Bioconductor Community Advisory Board (CAB) Agenda

8th July 2021, 10am EST

Members: Kozo, Matt, Aedin, Yagoub, Lori, Johannes, Saskia, Susan, Leonardo, Benilton, Daniela, Katerina, Estefania, Kevin, Mike

Attending: Kozo, Matt, Lori, Estefania, Mike, Daniela, Aedin, Benilton, Leo

Apologies: Saskia, Yagoub, Susan, Katerina, Jo, Kevin

Guest:

Schedule
:00 - :05: Welcome!

:05 - :07 Review minutes from previous meeting for posting

Minutes 6-10

Action Item: Approved for posting.

:07-:10 Report from TAB meeting

- Aedin absent (vacation). Lori was present.
- Members update: Stepping down from board: Martin Newly Elected Member: Lori . Everyone else was re-elected to positions.
- Next TAB meeting overlaps with the Bioc2021 TAB session. Debated topics and format. Suggested advertising to the community early and pre-submit any questions or concerns.
- DOI minting has been inactive since ~Oct 2020. Should Bioconductor continue to pay and provide this service? Not explicitly budgeted in grant and up to this point were generated through NCI connection.
- R-universe/organization
  - Compared pros and cons
    - Thumbs down: Weird definition of ‘Bioconductor’ (repos under github.com/Bioconductor); no recognition of devel and release branches; installation instructions don’t differentiate Bioconductor version; …
    - But… GitHub Actions build-on-demand; an app, rather than file system, behind `contrib.url()` -- scope for metrics, throttling, etc. ‘Meta’ take-home? -- we’re doing things differently, and this consistently causes problems.
    - Re-envision BiocManager::install() -- narrow scope to secured, managed installation of Bioc packages & dependencies?
    - Effort to provide access to package outside of (or overlapping with) CRAN
    - Scope for rethinking how we do things - more consistent with the broader community?
- Control install function -> can develop an app, never have problems with version mismatches.
- Good stuff in there - GitHub Actions
- Doing things differently from CRAN, but that's one of the original motivations for Bioc (stable release)
- Practically difficult to align with CRAN (sudden changes, hard to align)

- Build goals and project into smaller scale achievable goals in small groups that can include non-TAB members. There are different areas of the project
  - Technical genomics/genetics software (packages...)
  - Technical platform (hubs, bbs, spb…)
  - Community priorities (website, community-review system, …)
  - Compute platforms for users (AnVIL, Microsoft Genomics Data Lake, …)
  - Infrastructure committee (docker-based builders, system requirements eval….)

Comments: Some things are critical to the project and knowledge and scope limited to very few people. Others are more evolved and make the project better ideas/tasks. Working groups should not be limited to Board members and perhaps better to be community lead? This concept is also used in Galaxy new governance and organization -- working groups are formed from an identified community group/lead that then report to the appropriate board. Do we like this approach and want to encourage this practice?

**Suggestion:** Have Board meetings at conferences that the community could attend or monitor? Might depend on governance.

**:11 - :15 Funding**
- Bioc2021 sponsorship was more successful this year. The sponsorship committee (Aedin, Mahmoud, Simone, Erica) met to document the process such that it is easier to learn what was different.
- CZI EoSS - should hear back late July

**:15 - :40: Priority CAB activities**

- **Slide Deck for Bioc2021**
  - Do we need to schedule another meeting to finish the slide deck?
  - Who is going to lead Bioc2021 CAB session? Aedin and Matt as co-chairs?
  - **Action Item:** Lori needs everyone's email they would like to use for registration on the airmet platform. If you have not done so already please give her your email address if you plan on attending ASAP! Either slack or lori.shepherd@roswellpark.org

- The TAB are calling their session Bioc under the hood. They fear people may not know what the TAB is and want to make it more user friendly. Should we have a better name for the session? How can it be more interactive/ welcoming open.
- **Discussion Items:**
  - Can we make it more of an interactive session? Slido? Bioconductor trivia?
  - Slides on how far we’ve come: one Mailing list has become all the community channels/support. All the community activities and events
  - 20th anniversary idea: members of the community have mini video sessions that can play answering a question or sharing an experience. Or limit it to the CAB, since it is “meet the CAB”, have each CAB member answer some questions.
  - Live or pre-recorded? Leaning towards live. Start with live 1:00-1:30 for each person to intro themselves
- Reports from useR (Matt/Leo)
  - Excellent incubator sessions. What can we learn?
    - The AsiaR community seems to be considering how to set up their “platform” or “framework”. Kozo would like to contribute to AsiaR by introducing how CAB sets up its “framework (Governance, CoC, monthly meetings, overcoming the language barrier, etc.).”
  - Keynote from Jonathan Godfrey (Massey University) in the ‘Tools and technologies for supporting algorithm fairness and inclusion’ session’ of interest re: ensuring accessibility is maintained for people with disability / impairment (runs from 51:40 to 1:08:43)
  - Community and Outreach session - Stefanie Butland’s (rOpenSci Community Manager) talk on ‘rOpenSci’s Model for Managing a Federated Open Source Software Community’ (runs from 18:48 to 38.18) was also interesting.
  - Can we create a Bioconductor version of the ‘rOpenSci Community Contributing Guide’?
  - Maximizing Bioc2021. What can the CAB add to bioc2021? Should we have a welcome table for Bioconductor newcomers at the poster sessions? Should we meet Gabriela de Queiroz etc

---

*:40 - :50 CAB Regular Working Groups Reports*

- [Working Group Updates July 2021](#)

- Any Working Group Issues needed to be addressed by the CAB?

  - Bioc2021 Awards
    - We had ties. As it is the 20th anniversary and that we had the funding we decided to have 5 instead of 4. However, we cannot do this every year. What should the tie breaking procedure be?
- **Discussion:**
  - Open more on voting committee
  - Having a way of ranked voting? But not bias those nominated but on the voting committee
  - Dedicated award to new packages / new contributions. Should one always be to this category so it is not all long standing, well-known contributors

:50 - :55 *Bioconductor Event Reports*

- Bioc2021
  - **Important Dates:**
    - BiocAwards Aug 5th. 15:30 - 16:00 (GMT-4 / Boston / EST)
    - Meet the CAB Aug 6th 17:00 - 18:00 (GMT-4 / Boston / EST)

- New procedure for submitting events and youtube channel
  - [https://github.com/BioconductorBoards/CABWorkingGroups/issues/new/choose](https://github.com/BioconductorBoards/CABWorkingGroups/issues/new/choose)

:55 - :00 *Other Business*

- Opportunities for co-organiser of Developers’ Forum (Mike)
  - Mike is looking for joint organizers. Please volunteer