

2018-09-28 VIVO Steering Group Meeting

September 28, 2018

Attendees

SG members

Paul Albert , Julia Trimmer , Dong Joon (DJ) Lee , Mark Newton ★ , Anna Guillaumet , Violeta Ilik , Mike Conlon , Alex Viggio

Duraspace

Andrew Woods

Regrets

Connection Information

Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android:

<https://duraspace.zoom.us/j/9358074182>

(New call-in numbers were corrected on 5/10/2018)

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: +16468769923,,9358074182# or +16699006833,,9358074182#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 646 876 9923 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 408 638 0968 or +1 408 638 0986 or +1 646 558 8665

Meeting ID: 935 807 4182

International numbers available: <https://zoom.us/j/9358074182>

Agenda

- Review agenda (Julia, 5 minutes)
- Scheduling VIVO sprints (Julia, 10 minutes)
 - Facilitating contributions with advance planning
 - How often should sprints be?
 - Setting dates for the next four sprints
- Statement on VIVO's evolution (all, 40 minutes)
 - Review [notes from 9/28 LG meeting here](#)
 - Introduce statement and work done so far ([link to statement here](#))
 - Discussion of the statement (everyone)
 - Next steps

Notes

VIVO Meeting

Sprints

Can we get these on the calendar for the next four quarters

And then set up dates from there.

The statement on VIVO development coming out of leadership

Agenda

- Review agenda (Julia, 5 minutes)
- Scheduling VIVO sprints (Julia, 10 minutes)
 - Facilitating contributions with advance planning

Those scheduling the resources need information about how often they're going to be. And then start thinking about what to do when. What will the strategy be for the next year?

Quarterly sprints? — Mike Conlon remembers several conversations. Quarterly is a possible starting place.

Paul is yes on quarterly. Alex too. Anna — says yes.

Andrew: We are implying that people will commit two weeks per quarter?

Julia: We are going to handle this next, but yes, two weeks per quarter.

The tasks will take more planning.

MC: The question is about commitment. Not all institutions need to commit to all sprints.

Those voting yes need also to be thinking about their institutional commitments.

Julia: Most recent sprint is ending today. Can we look at 12 weeks from now. Last two weeks of each quarter? Although we might need to shift to the first two weeks of December.

MC: And so let's talk about dates

- How often should sprints be?
- Setting dates for the next four sprints
 - Dec 3-14 2018
 - Mar 18-29 2019
 - Jun 17-28 2018
 - Sep 17-27 2019
 - Dec 2-13 2019

Managers need ~6months in planning to make the commitment.

Having specific dates is essential for planning.

MC: We are trying to figure out whether this method works. One thing we know: we can't have a sprint during the conference.

Action Item: Send this forward as a tentative set of dates to Leadership. JT will do.

- Statement on VIVO's evolution (all, 40 minutes)
 - Review [notes from 9/28 LG meeting here](#)
 - Introduce statement and work done so far ([link to statement here](#))
 - Discussion of the statement (everyone)

Leadership met to discuss this yesterday. Felt this was a good way forward.

AV: Looks good. Glad to see a section on what the TF is not trying to achieve (e.g., recommend a new data model)

DJ: Questions

- Are these directions by priority? NO
- Under alignment — talks more about front-end. After this more of a focus on decoupling?

JT: Goal of the statement is to get everyone focused

Comes out of a lot of work done by the product evolution task force.

AW: maybe you are thinking the alignment effort is disproportionately focused on front-end

MC: Purposefully tried to avoid this appearance in the write-up. Not trying to overemphasize.

Anna: It's a clear document. Q: Interface is very important. Does this include mean to improve information upload.

AV: Agree with what Mike says. Hoping to move toward technologies that will be easier for front-end developers to work with.

MC: purposefully removed the "read-only" language to make sure to fully engage the community. This was substituted with "workflow" under de-couple. The read-only interface could have a button pointing to a yet-undefined application for editing data. Therefore workflow and decoupling admit the presence of a read-only interface in the prototype

MN: May want to clarify that this is a 'product' development document.

May also want to add to the guiding principles a specific note about how VIVO will be engaging the community in this development.

PA: Endorsed!

AW: Very helpful reconciliation efforts. Appreciate presence of Alex and Paul especially.

MC: This is product development type document. But we on the SG are very aware of the ways in which the community and participation has been opened up as well. This is a statement about the product — but we are sharing the lived experience of opening the product up. We have had a very good 2018 on this front.

- Next steps

Action Item: Minor tweaks to the document based on the discussion. MC doing this.

Action Item: Will seek endorsement of LG on Oct 12.

- New Business:

AW organizing a meetup.

Pulling together a group of architecture/developers to do some reflection and help with guidance on the product in 2019 and beyond

Putting together a list of candidate names together.

There is a list of seven that have been put forward.

Won't move forward on this if funding doesn't exist — will need to look toward project or institutions for resources.

Scope is a fly-in meeting for two working days.

Will be in the US — majority of participants. Seeking a lowest total cost location. Eg. DC or Boston

JT — Do this immediately in advance of the Dec sprint? Could this help us to kick things off.

MC — Not sure, because this would be an architectural meeting. We'd want them to not be constrained by sprint-planning.

AW — OK to postpone a discussion of the when. May ask SG to reflect on the candidate list:

- Jim Blake
- Huda
- Graham
- Alex V
- Richard
- Stanford (Justin Littman?)
- Andrew W

MC — Statement of direction talks about scope of work over 2019. But it's not clear exactly how we might do this — not perfectly clear what the architectural claims are on that work. This exercise would let us work this out for the one-year plan.

PA — Can this work be handled remotely?

MC — probably not, lots of white boarding and bandwidth issues

PA — why limit scope to one year? Wouldn't we want to look at the ideal state.

AW — Not presupposed or limited to one year. Talking concerns, initiatives, items in statement of direction, and pulling these into an architecture that resolves these things and moves us where we want to go.

