



Enabling Grids for E-science

3rd User Forum assessment and recommendations

Vangelis Floros, Frank Harris, Cal Loomis

NA4 SC Meeting, Paris, March 2008

www.eu-egee.org



- **Prepare a report with NA4 assessment on the 3rd User Forum results.**
- **Provide recommendations for future events**
- **Feedback received from:**
 - UF attendees
 - External Advisory Committee

- **Very successful:**
 - Very good scientific program (congrats to the PC)
 - Satisfactory attendance with more than 300 registrants
 - Appropriate venue and good LOC support
- **Positive feedback from participants and from EAC**

- **Parallel Sessions**
 - Very interesting topics presented
 - Good volume and extend of talks
 - Covered a great extend of disciplinary and topical activities and research
- **Demos**
 - Highlight of the event
 - Good to excellent organization and presentation
 - Followed instructions and EAC recommendations
- **Posters**
 - Probably the most successful poster session till now (~37 Posters)
 - Many of them could qualify for demo presentation
- **Plenaries**
 - Interesting keynotes and internal talks
 - Summary sessions very useful in the end

- **Parallel Sessions**
 - Not all the conveners followed the guidelines for proper introduction/summary of the session
 - Large number of presentations. Difficult to follow all of them.
 - A couple of talks were misplaced (or at least this is the authors' feeling).
- **Demo Sessions**
 - One no-show without warning or excuse
 - Presenters were not available all the time for the EAC
 - Missing “ground-breaking” work. Most of them matured but “mainstream”
- **Poster Sessions**
 - 6 no-shows
 - Problems with board numbering
 - Problems with best-poster selection process
- **Plenaries**
 - Summary sessions: many of them lengthy and difficult to follow.
 - Little participation from the audience

- **The PC should be the sole responsible for the assignment of demos, posters and oral presentations.**
 - Keep the same number of demos (~20).
 - Careful selection of demos: emphasis on mature work but also select a few not so mature yet innovative work
- **Rethink the poster voting process. Try to ensure fairness and avoid exploitation.**
- **Enforce presence of demo and poster presenters. Those who cannot attend the event should be replaced by runner-ups; especially for the demo session.**
- **Sessions chairs have to demonstrate stricter adherence to the convener rules. Proper introduction and a synopsis in the end should be escorted by a 2/3-slide presentation given by the convener.**
- **One afternoon is probably not enough for the demo/poster session. We could consider 2 full days for demos with dedicated staff manning the booth at all times**

- **The setup of Manchester with the round-tables in the middle of the exhibition area should return.**
- **Careful placement of posters, grouped per discipline, topic etc.**
 - Scattered posters may facilitate intermixing but grouping people together we give more rational arrangement and better chances for collaboration.
- **Boards should be clearly numbered on top left or right corners and numbers should stay there throughout the event.**
- **The summary sessions are a good idea and they should remain as part of the closing session in the future User Forums.**
 - The rapporterus should try as much as possible to deliver more focused and briefer summary talks.
 - Avoid 15 slide presentations on a 10-minute slot.
 - Avoid detailed presentation on specific talk but rather keep a balanced overview discussion of all the talks presented.

- **Next User Forum: April 2009**
- **Co-organized with OGF-25**
- **Bidding process will start soon. Bidders pack under preparation.**