| Area of Question or<br>Comment                      | Please select an area in this<br>category               | Please share your Question or Comment  | Please Leave Comment or Question   | Please select an area in this category         | Please share your Question or Comment  | Please Share Your Question or Comment   | Please Share your Question or Comment<br>The GWG is to be commended for managing effective pace in the discussions an<br>pulling together the outcome of these. The recommendations meet the five<br>attributes identified, and it is likely that the deviation is an one to the<br>the outcome of the second second second second second second second second<br>initial aims that I reflect here:<br>- Who will have commendation prevention of the different codmaps? This is relatively<br>converting and constiguing the third second seco |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|   |   |  |  |  |  |   | <ul> <li>The relationships between the different groups makes sense overall. Where<br/>there is a need for annual reporting to the Partners, how is it envisaged that this</li> </ul>  |  |
| Overview  |   | It will be of value to make it clearer how Partners can make a contribution through the sub-   |  |  |  |   | take place? Whilst there is good attention to the structures of Steering and<br>Components Council, it is less clear how the Partners themselves would be<br>organised to play the role intended.  |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations                       | Partners Will provide Contributions to<br>the Community | group proposed. To what extent does this lead to actions if a Partner is viewed as not being<br>in good standing? How would this be taken forward? Questions to consider as we move<br>forward rather than challenges and setting up a WG on this will be helpful.   |  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations                       | Hire a Community Manager                                | This question addresses both prospective hires, but maybe the community manager mostly<br>(given the breadth of addivity outlined). To what extent is it viewed that either or both of these<br>roles are full-time? Or does that require further attention in scoping them out (which would<br>affect the funding call to be made)?   |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|   |   | Now was 3.5 year term reached as a period of office? While this can be renewed and is a<br>essenable length of time, I voold like to propose making the length of time 4 years, to be<br>extended by 2 years if renewed, to add greater stability in the short mid-term without<br>compromising the benefit of unnover.  |  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations                       | Elect Partner Representatives to<br>Samvera Steering    | appreciate that there is a benefit in having a spread of Partner representatives this feels a<br>little artificial in possibly preventing good people from being part of how Samvera runs.<br>What was the basis for having only the Product Owners on this Council? Whilst there is an  |  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations<br>Governance         | Establish a Components Council                          | obvious focus there, it would be beneficial to have a small number (2-37) of non-Product<br>Owners as neutral participants to complement the specific Product Owner interests.<br>How is it envisaged that the reporting out to Partners take place? Who would be receiving<br>these reports? I assume this could be in the form of a Partners meeting (like a shareholders  |  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Recommendations                                     | Delineate Roles and Responsibilities                    | Underrigional / Romality recorded, but an eleven idea barrig considered?"  |  |  | It will be important to have a clear statement of<br>quoracy in determining what a valid vote would be<br>this would reasoning 20 of whateen body is<br>mature of the change being understaten.<br>What would be the way forward it a vote did not<br>agree to the recommendations? Does this suggest<br>and one of the options in the vote needs to be<br>message of which detection to go in rather than an<br>uncell of the state of the suggest<br>of Manifus status quo's to that we get a clear<br>message of which detection to go in rather than an<br>uncell of the second the suggest the suggest<br>to the suggest the suggest the suggest<br>term. Is this to inflorable the suggest term, while the<br>original recommendation take only of a 3-year<br>term. Is this to inflorable to pay the north term to<br>agree candidates to stand for the longer term to  |   |  |  |
| Recommendations                                     |   |  |  | Hold Elections for Steering                    | provide greater continuity.  | I would support the dissent expressed. The<br>community has shown a desire to coordinate  |  |  |
| Governance Working                                  |   |  |  |  |  | technical efforts and this will no doubt be enhanced<br>by a coordinator. But there is a more urgent need<br>to better coordinate community activity, which will<br>help to serve both the technical development and<br>non-technical development through better<br>communication and coordination generally. As<br>stated elsewhere, to what extent either post needs<br>to be full-time in the first instance could usefully be |  |  |
| Group Member Dissent                                |   |  | Overall I think the recommendations have potential but some things<br>are still unclear for me.  |  |  | explored further.   |  |  |
| Other   |   |  | justifies the separate. If the component council is functioning property<br>institutes the separate in the second second second second council is<br>analyzed to be lectrated second second second second second council<br>second, in life winderleing hexp patients have voice and<br>second, in life winderleing hexp patients have voice and<br>second, in life winderleing hexp patients have voice and<br>the responsibility of sourcing a PO, defining patients, and days to bar<br>analyzed second second second second second second second<br>maintenancelationismitation of the code defeesing PRI, issues,<br>question, and promotecing the provide independences which is<br>codings is weak or not well defined.<br>Third, labeling patient, life site patients direct influence on<br>readings is weak or not well defined.<br>Third, labeling patient, life site patients direct influence on<br>maintenancelations haves. This could be overcome, built<br>walking and coordination needs. This could be overcome, built<br>walking and coordination needs. This could be overcome, built<br>balaroos these and avoid potics of unequal attention or boring those<br>is inducting and could be good to by implementing the protificat<br>economendations incode these bodies (selenger, patients,<br>component council, and components which would help strengthen<br>poverance change. Think it to have by by by by by the singlement the paid<br>balaroos these bodies (selenger), patients, and various and patients and having attand understanding and<br>avoidous needs of components and having attand understanding and<br>avoidous needs of components by the by by by the singlement the<br>patients without the time to bot the patient adjust of the second<br>patients without the time to bot the strengthen of the<br>patients and conditions noniticated by the conditionated or<br>patients and conditions noniticated by the conditionated on<br>patients without the time to be the base to bot the second balaror?<br>PAVW, changolating the org chart is sec:<br>Second patient by the component by the conditionator?<br>PAVW, changolating the org chart is sec-<br>sed conducet fore the  |  | The rules for recommendation 3 are too resigned<br>from the supply graving above given members of section galaxies m |   |  |  |
| Prioritized   |   |  |  | Identify Existing Steering Members to Serve on | The class of recommendance are to weighter<br>(Three (a) existing number of Steering will save<br>or Steering for the purposes of on-boarding.<br>Involvedge transfer, and succession planning.") and<br>towards pulling in their close sascolates to expand<br>towards pulling in their close sascolates to expand<br>towards pulling in their close sascolates to expand<br>towards pulling in their close studied by the<br>solution of save on the neconstituted Steering are<br>eligible for eection during the first election cycle.<br>Should mby be elected, they are eligible to nut for a<br>second term once the first term is completed. The<br>metaneous and tableay are important, new<br>perspectives and new ideas are critical, so a<br>balance should be stuck that thoring in new players   |   |  |  |
| Prioritized<br>Implementation of<br>Recommendations |   |  |  | Steering<br>Hire a Technical Coordinator       | and new thinking.<br>This should be moved up to position 4 or 5 as   |   |  |  |
| Prioritized<br>Implementation of                    |   |  |  |  | something that needs to be very quickly addressed.<br>The priority of this item need to be 5 on the list, not<br>9. Staffing needs are too critical to be something<br>left for "later". Find the money and hire for items 8   |   |  |  |
| Governance  |   | I agree that the Technical Coordinator should be first priority, given that one of our biggest<br>challenges has been adequate coordination, resourcing, and release management of key<br>components. Civer that we will need to rake multi-year commitment of a sum to a scoord<br>per position from Partners, I think it's likely we will need to start with one staff position (or<br>even part of one is scoorded from another institution of rom existing DuraSpace staff, rather<br>to scoord be accorded to an advert institution of rom existing DuraSpace staff, rather<br>to the scoorded to an advert institution of rom existing DuraSpace staff, rather<br>to the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to an advert the scoord be accorded to an advert and the scoorded to an advert<br>to the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to a scoord be accorded to an advert<br>to the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to an advert<br>to the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to a scoorded to advert<br>the scoorded to approximate the scoorded to an advert<br>to the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to a scoorded to a scoorded to advert<br>the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to a scoorded to advert the scoorded to an advert<br>the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to an advert<br>the scoorded to an advert prior be accorded to advert the scoorded to advert the scoorded to advert prior be accorded to advert the scoorded to advert prior be accorded to advert the scoorded to advert prior be accorded to advert the scoorded to advert prior be advert to advert prior be adver |  | Hire a Community Manager                       | and 9 as soon as possible.   |   |  |  |
| Recommendations                                     | Hire a Technical Coordinator                            | than two. Under Becularist ander Bernstein und von eine Case of Debugset San Jack<br>(1) hink hat her membership of the Componentiation under under San Jack<br>supported component may need to be examined at hin more. For example, Availon is not<br>controlly in the superset Bark Juck of Vondo Is in control. However, a Vondo Is in a<br>control of the component and the component of control of the components, and a wold<br>make sense for 16 the prependent on the Component of control and any<br>interdependencies with and is contributing to development and maintenance sprints<br>are strained and the Components Concil will not be components, and any<br>under all sense the for the Components Concil will not be components and any<br>maintenance activities for all components, and that individual institutions will be controlled<br>maintenance activities for all components concil will not be component and maintenance sprints<br>the case, it would be good for mainte that more clear. If it not the case, then it has that as<br>the case. It would be good for mainte that more clear. If it not the case, then it has that as   |  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Recommendations                                     | Establish a Components Council                          | problem.   | Overal. I think this is the start of a sold governance framework, and I<br>comment the group for its work. I am generally supportive of all of the<br>interctions cullend, including making Sterming an excited body,<br>method and the start of the start of the start of the<br>sentialized staff, and establishing a hore formal process for technical<br>contrained starts project. However, excluding the start of the<br>framework are undefined (which i understand is largely based on the<br>framework are undefined (which i understand is largely based on the<br>particularly an issue in egad to the Partner Contribution Model : The<br>issue of the start of the start of the start of the<br>the start of the start of the start of the<br>the start of the start of the start of the<br>start of the constant of the<br>start of the start of the start of the<br>start of the start of the<br>start of the start of the start of the<br>start of the<br>st |  |  |   |  |  |

| Area of Question or<br>Comment             | Please select an area in this<br>category                  | Please share your Question or Comment<br>The issue of how solution bundle efforts, such as Hyrax or Avaion, are governed is left   | Please Leave Comment or Question | Please select an area in this category         | Please share your Question or Comment  | Please Share Your Question or Comment  | Please Share your Question or Comment  | Please Share your Question or Comment |  |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| Governance                                 | relationship of Solution Bundle project                    | unaddressed in the recommendations and proposed model, beyond beingr represented on<br>the Components Council. This may be OK, but it does mean that such projects will likely<br>need to develop their own governance structures and processes rather than be able to "plug<br>in" to an existing defined structure such as the Apache PMC framework, potentially making<br>is projects less transparent to canteries and other community members. I think this micht merit<br>and the project less transparent to canteries and other community members. I think this micht merit<br>the project less the structure such as the Apache PMC framework, potentially making<br>the project less that the structure such as the Apache PMC framework potentially making<br>the project less that the structure such as the Apache PMC framework potentially making<br>the project less that the structure such as the Apache PMC framework potentially making<br>the project less that the structure such as the Apache PMC framework potentially making<br>the project less that the project as the thread the project as the structure as the project as the project of the project as the the project as the pr | 9                                |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Recommendations                            | to the governance framework                                | some discussion, perhaps at the March Partner Meeting.<br>I don't believe 'Product Owner' is actually defined in this document. While it might be<br>premature to include a list of specific responsibilities, I would suggest that a couple<br>sentences on what the term 'product owner' means would be helpful in avoiding different  |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | people assuming they know what it means and not having the same idea. (Perhaps in the<br>"Glossary"? But not necessarily)  |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | The treatment of "product owner" I found on wikipedia was in the article on Sorum, where it<br>suggests: "The product owner should focus on the business side of product development an<br>spend the majority of their time liaising with stakeholders and should not dictate how the<br>team reaches a technical solution."   | nd                               |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | My understanding of the "product owner" role is that it is a non-technical stakeholder<br>representative, and the product owner determines what features should be developed and<br>how (including prioritization and requirements/acceptance criteria), but is not involved at all in<br>determining the technical implementation — not involved in determining what code to write or<br>the architecture. Just what the product should be. The technical team then determines how  | in<br>or                         |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | best to meet the needs expressed by the product owner.<br>I'm not totally sure if this is the same understanding the report has of the role. I totally agree<br>with the goal menilored in the report. Clearly articulated relationships between groups that<br>make decisions and groups that get things done' — I, think, the 'product owner' is of the<br>"make decision" group, with developes being in the 'get things done' group.   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | The relationship between them isn't entirely clear to me from the report.  |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | is n.q., enforcing technical decisions (how the team reaches technical solution', code an achitecture decisiona) — if an ot clear to me what role or entity, does have the responsibility and authority for this latter. As a developer, lack of clarity here has been one on yiologest governance' related challenges. I don't link: this recommodation advesses II, which may be quile fine, I's maybe just not in scope for what the governance recommendations at the specific section of the plant of the technical sections.   | a<br>of<br>8                     |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | document to just acknowledge/darify that though, lest some readers think it is making<br>recommendations about how those technical decisions are made when it does not intend to.<br>Unless of ourse it does intend to in which case that needs to be made more clear as it<br>and the source of                 |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations              | Associate Product Owners to<br>Community Owned Components  | was not b me. (Again, 1 don't, think, a 'product owne' rise involves<br>technical/injenemistation decision-making, but If the recommendations mean it to, then the<br>document needs to be more clear on this).<br>I'm wondering the standing working group is where metadata concerns are addressed in<br>this governance moder? Metadata tends to live in the space between technical requirements<br>and end-user communities so it is not really addressed by the Technical confuriements  | 8                                |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations              | Establish a Method for Creating<br>Standing Working Groups | and end-user communities so it's not really addressed by the Technical Coordinator position<br>or the Community Manager position, from what I am understanding. Is metadata considered<br>an ongoing need in the community (like the Helpers group)?   |                                  |  |  | Similar to the concern raised here that technical  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  | aspects are being preferred over non-technical<br>aspects in the community, I am concerned that<br>metadata issues are going to fall through the cracks<br>or lose a seat at the table in the governance model   |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  | as it currently stands. If there are metadata issues,<br>do they have to be aligned with a single community<br>owned component in order for them to be<br>addressed? How is metadata documentation (or<br>own other hold nor unenothere) segmented and |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  | any other help documentation) organized and<br>maintained when the technical aspects are<br>managed as components? Even though there's a<br>possibility to break things down technically, there is   |  |                                       |  |
| Governance Working<br>Group Member Dissent |  |  |                                  |  |  | still an overall metadata scope that has to receive<br>attention so the components can fit together.<br>Maybe that fits within the Technical Coordinator's<br>role but it would be helpful to make that explicit if<br>that is the case.               |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | It seems that the process for selecting and associating Product Owners will come from the<br>Components Maintenance Working Group. If so, I think that other working group's<br>recommendations should be incorporated in the ting governance proposal when It is reported<br>at the March Partner meetings. The two proposals seem to need to work together, at least   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | In regard to code governance - which was much of the initial impetus for senting us down<br>this road. Great work so far, but if il like to see recommendations on how Product Owners<br>are selected (meritocracy - Im not opposed as I don't know how else we would do it, but we<br>should be transparent about this), a recommended (repeatable?) ferm, whether for some<br>products (Hyva), employees should be prepared to give up release time to a Product Owner<br>moducts (Hyva), employees should be prepared to give up release time to a Product Owner<br>moducts (Hyva).   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | and whether for some products (Hyrax), a Release Manager - and/or a Standing Committee<br>- is needed as well as a product owner, and then the same questions apply to the Release<br>Manager and the Standing Committee, Also these comments bleed into the Components  | r.<br>-                          |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations              | Associate Product Owners to<br>Community Owned Components  | Council - should it include Release Managers and/or reps of Standing Committees? It's<br>possible we want some of these issues to evolve over time but then we should be explicit<br>about needing this resolution over the next 18 months or so. Thank you.   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations              | Establish a Method for Creating<br>Standing Working Groups | I am of the opinion that Hyrax (and possibly Avaion and Hyku) requires a Standing Working<br>Group. I think this should not be deferred to Steering to establish a method - but should be<br>part of these governance recommendations.   |                                  |  |  |  | All  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | I was unable to join the webinar last week because of the timing but I've spent th<br>first part of this morning reviewing the recording. Can I echo some of the though<br>expressed at the end of the session and thank veryone involved for a through<br>and thoughtui job. It will not come as a surprise to you when I admit to severe<br>reservations about this whole process at the beginning, these are rapidly  | e<br>Is                               |  |
| Overview                                   |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | dispelling. I shall submit some other responses to the recommendations via the<br>form in the hope of claritlying some of the processes that will need to be<br>undertaken in moving this forward and suggesting at least one small tweak.   |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | Timeline: I am not sure what exactly is meant by "Partners to hold a vote" and<br>"Adopt a Governance model". What are the Partners voting on, exactly? What to<br>recomment to the Steering Group to adopt moving floward, or actual adoption<br>Hydra (now Samvera) is backed by a legal document (the Memorandum of<br>Understantim. Moll) that - on the surfners at least - dnee on allow for Partners   | 0                                     |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | Understanding - MoU) that - on the surface at least - does not allow for Partners<br>making a decision like this. I suspect the legal way to do it is to recommend the<br>proposals to existing Steering and have as move the Community Itowards them a<br>quickly as possible. This would also require a vote for adoption on Steering. If the<br>idea is to vote on adoption per set, then think you would want to have. Steering's  | ne -                                  |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | idea is to vote on adoption per set, then it think you would want to have Steering's<br>explicit agreement in advance to this process and a guarantee that they will also<br>by the result. In this latter case you'd want to have an agreed voting mechanism<br>and a very otear criterion for deciding the result. (As I write this, emails are thing<br>to thy and the this down). Either way, od Steering (likely with the GWG or similar)   |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | would then have to engage with lawyers to come up with a new MoU that<br>embodies the recommendations of the GWG and provides for straightforward<br>channes as things worke over the years (are any lenal channes ever  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | straightforward)? I guess with goodwill the initial legal changes can be done<br>alongside other things progressing but I think, if that's the idea, that some<br>discussions with the old SG ideally need to itak place ahead of time.<br>I'm concerned about the idea of a vote 'on April 2nd' unless this is the start of a   |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | voting window. For instance, it's a holiday in the UK and quite a lot of people her<br>will go away for some time with children who are on school holiday. I halt could<br>mean that some UK 'voters' are not at work that whole week. Also, might there<br>not be some lash-minute suggestions at the Partner meeting the Thursday/Friday   |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | prior? In which case, a window beginning April 9th might be better, allowing time<br>to incorporate some tweaks, if any, and getting clear of Easter-holiday-related<br>timing issues.   | 1                                     |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | Partnership and new MoU: The make-up and operation of Steering, as well as it<br>relationship to the Partners and therefore the Community is largely defined by th<br>MOU. A new MoU will be significantly different – pertaps significantly enough the<br>existing Partners will need to ratify with their institution's management (and may<br>course) that their as hearow with it. If measure around early that the significant is different than the significant is different to the the significant is different to the significant is different to the significant of the significant is different to the significant different to the significant significant significant to the significant significant significant significant significant to the significant significan | e<br>It                               |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  |  |  | counsel) that they are happy with it. If may even require asking them to sign a<br>new Letter of Agreement. Potentially this could take us Patners but, at the<br>moment. J think it may be an excessary site). In regist suggest that a dark new Mo<br>be shared with Patners for community to work this would significantly delay the<br>process- worthwhite? - I'm not serve. All in all this is not likely to be aptinuized to<br>the process - worthwhite?  | U I                                   |  |
| Overview                                   |  | Hires: Old SG has already had discussions with DursSpace about the possibility of hiring<br>one or two staff and the possibility of their involvement in the recruitment process is written  |                                  |  |  |  | process - wornwhile - i m not sure. All in all this is not keep to be a particularly<br>short process and we need to be careful to fulfil legal obligations properly.  |                                       |  |
|  |  | one or two statif and the possibility of their involvement in the recruitment process is written<br>into the 2018 agreement with them (Rosaly) mought it might not be). Their advice is that a<br>Samvera person hired on the Community's behalf by a Partner would cost some \$156k per<br>year, or hired by DuraSpace on our behalf some \$210k per year. This on top of any other<br>Samvera initiative funding that might be needed. A the very least. We might need a   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | guaranteed \$200k pa to support a single hire plus other bits and pieces. Split between 30<br>Partners that \$6.7k each - and, 14 suggest, that wort happen because some Partners are<br>'cash poor' (as noted in the presentation) but contribute rather by in-kind contributions.<br>Obviously that increases the cash burrlen on the red. Softk per annum for han bires (no   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | matter how desirable they might be is a big, big ask. Further, I think if you are going to get<br>good people to apply you need to be able to guarantee their post for more than one year<br>thus, you'd need to have guarantees from your contributing funders. I realize that there<br>might be other ways (grants) to bring in some of this funding, but there's going to need to be<br>a tot of creative thinking! I di ask comment that the idea of seconding someone from an   |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  | existing post was raised at the November Partner meeting - still an idea to consider, I think,<br>in order to mitigate some of the initial risks on both sides.  |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance                                 |  | Steering, trying to get alread of the game, had some discussions with DuraSpace in January<br>hat touched on the idea of starting an employee (potentially employees) with them so that<br>expertise can be shared in both directions (Samwera person(s) and DuraSpace team) - this<br>could possibly reduce costs if a Samwera pot did not really usibly a whole file. However, it<br>would change the nature of Samvera's relationship with DuraSpace which is a different<br>discussion.  | v                                |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Recommendations                            | Hire a Technical Coordinator                               | Steering meetings: "Meets monthly on-line & possibly once a year in person". From<br>experience 1d say that a yearly 12 meet is essential (indeed 1d find it very easy to argue for<br>ban). If this this should he a clear avanctation for anymou who stands for the new Steering.  |                                  |  |  |  |  |                                       |  |
| Governance<br>Recommendations              | Elect Partner Representatives to<br>Samvera Steering       | No matter how good the on-line communication system, there are some things that just don't<br>come across in such an environment - a situation that is exacerbated if Steering are not all<br>US-based and thus may not be sharing the same cultural values and expectations in a<br>particular situation.   |                                  |  | #3 & #4: Reconstituting Steering: I am concerned   |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  | that your recommended method for moving to a<br>new Group may not adequately preserve the<br>knowledge base or, as Rosalyn put it in the<br>webiar, "honor the knowledge and history".                               |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  | Currently the knowledge base is spread across<br>nine people and, by the proposed transition<br>mechanism, you would immediately lose two-thirds<br>of that. I would propose, rather, a mechanism that               |  |  |                                       |  |
|  |  |  |                                  |  | is often used in other businesses and organizations<br>instituting major change, that three of the existing<br>Steering stand down 'immediately' opening three<br>new places, that at the end of year one three more |  |  |                                       |  |
| Prioritized<br>Implementation of           |  |  |                                  | Identify Existing Steering Members to Serve on | stand down and are replaced, and that at the end or<br>year two the remaining three stand down. This<br>preserves a broader knowledge base at the start of<br>the transition and, actually, completes the changes    | r  |  |                                       |  |
| Prioritized                                |  |  |                                  | Steering                                       | to Steering a year earlier.<br>#6 Update the Bylaws [including a] new section for<br>Standing Working Groups: in addition, I'd suggest<br>that Steering itself may want to have formally                             |  |  |                                       |  |
| Implementation of<br>Recommendations       |  |  |                                  | Update the Bylaws for Steering                 | established subcommittees - a finance committee<br>springs immediately to mind.  |  |  |                                       |  |

| ea of Question or<br>mment                    | Please select an area in this<br>category            | Please share your Question or Comment   | Please Leave Comment or Question | Please select an area in this category | Please share your Question or Comment   | Please Share Your Question or Comment | Please Share your Question or Comment                      | Please Share your Question or Comment  |  |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ionitized<br>plementation of                  |  |   |                                  | Hire a Technical Coordinator           | R and 8 Hires First stipht tangential concern<br>flow will you by to ensure kowdreet transfer<br>between the first person appointed to a position<br>and their acacessor's takents to mit its is<br>and their acacessor's takents to mit its and<br>tiffwhen people are in place. Novement, There is a more urgent nather: the<br>excernation would devolve to a community Manager<br>due course. In the GVG seems to inny that this<br>function would devolve to a community Manager<br>due course. In the GVG seems to inny that this<br>function would devolve to a community Manager<br>due course. In the GVG seems to inny that this<br>function would devolve to a community Manager<br>accentarial and accussed at the Partmer meeting<br>November but does not appear explicitly hee.<br>The accentaria the course to Steering meetingsclaft a<br>maybe ex-officio pending the Community Manager<br>poli if if an accelarial with a meeting classing.<br>A something the community Manager of Skeering.<br>A something the explicit of Skeering. | n<br>n                                |  |  |  |
| ioritized<br>plementation of<br>commendations |  |   |                                  | Assess Governance Recommendations      | #10 Assess Governance recommendations: 18<br>months from when? It seems to me there could be<br>a variety of answers to that question and it would<br>be useful to clarify the timeline. From the result of<br>the vote? From the start of the new Steering<br>Group? Or?   |                                       |  |  |  |
| overnance<br>commendations                    | Elect Partner Representatives to<br>Samvera Steering | I didn't think it warranted to dissent comment but I do still feel that candidates selecting wh<br>length of term they are standing for introduces an odd dynamic into the election process the<br>might not lead to the best candidates being elected. I still think it would be best to have<br>everyone stand on an equal footing, and then select terms after electing the top candidates<br>is a standard to the best candidates being elected. I still think is a standard to be aver<br>a standard best and the select terms after electing the top candidates<br>is a standard best of the set of the select terms after electing the top candidates<br>and the set of the set | nat                              |  |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| rview   |  |   |                                  |  |   |                                       | le there a way to work in language encouraging a commitmen | t to backwards compatibility? This is a matter of all three of our guiding principles: planning, sustainability and inclusion. |  |