**Questions and Requests for the Board**

1. **COCOM**: Are there better ways to manage selection of committee membership and chair-ships? More advanced exchange of information, guidance on # of alternates, when multiple committees per member are ok, etc.?

*Response:*

*(i) Filling Vacancies on IRIS Governance Committees*

* *Starting this year, IRIS will make an open call to membership soliciting interest from individuals to serve on IRIS governance committees. Names will be gathered centrally and made available to all governance committees. Committees should consider names from this list in addition to individuals that committee members suggest. Committees should refer to the existing committee membership list to avoid suggesting individuals already serving on IRIS governance committees.*
* *Each governance committee will generate a list of potential new members (2 names per vacancy) and submit the list to CoCom.*
* *Committees should consider diversity in membership to tap into the breadth of expertise and perspectives in the community. As appropriate, committees should consider members at a variety of career stages, including early career individuals.*
* *Prior to contacting individuals to serve on committees, CoCom will coordinate/iterate to avoid duplicates names. Once this process is completed, governance committee chairs can contact individuals regarding willingness to serve.*
* *New committee member names are then submitted to the BoD for approval at the November BoD meeting.*

*(ii) Governance Committee New Chairs*

*Committees should consider new committee chairs one-year in advance. Ideally, the incoming chair should have a year overlap serving on the committee with the current chair (although other on-boarding approaches may make sense in some instances). This means that the new chair should be identified and approved by the BoD up to a year in advance of the change in committee chair.*

*(iii) Multiple Committee Memberships*

*Membership on multiple IRIS governance committees is discouraged. This is in part out of respect for peoples’ time, but mostly because we seek to engage a broad spectrum of the community in IRIS governance. For this same reason, extending the terms of existing members is also discouraged. In rare instances, the BoD will consider multiple memberships between IRIS governance committees and working groups and/or special interest groups. Only under special circumstances will the IRIS BoD consider approving an individual to serve on multiple IRIS governance committees. Justification for this need should be provided by the SC asking for the second appointment.*

*(iv) Timeline for populating new members*

* *Late August/Early September open call issued for committee memberships*
* *Fall SC meetings – list of potential new members developed and submitted to Co-Com*
* *Fall CoCom meeting – potential new committee members finalized, iterated as needed*
* *After CoCom meeting – potential new members contacted by governance committee chairs, new member names forwarded to IRIS BoD for approval*
* *November BoD meeting – new members approved*

1. **COCOM**: Do SC’s need Board approval for Working Group charges and members?

*Response: Yes. Working group charges and membership should be submitted to the Board for approval. Note, the board will act on these items as needed throughout the year on an expedited basis. Requests for review and approval can be forwarded to the BoD as needed.*

Specifically:

* + **DS**: requests Board approve membership for **QAWG** (Hansen, Roecker, Porter, Duecker (on DSSC))

*Response: The Board believes the QAWG should be a joint DS/IS WG. The WG membership should be jointly proposed by DS and IS. The Board asks DS and IS to consult and re-propose the membership of this WG, with changes if necessary.*

* + **DS:** requests Board approve membership for **DPWG** (Fischer, McNamara(QAWG Chair), Schmandt, Waite, Thelen, Rubenstein). (Neither QAWG or DPWG yet checked against current committees)

*Response: Proposed DPWG membership is approved by the Board*

* + **IS**: CEUSN WG requests approval of charge and membership (see accompanying doc)

*Response: Proposed CEUSN WG charge and membership is approved by the Board*

1. **DS**: requests Board accept DS policy on large data/temporary deployments (no existing data would be affected)

*Response: The Board approves the LDTD policy.  The Board notes that the threshold for triggering LDTD charges should be reassessed on a regular basis by the DSSC and as the general data handling capabilities of the DMC grow, as they inevitably will, this threshold should increase so that this large data surcharge only applies to a very small number of projects that are well outside the “norm” of data sets coming into the DMC.*

1. **DS**: requests Board accept DS Data Acceptance Policy-Passive (if #3 accepted, this will be modified to make consistent. Biggest current impact on regional networks.) (BoD webpage reflects modified policy consistent with #3)

*Response: The Board did not approve the proposed Data Acceptance Policy for Passive Source Data and directs DS to remove this policy from the DS website until a revised policy can be developed and approved by the Board. The Board was concerned about the implications of this proposed policy on the continued archiving of data from regional networks, operated primarily with funding from the USGS. These data are heavily used and are seen as extremely valuable to both the academic research community as well as the USGS.  The Board felt that adopting a policy that might jeopardize the availability of these data would not be in the best interests of the IRIS community.*

*While the Board supports efforts to identify additional sources of funding to support archiving of non-NSF data at the DMC, it is not persuaded the proposed policy is the correct approach, especially for existing datasets already being archived at the DMC.  Value to the academic research community, as well as data volume and cost, should be taken into account, especially in deciding what new passive source network data, not currently archived at the DMC, should be accepted.  However, there is concern on the Board that charging for archiving for certain datasets is a slippery slope that could impede rather than promote the free and open exchange of data which IRIS has so long espoused.*

1. **IS**: Quality Principles Document ready for Board endorsement. (see accompanying doc)

*Response: The BoD has reviewed the Quality Principles Document and endorses it.*

1. **IS/EPO**: Has the outreach level after the Lower-48 TA deployment sufficient and fully capitalized on the opportunity? EPO sees many possible external links to help highlight research, but any ideas from Board?

*Response: It is important to find broad audiences for the research being done with EarthScope data and to highlight the excellent work that IRIS has done. This has been done successfully in the past by EPO working in close coordination with the EarthScope National Office (who’s main mission is to do this), UNAVCO and other appropriate organizations (e.g. USGS). The BoD encourages EPO and IS, and their Standing Committees, to continue their efforts to publicize EarthScope research findings and to bring broader recognition to EarthScope and the role that IRIS has played in facilitating the excellent science EarthScope has enabled.*

1. **PASC**: SC is reaching out to community, putting photos/bio-info on SC web page, and may post abbreviated minutes to public. *Do other SC’s want to follow*? Does Board want to update guidelines on what is communicated from SC’s?

*Response: All Standing and other Governance Committees should regularly post concise synopses of each meeting. These should include the Agenda and a list of Outcomes including Action Items, so the main results of meetings are clear.  These are generally more useful than lengthy minutes reporting on every discussion, and provide a good level of transparency.  The PASC should be commended for its efforts at outreach and other Governance Committees could follow suit if they deem it valuable, but the Board will leave that up to each committee.*