

2019-05-09 AG Agenda and Notes

Date

09 May 2019

Attendees

- John Kunze
- Sayeed Choudhury
- Bertrand Caron
- Kurt Ewoldsen
- Martin Kalfatovic
- Brian McBride
- Kate Wittenberg
- Erin Tripp
- Heather Greer Klein

Goals

- in-person Summit; WG reports: presentations, survey

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
30	WG reports Technical, Outreach, Sustainability Initial survey draft	all	Technical: John has communicated with the IETF RFC Editor in order to gauge whether the ARK specification submission would be well-received or perceived as competition for the other identifier specifications currently in progress. Outreach: Discussion of the initial survey, also input for the FAQ (that John is coordinating on the wiki currently) seeded from group members lists of common questions. Also some consideration of tutorial animations/videos targeted at all levels of ARK experience, novice to advanced. Sustainability: Still grappling with an compelling approach for our "ask" of the community. The initial survey is intended to help narrow the focus by identifying what activities are meaningful to the community as a whole.
15	next in-person Summit, who should we be aiming to have at the meeting; when /where?		Kurt brought up the issue of what audience we were targeting for the next ARK summit, as that would help to indicate what conference to co-locate with. Kate suggests CNI as a conference that has a diverse group of attendees, both from a role perspective (practitioners to executives) and a domain perspective. Sayeed seconds the CNI suggestion but also indicates there are already so many additional activities around CNI that it is a week-long event and it could be difficult to get traction there. Erin confirms that and suggests that we also strongly consider a virtual event (online forum) as easier on travel budgets and likely to draw more participants. She believes we need participants at all levels within an organization to champion the project. Says CNI is mostly a US event. Sayeed suggests that we still propose sessions for conferences like CNI and RDA as part of our outreach efforts, with likely good participation. Erin recommends picking one co-location meeting and seeing how it goes. Sayeed recommends asking for a December 2019 CNI session (eg, a panel) to pitch the community; also suggested co-location with Open Repositories. It can be a challenge to add a day onto an existing event. An online forum, similar to the one ArchivesSpace did recently, could be another option. Bolster participation from locations with travel limitations in place. Sayeed has seen a similar event but it was a high order of magnitude of work. Another option is regional face-to-face meetings, eg, in France. What is the goal for this event? A firm pitch for financial and other support for the project. The forum for ArchivesSpace was about encouraging users to become advocates and take ownership of the project. It would be great to also make a financial pitch to the people who can make that decision as well. Community building, networking, learning who is working in the space. A virtual forum would be more one-way communication; don't really get the peer-to-peer relationship building that happens from the in-person meetings. Instead of one event a year, the Fedora project uses the concept of user group meetings, yearly and regional. Can offer support to these in addition to a virtual forum. Here's a link to the ArchiveSpace online forum: https://archivesspace.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/ADC/pages/802127927/ArchivesSpace+Online+Forum+2019 Here's a link to a type of Fedora user group meetings that are held in-person in a variety of geographic locations: https://wiki.duraspace.org/display/FF/Fedora+User+Groups

Group interested in an online forum and user groups but would still like to find a meeting for co-locating and having a one day forum.

John connected with Cesar Olivarez from CONCYTEC in Peru, looking to implement ARKs in DSpace for the 160+ repositories in Peru. John has been talking to a DSpace developer about how to implement ARKs in DSpace.

Brian: discussed the founding member concept.

Circling discussion back to survey topic:

Erin suggested getting David Wilcox involved and doing some interviews to generate detailed options to add to the survey. Also, we should give clear ranges (multiple choice) for things like level of ARK use, what contributions exactly are available (contribute financially with specific amounts, contribute time and development, event planning). Used cognitive interviewing technique to develop a good Fedora survey, helped to remove jargon and shorten survey time, 110 responses in two weeks. Erin and David are fresh off of that initiative. There's a survey expert at Northwestern who might be able to help us.

Regarding how to keep the EOI respondents updated and engaged:

Bulletin or update to expression of interest list who are not on the working groups. Wanted to send the initial survey to them. Should they get a separate update? A bimonthly or monthly email update, VIVO does this for those who are interested, would be a lighter lift. A monthly newsletter would be a heavier lift and would be something from the outreach group. At the end you can always say, we would love to hear from you and love you to contribute in the following way. This could be a more direct way to share information, could begin with a simple message and links out to existing information to share the progress being made and to make any specific asks. Keeps the project in their mind.

An example of a VIVO update:

From: **Conlon, Mike** <mconlon@ufl.edu>

Date: Sun, Apr 14, 2019 at 9:11 PM

Subject: VIVO Updates for April 14, 2019 -- A DOI for VIVO software, VIVO Combine, RDA, CNI and Summit, ROR

To: vivo-all@googlegroups.com <vivo-all@googlegroups.com>, vivo-tech@googlegroups.com <vivo-tech@googlegroups.com>, vivo-community@googlegroups.com <vivo-community@googlegroups.com>, leadership-group@vivoweb.org <leadership-group@vivoweb.org>, Steering-Group@vivoweb.org <Steering-Group@vivoweb.org>

VIVO 1.10.0 has a DOI VIVO has a DOI! It is [10.5281/zenodo.2639713](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2639713) This is a Zenodo archive DOI for release 1.10.0. This DOI is required to complete the Journal of Open Source Software paper which has submitted last fall. The paper's favorable review has been completed and we expect publication shortly. You will also note that the VIVO repository README has been updated to include a Zenodo archive DOI badge. See <https://github.com/vivo-project/VIVO> A new wiki page has been created to document that the project now has a Zenodo community collection. The wiki page is here: [Zenodo Community Collection](https://zenodo.org/communities/vivo/). The Zenodo Community Collection is here: <https://zenodo.org/communities/vivo/> I'm currently the curator of the archive record at Zenodo. I'd love to have some community members join me as named archivists able to add things to the archive, mint new DOI as appropriate and execute the projects archive policy (to be written by project governance).

VIVO Combine Item 3 in the [Product Direction for 2019](#) is "VIVO Combine" – a new piece of software for collecting metadata for scholarship, providing disambiguation of works and people, and curation by authors and curators. We hope to form a Combine interest group soon and look forward to your ideas about it. Several VIVO sites have sophisticated metadata collection and curation processes and are considering the approach to producing open source software for use in the scholarly ecosystem. Look for an announcement soon.

RDA I had a good visit to the 13th plenary Research Data Alliance meeting in Philadelphia. FAIR data was all the rage, with many interest and working groups considering how best to make research data FAIR. VIVO has a straightforward approach based on ontology, RDF, and TPF. That is, VIVO can be deployed in a manner that provides FAIR data. I am using this approach as part of an NIH grant to make metabolomic data more FAIR. I am also contributing to a working group on representing specimens of various, which has recommended the VIVO ontology as an approach to FAIR specimen data. I continue to work with the Data Foundations and Terminology group, as well as an emerging interest group on research graphs. RDA participants understand that VIVO produces an institutional research graph based on its triple store and ontology. The emergence of research graphs is a hot topic at RDA. The next plenary will be held in October in Helsinki. We hope to continue all these efforts there.

CNI and Summit Last week I had a chance to see many members of the VIVO community at the [Coalition for Networked Information](#) meetings in St. Louis, followed by the Duraspace Summit. The VIVO project had two breakouts – one focused on current technical initiatives, including the transition from the product evolution effort to the new [VIVO Scholar Task Force](#) effort, work beginning on a second version of the VIVO ontology (more about that here soon), the VIVO Combine effort, and the recent work on VIVO 1.11, including additional decoupling and improvements in internationalization. A second breakout considered the needs of the VIVO project in the context of the merger of [Duraspace](#) and [LYRISIS](#). Laurie Arp from LYRISIS participated in the breakout as an observer. The [VIVO Leadership Group](#) is considering how best to create a strong future for the project. Your thoughts about the merger and how VIVO might prosper in a new organization are very welcome. Please share with any member of the leadership group, myself included.

ROR At both RDA and the CNI Meeting, presentations were made regarding ROR – the Research Organization Registry. See <http://ror.org> ROR is an effort of the California Digital Library, CrossRef, Digital Science, and others to build on the work of the Digital Science GRID project. GRID is a CC0 dataset of information regarding the research organizations of the world. ROR uses the GRID data to provide identifiers, URI, a curation process and an open API for research organization data. The goal is to create standard pick lists for publishers, repositories, and metadata integrates such as VIVO so that affiliation information is standardized across the ecosystem. Expect to hear more about ROR – its policies, sustainability and its use in the VIVO ontology to provide common organizational assertions across VIVO implementations.

Reminders See the [VIVO Event Calendar](#) for all VIVO meetings. Register for the [VIVO Conference](#). Submit your work for presentation at the conference!

Go VIVO!

Mike

VIVO Project Director

		John travel and promotion update: CNI, DuraSpace Summit, persistent identifier meeting in Portland. Best feedback has been that the flexibility of ARKs is a blessing and a curse. People want to be able to get started with identifiers. Best practices per discipline/sector would be valuable. Museum community has a particular set of concerns, as does scholarly communications, and repositories.
--	--	---

Action items

- Kurt and John will reach out to David Wilcox after the latest revision of the survey for suggestions