

# XAB 2021 October Meeting




























## [Executive Summary of Meeting](#)

Tuesday, October 12 (3-5 pm CDT)

### Location

Remote via Zoom (coordinates sent out via Outlook)

### Attendees

NAME	PRESENT  
<b>XAB Members</b>	
Lisa Arafune (Chair)	
Leah Bendavid	
Ken Bloom	
Elizabeth Cherry	
Rylan Chong	
Peter Couvares	
Rudi Eigenmann	
Ana Carmen Gonzales	
Ruby Mendenhall	
Brook Milligan	
Russell Poldrack	
Jennifer Schopf	
Ani Ural	
<b>Service Provider Forum</b>	
Ruth Marinshaw	
Dan Stanzione	
David Hancock	
<b>User Advisory Committee</b>	
Emre Brookes	
<b>XSEDE Staff</b>	
John Towns	
Kelly Gaither	
Philip Blood	
David Hart	
David Lifka	
Tabitha Samuel	
Shava Smallen	
Ron Payne	

Gregory Peterson	✓
Robert Sinkovits	✓
Lizanne DeStefano	✓
Leslie Froeschl	✓
Linda Akli	✓
Tim Boerner	✓
Victor Hazlewood	✓
Sergiu Sanielevici	✓
Julie Wernert	✓

## Draft Agenda

Tuesday, October 12

Time (CDT)	Duration	Topic (w/links to presentation materials)
3:00	5 mins	<p>Welcome</p> <p>Approval of July XAB meeting summary</p> <p>Move to approve (Emre, Ruby). Approved</p>
3:05	35 mins	<p>XSEDE User Survey Results</p> <p>Access slide deck for the User Survey &amp; Climate Study presentation <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service Providers are surveyed as part of User Survey. Outward look to consumers of our services. Report card that looks at awareness and satisfaction</li> <li>• Hard to get a high response rate given that the survey is non-incentivized. 19% response rate is high.</li> <li>• Onboarding of new faculty, students during pandemic was not as good, which could impact awareness.</li> <li>• XSEDE has been consistent at getting high satisfaction and importance ratings. Indicates the project is mature &amp; stable.</li> <li>• Slide 10/User Comments: can staff ask to use the comments in some manner? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments are anonymous. We can use the comments but not attribute to an individual.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 5,000 users are specifically XSEDE users. Would be interesting to see how the general HPC community would answer these questions.</li> <li>• 70-80 questions, so a participant is typically invested.</li> </ul>
3:40	35 mins	<p>XSEDE Staff Climate Study Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal look to staff to learn how to make XSEDE more effective.</li> <li>• Sent to everyone budgeted to work on XSEDE. Most do not work full time.</li> <li>• Written comments provide great insights to where people are at. Keep in mind comments convey how one person feels about something. While problems may be isolated, they are still important to address and resolve.</li> <li>• Gold mine of information that's been captured. Lizanne &amp; team do a great job of distilling the info to make it easier for leaders to use the info. Leadership uses the info to improve the project.</li> <li>• Any plans to have a gathering at SC? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertain about who will be there. Doing a hybrid event is difficult. Hoping to have an in-person event at PEARC next year</li> <li>• Talking about doing a virtual gathering, but not in conjunction with SC.</li> <li>• Series about people's whose lives have changed because of XSEDE. Open to the community. Opportunity to thank those who have worked on XSEDE and pushed science forward. What was their experience working with staff.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Opportunity for closure &amp; appreciation as we go into the transition to the next era.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do ECSS symposia that focus on work that people have been doing, challenges they face and how they addressed it.</li> <li>• Planning to suggest an alternate final report that is split into 2 parts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part 1: metrics etc.</li> <li>• Part 2: analysis of longitudinal studies, ROI—what has impact been on community. Retrospective look at how we have impacted community.</li> <li>• Intend to get this worked out by January.</li> <li>• Good to have XAB support. Like to run data collection up to the very end, so need a delayed report submission date post-end of XSEDE.</li> <li>• Hope to have mature draft of plan by next call for XAB feedback.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4:15	5 mins	Break

4:20	35 mins	<p>NSF panel report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review went really well. So little issues raised that we responded with a simple one-page PDF by email. Two issues to comment on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggesting making our survey data available. We are restricted by IRB rules/confidentiality</li> <li>• Asked us to continue prep for transition to ACCESS, which we are doing this on an ongoing basis. Developing communications campaign to help community better understand what we know and what we don't know. Many researchers may not be aware that this transition will happen. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Still don't know much other than what is in solicitations.</li> <li>• As things come to light and are shared with community by NSF, XSEDE will share these details with the community.</li> <li>• While not typical, we feel this is the right thing to do.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Indication of how far the project has come and all its done that there were so few issues that we had to respond to.</li> <li>• Strong, positive statements made in report from the panel.</li> <li>• Rudi: What is your take on this? You awed them so much that they didn't have any comments? Or project is at end so they didn't think it worth making comments? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More the first. Had a couple repeat reviewers who provided constructive feedback for the project. One of them noted that they just don't have anything to say this time around as they don't have anything more re. how we can improve</li> <li>• Noted attention &amp; responsiveness we gave in prior years.</li> <li>• We have gotten better at providing the info they want to hear &amp; conveying the value we deliver to the community. Reviewers clearly took the review seriously.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rudi: Anything you can tell us about the future? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing to say outside of what is in the solicitations. Proposals went in in June. No information about status of review.</li> <li>• Continue to have concerns about timing and whether NSF can announce them in time to allow sufficient time for transition. Will depend on who the awardees are. If they're new players it could be difficult. Overall budget is far less than what was available for XSEDE (about 50% less of current program budget).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Motivation to do 2022 user survey is that we could collect info from field that could be very useful for new ACCESS PIs /teams. Could be a strong transitional activity.</li> </ul>
4:55	5 mins	<p>Wrap up/Close Meeting</p> <p>Next meeting: December 16, 2021 (2-3pm CST)</p> <p>Will soon be scheduling 2022 meetings. Would like to do an in-person meeting in April if the pandemic allows.</p> <p>Close meeting (Rudi, Emre). Adjourn.</p>

## Notes