2018-02-16 Samvera Governance Working Group Meeting

Date
16 Feb 2018

Attendees
- Ryan Steans

Goals
- Discuss 3 models and synthesize
  - Nabeela, Carolyn, Maria: Formal Contributions
  - Simeon, Anna, Ryan: Stable Communications/Coordination Plan
  - Rosy, Michele, Evviva: Community defined Roadmap or Plan

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes

Group 1 (Nabeela, Carolyn, Maria: Formal Contributions)

Group 3 - Roadmap - how did we come to a community idea - components council - weekly meetings (coordination of parts)

Our Components working group manages this (Bess agrees) - Michele made a comment about fleshing it out.

Ignored finances.

Group 1 - formal contributions

Looked through models and tried to see how other models what was mapped to formal contributions. Problem statement: accountability from partners for obligations to community and formal contributions - Foundation model very articulate about those things.

Very concerned with financial sustainability - how to sustain 2 FTE. Take in a lot of income every year.

Partnerships could be monetary at different levels (tiered) - attached a Board of Directors/Steering. Tied to level of partnership. Could have open positions. Technical advisory and roadmap committee. Open to partners. Top level - spot on board and have to contribute to steering.

Solve resourcing issue - partners required to dedicate some part of an FTE to priorities of roadmap committee. Certain priorities decided upon and people pony up people to help with centrally resourced map. User experience, scrum masters, etc... all count toward people's possible contribution.

Group 2 - Partners are the custodians of Samvera - Steering would elect into an elected body - we see Governing Board as a smaller, functional body that represents partners in day-to-day business. WGs, IGs, PMCs would represent management of large projects (Avalon).

Most important role, Technical Coordinator to tie with IGs, WGs and PMCs direct resources to needs. Dealing with core and un-cool components that need to be managed. Also possibly a second role as a Community Coordinator.

Idea of a sort of Project coordination body from Model 3 - augment

Board is elected from Partners - any kind of requirement for partner - we didn't go into details of election process.

QUESTION (CC): In both summaries, one or two FTEs paid for by Samvera

How do we fund those positions?
Group 3 wanted that funding model with some tweaks. Michele - analysis of what contributions that can be given to the project. If project is in the US - what is engagement that you want to achieve for different solutions? Analysis brought a 4 tier, Broze, Silver and Gold. New one - two lower tiers of membership. In Europe - its very hard to find institutions that can spend that kind of money to spend money to join. It's a problem elsewhere, too. Open organization, get as many and as diverse a membership as possible. Add more than 3 tiers. Big institutions will have more weight in the organizations. The message that you send doesn't help engagement - will see a barrier that organization does even if they don't want it to be open. Different tiers is good, it works. The more you have, the better.

In kind and economic contribution are both viable.

DCE could make in-kind contributions before $ institutions. Easier to make staff contributions. What does in-kind look like? Open - project is perhaps elitist and privileged. Barrier for participation low would be a hallmark of a good solution.

A formula applied - a matrix

We did discuss in-kind - how much in-kind versus money - Managing in-kind is work itself. Will be a full time.

How do small orgs participate, how to contribute

Steering - aware that they need to raise funding. As project grows.

When Adam Wead was at Rockhall - small group making disproportionate contribution - sheer hours put in. Hard to figure the calculus. Historically - no barrier to entry.

Partnership versus Community barrier to entry.

Putting a technical lead in place - it's not just the coordination but also resourcing of development - a partner accountability statement - an expectation of certain number of hours. So, need to make sure people are contributing hours, get them to commit time that Tech Coordinator is managing.

Why a Tech Coordinator versus Community Coordinator - Is the gap in community organization, or technical organization. So much feedback that the issue was one of technical coordination - responding to resourcing questions.

Tech Coordinator (Group 2) was not a developer, but more of someone managing the technical resources - calGroup 3 called it a technical lead instead of Chief Technical Coordinator

We just provide a job idea/ desc and send it forward (an example in Group 2 proposal)

Last three bullet points in Group 2's Technical coordinator might be in the ocmunity coordinator - top 3

Steering - name is similar to other groups and connected groups

So what has changed - what will change and is modified -

Make it clear Steering has been doing a good job. Done good work - so we're building on that success. We may have a new Steering that's very similar to the existing Steering group.

Communicate the change - of voting, that there is changing.

What we want structure to look like, and how we get to that structure. Implementation details make it clear what the nature of the change is. (ugh, bad sentence). Organized in priority order - what has to happen (maybe dependencies). Move to electing members of steering. Once we do that, easier to do everything else. Updating bylaws - from perspective of new steering. There are bylaws on the Samvera Wiki.

Steering asking for evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Coming up with election process - makes everything easier. Putting in place - how to allow people to vote on governance model.

starting from election process for steering - good priority - tied to clear responsibility and distribution of responsibilities -

Each Partner would get a vote (a single vote) -

Every cycle at DuraSpace - one person they talk to about voting -

Agreed on 1 vote per institution - to vote on Steering

AI: Go through and update contact list

Barrier to partnership has been the MOU and CLA and plan of what you want to do and showing that you've got a Samvera instance up and going

How do we figure partners in good standing? Financial contribution
Partners - monetary - in-kind/ enforcement of that - Community manager - checking in with steering, etc. working with tech coordinator to establish contributions of FTEs. Did these people actually do any work?

Steering the option to de-Partner someone? Probably automatic - not make the bar super high. Language "board member has to make a personally significant financial contribution".

"Good standing" notion rather than kicking someone out - take that to Steering. Don't worry about the gap. Enforcement via body of partners?

difference between project mgmt council (PMC) for each project - and component council - should we have separate PMCs as separate for major products - and one PMC for Component group

Ongoing mgmt needs for way to have an ongoing - concrete body - IGs ongoing but no deliverables, WG's end, PMCs ongoing permanent work

Group 2 (Simeon, Anna, Ryan: Stable Communications/ Coordination Plan)

Group 3 (Rosy, Michele, Evviva: Community defined Roadmap or Plan)

Action items