

2019-11-14 AG Agenda and Notes

Date

14 Nov 2019

Attendees

- [John Kunze](#)
- [Laurie Gemmill Arp](#)
- [Kurt Ewoldsen](#)
- [Kate Wittenberg](#)
- [Mark Phillips](#)

Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
	Announcements		Laurie Arp joining the AG
	(each item below is linked) ITAV Assessment Survey results , secondary analysis (table below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% manager /executive • 80% assign ARKs • top vote getter (below): promotion Draft membership pitch		<p>MP: It's harder to sell promotion as a value that my institution would pay to support. But base technical infrastructure support is critical, and lack of a standard has hurt adoption of ARKs. Yes, it would be great to have clearer understanding of what it means to use ARKs, but how does ARK live on after John and CDL?</p> <p>KE: But why did the survey emphasize outreach rather than Tech Infra? Did we ask the wrong questions?</p> <p>MP: I think the cost of the base infra is hidden from people who responded to the survey, and everyone assumes, eg, the NAAN registry will just be there.</p> <p>KW: If we couldn't have everything we might want in terms of tech infra, would the bare minimum still be useful?</p> <p>MP: Yes, and the core dependencies should be enumerated.</p> <p>KW: Yes, it's important to know what members are being asked to pay for.</p> <p>KE: Can we give this pitch to the Sustainability WG?</p> <p>MP: There's a disconnect between what the group wants to do and the things that need to be in place for them to be interested. How I'd be able to pitch it to my institution would be to get an assurance of stable sustainable infrastructure. How do I explain to them what value they're getting for the membership?</p> <p>LA: Yes, outreach is great, but how to sell to your boss?</p> <p>KE: OK, so in our approach we need to cover the catastrophic case of CDL going away.</p> <p>JK: Yes, circling back, lack of a standard has hurt adoption. Also, it's not a one-time cost because a standard is a piece of technology that must be maintained. If it ceases to be relevant, that affects adoption, which touches back to the outreach priority from the survey. There will also be lots of post-standard specification activity, eg, metadata development, which would be organized and available via the arks.org website. Again, these infra activities can be tied back to the identified outreach and promotion priority.</p> <p>JK: Perhaps we also need a project manager to check in that the work is being done?</p> <p>KW, MP: Yes, that makes sense.</p> <p>MP: It would be nice for members or prospective members to have a more understanding of how specifically their funds were going to be spent.</p> <p>KE: Seems we need to package this core infra value together with promotional value.</p> <p>MP: Infra is an easy sell at my institution. Outreach is in the "would be nice" category.</p> <p>JK: Mark, would promotion ever matter to your institution?</p> <p>MP: Maybe in the long term. Would be good to say why the outreach is being done, eg, so that support docs becomes easier to find, or more software solutions are available.</p> <p>JK: Would the N2T resolver be valuable to you in the catastrophic event of loss of your or someone else's hostname?</p> <p>MP: Definitely. In case we come across some other institution's ARKs broken hostname, we can try resolving them from N2T. Same applies in case our hostname goes away.</p>

Numbers of respondents for survey questions 8-19	Effort	Funding
Effort to promote ARK understanding and usage	19	3
Effort to catalog what ARKs are being used to identify	11	1
Effort to coordinate the activities of the newly forming ARK community and provide policy, governance, sustainability & administrative support	8	3
Open source development of ARK resolver software (next generation of NOID & N2T.net)	9	1
Open source development of ARK management application (similar to ezid.cdlib.org)	7	2
Running a consortial ARK infrastructure based on the open source efforts listed above on behalf of the ARK community	6	5

Action items

