W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 1: Pt 1

Free-floating signifiers (words that mean different things to different people)	Does CR play advisory role?	Does CR play "verification" role?
"community" Does it mean just members? Is it broader? Is it entire scholarly community? **"Open infrastructure"** Does it means "open source?" Does it mean "open operations?" Does it mean promoting "Open Access" **"Reuse"** **"Assess"**	Standards (best set of metadata) Workflows	Validation Trustworthiness

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 2: Pt 1

Mission statement	Community	Clear language
Persistence missing - critical function that's not mentioned Better to say "effective & efficient" rather than "new and innovative technologies" as an end in themselves.	Who is the community? Who is Crossref for? Statement of purpose is directed to researchers rather than content creators. "Members" and "Community" both used.	Questions about "rally" and "play" and meaning for non-native English speakers and for native speakers ("play" problematic). Issue about R&D - if it's a priority then more resources needed.

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 3: Pt 1

What is/isn't clear?	Is Anything Missing?	Is there anything that you would remove
Membership smaller than the community - Who is the community?(definition?)	Vision for the future -expressing an aspiration "Open" -should be applied to geography, communities, metadata, etc Partnerships - Missing mention of persistent identification Research output do we want to define -maybe need strategic ambiguity	The last sentence of the mission -Marmite Role of Crossref as enabler vs the source of everything. Play -replace with something else?? Sounds diminishing

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 4: Pt 1

1. Need clarity!	2. Overall OK but...	3. Also OK but...
Assess, reuse, 'better' - what does these mean? Is new technology a goal; shouldn't it be a means to an end? Is 'assess' Similarity Check	'Researcher' is missing We should emphasize infrastructure Community vs, member - 'collaborate' should be there	Is the word 'play' the right word? Is the language too playful? Again, what does 'assess' mean? Reuse?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?

Table 5: Pt 1

"Assess" has raised questions	Where does Crossref begin and the community end?	Happy with the mission statement.
Uncertainty of what and how is being assessed. Range of opinion on what should be done. Suggestions that we remove altogether or do it more completely.	"Tagging" done by community. Broad community, there was no mention of global.	Maybe Crossref doesn't live up to it? "No change" came up on a few points as did. Also "it should be changed".

μετavators!

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 6: Pt 1

What is or isn't clear?	Anything missing?	Remove
- Who is the community - Who are members? - Who does Crossref directly benefit/serve - what is 'better'?	- Data quality & resolution 'Who' - researchers and the public/society/other infrastructure partners/disciplines - Equity/inclusiveness	- Do we need 'open infrastructure'? - Remove the word 'play' but not the sentiment/intent - Membership? Are there opportunities that could be constrained by this?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 7: Pt 1

Who is the community?	Persistence	Play
what is the actual community we are try to serve? All of scholarly research is very broad. Do academics know who Crossref is?	persistence of linking is missing from the mission - and this is seen as core to what Crossref is	this implies amusing yourself, throw-away, not serious and not driven by a question. Play trivialises R&D

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 8: Pt 1

Mission is vague	Community has changed	Theme 3 title
"Tag" - but Crossref doesn't, the members do - (rubbish in, rubbish out) Rally, tag, run, play - different meanings in different languages and contexts Play in particular isn't clear. No vision statement Crossref attitude to science information consumers	"End user" not represented in the mission No longer just publishers But all producers and consumers of information	Description

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 9: Pt 1

Dissemination and discovery	More emphasis on sharing	Who are the stakeholders?
Missing from the mission statement.	More emphasis should be put on sharing in the mission statement.	Mission statement mentions the research outputs but not the actors.

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 10: Pt 1

Shifting boundaries

- Infrastructure means doing stuff under the surface & leaving above the surface work to others.
- But, there are other infrastructure providers and boundaries change over time.

Infrastructure is a hairy beast

- Seek community definitions of services & infrastructure & keep them under review
- PID should remain core
- Is the mission about the content & does that make it unique? What about context?

Collaborating w/ other infrastructure providers

- E.g. access & ID management orgs
- Maybe open science platforms, e.g. European Open Science
- Are we assuming collaboration is desirable?
- Is value of Crossref to China in particular clear (b/c of their dominance)?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 11: Pt 1

Missing vision	What does "assess" mean?	Prioritisation
We have founding statement but no sense of the long term plan and vision.	What does "assess" mean? Content quality checking? Should Crossref quality check, or is this to allow others to quality check? Or assess academics?	There's a lot in the mission but with no sense of prioritisation. How does "Play" and "Make" get prioritised amongst the first few?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 1: Pt 2

Lack of diversity	No mention of user-community	Other
Overwhelming US/UK representation Nobody from Asia No representatives from users (libraries, researchers, funders, outside of industry altogether) "Small publishers" are not "smallest." Reflects that "small publisher" category casts too a broad net.	(libraries, researchers, funders) Need to understand their use-cases and needs better - in turn helps publishers better serve them. For example a "new products/services committee"	Possibly misleading categorization of publishers. For example, Library", "university"- when in fact these are just publishing subunits. We were not asked to consider "working groups" - which are separate from formal board and committees, but which are more accessible and which cover a lot more operational activity. They should be promoted as it is largely unknown how they are formed and how they operate. Also -- working groups page has not been updated since January 2017.

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 2: Pt 2

Board diversification	Committees & Working Groups	Staff time
Scholarly communications is changing - extending board representation has been positive - e.g. library publishers are important - institution as publisher is a compelling model. Geography - need to look at the person and the organization. Also, age, gender, global north/south. Focusing on specific aspects would be useful.	Missing: metadata consumers not represented - user group or committee or metadata users? E.g. Ludo. Staff talk to users frequently but nothing formal.	Most spent on large publishers - is that appropriate?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 3: Pt 2

Board Composition	Working/Advisory Groups	New Relationships
Sponsoring Orgs -broaden out/use the structure to support and represent small members. Geographical representation Staff time spent on Lg Pubs -can Crossref scale effectively to support sm pubs	Tension between basic services and innovation. Make membership broader or make activities more narrow	A structured way to formalize partnerships. Core business vs new activities -better explain value added

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 4: Pt 2

What is the future?	Who is the future?	Today, tomorrow, and the day after?
Need a vision statement - what is the Crossref's vision of the future, so how do we prepare? How is Crossref talking to users about the future?	Emerging types of publishers, universities, library publishers, researchers, funders, sponsored orgs - are they represented? (no)	How much time is spent on today, tomorrow, and the day after tomorrow, and dealing with yesterday?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 5: Pt 2

Hard to answer the question without articulated vision

Who sets that? Who is responsible?

Should there be a dedicated committee / group? It wasn't clear from the website.

Need a better sense of membership.

Geography
Business models
Field

Asia is missing (⁉)

Where are the funders?
Platform providers?
Infrastructure providers?
Metadata users?

Connection between board and actual members?

Not all members know the plans of people on the board.

The only visible signals are business models / sectors of members.

Don't need a representative, just a clearer way of judging.

μεταvators!

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 6: Pt 2

Representation/membership	Governance	Future Proofing Working Groups

• What is the diversity within the current membership (size and type of publisher)? No data on this.
• Who are stakeholders/members of the future?
• Include Data consumers as well as data creators
   ○ Researchers (Academies, learned Socs)
   ○ Libraries & Institutions
   ○ Funders
	• Should include consumers as well as creators	• A 'Futures' WG
		• Identifying and engaging with Strategic partners & collaborators and looking to the future
		• Alternative revenue sources (not from content creators but content users)

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?

Table 7: Pt 2

Membership growth	tension	Representation
how does Crossref scale as the number of smaller and more diverse members grows? Is the time spent serving large publishers appropriate? Is it a technology issue?		the board is predominantly publishers (except Clarivate), where are the funders, libraries, service providers etc? A membership organisation should represent the membership

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 8: Pt 2

Getting input	Getting out	Bring the move
Committees vs working/advisory groups - should the latter be renamed and opened up to wider community?

Committee nomination process should be more clear | Crossref shall be more involved with other groups in every continent and region | One major publisher can move the process on

Open call for Committee participation

Reducing support by improving technology |

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 9: Pt 2

Inclusivity & expansion	Size matters	More emphasis on metadata use/users
Involve other content producers like research institutions, funders, and metadata users. Be more geographically inclusive. HSS needs representing - books New governance change - is revenue really the best split for board? (8 seats reserved for XXL)	Include 'real' small (and sponsored) members more since this group is growing. Every group should be represented fairly on board, not necessarily the case now, for example sponsored members. Noted there is high attention on large members (large volume = large support needs.	Good that there is now no case-by-case opt-out of metadata use anymore. Q: How much effort/time is proactive vs reactive?

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 10: Pt 2

Future position: 1. small v large	**2. Different member categories**	**3. Staff time**
Definitions & representation One member, one vote? Global north vs. global south (east vs west)	Publishers, funders, libraries, new org types Regional / national / language chapters	Unclear in detail what staff spend time on Less blue, more yellow: Where are efficiencies & move from submission end (after 20 years) to making use easier.

W1: What is our mission and who do we serve?
Table 11: Pt 2

Membership vs community	Vision and representation	Value of membership
- What does it mean to be a member? (membership = obligations). No obligations for non-members? - Constraints in being membership org (officially a trade group). - How to balance input from the community and input from the member? - How to balance time spent with each group? How scalable is that? Automation?	- Need vision to define goals which will define committees and makeup of committees. - No Asia Pac on board.	- What value do the members feel they get from membership now? - Is this the same as they'll get in the future?