

# Revisions highlighted with explanations

Principles 1.1 compared to 1.0

## Governance

- Coverage across the ~~research~~scholarly enterprise – ~~it is increasingly clear that~~ research transcends disciplines, geography, institutions, and stakeholders. Organisations and the infrastructure ~~that supports it~~ needsthey run need to ~~do the same~~reflect this.

>>Simplified language, changed to “scholarly”, which goes beyond only “research”, and clarified the principle by adding “organisations”.

- **Stakeholder Governed** – a board-governed organisation drawn from the stakeholder community builds ~~more~~ confidence that the organisation will take decisions driven by community consensus and ~~consideration~~a balance of ~~different~~ interests.

>>Changed “consideration of different interests” to “balance of interests” to reflect the fact that community governance involves actually balancing interests, not just considering them.

- **Non-discriminatory participation or membership** – we see the best option as an “opt-in” approach with ~~a principle~~principles of non-discrimination and inclusivity where any stakeholder group may express an interest and should be welcome. ~~The process of~~ Representation in ~~day to day~~ governance must ~~also be inclusive with governance that reflects~~reflect the ~~demographics~~character of the community or membership.

>>Broadened by adding “participation” to include non-membership-based infrastructure, added “inclusivity” to “non-discrimination” for emphasis, and changed “demographics” to “character” for clarity and to broaden to the many natures a community or membership may take.

- **Transparent operations** – ~~achieving governance~~ – to achieve trust ~~in~~, the ~~selection of processes and policies for selecting~~ representatives to governance groups ~~will~~should be ~~best achieved through~~ transparent ~~processes and operations in general~~ (within the constraints of privacy laws).

>>The original text was confusing - it conflated governance and operational transparency. This principle is updated to focus on transparent governance. Transparent operations are also very important and the adopters discussed that this should have a principle on its own when there is next a major revision i.e. a version 2.0.

- **Cannot lobby** – ~~the community, not~~ infrastructure organisations; should ~~collectively driven~~not lobby for regulatory change; to cement their own positions or narrow self-interest. However, an infrastructure organisation’s role is to ~~provide a base for others to work on and should depend on support~~ its community ~~to support the creation of a legislative environment that affects it,~~ and this can include advocating for policy changes.

>>Clarified original language to distinguish between lobbying based on self-interest which can cause lock-in, and advocacy for things like policy change or adoption. The new language makes it clear that this principle is specifically about not lobbying for self-interest. An organisation advocating on behalf of its community and relevant policies is not only fine but often expected.

- **Living will** – a powerful way to create trust is to publicly describe a plan addressing the ~~condition~~conditions under which an organisation or

service would be wound down, It should include how this would happen, and how any ~~ongoing~~ assets could be archived and preserved when passed to a successor organisation or service. Any such organisation ~~would need to~~ service must adopt POSI and honour ~~this same set of the~~ POSI principles.

>>Clarified the language to be clear that a public plan for winding down should specify that any successor organisation should adopt and follow the POSI principles.

- **Formal incentives to fulfil mission & wind-down** – infrastructures exist for a specific purpose, and that purpose can be radically simplified or even rendered unnecessary by technological or social change. Organisations and services should regularly review community support and the need for their activities. If it is possible, the organisation or service (and staff) should have direct incentives to deliver on the mission and wind down.

>>Added language for organisations and services to regularly review community support without waiting for a crisis.

## Sustainability

- **Time-limited funds are used only for time-limited activities** – ~~day to day~~ operations should be supported by ~~day to day~~ sustainable revenue sources. Grant dependency - whereas time-limited funds are used only for funding time-limited activities. Depending on grants to fund ongoing and/or long-term infrastructure operations fully makes them fragile and ~~more easily distracted~~ distracts from building core infrastructure.

>>Added language to clarify that relying on grant-funding for ongoing operations of infrastructure is not desirable as it's not sustainable.

- **Goal to generate surplus** – organisations ~~which~~(or services) that define sustainability based merely on recovering costs are brittle and stagnant. It is not enough to merely survive,~~it has;~~ organisations and services have to be able to adapt and change. To weather economic, social and technological volatility, they need financial resources beyond immediate operating costs.

>>Added “services” in addition to “organisations” and cleaned up punctuation.

- **Goal to create ~~contingency fund to support operations for 12 months~~financial reserves** – a high priority should be ~~generating a contingency fund~~having ring-fenced financial reserves, separate from operating funds, that can support implementing living will plans, including a complete, orderly wind down ~~(12 months in most cases)~~. ~~This fund should be separate from those allocated to covering operating risk and investment in development, or transition to a successor organisation, or major unexpected events.~~

>>Updated language to focus on dedicated, ring-fenced financial reserves separate from operating funds. Removed 12 months as the right level of reserves varies greatly between different organisations and services. A principle shouldn't be so specific as to suit only one shape or size of infrastructure. The FAQ will be updated to include 12 months as a guideline, and also that for infrastructure organisations and services, reserves may need to be higher than other types of not-for-profits. Expanded reasons where the financial reserves could be used, to reflect the fiduciary responsibility of boards.

- **Mission-consistent revenue generation** – ~~potential~~ revenue sources should be ~~considered for consistency with~~evaluated against the ~~organisational~~infrastructure's mission and not run counter to the aims of the organisation. ~~For instance...~~ or service.

>> Clarified language that revenue generation has to be consistent with the mission and aims of the infrastructure and organisation or service.

- **Revenue based on services, not data** – data related to the running of the ~~research enterprises~~ scholarly infrastructure should be a community property. Appropriate revenue sources might include value-added services, consulting, API Service Level Agreements or membership fees.

>> Revised to use “scholarly” rather than “research” as scholarly is wider than only research (e.g. teaching). Also then specified “infrastructure” since these principles apply to the underlying infrastructures and organisations but not the entirety of the scholarly enterprise.

## Insurance

- **Open source** – All software and assets required to run the infrastructure should be available under an open-source license/licence. This does not include other software that may be involved with running the organisation.

>> Added “Assets” - to fork and run open-source software, more is needed than merely the software’s code - there are likely other technical assets, configurations, and information that should also be open source.

- **Open data (within constraints of privacy laws)** – For an infrastructure to be forked (reproduced), it will be necessary to replicate all relevant data. ~~The CC0 waiver~~ The CC0 waiver is the best practice in making data openly and legally available. Privacy and data protection laws will limit the extent to which this is possible.

>> Clarified language around “forked” which is more commonly known in technical communities, added a link to the CC0 waiver, and reinforced “openly” not just “legally” available.

- **Available data (within constraints of privacy laws)** – It is not enough that the data be ~~made~~ “open” if there is ~~not an~~o practical way to **actually** obtain it. Underlying data should be made easily available via periodic open data dumps.

>> Clarified language and added “open” data dumps for further reiteration.

- **Patent non-assertion** – The organisation should commit to a patent non-assertion policy or covenant. The organisation may obtain patents to protect its own operations, but not use them to prevent the community from replicating the infrastructure.

>> Added “policy” in addition to “covenant”.