

# 2019-07-11 AG Agenda and Notes

## Date

11 Jul 2019

## Attendees

- [John Kunze](#)
- [Brian McBride](#)
- [Mark Phillips](#)
- [David Wilcox](#)
- [Joannic-Seta](#)
- [Kurt Ewoldsen](#)
- [Erin Tripp](#)

## Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
	announcements  LYRASIS / DuraSpace merger  Laurie Arp joining AG calls		Merger <a href="https://twitter.com/duraspace/status/1148594779279810564">https://twitter.com/duraspace/status/1148594779279810564</a>  DuraStaff are now LYRASIS staff - we are functionally and operationally working as one team. We had the first DuraSpace division team meeting in Atlanta this week. We had training on ITAV and we are going to begin using a common vocabulary. Laurie can begin attending the Advisory meetings going forward to leverage her ITAV expertise and also prep for Erin's parental leave this fall.
	WG progress updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• outreach: <a href="#">ARKs FAQ 0.92</a> released, announced to arks-forum</li><li>• sustainability: first round survey analysis; sharpening questions</li><li>• technical: all spec changes from ARKs Summit approved</li></ul>		FAQ is published. It's mature enough that it had public airing via the ARKS mailing list. We have a Gdoc version too and hopefully, that will avoid needing a login to provide edits.  David - Confluence has a commenting feature - but you need an account to use it. If you're logged into the wiki you can add in-line comments. Not as low a barrier for editing as GDoc. Wiki is configured to require a login because it gets spammed if we change it to allowing people to create their own account.  JohnK - we have a license to a product that could help us manage this. It's called UserSnap and it uses JavaScript to make access more secure and allow editing.  ACTION - David will check if there's integration with that tool.  Sustainability (see the section below)  Technical - we have approval for all spec changes suggested in the ARKS summit.  Will submit the spec next. One late-breaking change is holding this up.

<p>initial survey results (22 respondents out of 32):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• link to <a href="#">report</a></li> <li>• link to <a href="#">analysis</a></li> </ul>	<p>Everyone opens the Report PDF - Kurt walking us through it.</p> <p>We had one respondent said they had 200 ppl using ARKS in their organization. But that person didn't share contact info! So we can't know if this is real or if they misunderstood the question. This brings into question our decision to not make contact information required for participants in the survey. I'm finding the inability to follow up not very useful. Especially for where we're asking for financial contribution - we want to follow up with them and get on their budgets for next year.</p> <p>David - if they're not useful then let's strongly encourage providing contact info or make it mandatory.</p> <p>John - In this case, contact info is really important.</p> <p>Kurt - we sent out 32 invitations - 22 responses and 14 included their contact info. So half included their contact information on a small sample size. We will send it out to 540 NAAN registered organizations. If we got 250 responses that would be amazing and it would be representative.</p> <p>Erin - I would expect less than 100 responses.</p> <p>Brian - yeah I think we should ask for the info and expect fewer responses.</p> <p>Kurt - half are running their own infrastructure. Some people we're sure on Q7.</p> <p>We modified the membership question so we can differentiate the responses better for next round.</p> <p>Q9 - ranking (the priority heat map on the analysis document is easiest to interpret). "Effort to promote ARK understanding and usage" is a high priority and everything else is a distant second. But much of the list was acknowledged as important.</p> <p>Surprises? Kurt - I expected more self-serving responses, e.g. let's create someone I or my org can use. but we saw much more of a 'public good' response here. Our community is full of a bunch of do-gooders 😊 .</p> <p>John - it was surprising to see a focus on outreach and promotion. I hope it means or leads to engagement. There were people who shared the survey link with their friends. That might have skewed things. 3 people from Argentina filled it out and they're not using but will put a push to get them.</p> <p>Kurt - the number one vote-getter was the first option on the list. We don't need to go there. Did they chose that because it was</p> <p>Erin - Survey monkey can allow you to randomize the order of the list.</p> <p>John - we put the options in this order because we thought it would make it easier to understand.</p> <p>Kurt - we'll need to think about this and decide on an approach.</p> <p>Go back to the report and scroll to the end - it's a catch-all question for additional comments. Some contradiction there.</p> <p>John - some of the ppl who didn't respond was interesting. Some ppl who are sitting on working groups didn't fill it out. They were part of the review of the survey. We could have improved our communications.</p> <p>Kurt - contribute effort or funding - the analysis document shows this better.</p> <p>Seeing that people are more likely to contribute effort but there was support for the 2 open source development pieces.</p> <p>David - the responses around effort - those might be from people who don't have budget control.</p> <p>Kurt - 75% of respondents are managers so we think they have funding control.</p> <p>Erin - should we include what contributing effort looks like from a time commitment? I hope they would actually show up.</p> <p>Kurt - we can think about including time commitment in the next phase or in another future survey.</p> <p>Already some lessons learned from this process. We made some revisions to the survey. I am wondering how this small sample will compare to the larger group that has actually registered with ARKS (because 50% of the current respondents aren't using ARKS).</p> <p>John - still feels like there's a big vacuum in our sustainability planning. If the survey shows us that promotion is what's important then at least we'll need what we'll be asking for money for.</p> <p>Kurt - it could fund website, animations, travel to conferences if the results hold true.</p> <p>And hopefully the promotion piece could lead to more interest in running community infrastructure.</p> <p>John - another question that's front and center is to understand what our organizational home will be. The merger impacts that. It ties into Roger Schofield's concerns. There weren't many people who indicated they are already members in LYR or DuraSpace.</p> <p>Erin - some respondents may think they are Fedora members, not DuraSpace members.</p> <p>Kurt - I'm not too worried about that. We might be creating something new.</p> <p>Next steps - meeting with outreach group and in next 3 wks sending out this survey to every org registered for a NAAN. We will keep it open a few weeks and we will see what we get.</p> <p>No red flags from Mark and Brian.</p>
--	---

## Action items

