

RIF-CS Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

Meeting details:

Date: 28 June 2013

Venue: Video/teleconference

Meeting started: 10:10 AM

Meeting ended: 11:10 AM

Meeting Chair: Nigel Ward

Attendees:

Nigel Ward (UQ), Dave Connell (AAD), Neil Godfrey (CDU), Daniela Nastasie (UniSA), Anne Stevenson (CSIRO), Michelle Teis (Griffith), Peter Walsh (UTas), Adrian Burton (ANDS), Liz Woods (ANDS), Gerry Ryder (ANDS), Joel Benn (ANDS), Cel Pilapil (ANDS),

Guest Presenters:

Melanie Adamson (ANDS)

Apologies:

Gavan McCarthy (UNIMELB), Steve Androulakis (Monash), Peter Sefton (Consultant), Conal Tuohy (VerSI), Simon Porter (UNIMELB),

Agenda:

1. Welcome - Nigel Ward
2. Review of Action items from the last meeting - Nigel Ward
3. Discussion of RIF-CS change proposal and briefing papers (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.	Ensure proper documentation and communication of the changes to citation metadata.	ANDS	Completed: Communicated through ANDS Services News CPG Citation page updated.
2.	Contact affected providers regarding removal of name part type 'initial'	ANDS- IT Services	Completed. IT Service Desk Tickets were created for each affected contributor.
3.	Schedule the first meeting in 2013 sometime in March	ANDS – Cel Pilapil	Completed. Scheduled 28 th June 2013.
4.	Draft a proposal to add a new description type vocabulary and send to ANDS for review	Anne Stevenson	Completed. RAB Meeting item # 1 (this meeting)

RIF-CS Schema recommended changes:

Before presenting the proposed change and the briefing papers in the agenda, Nigel explained that this RAB meeting is not like any other meetings that were held in the past. Two of the items for discussion aim to present some ideas

received from the ANDS community and present to RAB with initial analysis by ANDS. At the end of the discussion, RAB will not be asked to vote or agree on the proposed item but will be asked to share their opinions so that ANDS can formulate a recommendation to be presented in the next meeting.

1. Addition of 'lineage' description type (Discussed by Anne Stevenson)

This [proposal](#) aims to:

- Allow RIF-CS to capture and accurately reflect lineage content from provider records by adding a new description type 'lineage'.

Discussion:

- Anne briefly discussed her proposal and its objective, as well as the CSIRO use case.
- Gerry agreed to Anne's proposal.
- Adrian asked whether the 'relatedInfo' of type metadata can be used for this purpose instead.
- Anne clarified that the 'relatedInfo' element allows you to link to a related source of information while 'lineage' as a description, only allows you to just simply provide a more detailed information about the collection.
- Michelle agreed to the proposal, adding that this will be very helpful in improving discovery in Research Data Australia.
- Anne further added that the data generated by a piece of equipment can be articulated using the use of the lineage description. In CSIRO Data Portal, there is a dedicated lineage field and currently this field is not included in the current harvest to RDA. It would be good to include this in their feed and be able to provide more information in RDA.
- Melanie suggested that it be considered whether a new element containing lineage and related 'provenance' information would be useful.
- Anne then clarified that lineage is different in that it is about how a dataset is generated while provenance is more of re-analysis of the data set.
- Towards the end of discussion Nigel asked whether this type of request can be reviewed and approved online and Adrian clarified that as per Terms or Reference, all vocabulary changes can be approved outside the regular meeting.
- Nigel suggested that review and approval of future vocabulary changes can be done offline.
- He then asked the board if there's anyone who did not agree to the proposal. Hearing none, this proposal was declared accepted by the RAB taking note that there is a potential for a new 'provenance' element in the future.

Decision: RAB endorsed this proposal.

***ACTION:** Consider adding a new 'provenance' element in the future, if necessary.*

2. Related External Resources (Discussed by Melanie Adamson)

This [briefing paper](#) talks about:

- Improved linking to external resources by linking to identifier instead of a key
- Improved RDA display of objects related to external identifiers

Discussion:

- Melanie presented the briefing paper to RAB. She discussed how ANDS took Duncan's idea of linking to external identifier instead of a record key and thought of expanding the scope through the use of an existing element.
- There were 2 scenarios or options available for discussion:
 - Option 1 – using 'relatedObject' element, with the additional attributes for a more descriptive information about the relation
 - Option 2 – using the 'relatedInfo' element; with additional attributes such as relation type, similar to the types available in relatedObject element.
- Melanie mentioned that the briefing paper has been discussed with Duncan and that Duncan and ANDS agreed that relating an object through identifier would be a more sustainable solution.

- After the brief presentation from Melanie, Nigel again clarified that the purpose of the discussion is to hear what RAB thinks about the idea of enriching the related entities in RDA and that no agreement or solution is expected to be achieved at this meeting.
- Michelle was first to share her opinion. She thought that the idea of extending 'relatedInfo' sounded good but she wanted to know its impact to the existing records in RDA. What will happen to those objects, such as parties, related through the 'relatedObject' element – the backwards compatibility of this option is being questioned here.
- Melanie clarified that this is an optional requirement and that contributors can still continue with relatedObject usage. ANDS can then start building an RDA view to relate or connect objects that share the same identifier. There may be a case where an RDA record's related object has the identifier that may have been used as a 'relatedInfo' identifier from another contributor or data source. In this case, RDA should be able to connect those and display the connection properly in RDA.
- Adrian pointed out that the purpose of this proposal or idea is to make it easier for contributors to provide richer information in RDA through the use of a known identifier; rather than requiring them to use the registryObject key. It may be difficult for providers to know the record's key or even find out if there is a key.
- Daniela then suggested that we may need to consider 'infoPointer' from ISO2146 and create a separate element. By using 'infoPointer', we can have different identifiers for parties and publications. 'InfoPointer', as a new element, can be at the same level of relatedInfo and relatedObject.
- Nigel, on the other hand, explained that ISO 2146 is the conceptual model of RIF-CS. To him, relatedInfo seemed to be the RIF-CS implementation of 'infoPointer'.
- Adrian agreed with Nigel and further clarified that the relatedInfo element requires an identifier attribute.
- Daniela then suggested that we could extend the vocabulary types for identifier in order to cater to other identifiers out there.
- Melanie then agreed that we definitely need to extend the identifier types and also the relation types.
- With this discussion, Nigel then reminded everyone that there is requirement to meet an agreement at this meeting but rather, provide our feedback to ANDS so that they can get back to RAB with a recommendation.
- Nigel then opened the discussion to the next topic, Addition of a registry object for 'publications'.

Decision: No decision. ANDS to recommend a solution in the next meeting.

3. Addition of registry object for publications (Discussed by Gerry Ryder)

This briefing paper discusses the possible solutions and the requirements to:

- Discover other publications relevant to a data collection.
- Discover other entities (data collections, activities, etc) relevant to a publication.
- Understand how a collection has been used previously.
- Understand outputs that have flowed from research activity.
- Better assess the value of a data collection by reviewing related publications.
- Identify parties for collaboration.
- Identify areas for further research.

Discussion:

- Gerry started by discussing the paper briefly and mentioning the email she sent out to the community to find out what they think and what they require – to understand the environment.
- Anne voiced her concern that a new registry object for publications may lead to 'orphaned' publications – those that are not connected to any collection or object in RDA. She would prefer adding a new element or enhancing an existing element in RIF-CS.
- Daniela then commented that this is an important issue that researchers are hoping to have addressed. She agreed with Anne that creating a new registry object is not the way to go. She suggested looking at infoPointer in ISO 2146 for this purpose. Adrian suggested that a similar outcome could be achieved using the relatedInfo element. If desirable, it would be possible in the future to transition from RIF-CS to DC RDF as Peter Sefton suggested in his email.

- Some questions to answer when considering a recommendation for this issue:
 - How will we handle publications if they are outputs of collaboration between institutions?
 - How will we handle connections in RDA and what label will we use in the above scenario?
- Dave asked the board if there is currently a place in RIF-CS to add publication.
- Melanie replied, clarifying that a publication can be added through the relatedInfo element wherein an identifier is required and there is also an option to add the title and notes.
- Adrian then asked the board to consider the following questions to help in understanding this issue:
 - Does the community need rich information about publication?
 - If you are linking to a publication, can you get more information about the publication? Will that be enough?
 - Is there a use case where a RIF-CS system requires richer information about publication?
- Michelle pointed out that there is no need to repeat any work has been done in an institutional publications repository, to which Anne agreed.
- To further the discussion, Nigel suggested some drivers for providing richer information about publications such as:
 - Being able to know more information when you click on the linked publication
 - Describing a dataset based on publication
- Michelle added that knowing how the data has been used is important. Some data available are raw data while analysis or outputs are explained in publications. That information is useful to researchers.
- Dave agreed with this. A researcher could be reading an article that may use different datasets which were gathered through collaboration between institutions around the world. In this scenario, ultimately, the link between data and publication would be very important
- Gerry queried whether there is a need to describe the relationship between the publication and the dataset. eg basedOn, supplementTo etc. Michelle suggested that knowing the relationship between publication and dataset is important.
- Nigel then reminded the board that the allocated time for discussion had passed. It was agreed that a new meeting would be scheduled in about a month's time.

Decision: No decision. ANDS to recommend a solution in the next meeting.

Date and time of next meeting:

About a month from today's meeting.

ACTION:

- *Cel to schedule the next meeting in a month's time*

Action items from this meeting:

No	Action	Responsible	Status/Comments
1	Schedule the next meeting	ANDS - Cel	
2	Prepare a recommendation for the two issues discussed today: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Linking to external identifiers - Richer information about publications 	ANDS	
3	Consider adding a new 'provenance' element in the future, if necessary	ANDS	Only if there is a valid need.