2021-03-08 NAAN Registry WG Agenda and Notes

Date
08 Mar 2021

Attendees

- John Kunze
- Brian McBride
- Maria Gould
- Regrets: Bertrand Caron

Goals

- past action items; duty roster; lab practicum

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upcoming meetings, calls for papers, submission deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.            | when a requester does not use the form but sends us a mail, and supposing he/she gives us enough information for completing the request, should we ask her/him to fill the form? | Bertrand Caron questions in absentia | 1. All agreed that the form should be filled out if possible. Blame the needs of record-keeping. If the person can’t do it (e.g., because China can’t reach google forms), try to do it on their behalf. agreed, except when google isn’t an option (e.g, china)
2. OK. We will postpone start of the roster until April.

Previous action item: Has there been an uptick in new NAAN requests (since the January 26 rollout announcements)?

Yes. Very crude back-of-the-envelope requests per day:

0.22 Oct
0.50 Nov
0.43 Dec
0.59 Jan
1.00 Feb (stopped early Feb, before drought)

MG: would be nice to have a monthly and/or quarterly sense of the request rate; this would help understand resourcing (eg, more curators needed?) and the effect of publicity (announcements, events) on request rates

JK: ACTION will look into automating that
Previous action item: draft duty roster

- embedded in working group page
- duty for now is just intellectual assessment
- should we do first few of these as a group? via impromptu meeting?
- develop checklist of points to verify (based on private github doc here)?

### Duty Roster (draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Backup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>Bertrand</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2021</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2021</td>
<td>Aurélien</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lab practicum: shared screen assessment of recent NAAN requests:

NAAN for mine (4 days ago, ok to let age since probable spam)

I would like                  To update an existing NAAN

Update an existing NAAN

Current NAAN and organization name: mine

What changes are you requesting? seabas

Your email address: jhuard1920@gmail.com

Fondation Cartier (5 hours ago)

I would like                  To request a new NAAN

Organization name: Fondation Cartier pour l'art contemporain

Are you a service provider? No, or I'm not sure

Contact name: Anais Choiselle

Contact email address: anais.choiselle@fondation.cartier.com

Position in organization: chargée du projet de migration

Organization address: 261 boulevard Raspail 75014 PARIS

Organization status: For profit

Organization acronym preferred: FCAC

Organization base URL: https://www.fondationcartier.com/

Committed to data persistence? Agree

Judged “NAAN for mine” to be safe to ignore. It was an update request, and no string in the request matched any existing string in the registry.

Judged “Fondation Cartier” to be legit. Small question about whether the museum was or wasn’t likely to be “for profit”. Is it worth verifying? In this case we judged it to be too unimportant to be worth worrying about (not necessarily in the individual case, but as a general policy to help keep the assessment workload down).

Demo of Terminal window steps to create the new NAAN entry, create and publish derivative files, announce it, and respond to requester.

MG: is the documentation complete? Eg, still says 24 hours instead of 2 business days (now fixed).

JK: no, but I expect curator involvement and feedback will help to refine it.

MG: suggest we schedule our next meeting early in April to coincide with start of duty roster; that way we can all talk through the changes needed; it would be good to make more progress on the crowdsourcing of NAAN registry maintenance.

MG: have github issue templates been explored? that could simplify the steps by not requiring an email response to the requester (but it would require the requester obtain github credentials).

Previous action item: Create documentation for third party NAAN requests

Draft added after paragraph 5 in https://arks.org/about/ark-naans-and-systems/: You may also use that form to request NAANs on behalf of other organizations, as long as your organization provides services (such as ARK minting and database management) to them. Your organization might be, for example, a non-profit aggregator or a for-profit archival system vendor. To proceed, you would fill out the form and list your own organization as a "service provider". Note that a NAAN requested in this way is meant for an organization that directly curates or creates content to which ARKs will be assigned. Each such organization that you serve should have its own NAAN. Moreover, if a service provider does resolution for a dozen organizations, it would not be surprising if its resolver URL were registered with a dozen different NAANs.

Action items

- John Kunze look into automating report on NAAN request rate