****

**INTERNAL MEETING MINUTES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Meeting Purpose | TDWG Sensitive Species Extension Task Group Meeting |
| Time and Date | 5th March 2025, from 17:00 AEDT |
| Attendees | Tania Laity  Cam Slatyer  Arthur Chapman  Piers Higgs  Alice Catherine Hughes  Andrew Rodrigues  Cassia Piper  Donna Lewis  Martin Kaehrle  Mieke Strong  William K Morris |

**Minutes**

Housekeeping

* Next meeting - stagger to suit the eastern and western hemispheres respectively - next meeting held in US time, then the next one back in Australian time.
* TDWG Executive Committee email received about TDWG working sessions in the week of April 14-18. We need to pick some times in the supplied spreadsheet that we could use. We don’t have to showcase our work so far - we could just do a short 5 minute introduction about where we're intending to head and then open up for discussion instead.

**Action: CS will follow up with TDWG Exec re the working sessions**

Agenda

* To RASD or not to RASD? (ie keep using the term Sensitive Species)
  + Cam indicated that the term “sensitive species” is causing a few issues with some other parties mis-interpreting the name of the group and getting confused and conflating things
  + AR: Using RASD more often these days
  + AC: Would like RASD - better explains what we are aiming to do
  + CS: some of the confusion was that some people thought that the record was being withheld for government reasons, not the reasons we were talking about from this group Any dissenting people wanting to use sensitive species?
  + WM: The term RASD paints you into the corner of having to restrict access because of the name; but using sensitive species doesn’t mean you have to restrict access to it. Agree with the need to move away from sensitive but the effect of the other direction is that it’s all restricted - worried about it.
  + CS: Adopt RASD in the interim, or retain sensitive, but come up with suggested titles we can discuss at the next meeting.
  + AC: perhaps combine sensitive and restricted access species data? Sensitive seems to get people to draw people towards regulatory lists; so combine both.
  + CS: Retain it as it is now and put in your ideas - deadlines by 23 March

**Action: Cam to circulate some suggested titles and send a call out for all members to come up with suggestions – to be submitted by 23rd March**

* Discuss Additions to Sensitivity Reasons and Treatments
  + CS: Introduction to Tania and she showed the work she’d been working on
  + TL: Presents the document submitted with the meeting minutes, main points:
    - Additional preamble at the start around intent and subcategories
    - Additional reasons - such as 2.7 & 2.8 – these were around harm to people due to release of info, contextual information provided for associated but non-sensitive species
    - Additional reasons - catchall added e.g. 2.9 and 4.3 where the data provider knows that a species is potentially sensitive but is unsure of the specific reasons
    - Treatments – B.1 was added – generalising coordinates to degrees
    - Treatments – B.4 was added – generalising to a standardised grid
    - Treatments - B.5 was added as well for the centroid of a region
    - Treatments – Category C was added to enable replacing an attribute value with a generalised value e.g precise locality to nearest named place
    - Category D.1 was added in Treatments for obfuscation date to month
    - And E.2 just handling where non-sensitive species are linked to other non-sensitive ones
    - Changed the numbering so that reasons and categories weren’t linked, using separate and alpha numeric IDs for treatments now
  + There are a few that are missing use cases but we want to have those in the document as well - hence the next point.
  + AC had a bunch of use cases around data quality that might be useful - that was published somewhere - he will provide a link to the publication; paper he wrote a few years ago with Miles Nicholls as well. Will be good to review that.

**Action: AC to send a link to the use cases to Tania to review (Done)**Rees ER, Nicholls M (2020). Suppl. material 2: Data Quality Use Case Study Result. <https://biss.pensoft.net/article/download/suppl/5255738/> .

* + AD indicates there is a TDWG indigenous knowledge task group - could liaise with them to get some use cases for the new indigenous ones in treatment category D.

**Action: CS and TL will tease out the best examples into a series of use cases and then highlight the ones that are needed for more information and ask the group for examples for those.**

Other items for discussion - ability to choose categories / sub categories; protection of IP rights; Fitness for Use considerations?

* Ability to choose categories / sub categories
  + CS: A few people suggested you don’t need to go into sub-categories, but these do seem to fit into the FAIR categories and approach. We want people to explain why they are doing these things - the subcategories do line up with the FAIR principles - add in a preamble that makes that statement up front. This is already at the top of the document so feedback anything after this session
* Protection of IP rights
  + TL: Need for proper attribution and citation - not something attributed to the data, this is a legal agreement, usage agreement - this is in the agreement between the data provider and the data requester. Not part of the data itself - shouldn’t be in a Reason, but it’s in there a little because of the embargo.
  + AC: Darwin Core uses the Dublin Core licence term - people can put the data into that field - so that would cover that.
  + WM: Avoid IP issues as much as possible – personal opinion that we avoid the use of embargoes, they shouldn’t be used these days
* Fitness for use considerations
  + CS: People were worried about if the data was fit for purpose - should we be past this?
  + AC: Should be up to the user, not the data provider in any way - you make it available, and the user has to decide if it’s fit for purpose or not - can’t do it any other way. Need to document what the data is but the user needs to make that decision. For any one you think of any other would be perfectly good.
  + AH: Wildlife trade needs a bunch of things - not the same thing. Lots of crap analysis out there, so making sure the minimum data standards are there we can limit improper use of the data.
  + CP: Can’t tell people that certain data is good and bad, that’s elitist - let people make their own decisions
  + CS: Will leave that outside the categories and treatments
* Next Steps
  + TL: Action list recapped
  + CS: Aim to have the next meeting after those TDWG group meetings - later in April
  + TL: We will need to look at the ability to put more than one reason or treatment onto the data - that will be the likely next meeting focus
  + CS: Thanks - next meeting will be in US time zones.

Meeting Closed: 17:50 AEDT