**CF meeting**
**9-11 June 2020**
**Zoom session link**

# Discussion topic notes

---

**Moderation of proposals (Chris Barker)**
https://github.com/cf-convention/cf-conventions/issues/151
5 attendees

Both due to a maturing project and new tools it's a good time to discuss and perhaps update and/or clarify how proposals for changes to CF are managed. The CF conventions have been managed in gitHub for a while now, so that we now have a bit of experience with the system. It has worked fairly well in some cases, not so well in others.

We will review the current rules for convention changes:

http://cfconventions.org/rules.html, and discuss what's worked well, what has not, and mull over possible ideas from improvements.

This discussion relates to the following issues in gitHub:

#151 #130 #172

(most of which are closed, but provide context)

---

Moderator is [should be] assigned to issue
Moderator is technically compulsory -- but doesn't always happen;
Need a high-level view of all issues so can see ones that are lingering

Shouldn't allow changes to the text at the top of the issue because people's comments refer back to it.
   ● Ethan - Current rules say it should be updated, issue template includes "last updated" date stamp

If the issue starts getting very difficult there should be a separate "concept paper" to work on the text.

We should document why a proposal is or isn't accepted.

It's useful to have a useful moderator but that person doesn't necessarily need an in depth view of the subject - they should be in the position of an "average user" of the conventions.

We maybe need more potential moderators:
   Conversation turned to perhaps expanding the committee
   How to recruit / nominate members?

Should there be a process for making sure proposals get a moderator?

How to deal with proposals that keep coming up again and again.

The goal is to have a single document that will be the final proposal -- and we need to maintain a draft of it as the discussion evolves.

So: should that be the initial issue description? Or should it be somewhere else?

**Problem: A minority of discussions have grown up to a point which makes it difficult to follow or summarise.**

Idea:
Most issues can be resolved fairly quickly, without a very formal process or document.
If an issue becomes "large" then a separate document can be produced:
        "Large": discussion is too long or complicated to be followed.
It is at the discretion of the moderator to create this separate document.
The document should be structured and include the proposal  and  itself, as well as a summary of the discussion: pros, cons, alternatives (actual text changes of the conventions will go in a PR, the "proposal" here is a statement of motivation and intent).

**Question**:
   - Does the initial issue description get updated as the conversation goes?

Having an active moderator is very important in moving conversations forward. The moderator should try to get people to focus on what problems need to be solved. The moderator should break off separate issues to be discussed if it helps to move things forward.

**Problem: Getting moderators for long or complex issues.**
Ideas:
   ● More people on committees
   ● GitHub label "Needs Moderator": this could be automatically added to each new issue

- High-level overview of open issues, notice when stuck
- How do people communicate with committee members? When no moderator found
  - GitHub teams are not visible to all