2015-11-20 Steering Group Minutes

November 20, 2015, 1 PM EST

Attendees

Steering Group Members

Melissa Haendel, Kristi Holmes, Eric Meeks, Julia Trimmer

⭐= note taker

Ex officio

debra hanken kurtz, Graham Triggs, Mike Conlon ⭐, Jonathan Markow

Regrets

 Dean B. Krafft, Andi Ogier, Robert H. McDonald, Alex Viggio, Paul Albert, Bart Ragon, Jon Corson-Rikert

Dial-In Number:

DIAL-IN: 641-715-3650, Participant code: 117433# Local country dial-in codes

Agenda

	Item	Time	Facilitator	Notes
1	Updates	5 min	All	See below.
2	Review agenda	2 min	All	Revise, reorder if needed
3	Program chair for conference	5 min	Mike, Julia	Michael Winkler has taken a position as director of Kuali OLE (three year position, on-leave from Penn) and has asked that Manuel de la Cruz Gutierrez at Penn Library be program chair.
4	Opportunity for VIVO meet-up at Force11	5 min	Melissa, Mike	Pre-conference meetings can be arranged.
5	SciENcv overview	10 min	Melissa	Overview of the SciENcv administrative supplement to the OHSU CTSA.
6	Harvard Profiles	30 min	Eric	Harvard Profile overview. Advantages/disadvantages compared to VIVO.
7	Future topics	3 min	All	webinar series; training program; social media strategy

Notes

1. Updates
    a. Email conversion complete. SourceForge lists have been migrated and shut down. Please use vivo-community@googlegroups.com, vivo-tech@googlegroups.com and vivo-all@googlegroups.com as previously described.
    b. Anyone know this group? http://www.asis.org/rdap/ Opportunity to present VIVO.
    c. Web site DNS changes switching hosting from Cornell to the new site at Duraspace began at 1 PM Thursday. As of Friday morning US time, some ISP have the new address and are pointing at the new site, some have not yet updated and point at the old site. See http://vivoweb.org
    d. Draft agenda for Leadership Call on December 4 is here https://goo.gl/aiEQXS: The call is not required for Steering Group members. Of course, some Steering Group Members are Leadership Group members as well. And feel free to attend as an observer if you are not a leadership group member.
    e. Schedule for the remainder of the year through the holidays:
        i. November 27 – no meeting. Thanksgiving in the US
        ii. December 4. Meeting followed immediately by Leadership Group meeting
        iii. December 11 meeting
        iv. December 18 meeting
        v. December 25 no meeting
        vi. January 1 no meeting
        vii. January 8 resume weekly meetings
2. Agenda review
3. Program chair. Following discussion, Manuel is the new program chair. We will all work to support Manuel in this important role.
4. Opportunity at Force11. Similar to VIVO conference – concepts similar. Conference is very "unconference." Very mashed up with a goal of brainstorming improvements in scholarly communication. Describing the ecosystem, representing work. Natural synergies. Workshops are open. Typically a work group or work shop. What is the goal of getting together? Morning slot and afternoon slot. Doing something together.
5. SciENcv review
    a. Ontology is being refactored and new there is a new OpenRIF GitHub organization. Application repositories within the OpenRif organization. VIVO-ISF, Eagle-i ontology, SciENcv extract (NCBI), NIH PARDI.
    b. Hiring for SciENcv
    c. Hope is to encourage the use of these standards

6. Harvard Profiles
    a. Technology differences
        i. Microsoft .Net stack. Open Source software.
        ii. Heavily relational. Heavily SQL.
        iii. Front-end runs in IS. Written in C#. Very little happens up front.
        iv. 180 tables, 300 stored procedures.
        v. A lot of technologists understand how to work with the stack – accounts, tables
        vi. Advantage – ages well. Java products are more rapidly changing. Legacy Java is often difficult.
        vii. Profiles has many data analytics
        viii. Batch jobs update analytics and linked open data
    b. Product differences
        i. Focused on html and presentation. Not data and linked data. Designed as a presentation device for researchers. First order – researcher. Derived data – MeSH terms, connections, other people similar, geographic linkages. A lot of work went into optimizing the derived data.
        ii. Linked data came later. Very minimal (version 1.4). SPARQL is delivered, but is minimal. Harvard uses Stardog, but the one that comes out of the box is minimal.
        iii. Trivial to set up. Three tables (can be spreadsheets), run a job – the job grabs publications and does disambiguation. Grabs PubMed papers and puts them in.
            1. Record per researcher. Flat data – name, id, title, department, contact info
            2. Appointments for the people – many to one.
            3. Filters – adhoc groups of people. Alumni, etc. Some sites do not use adhoc groups.
        iv. Very inflexible, but very easy.
        v. No claiming interface for publications.
    c. Community differences
        i. VIVO is much more active and vibrant. Multiple calls per week.
        ii. Profiles has one meeting a month if not canceled. UCSF also has calls, and they get canceled. Very little community.
        iii. Profiles leverages the VIVO community.
        iv. Most sites set it up and leave it.
        v. Harvard does the bulk of the development. UCSF added SEO and Open Social. There is no roadmap. BU provided ORCID integration – from Profiles to ORCID. Will pull from CTSAsearch and link to researchers. Informal organization.

Action Items