



Project Steering Committee

Arches Project Governance

Meeting Minutes

17 April, 2025

Present

Yiannis Avramides, World Monuments Fund
Alison Dalgity, Getty (GCI)
Karl Fogel, Open Tech Strategies
Mike Heyworth, Arcadia Fund
Kevin Kochanski, Getty (GCI)

David Myers, Getty (GCI)
Tony Presland, Historic England
Dennis Wuthrich, Farallon Geographics
Nina Young, Getty (GCI)

New Business (Inaugural Meeting)

Introductory agenda set by GCI representatives, facilitated by KKochanski

1. Introductions & welcome
2. GCI Arches team: Orientation
 - a. *Importance of governance; purpose and overview of Project Steering Committee*
 - i. Responsibility of Steering Committee is to oversee governance and effectiveness of other Committees, incl. Governance changes, roadmap, code of conduct, AGPL3 license, conflict of interest
 - ii. Moving forward, GCI representatives will serve as co-chairs, with the purpose of scheduling the meetings, setting agenda and confirming action items.
 - iii. Acknowledged that the presence of service providers on Steering is not a conflict of interest and is in alignment with Open Source
 - iv. Acknowledge update of [Arches Governance webpage](#), including charter.
 1. *TPresland suggests also updating a 1-pager quick guide pointing people in the right direction for Developers, Implementers, Governance*
 - b. *Meeting logistics*
 - i. Minutes or at least summary of decisions will be publicly available; KFogel will help us decide how to archive and share
 - ii. Agendas will be collaborative, in future members can contribute directly to document
 - iii. Meeting frequency, according to the Governance Charter, should be at least 3 meetings/year, with additional meetings in the first year. A fixed time to be identified following the meeting (**KKochanski**).

- iv. Setting an in-person governance meeting in Los Angeles is still important but delayed due to logistical challenges since the recent wildfires. We hope to hold this meeting in summer 2025.

Committee Open Discussion

- 3. Input solicited on approach to Governance and responsibilities to the Arches mission
 - a. *DMyers reminder that governance committees and their discussions should be high-level:*
 - i. Spirit of governance in line with the Arches mission (outlined in the charter) is working for the greater good, not just individual institutions.
 - ii. More than a user group; Committees are meant to govern the entire program of Arches
 - b. *KFogel notes the mandate is: Committees are advisory, GCI will ultimately make decisions. Possible guiding star for committee discussions: What kind of information does the GCI need to be making the best decisions?*
 - i. Funding and monetary decisions, as other organizations seek to expand contributions:
 - 1. ADalgity: Legally, non-Getty groups cannot fundraise on our behalf.
 - 2. DMyers: suggestion to ask Getty Development team how to handle funding opportunities that come to us through Governance.
 - 3. TPresland: as there are an infinite number of possible scenarios, Steering should focus on just a few most likely contingencies and develop models for tricky situations of fund allocation and new organizations becoming involved.
 - 4. KKochanski: Committees provide formal input on the value of what contributions (whether financial or technical) are being proposed.
 - ii. Stakeholder interests:
 - 1. KFogel: Propose updating Arches stakeholder mapping exercise GCI undertook a few years ago. Steering/Governance should measure all decisions against stakeholder interests.
 - c. *DWuthrich is curious about communication workflows. How should Steering Committee engage with the Technical and Community Advisory committees. Proactive or reactive? Seems natural that there would be an up and down flow. [Consensus agreed]*
 - i. MHeyworth: In the case of Arcadia contributing Internationalization, the process would have been different with the involvement of a Technical Advisory Committee; potentially more complicated?
 - ii. DWuthrich: An idea could germinate in the Technical Committee and bubble up to Steering, and then vice versa. Defining and prioritizing - getting the communication right initially seems like a high priority.
 - iii. MHeyworth: There might be competing interests or community needs to consider.
 - iv. DWuthrich: Steering Committee identifies WHAT happens, Technical Advisory Committee identifies HOW it happens, and Community Advisory Committee identifies HOW IMPORTANT it is to do for us ("WHEN")
 - d. *KFogel asks where do technical specifics like Bugs and Features fit into the conversation? Steering needs to make sure Governance responsibilities are clear and everything has an Owner.*

- i. ADalgity: That is going to be our responsibility as Steering, through the hierarchy of the committees.
- ii. YAvramides: GCI representation on all committees will help notice broader themes emerging. Consider goal setting on a time basis (annual, biannual) that could help Steering analyze priorities.
- iii. DWuthrich: Need to be careful about what we choose to measure, as the default could only concern the Roadmap but need to re-focus on the community more broadly. What does participation look like by the whole community, what new community members?

Action Items:

- KKochanski to determine standing meeting time with committee
- KKochanski to share minutes with attendees
- GCI Arches representatives to prioritize coming up with better communication channels, sharing of minutes and decisions (input from KFogel would be great)