

RIF-CS Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Meeting details:

Date: 03 October 2012
 Venue: Video/teleconference
 Meeting started: 10:30 AM
 Meeting ended: 11:50 AM
 Meeting Chair: Nigel Ward

Attendees:

Nigel Ward (UQ), Anne Stevenson (CSIRO), Simon Porter (UNIMELB), Peter Walsh (UTas), Dave Connell (AAD), Michelle Teis (QCIF-TERN), Joan Gray (ANDS), Cel Pilapil (ANDS), Adrian Burton (ANDS), Liz Woods (ANDS), Gerry Ryder (ANDS),

Guest Presenters:

Duncan Dickinson (QCIF-TERN), Alexander Hayes (ANDS)

Apologies:

Gavan McCarthy (UNIMELB), Steve Androulakis (Monash), Peter Sefton (Consultant), Neil Godfrey (CDU), Conal Tuohy (VerSI), Daniela Nastasie (UniSA),

Agenda:

1. Welcome - Nigel Ward
2. Review of Action items from the last meeting - Nigel Ward
3. Discussion of RIF-CS change proposals / recommendations (ANDS, RAB members)
4. Other business - Nigel Ward/Adrian Burton
5. Date and time of next meeting

DISCUSSION:

Review of action items from previous meeting:

No	Action	Responsible	Status/Comments
1	Update the 'metadata' type related info proposal and recommend the best way to describe the format of the metadata then present it to RAB in the next meeting.	Duncan Dickinson / Conal Tuohy	COMPLETED. Proposal available on the Bulletin Board
2	Update the discussion paper to include the agreed 'dates' types (prefixed with 'dc.')	ANDS – Joan Gray	COMPLETED. The paper already includes this. RAB decision was documented. Note: No further action required from RAB.
3	Update the Content Providers Guide to provide guidance on how the 'dates' types will be used to clearly describe research data	ANDS	Note: To be done as part of implementation
4	Allocate resource who will review this proposal next year, as necessary and present to RAB in 2013 when ready	ANDS	No action expected until next year. Note: Slated for 2013 RIF-CS change.

5	Schedule another meeting on the first week of October. Doodle poll to be sent to identify best time and day.	ANDS – Cel Pilapil	COMPLETED. Next meeting – 03 Oct 2012, 10:30AM – 12:30PM.
6	Post the agenda for the next meeting on the ANDS Bulletin Board	ANDS – Cel Pilapil	COMPLETED. Link to agenda

RIF-CS Schema recommended changes:

1. Changes to the citation element (Discussed by Joan Gray and Michelle Teis)

This [proposal](#) aims to:

- Improve the format of a data citation, be flexible and extensible enough to cater for the citation requirements across disciplines and ensure closer alignment with other standards, including the DataCite Metadata Schema v.2.2 by changing the obligation of citationInfo elements.
- Accurately reflect the research data environment as opposed to the print publication environment by changing the label of Edition to Version.

Discussion:

- Michelle started the discussion by giving a brief background on how this change originated. She mentioned that TERN started evaluating citation element and compared RIF-CS with other schema like DataCite. It turned out that RIF-CS has stricter requirements and yet, do not allow recording of other optional information unlike DataCite.
- She further commented that this proposal is focused on research data outputs rather than publications.
- Joan added that this proposal is timely and that will allow us to align RIF-CS with DataCite.
- Adrian briefed the board with a short history of why the RIF-CS citation element was not aligned with DataCite the first time it was introduced: The early implementation of citation element in RIF-CS had been scheduled during the annual RIF-CS change. At that time, DataCite’s metadata had not been finalized. Later, when the DataCite metadata had been published, ANDS failed to initiate the review of the citation element and since there was very little take up of this element by our providers, ANDS did not receive feedback from any of them. With the introduction of the Cite My Data service (DOI), the need to change the citation element seemed necessary.
- A question from Anne: How do Michelle and Joan envisage the implementation of making the url mandatory and resolvable? Joan replied that the identifier does not have to be resolvable provided it is global, persistent and well-managed but it is strongly recommended that the identifier resolves to the dataset or metadata about the dataset.
- Nigel then re-phrased the question and asked IT Services if there is a process to check if a url is resolvable or not. Cel confirmed that there is a process to scan Research Data Australia and check for broken links or unresolvable links.
- Adrian clarified though that this process is a post-harvest check.
- Nigel asked whether it is possible to add the broken links to the Data Source report. Adrian suggested that one possible way to ensure that urls are resolvable is to add checks when a record is deposited to the ANDS Registry, however, this method is not a standard way of validating the schema.
- Duncan thought that checking resolvable links should be the provider’s responsibility rather than ANDS’s. The publisher of the records should be responsible to check these links internally.
- Dave wanted a clarification on whether the citation element itself is mandatory or not. Joan confirmed that citation is not mandatory. It is, however, recommended to all data providers and is required if minting DOIs. Dave and Peter supported this proposal.
- Nigel asked if the proposal is a total alignment to DataCite. And if not, why not? Joan confirmed that this proposal is not a total alignment with DataCite. There are 2 citationMetadata elements in RIF-CS eg context and place published that are not part of the DataCite metadata schema and are now optional in this proposal and there is alignment with mandatory properties in DataCite. Michelle then added that similar to DataCite, RIF-CS will now have 5 mandatory requirements.

- Adrian asked for clarification regarding the identifier being mandatory: In legacy records where they may not have an identifier (say, due to software limitation), are we saying that RIF-CS will not accept those records simply because there is no identifier? Joan and Michelle clarified that legacy records can have local identifier and a resolvable url will be picked up from the location element.
- Joan clarified that the business rules and the CPG will be provided to guide users in proper use of the citation metadata.
- Adrian asked Michelle and Joan regarding the issue of backwards compatibility and whether the community had been consulted regarding this proposal. Michelle confirmed that this proposal was based on the presentation she gave the community in Brisbane.
- Adrian then pointed out that the risk of backwards compatibility should be mitigated through communications and proper documentation – especially to providers who have registered to the Cite My Data Service.
- Nigel then asked the board if anyone is not in favor of this proposal. Hearing none, this proposal was declared accepted by the RAB.

Decision: RAB endorsed this proposal.

***ACTION:** ANDS to ensure proper documentation and communication of the changes to citation metadata. This action will be done as part of the implementation.*

2. How to describe the relatedInfo type 'metadata' (Discussed by Duncan Dickinson)

This [proposal](#) is in response to an action item from the previous meeting.

Discussion:

- Duncan presented the 2 options to address this requirement (an action item from the previous meeting).
- Adrian supported the proposal because it supports discovery and appraisal of record in Research Data Australia. There is however, another aspect that needs to be considered (outside of this proposal), and that is around service orchestration. For instance, if a collection is related to a service, the service record can therefore record the information about the metadata as a service argument instead of recording the metadata information in the collection's relatedInfo.
- Peter and Gerry supported the proposal.
- Nigel, Michelle, Joan and Anne supported this proposal with preference to option 1 – make it simple.

Decision: RAB accepted this proposal and endorsed Option 1.

3. Changes to spatial type vocabulary (Discussed by Alexander Hayes)

This [proposal](#) would ensure that only the used and valid spatial types are available in RIF-CS as well as address a community's requirement to add a new type.

Discussion:

- Alex presented the proposal on behalf of Karen, the requester.
- Adrian discussed that this change is similar to the change in date format type vocabulary which was approved by RAB in the previous meeting. He clarified that gmlKmlPolyCoords and kmlPolyCoords are the valid types that should be used in recording spatial coordinates rather than the broader kml and/or gml.
- Anne asked whether the kml and gml types are distinct. Adrian confirmed that they are.
- Anne supported this proposal especially that removal of these 2 types will not impact any provider.
- Dave, Gerry, Joan, Michelle, Nigel and Peter supported this proposal

Decision: RAB endorsed this proposal.

4. Remove 'initial' name part type (Discussed by Joan Gray)

This [proposal](#) aimed to align the name part type vocabulary with the best practice guidelines in the Content Providers Guide (Note: The CPG was changed last year in alignment with the NLA-Trove requirements).

Discussion:

- Joan presented the proposal to the board. The CPG was changed last year but the 'initial' type was not removed from the vocabulary. Only 18 records will be affected by this change. It should be noted though that these records will not be rejected by the ANDS Registry but display of this type will not be supported in Research Data Australia.
- Nigel asked whether ANDS has already contacted the affected providers. Joan confirmed that they will be contacted after the approval of the change.
- Michelle was curious to know if it is a normal practice to change the RIF-CS in order to align with the CPG. Adrian affirmed that this is an extraordinary instance and the normal process is that the CPG is changed to align with the schema
- All RAB members supported the proposal

Decision: RAB endorsed this proposal.

ACTION: ANDS to contact affected providers.

Date and time of next meeting:

Given that there are no more outstanding issues to be discussed, this meeting will be the last meeting for 2012. In the event that ANDS receives a vocabulary change request, it can be handled offline. We are looking at the possibility of having our first 2013 RAB meeting sometime in March, unless something urgent comes up.

Heads up from Anne: She will be proposing a new description type. This is not urgent but something to be discussed in March. She will work on the paper and send it to ANDS for review.

ACTIONS:

- Cel to schedule the first meeting in 2013 sometime in March
- Anne to draft her proposal and send to ANDS for review.

Action items from this meeting:

No	Action	Responsible	Status/Comments
1	Ensure proper documentation and communication of the changes to citation metadata.	ANDS	Note: To be done as part of implementation
2	Contact affected providers regarding removal of name part type 'initial'	ANDS – IT Services	
3	Schedule the first meeting in 2013 sometime in March	ANDS – Cel Pilapil	
4	Draft a proposal to add a new description type vocabulary and send to ANDS for review.	Anne Stevenson	Note: For March 2013 discussion.