspired use cases
  • Object framework (e.g., discoverability, bridging, registries)
  • Fog formation
  • Work orchestration
  • Data economy

• Build tools and demonstrate viability of Smart Objects approach
  • POC(s) implemented (on OpenFog testbed)
  • Open Source

Identify, coordinate with, influence, extend, and drive relevant standards
Transaction Management & Orchestration Principles

Katalin KB Walcott – Principal Engineer, Intel IoTG
Intel Fog SW Architecture Technical Lead
katalin.kb.Walcott@intel.com
Logical Transaction Layers – concept

Fog Platform Infrastructure – Shared Resources

Intel Corporation – Concept Recommendation
What is a Transaction?

Contract Management of Transaction based Agreements

<Service name> will be available <#%> of time during <hrs> of operation during <hrs> and <days> of the week.

- Individual service outage in excess of <time period> or <sum> of outages exceeding <time period> will constitute violation

<#%> of <service name> transactions will exhibit <#seconds> or less response time, defined as the interval from the time the user sends a transaction to the time a visual confirmation of transaction completion is received.

- Missing the metrics for business transactions measured over any business week will result in a violation.

Example: Transaction Response Time for Promised Service Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Elements:</th>
<th>Management Elements:</th>
<th>Metrics to Monitor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Include the specifics of services provided:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conditions of service availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Standards such as time windows for each level of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Responsibilities of each party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Escalation procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost/service tradeoffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include the definitions of measurements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Standards,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reporting process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SLA breaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitoring schemas may include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service availability – amount of time the service is available for use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Usability – timeliness, transaction completion, latency, refresh rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delivery - Performance , Availability, Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Defect rates – percentages of errors in major deliverable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical quality – measurement of quality in delivery (time, response rate etc...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security/Trustworthiness -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transaction Level Management Elements

Delivery Model
- MINUTES
- MINUTES
- HOURS
- HOURS
- SECONDS
- MINUTES
- MINUTES

Scheduling & Orchestration Layer
- TLA
- TLO
- TLO

Logical Landscape
- FOG
  - Composition & Assembly Layer
  - Datacenter
    - COMPUTE
      - TLS
    - STORAGE
    - NETWORK
- Edge

Atomic Resource & Allocation Layer
- CPU
- RAM
- NIC
- DISK
- POWER
- FAN
- CNTRL
- IOT

Intel Corporation – Concept Recommendation
Resource, Data, Object Transaction Management

Data Center Cloud

Fog

Edge Local Micro

• Resource, Data, Object Transaction Management

ORCHESTRATION

Transaction

Transaction

Composition

Microservice

Distribution

Microservice

Fog Infrastructure

Software

Fog Platform

Hardware

Network

Sensors

• Datacenter Transaction Management, Federation and ORCHESTRATION

ORCHESTRATION

• Placement flow analysis
• Placement metadata
• Object Management

• Microservice Composition
• Fog microservice dynamic placement & optimization

• Real-time Asset/Resource & Capacity Management
• Reputation Services
• Service Domain Management (Zones)

• Fog Asset Characterization

• Predictive service fulfillment models
• Workload service optimization (shadow provisioning techniques; brokering)
• Standardized interfaces and metrics

Intel Corporation – Concept Recommendation
Moving forward...
OpenFog Priorities (2017-2018)

Plan of Attack (2017 Focus)

- Interface standardization with an SDO
- Open Reference Implementation (Q1’18)
- Iterate and Refine the OpenFog Reference Architecture
  - Market Acceleration via Testbeds
  - Certification & Interoperability Fogfests
- University & Industry Research
- Technical Liaisons

Technological Focus:
- Communications WG
- SW-Infra WG
- Architecture WG
- Manageability WG
- Security WG
- Testbed WG

Regional Focus:
- Americas Regional Committee
- Greater China Regional Committee
- Japan Regional Committee

New Specifications (APIs)

Regional Use Cases:
- Americas Regional Committee
- Japan Regional Committee