TDWG Technical Architecture Group (TAG)
Online meeting
2022-11-07 13:00 UTC

Agenda/Meeting notes (November working session):

Participating:
-

Regrets:
-

As with previous meetings, Steve will record the meeting for note taking and private viewing.

I. Set time and date for next meeting. Suggest 2023-01-09 13:00 UTC.
II. For new attendees: about the TAG and review of recent activities (Steve)
III. Follow-up on items from the previous meeting
    A. 3D Task Group will probably move ahead regardless of resolution of the dc:type issue. To be discussed at the Audubon Core Maintenance Group working session Thursday, 10 November 17:00 UTC. Close https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/27
    B. Propose recommendation to Executive to abandon effort to make GGBN a TDWG standard until a champion emerges. Close https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/17
    C. Brief report back on Memorandum of Understanding between TDWG and the Genomic Standards Consortium (GSC)
IV. Policy on boolean values.
    A. Draft controlled vocabulary: https://github.com/tdwg/tag/blob/master/build/boolean/index.md
    B. Ancillary document
    C. Does this need to go through a formal standards process? Or do we just recommend it in a manner similar to the tdwgutility: namespace terms? See https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/13
    D. How do people find this? Where do we put TAG-developed best practices?
    E. The process established here will set the stage for the next effort to address arrays and is directly connected to the Latimer Core review.
V. GUID issues
    A. Open issues related to this:
        1. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/14 (Convene an identifiers task group)
        2. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/2 (Deprecate LSID Applicability Statement)

3. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/9 (Revise GUID Applicability Statement)
B. Options:
1. Convene a task group to update the GUID Applicability Statement. Needs a champion to convene the group.
2. Create documents (not to be included in the standard) that explain the history, current practice within TDWG, and non-binding recommendations. Include links to these documents on the standards landing page. Work to be done by TAG members as part of normal operations.
3. Do nothing.
C. Discussion and decision. Record decision while closing ancient issues. Open a single new issue if necessary, clearly defining the task.

Comment (Ian Engelbrecht): I support Option 1, and would like to add Roger Hyam and Wouter Addink as additional names to the list of potential participants included in minutes from an earlier meeting. My sense is that there's a real need for TDWG to provide a guideline on identifiers for the community, but that there's also still quite serious work to be done to resolve what exactly we want from identifiers (pointers to database records versus disambiguating entities like taxon names). I'd like to propose another option, to set a meeting date for early 2023 for that proposed list of participants to discuss forming a task group, identifying a (respectable) convenor, setting a plan of attack, etc. I'm happy to organize that meeting and hopefully get the ball rolling.

VI. Recommendations for expressing complex values
A. In several task groups there has been discussion about what to recommend in cases where properties may require multiple values, or in cases where values of several properties need to be linked in order for them to be meaningful. Rather than having each group adopt its own ad hoc solution, it was suggested that the TAG might coordinate TDWG-wide recommendations.
B. There is a review of current precedents within TDWG at https://github.com/tdwg/tag/blob/master/complex_values/existing_precedents.md
C. There is a list of use cases to be considered at https://github.com/tdwg/tag/blob/master/complex_values/use_cases.md
D. Is this something that the TAG wishes to take up? If so, timely action would be necessary as several of the groups are in the last stages of developing their standards.
VII. Discuss future work for 2023
A. Review standards status and recommend standards to be retired. Non-retired standards should have some mechanism for their maintenance. See:
1. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/21
2. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/20
3. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/16 (This is a 2017 task from the Executive committee. What does it actually mean?
B. Other issues
1. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/28 (anthropological/cultural knowledge terms needed across vocabularies - needs a champion)

2. https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/22 (consider use of SKOS-XL for labels across TDWG vocabularies; maybe under consideration by TCS2?)

VIII. Any additional announcements or new business.
    A. Views controlled vocabularies are now in the public comment period. See https://github.com/tdwg/ac/issues/245 and comment.
    B. Revise TAG membership for 2023.
        1. Constitutional limit of "fewer than 15 members"
        2. One year commitment.
    C. Report from the TDWG Unconference Group about Standards Mappings (David)
        1. Is this something that should/could be pursued under the umbrella of the TAG?
    D. Status of the old TDWG-TAG Mailing List: https://lists.tdwg.org/mailman/listinfo/tdwg-tag should we start actively using it or retire it for good? (suggested by David)
        1. Comment by David: This is just something I noticed recently. It is not urgent, so feel free to postpone this to a future meeting if time runs out.

IX. Action items for next meeting (or before):
    A.