



Global Lambda Integrated Facility Governance Working Group
10th Meeting, 12 October 2012
Hyatt Regency Hotel, Chicago, United States

Attendees

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation</u>	<u>Country</u>
Heidi Alvarez	AMPATH	United States
Maxine Brown	University of Illinois at Chicago	United States
Tareck Elass	KAUST	Saudi Arabia
Jim Ghadbane	CANARIE	Canada
Jan Gruntorad	CESNET	Czech Republic
Niels Hersoug	DANTE	-
Ong Bin Lay	SingAREN	Singapore
Francis Lee	SingAREN	Singapore
Luis Fernandez Lopez	ANSP	Brazil
Joe Mambretti	Northwestern University	United States
Kevin Meynell (Secretary)	TERENA/GLIF Secretariat	-
Kees Neggers (Chair)	SURF	The Netherlands
Bram Peeters	SURFnet	The Netherlands
Leena Wadia	ORF Mumbai	India

1. Welcome

Kees Neggers welcomed everyone to the meeting.

He announced that Karel Vietsch who had been managing the GLIF Secretariat, had unfortunately been taken ill earlier in the year and Kevin Meynell had therefore taken over his responsibilities for GLIF. Kevin had already been working with GLIF for several years and so was familiar with the activities, but he expressed his thanks for filling in at short notice. He also extended his best wishes to Karel on behalf of GLIF.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting held on 12 October 2011 were approved. These are available at <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2011gov/minutes.pdf>.

3. Actions from last meeting

- 9.1 GLIF Secretariat to have GLIF signage produced and to liaise with Maxine Brown for their distribution at Supercomputing 2011.
Done.
- 9.2 GLIF Secretariat to recommend sponsorship tiers and develop sponsorship prospectus.
Done.
- 9.3 GLIF Secretariat to send out sponsorship prospectus to potential Sponsors before the end of 2011, asking for their sponsorship commitment for the year 2012.

Sponsorship was requested and collected.

4. Update on GLIF Secretariat: January 2011-July 2012

Kevin Meynell reported on the work undertaken by the GLIF Secretariat over the past 18 months (see <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2012/gov/secretariat-report.pdf>).

The GLIF Secretariat was provided by TERENA who hosted and maintained the website and mailing lists, organised three workshops and meetings, and provided administrative support to the working groups. They had also made arrangements for future events in 2013. Other activities included production and distribution of signage for Supercomputing 2011, and the publication of news items on GLIF events and other major developments.

One change from the previous year was that Kevin Meynell had replaced Karel Vietsch as the Secretary of the Governance Working Group. Peter Szegedi continued to provide secretarial support to the Technical Working Group.

24 organisations had provided sponsorship amounting to €56,826 in 2011, and they were thanked for their support. JANET had withdrawn as a sponsor at the end of 2010, although on the positive side, ANSP (Brazil) became a new sponsor, whilst CESNET resumed their sponsorship.

Actual expenditure amounted in 2011 to €84,393, which was somewhat higher than the agreed budget of €75,000 for the year, although this included the costs of printing the new GLIF brochure. The result was that the reserves had been reduced from €45,097 at the end of 2010, to €17,452 at the end of 2011.

With an estimated budget of €79,000 and projected income of €62,000 for 2012, it had looked likely the reserves would be depleted by the end of year. It was therefore decided to ask existing sponsors whether they would be willing to increase their contributions by 30% in order to cover the expected shortfall, which many generously agreed to do.

22 organisations had so far committed sponsorship for 2012, amounting to €65,576. PSNC (Poland) became a new sponsor, although unfortunately CPqD and Indiana University indicated they were unable to sponsor for this year. NLR had also agreed to contribute USD 9.5K, although this was still in the process of being collected and they were therefore not included in the quoted figures.

Upon reviewing the financial situation though, it became clear that expenditure would likely be significantly less than anticipated in 2012. Only €24,859 had been spent up until the end of July, and even taking Secretariat participation in GLIF 2012 and preparation for future events into account, total expenditure would likely come to well under €50,000. That would actually create a surplus of more than €16,000 that would bring up the level of the reserves to more than €34,000 which was a much healthier position.

The reasons for the reduced expenditure were primarily one less staff member working on GLIF activities, but also less secretariat effort had been required for GLIF 2012 than in previous years (although this likely is a one-off). In addition, the hosting costs of the winter meeting in Baton Rouge, USA had been lower than expected, and there were no brochure or map production costs in 2012 either.

The GLIF Secretariat was asked whether it could again produce some GLIF signs for Supercomputing 2012, and liaise with Maxine Brown with respect to distributing them. Maxine said that she was not planning to attend this year, but she would arrange for someone there to do it.

Action 10.1 – GLIF Secretariat to have GLIF signage produced and to liaise with Maxine Brown with respect to their distribution at Supercomputing 2012.

5. Budget for GLIF Secretariat 2013

Kevin Meynell presented the proposed budget for the GLIF Secretariat for 2013 (see <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2012/gov/secretariat-report.pdf>).

The proposal was for a budget of €63,300 which represented a significant decrease compared to 2012. It was felt existing services could be provided with this, and could be funded by current levels of sponsorship without running at a deficit.

It was explained that travel and subsistence was slightly higher than previous years as GLIF 2013 and the Technical Working Group winter meeting would be held in Singapore and Honolulu respectively which were more expensive destinations from a GLIF Secretariat perspective.

Jim Ghadbane asked whether the GLIF Secretariat envisaged needing more staff in future. Kevin replied that two members of staff (plus occasional support from other TERENA personnel) were adequate for the current activities, although that might change if the GLIF Secretariat was asked to undertake additional work. His colleague Peter Szegedi was also interested in becoming more involved in the technical activities of GLIF, so that might be an option if funding and other TERENA activities allowed.

Jim Ghadbane also asked about the overhead in the budget, and why this was lower than previous years. Kevin explained this was charged by TERENA on the costs of personnel working directly on GLIF, and was a standard way of charging for the management, IT services and office running costs. This was calculated on a year-to-year basis, and had decreased significantly in 2012.

Maxine Brown said that the GLIF map might need to be updated in the coming year, and suggested adding the costs of this to the 2013 budget. This work had previously been contracted to Bob Patterson at NCSA, and was usually in the order of US\$ 10,000.

It was agreed that as a conservative budget had been proposed and the reserves were likely to be healthier than anticipated, the costs of updating the GLIF map could be added to the 2013 budget. Maxine was asked to contact Bob Patterson to see whether he could update the map, and if so, she offered to assist in the usual way to collect the data. This offer was gratefully accepted.

Action 10.2 – Maxine Brown to contact Bob Patterson to see whether he can update the GLIF map in 2013.

6. Sponsorship & Continuity of Funding

Kevin Meynell presented a proposal on revising the existing sponsorship model (see <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2012/gov/funding.pdf>). A discussion paper had already been drafted by himself, and the GLIF Working Chairs had added their comments before it was circulated more widely (see <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2012/gov/sponsorship-proposal.pdf>).

The running costs of GLIF were met from voluntary sponsorship from GLIF participants. 22 organisations currently contributed amounts of between €500 and €10,400, but there were probably a total of 60 organisations participating in GLIF. Financial contributions have remained relatively stable, but a balanced budget had relied on a subsidy from TERENA that had been withdrawn from 2010 by decision of the TERENA membership. To date, there had been limited success in attracting new sponsors, and although this effort had been hampered by the illness of Karel Vietsch earlier in the year, reserves had been depleted to the point that the ongoing operation of GLIF was endangered.

The financial situation also meant there was limited scope to undertake additional activities to enhance and expand GLIF, and that it was difficult to calculate fair methods to raise revenue if costs increase and/or sponsors drop out. More generally though, there were no guidelines as to who should sponsor or how much, and this meant there was little consistency in contributions from organisation-to-organisation.

As a result, the Governance Working Group at its meeting on 14 September 2011 had agreed that more coherent sponsorship tiers should be developed; guidelines should be produced as to what would be appropriate contributions for particular types of organisations; and ways of increasing revenue should be considered. Several existing sponsors also suggested that higher contributions could be possible if requests were received whilst they were planning for their forthcoming financial year, and/or if their contributions were linked to a type of membership. The proposed new sponsorship model was developed along these lines, although it was stressed nothing had been agreed or adopted as yet, and the consent of the sponsors was required. In any case, the stated figures were *recommended* amounts.

One of the original ideas was to have ‘Gold’, ‘Silver’ and ‘Bronze’ sponsorship tiers, but upon reflection it was felt these did not provide any tangible guidelines as to what was an appropriate level of sponsorship for any given organisation. Furthermore, it was felt GLIF should be considered a collaborative activity whereby the size of a contribution should not visibly elevate the status of one organisation in comparison to another, which is why a scheme based on organisation type was considered more appropriate.

To this end, four categories were proposed in the discussion paper:

- International GOLE Operator - Organisation providing an optical exchange that is critical to connecting global communities. Would typically have more than 4 international links. *6 units*
- National Lightpath Operator - Organisation providing lightpath services to a country or territory. Would normally operate an optical exchange with up to 4 international links. *4 units*
- Regional Lightpath Operator - Organisation providing an lightpath services to a region of a country or territory. May or may not operate an optical exchange or have international links. *2 units*
- Lightpath User - University or research institute utilising lightpath services. *1 unit*

Units would be assigned to each category as indicated above, and the number of units of all the sponsors would be totalled. The agreed budget would then be divided by the total units to determine the unit value, which in turn would determine the recommended contribution for the organisations in each category.

The aim would be to try to raise €80,000 in 2013. This would not only cover the agreed operating budget, but would allow for reduced contributions and potential loss of sponsors. The current sponsors added up to 80 units, so the unit value would be €1,000 thus making the recommended contributions for a *International GOLE Operator* €6,000; for a *National Lightpath Operator* €4,000; for a *Regional Lightpath Operator* €2,000; and for a *Lightpath Operator* €1,000.

It was recognised that some sponsors fell into more than one category, although in most cases they had been placed in the highest category in the draft proposal. In addition, some organisations such as CERN didn't fit into any particular category. Furthermore, it was understood that GOLEs were sometimes jointly operated by two or more sponsoring organisation, so some mechanism for sharing the GLIF contribution might need to be considered.

Finally, the draft proposal only considered existing sponsors, but there were several other *GOLE operating organisations* that could be approached for contributions. Obviously, the unit price would decrease if more sponsors came on board, although conversely it might have to increase if too many sponsors decided to drop to a lower category.

Kees Neggers thanked the GLIF Secretariat for the proposal and opened the floor for questions.

Joe Mambretti said the principle of four categories was fine, but the difference between the *International GOLE* and *National Lightpath Operator* categories was a bit arbitrary. In addition, GOLEs were also operated by *Regional Lightpath Operators*. He therefore asked whether the categories could be reclassified.

Kevin Meynell replied that the *International GOLE* category was actually intended to be those GOLEs such as NetherLight, StarLight and NorthernLight that were critical to the operation of GLIF. Other organisations did operate GOLEs, but these generally served countries or regions and were less critical to the global infrastructure. Nevertheless, the descriptions could be changed to better reflect realities.

Kees Neggers proposed to change the *International GOLE* category to *Critical* or *Key GOLE* which was accepted.

Heidi Alvarez said that AMPATH was currently only categorised as a *Regional Lightpath Operator*, but they operated a GOLE that was critical for connectivity to Latin America. They needed to be categorised as an *International GOLE*, even if this meant paying a higher contribution and asking the AMPATH users to contribute.

Kees Neggers replied that he agreed with Heidi's categorisation of AMPATH and added that no-one would object to an organisation wanting to be placed in a higher category. He would also be pleased if other organisations took the lead of AMPATH.

Maxine Brown pointed that StarLight was jointly operated by several organisations and didn't have any income of its own. However, she felt these categories were the way forward and she would investigate how their substantially increased contribution could be raised.

Heidi Alvarez also asked if it were possible to pay two years contributions in advance as this would minimise the amount of paperwork that was required.

Kevin Meynell replied this possibility hadn't been considered in the sponsorship proposal, but he didn't see that it should be a problem. Recommended contributions were not expected to fluctuate much from year-to-year, so advanced payment should be welcomed.

It was agreed that the proposed sponsorship model should be adopted subject to minor modifications and re-classification of certain organisations. In addition, potential sponsors should be identified and recommended amounts calculated, even those these should not be considered in the budget for 2013.

Action 10.3 – GLIF Secretariat to produce revised proposal and table of recommended contributions. [This proposal is attached as an annex to these minutes.]

Kees Neggers said that it was important that requests for 2013 sponsorship go out as soon as possible, so that potential sponsors could plan for their forthcoming financial years. Kevin Meynell replied that the timing of the Governance Working Group was itself a bit problematic as it came quite late in the year, but that he would make sending out the requests a high priority.

Action 10.4 – GLIF Secretariat to send out sponsorship requests for 2013 as soon as possible.

7. Global LambdaGrid Workshop 2013

Kees Neggers reported that a proposal had been received from SingAREN to host the 13th Global LambdaGrid Workshop in Singapore.

Francis Lee then presented some details about the planned event (see <http://www.glif.is/meetings/2012/gov/glif2013.pdf>). It was proposed to hold this on 3-4 October 2012 at the Nanyang Technological University (NTU), with provision for side meetings on 2 October 2012. There was some accommodation available on-site, although as NTU was in the western part of Singapore, the main hotel accommodation was expected to be in the downtown area with buses provided.

It was agreed that the proposal looked very good, and that Singapore should be confirmed as the host for GLIF 2013. SingAREN and NTU were thanked for their offer.

8. Any other business

Kees Neggers said that he would like to extend his thanks to Maxine Brown and the Electronic Visualization Laboratory of the University of Chicago at Illinois, and to Joe Mambretti and the International Center for Advanced Internet Research at Northwestern University for hosting the 12th Global LambdaGrid Workshop.

Open Actions

- 10.1 GLIF Secretariat to have GLIF signage produced and to liaise with Maxine Brown with respect to their distribution at Supercomputing 2012.
- 10.2 Maxine Brown to contact Bob Patterson to see whether he can update the GLIF map in 2013.
- 10.3 GLIF Secretariat to produce revised proposal and table of recommended contributions.
- 10.4 GLIF Secretariat to send out sponsorship requests for 2013 as soon as possible.



Global Lambda Integrated Facility

Sponsorship Structure

Approved on 12 October 2012 by the Governance Working Group

The Global Lambda Integrated Facility (GLIF) has its origins in the annual Global LambdaGrid Workshops that started in 2001. At the 3rd Annual Global LambdaGrid Workshop in Reykjavik (2003), the GLIF name was formally adopted, whilst at the 4th Annual Global LambdaGrid Workshop in Nottingham (2004), it was agreed to establish a Secretariat paid from sponsorship from participating organisations. The Trans-European Research and Education Networking Association (TERENA) has run the GLIF Secretariat since 1 January 2005, and reports to the GLIF Governance Working Group that meets at every Global LambdaGrid Workshop.

The main tasks undertaken by the GLIF Secretariat are:

- Organising the Global LambdaGrid Workshops together with the local hosts.
- Organising the interim meetings of the GLIF Technical Working Group.
- Administratively supporting the GLIF Working Groups.
- Hosting, maintaining and updating the GLIF website (<http://www.glif.is/>).
- Hosting and administering the GLIF mailing lists.
- Producing publicity material as well as publishing news items as necessary.
- Contracting and supervising production of the GLIF map.
- Promoting and presenting GLIF at other conferences, workshops and fora.

The running costs are met from voluntary sponsorships paid by organisations participating in GLIF. Voluntary financial contributions to GLIF have been sufficient over the years. However, sponsors have indicated that it would be easier to justify GLIF sponsorship if a more structured way of defining a fair GLIF contribution would be available. As a response to this, the following funding model was discussed and approved at the Global LambdaGrid Workshop in Chicago in 2012.

GLIF Funding Model

Sponsors can be categorised as GOLE operators, lightpath providers, and lightpath users; although there are overlaps among these categories. Historical contributions suggest that GOLE operators find the most value in GLIF to varying degrees. Therefore GLIF has defined sponsorship tiers around these categories and defined these tiers as follows:

Tier	Category	Description	Units
1	Key GOLE Operator	Organisation providing a GOLE critical to connecting global communities. Typically has links to other continents	6
2	GOLE Lightpath Operator	Organisation providing lightpath services to a country, territory or region. Typically operates a GOLE with multiple international links.	4
3	Lightpath Operator	Organisation providing lightpath services to a region within a country or territory. May or may not operate a lightpath exchange.	2
4	Lightpath User	University, research institute or other organizations utilizing lightpath services	1

Categories are intended to be self-selecting, and organisations can choose the category they feel is most appropriate to their circumstances. The number of 'units' listed above for each category is used to calculate the suggested contributions. The GLIF budget, as agreed to each year by the GLIF Governance Working Group, is divided by the total number of units listed against all the contributors in order to produce a unit value. This is then multiplied in accordance with the table above to derive the *suggested* contribution for each sponsor. If the number of sponsoring organisations changes, the unit contribution would be adjusted as appropriate.

Sponsorship for 2013

At the Governance meeting in Chicago, a budget for the GLIF Secretariat of 73,300 euros was approved and the unit price for 2013 was set at 1,000 euros. It was anticipated that this would generate a small surplus to supplement the reserves. It is expected that a growing number of GLIF participants operating GOLEs and offering lightpath services will become sponsors too, again contributing towards a more healthy reserves level. Some GOLEs are not operated by a single organization and it was agreed that, in such cases, the contribution can be collected from the various partners of such GOLE and that the GLIF Secretariat will be able to send separate invoices to these partners if so requested.

The resulting contribution for 2013 for the different tiers is shown in the table below:

Tier	Category	Units	Suggested Contribution 2013
1	Key GOLE Operator	6	6,000 euros
2	GOLE Lightpath Operator	4	4,000 euros
3	Lightpath Operator	2	2,000 euros
4	Lightpath User	1	1,000 euros

24 October 2012