

DeiC HPC-Forum

Meeting 2022-6

24/11/2022 @ 09.30 – 11.30

Zoom: <https://deic.zoom.us/j/2909030409>

Invited members and support:

- Members, present: Hans Jørgen Aagaard (SDU, Chairperson), Claudio Pica (SDU), Dan Ariel Søndergaard (AU), Erik Dam (KU), Kåre Lehmann, Nielsen (AAU), Lars Nondal (CBS), Lars Sørensen (AAU), Piotr Chmura (KU), Svend Karlson (DTU), Søren Besenbacher (AU), Thomas Schrøder (RUC)
- Members, absent (announced): Carsten Sørensen (CBS), Martin Amüller, Thomas Bligaard (DTU)
- Members, absent (not announced): -
- Support: Eske Christiansen (DeiC), Adam Stahl (DeiC, referent)

Guests:

- ...
- ...

Minutes from last meeting (2022-5) added to meeting invitation.

Minutes by: Adam Stahl

Item	Issue	Comments Actions
1	<p>Information and approval of minutes from last meeting</p> <p>Approval:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">A. Minutes from meeting 2022-5 (written comments/or important changes must be submitted directly to Adam Stahl and Hans Jørgen).</p> <p>Information items:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">A. DeiC-DST focus areas 2023 (Eske)</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">B. LUMI-G (Claudio)</p>	<p>→</p> <p>A: Minutes Approved</p> <p>→</p> <p>A:</p> <p>DeiC is working on a new contract with DST. The goal is to make it possible to work with DST data to on Danish HPC facilities. The plan is that DST will define one common API all HPC facilities used.</p> <p>The API is about moving data into HPC and to monitor it. DeiC will do a couple of tests to integrate the DST data transfer to Danish HPC machines. It will also be investigated what ISO certification this should have.</p> <p>Later in the process KOR will be working on a CO-KEY for linking datasets. Especially when data is anonymized to and from different sources.</p> <p>There will be a need to figure out what and how DST want to monitor data. For instance, through sample controls, and come up with a model.</p> <p>Another challenge will be how do we get to use data instead of just move it. For now, the API will be limited to data movement.</p> <p>Data Management Agreements is not a part of the contract negotiations for now.</p> <p>White papers and used cases will be presented during the year 2023.</p>

		<p>The solution will solely be for data transferring DST data to HPC facilities, not handing over the data, and the researchers will still be data responsible.</p> <p>It would therefore be good to have a general agreement between the Universities and the HPC facilities.</p> <p>Danske Universiteter is looking into a general agreement for all universities to make an agreement between the universities and the facilities.</p> <p>The Topic is High Priority.</p> <p>B: LUMI_G</p> <p>The Acceptance for LUMI-G should be finished by the end of the month. After that pilot users will start testing the system, and then there will be general access around medio December 2022 or January 2023.</p> <p>Most problems on the hardware and software level should be solved by now. It does however look like there is Slurm problem that need to be solved.</p> <p>Pilot access is scheduled to four weeks and will be done parallel with the general access.</p> <p>It is unlikely that researchers will have access before January 2023.</p> <p>Eske will investigate whether it is possible, that the HPC can get the same information as the DeiC board about ongoing HPC activities relating to the work of HPC Forum. Eventually this can be written into the new HPC Forum commission paper.</p>
2	<p>On the recommendation for investment in interactive HPC with GPUs. Response to the outcome on this matter at the DeiC board meeting Oct. 2022, minutes for this point attached and sent to HPC Forum Friday 21. Oct. 2022 It should be explained to the board what the GPU need of the end users is which cannot be fulfilled by LUMI-G and why.</p>	<p>→ The survey in the spring concluded that the universities are asking for Interactive HPC with GPU's. After the board have made their decision about in investing in half the amount of GPU's as recommended, it is unclear whether the board fully understood the concerns from HPC Forum.</p>

		Therefore, the paper will be rephrased and send out for approval by mail. And then it will be sent to the new board as a reminder. Hans Jørgen will hand it over to the new HPC Forum chairman.
3	<p>Discussion of the grant system for Type 1 interactive HPC Should it for example be modified to 70-75% resources are allocated by universities (now 50%) and 25-30% by the national peer reviewed process.</p>	<p>→ Hans Jørgen had talked with the Chairman of the e-resource committee Frank Jensen. Frank Jensen says that from the committees' point of view; if there are no applications then there is no interest.</p> <p>Maybe the committee can/should investigate how to shape the process for entry level applicants.</p> <p>If DeiC want researchers to start writing more applications for national resources, then maybe they should be suggested a simpler process for entry level users (for instance on T1).</p> <p>This work should be done in the e-resource committee. HPC Forum will not look further into it for now.</p>
4	<p>Discussion of the structure with front offices and back offices Initial discussion of the FO/BO split and whether HPC Forum should propose a new model for the FO/BO split</p>	<p>→ The FO are encouraged to seek help from each other. For instance, some FOs have a lot of experience in helping Ph.D.'s which other FO could benefit from.</p>
5	<p>Discussion of KPIs and other indicators At the HPC Forum meeting 28/09/22 it was decided that this discussion should be divided into three topics: 1. Pure KPIs for centers to deliver on (in future contracts). 2. Indicators with information about whether the HPC resources are used/searched for. 3. Are the resources well used from the universities point of view - How much value do they get for the money.</p>	<p>→ First, it should be clarified what are meant with each KPI. A clear definition is needed.</p> <p>Second there should be a threshold for each KPI to know, when the facilities are delivering sufficiently.</p> <p>Third KPI's need to be something that the facilities have influence on. And the facilities should be consulted about what are realistic levels of performance to expect.</p> <p>Forth the KPI's should be approximately the same for each consortium.</p> <p>Fifth It should make usure that we can get data on the KPI's defined. For instance, "time handling tickets" assume you have a ticket</p>

		<p>system, and not all facilities have that.</p> <p>A user survey yearly is great, but one need to keep in mind, that only half of answers has to do with the service providers. For instance, if you have slow internet connection at your home office, it can influence your experience and satisfaction with the HPC services. User satisfaction is also a KPI on LUMI.</p> <p>If the KPI's should be written into contracts, the matter is not urgent now, as DeiC are waiting for a new government, and will prioritize the contract negotiation for Data Management services and for the research network before looking into HPC contracts.</p> <p>The presented list of KPI's will not be send to the board now, but should instead be discussed with the facilities, so the list is based on what is possible</p>
6	AOB.	<p>→</p> <p>The Chairman thanked for the year and announced that he will step down.</p> <p>The Forum thanked him for his work during the years.</p> <p>The Leonardo Pre-exascale in Italy is going online very soon and are applying for pilot projects.</p> <p>A video presentation of the Cotainr solution will be send out tomorrow.</p>

Contacts:

- Eske Hjalmer Bergishagen Christiansen (DeiC HPC Director), eske.christiansen@deic.dk, +45 9351 0048.
- Hans Jørgen Aagaard Jensen (HPC-Forum Chairman), hjj@sdu.dk