

**MINUTES
LOUISIANA OPTICAL NETWORK INITIATIVE
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

October 13, 2015

The Louisiana Optical Network Initiative (LONI) Management Council (MC) met at 1:05 p.m., Tuesday, October 13, 2015, in the Board Conference Room, 6st Floor, Claiborne Building, Baton Rouge, LA. Dr. Michael Stubblefield asked for a roll call. A roll call was taken and a quorum was established. Dr. Stubblefield welcomed everyone.

Council Members Present:

Mike Asoodeh
Stephen Beck for Ram Ramanujam
Beth Courtney
Gene Fields
Richard Howze
Lonnie Leger
Charlie McMahan
Ramgopal Mettu *via telephone*
Tony Moore
Bettina Owens
Ramu Ramachandran
Eric Setz
Michael Stubblefield
Greg Trahan
Rachel Vincent-Finley

Council Members Absent:

Barbara Goodson for Commissioner of H.E.
Thomas Lovince
Brian Nichols

Guests:

Leo Tran
Hunter Ely, Tulane Security
Charles Broome, UL Lafayette
Jan Waguespack, AT&T
Walt Orgar, DELL
Sam White, LSU
Frank Scroggs, Dell
Honggao Liu, LSU
Angela Mastainich, BoR
Tim Magner, LSUHSC-Shreveport *via telephone*

APPROVAL OF JULY 14, 2015 MINUTES

Dr. Michael Stubblefield asked for a motion to approve the July minutes.

On a motion from Mr. McMahon, seconded by Mr. Fields, the LONI Management Council voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the July 14, 2015 LONI Management Council meeting.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Stubblefield stated he wanted to begin with the Business piece first and recognized Mr. Trahan. Mr. Trahan stated that since the last meeting he has had discussions about making sure LONI has everything to satisfy the research needs and in this process has found it is missing ongoing proper storage. There will be some long-term storage solutions put into place, this is a technical element, so this will not preclude us from getting our message out and continue productive conversations. Dr. Stubblefield stated that now in our transition to a new administration this provides us new goals as we move forward.

Dr. Stubblefield asked for a point of privilege to review the Meeting Dates for 2016. Mr. McMahon asked if anyone had checked to see if these dates conflict with any higher education meetings, such as, Educause or Internet2? That will be checked into and if there is a conflict, we will come back and revised the dates. Mr. McMahon moved approval, seconded by Dr. Ramachandran, with no objection, motion passed. Mr. Leger will check for conflicts with the dates and report back to the Council.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATES

Mr. Leger began by thanking everyone for their continued efforts to increase the capacity and efficiency of the Network. He stated that everyone working together provides a better tool, not only for higher education, but for the State's constituency as a whole.

Mr. Leger recognized Dr. Ramachandran to go over his report from the Allocations Committee and recommendations, before he goes over some technical reporting and his Work Plan. Dr. Ramachandran directed everyone to his handout "Summary of LONI Resource Allocation: Recent History and Disciplinary Breakdown". He stated that the Council had asked him to provide an overview of the work of the allocation and this document shows data that goes back to the First Quarter of 2012. He went over the information and explained each graph. He directed the Council to the "LONI Resource Allocation Committee (LRAC)", suggesting that since LONI's structure has changed since the original six campuses, it may be time to review the make-up of the committee. He further stated that a problem with a large committee is that decision making also gets more complicated. Mr. Leger thanked all the members that have participated and acknowledged that they have reviewed the requests and on LONI's behalf have made appropriate use of the LONI resources. He further stated he would like for the

Allocations Committee to be more reflective of the structure of the Council in the number of representatives and hopefully a broader adoption of the internal use of the computer. Mr. McMahon stated that the original resource allocation committee was large and there was a small resource allocation process. The small allocation process was that each of the original six schools received an allocation and they administered their allocation locally. He asked if that was still the process. Dr. Ramachandran stated that there is a so-called “start-up allocation” and each campus makes their own decisions, 50,000 SUs (service units) or less. Mr. McMahon stated he would like to preserve that process, so that allocations can be handled internally by campuses. Dr. Ramachandran agreed with Mr. McMahon and stated that the small allocations, 50,000 SUs, should be available quickly and with fairly low barrier, not wait for a quarterly allocation deadline. At the same time, if a request comes in, who should make a decision, expanding the make-up may help. Mr. Leger stated that we need more representatives to help facilitate the smaller requests as LONI gets wider and deeper utilization. He anticipates a demand that allows for a better and broader interface to the allocations. He agreed with Mr. McMahon that LONI has enough SUs, as depicted in the graph, to allow a local team to formulate how to best use the system for their research purposes on the small allocation requests. Dr. Asoodeh pointed out that LaTech, ULL and UNO (that was previously not part of ULS) on the LONI Management Council, so in his opinion, Southeastern does not have representation and he would like to nominate himself to the Allocation Committee. He stated that when we have availability higher than requests, something needs to be done. Mr. Leger agreed and stated that this is an opportunity to do some forming, areas that might not have representation, he would like to see more. The Allocation Committee is a working group and it takes effort on their part to review requests and have some responsiveness. He recommends that the Allocation Committee have the equivalent representation of the make-up of the Management Council. He realizes that this may mean more responsibility for the Chair or Vice Chair. He suggested two per system, including Tulane and Xavier. Mr. McMahon asked for a specific recommendation. Mr. Leger stated he would like for the Allocation Committee, in membership, to model the membership of the Council. This would also include someone from LPB and LCTCS. Ms. Owens asked about LSU Health Sciences, she thinks they are a separate entity from LSU. Mr. Leger stated that as far as the Council, they are part of the LSU System. He further stated that we maintain the two (2) representatives from each system, moving forward, and with the continued growth, we will add more. Mr. McMahon added for clarification, two representatives from each system, LSU, SU, UL, Privates, LCTCS, and one from LPB. Dr. Ramachandran added that UNO’s move from LSU to UL now gives UL three representatives. Mr. Leger stated this will have to be worked out by the Chair. Mr. Trahan questioned Dr. Ramachandran about the delta between the orange and the blue on the QB2 available on the “Summary of LONI Resource Allocation”. Dr. Ramachandran

stated that the allocations are done each quarter, but each allocation is valid for a year. Mr. Trahan understood that it is a rolling availability. He wanted clarification on how the process for “start-up request” and their management differed from requests from LSU or Tulane. Second, if we receive from industry or additional government request, he thinks we will need a mechanism to manage those requests. Third, if we are successful in getting additional requests, will we need triage if the Total and Available Allocations become equal, would we be in a position to have to turn down a request from a school? He thinks we may need to have a process in place for the sake of fairness. Dr. Ramachandran stated that usually supply has an effect on demand or vice versa. He further stated that he agrees with Mr. McMahan, that for the people that want to access the system, let us start those smaller requests at a university level. Mr. McMahan stated that what we are doing with this large allocation process is mirroring what was done in the old terragrid days is currently done at XSEDE (Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment), and that is one of the things that we want to instill, process wise, just like the discussions getting people prepared locally with a light process. By the time we move to this darker process, we come closer to what is expected from XSEDE. In making these architectural decisions, we have lined up closely with what’s going on at TACC. What we see is the ability to take on a progression, so LSU has some machines that are LSU owned, Tulane has an LSU owned machine, the progression is that when we outgrow a machine, we move into the LONI space, when we outgrow the LONI space, we move into the XSEDE space. Mr. McMahan further stated that he thinks that one of the ways we mitigate absolute full consumption of the machines and we still make room for our researchers, because when they are successful enough to be consuming that many cycles, we encourage them and help them move into the national footprint. He thinks our strategy hangs together from bottom to top. Mr. Trahan asked Dr. Ramachandran who monitors the requests. Dr. Ramachandran stated he keeps up with the quarterly requests and Le Yan provides a report of cycles available, cycles that are allocated, so far, and every quarter he collects those reports. Mr. McMahan further stated that the people administering the machine have an accounting system, he has an allocation whenever he runs a job it decrements his allocation, so they can count for usage compared to the approved amounts. Dr. Ramachandran said they have rarely, almost never turn down a request because there are so many cycles available. Occasionally, someone will come up with a million SU request, but they already have 1.5 million allocated that is valid for the rest of the year and they have used only 2%. In that case, he will tell them they don’t need an addition million. Ms. Courtney asked Dr. Ramachandran why the 3rd quarter usage always goes down? He stated he did not know. Some commented that it may have to do with the startup of the Fall Semester, Grad students are gone, and most big users make their requests early. Mr. McMahan stated that once the allocations are made, someone has to manage the priorities on the machine. If all allocations tried to

execute at once, we would have more demand than we could handle. That process is not managed through the committee it is managed through the System Administrators running the machine. There are rules in place, fair use rules that keep users from dominating the machine. Quite frequently, researchers get together when someone states that they need to bump another because of a specific reason. Dr. Ramachandran stated that there are rules built into the queuing system. Someone could submit 10+ calculations all at once, but only about 5 of them would run. Dr. Stubblefield asked if there is one page that list the allocations. Dr. Ramachandran stated there is a document that has the policies for the Allocations Committee, but that is not the queuing system policy. Dr. Stubblefield asked to go back to the make-up of the Committee. Is it suggested that it be composed of at least 2 members from each of the college systems, Mr. Leger said “yes”. Then, Dr. Stubblefield said an additional representative from LPB and Economic Development, Mr. Leger said “yes”. Dr. Stubblefield asked if they would be the ones to approve the small allocations, from the schools in their system. An example, UNO is not on there, so a representative from the University of Louisiana System would make the recommendation for UNO. That was confirmed. Dr. Stubblefield asked if all of this information is included in the motion, it was confirmed it is all in the motion. Tim Magner, via teleconferencing, asked if the Committee make-up that is proposed, balances out from a usage and general allocation perspective? Dr. Ramachandran stated that the 3 big users are LSU, Tulane, and LaTech, probably due to the number of computational researchers at those campuses. Mr. McMahon stated that he has no problem with representation from a system or school that is not as intensive as Tulane is, having an equal vote. He stated that this is a very collegial group. Dr. Ramachandran stated there is no favoritism for any system. Mr. Owens stated we are always trying to encourage people to use the LONI. Dr. Stephen Beck stated that from LSUs perspective, that is exactly the view, by having other entities involved only encourages them to be more involved. Mr. McMahon stated that the users are what help us sustain our funding. Mr. Trahan asked Mr. McMahon about the light process that had been mentioned. He asked if that means if someone at Grambling made a request, they now have a mechanism that he can use for his request. Dr. Ramachandran stated that in the current structure which was dictated by physically located hardware on campuses, so campuses that did not have the hardware, when they make a request for 50,000 or less, technically it is Mr. Leger or his designee that makes that decision. Anything above 50,000 requires a proposal and can only be submitted once a quarter. Dr. Ramachandran further stated that a request for 50,000 or less should be authorized quickly, within 2 days. Mr. Trahan stated that a 50,000 allocation, plus a light process, is a real product to approach industry with using computational capability. Dr. Ramachandran stated it can be done by submitting a request on the web page and they receive a ping that a proposal is waiting. Dr. Stubblefield asked if we want each system to recommend a representative to the committee for approval. Dr. Asoodeh

stated that this process may provide an opportunity to consider term limits and rotation. Mr. Leger this would provide a governance structure. Dr. Ramachandran asked Mr. Leger if the By-Laws/Rules that the Committee uses could be sent electronically to the members. Mr. Leger stated that they could be sent.

Dr. Stubblefield stated the motion is to have the Working Committee for the Allocations Committee to be represented by a minimum of at least 2 members from each System, plus a representative from LPB and Economic Development, to mirror the composition and structure of the LONI Management Council. Mr. Magner asked if each system is limited to 2 votes, Mr. Leger said “no, that it is a representative lead committee, so the representatives determine the governance of how they are structured, for example, their rotation and the number of officers who are serving, we advocate and allow them to determine the process.” Dr. Stubblefield moved that the Allocations Committee minimally be representative of the LONI Management Council with each System having the opportunity to appoint as many as they so choose, seconded by Ms. Courtney, Dr. Stubblefield further added that we encourage that the Systems to go through a process of looking at their representatives leadership abilities, with no objection, motion passed.

Mr. Leger recognized Mr. Gene Fields for the LONI Security Working Group report. Mr. Fields introduce Mr. Charles Broome, Chief Security Officer, from UL Lafayette and Mr. Hunter Ely, Chief Security Officer, from Tulane to share some of the work they have been doing. Mr. Ely and Mr. Broome went over the “Recommendations to the LONI Management Council regarding Security Services” provided to the Council. Mr. Leger stated there is one motion he would like for the Council to consider, that is, “how to use the area buying power of the LONI Network to facilitate these additional security services”. He stated that we can leverage our collective buying power to go after these services and facilitate them on your behalf. That will constitute an obligation on our part and your part, as well. For us, in the operation side, he is looking for a motion to help empower them to go ahead and do that on our behalf and come back to the Security Working Group that is representative of each of the institutions. Motion made by Mr. Fields to go forward with Mr. Leger’s recommendations, seconded by Dr. Ramachandran, with no objection, the motion passed. Mr. Leger commended the Security Working Group on their work and stated that looking at some of the universities that have been hit this year, Rutgers, Penn State, and Harvard, universities are becoming more of a target of malicious activity to take down a university, more so than the financial sector. The good news is that if we spread out the cost to the LONI membership of participating schools and partners, we are talking about \$2 per megabit cost, across the board statewide to cover every computing node. Mr. McMahon stated that the Security Working Group has put a lot of time and energy in, but it is a very small number of people, he encouraged the Council Members to have someone from their organization, even if they don’t have a “CI / SO” title,

to actively participate. This could be someone from their network group, anyone because each system will be better off for having participated with this team to learn what the issues are and what the threats are. Dr. Stubblefield asked that a request be made to each school as it relates to security issues, to have a dedicated person assigned to the group. Mr. Leger discussed the WORKING PLAN.

Mr. Fields made a request for exploring some type of outer band notification for outages that was mentioned by Mr. Broome and Mr. Ely in their report. He would like to know what type of mechanism it would take to put that in place and report back at the next Management Council meeting. If it has a reasonable cost then we could all benefit from the visibility that is the key to mitigate those threats. Mr. Leger said he would work with the Security Working Group on this request. Mr. Ely stated that Mr. McMahan had mentioned that when someone is having problems and can't get out of it long enough to see what is going on, the quicker we can surface those things, the quicker he and Mr. Broome can get together with the Security Working Group and assist those groups. That is where they see one of the biggest risk. He agrees with Mr. Fields, that it is probably very reasonable in cost and good for the community to have someone they can come to even if they do not have a security professional on staff. Mr. Ely considers this a top priority. Mr. McMahan stated that there are mechanisms, such as, emergency notification in all schools, so it could be as simple as going the LSU and ask that 50 to 100 people be put in a text notification. Or, going to a school and saying we want a conference bridge that can be set up for people get on and talk. We don't have to build a separate network. Mr. Leger agreed with Mr. McMahan and complimented the Security Working Group for their work. Mr. Fields stated that the Security Working Group is a real asset for LONI and they are some of the best he has seen. Ms. Courtney asked if we have a grasp on the location and number of outages, Mr. Leger stated we do, through our ticketing system. She requested that all the Council be able to see a report. Some members requested a monthly report.

Network Update

Mr. Leger began his Executive Director's Report and went over the 2016 Work Plan. He stated that LONI has developed a forum through our meetings that everyone trust and is able to speak frankly, secondly, we advocate for research and education statewide and in our national contexts, thirdly, we collaborate with the Board of Regents staff, with our members, and we develop our plans for the upcoming year. He then went over replacing the AT&T dark fiber and went over the priority of the routes. We have seven priority routes, six of which are funded by Capital Outlay. He went over ongoing and upcoming projects and their collaboration with OTS Network Service relative to joining state buildings. He went over the Internet Fees and hopes to keep reducing the cost and continuing to bring in services that the membership finds of value. He stated that this is a working plan, it will probably modify

from quarter to quarter as we meet, he will provide updates and schedules, where we had to shift, and where we've been successful. He welcomes any questions, but he would like to have it fine tuned by the January meeting to have a motion to accept the report and the direction he is going, and concurrence.

HPC Update

Mr. Leger stated the two biggest items on HPC Update are that Mr. White was able to acquire licensing and installing Gaussian on QB2. They are working with the Board of Regents' staff to fund the ongoing maintenance support, as required. His goal is to get an appliance out to as many institutions as possible and possibly inside the institutions, that would help their participation. As the datasets get larger, their need for computation more interactive and timely, for us to be able to transmit at a well-defined speed, close to 40 gigabits area, this will be a goal for HPC and LONI this year. Mr. McMahon mentioned Larry Smarr at California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology, has some appliances with data transfer nodes that are very reasonably priced. He asked if we would be looking at something like that or something else. Mr. Leger responded, it is too early to say. Mr. Smarr's project is a NSF grant and the availability of that may not coincide with our schedule and can we operationalize it. Mr. McMahon stated he is aware of the grant Mr. Leger mentioned, but the data transfer node is a tool they are going to use in the grant, but that is not a part of the grant. Mr. Leger stated that the issue is the transmission, first is buying the appliance, second how to use it and can we use it in the context that we need to use it for.

Ms. Courtney asked about briefing the new administration that will be coming in office soon. Will the Board of Regents take the lead to inform them about LONI? She thinks we all need briefing, because some groups she is involved with have been briefing potential candidates and we have a lot of information and we should think about the appropriate way of doing that. Dr. Stubblefield stated that the Board of Regents has been meeting with all system presidents to create a mission statement with goals to present to the new administration. Ms. Courtney said she would like to see those and she is willing to do whatever is appropriate, as needed. Mr. Leger stated that Ms. Goodson is very detailed oriented and has been conveying the message. She was involved with the budget hearings and Lonnie was able to communicate our direction for the next year to the Commissioner, Chairman, and the Board Members. Mr. Courtney has concerns about a new administration, two special sessions, and everything happening, this is a great time for us to give good information. She thinks we need to impress upon them LONI as an asset. She suggested that if we could give her information on some collaborations that are going on that she can highlight, that would be great. She asked about the six projects that were funded in Capital Outlay, but what about the seventh? Mr. Leger stated that the seventh was Capital Outlay, but it was done differently than the others. The six have projects numbers from Facility Planning and Control. The

seventh project doesn't, it was part of a Capital Outlay initiative that was part of Pennington, that we were able to justify and utilize. We actually have the dollars, it is already at LSU to be used. It has a different governance and it is a Capital Outlay, but not in the way the first six were done.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Stubblefield asked if there was any additional business to come before the Council, there was no response.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before LONI Management Council, Dr. Stubblefield asked for a motion for adjournment. On a motion by Dr. Stephen Beck, seconded by Ms. Courtney, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.