

# FORCE11 - DCIP Executive Meeting

November 11, 2015 08:00 AM Pacific Time

Invitees: Tim Clark, Martin Fenner, Carole Goble, Jeffrey Grethe, Simon Hodson, Maryann Martone, Jo McEntyre, Joan Starr

In Attendance: Maryann, Joan, Martin, John, Stephanie, Cassie

## AGENDA

1. John Kunze's presentation
  - a. Identifier schemes that have proven consistent - how to make these long use schemes actionable and resolvable
  - b. Currently working example for PubMed IDs - PMID
    - i. Other examples that work: gene ontology identifiers, enzyme class ids, etc.
  - c. N2t.net is neither the first or last meta-resolver (has slip-streamed prior examples via isrn.org)
    - i. Sustainability requires: mission, organizational longevity, realistic cost basis
  - d. Rule-based vs. Data-based resolution
    - i. Rule based is very simple and cheap (e.g., one "rewrite rule" to another resolver)
      1. Doesn't take much time to set up
    - ii. Data-based resolution is harder but rule-based requires an existence of another resolver
      1. you get your own metadata (e.g., for citation support)
      2. N2T via EZID can do this along with any other scheme (2-3 weeks development time per scheme)
        - a. Receive full support from EZID UI and API, visibility to T-R data citation index, access to EZID community, suffix passthrough, etc.
  - e. Resolvers should include open source software, organizational sustainability, transparency
  - f. Identifiers.org - N2T hasn't engaged with them very much so far
    - i. Identifiers.org is still in transition from being a research project
  - g. The DCIP timeframe ends in August 2016, we have to come up with an approach right now - something that's not a work in progress
    - i. We need something that's ready now, or at least by February 2016
    - ii. Refer to John's slide that lists methods that are ready now (for example, gene ontology ids, enzyme class ids...)
      1. We would need to establish a service agreement with each repository which takes additional time

- 2. bioCADDIE/NIH isn't expecting us to come up with one solution, but rather an attempt with a method that works
  - iii. We should start with a simple use case, for example, how would an author use an identifier in their paper
    - 1. For the purpose of the pilot, maybe we could establish a service agreement with FORCE11 - would act as an umbrella
    - 2. We need to educate the repositories so that they know they're part of a network
  - iv. How would you handle PDB IDs with the N2T resolver?
    - 1. For the purposes of the pilot, I wouldn't expect much usage
    - 2. In this pilot, we can be aware of these sorts of problems right now but not attempt to solve them
    - 3. We can allow their local identifiers to be actionable
  - v. **Action:** John and Joan will write up a simple list of requirements to help us when we ask the repositories to participate
- 2. Review Slides
  - a. Strategy
    - i. Four teams currently, but will we have a fifth team of reference managers?
  - b. Draft: Publisher Expectations (previously listed as levels - bronze, gold, etc.)
    - i. Good: endorse the JDDCP principles
    - ii. Better: provide us with the steps it will take you to adopt new JATS as well as obstacles you'll face
    - iii. Best: Publish articles w/ cited data using JATS 1.1d3
      - 1. Require data deposition by authors - not a standard way for authors to do this right now
      - 2. Martin will send his suggestions for this list to Maryann and Joan
      - 3. Is JATS 4r another update?
        - a. JATS is a framework, it's not enough to update a standard
      - 4. Open issue for what the best level for the publishers should be - we need more people to participate in this discussion
        - a. Pilot project includes money for workshops - this may be something we can only resolve in a workshop
        - b. If JATS isn't being used, we need to understand why
          - i. We need to learn if JATS 1.1d3 is implementable
          - ii. Adoption of JATS is slow due to publishers' relationship with outside vendors
          - iii. Our goal in this pilot is to provide data to publishers in why they should adopt particular standards
      - 5. **Action:** defer this topic to the next meeting's agenda for more discussion
    - iv. All levels: participate in workshops and discussions

- c. Maryann wants to combine all recommendations and indicate our approach to each - some may be out of scope, we shouldn't let these items dominate the discussion

< Meeting adjourned >

### 3. Next Steps

See last slide--is this a complete list?

Open issues:

- Agreement on goals
- Decision on a short-term PID strategy for repositories
- Role of the reference management vendors—is there an ask?
- Identifying the list of repositories
- Identifying the list of publishers
- Identifying the experts

DCIP Action Items:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LfkAq34gvC5Su\\_4cM9dH-8pCYi6wGNyWSw58ao7mlc/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LfkAq34gvC5Su_4cM9dH-8pCYi6wGNyWSw58ao7mlc/edit?usp=sharing)