Abstract Summary

The Python in Heliophysics Community (PyHC) members discussed a new process called "PyHC Enhancement Proposal" (PhEP), modeled after Python Enhancement Proposals (PEPs). The PHEP process aims to document consensus among the community, as the current standards document is inflexible and difficult to update. The proposed process involves community members making proposals, followed by community input and discussion, approval, and potential replacement or retirement of proposals. The process is modeled on Python PEPs and similar processes within the PyHC. The discussion also touched on the need for a formal process for decision-making and the potential for a steering council. The group agreed to base the PHEP process on PEP 1 and to develop and archive the proposals on GitHub. The approval process will involve two rounds of voting, with no objections allowed for a proposal to pass. The finalized process is expected to be approved at a future meeting.

Key Points

- PyHC Enhancement Proposal (PhEP)
    - modeled after Python Enhancement Proposals (PEPs)
        - Members pointed out other related processes:
            - Numpy Enhancement Proposal (NEP) https://numpy.org/neps/
            - PlasmaPy Enhancement Proposal (PLEP) https://github.com/PlasmaPy/PlasmaPy-PLEPs
            - SunPy Enhancement Proposal (SEP) https://github.com/sunpy/sunpy-SEP
            - Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Request for Comments (RFC) process https://www.ietf.org/standards/rfcs/
            - Scientific Python Ecosystem Coordination (SPEC) https://scientific-python.org/specs/
    - PhEP Document link
        - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1E1Sfm2oWm4NR8Dd3MzCKpkzwIrOpmSYjQDCPdRleOQA/edit?usp=sharing
- Motivation
    - designed to help find and document consensus among the PyHC community
    - make the standards document more flexible and responsive to changes, as the current document is five years old and updates discussed in 2019 have not been acted on.
- Process

    - The PhEP process involves creating proposals, having community input and discussion, approval, and potentially retiring or replacing the proposals.
    - How to approve PHEPs?
        - Anyone present gets a vote, have two rounds of voting, and having no objections for approval (if there's an objection, we need to revisit the proposed PHEP).
            - ensures fair representation across different packages and members
- Positives
    - The PhEP process could potentially allow for the existing standards document to be broken up into different documents that can be updated independently.
    - Make decisions/PyHC recommendations on important topics such as a unified coordinate description, a standard syntax for coordinate transformations, and publishing in PIP *and* Conda.
- Concerns
    - Could be time intensive, both in creation and gaining consensus
    - Don't put this in somewhere closed (e.g. Slack) – keep it open in GitHub
    - One group might halt progress on a PHEP
- Plan moving forward
    - Use PyHC Standard GitHub repo to develop the PhEP process and Zenodo for archiving.
        - Keep all official discussions/decisions within GitHub discussions/issues. Other avenues for sidebar discussion can include the PyHC mailing list and Element/Slack, but no official decisions made therein.
    - Discuss within GitHub to refine the process.
    - Present on this again at upcoming telecons, and importantly, approve the process at our spring 2024 meeting.

Action Items

- Jon N.
    - open a pull request against the standards repository with a markdown version of the PyHC Enhancement Proposal (PhEP) process for further discussion and development.
    - send an announcement out to the mailing list that the PhEP process is available for discussion on GitHub.
- Community as a whole
    - discuss and refine the PhEP process within GitHub, with the aim of having a more put-together draft ready for discussion in a future meeting and telecon.

- Prepare to potentially approve the PhEP process at the spring meeting, following the proposed approval process of two successive meetings.
- consider how to handle potential objections in the approval process, with the aim of capturing consensus without allowing a single objection to halt progress.
- Define the editor role
    - ensure the process is managed effectively without overburdening any one individual
    - Document the editor role
        - The editor(s?) will manage the proposal through the process but not be the advocate for it (i.e. cannot be the initial author)