

# DuraSpace Membership/Governance Models

(Carol, rec)

*Jonathan Markow introduction*

- Interim steering committee in place until full governance is in effect; SG and Vision group members are present
- DSpace is an outlier; how can DSpace conform to this model--how can we make it work?
- There will be alternatives to this model as well
- What do you think and how will it benefit the community?
- In the future the DSpace Steering Group (DSG) would coordinate and be the hub for communications

Q: What are "working groups"?

A: Fedora example: FSG started meeting every week and now have morphed into ad hoc or specific task-oriented working groups that focus on specific issues because the everyone-every week schedule was too demanding. A way to tackle one-off issues. VIVO example: technical working groups hone in on specific technical issues on a monthly basis and report back to SG

Q: Where would DCAT fit into this model?

A: "How" is up for discussion

*What are your initial impressions?*

- Missing representation and voices from developing countries or small institutions who cannot afford to contribute. How do they participate?
- Have a number of small inst who have done a lot of the heavy lifting in OA and when those people are excluded it does not work
- Limiting the SG to the contributors goes against the fundamental nature of the DSpace community; this model does not work for DSpace
  - Representatives in the SG could be determined by smaller inst
- 2 issues: How to represent the interests of the entire community; How to gather enough contributions to move the project forward
- committer contributions need to be counted/measured and applied
  - "Tin" membership, just the communications pieces and we track you
    - Should still be able to submit requests
    - Is this a way to involve more developing nations?
    - Benefits would have to be very clear even for a small contribution (\$500)
    - UN list reaches 100 countries and would be a way to get the word out
    - Open Core is aimed at developing countries; could have a representative contribution

Q: What resources does the SG have to control; how do we merge the way DSpace has always worked with a structure that adds benefits to membership?

A: No one is excluded from contributing code; right now the SG has very few resources to direct

- Example: FSG has said that if you contribute more than half of a developer then SG directs efforts
- Developer time could be earmarked for certain things that the SG wants to do
- "trial memberships" that don't cost anything would expand the community
- Getting them involved and giving them a voice is a key issue and more importantly how do we serve these people
- DSpace knowledge base content is missing; adding to it could be an in-kind contribution

*What is the right amount and who should be able to come in at that level? (JJM)*

- There may be funds available through UN or World Bank that could help DSpace focus on community building

What about community building would interest international funders like the UN?

- New skills and education, status of being a member of, different from capacity building
- ByLine fosters scientific communication by and for the third world; capacity-building; also EIFL net; Role for consortia
- Should there be a separate category for consortia? No--anyone-any group can join

Again, what about DCAT this group has already broadened participation.

- Not questioning the value of DCAT, just working on where it fits in

What is the purpose of governance for DSpace? Is it community source development or community building?

- DSpace community is more complex and more diverse. Need to put effort into investigation and effort
- Product manager or project director could help with that but now we do not have enough resources to do that. What else does DSpace need; What does DSpace need to be in the future? A majority of institutions may not be feeling that it needs anything.
- Large contingent may be content with DSpace as it is?
- Development or community building? Can't answer that question yet

(Lieven) The latest release of DSpace is always feature rich. Adding communities is relevant to add funding from various regions in the world especially Europe. Development activities have not been undertaken and several attempts have been made to add major features. Right now we do not have the ability to pull together to add standard frameworks to DSpace. The effort needs to be led and coordinated by a tech lead or a product manager. A continual problem is that while the process is organic, the internal changes that are coordinated need big institutions to back them up. Tim has no control over developer time. Big institutions with dedicated developers is what is needed.

Challenge is to define big task items so that the community understands

- All the work we have outlined needs direction and coordination that require funds (JJM)
- The membership model fits the ideas that we have generated today. Generic solutions to things like big data management through DSpace could work

Project Director--could this be a community contributed position?

- Yes--2 year rotation?
- PKP consortial model
- 1 dedicated developer, development priorities, then a discussion with PKP then we wrote the code; we had unprecedented access to a developer
- Fedora 2 week agile sprints allow everyone to see the work in great detail and for re-tooling development priorities
- Product manager for DSpace would allow us to oversee a big project--more than a one-off effort
- Big sponsorship levels would be more attractive if the product manager position would be in place
- PM is not only a technical role, coordination, business and community development, user groups in different countries
- Goal of governance is to put the second person on the project

How much money do we need to have a full time tech lead and a full time project manager?

- Everything is now covered up to 50-60% of Tim's time plus overhead
- 200K of new money is needed, we have 270K
- Goal should be to get to half a million to move forward
- Governance should be structured to incentivize contributions that will get us there. How do you make the gov structure work to get contributions? You contribute to get a seat at the table to make strategic decisions about development--technical and community. The reason to join is to have influence
- OCLC regional model seems to work. Pay less but they still have a person

Marketing for sponsorship outside of US?

- Japan, SAKAI and SPARC have tried with unknown success; best way to do that is to get well-organized with the group that is already there; get our governance right and show that it works

What do we want the governance model to do?

- more resources and faster, better code
- strategic direction of the product and what are the roles and responsibilities (MIT)
- want to get away from the committers and developers in a room at OR having a free-for-all on details
- position DSpace to be part of big national and international efforts is being hampered by a lack of strategic direction
- no three year road map; bpress is better governed and has a roadmap
- define the responsibilities of a product manager

To hire a PM the SG works with a committee; SG is the oversight group for the project

- You are not buying influence with governance; we all want DSpace to go in a good direction; if I give money will it be used to take us where we want to go?
- We need a governance model to inspire people to join in and the SG can help along with DuraSpace.
- Interim SG will form a working group to continue discussions

What are we going to do as a follow-up and structure a governance model

- Collapse levels into ranges of contribution (Lievan)
- One constraint is no 3 models for 3 projects
- Base model with extensions for DSpace; needs to be a certain normalcy to the structure
- Still need to think about the groups that are underresourced
- Range of contributions (bronze 2k-5k etc.)
- Get agreement on the in-kind contributions and measurement
- Best policy possible to get to a half million dollars
- Atmire does not care so much about details but that there is good governance