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## 

# Abstract

# Introduction

What are open communities?

What is the health of an open community?

Why do we care about open community health?

To begin somewhere, we start with what already exists.

Introduce open source, citizen science, and wikipedia as instances of open communities.

Cite a paper or two for each area, where people have thought about open community health in their respective contexts.

# Workshop Design

The workshop followed a structure that facilitated interaction, knowledge transfer, and idea generation between participants from different contexts. The workshop started out with a primer about open community health and a participants exchanged pointers to initiatives and projects they were aware of to be addressing this issue <insert items from Matt’s slide and other mentions from scribe notes>.

Data was systematically collected from the workshop. Scribes took notes during each session, capturing the conversation in as much detail as they could. Additionally, participants were given shared documents to work in. In this, the workshop employed the Goal-Question-Metrics approach to structuring and fostering conversations. In this, goals are objectives that people have when observing open community health. Questions are uncertainties and unknowns that people need answered to make decisions to reach their goals. Metrics are data points that can be employed to inform the questions and consequently make data-driven decisions. By bringing goal, question, and metric together, the purpose around what is measured and for what reason becomes easily communicated. These shared session notes and the notes from the scribes were analyzed in-between sessions and summarized for participants to validate that the notes correctly reflected the conversations and extracted the central ideas and take-aways.

The workshop had a series of sessions in which separated group and whole group discussion alternated around this Goal-Question-Metric approach. First, participants self selected into one of two groups focused on either open source and citizen science. The goal of this session was to discuss what needs to be done in each context. Second, a whole group session summarized the findings from each group and a discussion occurred to transfer knowledge about each context. Third, two groups were formed, mixing to equal parts participants form the previous two groups, with the goal to discuss similarities and differences between open source and citizen science with regards to determining open community health. Fourth, the whole group discussed the conversations and take-aways, synthesizing the similarities and differences. Fifth, the two groups focused on open source and citizen science, respectively, discussed who else needed to be involved in future conversations and what the next steps were to advance the topic. In a six and final whole group session, the workshop participants discussed these next steps and how to advance the conversation about open community health.

# Outcomes

Following, we present the central outcomes. The workshop participants were very productive and the summary in this paper highlight three central outcomes.

# Outcome 1: Similarities and Differences

## Similarities

* Difficult to determine a boundary on ecosystem of all interrelated projects to determine the health within the il-defined ecosystem
* Community health focuses on People
* What about sustainability in terms of in-/out-flow of people (apprentice ship model)

## Differences

* What the community engages around: open source has a stable technological center. Citizen science has very different goals, scientific purposes, and engagement modes
  + Shepard people between projects (to new projects, after a project ends)
* Citizen Science has a spectrum of long-short-term projects
* What is the level of community? Zooniverse = community - moves between science projects. - Focus on movement of people between projects.
  + Ray: can abandon projects (focused on a feature) within OPNFV - community of projects and let people move between different projects
* Difference in skill level needed? Software development requires specialized skills whereas Citizen Science can be contributed to by anyone. CS needs more people to look at data than OSS.
  + CS has less hierarchy, because emerging from a contributor to a research team member is impossible.
* Terms and Agreements - OSS requires a CLA to contribute to code - CS has a checkbox to agree for terms for how data is used.
* OSS is a way to do external R&D. A new corporate engagement way. Look a lot like Joint-Ventures. - CS is much more about community
* CS has a way to serialize tasks and split them up to allow many different people to do little work - OSS does not allow that kind of engagement much [Who assigns the work and who does the work - OSS:selfassign/CS:dedicate work]
  + Co-created CS projects (community sets out their own project and data needs)
  + Zooniverse style CS project (tasks split up by project teams)
* CS: Community less bounded, and more ephemeral than open source where we have a repository
* CS: Not lack of consensus of what sustainability is but a lot of ideas of sustainability
* Citizen science has much more variability in the artifact (data collected and interactions are less defined) - in Open Source we have commits and very similar interaction tools

# Outcome 2: Focus on People

Why focus on people, not artifacts, or engagement methods?

Metrics ...

Methods ...

<See scribes’ notes and session etherpad documents>

# Outcome 3: Taxonomy Mapping

<See Sean’s pictures, etherpad documents, and scribes notes>

# Future Work

The workshop participants determined four concrete next steps to take:

Ford call -- <https://ford-foundation-6.forms.fm/digital-infrastructure-research-rfp>

* Carsten, Greg, Sean, Matt (after call comes out)

CSA conference session/track

* Topic: Health and Sustainability
* 15 minute talks (maybe)
* Outcome: Round up the participants to write a shared paper

Workshop writeup Whitepaper

* 4 page summary
* Put in digital commons @uno
* Advertise via blog posts Mozilla / OpenSource.com

CSCW / Group Workshop Proposal

* Opt-in only, not invite people (?), avoid bias towards our network, requires advertising
* Workshop helps to draw in new people
* Might need travel funding to get people from outside CSCW community to join
* Would be good to establish a continuity and affiliation - run yearly at CSCW