

TAC - 14 July 2020

Attendees:

1. Gabor
2. Jonas
3. Debbie
4. Phil
5. Shuli
6. Jefro
7. Naomi

[Presentation](#)

Agenda

[Jefro] Moving forward, start using a standard agenda and doing a readout from the previous meetings. Readout from the governing board. Quick events update and review of the workshop. Any other TAC business and required votes.

Jefro summarized of the [June 16th meeting](#) and action items

Jefro from highlighted Board updates from July 7th meeting (will not link due to confidentiality)

- OpenADR update
- Project stages and TAC representation
- Architecture Sprint
- Project Alexandria

Workshop Readout

[Jonas] I thought it was good to put LF Energy in the spotlight. When we do it again, there are a few things we should do differently, but it was definitely a success.

[Gabor] Judging by the sign-ups to the mailing lists, definitely gained tons of interest

[Shuli] The workshop began with just use cases, but things emerged as another interest took hold (cloud, security, data architecture, etc.)

TAC Purpose & Cadence

[Shuli] I think we were too quick to go to 1 meeting a month. It will probably be better to meet more regularly as they're quite a few things that we need to get in place before the end of the year.

- Core Infrastructure Badging
- Security analysis for each project
- Define Annual reviews (projects that want to graduate to another level need guidance)

[Shuli] I want the security team to be invited into the meeting and be more standard. Same for data architecture and infrastructure as well. We really began weaving in across all our projects in regards to data/standards architecture, security, and infrastructure.

[Shuli] Really valuable for us to define what an annual review looks like and how often do we need to do that. We seek to create repeatable processes so the TAC becomes a valuable part of participating in LF Energy. We can do a better job of getting people engaged and participating. This is not meant to be an obligation, but tremendously valuable to helping with the projects.

[Jonas] Adding to the Core Infrastructure Badge and we worked on applying it to GXF. I agree we need to make this a part of every project at LF Energy to show them where they stand for best practices. If we have more mature projects, we definitely should. GXF ended up at 98% from doing the badging. It will show that our projects take security very seriously and the best practices.

[Shuli] Every project that comes in we do a security audit and get them a badge. It's absolutely essential that projects that come in can always stage to the next level. For LFE to be the center of gravity, we have to get security, staging, and annual reviews correct.

[Debbie] Annual review is definitely a good thing. We need more transparency on what projects are doing for sure. If we go back to more regular meetings then what would we be covering?

[Shuli] We have 8 projects, we have some new ones: OpenADR, e-mobility, etc. I want to identify an onboarding process, do we want a holding process, throw them into a security badging, etc? We need to make a decision on what an annual review looks like. I think Jefe has started a great list of what an annual review looks like. Some of this is process oriented, taking time to see what things look like. There is a lot of business between now and the end of the year that we can identify. My commitments to you (everybody) these future meetings will be well planned and designed. I see us using the time to implement data standards, infrastructure, security, etc.

[Debbie] ok, yes, I think that makes sense

[Jefro] Shuli always talks about building capacity and what this will do by creating processes.

[Jonas] I agree that we should bring in the functional architecture in this group.

[Shuli] Infrastructure, security, data, and functional architecture should live in the TAC because these things cut across each one of our projects. And that requires regular cadence and meetings.

[Jefro] I don't think there will be an issue with meeting cadence, but just the summer hours.

[Gabor] I would like to understand what an annual review means in this context. And the sort of details. You don't want the review to end up as a checkbox list, but more engagement with the

projects. It would be great to see how many of the projects have outside contributors beyond the start-up group.

[Jefro] Many of the projects don't have that

[Shuli] We don't want to tell the projects what to do at all. We would like to take the list (found in presentation, slide 2), that it's not one size fits all but it's useful to people. It's not that we are trying to impose something, but creating a structure.

[Phil] I think the list looks uncontroversial. It looks like a straightforward way to give time and attention to the project. I think this is really important. I think we should schedule these as soon as possible to get them on the calendar. That's when it will become obvious of what is helpful and what is not. The purpose of this committee is to help the project succeed and the most important piece is that the projects get more focus time. I think our time in the TAC will be more useful if we discuss projects specifically. Some items on the agenda (readouts of TAC and board) can be sent in an email not a readout that takes time. The more discussion oriented and active will be more useful for me.

[Gabor] Every meeting should have a page on the wiki with notes.

[Naomi] I think we should make things more public sense the TAC

[Shuli] What I don't think we did very well, I don't know that we did that tie in from TAC to Board meeting.

[Debbie] I agree for sure. There has been a lot going on with OEDI and partly my fault that we haven't been more cross collaboration.

[Phil] My impression is there isn't a big problem but maybe I don't know what success would look like. I think there has been some cross talk on important things. For example, the stages which was driven by the TAC.

[Shuli] Is an annual review different from project updates?

[Jefro] Using the TAC as a big picture view and then aligning them with the LF Energy project roadmap. Does the roadmap address the goals, etc.

[Shuli] Project Annual review on the standard agenda. And every meeting someone can give updates.

[Naomi] Create an agenda submission for TAC so that projects can suggest agenda items.

[Shuli] Chair for TAC / governing board representative. Would give board readout and help build the agenda.

- Is the representation to the governing board, the chair? We need to figure that out

[Jefro] Set expectations for the governing board and chair role. Part of the reason why I think we haven't done that is because we were new to open source and kind of just went with it. It's up to the project to decide how we want to do that.

[Shuli] Have a series of structured conversations to the agenda. Add representation to the board and chairship.

Meeting cadence

- [Jonas] 3 weeks we had in mind worked for me because it gave me time to work on actions. But if you make it 2 it will work, but I prefer 3.
- [Debbie] 3 weeks will be fine.
- [Gabor] 2 or 3 weeks will work
- [Phil] Monthly will be ok with one caveat, the discussion about what should the chair be doing, what is missing is the agenda is being set by us (If energy). It would be really valuable to have a TAC chair set the agenda or work with us (LFE) to set the agenda. It will be a hard and painful step to take probably and it may involve relinquishing control and stumbling in a few meetings. I think you could accomplish that on a monthly scale because it's asking a lot but less frequently. When I look at OpenEEmeer, I have more to talk about after 1 month vs 2 or 3 weeks. It makes the meeting be more effective.

[Phil] I feel like I'm flying blind with where the projects are going because updates are top down vs bottom up. This is problematic.

[Shuli] If we went once a month, how long? We can also divide it up where it's business, and then the second meeting would be specifically focused on security, badging, and annual reviews.

- Once a month: business
- Second meeting (hour): focus on annual review process, target and attention

Concern: we go to a monthly meeting and things can slip because we meet less.

[Gabor] what I learned from program managers he does catch up meeting for all projects. What he asks for is a short A-list (challenges, expectations, successes). I've found it's not a lot of work to put this together but it keeps people up to date.

[Phil] I was also thinking about a 5 minute update for 3-4 projects. Not for the annual review, that will need to be longer.

[Shuli] What if we do 90 mins that focuses on TAC business and making sure cross projects, an hour that does annual review or project check in.

[Phil] Personally 90 mins is already pushing it to stay focused. Or are you proposing something like

- Every 3 wks we do one or the other of those

[Shuli] We need to decide new projects that come on board and decide how to handle them.

[Jonas] I still think the cadence of 3 wks, 90 mins, is still best.

Agreement: 3 weeks, 90 minutes

[Shuli] Make a vote to bring more people in.

Opening up the TAC

- Functional architecture
- Security best practices
- Data and standards eventually needs to be moved into it
- Infrastructure at one point

[Gabor] Are we tracking how many people download documents? I think it is necessary to track as it gives useful feedback on how useful the document is.

[Jefro] We can take metrics of the website, but the taxonomy is in multiple places.

[Gabor] Publish versions on website

[Jonas] Personally I think the first step would be very valuable to update the TAC on the functional and data architecture. And vote in key architecture for the TAC. Next step will be how to connect things to the project. As we grow we can connect metrics, but I see that as next steps in the process

[Gabor] If we have wider dissemination of the documents but later will make sense.

[Shuli] First thing is to go through these internally.

[Jonas] Must formalize things within the TAC. Will get with Benoit to update functional architecture

[Shuli] 30 mins annual review, 30 minutes look at working group, 30 minutes things related to votes

[Jonas] It is important to formalize and all accepted by the TAC is a goal for this year. Along with annual review process.

Links shared

Action Items

- Find more ways to be efficient with the time in the meetings it will be better
 - Send readouts prior to the meetings or include them on the
- Standing agenda item (at least once a month): Project Annual review
- Create an agenda submittal for TAC so that projects can suggest agenda items.
- Jefro -Schedule TAC meetings, 3 weeks 90 minutes
 - Formally invite others to join the TAC meetings and create a agenda of functional architecture
 - Next agenda - start with data architecture update