**OFA XWG Meeting**

**June 13, 2019**

**10am Pacific Time**

* Roll Call:

Board Members:

 **At-Large / Harold Cook**

Broadcom / Eddie Wai

**Cray/Paul Grun**

**HPE / John Byrne**

Huawei / Daqi Ren

IBM / Bernard Metzler

**Intel / Divya Kolar**

Jump Trading / Christoph Lameter

**LLNL / Matt Leininger**

Mellanox / Gilad Shainer

NetApp / David Dale

Oak Ridge / Scott Atchley

**Red Hat / Doug Ledford**

**Sandia / Mike Aguilar**

Others:

 **OFA/Jim Ryan**

 **Intel/Bob Woodruff**

* Opens, Agenda Bashing
	+ Next Board meeting (6/20/19)
		1. OFA’s stance w.r.t. EAR and the Entity List. A voteable motion will be presented.
		2. Officer elections
* Approve minutes from 06/06/19
* A motion to approved the minutes from 6 June was made by Doug Ledford (Red Hat). A second to the motion was made by John Byrne (HPE).
* Interop Program Funding, Membership levels
* OFA committed to a breakeven budget in FY ‘20
	+ Lower cost alternative to UNH-IOL (currently $180k)
		- Investigate alternate vendors, e.g. NMC
	+ Expect to lose two current Promoters due to acquisitions while assuming no further attrition. Further, we would assume that we can gain 5 new members at the Quality Program level
	+ Early work suggests we can fund the OFA at breakeven, including the new interop program by:
		- Increasing Promoter dues to $15,000
			* Includes access to the testing program in addition to current Promoter privileges
		- Create a new “Quality Program” membership level
			* dues are $10,000
		- Merge Adopters and Supporters into one class
			* dues are $3,000
			* access to testing services on a limited, pay-to-play basis
* Intertwined in the budget are questions about Interop program funding
	+ Is it worthwhile?
	+ If yes, how is it funded?
* This slide deck proposes a funding model that:
	+ Delivers a high value interop program
	+ Puts us on a sustainable, break even footing
* Current program is focused on validating interoperability between various h/w vendors
* The program was valued by a small (but shrinking) number of subscribers
* It simply doesn’t deliver major value to the industry
	+ No connection to the open source community,
	+ Relies on the OFED distribution
		- versus widely adopted commercial distributions,
	+ Industry consolidation has shrunk the subscriber base
* This is spring, we cancelled our contract with UNH-due to shrinking participation that created unsustainable costs for the OFA.
* Leading up to this year’s workshop, a small project team began developing an updated interop program
	+ A key issue is funding for the proposed updated program
	+ Key objective – deliver greater value
		- Industry value: directly support upstream kernel release cycle
		- Consumer value: based on familiar Linux distributions
		- Vendor and distro value: deliver responsive ‘on-demand’ testing
	+ The proposal was tested at this year’s workshop and a full proposal is coming to the Board soon for its approval
	+ Two major elements to the program:
		- Pre-release integration testing
			* driven by kernel release cycles
		- On-demand testing for distros and h/w vendors
			* with an option to continue the Logo program if desired
	+ Key issue is funding. Two scenarios are under investigation
		- **“Shared cost model”** : program fees are built into Alliance membership dues
			* argument in favor – the new program delivers significant benefits to the industry as a whole and to Alliance members, even if those members aren’t directly testing hardware. It is a major service being provided to the industry by the OFA
			* argument in favor – delivers on the OFA mission statement and couples us more closely to the Linux open source community
			* argument against – why should a member who is not a participant in the program support it?
		- **“Subscription model”** : program is supported solely by its subscribers (today’s model)
			* argument in favor – cost should be borne by those who directly benefit
			* argument against – this model tends to ‘balkanize’ testing as a separate side activity of the OFA
* Invitation to join “Consortia Letter to Sec Ross re; Entity List”---**We are going to decline to sign on to this letter.**

*June [\_\_], 2019*

*The Honorable Wilbur L. Ross*

*Secretary of Commerce*

*U.S. Department of Commerce*

*1401 Constitution Ave. NW*

*Washington, DC 20230*

*RE: Request for clarification from developers of standards and industry specifications*

*concerning the addition of Huawei and its affiliates to the Entity List*

*Dear Secretary Ross:*

*The undersigned represent a sample of the many hundreds of U.S.-based technology consortia*

*that today create the majority of standards and technical specifications that shape global*

*technology ecosystems. The May 16, 2019 order adding Huawei and its affiliates to the Entity*

*List has created a serious problem of uncertainty for standards-setting consortia, causing harm*

*to the consortia system and the many major U.S. companies that rely on it. We write now to*

*ask that you act to resolve this uncertainty.*

*The information and communications technology industry (ICT) faces complex needs for*

*interoperability between third party products and services, from the smallest component level*

*up through globe-spanning communications networks. Over the past several decades the ICT*

*industry has developed and honed a model for the formation and operation of private sectorled*

*standards and specification development organizations that has enabled ICT product*

*interoperability in a diverse array of technology areas. A very significant percentage of activity*

*takes place in so-called “consortia.” These organizations adopt rules and procedures that are*

*largely similar to those of entities that have chosen to seek accreditation by the American*

*National Standards Institute (ANSI), but rarely seek such accreditation themselves, in part to*

*emphasize their status as neutral platforms for international collaboration.*

*Consortia almost invariably make their standards and technical specifications available for*

*adoption by anyone, because universal adoption is the goal. Some require adopters to become*

*members, but then welcome anyone to do so for a reasonable fee relative to the costs of*

*maintaining standards development. The difficult question for organizations and their*

*participating members as a result of the May 16, 2019 Entity List order has been whether this*

*level of openness and public output sufficiently meets the criteria set forth in 15 CFR 734.7 (or*

*other relevant exceptions) such that participants can continue to engage in typical consortia*

*activities in organizations where Huawei is a member without violating the new Entity List*

*order.*

*Due to the current uncertainty on this question, some consortia have taken the precaution of*

*suspending Huawei and its non-U.S. affiliates from organization membership; others have*

*restricted the participation of Huawei and its affiliates to non-technical activities. A key difficulty with this solution is that it ultimately undermines the effectiveness of the consortiabased*

*development process, as well as the desirability, in the eyes of the global ICT community,*

*of hosting such activities in U.S. based consortia at all. This creates a serious risk that*

*specifications developed by U.S.-based consortia will fail to achieve the goal of adoption as*

*formal or de facto international standards, and that future necessary standardization efforts*

*will be led elsewhere. Further, if companies with large market presence are excluded from U.S.-*

*based standards efforts, a possible result is the launch of competing standards, leading to*

*lengthy and destructive “standards wars.”*

*Accordingly, we urgently request: please make a clear statement that development of open*

*enrollment, consensus-based standards or technical specifications as conducted by consortia is*

*exempt from the scope of the Entity List designation.*

*We welcome clarification in whatever form you deem appropriate. For purposes of illustration*

*we have attached (as Attachment A) an example of how the current Temporary General License*

*language focused on standards could be adapted to address our concerns—although we*

*emphasize that any clarification should be permanent, not temporary. We do not suggest that*

*this proposed text is the only or best way to address our concerns, however.*

*We respectfully request your prompt attention to this matter. We welcome the opportunity to*

*provide additional information to your staff – please let us know how we can be of assistance.*

*Yours truly,*

*[ORG #1]*

*[ORG # \_\_]*

*[ORG #2]*

*[ . . . ]*

*ATTACHMENT A*

*Engagement as Necessary for Development of technical specifications and 5G Standards by a*

*Duly Recognized Standards Body: BIS authorizes, subject to other provisions of the EAR,*

*engagement with Huawei and/or the sixty-eight non-U.S. affiliates as necessary for the*

*development of 5G standards, technical specifications, and related services (including testing*

*and certification services) in duly recognized international standards bodies and industry*

*consortia (e.g., IEEE – Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers; IETF – Internet*

*Engineering Task Force; ISO – International Organization for Standards; ITU – International*

*Telecommunications Union; ETSI- European Telecommunications Standards Institute; 3GPP -*

*3rd Generation Partnership Project; TIA- Telecommunications Industry Association; GSMA,*

*a.k.a., GSM Association, Global System for Mobile Communications).*

* SC19 BoF Opportunities
	+ SC19 BoF
* Architectures and Networks would be the targeted topic area.
* Target HPC stakeholders like users, administrators, software writers, and HPC archtects
* **Prepare a BoF submission to SC19, submissions close** July 31, 2019
* Exploring putting together a BoF on Monitoring Metrics.
	+ Representatives from the HPC community will be encouraged to demonstrate how they use Monitoring Metrics from fabrics.
	+ Results from different types of RDMA fabrics.
* Looking to put an SC19 BoF Proposal Working Group together
	+ I would like to gather a few people that represent companies that develop RDMA fabrics.
	+ I would like to gather a few people that represent companies that administer and use HPC clusters.
	+ I would like to have a multi-national element to the group.
	+ Kernel and OS developers