2016-12-14 XAB

Date

14 Dec 2016

Coordinates

....

....

Attendees

XSEDE Advisory Board

- ☐ Randy Bryant
- ☑ Thomas Cheatham
- ☐ Rama Govindaraju
- ☑ Cliff Jacobs
- ☑ Albert Lazzarini
- ☑ Phil Maechling
- ☑ Karin Remington
- ☑ Shaowen Wang
- ☐ Theresa Windus

Service Provider Forum

- ☑ Dan Stanzione
- ☑ Shawn Strande
- ☐ Craig Stewart

User Advisory Committe

- ☑ Emre Brooks

PIs

- ☑ John Towns
- ☑ Kelly Gaither
- ☑ Ralph Roskies
- ☑ Nancy Wilkins-Diehr

Program and Project Manangers

- ☑ Dave Hart
- ☑ Laura Herriott
- ☐ Scott Lathrop
- ☑ Dave Lifka
- ☑ Ron Payne
- ☑ Greg Peterson

Agenda

Item	Who	Notes

Welcome and discussion of the process NSF plans to use during the next round of re-competition of XSEDE	John Towns	- Lessons Learned from TeraGrid seem to have been lost by NSF - NSF process constructed that the awards being made are smaller in size - How do we advocate for what we've got without sounding self-serving? - Dave Lifka - difficult to justify a large project to congress - Albert Lazzarini - could it be that NSF is reflecting what they are hearing from the community? - Ralph - if you want to recompete XSEDE, it would be difficult for another team to put something together. Bank being too big to fail; therefore break it up so the competition is manageble. There are very severe consequences. What was missing in TeraGrid was central communication. - Cliff - don't buy the argument for large award. Therefore, what is the best approach? Attitude you should have: we are in a good position to provide computational capability to the community, we think there are multiple approaches. Present the options for going forward in a small report, stating that the current situation is a good situation. NSF doesn't know what it wants, but it knows its pressure. Providing a report gives thoughtful community input. Acting as an agent for NSF. - Karin - responsibillty as the XAB to perhaps provide this report. - John - TeraGrid Futures had community input, NSF largely didnt' listen to the recommendations - Cliff - NSF is reorganizing again. - John - Rudi's term will be up in June an do not yet know who the new program officer will be - Nancy - could we pitch it as we are not the only institutions who can, but we could present it as this is the best structure to move forward - Cliff - help NSF achieve its goals through a set of options - Shaowen - time is ripe for a more defined process and structure for digital infrastructure; for example, NCAR getting sustained support. Solid community structure perceived as objective and representative. While the XSEDE work is phenomenal, it is to a degree ad hoc–how can we establish a structure for a long-term vision for the community. - John - NCAR is an FFRDC the funding threshold for MREFC has changed and is now at $70M. Not advocating that XSEDE become an MREFC - Cliff - value in FFRDC, but it is a cultural issue. We could achieve much more with the building infrastructures than with individual grants. - Dan - matching risk profile to budget and managing budget, kicks in at $50M - Ralph - XAB approach the ACI board to think of alternatives - Cliff - we would have to have OCI bring it to NSF's attention, not sure OCI would do it - Albert - program advisory committee selects and advises and has no relationship with NSF. XSEDE management could formally ask for XAB feedback and share feedback with NSF - John - it has to fall back to a process NSF is comfortable with. Recommendations from us and the community to NSF, but XSEDE wouldn't be driving it. - Cliff - ask NSF their vision 10 years from now as a foundation - Shaowen - long-term vision answer might be to ask community input - Karin - workshop for community to come up with vision - Cliff - we want to figure out how to engage them. Thom Dunning working to respond to larger reports, there might be kernels of information that feeds into the recommendations. - John - haven't been engaged in that process, concnered they don't want XSEDE involved - Shawn - between the broader community and the XSEDE community is the user community–how do we engage that community? - John - planning grant exercise - Shawn - plenary town hall session at SC17 asking for feedback - John - have done similar exercises. Challenge, SC is appropriate, but XSEDE is broader than SC. - Shawn - do how to you reach 80% of your users? - John - user surveys, focus group discussions. Holding several town hall meetings over the course of a year or more. - Cliff - focus on the science. OCI will be receptive to a long-term strategy gathered at Science conferences as a way to accelerate discovery in particular domains - Ralph - when the original XSEDE grant was made, it was stated that it could be renewed without a public competition; that is what they removed this time - Shawn - how could the characteristics of what XSEDE provides vs. what XSEDE should provide conflate the issue - Ralph - most would say we have a lack of resources - Tom - could re-compete subsets - Program office - Operations - XRAS - CEE - ECSS - XCI - John - requirements for success. Because we don't have independent PIs, they don't behave in the best interest of them–they work collectively toward what is best for the program as a whole. The reach of XSEDE should be broader, NSF felt XSEDE is the core. Concern is fracturing the core. - Ralph - the L2 areas were decided by NSF for XSEDE2. Different than XSEDE1 - John - XSEDE is flexible to change, but an award structure creates a certain set of permanence. Have to deliberatly change through a process. We will be coming back to this issue. Clear that more concrete plans are needed for NSF. Going in a direction that XSEDE agrees with and figuring out how to address that. - Cliff - success you've had should allow playing a role in defining the future going forward

Presentation Materials

Action items

- [ ]