Bioc Technical Advisory Board Minutes

1 June 2023

Present: Vince Carey, Lori Kern, Alexandru Mahmoud, Charlotte Soneson, Robert Shear, Michael Love, Levi Waldron, Kasper Hansen, Wolfgang Huber, Marcel Ramos, Sean Davis, Hervé Pagès, Jennifer Wokaty, Laurent Gatto, Stephanie Hicks, Aedin Culhane **Apologies**: Shila Ghazanfar, Davide Risso, Robert Gentleman, Rafael Irizarry

:00 - :03 Previous minutes approved

:03 - :12 Organizational topics

- Format of future TAB meetings. Should we alter the schedule to be more accommodating to non-USA members?
 - CAB is currently alternating time every 6 months.
 - More frequent meetings, on alternate times?
 - Retreat opportunity for more thorough discussions with a larger group of people. Combined with the conferences?
- Do we have enough coverage of key emerging areas/scientific topics (ML/AI, spatial, proteomics, ...)?
- TAB meeting agenda setting is quite centralized, meetings information-heavy, could be more time for discussions.
- Proposed SWOT analysis (of the project as a whole, or of the TAB specifically).

:12 - :14 Technical solution to "getting Bioconductor packages in R-devel from April to October"

• PR in progress for BiocManager

:14 - :20 Python

- <u>https://rstudio.github.io/reticulate/articles/python_dependencies.html</u>.
- basilisk is great but when its approach to process isolation is not needed, could this be sufficient?
 - Collect more data, interrogate Aaron/Jayaram.
- Provide recommendations to developers in the contributions guide.
- python/conda experience is required for maintenance of basilisk.

:20 - :28 Authorship of collaborative publications (Mike Love)

- Projects that spin out of Bioconductor many different types of contributions on different levels. What type of contributions lead to authorship? Should we have guidance on this topic/recommendations that there are many types of contributions that can be considered?
- For cases where an acknowledgement is appropriate, can we suggest a suitable formulation? "How can I acknowledge the Bioconductor community?". E.g., "We especially thank XX and YY, along with all members of the Bioconductor Project ZZ

channel/contributors to the GitHub issue, for their careful feedback and engagement." This could be placed near the instructions about citation (e.g., <u>https://www.bioconductor.org/help/fag/</u>).

:28 - :30 August TAB meeting coincides with conference – decided to cancel.

:30 - :34 Request from the CoC committee concerning wording regarding external partners to the Bioconductor Code of Conduct:

We have recently become aware that our Code of Conduct does not explicitly include business partnerships that Bioconductor may engage in. After discussion with the committee, we believe that business partnerships fall within the purview of the Code of Conduct to ensure ethical and fair dealing within our community. As such, we think that members of the Bioconductor community should be able to submit reports questioning the appropriateness of the community's business partnerships. To facilitate this we would like your feedback on the addition of the following wording to the Code of Conduct:

"The Bioconductor community is mindful of not partnering with entities that take unfair advantage of or injure anyone through manipulation, concealment, abuse of privileged or confidential information, misrepresentation of material facts, fraudulent behaviour or any other unfair dealing practice. We encourage community members to report and/or question partnerships that they deem unethical to the CoC committee via the reporting form."

Note that we will also be updating the reporting form to accommodate this change.

- Suggestion to word "not partnering" as "ceasing any partnership in light of any unfair advantage..."
- Might be worth stating what the CoC committee expected actions are at the end of the paragraph, e.g. "The CoC committee will address and take action accordingly" or similar.

:34 - :40 Discussion of nominees for TAB positions, voting process.

:40 - :60 Other topics

- Communication channels do we have too many? Communication gets scattered, hard to bring people together. Also want to have a diverse set of communication channels to make sure that as many as possible can contribute. Development and support channels have different purposes. Would be useful to have experts in the domain of communication to give advice. Need to understand who uses the different channels (and why).
- Perhaps some private channels should be created (e.g. for communication within boards), and existing public channels reinforce that these are the bridge between the boards and the broader community.
- Contract signed with company for rebuilding the Bioconductor website. First thing will be setting up a survey to collect indicators and metrics to compare before/after status.

- Workshop Galaxy instance (<u>https://workshop.bioconductor.org</u>). Used for the first time during the Smorgasbord. Goal is to have the setup be "self-served", built using GitHub Actions. Scalable Kubernetes cluster can be run constantly with low capacity, scaled up during conferences/workshops.
- FYI Software repositories security risks, PyPi, npm, ... (<u>https://fosstodon.org/@cyberlibrarian@infosec.exchange/110407491856081632</u>) - could we or CRAN be at risk?