2018-01-09 Samvera Governance WG Agenda and Meeting Notes

- Attendees
- Agenda
- Possibly Useful Documents
- Action Items
- Deliverables
- Community Feedback
  - Michael J. Giarlo
  - Ryan Steans
  - Richard Green
- Notes

Meeting at 1:00 Central, US. 2018-01-09.

https://bluejeans.com/667013494

Attendees

- Ryan Steans
- Evviva Weinraub
- Karen Estlund
- Mark Bussey
- Simeon Warner
- Carolyn Caizzi
- Anna Headley
- Maria Whitaker
- Michele Menniell
- Nebella Jaffer
- Rosalyn Metz

Agenda

Introductions

Review Charter

Review Timeline

Review Comments and Issues raised by community

Appoint Chair

Set Calendar of Meetings

Review First Deliverables

- Context: the discussion summary document will be completed by Friday, January 19th, 2018
- Synthesis: the summary of themes will be completed and circulated by Friday, January 19th, 2018

Possibly Useful Documents

- Samvera Governance / Roadmapping/ Resourcing Activity - 2017-11-10
- Governance Models for Samvera - original
- Governance Model Planning and Notes - RJS 2017-11-30

Action Items

Meet again 2018-01-12

Carolyn and Rosie - Co-Facilitators
Pull together small team to work on Context/ Synthesis doc

Deliverables

The scope of the Samvera Governance Working Group’s deliverables will be:

- **Context**: A one-page summary of the discussion, documentation, and feedback to-date related to the various governance models under consideration.
- **Synthesis**: A summary of the themes and issues that the community hopes to address by refining existing or adopting new governance practices and structures. Ideally identifies key differences and decision points between the models provided for evaluation and current model. This combined context and synthesis documents should be approximately 750-1500 words (1-3 pages) in length.
- **Draft**: Development of a draft governance proposal and incremental steps to implementation if appropriate.
- **Community Input**: Circulation of the above to Partners, stakeholders, and the Steering group for review, comment, and change requests to the proposal.
- **Legal Review**: This step will be shepherded by Steering, as the proposed model will also be assessed for legal, licensing, and MOU implications prior to further community review.
- **Proposal**: A revised governance proposal based on community, stakeholder, & legal feedback.
- **Community Review**: Circulation of the final proposal for potential adoption at a Spring/Summer 2018 partner meeting.

Community Feedback

In the Comments for the establishment of the Working Group:

- **Michael J. Giarlo**

  Does the "governance proposal" necessary include details on how the community will resource shared work, and specifically software maintenance and development? I would find it difficult to support this group unless that is a stated focus of the proposal. (My understanding is that how we resource this shared work is what got us down this governance path in the first place, so I'm concerned that there's a risk this effort will be focused elsewhere.

  Reply
  Like
  Dec 15, 2017

- **Ryan Steans**

  Great question, Mike. I'll follow up.

  Reply
  Edit
  Delete
  Like
  Dec 15, 2017

- **Richard Green**

  May I echo Mike's concern? My recollection is that all this started in a discussion about how to make our software development "more professional" now that it seems clear there is likely to be a general community move toward Hyrax and, in particular maybe, commercial service providers using it through Hyku. We all have a real need to understand the process: how we can feed into it (feature requests etc) and what changes might be coming and when that could affect our delivery systems (roadmap). The more established community would also welcome a clearer view of how materials coming from IGS and WGs get fed into the process (or not), likewise feature requests from users, and who makes these decisions. Behind all this is the need to encourage and sustain software development. So from a personal point of view, I feel that this WG might usefully take a "bottom-up" approach. What does Samvera need at the software R&D level to maintain and further the product, and what resources will this take? Next, how do we reliably put these resources together (both people and $$$) and then, to my mind last, what management structures are needed to organize all this. During the first round of discussions I sometimes felt that the "models" were coming first, rather than our needs (a more top-down process).
Somehow, during the last round, these software-related needs got conflated with community concerns which were not, I think, intended to be a primary focus. The first WG did extensive work on a CAIRO matrix around software matters but did not do the same for the community side of things. Perhaps this group, too, should focus on software-related issues unless and until work goes into a similarly detailed CAIRO matrix about the community.

Ideally, to my mind, anything that is proposed will be compatible with an evolutionary (rather than revolutionary) implementation! Purely personal thoughts...

Notes

Anna: Define the problem statement the Working Group is trying to solve. Does steering nor work anymore? What was the issue or issues that drove a need for governance?

Karen Estlund: You can review the bullets in the charter about desired attributes. A need for a common, defined roadmap and plan.

Not knowing what steering and partners do. Partners may not feel they can make appropriate calls.

If you have a project and no roadmap, it's difficult to coordinate and work with others

Rosie: There are questions around the direction of governance. What direction is the community going in?

Simeon: How to finance general development - how do we get money to support common development?

Mark: Notion of a how decisions get made. As a larger community, how do people plug in? How do you participate?

Evviva: Samvera very developer driven, to become sustainable, we need non-developers in governance and roadmaps

Mark: we can't solve everything on the first shot

Michele: We do have international concerns. How do we include people from outside US and Canada?

Anna: Look at the Component Working Group. They are important to talk to as they work to organize and plan around specific components

Document development - discovery of themes in Context Document - if we can knock out issues we're trying to address