2018-03-16 Governance Agenda And Notes

Date
16 Mar 2018

Attendees
- Ryan Steans
- Carolyn Caizzi
- Rosalyn Metz
- Maria Whitaker
- Michele Mennielli
- Simeon Warner
- Mark Bussey
- Anna Headley

https://bluejeans.com/128863099

Goals
- Come to agreement about final points in document that will be sent out to community for voting.

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>House keeping: update about phone call with Mark and Richard;</td>
<td>Rosy, Carolyn, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>see re-written intro in doc: <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DtKOO8MJTU7k6svMrvQ2M_ZrMep1-6s0xV05PUI/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DtKOO8MJTU7k6svMrvQ2M_ZrMep1-6s0xV05PUI/edit?usp=sharing</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notes from the meeting: <a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ja_ZgjVJBea8EH-D0VRs3Jk6yaBq-kX_iPHIKaKufaE/edit">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ja_ZgjVJBea8EH-D0VRs3Jk6yaBq-kX_iPHIKaKufaE/edit</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>There are 11 items that need to be decided.</td>
<td>Rosy, Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DtKOO8MJTU7k6svMrvQ2M_ZrMep1-6s0xV05PUI/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1DtKOO8MJTU7k6svMrvQ2M_ZrMep1-6s0xV05PUI/edit?usp=sharing</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Comment about vote and contribution model in beginning - Can this be resolved now?</td>
<td>resolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Not more than one rep from any given Partner shall serve on the newly formed Steering. Need to come to agreement. Steering does not like this idea. Also need to come to agreement about when new election happens and subsequent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. If the agreement is only one rep from one institution, that should cover the issue of whether people need to rotate off if they move institutions or do we need to specify?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Steering Meeting in person once per year - yay or nay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Can we just say - &quot;Will elect a Chair and Chair-Elect from among their membership&quot;? And let Steering sort it out in the bylaws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Partners will have input to decide on order of which position will be hired first - Technical or Community Manager position. Yay or nay? Do we say Tech Manager first?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Principles for contribution model added - Partners will develop a contribution model which will get voted on, based on 4 principles - Do we need to include all the verbage and brainstorming in this document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Contribution Model - new WG or this one?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Resolved what happens when a PO steps away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Support Simeon's comments about Components Council making language stronger?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Standing Working Groups? Do we need this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Recap the sending out, the voting, next steps</td>
<td>Carolyn, Rosy, Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component Council versus Roadmap Council - Because Avalon and HyRax are not technically Components - and not hosted in Hyrax Github

Action items

For the document
- Add a qualifier to say July or end of summer at the latest
- Remove the requirement for in person once per year
- “Will elect a Chair and Chair-Elect from among their membership” And let Steering sort out how in the bylaws.
Rosalyn Metz: Roadmap Council is core components and other components as identified by the Steering Group (Avalon, Hyrax, metadata, etc.)

Rosalyn Metz: Make sure all voting models are consistent throughout

Rosalyn Metz: Get rid of any reference to standing working groups

Rosalyn Metz: Update the glossary of terms

Rosalyn Metz: Add a title

Rosalyn Metz: Update the overview section to talk about the documentation we've generated being available to future working groups

Other action items

Carolyn Caizzi: Draft an email to send to the community.

Meeting Notes

Housekeeping: Mark, Ryan, CC, Rosy, Richard Green - talk about what we're actually voting on -

Discussed what it was Steering saw us voting on - around steering implementing - Partners recommend and steering is implementing in partnership with Partners. Outcome of vote - want Steering to work with partners via WG's to clarify and implement rec's.

1 partner one vote, 2/3rds - will name numbers (ex: 24 of 36 partners).

Take it upon ourselves to make sure we get all the votes. It will take x number of Yes votes - to state we're moving forward.

Steering is not ratifying these rec's - Steering is implementing with Partners

How we will take the vote: identifying the contact - can't dictate how partners do that. Finding a contact to be able to say - collect voters ID via a Spreadsheet

Steering is culling some Partners who aren't active -

UK is closed the week of April 2 -

Agreement: Results of vote will be made public - note in doc

1. Comment about vote and contribution model in beginning - Can this be resolved now? Resolved

We resolved this question. New WG's will be formed.

We will pass on comments to any WG's working on Governance

1. Not more than one rep from any given Partner shall serve on the newly formed Steering. Need to come to agreement. Steering does not like this idea. Also need to come to agreement about when new election happens and subsequent.

We need to clarify - asking DCE, Hull and Stanford to make a decision 3 of the six people will step down

diverse body working together - multiple people from same institution

We are agreement on one rep per institution (figuring out exceptions can be worked out in bylaws by someone else)

1. If the agreement is only one rep from one institution, that should cover the issue of whether people need to rotate off if they move institutions or do we need to specify?

Pick July 18 as date, but we won't hit that, likely, for this election cycle - so we should just say summer 2018? End of summer at the latest.

1. Steering Meeting in person once per year - yay or nay?

Cost may be problematic - remote participation? Financial lever to that. Recommend 12! but remote for those who can't be there. Don't codify that you HAVE to be there in person (tie steering to existing events).

Are meetings compulsory? If you miss X meetings, you're out? AGREEMENT: Remove language for in-person attendance
1. Can we just say - "Will elect a Chair and Chair-Elect from among their membership"? And let Steering sort it out. restriction comment.  
Have them sort it out. We just like Chair and Chair Elect! AGREED

1. Partners will have input to decide on order of which position will be hired first - Technical or Community Manager position. Yay or nay? Do we say Tech Manager first?  
DuraSpace could take on some features and roles. Have transitional staff take care of it. that might lead us to want to hire one or the other first. Constraining that process when we don't know the funding - what parts of those jobs does Steering want done? What are the pieces we need filled?  
A person would do tech coordination if he knew that there was a place to fall back.  
Job would likely fall under DuraSpace - DuraSpace would handle the funds.  
We are in agreement - needs of Community will drive the hiring  

1. Principles for contribution model added - Partners will develop a contribution model which will get voted on, based on 4 Principles - Do we need to include all the verbiage and brainstorming in this document?  
In case of verbage - keep as appendix - Remove verbiage but keep the principles in place  

1. Contribution Model--new WG or this one?  
We will charter a new WG. Will be approved by majority 2/3rds

1. Resolved what happens when a PO steps away  
When a PO steps away, Partners will acknowledge and we'll find a replacement PO

1. Support Simeon’s comments about Components Council making language stronger?  
Goes back to re-naming of Components to Roadmap Council

Left avalon and SIGAH separate - Components Council and Community Roadmapping Group  
Practically be Sr. folks who will be on the roadmap council. Technical coordinator will oversee the coordination of  
Things from the Core Components as decided by CCMWG and Solution Bundles as Designated by Steering  

1. Roadmap Council is name  
2. Solution Bundles and Community Owned Components and other Components Identified by the Steering Group

Will be responsible for roadmaps

1. Standing Working Groups? Do we need this?  
New framework allows for rechartering - so we don’t need "Standing" Working groups in new format

Other Comments:  
We could erase the first paragraph - Agreed  
Could put a title on it - This is a new version of Rec’s - use that title  
4th paragraph in overview section - we could put 4th paragraph into an email to the community  
Clarify that we’re talking about new WG’s and IG’s tied to work related to Governance  
What groups do we need to list:  
Voting  
Contributions
To be worked out by new working groups and...

What's Next:

Between Rosy, Ryan and CC we’ll clean up doc
Write email to introduce the doc
Pass out to Community Next week
Ryan and Mark will get contacts for votes
Select technology for vote
Don't know that we'll need a larger group meeting -