

# 2020-06-11 AG Agenda and Notes

## Date

11 Jun 2020

## Attendees

- [John Kunze](#)
- [Kurt Ewoldsen](#)
- [Erin Tripp](#)
- [Mark Phillips](#)
- [Brian McBride](#)
- [Kate Wittenberg](#)
- (Frédérique)[Joannic-Seta](#)

## Goals

- Grant next steps; what is our identity going forward

## Discussion items

Time	Item	Who	Notes
	announcements		Ongoing conversation with UCOP General Counsel on appropriateness of giving an ARK NAAN to a Cuban Journal of Military Medicine.

	<p>Todo items from last time:</p> <p>Updates on shopping proposal with funders</p> <p><a href="#">draft next-gen ARK resolver funding proposal</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sayeed to approach Sloan (<a href="https://imls.gov/grants/apply-grant/available-grants">https://imls.gov/grants/apply-grant/available-grants</a>) (<b>update</b>: Sloan Advisory Board to meet in 2 weeks, will know more about how much money to give out after that) Erin: interesting funding news at <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/10/business/ford-foundation-bonds-coronavirus.html?referringSource=articleShare">https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/10/business/ford-foundation-bonds-coronavirus.html?referringSource=articleShare</a></li> <li>• John to ask INCIPIT (Swiss) project to comment on EOSC PID policy doc (<b>update</b>: it turns out they had already commented, asking ARK to be included, but no action had been taken; they asked again and got an answer)</li> <li>• Mark Phillips approach IMLS (<b>update</b>: asked Ashley Sands at IMLS; new call for a 2-pager will be Oct 2, back in Feb Erin: would be with great to get feedback from IMLS)</li> <li>• Kurt Ewoldsen approach LYRASIS (<b>update</b>: initial contact, with follow-up pending)</li> <li>• Kurt Ewoldsen confirm CDL overhead (<b>update</b>: 17.8% generally)</li> <li>• John Kunze ask Chris M about proposal and ask if it might be a good fit for Moore Foundation (<b>update</b>: Chris now at Stanford directing their Data Science Initiative)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>What is our brand?</b> For example, should we continue with the ARKsInTheOpen brand, or are we now something like the ARK Alliance?</p> <p>This discussion item came out of the last meeting of the Outreach working group. The task started as a revision of the existing wiki presence and led to a pass through an Open Canvas exercise that led to further identity questions. We are also in need of a logo.</p> <p>The perspective of some members of that group is that ARKsInTheOpen and associated wiki pages describes a project to create an active community around the ARK identifier which appears (at least to them) to have been accomplished and that now would be a good time to shift from the focus from the initial creation to a focus on maintaining and expanding what has been put in place. The initial AITO wiki space does indeed refer mainly to the initial collaboration with Duraspace, now LYRASIS, to define goals and set into place a structure for participation by others in the ARK community, including and encouraging organizations beyond CDL to take leadership roles and help to promote related activity and technical progress.</p> <p>So while we were updating these wiki pages, the question arose about whether we have entered a new phase and if we should modify our public facing content to reflect that change going forward. Do others feel that it is the right time to mark a change from <i>creating a community</i> to a <i>community that has been created</i>? If so, then that opens up a series of questions starting with how we should refer to ourselves going forward.</p> <p>Should we continue with ARKsintheOpen (have we created "brand" recognition that would be useful to continue)? Or should we find some new term like "The ARK Alliance" or should we just refer to ourselves as the ARK community? We would like to have a consensus on this issue to take back to the working group for further action.</p>	<p>Erin: have you done the catastrophizing exercises? (no)</p> <p>Erin: like "ARKs Alliance"</p> <p>Mark: me too</p> <p>Kurt: acronym AA?</p> <p>Erin: in terms of financial sustainability modeling, the membership model is tough right now in this period of cuts. My IMLS CARES proposal is to investigate these issues, comparing resourcing for open source vs proprietary products</p> <p>Kurt: this could be useful</p> <p>John: separately, the NAAN registry WG could use some technical help to get us over the last hump of creating a curator-friendly interface to the automated validation of new entries and creation of anonymized derivative files that feed the n2t resolver.</p> <p>ACTION: John will write up what's needed and share with this group</p>

## Action items

