

# Technical Architecture Group (TAG)

Interest Group Meeting, November 2021

## Agenda

1. Introduction to the TAG
2. Membership
3. 2021 Progress
4. Process/Documentation
  - How can we improve our processes?
  - How can we improve our documentation?
5. What should we be aware of now?
  - Challenges and Opportunities
6. Guidance
  - Need to revise scope of the TAG?
  - Roadmap
7. To Dos

GitHub repo: <https://github.com/tdwg/tag>

## Participants: (Name, Organization, e-mail)

| Name                | Affiliation                     | TDWG role                     | e-mail   | Interested in TAG membership |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| James Macklin (JM)  | AAFC                            | TAG co-convenor, (chair)      | <a href="mailto:james.macklin@gmail.com">james.macklin@gmail.com</a>           |                              |
| Stan Blum(SBm)      | TDWG                            | Admin                         | <a href="mailto:stanblum@gmail.com">stanblum@gmail.com</a>                     | Y                            |
| Steve Baskauf (SBf) | Vanderbilt University Libraries | Audubon/Darwin Core MG        | <a href="mailto:steve.baskauf@vanderbilt.edu">steve.baskauf@vanderbilt.edu</a> |                              |
| John Wieczorek (JW) | VertNet, Rauthiflor LLC         | Darwin Core Maintenance Group | <a href="mailto:gtuco.btuco@gmail.com">gtuco.btuco@gmail.com</a>               | Y                            |

|                         |  |                         |  |   |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---|
| John Torgersen (JT)     | Canadian Museum of Nature,                                 |                         | <a href="mailto:jtorgersen@nature.ca">jtorgersen@nature.ca</a>                       |   |
| David Fichtmueller (DF) | Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum (BGBM) Berlin, Germany |                         | <a href="mailto:d.fichtmueller@bgbm.org">d.fichtmueller@bgbm.org</a>                 | Y |
| William Ulate (WU)      | Missouri Botanical Garden                                  | Treasurer, exec         | <a href="mailto:william_ulate_r@yahoo.com">william_ulate_r@yahoo.com</a>             | Y |
| Holly Little (HL)       | Smithsonian NMNH   |                         | <a href="mailto:littleh@si.edu">littleh@si.edu</a>                                   |   |
| Ben Norton (BN)         | North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences                  |                         | <a href="mailto:ben.norton@natural-sciences.org">ben.norton@natural-sciences.org</a> | Y |
| Nicky Nicolson (NN)     | RBG Kew  | TAG co-convenor (notes) | <a href="mailto:n.nicolson@kew.org">n.nicolson@kew.org</a>                           |   |
| Visotheary Ung (VU)     | MNHN Paris   | TDWG secretary, exec    | <a href="mailto:visotheary.ung@mnhn.fr">visotheary.ung@mnhn.fr</a>                   |   |
| Greg Whitbread (GW)     | Taxamatics   | Previous TAG convenor   | <a href="mailto:taxamatics@gmail.com">taxamatics@gmail.com</a>                       | Y |
| Ian Engelbrecht (IE)    | Natural Science Collections Facility (South Africa)        |                         | <a href="mailto:ian@nscf.org.za">ian@nscf.org.za</a>                                 |   |
| Joel Sachs (JS)         | Agriculture and AgrFood Canada                             |                         | <a href="mailto:joel.sachs@agr.gc.ca">joel.sachs@agr.gc.ca</a>                       |   |
| Deborah Paul (DP)       | Species File Group, Illinois Natural History Survey        | TDWG chair              | <a href="mailto:dlpaul@illinois.edu">dlpaul@illinois.edu</a>                         |   |
| Arthur Chapman          | Australian Biodiversity Information Services               | Convenor BDQIG          | <a href="mailto:biodiv_2@achapman.org">biodiv_2@achapman.org</a>                     |   |
| Niels Klazenga          | Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria / Atlas                     | TCS Maintenance Group   | <a href="mailto:Niels.Klazenga@rbg.vic.gov.au">Niels.Klazenga@rbg.vic.gov.au</a>     |   |

|                    |   |                        |                               |  |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
|                    | of Living<br>Australia                        |                        |                               |  |
| Takeru<br>Nakazato | Database<br>Center for Life<br>Science, Japan | Asia<br>representative | nakazato@dbcls.ro<br>is.ac.jp |  |
|                    |   |                        |                               |  |
|                    |   |                        |                               |  |
|                    |   |                        |                               |  |
|                    |   |                        |                               |  |

## Discussion notes (session 1 - 2021-11-10)

JM led discussion using this slideset:

[https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1mFkUwuh4\\_IEXB-sH8OhXdiQ4oCfxVHI04TphOhxI\\_Z9A/edit#slide=id.gfc2a9b2c55\\_0\\_43](https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1mFkUwuh4_IEXB-sH8OhXdiQ4oCfxVHI04TphOhxI_Z9A/edit#slide=id.gfc2a9b2c55_0_43)

### Membership (slide 5, 0:00)

- JM We need to rebuild membership of TAG - please indicate interest in participant list Q (SBf) There was an expectation that TAG would include representation from interest groups / task groups?

JM: That is not specifically in the charter (though we could discuss if the TAG charter should be revised). IG/TG could participate via reporting (as they already report to exec) or in TAG membership.

### 2021 progress (slide 6, 00:03:46)

- Met with key stakeholders re role of TAG & challenges, & how to support standards development
- Reviewed TG requests
- Need some clear documentation, especially as some people will enter the standards process having already done some work

### Standards process & documentation (slide 7, 00:06:02 )

Standards documentation standard  
Vocabulary maintenance standard

Overview from SBf

**SDS** - reincarnation of earlier unratified document

How to document machine readable parts of standards

Human readable part

Tried to implement on existing standards: AC, DwC, SDS and VMS all conform

MR part generated via build scripts

HR part gives predictable format to documents

**VMS** - how to take care of vocabulary once it has been adopted, given that the TDWG standards process is really about creating standards in the first place. Maintenance groups for DwC, AC (and one other). No maintenance strategy for standards which are not vocabularies. VMS does not define what a "vocabulary" is (e.g. is an XML schema in scope or not).

Coordinating changes: inspired from other standards bodies, eg ensure that changes are supported by use cases. These processes applied to maintenance activities but not de novo standards development - should they be? (point for later discussion).

JM: SBF how do we address the gaps that you have highlighted?

SBf: chicken & egg problem - if we wanted to define what a vocabulary is we would have to revise the VMS & there is no process governing how that happens as it does not apply to itself. Perhaps we need to revise the process to ensure a similar level of specification regarding standards which are not vocabularies. Add in a revision of the TDWG process document? (Technically the by-laws of TDWG).

SBm: The initial process re IG / TG, all that evolution specified pretty loosely, but acknowledged need for more rigor as SBf has outlined. ie VMS

Updating the VMS - how extensive is the modification & does it warrant full review or not. Up to executive / TAG to advise on charters and reports of TG.

JM: TAG does not have TG (as it is a functional subcommittee)

SBm: Nothing served by being overly strict & preventing formation of TGs in TAG

SBf: Process for maintenance of vocabularies,

Review manager: runs public comment period, solicits expert reviews, determines if comments addressed, recommendations to exec re ratification (or not).

Review manager guidelines ((not a standard, but a sort of "best practices" document based on the past experience of TDWG review managers

[https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review\\_manager.md](https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review_manager.md)) listed after discussing with all who have performed this role.

DF: No process to maintain non-vocabulary standards, would it be pragmatic to get whatever group is working on revision of a non-vocab standard to document the process as they go? Given there is consensus among exec, TAG & group pursuing the work that the *specific* work should be done, this would ensure that the *generic* process is documented.

SBm: Fits with what I was trying to say.

JW: Another pragmatic approach - have any other type of standard try to use the VMS & inform it what was it doesn't work (ie try to further generalise the VMS to cover all standards)

JM: That sounds reasonable, do we have a candidate (not a vocabulary) that could do this?

JW: We don't have a definition of a vocabulary!

SBf: re the VMS: recognition of the level of work required to warrant a maintenance group. (ie contrast DwC with those that don't change very often). Just something like having an issue tracker where people can raise issues

SBm: 2007 process - standards should be maintained by those who created it. Once created & stable, then the IG responsible for creation should maintain.

SBf: Strictly it is the TG of an IG that creates standard.

SBm: Metadata not explicit about this, would need to dig around in the charter.

BN: Discussion is a bit hard to follow! Could we have a status? ie what problem is trying to be addressed / what is the goal?

JM: All of the above

SBm: Executive is supposed to designate when something is no longer in use.  
(Notes that discussion is a lot of legalistic / process definition stuff & there may be other things which the meeting could focus on).

00:33

JM: Maybe process / flow diagrams could help, showing people where to enter the process, repercussions of entering at different stages etc. Could we (JM/SBm) work together on that?

SBm: Noted issue that "things get put on backburner" & then status is unclear. SDS makes steps & documentation explicit, could address problem where it has been hard to recruit review managers as they are simply handed a bunch of github resources & it was difficult to see what needed to be done.

Processes modelled after the "reviewing of a scientific paper" process, were hoping that the human readable documentation could be an article & the technical (machine readable) parts would be an appendix to this. (This aspiration still endorsed by JM).

00:37 Challenges & opportunities

"Process" meeting the ability of the TAG to help people with technical issues

SBm One of the challenges faced by people starting IG / TGs is help with modelling, how to translate use cases into data structures, classes, terms etc that will actually work.

JM: Plant phenology example

## "What should we be aware of" (slide #8, 00:39:00)

### GUIDs

JM: GUIDs - if we were asked for advice on GUIDs, what should we say as a technical perspective? How involved in GUIDs should TAG be? Many standards reliant on GUIDs. How should we provide advice to those who ask?

SBf: experience from Audubon core - people said what we want is a best practices guide. Struggled with how to write a best practices guide, then realised people wanted examples of how people had approached things. So maybe with GUIDs we need to say what are people doing with GUIDs & how is it working for them? Rather than throwing out all existing guidance & starting over on everything. ie look at pros & cons & start from there.

JM: The current GUID standard that we have is no longer completely relevant.

SBf: GUID applicability statement was an umbrella statement with generalities, with the idea that there would be specific standards fitting underneath addressing particular GUID implementations. The only one of these that was completed was for LSIDs - general principles still useful, & perhaps because GUID & LSID statements came out at the same time, they have become conflated. ie lets not discard the useful general principles because the technical part has been superseded.

JM: Add to todo to revise general guidance.

SBm: Modelling off of working practices followed by IETF & W3C ie we don't endorse another groups standards instead we explain how another groups standards can be adopted or used by our community. LSID statement followed that principle. GUIDs still a gap & an important one. The CETAF work & GBIFs activities could be summarised, proposal for GUIDs to be discussed in a symposium at SPNHC.

IE: Obviously something that is essential. \_Somebody\_ needs to take the lead.

JM: TAG is meant to be advisors - if we see gaps we need to report them & foster a group to address them

IE: So is there room for a GUIDs interest group & where would it sit?

SBm: Previous applicability statement was chartered as a task group from the TAG.

GW: Applicability statement is still a useful document, all we need to do is deprecate the recommendation to use LSIDs

GUID area is really huge - the TAG recommendation should be that everybody should use GUIDs & the applicability statement would back this up.

SBf: GUID applicability statement quite strong on HTTP access & that GUIDs should be dereferencable

BN: Would the TAG put together a tool to assign GUIDs?

JM: I think the answer is "no" (with GW on don't go too deep on this).

DF: The TAG could be aware of services offered by a group or project, but not something the TDWG / the TAG would provide itself. Be careful, as services have a shelf life.

## Semantic models & frameworks (00:54:50)

00:54:50 Semantic models & frameworks.

JM: How do we interact with semantic models & frameworks

Is it within the TAG's remit to say anything about the semantic / ontology space, as a standards body?

JW relationship btw ontologies & vocabularies

JM this can be discussed in the TAG

SBf: dwc been held back with the lack of a model. two approaches

tag could consider eg dwc has built this model, what are the implications for plinian core, for abcd

SBm: notes work underway by JW and GBIF, we should support

JW: would be happy to have a TAG available to comment on what has been done. Use case based, modelling is conceptual & with data publishing aim. When & how to review "grand unified model"? btw now & end of year (JW contract ends at end 2021).

## Future proofing (01:03)

JM: What things stick around (eg XML forever), what should we be aware of?

SBm: Looking at emerging technologies definitely in-scope, making sure that we are aware of what is being used in other domains.

## Emerging standards in relevant domains (01:04:45)

JM: We should borrow, rather than re-invent, but we should consider: in borrowing, how stable is the thing we are borrowing from?

JM: As well as emerging standards, we need to think about changes in "previously emerged" standards

JM: Relevant to the breadth of the TAG, that we have people plugged into other networks & aware of emerging standards.

## Implementation advice (01:06:20)

JM: How involved should the TAG be in the implementation of standards? Do we provide advice to implementers, or do we only provide advice to standards developers? Broad remit (of TAG) as a group of volunteers, we will have to focus.

SBm: The community has a gap (re implementation advice) - whilst the TAG has the expertise it may not have the bandwidth

GW: Provision of advice is the role of the interest groups

SBm: True, except in the case of GUIDs as its cross-cutting

HL: wouldn't assume TAG would give implementation guidance by default (with exceptions like GUID), but could review implementation guidance if an IG or TG develops a more formal product to ensure it doesn't contradict the intention of the standard

## Github (01:11:45)

JM: Some historic issues & we need to clean up bit, to demonstrate progress

JM: Charter specifies public & private TAG repos

SBm: Infrastructure group has a need to separate public / private for implementation / deployment details

GW: Need for discussion between TAG members, private area facilitates initial discussions.

SBm: Maybe private Slack channel would be better.

## Guidance (slide #9, 01:16:14)

JM: this last section about bigger questions:

Is scope / number of responsibilities realistic?

- We could / should prioritise responsibilities
- Identify those which are time-bound - eg to provide advice on proposals to exec etc.

Representation:

- TDWG has a lot of interest groups, representation on TAG from each of these would build a big group (exceeding the aimed size of 10 in charter)

Access to funds:

- Should TAG have access to funds eg to pay for coordination, or are all activities volunteer led. Could this lead to false expectations? From William Ulate: "Can we go back to TDWG Exec and ask them to consider a budget to be able to hire certain surveys, reports, evaluations, etc. to support TAG's analysis, decision and recommendations?"

## Roadmap:

GW:

- Aim to have roadmap dates from Roger Hyam (RH) TAG days.



- Mandated in charter
- Is it the TAG's job to build a technical roadmap? r should this come from the executive or the membership more generally.
- TAG could be responsible for on-going maintenance once defined.

SBm:

- could update RH's document, which predates a lot of advances in tooling (github, dereferencable access to definitions of terms)

AOB:

- SBm: SBf has volunteered to convene TAG (all send thanks to Steve)
- DF: Who should do prioritisation: TAG or general TDWG membership?
- JM: TAG can build & prioritise a list then pass to exec for decision about how to take forward, could use a survey of the membership and / or interest / task group convenors.
- GUIDs (raised by IE) - could form task group & pass by exec (with possibility to request funds etc). IE happy to be involved in review of doc, but would this necessitate being a member of the TAG? JM; TAG can call on external expertise, so no). (Note SPNHC will have session/symposium(?) on GUIDs, also activity in DISSCO, iSamples). And SPNHC will have sessions on People and Wikidata and a Data Help Desk.
- HL: "Smithsonian did a big cross institutional review (on GUIDs) and plan as well. Can pull that documentation if you end up needing it".

## Appendix 1 - Useful links

Review manager guidelines (not a standard, but a sort of "best practices" document based on the past experience of TDWG review managers

[https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review\\_manager.md](https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review_manager.md)

GUID Applicability Statement

[https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg\\_isid\\_applicability\\_statement.pdf](https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg_isid_applicability_statement.pdf)

## Appendix 2 - Glossary

CETAF: Consortium of European Taxonomic Facilities

DISSCO - "Distributed System of Scientific Collections" European research infrastructure

GBIF: Global Biodiversity Information Facility

GUID: Globally Unique Identifier

IETF: Internet Engineering Task Force  
IG: Interest group  
RDA: Research Data Alliance  
RDF: Resource description framework  
RM: Review manager  
SDS: Standards documentation standard  
SPNHC: Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections  
TAG: Technical architecture group  
TG: Task group  
VMS: Vocabulary maintenance standard  
W3C: World wide web consortium  
XML: eXtensible Markup Language

## Appendix 3 - Zoom chat notes

18:36:09 from James Macklin to everyone:  
Sorry all, having technical issues :-( Will need to reboot!

18:36:10 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
We hear you James

18:36:27 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
Nothing?

18:36:34 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
Yes

18:43:25 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:  
Murphy's Law

18:43:39 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
Chisholm's Law!

18:43:46 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit>

18:44:16 from Holly Little to everyone:  
May need to update to make editable?

18:44:25 from Theary Ung to everyone:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit>

18:45:13 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
I have no edit access

18:45:26 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:  
me neither

18:50:28 from Holly Little to everyone:  
<https://github.com/tdwg/tag>

18:54:04 from Theary Ung to everyone:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit>

19:01:41 from Theary Ung to everyone:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit>

19:10:01 from John Wieczorek to everyone:

Can the TAG have Task Groups?

19:14:35 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:

[https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review\\_manager.md](https://github.com/tdwg/process/blob/master/review_manager.md)

19:22:01 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:

Yes the category "retired standard"

19:22:15 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:

No standards have actually been given that status, though

19:25:04 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:

as discussed during the conference week, a standard that is a likely candidate for retirement is <https://www.tdwg.org/standards/xdf/>

19:25:48 from Ben Norton to everyone:

Are there a set of criteria necessary to avoid being retired?

19:25:59 from Ben Norton to everyone:

\*Is

19:26:01 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:

The SDS applies to all standards. The VMS does not (only to Vocabularies)

19:30:21 from Ian Engelbrecht to everyone:

Yes please GUIDs

19:33:10 from Stanley Blum to everyone:

An earlier TAG created a task group to create the GUID Applicability Statement (now old).

19:34:27 from Ian Engelbrecht to everyone:

Is there a link to that GUIDs standard handy?

19:34:56 from John Wieczorek to everyone:

[https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg\\_isid\\_applicability\\_statement.pdf](https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg_isid_applicability_statement.pdf)

19:35:24 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:

<http://rs.tdwg.org/guid/doc/guidas/>

19:35:39 from John Wieczorek to everyone:

[https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg\\_guid\\_applicability\\_statement.pdf](https://www.tdwg.org/static/pages/standards/guid-as/tdwg_guid_applicability_statement.pdf)

19:36:19 from Ian Engelbrecht to everyone:

Thanks everyone

19:37:40 from John Wieczorek to everyone:

Going back a step, should the TAG be promoted as a support body? That is, that the TAG is open to and eager to help people solve technical issues related to TDWG standards (or prospective ones)?

19:38:10 from John Wieczorek to everyone:

And if so, would Technical Support Group be a better name?

19:41:42 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:  
 +1 for a bit of updating, GUID landscapes have shifted in the past 11 years

19:43:36 from Stanley Blum to everyone:  
 +1 for updating because of changed landscape

19:44:09 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:  
 There was a TDWG LSID resolver that was provided and it was not maintained.  
 So it died

19:44:53 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:  
 The point being that it's probably better not to promise things we can't maintain

19:45:02 from Holly Little to everyone:  
 Also +1 with Greg. Flexibility in following the more general guideline is important.  
 Everyone has different requirements and capability for implementing.

19:51:07 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 +1 Chocho! Hahaha

19:52:23 from Ian Engelbrecht to everyone:  
 Sounds very interesting

19:52:30 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 +1 to Steve's last comment: from our experience with Plinian Core and the great guidance from Steve, we understood \*currently\* TDWG's standards end at the bag of terms and the formal documentation gives no indications on further implementation / application paths.

19:52:50 from Steve Baskauf to everyone:  
 Just dropping out, but I think that the TAG might play a role in helping people figure out how to describe a model so that it can be understood by relational database users, Linked Data users, and the general community.

19:52:50 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 ... and that's on purpose!

20:00:36 from Holly Little to everyone:  
 I wouldn't assume TAG would give implementation guidance by default (with exceptions like GUID), but could review implementation guidance if an IG or TG develops a more formal product to ensure it doesn't contradict the intention of the standard

20:01:50 from David Fichtmueller to everyone:  
 @Holly: +1

20:12:44 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 Without attempting to open a can of worms or create false expectations? Does it ALL have to be volunteer work? Can we go back to TDWG Exec and ask them to consider a budget to be able to hire certain surveys, reports, evaluations, etc. to support TAG's analysis, decision and recommendations?

20:20:19 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 LetSeñor Kisses

20:20:53 from William Ulate to everyone:  
 \* Let's get funds from Señor Kisses or "Mr. Bezos"

20:22:35 from John Wieczorek to everyone:  
 Will the chat be copied to the Meeting Notes?

20:22:39 from Nicky Nicolson to everyone:

James would you aim for particular responsibilities in the formation of the TAG - this would fit with prioritisation?

20:23:00 from Theary Ung to everyone:

I just add the chat

20:24:32 from Nicky Nicolson to everyone:

Thanks Theary. I took notes on the later part of the discussion in the meeting notes, but can listen to the recording for the earlier parts.

20:29:46 from Holly Little to everyone:

Smithsonian did a big cross institutional review and plan as well. Can pull that documentation if you end up needing it.

20:29:51 from Holly Little to everyone:

For GUIDs

20:30:04 from Stanley Blum to everyone:

@Holly +1

20:30:44 from Holly Little to everyone:

Thank you!

20:30:50 from Nicky Nicolson to everyone:

thanks James

20:31:03 from William Ulate to everyone:

Thank you!

20:31:25 from Holly Little to everyone:

FS01-R: Technical Architecture Group (TAG), (Wed. Nov 17, 23:00 UTC)

20:31:25 from Theary Ung to everyone:

17 nov 23:00 UTC

16:59:27 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit#heading=h.f9y7nerlgfji>

17:04:07 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:

Theres a agenda / notes doc if you can please add yourselves to the participants list:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit#heading=h.f9y7nerlgfji>

17:12:40 From TDWG Executive to Everyone:

Agenda:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ebPXwz-X5P3VnsElkxKAGtce5RTd1Q4tnQq9-ZqCPjc/edit#heading=h.f9y7nerlgfji>

17:15:35 From John Wieczorek to Everyone:

I am only able to jump on here to say that I can't stay because Paula is giving a course and Zoom just takes too much bandwidth. Super sorry about it. As penance, feel free to assign anything to me that I am capable of that no one else wants.

17:16:31 From John Wieczorek to Everyone:

On the model stuff, Tim and I are going to release it all generally rather than have a bunch of different lines of review, which would be too cumbersome in the little time we have left this year.

17:16:48 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:

That's exciting to hear John!

17:22:46 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:  
RE requirement of ZooBank publishing taxonomic names to have an LSID SEE:  
<https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Registering-new-animal-names-in-ZooBank.pdf>

17:25:11 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
It seems like the TAGs role isn't necessarily to "bless" a model or any standard.  
Rather to assess whether it will work across standards

17:25:32 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
Yes on the bus

17:26:08 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
This is a bit different from the TAG of Roger Hyans day

17:26:32 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
He actually was developing "the TDWG ontology

17:27:25 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:  
@SteveB: assess not certify?

17:30:34 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
Don't know

17:32:18 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:  
I would think certify much more formal.

17:33:45 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:  
So RDA, ...

17:33:59 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:  
Humanities world

17:34:48 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
Hi Greg

17:34:55 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
Having connection issues?

17:35:11 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
Hi Greg, are you having connection issues?

17:36:18 From Greg Whitbread to Deborah Paul(Direct Message):  
yes. in now. sound not so good. On the road, working from phone. 600k from home.

17:39:22 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
Lemme know if you have input!

17:39:30 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
I'll share if your connection not great

17:39:54 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
Annotations have some of the same management issues as identifiers

17:41:14 From Greg Whitbread to Deborah Paul(Direct Message):  
Echoing Steve's comments so far. TAG: principles, not technology.

17:41:36 From Deborah Paul to Greg Whitbread(Direct Message):  
Thanks Greg!

17:42:17 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:  
We were looking into annotations in AC because they are a key part of IIIF but gave up on it because nothing was happening on the annotations front

17:48:48 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:  
Maybe a BBQ?

17:49:04 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:

Work on them together over a cup of tea / coffee / etc?

17:52:03 From Steve Baskauf to Everyone:

Well I've heard people say data don't belong on GitHub but I don't see a problem with it if it's small set

17:52:40 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:

+1 steve

17:58:49 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:

Is there a roadmap for the organisation generally?

17:59:58 From Nicky Nicolson to Everyone:

Yeah that's what I meant - an aim. Because that is necessary to frame the "technical" roadmap

18:03:03 From Deborah Paul to Everyone:

SYNTHESYS+ and BiCIKL