

Agenda/Meeting notes:

Participating:

- Steve Baskauf
- David Fichtmueller
- Anahita Kazem
- John Kunze
- Ben Norton

Regrets:

- Raïssa Meïyer
- Kate Gill
- Kit Lewers

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.

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

- I. Time and date for the next meeting are to be set by the new chair, depending on time zones of members. It should be sometime in mid-January.
- II. New items
 - A. Composition of the TAG in 2024. As a Functional Subcommittee, the members of the TAG are invited by the chair (see <https://github.com/tdwg/constitution/blob/master/constitution.md#73-functional-subcommittee-membership-and-leadership>). If you are interested in serving on the TAG in 2024, please send Steve an email indicating so and he will pass on the names of interested parties to the new chair.
 - B. Update on a proposal for categorization of and retiring standards. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qg8JKHmsEzBWcSo2lp0ga6PcS4vJtTt2-r-XJALjk5E/edit?usp=sharing>. The proposal was discussed at the 2023-10-24 Executive meeting. Proposal 2 (moving standards that are no longer maintained to a new page) and Proposal 3 (grouping standards by whether they are under active maintenance or not) were accepted. Proposals 1 (a criterion for retiring standards) and Proposal 4 (shifting categories to the document level rather than the standard level) were to be discussed at the next meeting to give members more time to review the proposals. The additional proposal made by Peter Desmet (using repostatus.org statuses for standards) was not discussed as it needs to be reviewed by the TAG first. Proposal 2 and 3 will be implemented as time permits. Note following the meeting: Proposals 1 and 4 were discussed at the Executive meeting on 2023-11-14/5 but stalled out due to suggested revisions.
- III. Review of open issues

- A. Best practices for borrowing terms from non-TDWG vocabularies (<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/39>). This is to be taken up as a task by the new Mapping Task Group.

It is in the draft charter which has not yet been submitted. If the Mapping Task Group takes it up, the issue will be transferred to them to track.

- B. Categorization of standards (part of <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/37#issuecomment-1803930209>) proposal by Peter Desmet. Needs to be studied by the TAG.

Question by Steve: who is going to be responsible for monitoring and updating the statuses once they are assigned? There are also a lot of categories designed for tracking software, so not all of them may be appropriate for this use (there might need to be a subset of categories).

Ben: Is the issue about monitoring more important with these statuses than the existing ones?

Steve: The other statuses are more for categorizing the kind of standard. These are about the maintenance situation, which could change more over time (inactive, stable, etc.). Some of those categories would only apply to drafts that weren't yet standards, so they aren't relevant being applied to ratified standards.

Does this look useful enough that we should keep looking at it or is it not that useful?

Anahita: Doesn't fairsharing.org keep a list of standards categorized like this? Maybe we could put this on a group like them. There should just be one group keeping a list of standards.

Ben: They do keep a list like that.

Steve: When people come to the TDWG website, they go to the "standards" page to find out what our standards are. This whole project is about making that page be less of a mess. Peter's feeling was that we would put these classifications on that page. Proposal 2 is a more course-grained version of this classification.

John: It would be nice to offload this work on fairsharing.org . But there isn't a lot of oversight there. Individuals "shepherd" a page, so it's up to them to take action.

Steve: I think we (TDWG) have some responsibility to let people know what are our standards, what is included in them, and some indication of their status (current vs. retired). I don't think we can just offload categorization. Maybe we as a group should look at Peter's list of standards at the bottom of the page, then look at the list of categories at the top and decide which ones are actually usable by us. We would then adopt a subset of them.

Anahita: if we do this and someone takes the responsibility couldn't we have them pass this information on to fairsharing?

David: Since the TDWG website is the primary place for people to find out about TDWG standards it doesn't feel right to put that off to an external site. This seems a bit too fine-grained. But maybe with the two-category "active" and "retired" might be too vague. Something in the middle might be the best option. This adds unnecessary complexity and doesn't really help in discerning about the standards. For example, what's the difference between "inactive" and "unsupported". We might find one or two additional standards

categories that are useful to extend what we already have, but taking all 8 is too much.

Ben: I think "unsupported" is good one to borrow

Steve: Let's study this a bit more and take it up at the next meeting. We could take a few of them that seem useful and forget about the rest.

David: There are some draft standards that are actively being worked on.

Steve: I think the solution is to fix the community page so that people can know that a group is almost done and you can look at their deliverable.

David: Functional subcommittees should be on that page too, since that's where work gets done.

- C. Identifiers Task Group. <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/36>. David Bloom said he would take on the convener role, but so far, the chartering of the group is stalled.

- D. Anthropology/cultural knowledge terms vocabulary.

<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/28>. This was discussed several times at the TDWG 2023 conference but needs leadership to move forward.

- E. Maintenance of the tdwgutility: terms. <https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/13>. Not sure what to do with this.

There isn't really any administrative entity that is responsible for it. Steve has basically just maintaining it. David: he thinks it's fine for the TAG to maintain it. It's not much work and it's important for the technical infrastructure. Steve: there probably should be a description of this in a doc in the "technical" menu. Conclusion: we should write up some guidelines for it, saying that the TAG maintains it, and just close the issue.

- F. Best practices for handling complex values:

<https://github.com/tdwg/tag/issues/43> This is possibly the same issue as looking at recommendations for using JSON-LD across TDWG. We've been handling this during discussions at the regular TAG meetings, but it often gets pushed off due to lack of time. Is this complex enough that we need a task group to work on it outside of the regular TAG meetings, or should we keep up the discussion here?

Since we've closed a lot of other issues and don't have a lot of other things to work on, we should just press forward in working on this in the TAG. If it gets too complicated and leadership arises, we could create a task group for it.

Ben: Latimer Core uses a lot of JSON, and he's written it up, so that could be a starting point for discussion.

Steve: we have some very XML based standards that work, some very spreadsheet oriented standards, and Latimer Core is very JSON related. Do we need a way for them to talk with each other? Maybe not, but from a Linked Data point of view it seems like there should be a way to make "transformations" from one serialization to another. It seems like in a dream world it would be possible if they all could be converted to JSON-LD, because then you would just have RDF. But maybe that's too hard and is there really a compelling reason to do it?

There is a very basic need for handling things like multiple values of a single term (lists/arrays) or multiples of paired terms (like unit and value) in a spreadsheet. There's a real need to solve those kinds of problems.

IV. Any additional announcements.

A. None

V. Action items for next meeting (or before):

A. Steve: write up guidelines for the tdwgutility: terms and put them on the website.