Agenda topics

**UPDATE ON ICS CLUSTERS & HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING WORKING GROUP**

Adri reported that he has become a member of the HPC working group and provided an update on the current status of the phased transition from Lion Clusters to ICS. Current status and rough schedule:

- Lion Clusters: first cluster is shut down, a second cluster will be shut down in Fall 2016, and the final cluster is expected to be shut down in early 2017.
- ICS Clusters: Phase 1 is up and running, Phase 2 is expected to be up and running soon; Phase 3 purchases/planning still in discussion.
- Prior to making Phase 3 purchasing/planning decisions the HPC committee will send out a Survey soon to the faculty/stakeholders. They expect to use the survey results to guide the Phase 3 purchases, so they are hoping for a strong response to the survey.
- Current Phase 1 cost: $11.00/core month. This is still very high in his opinion. Expected Phase 2 cost: similar; Expected Phase 3 cost: ~$7.00/core month, which will start to make rates competitive with buying/maintaining own hardware.
- Service model of ICS discussed, Adri stated he would prefer to see more flexibility in the levels of customer service offered to faculty, with a resulting decrease in cost for those who prefer to work with a reduced level of support. This issue will be addressed in the upcoming Survey.
- The question of ICS co-hosting equipment was discussed and Adri has found that ICS is willing to discuss this possibility. As an example, the ICS and data center staff have been communicating - in a very positive way - with various faculty from MNE, ChemEng, Chemistry and Physics regarding a faculty-owned cluster (a.k.a. the NCISSE cluster) - which will probably be purchased this semester through ChemEng.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Adri addressed the importance of everyone replying to the HPC Survey that will be distributed soon.

**ACTION for RCC members:** be proactive in your departments, either at department meetings or directly with colleagues encouraging everyone to respond to the survey.

**CHARGE TO THIS COMMITTEE**

As requested by this committee at the meeting in January 2016, Dean Atchley drafted a charge to the committee and now asks for feedback from all so that the charge can be revised and finalized.

Draft charge follows:

The purpose of the College of Engineering Research Computing Committee (COERCC) is to:
- bring matters of importance to the research computing community to the College leadership via the Associate Dean for Research and Innovation to ensure that the College's research computing environment is effective, efficient and secure,
- provide information to and solicit information from the faculty regarding research computing
- provide guidance to the College’s representatives to University-level research computing organizations and committees,
- assist College leadership with strategic planning for the research computing environment and the implementation of that plan, and
- advise the College's Director of Information Technology on policies that impact the research computing environment,

The COERCC should develop a governance plan to include a leadership structure, selection of membership, terms of office, etc.

Discussion followed and Dean Atchley suggested that in considering the charge, committee members ask themselves “What are the actions needed after these meetings?” If this is a mechanism to communicate with the rest of the faculty about the issues, to collect feedback, and to report the needs of the faculty to the Senior Leadership, then how can that be most effectively accomplished?

- Open meetings of the COERCC, perhaps on a semester or annual basis, where all faculty are invited to come and participate.
- What methods of reporting and gathering information can be employed?
  - Surveys
  - Distribution of minutes
  - Committee members reporting at Department meetings
- Solid representation of all COE departments on the committee. The current make-up of the committee is representative of all of the departments plus IT and an ex officio member. The Associate Dean for Research is involved but not necessarily a regular participant.
- What are the areas that this committee could discuss and impact?
  - Proposal reviews?
  - Funding?
  - Identifying faculty who might benefit but may not have an understanding of HPC and how it could help them?
  - Broader definition of ‘research computing” and how there may be other possibilities of ‘shared resources’ that could increase available resources for faculty.
- Leadership structure; membership guidelines
  - Committee Chair? Responsibilities and length of term
  - Committee Members? Responsibilities and length of term, department affiliation,
  - Frequency of meetings

**CONCLUSIONS**

**ACTION:** Committee members are asked to review and think about the draft charge and send edits, additions, deletions, and any other comments to Susie for consideration by all April 15.

**ACTION:** Committee members can help to identify others who may be interested in attending and contributing to COERCC committee meetings. All would be welcome.