

## **Green Group – Round 1**

### **Re-usable Software**

Participants:

Chris McClerdon (?) [chris.lee.mc@gmail.com](mailto:chris.lee.mc@gmail.com)

Charles Ross [charleshross@gmail.com](mailto:charleshross@gmail.com)

Gary Huber [gahuber95@gmail.com](mailto:gahuber95@gmail.com)

Shane Hutson [shane.hutson@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:shane.hutson@vanderbilt.edu)

Tony Hunt [a.hunt@ucsf.edu](mailto:a.hunt@ucsf.edu)

Scribe: Wolfgang Bluhm [wbluhm@ucsd.edu](mailto:wbluhm@ucsd.edu)

Re-usable what? Software? Models? By whom, when?  
Are “one-off”, not re-used models necessarily a bad thing?

Wet lab experiments are built from off the shelf commodity components

“I’m having problems getting my students to document even versions of their models”

LittleBits: startup company making little electronic components => need to have small enough components of models to make them more re-usable

APIs a la OpenMM, OpenSym

To what extent do we need to define the scope of the community before we can define APIs?

Often it’s easier to reinvent than to understand existing software.

If software gets too big to be understood it often means the problem wasn’t defined well enough.

Documentation standards

Separate app store areas for software vs. models/data

Ptolemy II (<http://ptolemy.eecs.berkeley.edu/ptolemyII/>)

Dozens of software packages that implement Amber force fields, but none fit my needs, e.g. my data structures don’t match theirs