Agenda/Meeting notes:

Participating:
- Steve Baskauf
- Rob Sanderson (Yale)
- Ian Engelbrecht
- Jeff Gerbracht
- David Fichtmueller
- Visotheary Ung
- Rod Page
- David Shorthouse
- John Wieczorek
- Ben Norton
- Jonathan Rees
- Kate Webbink

Regrets:
- Tim Robertson (GBIF) - comments added to doc where appropriate
- Raïssa Meyer
- Camila Plata

Comments and notes taken during the meeting are in red.
NOTE: please make comments as text directly in the document rather than in marginal comments.

There was interest in having a recording of the meeting for those who couldn't be present to view. It would also help me with note taking. So unless someone objects, Steve will record the meeting for private viewing.

I.   Set time and date for next meeting. Suggest Monday, 2022-10-31 at 13:00 UTC (Europe off summer time, so an hour earlier; others same time as this meeting). This will be after the annual meeting, so that may provide an opportunity for recruitment for our efforts. Another option: defer meeting until IG/TG meetings (in November?).

II. Follow up on action items from previous meeting:
   A.   OntoCommons collaboration: sent email indicating Jonathan would talk to them but no response.
   B.   Advancing GGBN draft through TDWG process: Raïssa reported that Katharine Barker was trying to identify a technical point of contact. We were also waiting on Gabi Dröge to return at end of summer. Need to gauge interest in moving forward, otherwise leave it as an existing external standard.
   C.   Participation in ISO. James was going to apply via Canadian Standards Organization and monitor their activities. Further action?

III.   Update on Issue 27 (Use of controlled values for dc:type not in the DCMI type vocabulary) https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/27 . The 3D Imaging Task Group recently officially proposed adding a term to the DCMI type vocabulary and it got nowhere. So that option is out. Do we want to get involved in this (and provide potentially useful guidance to the 3D TG, which is somewhat stuck) or do we stay out of it and let them do what they want (and close that issue)?

- Background by Kate Webbink. Goal in proposing a term to the DCMI type vocabulary: to group together and to make more readily findable things that are 3D resources of various kinds. Currently, some groups are using Dataset (for example CT scans) while other types like photogrammetry might fall under Image. The problem is that many 3D resources are something that crosses over between these two types. One problem with Dataset is that one category that falls within 3D are constructed, non-factual 3D models. The DCMI Usage Board, which controls changes to the Dublin Core vocabularies, declined to take up the proposal, so that avenue is dead.

- Comment by Steve: Some of the Usage Board's reluctance was that opening up the Type Vocabulary to additions might allow for a flurry of additional proposals. Steve also noted that Tom Baker (of the Usage Board) pointed out that although it is recommended to use terms from the Type Vocabulary as values for dc:/dcterms:type, it is not a requirement. However, historically within TDWG values for dcterms:type were restricted to terms from the DCMI Type Vocabulary (see http://rs.tdwg.org/decisions.htm decisions 1 and 2). So one question is whether we go against that precedent and mint our own term? That could cause problems if some picklists or validators only allow Type Vocabulary terms.

- Rob Sanderson suggested https://schema.org/3DModel ?
  [KW] - CT scans seem precluded by this currently, but might be something we can clarify with the schema.org group. If it's appropriate, where does it go if not in dc:type? The 3D group has looked at DataCite, which has its own modification of the Type Vocabulary, so that might work for us.

- Steve asks: Kate, does the 3D group want advice, and does the TAG want to offer advice? If this affects interoperability among a lot of groups, probably we should get involved, otherwise let the 3D Task Group do what it thinks best.

- Kate: Perhaps the TAG should get involved if action here is likely to set precedents for other groups. For example, Latimer Core has avoided using dc:type because they needed to have different values than the standard ones. The 3D task group has come up with come other terms for describing aspects of 3D resources, such as "modality". If the TAG (representing TDWG) thinks they could coordinate with DCMI on this, then the TAG might play a role.

- David Fichtmueller recommended in dc:type's "Usage Remarks", AC group could add/modify terms as needed, including "3dResource". David Shorthouse, John Wieczorek & Rob Sanderson agreed -- from the chat:
    - [DS] - Agree with David. https://ac.tdwg.org/termlist/#dc_type says "SHOULD (…"SHOULD" not "MUST" :)
    - [JW] - No dissent from me, David. I would go one step further and ask whether subtyping of dcmi:Image would be recommended.
    - [RS] - Also agreed

- David F. also said he's fairly convinced that there are hardly any validators out there that will have a problem with values outside the type vocabulary.
  - In the interest of time, the discussion was stopped at that point. There was some interest in continuing the discussion via Slack. The 3D group should probably be involved – they could be invited to join the TAG Slack channel.

IV. GUID Task Group. Rod suggested starting with a review of the GUID and LSID Applicability Statements. We have a thread on the Slack channel, but limited activity. We need to decide whether there is sufficient interest and a champion to lead the effort. (Comment from Tim Robertson, who could not attend, via a Doc comment: My own feeling is TDWG should focus on the standards for biodiversity data models and not on generic standards for ID and resolution services or infrastructure which will be 1) too implementation specific for TDWG to have any real influence and 2) strongly influenced by broader trends in infrastructure than biodiversity.) Here is a list of potential participants identified recently, as well as in 2017 in Issue 14 of the TAG GitHub tracker https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/14 :

1. Rod Page
2. Jonathan Rees
3. Rob Sanderson
4. Ian Engelbrecht
5. Larry Lannom (DiSSCO suggested by James)
6. Paul Morris (2017)
7. Dimitris Koureas (2017)
8. Dag Endresen (2017)
9. Joel Sachs (2017)
10. Pier Buttigieg (2017)
11. Jeff Gerbracht (2017)
12. Stan Blum (2017)
13. Donald Hobern (2017)

Steve asked for discussion as to whether any of these people might be willing to convene a group to decide what to do about the GUID/LSID Applicability Statements. Optimally, it would be someone who had a vested interest in the issue and who would be willing to put in the time necessary to organize the group.

- Jonathan: He and Rod Page were involved in the discussion before, but did not have enough skin in the game to lead the effort. If this is a non-problem, he isn't sure how much attention it needs. [visual "thumbs-up" from Rob Sanderson]
- Rod: This is just going to happen anyway. The place where he has skin in the game is with LSIDs. They exist, despite a lack of attention. It's not clear what the mission is: is it to recommend use? Is it to encourage a specific kind? After looking at Tim's comment, maybe this isn't something we need to do. It's not that there's a lack of interest – there is lack of a clear driver for whatever it is that we're supposed to do.
- Steve: His main reason for bringing this up is that there are issues in the tracker from a previous TAG converner that there was a mandate from the Executive Committee to do something about this. He hasn't heard it come up in the Executive recently. If that mandate has evaporated and nobody cares, the simple solution is to close those issues and move on. At the time the

issues were opened, there was talk of actual deprecation of those documents, but what does that actually mean? At some point in the past LSIDs were THE identifier recommended by TDWG, but it's safe to say that they are not the recommended identifier any more. Maybe all that needs to happen is to just add a comment saying that this is no longer a preferred identifier and leave it at that.

- Jonathan: He thinks he brought this up 10 years ago and what bothered him was the contradiction on the website which would be confusing to a newcomer (they are recommended, but not actually in use). It's a question of giving accurate advice to people who come to the organization for advice.
- Steve: What we have now is prescription. Maybe that is too much. But along the line of documenting precedent, we do have presidents. For example, all of the TDWG standards term identifiers are HTTP identifiers and they all dereference. Maybe part of the solution of this is not to revise these standards (just leave them as they are) and record the practices that people are following. Whether we want to elevate them to "best practices" or not, at least it would be something.
- David F.: In the initial discussion we had in our first meeting in March, the idea was to split the LSID A.S. from the GUID A.S.. The LSID part is not recommended, but the GUID part is still relevant but needs updating. In the Task Group/Interest Group meetings in November there could be more external people who have a vested interest. We could put this on the agenda as something we want to update – is there anyone who is willing to champion this?
- Steve: Updating the GUID document is a good idea but not critical. If someone wants to take that on, fine, but presenting some kind of documentation that LSIDs aren't recommended anymore would be good.

Notes added after the meeting: There has been significant discussion on this topic under the three issues in the TAG issues tracker:

Issue 14 (Convene an Identifiers Task Group), starting with Jonathan Rees comment at https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/14#issuecomment-1230968521 He notes that after 2017, the TDWG website seems to be consistent and perhaps the issue can just be closed.

Issue 9 (Revise GUID standard), starting with https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/9#issuecomment-1232924229 Marc Portier makes some recommendations about revising the LSID recommendations with respect to their use in RDF. Donald Hobern provides some context with respect to the considerations that were in place during the original TDWG GUID work. I recommend reading this for important perspective about the desire to have identifiers that work on the web (and in Linked Data) vs. the long timeframe over which taxonomic and collections identifiers need to persist.

Issue 2 (Deprecate TDWG LSID recommendation) https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/2 does not have recent comments, but is related to the previous two issues.

V. Policy on boolean values. Ben Norton wrote a draft with discussion and input from Tim Robertson, John Wieczorek, and Steve Baskauf. Discussion. Google doc link

(still under revision):
https://docs.google.com/document/d/14f7H7hSTyiu0LXCJc9nG-uvy3-EIAkUd/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=116662525049431320321&rtpof=true&sd=true (Comment from Tim Robertson prior to the meeting: It would be good to determine where exactly this would reside in TDWG process. That will help guide decisions on content.)

- Ben: The document probably has more details than will remain in the final document. He thinks it's important to have these recommendations. Question: where are these kind of recommendations and is it within scope to make these kind of recommendations (he thinks so) and have them in a central location. He also has some recommendations about terms expecting boolean values: use "is" as the first part of the term name. He thinks it's an opportunity to provide guidance so that people building things don't have to spend a lot of time thinking about this.
- John W. (in chat): I really appreciate the work that Ben has done. It's useful, and will be in perpetuity. It will be useful to be able to point people to that document rather than try to answer the question in perpetuity, and perhaps inconsistently. Thus, I think it is a good idea for us to incorporate documents like this in TDWG standards. It seems reasonable as an Applicability Statement. Can we make that a target, along with a controlled value vocabulary?
- Steve: there are several courses of action. One would be to continue modifying this document and stash it somewhere as a recommended practice. The other possibility that would fit into the existing infrastructure for controlled values would be to construct an official controlled vocabulary for booleans. It would be really easy (at least at the start) because it would have only two values (true and false). The advantage is that the existing system mints a SKOS concept (a conceptual entity with IRI and multilingual labels) but also handles the traditional database view that a controlled vocabulary is the strings you tell people to use in their tables. In that case the controlled value strings would be what Ben recommended: "true" and "false". For serializations that do not support datatyping (e.g. CSV), we recommend those strings. As either an ancillary document, or in the term list preamble, we could have advice on how those values get translated in systems where datatyping is supported (e.g. JSON).
- Ben: this has come up in the Collections Description (Latimer Core) review. It would be nice to not have to explain in that standard, you could just refer to the other document. Other recommendations would also be important, such as whether a term is called "vernacularName" or "vernacularNames" in the situation were array values are allowed.
- Steve: there might be some value for the TAG (in lieu of some other group doing it) to have a document just documenting precedents or practices that wouldn't have prescriptive force but that are recommended across TDWG. For example, if a term should have a boolean value, use "isPresent" rather than "present".
- There was support for creating the controlled vocabulary and an explanatory document to go along with it. It was agreed that this was simple enough that the TAG can just do it (vs. having a task group).

- David F.: The recommendations could be "soft". That is, if you don't know what you are doing, follow them. If you know what you are doing and have a reason to not follow them, you could do so. If a task group doesn't follow them, they can either revise (and follow) or explain why they deviated.
    - From the chat:

08:56:33   From Jonathan Rees : Another relevant precedent would be CSVW, W3C recommendation on how to represent linked data as CSV files
08:57:32   From Jonathan Rees : I bet it takes a stand on true/false representation
08:58:17   From Ben Norton : https://www.w3.org/TR/tabular-data-primer/
08:58:31   From Ben Norton : https://www.w3.org/TR/csvw-ucr/

VI.   Any additional announcements or new business.
   A. **Session for late-stage task groups at the TDWG conference.** There will be an informational symposium at the meeting where all of the Task Groups that are near to completing (or have recently completed) their deliverables will update the community about their work. This would be an excellent opportunity for TAG members to become more aware of what's coming out of the standards pipeline, particularly since many of these deliverables will soon be moving into the public comment phase. For more information, see https://www.tdwg.org/conferences/2022/session-list/#sym15%20information%20session%20about%20late-stage%20task%20group%20submissions%20of%20standards%20additions List of abstracts for the session: https://biss.pensoft.net/collection/401/
   B. **Sustainable Darwin Core MIxS Interoperability maintenance procedures**. From Raïssa: The suggested strategy is for TDWG to co-maintain the SSSOM mapping file in the GBWG GH repo. The repo would be forked by the GSC or linked out to. Would this group have any other suggestions for the maintenance? Further, would this group be the right guardians and updaters of the mapping (if not, do we know who would be)? We are also planning to have a call with the TDWG EC and GSC board to finalise the strategy and the proposed Memorandum of Understanding. Would any members of the TAG like to join this call? Jeff Gerbracht would be interested in it if taxonomic concepts are part of the discussion. John Wieczorek commented that since Darwin Core is directly involved in this, that it makes sense for the DwC Maintenance Group to bear the primary responsibility for maintenance. However, TAG participants who are interested in the issue should contact Raïssa about attending the meeting.
      1. https://www.tdwg.org/community/gbwg/MIxS/
      2. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PMduF-42m0CqtCsgczG-MajcKLkzkj6BRBs2DVyLX64/edit?usp=sharing
      3. https://github.com/tdwg/gbwg/tree/main/dwc-mixs/mapping

From the chat:
09:01:25   From David Fichtmueller : this touches on a General Question on how mappings between Standards should be documented
09:01:58   From Ben Norton : The Latimer Core group is adding a SKOS mapping section to existing vocabularies

VII.   Action items for next meeting (or before):
   A. The next meeting will probably be the last one of this calendar year. Given that Steve asked for a one-year commitment, please consider whether you

want to stay on the TAG for another year or step off. There is a limit in the constitution on the number of members of a functional subcommittee and we are at or near that limit, so new members can't be added unless others step off. However, the meetings are open to anyone, so it's possible to continue participating and attending the meetings even if not an official "member".

B. With respect to the booleans issue: Steve will create the controlled vocabulary List of Terms document and get together with Ben to morph his document into something to go along with that.