

Agenda/Meeting notes:

Participating:

- Steve Baskauf
- James Macklin
- Jeff Gerbracht
- David Shorthouse
- Sarah Vincent
- David Fichtmueller
- Raïssa Meyer
- Camila Plata
- Jonathan Rees (non TAG member)
- Rob Sanderson
- Lyubomir Penev
- Ben Norton
- Ian Engelbrecht
- (Rod Page)

Regrets:

-

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.

- I. Set time and date for next meeting. Suggest and accepted: Monday, June 27 at 13:00 UTC.
- II. Charter revisions.
 - A. See public comments at <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/31>
 - B. Hopefully we can draft a revised proposal in advance of the meeting since we don't really need to waste any more valuable meeting time on this.
 - C. I have proposed an additional wording change at <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/commit/6f179c78d6280c0f9594ef9e09b5393eb3a09037> that addresses some of the concerns raised by commenters.
 1. A key concern seemed to be that decisions would be made by a small number of members. The proposed change require votes from at least half of the members for the result to be valid.
 2. I've separated the idea of a quorum to meet from a majority to vote. There is nothing to say that votes can only be held during live meetings. In fact, I consider it to be more likely that if we held votes, they would be done asynchronously via email, GitHub, or some other online mechanism.
 3. Note from meeting: there was support for the change and none opposed.

III. Vice Chair.

- A. The charter (<https://www.tdwg.org/about/committees/tag/>) says the chair appoints a deputy chair.
- B. Presumably the vice chair takes over if the chair is incapacitated prior to the end of the term and convenes meetings if the chair cannot attend.
- C. Steve would be happy for volunteers. Ben Norton is willing to do it, so I've appointed him.

IV. Role of the TAG prior to review of proposed standards (informative).

- A. Latimer Core (Collections Description) Standard proposal is nearing submission. Steve asked the Executive on 2022-04-25 whether the TAG should expect to be asked for an assessment of the proposal during the 30 day period that the Executive has to respond to the submission before either appointing a Review Manager or returning the submission for revisions (see details in Appendix). See also Rob Sanderson's comments in the notes from the last meeting about the useful roles TAGs can perform in the standards development process (<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/blob/master/meetings/2022-03-23-tag-meeting-notes.pdf>).
- B. There was considerable discussion at the Exec meeting without a clear answer. One comment made was that generally it would be expected that Task Groups would be in conversation with the TAG during the development of their standards. Therefore, last-minute surprises of technical problems with the submission should be avoided. Steve stated at the end of the discussion that the communication mechanisms (Slack and email) are in place such that the TAG could be called upon for a quick evaluation (i.e. timescale of a week) if necessary.
- C. In the case of Latimer Core, Steve has been working with the group for some time about conformance with the Standards Documentation Specification, and he anticipates few or no problems, although he has not seen all of the documents that will be submitted. One thing to note is Issue 18 <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/18>, which notes the potential overlap in the concept of a Collection entity in Audubon Core and Latimer Core. Steve is not aware that there has been any further discussion about this. Not to my knowledge either - will raise with the LtC working group and update TAG (SV)
- D. Most of the other late-stage Task Groups have representation on the TAG, so we should be able to have sufficient communication with the TGs to guide them with technical and interoperability issues prior to submission. Great idea. At W3C the TAG was often brought in only after there had been some sort of disaster. (JAR) The exception to this is the MIDS Task Group (<https://www.tdwg.org/community/cd/mids/>), which isn't represented and is apparently close to submitting a draft standard.. Ben Norton, who attended their last meeting, recommended they submit their draft to the TAG prior to submission.

V. Any additional announcements or new business (include your name):

- A. none raised

VI. Priorities for work during the remainder of 2022.

- A. Please refer to section VII "Key issues identified" in the notes from the last meeting

(<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/blob/master/meetings/2022-03-23-tag-meeting-notes.pdf>)

B. Publication recommendations for XML-based standards

1. Involves ABCD, EFG, and Plinian Core

David F.: ABCD 3.0 is at draft stage. ABCD 2 is still used as XML. Idea was to submit both the ontology and XML part for ratification. Also adjust ABCD 2.0 to conform to SDS.

Plinian Core (CP)

Has been working for a year and a half, to transform the standard structure so it becomes compatible to the current recommended structure recommended by tdwg

Flattened Version of Plinian removing the XML structure:

https://github.com/mfvargas/rs.tdwg.org/blob/master/process/page_build_scripts/pc.md

Documentacion of Plinian with full XML structure:

<https://github.com/tdwg/PlinianCore/>

There are some unresolved problems with repeated terms used across the standard.

2. EFG went through public review and was accepted by the Executive Committee as a ratified standard. But it has not been published and the mechanism of its maintenance has not been determined.

3. Review of issues (all related to each other)

- a) Are they vocabularies and therefore subject to SDS requirements for vocabularies?
- b) What are the documentation requirements? Schema only? List of Terms document?
- c) Do they fall within the current management regime for "bags of terms" in the rs.tdwg.org repository, or something else?

David (ABCD, EFG) and Camila (Plinian) will meet to see how to address common problems.

4. What is the best administrative mechanism for addressing this issue? A "sub-committee" (see charter)? External advice with a recommendation? Something else? **At next meeting we will get some feedback from David and Camila before taking further action.**

C. Course of action on moving the GGBN proposed standard forward.

1. Review of issues:

- a) GGBN went through public comment and was submitted for ratification, but was not accepted by the Executive Committee for a number of technical reasons.

b) Management of the GGBN namespace

<https://github.com/tdwg/ggbn/issues/3>

c) Potential interoperability issues with Darwin Core

<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/17>

d) Clarity about what documents are included in the standard and conformance of those documents to the Standards

Documentation Specification

<https://github.com/tdwg/ggbn/issues/3>

- e) GGBN includes terms that may be usable across TDWG for describing anthropological/cultural knowledge
<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/28>
 - 2. What is the best administrative mechanism for addressing this problem? A "sub-committee" (see charter)? External advice with a recommendation? As far as I know, there is no "champion" to advocate for this proposal. It was noted that GGBN is built in part on Darwin Core and also on the MxS (<https://gensc.org/mixs/>) standards and that a Memorandum of Understanding now exists for coordination between MxS and Darwin Core. There was agreement that forward motion in TDWG usually results when there is a "champion" to put in the effort required to move the standards process forward. At least some of the key people in the effort to adopt GGBN as a TDWG Standard have moved on to other projects. Since GGBN is already standing alone as a standard in use, a possible course of action is to do nothing and let people use it as they do any other standard outside TDWG. Raïssa Meyer and James Macklin are the members who have contacts with the GGBN group and will reach out to try to determine whether there is still a desire (and "champion") to try to move the adoption process forward.
- D. Revision of the GUID Applicability Statement (AS)
- 1. Review of issues
 - a) GUID AS is an "umbrella" document; LSID is an AS for a specific GUID technology. See the Abstract and Motivation sections of <http://rs.tdwg.org/guid/doc/guidas/>
 - b) There have been calls for some time to retire the LSID Applicability Statement <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/2> There were strong points put forward against this, LSIDs are still widely used, even if just as string identifiers. Perhaps incorporate into the GUID AS.
 - c) Although the GUID AS still seems generally applicable, it is somewhat outdated and does not include important current efforts such as Wikidata and current GUID technologies. Reference provided by Rob S. about decentralized identifiers (DIDs): <https://www.w3.org/TR/did-core/>
 - 2. Because it involves revising an existing standard, this effort would probably need to be done by a chartered Task Group.
 - a) Who would lead it?
 A core group of potential participants was identified, Rod Page, Jonathan Rees, Rob Sanderson, Ian Engelbrecht, possibly Larry Lannom from DiSSCO via James.
 - b) Identify the stakeholders that should be involved.
 - c) What would the relationship be to the TAG? The opinion has been expressed that the TAG cannot administratively be the chartering Interest Group for Task Groups, but there is precedence for this (see <https://github.com/tdwg/rdf/blob/master/CharterOfTG.md>). If not the TAG, then who? No one seemed to consider it to be a

problem if the TAG chartered such a Task Group, so unless we learn otherwise, we will presume that chartering a Task Group is a possibility for us.

3. What would the scope and deliverables be for this group? Simply an updating of the GUID or more (such as the planned AS for particular GUID technologies)?
4. Rod: Docs recently produced by others:
 - a) https://know.dissco.eu/bitstream/item/296/1/DPP_MS_5-3_PIDS_v2_with_coverpage.pdf
 - b) <https://doi.org/10.1093/database/bax003>
 - c) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1tsqzk3JQ2U-xbQSPIRE7ryilYCdbl1sj/edit>

VII. Action items (for next meeting):

- A. Camila Plata and David Fichtmueller to report back about the current status of Plinian Core and ABCD/EFG with respect to the feasibility of representing XML elements in those standards as "terms" (identified by IRIs) while also capturing the complexity encoded by deep nesting in the schema.
- B. Raïssa Meyer and James Macklin to query their contacts with GGBN to determine what the GGBN group's intentions are with respect to continuing to ratify GGBN as a TDWG standard.
- C. Rod Page and others listed above to review existing documents and identify potential participants for a task group that might take on revision of the GUID A.S., with the convener and exact scope of the group to be determined prior to submitting a charter.

Appendix:

Text of email from Steve to Executive asking for clarification about TAG role in review of proposed standards:

Based on recent activity, it appears that the Latimer Core TG is going to be ready to formally submit a draft for ratification soon. I believe that the next step based on the Process is for the Executive to decide on advancing the draft to a Review Manager:

"· When a Task Group believes that a working draft is ready for wider review, the Task Group Convener submits the working draft and appropriate documentation as a package to the Executive Committee via the Secretary.
· The Secretary notifies the Executive Committee of the submission and requests a decision on advancing the draft. This decision must be made within 30 days of receipt of the draft. If the response is positive, the Executive Committee appoints a Review Manager to seek appropriate independent and expert reviews.
If the response is negative, the Secretary reports the decision with justification to the Task Group Convener. "

It's my understanding that one role that the TAG is supposed to have is "The technical evaluation of task group proposals..." (from the TAG charter), but it's not clear exactly what that means. We do now have in place the people and communications infrastructure for the TAG members to do an evaluation of proposed standards, so we could advise the Executive

in that way. When I asked people to participate in the TAG, I told them that there might be situations where they would be called upon for time-sensitive responses, and this could be one of them.

So I guess what I'm wanting to be discussed at the Exec meeting is whether requesting an evaluation from the TAG is something the Exec is going to do when the submission is official, and what that would involve. I would envision something like me sending the proposal link to the TAG via Slack and requesting them to give me comments within something like a week. I could then assemble the comments into some kind of summary doc or report to send back to the Exec. Depending on the timing of the request relative to the 2 week Xcom meeting schedule, it should be possible to pull something off like this within the 30 day response window required by the Process.