TDWG TG MIDS meeting notes, cumulative

Short link to this document: http://bit.ly/tgmids-notes

Cumulative notes of meetings of the TDWG TG MIDS, most recent meeting first.

GitHub pages for the work: https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Open issues: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues

Please open a new GitHub issue when you see something wrong. It is by issues that we will make progress with the work and achieve consensus.

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

MIDS SSSOM Mapping:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit#gid=1894178926

Extra TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 58, 3 September 2024

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Mathias Dillen

Actions:

Set up a date for online meeting with Mathias, Sam and Ben to discuss documentation of MIDS website.
Talk to Steve (cc Stan) for hosting draft website on TDWG domain, including how deployments would work.
Talk to Steve about permissions for the MIDS Project on the TDWG GitHub

MIDS review plan (from Matt)
https://docs.google.com/document/d/15c-Fc3C5WPOqg-k9jQYk3vdDjqLkYgHr0S6tVmJrxTc/edit#heading=h.j3o7nyd8bqc3

Potential reviewers needed

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 57, 22 August 2024

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Eirik Rindal

Agenda & Notes

- MIDS Review Plan
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/15c-Fc3C5WPOqg-k9jQYk3vdDjqLkYgHr0S6tVmJrxTc/edit
  - Documentation for submission
    - List of closed issues also submitted as evidence
    - Wiki
      - Latimer Core example https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/wiki
      - MIDS wiki https://github.com/tdwg/mids/wiki
  - 3 reviewers
  - Github project https://github.com/orgs/tdwg/projects/4
    - Can't seem to add non-tdwg github members to the project?
  - scientificNameID implementation warrants some discussion
  -

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 56, 15 August 2024

Participants:

Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen
Matt Woodburn

Agenda & Notes

- MIDS project in GitHub: https://github.com/orgs/tdwg/projects/4/views/1?visibleFields=%5B%22Title%22%2C%22Assignees%22%2C%22Status%22%2C%22Labels%22%5D
- https://dev.mids.dissco.tech/
- MIDS Standard
  - Main parts of MIDS
    - MIDS levels
      - normative
    - MIDS Information Elements
      - normative
    - Mapping Information Elements to Levels
      - Includes conditional logic
      - Currently included as a Required field, but may need to be pulled apart
      - Need to include a clear section on the different disciplines in the Normative section
    - SSSOM Mapping structure
      - ideally part of the normative
      - if it's going to significantly delay ratification, then consider working towards being included in the normative section in future
    - SSSOM Mapping
      - mapping to a standard
      - mapping to a serialisation of a standard
    - Implementations
      - Write up TDWG implementation experience
        - template available
- MIDS Review Plan
  - https://docs.google.com/document/d/15c-Fc3C5WPOqg-k9jQYk3vdDjqLkYgHr0S6tVmJrxTc/edit
  - Documentation for submission
    - List of closed issues also submitted as evidence
    - Wiki
      - Latimer Core example https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/wiki
      - MIDS wiki https://github.com/tdwg/mids/wiki
  - 3 reviewers
    - 1 review manager
    - 1 tech
    - 1 user-based
  -
  - (copypasting Cat notes here, to organize later):
    - Documentation needs to be looked at in depth
    - We need to ensure MIDS is an implementable standard and not just a table on e.g. GitHub
    - What do we look for? what do we mean by the elements? need an authoritative schema that can be implemented
    - Prominent authoritative example
    - Is the mapping separate from mapping *framework*?

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 55, 08 August 2024

Participants:

Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen
David Fichtmueller

Agenda & Notes

- https://dev.mids.dissco.tech/
  - Mathias has successfully built a local copy
  - We will continue to tweak the existing site until we can discuss further with Sam
- Mapping
  - SSSOM maps to the standard, not to the serialisation or the structure, but to the xfiles
    - Do we need to create an additional mapping for the xpaths
    - If we want to use a BioCASE endpoint file then we would need access to the xpath data
    - The xpath is currently in the SSSOM mapping file but will be removed and entered into a separate mapping file
  - Question about whether the SSSOM mapping for ABCD is complete, particularly the MIDS 3 elements.
    - There are currently no terms in ABCD for the missing identifiers
    - ABCD3 is still under development
  - Comparison of datasets that are both in DWC and ABCD
    - BGBM - provide data to GBIF via BioCASE, and data download as DWCA
    - Do they result in the same MIDS calculation
  - https://ww3.bgbm.org/biocase/downloads/Herbar/Herbarium%20Berolinense%2C%20Berlin%20%28B%29.ABCD_2.06.zip
  - Mathias will generalise functionality in the MIDS calculator to handle any DWCA file as well as a BioCASE generated zip file with xml files in it.
- Values which are considered unacceptable in MIDS
  - eg Unknown
  - This is included in the yaml files (semapv:RegexRemoval) see mapping ReadMe https://github.com/tdwg/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping
  - Consider other values: only whitespace, trailing whitespace
-

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 54, 01 August 2024

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Agenda & Notes

- https://dev.mids.dissco.tech/
    - Need to change page title from "Home - Latimer Core" to "Home - MIDS"
        - Seems to be simple html attribute change in lines 6 and 9 here? https://github.com/DiSSCo/mids-documentation/blob/main/app/templates/base.html#L6
    - Want Sam's wisdom on how he got this to work :)
    - We need to be able to run locally to test changes which would then be pulled into the live version
    - We could also run on a separate branch
    - Permissions:
        - SL is creator, has admin access
        - MD, CC, EH & JH have admin access
    -
- MIDS GitHub Project (separate from repo) https://github.com/orgs/tdwg/projects/4
- Mapping
    - SSSOM mapping is mapping to a specific format of a standard, rather than the standard itself
    - Invite

Actions

Ask Naturalis to rebuild MIDS GitHub site on https://dev.mids.dissco.tech/
Ask Ben for support with building a local copy
Otherwise ask Naturalis if they are able to build a local version - there are some issues with rebuilding locally at the moment. Both Cat and Mathias have hit problems, including 404 errors.

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 53, 25 July 2024

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen
Josh Humphries

Agenda & Notes
1. MIDS Project
    a. TDWG project https://github.com/orgs/tdwg/projects/4
        i. Access issues - Cat and Mathias can access, Josh can't
2. Mapping
    a. Current documentation
        i. MIDS github: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping
            1. This needs some structure, with folders for standard and discipline
            2. Also a readme to document how the mapping works and is to be interpreted right now

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

      ii.   Mathias github: https://github.com/matdillen/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping
      iii.   ABCD mapping from David:
         https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ftVORwG4sdU4Tqh3SRhciSvC0je
         Lk5Bx4_Ck41dR7Ls/edit?gid=1978703278#gid=1978703278

3. MIDS Draft Website
   a. https://dev.mids.dissco.tech/
      i.   currently pointing to wrong version of mapping
      ii.   Mathias will update and ask for the site to be rebuilt

4. Implementations
   a. Meise: https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator
   b. NHM: https://naturalhistorymuseum.github.io/gamc/
      i.   Josh will write up the mapping in SSSOM format as an additional test of the
         SSSOM method for MIDS

Documentation for SSSOM mapping
Mathias will write up some documentation for decisions and structure to date
What is included in the Normative section?

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 52, 18 July 2024

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Dagmar Triebel
Eirik Rindal
Anke Penzlin
Mathias Dillen
Sam Leeflang
Josh Humphries
Rachel Walcott

Agenda & Notes
5. Making Information Elements visible
    ● MIDS Information Elements spreadsheet
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEF
      Ku7A6PW-hA/edit?gid=0#gid=0
    ● Visualising MIDS in a Browser - Example for structuring: LatimerCore
      https://ltc.tdwg.org/terms/ → use the HTML pages as a template?
    ● Sam Leeflang: I recently did one for openDS where I forked the stacdoc from Ben's
      repo and customized it for DiSSCo (dev.terms.dissco.tech). I know more or less how
      it works and how we can define it. I won't mind working on that part.
    ● there's so many terms. We only need to modify the first handful to create mockups
      of how it would look
   → fork the LtC git for a MIDS instance

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

6. Add list of suggested changes to the elements list
(not any element hindering ever reaching MIDS 3 e.g.)
7. Matt asking for geological(!) ABCD(EFG) dataset → difficult since rarely to not produced Paleo examples exist, minerals/rock rather not

Sam Leeflang 15:12
I recently did one for openDS where I forked the stacdoc from Ben's repo and customized it for DiSSCo (dev.terms.dissco.tech). I know more or less how it works and how we can define it. I won't mind working on that part.

You 15:17
MIDS Information Elements spreadsheet
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEFKu7A6PW-hA/edit?gid=0#gid=0

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:19
I thought about that too!
so the page source for https://ltc.tdwg.org/terms/ is 118k lines, so creating a mockup by tweaking the html will be a bit tedious, lol

Mathias Dillen 15:23
That's mainly because there's so many terms. We only need to modify the first handful
To create mockups of how it would ook
*look

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:49
at this point the closest we could come, IMO, to expecting that requirement to be fulfilled is by accepting e.g. an image URL as a media ID...which is A: imperfect and B: maybe kind of useless since any specimen "with media" would, presumably, have a URL, meaning the requirement of "ID" would be moot if we accept URLs as the ID. so yeah. big "hmm" from me. (long winded way for me to say I agree w/what has been said)

Sam Leeflang 15:59
Some data in abcd from senckenberg (don't ask me why the link looks like this), will try to find the taltech link:
http://ww3.bgbm.org/biocase/pywrapper.cgi?dsa=NaturkundemuseumMainz&request=%3C%3Fxml%20version%3D%271.0%27%20encoding%3D%27UTF-8%27%3F%3E%0A%3Crequest%20xmlns%3D%27http%3A%2F%2Fwww.biocase.org%2Fschemas%2Fprotocol%2F1.3%27%20xmlns%3Axsi%3D%27http%3A%2F%2Fwww.w3.org%2F2001%2FXMLSchema-instance%27%20xsi%3AschemaLocation%3D%27http%3A%2F%2Fwww.biocase.org%2Fschemas%2Fprotocol%2F1.3%20http%3A%2F%2Fwww.bgbm.org%2Fbiodivinf%2FSchema%2Fprotocol_1_3.xsd%27%3E%0A%3Cheader%3E%0A%3Ctype%3Esearch%3C%2Ftype%3E%0A%3C%2Fheader%3E%0A%3Csearch%3E%0A%3CrequestFormat%3Ehttp%3A%2F%2Fwww.tdwg.org%2Fschemas%2Fabcd%2F2.06%3C%2FrequestFormat%3E%0A%3CresponseFormat%20start%3D%220%22%20limit%3D%222200%22%3Ehttp%3A%2F%2Fwww.tdwg.org%2Fschemas%2Fabcd%2F2.06%3C%2FresponseFormat%3E%0A%3Ccount%3Efalse%3C%2Fcount%3E%0A%3C%2Fsearch%3E%0A%3C%2Frequest%3E

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Sam Leeflang 16:03

Taltech should be here but for some reason it is not accesible (anymore):
https://bc.geocollections.info/pywrapper.cgi?dsa=sarv&request=%3C%3Fxml%20version%3D%27
1.0%27%20encoding%3D%27UTF-8%27%3F%3E%0A%3Crequest%20xmlns%3D%27http%3A%
2F%2Fwww.biocase.org%2Fschemas%2Fprotocol%2F1.3%27%20xmlns%3Axsi%3D%27http%3A
%2F%2Fwww.w3.org%2F2001%2FXMLSchema-instance%27%20xsi%3AschemaLocation%3D%
27http%3A%2F%2Fwww.biocase.org%2Fschemas%2Fprotocol%2F1.3%20http%3A%2F%2Fwww
.bgbm.org%2Fbiodivinf%2FSchema%2Fprotocol_1_3.xsd%27%3E%0A%3Cheader%3E%0A%3Ct
ype%3Esearch%3C%2Ftype%3E%0A%3C%2Fheader%3E%0A%3Csearch%3E%0A%3Crequest
Format%3Ehttp%3A%2F%2Fwww.tdwg.org%2Fschemas%2Fabcd%2F2.06%3C%2FrequestForm
at%3E%0A%3CresponseFormat%20start%3D%220%22%20limit%3D%22200%22%3Ehttp%3A%
2F%2Fwww.tdwg.org%2Fschemas%2Fabcd%2F2.06%3C%2FresponseFormat%3E%0A%3Ccoun
t%3Efalse%3C%2Fcount%3E%0A%3C%2Fsearch%3E%0A%3C%2Frequest%3E

TDWG MIDS TG Meeting 51, 11 July 2024

Participants:

Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Anke Penzlin
Dagmar Triebel
Mathias Dillen

- MIDS is not a vocabulary standard as expected by TDWG
- Technical specification
- rather concerning implementation into collection management systems than a standard
- Dagmar included her short summary on the TAG meeting at the end of the meeting notes of 27 June.
- Question if we can achieve what we planned with MIDS in TDWG structure
- CETAF association maybe an alternative?
- GBIF interested in integrating MIDS (confirmation email), in GRSciColl
  - GBIF needs a complete mapping
    -> mapping to DwC as the suggested mapping as the normative part
- Cat is asking this group https://paleo-data.github.io/ about barriers

Next steps:
- More implementations
- Make mappings available -> enhance implementations
Next week: get information elements in place
Week after: mapping structure

TDWG TAG MIDS TG Meeting 50, 27 June 2024

Participants:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Eirik Rindal
Mathias Dillen
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)
Sam Leeflang

Discussion points:
Steve - If MIDS is not a TDWG Standard why are we having this meeting
Questions about Information elements vs Classes and Terms and Properties
Ben - SKOS terms are term to term. This mapping is a different take on SKOS mapping. Steve is suggesting the MIDS information elements are more like properties. Steve is okay with the SSSOM mapping. The class could be the dataset rather than the information elements.
Are the relationships valid in SSSOM mapping is maybe the question to ask.
Look at Tapir specification as an example
Is MIDS a technical specification for people to build an application to measure the MIDS level of a record, dataset. Is it written well enough for someone to be able to build an application that works?
How would the MIDS level be published? - record level in GBIF as a field - could need a DWC term for it. Interesting that it would be a field that would be calculated from the other fields in the record.
We may need a testing environment as part of the ratification process that includes a number of test builds that give the same answer.

MIDS requirements document
Expectation that different results from different contexts
If no one can create an application that can do what the specification specifies then it needs to be removed.
Steve is suggesting that the mapping values are not included in the specification to enable it to be more agile.
Stan's point is that fitness for use is very specific to the user. Concerned about the rationale for the inclusion of the elements at each level. Will the community agree on the rationale of the different levels. The public review would be a good place to get this input?
Ratification process - what did the group say that they would accomplish and have they achieved it?
There is currently no mechanism for updating a standard that is not a vocabulary.
Stan - the level of review required is up to the Exec Committee to decide. May be important to include the mapping in the standard or is it simply a framework and the mapping should be excluded.
John - MIDS is a set of data quality profiles. MIDS could be a data quality specification of data quality tests. A defined set of tests for data quality. This could feed into the Data Quality Standard.

Ben Norton 19:03
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1z5GqpFHC28yRdgHOfFeDz9tflGqUPIzFwOt5DymXuWA/edit?usp=sharing

John's OtterPilot 19:03
Hi, I'm an AI assistant helping John Wieczorek take notes for this meeting. Follow along the transcript here: https://otter.ai/u/HTf1jiNmVScHrGutwck4fzrj1lc?utm_source=va_chat_link_1
You'll also be able to see screenshots of key moments, add highlights, comments, or action items to anything being said, and get an automatic summary after the meeting.

You 19:07
Draft development copy of specification
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mc9sf8X8l8iSc-GO2ZFmgCoOiJNxKRhYeGq5OFmsfw8/edit

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

You 19:12
MIDS information elements
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEFKu7A6PW-hA/edit?gid=0#gid=0

David Bloom 19:12
https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Stan Blum 19:21
Guideline, "Best Practice"?

Ben Norton 19:34
https://github.com/matdillen/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping

Kit Lewers 19:43
I'll get the link for you now :)
https://www.tdwg.org/standards/tapir/

James Macklin, AAFC 19:45
I like Steve's logic :-)

Stan Blum 19:45
Scored by record, then averaged (?) across the whole collection (or sub collection)

Kit Lewers 19:48
https://github.com/matdillen/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping
If you want a quick link to GitHub @Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers)

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 19:49
thank you Kit!

Kit Lewers 19:48
Sorry to belabor this, but just want to double check: would you get a score for each level of the hierarchy if records —> collection —> institution were viewed as parent child relationships

Matt Woodburn 19:51
In some of the pilot collection level dashboards and Latimer Core examples, it's tended to be reported as a % of the collection reaching each MIDS level (e.g. https://rebrand.ly/synth-cdd), although there are of course other methods for aggregrating

Stan Blum 19:51 (Edited)
TAPIR is a query/response protocol specification: how to express a query (message/doc); then how to express the response. Kinda like an http/xml version of Z39.50

Mathias Dillen 19:54
Sorry to belabor this, but just want to double check: would you get a score for each level of the hierarchy if records —> collection —> institution were viewed as parent child relationships
I think the answer is "you could". The current approach is to calculate at the specimen level, then you can aggregate these in any way.

James Macklin, AAFC 19:55
Mapping to a CMS schema vs GBIF is gong to vary. CMS models do not necessarily have 1:1 mappings for DwC or ABCD. So, to be comparable it will need to follow one interpreted mapping (likely GBIF)...

Mathias Dillen 19:58
We do still need better metadata (and maybe versioning) for the sssom mapping(s).

David Bloom 19:59
MIDS: We're here to "Pump You Up!"

Mathias Dillen 20:02
https://github.com/gbif/pipelines/issues/807

Mathias Dillen 20:10
https://github.com/gbif/registry/issues/558

Laurence Livermore (NHMUK) 20:11
It's been great listening to the MIDS discussions - I need to go and take another call at quarter past. I'll catch up with Matt soon. @Elspeth Haston it would be good to catch-up on MIDS and DiSSCo UK soon :)

Kit Lewers 20:16
Like a suggested use case? Does that belong in the standard itself?

SSSOM mapping

Meeting Summary from Dagmar:

Tag Gremium discussed the following points
- Is MIDS a technical specification? (answer: yes, but more than that)
- What is the normative part essential for a ratification? (comparison with TAPIR?)
- What are the "information elements" Are there classes or more? What about skos in this context?
- What is the relation to DvC? (and ABCD?)
- What is the role of MIDS in relation to data quality and quality assurance?
- What are the requirements to fulfil MIDs specification?
- What is the role of MIDS lecvels?
- Are there already software implementations? As extensions of (in-house) collection management systems? Or extensions of data portals? Plattform? Like GBIF orCETAF-DiSSCo?

MIDS TG Meeting 49, 27 June 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Eirik Rindal
Mathias Dillen
Stefan Seifert (SNSB)
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)
Sam…

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

1. TAG meeting
   a. Specification - draft googledoc
      i. Informative and Normative
         1. Process for updating/modifying Normative section
            a. Our decision or TDWG's?
            b. Annual basis?
         2. What is included in Normative and structure
            a. SSSOM mapping
            b. Every column?
      ii. Permissions for the MIDS GitHub repo?
      iii.
2. Future meetings
   a. Managing and status of unknown values
   b. Mapping Latimer Core
   c. Mapping ABCDEFG (From David F. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ftVORwG4sdU4Tqh3SRhciSvC0jeLk5Bx4_Ck41dR7Ls/edit?gid=1978703278#gid=1978703278)
   d. SSSOM mapping
   e. Ratification process (feedback and actions)
3. Mapping spreadsheets:
   a. Normative, master csv files in GitHub (+ yml for the mapping set metadata), separate for each standard
   b. Download a new version to Google Sheets to work on if required)
   c. Documentation for sssom mapping, metadata, versioning

MIDS TG Meeting 48, 20 June 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal
Mathias Dillen
Ben Norton

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

4. TAG meeting

Ben Norton 15:19
The Structure of MIDS
Specification vs Standard
Whats included in the Normative Docs
How is MIDS different than the existing TDWG standards (use docs page as visual frame of reference - (https://dwc.tdwg.org/, https://ac.tdwg.org/)
The role of implementations in MIDS, especially in the review process
Messages addressed to "Meeting Group Chat" will also appear in the meeting group chat in Team Chat

Mathias Dillen 15:37
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ioRhHIvdYl88yoPTsYLG_k5-8n-05CiP

Ben Norton 15:53
folder_address = paste0(getwd(),"/src/Shiny_MIDS/MIDScalcApp.R")
folder_address = paste0("C:/MIDSCalculator/src/Shiny_MIDS/MIDScalcApp.R")

MIDS TG Meeting 47, 13 June 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Josh Humphries
Eirik Rindal
Mathias Dillen

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

5. Use of the MIDS Calculator tool
   a. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/2
   b. Test calculations review of results and questions
      i. Eirik:
         1. Tried 3 datasets
            a. Downloaded from GBIF IPT
            b. Downloaded from GBIF.org
            c.
         2. Issues:
            a. Designed to work with GBIF DWC annotated archive file
      ii. Make sure the most up to date schema is being used. Most recent version can be downloaded using link in comment
   c. Josh - tested javascript version using GBIF predicate api
   d. Sam - developing and testing DiSSCo SSSOM mapping
      i. Question about TypeStatus
      ii. Not yet including more information about results
      iii. Experimenting with Ben Norton, a tool for LatimerCore
         1. for future MIDS meeting
   e. Finding a SSSOM mapping contact to discuss some of our methods and issues with them
      i. https://academic.oup.com/database/article/doi/10.1093/database/baac035/6591806
      ii. EOSC? - Sam will check
      iii. Have a future meeting dedicated to this and invite someone
   f. Managing unknown values (particularly the Unknown: not present)
      i. Future
   g.

MD: How to include unacceptable values ("unknown") into the SSSOM mapping?
   - `object_preprocessing: semapv:RegexRemoval` in the yml file and `semapv:RegexRemoval` as a column in the tsv?
   - Should the namespace be in the column names of the tsv file?

Chat
Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO 15:02
https://www.unimus.no/photos/image/jpeg/O-V-2207490-01

Mathias Dillen 15:15
On windows, the schema.json should be under "Documents\MIDSCalculator\data\schemas"

You 15:18
E Herbarium key bf2a4bf0-5f31-11de-b67e-b8a03c50a862

Josh Humphries (he/him) 15:27
github.com/naturalHistoryMuseum/pymids

Mathias Dillen 15:32
```
"unknownOrMissing": [
    {
        "value": "unknown:undigitized",
        "midsAchieved": false
    },
    {
        "value": "unknown",
        "midsAchieved": false
    },
    {
        "value": "",
        "midsAchieved": false
    },
    {
        "value": "Unknown",
        "midsAchieved": false
    },
    {
        "value": "0",
        "property": "taxonKey",
        "midsAchieved": false
    }
  ]
```

Stefan Seifert 15:44
Shiny App in RStudio Docker:
Error in library(stringr) : there is no package called 'stringr'

Mathias Dillen 15:45
Packages should be automatically installed if not available in the environment. Maybe there is an error upon installation of the package?

You 15:45
https://academic.oup.com/database/article/doi/10.1093/database/baac035/6591806

Mathias Dillen 15:46
And they are bundled into the installer, so there should be no issue there unless there occurs an r version conflict.

Kari Lintulaakso (FMNH, Finland) 15:59
Thank you. I'll share information about this task group in our museum. Luomus (the museum) has shared many dataset with GBIF.

MIDS TG Meeting 46, 30 May 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Mathias Dillen
Josh Humphries
Rachel Walcott
Cat Chapman

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

1. Development of the MIDS GitHub
   a. Building the home page following the LtC model:
      https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/blob/main/docs/index.html
      https://ltc.tdwg.org/index.html
   b. We need to create the Source area in GitHub
   c.
2. Including Specification vs Standard decision in the text
3. Normative vs Informative
   a. implications of each section, particularly for a specification rather than a standard, for the definition of each element
4. Use of the MIDS Calculator tool
   a. Use one of our sessions for reporting on findings
   b. Add issue for it in the GitHub and tag people for homework
5. Mapping to Latimer core
   a. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/65
   b. Need to review this to determine whether this should be included in the MIDS specification
6. Mapping to ABCD
   a. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/64

        b.   Need to transform this into a csv similar to
             https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOi
yX1wYl0SbFkU/edit#gid=1894178926

7.

Chat Notes

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:05
https://paleo-data.github.io/ they do have this website

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:06
https://paleo-data.github.io/happy-hours

You 15:09
https://tdwg.github.io/esp/

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:12
https://ltc.tdwg.org/ like this
but instead of LtC, MIDS. obviously ;)

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:19
https://ltc.tdwg.org/quick-reference/
generates: quick reference, resources, and maybe the front page after all lol

You 15:21
Specification
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mc9sf8X8l8iSc-GO2ZFmgCoOiJNxKRhYeGq5OFmsfw8/edit

You 16:02
Mapping to Latimer Core https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/65

MIDS TG Meeting 45, 23 May 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Stefan Seifert, SNSB
Mathias Dillen, MeiseBG
Ben Norton
Anke Penzlin
Dagmar Triebel, SNSB
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)

Apologies
Rachel Walcott

      Current Draft MIDS Specification:
      https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13J
ul2023.md

                                       Meeting notes:
  https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

MIDS Specification development document: [MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development](#)

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

8. Update about the development of the MIDS GitHub
    a. Regeneration of the Latimer Core pages was successful
    b. Static Gen takes the headers and needs csv files
9. Update about mapping, particularly to ABCD
    a. Aiming to do it in June
    b. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/64
        (Note on GeoCase portal https://geocase.eu/ and EFG extension, see https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1eyGbNVZLATk-UC9CROOIaKoJ2y88KacS)

10. Review of the Latimer Core website to assess what we would want to include in the MIDS website for the DRAFT version
    a. Home
        i.   Getting started - yes
        ii. Public Review - yes
    b. Terms
        i.   Introduction - yes
        ii.   Borrowed vocabulary - yes
        iii. Namespaces - yes
        iv.   Term index - yes, as Information Element index
        v.   Vocabulary - yes
    c. Guide
        i.

11.

Chat
Stefan Seifert (SNSB, Munich) 15:04
http://bit.ly/tgmids-notes
Messages addressed to "Meeting Group Chat" will also appear in the meeting group chat in Team Chat

Dagmar Triebel (SNSB) 15:19
https://geocase.eu/

Ben Norton 15:22
EFG Versions:
https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1eyGbNVZLATk-UC9CROOIaKoJ2y88KacS?usp=sharing

You 15:24
https://ltc.tdwg.org/index.html

Mathias Dillen 15:28

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

The hierarchy currently goes: discipline (e.g. biology) -> mids level -> mids element -> standard mapped to -> mapping

Ben Norton 15:36
LtC term with all of the term properties populated:
https://ltc.tdwg.org/terms/index.html#ChronometricAge_verbatimChronometricAge

Ben Norton 15:51
MIDS Green: #2B590D?
or #0D590F
https://www.color-hex.com/color/0d590f
https://www.color-hex.com/color/2b590d

MIDS TG Meeting 44, 16 May 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Eirik Rindal
Mike Howe (NGR/BGS/GCG)
Stefan Seifert (SNSB, Munich, seifert@snsb.de)
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)
Rachel Walcott (NMS)

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

1. Preparing the specification documentation, including the website and GitHub for the ratification process
2. Suggestion to look at the names of the information elements again, eg use of ID rather than Identifiers
3. Discussion about concept of Information Elements being Classes in rdf, with the mapped terms being the properties within each Class.
4. Information elements now uploaded as a csv to the github https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/main/standard/information_elements/mids_information_elements_draft.csv
5. Mapping update:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

See first MIDS to ABCD Mapping done by David Fichtmüller under https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/64, he will continue with MIDS SSSOM Mapping in the spreadsheet

Next meeting:

Review Latimer Core website - https://ltc.tdwg.org/

Notes from Chat

Ben Norton 15:14
https://ltc.tdwg.org/terms/index.html#13-categories-of-terms

You 15:26
Mapping https://github.com/matdillen/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping

Dagmar Triebel (SNSB) 15:27
Standards are eg.g. https://abcd.tdwg.org/terms/

Stefan Seifert (SNSB) 15:28
ABCD Mapping https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/64

You 15:34
Master s/s
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEFKu7A6PW-hA/edit#gid=0

MIDS TG Meeting 43, 02 May 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Eirik Rindal
Mike Howe (NGR/BGS/GCG)
Matt Woodburn (NHM London)
Janeen Jones (FMNH)
Rachel Walcott (NMS/SMMP/MinExt/GCG)
Stefan Seifert (SNSB, Munich, seifert@snsb.de)
Vanni Moggi Cecchi (NHM, Unifi Florence)

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

MIDS Specification development document: [MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development](#)

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

6. Preparing the specification documentation, including the website and GitHub for the ratification process
   a. **MIDS Information elements:**
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEFKu7A6PW-hA/edit#gid=0
   b. **MIDS Specification development document:** [MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development](#)
7. Starting the ratification process
   a. Need to find reviewers who are NOT involved, in any way, with development of the standard
   b. Submit use cases - not required but would be helpful
   c. **Key things to submit**
      i. MIDS specification document https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mc9sf8X8l8iSc-GO2ZFmgCoOiJNxKRhYeGq5OFmsfw8/edit
      ii. CSV w/MIDS elements
      iii. SSSOM mapping docs
   d. Meet with Steve Baskauf
   e. Identify potential reviewers (e-mail Cat and Elspeth with ideas)
      i.
8. "What is MIDS to you?" - we want people's view of MIDS
   a. Use cases
9. Collections Description Interest Group

Notes:
ABCD mapping (v2 or v3?) will be done by Anton and David
2.06 could be most useful but both are needed
We should do a clearout of MIDS GitHub - "close" the elements since we have a CSV now, should use CSV as "authoritative" source for data/info on elements. TLDR cleanup the GitHub!!

(stream of consciousness notes)
StaDocGen https://github.com/ben-norton/stadocgen-development
Uses same CSVs we would submit for RDF
SSOM is different - takes SSOM file and generates page/contents based on the terms
some customization - tweaking? - might be necessary? For things outside of RDF scope
(Note to self (Cat): ask for examples form Ben for generating example pages… assuming it is in github but want to confirm)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Term Name **hasIdentifier**	
Qualified Term	ltc:hasIdentifier
Term IRI	http://rs.tdwg.org/ltc/terms/hasIdentifier
Label	Has Identifier
Definition	This property refers to one or more related instances of the Identifier class.
Datatype	array<ltc:Identifier>
Belongs to Class	GeographicContext
Required	False
Repeatable	False
RDF Type	rdf:Property
SKOS Mappings	

Section that is reviewed

Not all fields are part of the rdf

Notes from chat
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:17
https://github.com/ben-norton/stadocgen-development is this the current URL?
for stadocgen

MIDS TG Meeting 42, 25 April 2024
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDST 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Josh Humphries (NHM London)
Mike Howe (National Geological Repository, British Geological Survey) mhowe@bgs.ac.uk
Laura Tilley (CETAF) joined at 16:15
Rachel Walcott (NMS)
Mathias Dillen

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

[2023-development](#)

GitHub https://github.com/tdwg/mids

Agenda & Notes

1. General update
2. Preparing the specification documentation, including the website and GitHub for the ratification process
   a. **MIDS Information elements:**
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1L_J0hdh6otOFkuiKaY2axTxs7QOrYLBEFKu7A6PW-hA/edit#gid=0
   b. **MIDS Specification development document:** [MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development](#)
3. Starting the ratification process
4. Continuing to implement MIDS in systems using the SSSOM mapping and to encourage additional implementation by other users
   a. **MIDS SSSOM Mapping**
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit#gid=1894178926
   b. https://github.com/matdillen/mids/tree/main/sssom-mapping
   c. Updated MIDS calculator (not yet using the SSSOM mapping) https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator
   d. Josh developed a Python implementation using Darwin Core archives and SSSOM mapping
      i. reads the SSSOM mapping creates the logic to calculate the MIDS level per specimen
   e. Possibly scope to work on this within DiSSCo Transition
   f. Potential to test Josh's python with
   g. Wouter - added a topic of discipline - how do we define discipline in MIDS
      i. recent changes in DWC - material entity etc are not yet being used extensively
      ii.
5. Papers and presentations to increase dissemination
   a. TDWG/SPNHC 2024

MIDS TG Meeting 41, 14 December 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen
Eirik Rindal
Rachel Walcott

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Release of next version of MIDS - update
2. Information elements
    a. ScientificNameID - required for all? https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/74 (check with palaeo community, eg Holly)
        i. Feedback from Palaeo community is that there is not currently a name service so not to include for Palaeo at present.
    b. GeographicalLocalityID - needs recommendations and examples https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/81
    c. IdentifiedByID - to be included?
        i. Identified By ID: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/72
            1. Label name would be assumed to be collector's det
            2. Very rarely not met if there is a collector ID
            3. Required: most recent determiner ID
            4. Recommended: all determiner IDs
    d. AssociatedMediaID - to be included?
        i. include at present for testing
3. SSSOM mapping
    a. MinExt DWC extension
        i. Can this be included in this release?
        ii. Ask Ben about this - Rachael to e-mail
4. Line up reviewers
5. Move out irrelevant tabs of SSSOM mapping googlesheet
6.

Actions:
Check TypeStatus
Check Mass

MIDS TG Meeting 40, 30 November 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Laura Tilley (CETAF ESG).
Cat Chapman

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Sam Leeflang
Rachel Walcott

Mathias Dillen

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Next steps
    a. Release of next version of MIDS
        i. SSSOM mapping in GitHub
        ii. Structure of the GitHub
        iii. Draft version of MIDS (in same format as draft Latimer Core)
        iv. Consider publication of Report of draft specification
            1. Connect repo to Zenodo
        v. Consider authorship
            1. MIDS Task Group
            2. E-mail round to check authors
        vi. One page summary
        vii. Dissemination: Pensoft journal - for future version
        viii. Training and workshops - for pilot implementations
    b. Milestone 1 (End of 2023)
        i. Updating and formatting the Information Elements in github and googlesheet
            1. Remove mapping from the issues
            2. Add examples, add recommendations
        ii. Updating and formatting the SSSOM mapping
            1. DWC and extensions (with a look at ABCD2 via DWC?)
            2. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit?pli=1#gid=1894178926
        iii. Updating the draft specification
        iv. Update GitHub (links etc)
    c. Milestone 2
        i. Outreach plan for implementation and pilot tests
    d. Milestone 3
        i. Plan for review and ratification
        ii.

ACTIONS

EH to send through mapping of Geological Age to Laura
        check any mapping that requires an "AND"
        try to reduce the number of terms mapped if possible

MIDS TG Meeting 39, 23 November 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Josh Humphries
Mathias Dillen

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. MIDS mapping
    a. Mathias' spreadsheet has been incorporated as a tab into the main mapping spreadsheet:
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit?pli=1#gid=1894178926
    b. Added 'Required' column
2. Next steps
    a. Release of next version of MIDS
        i. SSSOM mapping in GitHub
        ii. Draft version of MIDS (in same format as draft Latimer Core)
        iii. Consider publication of Report of draft specification
            1. Connect repo to Zenodo
        iv. Consider authorship
            1. MIDS Task Group
            2. E-mail round to check authors

ACTIONS

EH to send through mapping of Geological Age to Laura
        check any mapping that requires an "AND"
        try to reduce the number of terms mapped if possible

MIDS TG Meeting 38, 16 November 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal (till 15:18)
Laura Tilley (CETAF GS/CETAF Earth Science Group)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Rachel Walcott (NMS / MinEXT for DWC / GCG)
Cat Chapman
Josh Humphries
Mathias Dillen
Dagmar Triebel (until 15:30)
Anke Penzlin
Claus Weiland (from 15:30)

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. MIDS 3 - Identifiers https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68
   a. (Geographical Locality ID: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/81)
      i. mindatID/mindat.org - UUID/GUID and also long form
         1. E.g. https://www.mindat.org/loc-224692.html
            a. Quartz we have https://www.mindat.org/min-3337.html links to
               -> Long form, https://www.mindat.org/1:1:337:0 UUID/GUID
               -> https://mindat.org/4ca61d6f-4208-8fb2-3b0eecbcs8f0
      ii. http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/locationID
   b. Media identifier : https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/75
      i. Potential to bring this in, mapped to
         https://ac.tdwg.org/termlist/#dcterms_identifier
      ii. Would potentially enable images to be retrieved
      iii. Does a hash suffice?
   c. Licence identifier: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/83
      i. Do not include - just add a strong recommendation
   d. PhysicalSpecimenID: 'replace' with occurrenceID or materialEntityID? or add?
      i. Potential to bring in materialEntityID for biological collections and look at
         equivalents for geo and palaeo
         (does CETAF-ID + CSPP also work for non-taxonomic objects?)
2. MIDS 3 - Data elements https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/69
   a.

ACTIONS

Look at mapping of quantitative locality next week

Chat

Josh Humphries (he/him) 15:06
mindat.org is the site

Rachel Walcott 15:08
https://www.mindat.org UUID/GUID and also long form

Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO 15:08
https://www.mindat.org/loc-224692.html

Rachel Walcott 15:08
Quartz we have https://www.mindat.org/in-3337.html
links to -> Long form, https://www.mindat.org/1:1:337:0
UUID/GUID -> https://mindat.org/4ca61d6f-4208-8fb2-3b0eecbcs8f0

Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO 15:09
https://www.mindat.org/loc-224692.html

Rachel Walcott 15:10
uartz we have https://www.mindat.org/min-3337.html
links to -> Long form, https://www.mindat.org/1:1:337:0
UUID/GUID -> https://mindat.org/4ca61d6f-4208-8fb2-3b0eecbcs8f0

Mathias Dillen 15:15
https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:locationID
for Darwin core

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:24
I have seen it (locationIDs) used, but it's not terribly common in my experience - usually in the context of collections georeferencing projects

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:25
that said, georeferencing is important so when used, these IDs are invaluable to the collections managers...

Mathias Dillen 15:25
And it's not indexed in GBIF afaik, so you can't search on it.

Mathias Dillen 15:40
Yes, handles, DOIs, IIIF manifest URLs, hashes (with algorithm id) would be what I expect for this mids3 term

You 15:41
https://ac.tdwg.org/termlist/#dcterms_identifier

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:46
yeah there is no agreement on what to use to refer to e.g. CC0
and i think trying to enforce a "controlled vocabulary" would result in drama lol

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

You 15:59

MaterialEntityID: Values of dwc:materialEntityID are intended to uniquely and persistently identify a particular dwc:MaterialEntity within some context. Examples of context include a particular sample collection, an organization, or the worldwide scale. Recommended best practice is to use a persistent, globally unique identifier. The identifier is bound to a physical object (the dwc:MaterialEntity) as opposed to a particular digital record (representation) of that physical object.

Mathias Dillen 16:04

https://cetafidentifiers.biowikifarm.net/wiki/CETAF_Specimen_Preview_Profile_(CSPP)

down at the moment again

MIDS TG Meeting 37, 9 November 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal
Cat Chapman
Josh Humphries
Rachel Walcot
Claus Weiland (16:30)t

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Mapping MIDS
   a. Mapping spreadsheet from Mathias:
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1a0GExvwbjclx-sSvZoubZrmXcHFNJRXqlZ3Vj-YZ0n8/edit#gid=1263507005
   b. Add Required (Bio, Palaeo, Geo)
   c. OtherCatalogNumbers - consider not including in mapping at MIDS 0 - MIDS 3?
   d. OwnerInstitutionCode - check if being used. If not, consider deleting
   e. MaterialEntity - should this be mapped to SpecimenType (where SpecimenType is the broader concept) consider born digital or ObjectType? Check the proposal to Darwin Core. https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/issues/426
2. MIDS identifiers
        IGSN MaterialSample in geosciences https://www.igsn.org/

MIDS TG Meeting 36, 2 November 2023
UTC 15:00 - 16:00 (CET 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 11:00 - 12:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Anke Penzlin
Mathias Dillen
Dagmar Triebel
Wouter Addink
Laura Tilley (from 15:25)

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Latimer Core Links:
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html
https://github.com/tdwg/ltc
https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/tree/main/app

Agenda & Notes

1. MIDS 0,1 & 2
    a. Finalisation - what is needed to finalise these?
        i. mappings
            1. especially to extensions
                a. eg GeologicalAge, https://chrono.tdwg.org/terms/ (?)
    b. Publication - how do we publish these levels whilst still finalising MIDS level 3 and the overall specification?
        i. eg, https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html
        ii.
    c. Citation - how do we cite the specification
        i. eg, TDWG MIDS Task Group (2023). The Minimum Information about a Digital Specimen (MIDS) specification.
2. MIDS 3
    a. Identifiers: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68
        i. Scientific Name ID: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/74
            1. Categories:
                a. LSID [LIfe Science Identifiers]
                b. CoL ID [Catalogue of LIfe Identifiers]
                c. GBIF taxon ID
                d. AphiaID (WoRMS)
                e. IndexFungorum ID/ MycoBank ID
                f. Wikidata Q Item ID [QID is for Items on Wikidata]
                g. Mindat Rock & Mineral Name ID [mindat ID]

Would not include any taxon concept behind the name

   ii. Identified By ID: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/72

     1. Label name would be assumed to be collector's det
     2. Very rarely not met if there is a collector ID
     3. Required: most recent determiner ID
     4. Recommended: all determiner IDs

   iii. (Geographical Locality ID: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/81) next time

ACTIONS

- Contact Ben Norton for structure for LTC draft so we can follow the same model
- Contact earth science experts / geologists about MIDS 0-2

Chat

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:04
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html
https://github.com/tdwg/ltc

Mathias Dillen 15:06
https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/tree/main/app
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 16:03
https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/tree/main/docs

You 15:28
List of IDs https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:33
the example from dwc.tdwg is urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:37829-1:1.3 ... are there any other equivalent examples for such an ID?

Wouter Addink 15:36
another example of such a scientific name ID: https://www.catalogueoflife.org/data/taxon/9VYYB

MIDS TG Meeting 35, 26 October 2023
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 10:00 - 11:00)

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82564540411?pwd=NWo4dWJiME55QjgvdERPTlhKTVlhdz09
(use this zoom link, from last week)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Felipe Simoes (Plazi)
Cat Chapman
Wouter Addink
Claus Weiland (till 16:30)
Mathias Dillen,
Sam Leeflang
Dagmar Triebel

Relevant **documents and links**:

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. MIDS mapping
   a. Cleanup + deduplication of the spreadsheet
      https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit?pli=1#gid=0
2. Information Element vs Term
   a. Information Element may be preferred
      ■ Need to tighten definition of Information Element
      ■ Use of capitalisation of SubjectID may help distinguish these from "terms"
      ■ A suggestion:

         information element - a designation for a specific piece of information about the specimen which has a definition and is mapped to relevant schemas to determine whether a dataset satisfies each information element within each MIDS level.

   b. Using SKOS as a tool
      ■ May not be applied correctly - Claus will check
         1. https://www.w3.org/TR/skos-primer/
         2. http://www.w3.org/2004/02/skos/core#broadMatch
      ■ May not be the most appropriate tool
      ■ We will add in the additional mapping from Mathias to consider
         1. object_match_field
            a. currently uses pipes to separate union
            b. option to use boolean OR and AND?

MIDS TG Meeting 34, 19 October 2023
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 10:00 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Rachel Walcott
Felipe Simoes
Anke Penzlin

Relevant **documents and links**:

Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Identifiers https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68
Organization https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11

GRSciColl
https://scientific-collections.gbif.org/collection/search
https://scientific-collections.gbif.org/collection/e9d2c520-d9fc-4331-9ed8-73bea2b22af0

CollectorID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/79
Expeditions: https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:WikiProject_Research_expeditions

Agenda & Notes

1. MIDS 3
   a. MIDS 3 elements - **Identifiers** (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
      - General: We don't resolve them, but state they should be resolvable
      - **OrganizationID** (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11):
        1. add resolvable recommendation
      - **CollectionID** (no separate issue)
        1. not included at present based on our discussion. Not considered a key piece of information.
        2. Doable with **GRSciColl**
           https://scientific-collections.gbif.org/collection/search
           https://scientific-collections.gbif.org/collection/e9d2c520-d9fc-4331-9ed8-73bea2b22af0
      - **CollectorID** (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/79)
        1. Expeditions etc: also groups (like expedition teams) can get a WikiData-ID
           Expeditions:
           https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:WikiProject_Research_expeditions
        2. Individuals - ORCID or Wikidata
        3. Maps to dwc:recordedByID

MIDS TG Meeting 33, 28 September 2023
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 10:00 - 11:00)

Participants:
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Dagmar Triebel
Josh Humphries
Wouter Addink
Sam Leeflang
Rachel Walcott
Claus Weiland

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Updates
    a. Mapping progress being made in the SSSOM mapping spreadsheet (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFkU/edit#gid=556703795)
    b. ABCD2 still needs most work
2. Google slide presentation (https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1x0mbTp4aXBaAkMqCEWRXbqWtaq7_Q5BgeQ_11dMdos8/edit#slide=id.g260c2db9cf1_0_1)
    a. Everyone to feel free to add comments etc
    b. Inclusion of DiSSCo case study as an embedded presentation
3. Discussion of GeoCASE
    a. Issue that GeoCASE is currently not being developed further
    b. Limitations of included data mean that it is impossible to reach higher MIDS levels
    c. For Earth Science collections the current answer will be to focus on DiSSCo and institutional portals for a more accurate representation of the level of digitisation for these collections
4. Discussion of TDWG Mapping Interest Group
    a. Some discussion with David Fichtmüller
    b. Will share the mapping spreadsheet

Chat
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:13
iDigBio tried to do something very MIDS-like back in 2012, but it never really took off....
https://www.idigbio.org/wiki/index.php/MISC-Authority-File-Working-Group "minimum information for a scientific collection"
so, the closest thing we currently have on the iDB side of things is "data flags", that some providers use. ideally MIDS would be implemented in our portal but that is.... a ways away

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Wouter Addink joined as a guest

MIDS TG Meeting 32, 21 September 2023
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 10:00 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal
Cat Chapman
Dagmar Triebel

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Updates
2. Presentation by John Kunze (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7604-8041)
    a. "The advantages of ARK (Archival Resource Key) identifiers for persistent identification, as well as the YAMZ.net service to help reach consensus quickly on metadata terms and jargon"
    b. With a background in computer science and mathematics, John Kunze wrote BSD Unix software that comes pre-installed with Mac and Linux systems, and has contributed heavily to the creation of standards for URLs, archiving (BagIt), and web archiving (WARC). While working at NLM, he chaired the NISO committee for the Dublin Core metadata standard and began an identifier study leading to the creation of the ARK identifier scheme. His current work focuses on identifiers for materials and for concepts, metadata vocabulary building (yamz.net), and open, scheme-agnostic resolver infrastructures (n2t.net). Recent collaborations have resulted in the ARK Alliance (arks.org) and harmonized support of over 600 "compact actionable identifier" schemes between the n2t.net and identifiers.org meta-resolvers.
    c. ARK (Archival Resource Key) & YAMZ.net metadata
        ■ https://arks.org/

ARK anatomy

A labelled URL with a globally unique identity inside it

https://n2t.net/ark:/12345/fk1234

makes ARK
actionable
(the resolver)

    d.
    e. Name to thing resolver (n2t)
    f. Smithsonian example: GUID (Link to Original Record)
       http://n2t.net/ark:/65665/3248c7096-3e39-4862-83e6-cf15b93c90a8
        ■ Smithsonian NAAN = 65665

ARK anatomy revisited

```
https://example.org/ark:/12345/x54xz321/s3/f8.05v.tiff
_____/ \___/ \___/ _____/\____/_____/
         |              |     |       |       |      |
         |          ARK Label |       |  Sub-parts Variants
         |              |      |       |       |      ¦
Name Mapping Authority (NMA)   | Assigned Name
                               |
         Name Assigning Authority Number (NAAN)
```

    g.
    h. Can work with IIIF
    i. YAMZ: https://yamz.net/
    j.
  3. MIDS 3
    a. Identifiers
       ■ Include recommendation to ARKS
       ■ Resolvers should not be tested within MIDS

Questions on ARKS

Who is behind the ARKS - who guarantees them?
- Work is done by the end provider, the ARK Alliance is voluntary - no fees.
- Maintenance of the NAAN directory is main piece of work carried out by ARKS Alliance
- "Use this form to request a Name Assigning Authority Number (NAAN) so that you can create ARK (Archival Resource Key)" identifiers.https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfd1CX6idwLB47g8OGKUG654auV8IU8yI7DAs61cXGOoFDn0g/viewform?c=0&w=1

Where are the ARKS stored?
- Used to be n2t
- Discussion with CrossRef about archiving the ARKS

Is there an enforced schema for resolving the ARKS?
- A minimum list of attributes
- There is a "who, what, when"
- There is no enforced schema - optional to use DC or Datacite for example

Identity independence - what happens if resolvers disagree about what an ARK is?
- n2t is a source of truth

If Identifiers die - should we be accepting many identifiers?
- If there are multiple identifiers there could be confusion
- Converting between identifier systems can be more or less disruptive depending on conversion method
- Recognisability of the identifier is important

At what point can an Identifier be created?
- ARKS can be created with very little metadata
- DOIs may need more metadata?
- ARKS can be thrown away if they are an experiment and not wanted

Alex Hardisty: Article on the DiSSCo Decision: Hardisty AR, Addink W, Glöckler F, Güntsch A, Islam S, Weiland C (2021) A choice of persistent identifier schemes for the Distributed System of Scientific Collections (DiSSCo). Research Ideas and Outcomes 7: e67379.
https://doi.org/10.3897/rio.7.e67379

MIDS TG Meeting 31, 14 September 2023
UTC 14:00 - 15:00 (BST 15:00 - 16:00, CEST 16:00 - 17:00, EDT 10:00 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Dagmar Triebel
Josh Humphries
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Mapping updates
    a. Testing MIDS calculator (https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator)
        ■ Elspeth
        ■ Josh
        ■ Cat
        ■ Dagmar - colleague
    b. start with GBIF-generated downloads (zipped)
    c. mediaType may be more tricky
    d. modified picked from metadata (more feasible from a single dataset)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

e. not yet possible to use ABCD datasets
            ■ try a DWC export in the first instance
    2. SSOM
        a. From Sam: DiSSCo mapping:
            https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1JKnJZ12kNwcJHDDyFY9lY1E18VeJl5ZZ
            xFKnsaBZTbM/edit#gid=0
        b. From Mathias: MIDS Calculator mapping:
            https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1a0GExvwbjclx-sSvZoubZrmXcHFNJRXql
            Z3Vj-YZ0n8/edit#gid=0
        c. Use of objectMatchField with pipes as a way to incorporate one to many
            requirements: mapping derived from MIDSCalculator schema
            ■ https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1a0GExvwbjclx-sSvZoubZrmXcHF
                NJRXqlZ3Vj-YZ0n8/edit#gid=0
        d. SKOS
            ■ broadMatch - or
            ■ narrowMatch - and
            ■ subject category = lowest MIDS level only
        e. plan to import Sam's and Mathias's SSSOM mapping spreadsheets into this top
            copy:
            https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOi
            yX1wYl0SbFkU/edit#gid=0
        f.
    3. Arks etc

Actions

- Create a folder for output and documentation of MIDS calculator testing (Elspeth) - done
    https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1er2_o1Qz_aruKO86i928jo_pxFFcDv_Z
- Download and install MIDS calculator tool developed by Mathias
    (https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator) and test it out on
    datasets downloaded from GBIF (ALL)
    ○ Elspeth done - still to upload results to folder - some questions
- Pull together the SKOS mapping from Sam, Mathias and Elspeth into a single spreadsheet
    (Elspeth) - done
    https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl
    0SbFkU/edit#gid=0
-

Chat
Messages addressed to "Meeting Group Chat" will also appear in the meeting group chat in Team
Chat

Mathias Dillen 15:09
https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator
You 15:20
From Sam:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1JKnJZ12kNwcJHDDyFY9lY1E18VeJl5ZZxFKnsaBZTbM/
edit#gid=0
Mathias Dillen 15:22
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1a0GExvwbjclx-sSvZoubZrmXcHFNJRXqlZ3Vj-YZ0n8/edi
t#gid=0
Mathias Dillen 15:36

Meeting notes:
 https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

owl:unionOf
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) 15:37
to me and my squishy human brain, "unionOf" i think makes more sense to me than "narrowMatch"
- but not sure how much energy we want to spend on this specific thing.
You 15:47
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ydNC8DHnrAPhPhTEQ7RmAztKJjJQCOiyX1wYl0SbFk
U/edit#gid=0
You 16:03
John Kunze: https://www.rd-alliance.org/users/john-kunze

MIDS TG Meeting 30, 31 August 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Felipe Simoes (Plazi)
Josh Humphries (NHM, London)
Sam Leeflang

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Mapping
   a. https://app.diagrams.net/#G1w32D-dTAbbMabgULq46UEmUiPxDXPItE
      - We should add labels to the arrows, elaborate on MIDS levels
      - Ideally this diagram should be independently readable and understandable without relying on "given context"
2.

MIDS TG Meeting 29, 24 August 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Dagmar Triebel
Anke Penzlin
Eirik Rindal
Sam Leeflang

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Agenda & Notes

1. Mapping vs MIDS 3
   a. Proposal to hold additional working meetings to draw up the mappings and write them up using standard, machine-readable mapping structure, eg SSOM, SKOS
   b. Retain alternate meetings for progress on MIDS 3 and the remaining MIDS 2 elements
2. Mapping
   a. Graphic: https://app.diagrams.net/#G1w32D-dTAbbMabgULq46UEmUiPxDXPltE
   b.
3. Presentation at TDWG 2023
   a. Slides: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1x0mbTp4aXBaAkMqCEWRXbqWtaq7_Q5BgeQ_11dMdos8/edit#slide=id.g260c2db9cf1_0_1
4. SSOM mapping, similar to: https://github.com/tdwg/ltc/blob/e7e3b1043dcc71db04ab767f553faf44a210ffa3/app/data/ltc-set/ltc-sssom-mapping.csv
5. MIDS 3 elements
   a. Identifiers (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
      ■ Identifier as a Property?
      ■ PhysicalSpecimenId (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10)
         1. AC have locallyManagedIdentifier
      ■ OrganizationId
         1. Schema.org treat the identifier as a property of the organization
         2. dwc:ownerInstitutionCode : RBGE, dwc:institutionID : https://www.gbif.org/grscicoll/institution/0237598a-853a-492c-af74-a723fe251799; dwc:ownerInstitutionCode : MNHN, dwc:institutionID : https://www.gbif.org/grscicoll/institution/fe534fe7-dccd-4d79-8313-c11b2ea854ab; dwc:ownerInstitutionCode : BZ, dwc:institutionID : https://www.gbif.org/grscicoll/institution/6a6ac6c5-1b8a-48db-91a2-f8661274ff80
         3. CollectionId?
      ■ Mathias:
         1. Identifier + resolver
         2. No single technology
      ■ How can we check the resolver actually resolves?

Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 15:41
data quality enforcement is basically impossible outside of areas where we can have controlled vocabularies, and even then there can still be "valid garbage". for an identifier for a given organization/institution I feel like "enforcement" should be something we do NOT concern ourselves with.

MIDS TG Meeting 28, 10 August 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Felipe Simoes (Plazi)
Rachel Walcott
Dagmar Triebel
Anke Penzlin
Claus Weiland
Mathias Dillen
Josh Humphries
Laura Tilley

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

Agenda & Notes

1. Presentation at TDWG 2023
   a. Abstract
   b. draft slides:
      https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1x0mbTp4aXBaAkMqCEWRXbqWtaq7_Q5BgeQ_11dMdos8/edit#slide=id.g260c2db9cf1_0_1
2. Status of Version 0.17 of the MIDS Specification in the GitHub
3. Review of Latimer Core
   a. Status of review
   b. Feedback
4. Status of mapping
   a. SKOS
   b. schema.org; dc; dwc +extensions; ltc; abcd +extensions (e.g. efg); i-samples;
   c. Collection Management Systems (CMS)
   d. MIDS structure
      ■ Classes - MIDS levels
      ■ MIDS information elements rather than terms
      ■ All MIDS elements should map to something
      ■ Schema and data model potentially not needed for MIDS
         1. MIDS not a schema in itself - maps to other schemas
      ■ Information elements that do not map exactly to other schemas will have a unique name - is a namespace required for these names? Does it just need an identifier?
      ■ CETAF Collections Registry
   e. Machine-readable mapping
      ■ LtC - SSSOM
      ■ EOS - home for mapping
      ■ export from Github issues
5. MIDS 3
   a. Identifiers (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
      ■ PhysicalSpecimenIdentifier (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10)
         1. AC have locallyManagedIdentifier
6. ICS review
   a. update from CETAF Working Group heads meeting
   b. Case studies

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

7. Next meeting:

Actions

Ask LtC about single mapping decision-making
Machine readable mapping structure -
      https://github.com/mapping-commons/SSSOM ?
      https://mapping-commons.github.io/sssom/

Chat
You to Everyone 14:55
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11

You to Everyone 14:48
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html#OrganisationalUnit_OrganisationalUnit

Mathias Dillen to Everyone 14:52
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html#ObjectGroup_objectType maps to abcd

Josh Humphries (he/him) to Everyone 15:31
https://github.com/mapping-commons/SSSOM ?
https://mapping-commons.github.io/sssom/

MIDS TG Meeting 27, 27 July 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Rachel Walcott (National Museums Scotland, CETAF-ESG)
Laura Tilley (CETAF)
Felipe Simoes (Plazi)
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)

Apologies:
Anke Penzlin (Senckenberg)
Claus Weiland (Senckenberg, DiSSCo)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13 Jul 2023-development

1. Status of updated version of the draft specification in Github and the development googledoc
    a. Text for MIDS 3

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

- - - ■ Text drafted - to check
    - b. Link to Github for MIDS 3 (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/69 & https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
      - ■ Not included - should they be?
2. MIDS calculation and specimen parts
   - a. Identifications and assertions can be made for each part of a specimen
   - b. Carry to next meeting for Wouter
3. Mapping MIDS 0-2 (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/76, https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/77, https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/78)
4. MIDS 3
   - a. Identifiers (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
     - ■ PhysicalSpecimenIdentifier (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10)
       1. AC have locallyManagedIdentifier
   - b. Additional Terms (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/69)
     - ■ Terms moved from earlier levels
       1. Mass
     - ■ New terms
5. Update from Ben Norton
   - a. Latimer Core review starting in August
     - ■ https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html
     - ■ SKOS mapping included in the terms
     - ■ SSOM not on same page
   - b. Process of generating documentation being streamlined
     - ■ https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/
     - ■ More automated
   - c. TDWG repos being streamlined
     - ■ https://github.com/ben-norton/stadocgen
6. Next meeting Thursday 10th August 2023

Actions

Review draft specification in Github
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md (all)
Review LTC (all)
- Quick reference Guide: https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/quick-reference/
- List of Terms: https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html
- Consider mapping to MIDS terms as you review
  - eg, ObjectType - mapping to MIDS ObjectType, SpecimenType
Presentation at EarthSciences Group
Raise ICS review and update at the next CETAF Head of Working Group meeting (RW)
- Case studies needed for this process
Update mapping to SKOS format in MIDS Terms (EH)

Chat

Ben Norton to Everyone 14:46
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html

Ben Norton to Everyone 14:50
https://academic.oup.com/database/article/doi/10.1093/database/baac035/6591806
https://mapping-commons.github.io/sssom/spec/

Mathias Dillen to Everyone 14:57
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/44
https://tdwg.github.io/ltc/terms/index.html#ObjectGroup_objectType

MIDS TG Meeting 26, 13 July 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)
Wouter Addink (DiSSCo)
Anke Penzlin (Senckenberg)
Claus Weiland (Senckenberg, DiSSCo)
Rachel Walcott (NMS)
Mathias Dillen
Donat Agosti (Plazi)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Current Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft%20/MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023.md

MIDS Specification development document: MIDS-definition-v0.17-13Jul2023-development

1. Presentation at TDWG 2023
2. MIDS 2 - Geo
    a. Proposal to replace Stratigraphy with GeologicalAge
       (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/61)
        ■ Would map to DWC GeologicalContext terms
          https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#geologicalcontext
        ■ Would map to ABCDEFG terms (Rachel can help provide these & Sam has
          also done some work here)
        ■ How will it map to Latimer Core?
    b. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4)
        ■ Would form part of the Identifier if required at MIDS 0-2? Would this be a
          recommendation??
        ■ Move to MIDS 3
        ■ Mapping needs to be clarified - DWC MeasurementOrFact?
3. Specification v0.17
    a. Link to MIDS terms in GitHub at present
    b. Inclusion of MIDS Level 3?
        ■ Exclude but add a paragraph for current status
        ■ Potentially link GitHub issue
4. MIDS calculation and specimen parts
    a. Identifications and assertions can be made for each part of a specimen
        ■ Add to agenda for next meeting
5. PhysicalSpecimenIdentifier

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

      a. AC have locallyManagedIdentifier

MIDS TG Meeting 25, 15 June 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman (iDigBio)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.m
d
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Presentation at TDWG 2023
   a. https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1x0mbTp4aXBaAkMqCEWRXbqWtaq7_Q5
      BgeQ_11dMdos8/edit?userstoinvite=triebel@bsm.mwn.de&actionButton=1#slide=id
      .g25178d033b2_0_16
   b. Deadline 1 July 2023
   c. Submit to SYM02 Building bridges: Mapping from, to and between TDWG standards
      ■ Or do we submit contributed oral?
      ■ We should focus on building a presentation focused on mapping regardless
   d. 3 abstract ideas:
      ■ 1: a functional approach to the talk, focusing on the mapping
      ■ 2: a conceptual approach - looking at mapping in the context of openDS;
        how MIDS-3 relates to the openDS schema. Basically looking towards the
        future, a bit speculative (?)
      ■ 3: a general update/progress report on MIDS, ensuring people are using the
        up to date version
2. Mapping progress
   a. MaterialEntityID - from Material Sample group
   IGSN

MIDS TG Meeting 24, 1 June 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Eirik Rindal (NHMO)
Josh Humphries (NHM London)
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB München)
Mathias Dillen (MeiseBG)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Anke Penzlin (SGN)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Milestones being used
    a. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/milestone/3
    b.
2. Review mapping for MIDS 0
    a. https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/76
    b. Organization:
        ■ update purpose to indicate contact/admin points raised: To allow a user to gain access to the physical specimen
        ■ examples, include different mappings for each example
        ■ maps narrowly to schema.org/organization
    c. PhysicalSpecimenID
        ■ Not an exact match to materialSampleID
        ■ retain term as is
        ■ potentially no match in LtC since it's at a higher level
        ■ strong recommendation to use materialSampleID
            1. occurrenceID is a required field in IPT
            2. flag occurrenceID as a fuzzy match

MIDS TG Meeting 23, 18 May 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman
Eirik Rindal (NHMO)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Work on MIDS 3

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

    a. Identifiers (Draft list here: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68)
- InstitutionID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/is1sues/57
- CollectionID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/70
  1. See GRSciColl https://www.gbif.org/grscicoll
  2. Example: https://registry.gbif.org/collection/ca84c5f7-e482-4c79-8b58-c0111f2efe0d
  3. Registry in GRSciColl use a globally unique url for collections, eg https://registry.gbif.org/collection/458e5e87-fff4-42e3-9d3c-b3383ffb1c2a
  4. The ID element of the url is also used as part of the guid for collection in the GRSciColl part of GBIF, eg https://www.gbif.org/grscicoll/collection/458e5e87-fff4-42e3-9d3c-b3383ffb1c2a
  5. Wikidata could also be seen as an option
- RecordedByID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/71
- IdentifiedByID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/72
- LocationID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/73
  1. Geonames, GADM?
- ScientificNameID - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/74
  1. LSID?
- AssociatedMediaID -
  1. URL?
  2. IIIF?
- LicenseID
  1. Not required

MIDS TG Meeting 22, 4 May 2023

UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:

Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman
Claus Weiland
Anke Penzlin
Mathias Dillen

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review MIDS 2
   a. Mass: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4
   - Given lack of data being recorded and the lack of ability to submit to GeoCASE, recommendation to remove this from MIDS 2.
   - Potential to include in later version of MIDS in future

- If not on label, do we expect collections to weigh the specimens?
  b. Stratigraphy: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/61
     - chronostratigraphy only included at MIDS 2?
     - term name?
     - mapping? Stratigraphy (1 search field) in GeoCASE, many terms in DWC (https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#geologicalcontext), ABCDEFG (maybe https://terms.tdwg.org/wiki/abcd-efg:UnitStratigraphicDetermination or https://efg.geocase.eu/sites/default/documentation/html/efg.html#element_StratigraphicMeasurementsOrFacts ?)
2. Start looking at structure of MIDS 3
   a. Identifiers and links https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/68
      1. Specimen identifier
      2. Media identifier(s)
      3. Collection identifier
      4. Institution identifier
      5. Collector(s) identifier(s)
      6. Determiner(s) identifier(s)
      7. Geographical locality identifier(s)
      8. Licence identifier
      9. Specimen name identifier(s)
      - Option to add an additional term for the Identifier or to replace the more general term in MIDS-0,1,2 with a more prescriptive term
      - Shouldn't impact the calculation tool, since the mapping is the key to calculating the MIDS level
      - Could look a little 'clunky' for mapping if a collection had included the ROR ID in Organisation at MIDS-0 and then again for OrganisationID at MIDS-3? No - the terms would not be used as a template for publishing data.
      - Example 1 - Organisation
        1. MIDS-0 - user enters ROR ID
        2. MIDS-3 - this satisfies OrganisationID
      - Example 2 - Organisation
        1. MIDS-0 - user enters RBGE
        2. MIDS-3 - user needs to add ROR ID into the record
   b. Additional data elements https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/69
3. Create Element records in Github for the identifiers to build up
   a. Resolvability
4. Additional elements
   a. Taxonomic determination vs Name vs Scientific Name
      -
5. Ask for demos/feedback on implementation of MIDS in other projects etc
   a. Allocate session on this - date to be determined?

MIDS TG Meeting 21, 20 April 2023
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen (MeiseBG)
Pip Brewer (NHMD)
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)
Claus Weiland (SGN)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Status of MIDS Specification (link above)
    a. MIDS 0 and 1 complete
    b. MIDS 2 drafted, terms to confirm:
        ■ Mass: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4
            1. Can we get examples of this field in datasets? It's not visible in GeoCASE. How commonly is this captured and made available?
        ■ Type status: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/26
            1. Suggestion: Type / Not a type is sufficient
            2. Question: How important?
            3. Recommendation 1: Type / Not a type / Assumed not a type
            4. Recommendation 2: Do not include this term (include in section on Data not included but which should be captured)
            5. **Recommendation 3: Retain, with null value = Assumed not to be a type**
        ■ Stratigraphy: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/61
        ■ Media: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/33
        ■ Introduced / Establishment - added as a MIDS element in Github
2. Next steps
    a. Mapping and alignment
    b. MIDS 3 - structure and content
        ■ Identifiers and links
            1. Create list of which identifiers should be included
        ■ Additional data fields
            1. Create list of which additional data fields should be considered
        ■ Keep in mind - MINIMUM information and purpose
        ■ Standalone research data
        ■ Interoperable
        ■ Curators/collection managers

Actions:
PB to contact Rachael Walcott and NHM about Mass
PB to update Stratigraphy
EH to write up TypeStatus

From Sam:
I am sorry I won't be able to attend today's meeting due to a conference and at the next session I will be on holiday.
However, I would like to give a quick update from DiSSCo.
The past months we have been working on data ingestion (from DWCA and BioCASE instances) and the MIDS calculation.
We were able to, based on the MIDS mapping to dwc and abcdefg, implement a MIDS calculation for the levels 0, 1 and 2.

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

There are some things we still need to do such as:
- Check David's ABCD mapping and align it with our implementation. A quick look shows that it is relatively well in line, but there are some minor differences which we will fix.
- There was some discussion on Mass, so we decided to exclude it currently in the MIDS calculation. I got the required feedback and can implement it.

If you think there is space/interest in the MIDS meeting I would like to explain what we did and share the documentation with the MIDS group.
Additionally, I can run a demo where we calculate MIDS for a particular dataset.
So far we ingested some datasets for testing (about 1.200.000 records in total).
About 225.000 of the ingested specimen are MIDS level 1, the other 1.000.000 or MIDS 0, we haven't seen MIDS 2 yet.
We can discuss some of the things we noticed.

Sorry I can't join sooner, but I would be very happy to show our work in the session of 18th of May.

Kind regards,
Sam

Chat

Wouter Addink to Everyone 14:53
https://www.bgs.ac.uk/technologies/bgs-rock-classification-scheme/
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 15:14
at the end of the day it's impossible for us to meaningfully enforce data quality... we can only enforce data richness, at best
Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 15:27
I think it could map to https://dwc.tdwg.org/list/#dwc_establishmentMeans

---

MIDS TG Meeting 20, 1 December 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston
Mathias Dillen
Cat Chapman

Apologies:
Dagmar Triebel

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
                                                        Meeting notes:
 https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Actions
2. Next steps
    a. Update MIDS specification
        ■ Element identifier - reviewed metadata for PhysicalSpecimenIdentifier
        ■ Discussed mapping
        ■ Top copy of each MIDS element will be the Github issue
    b. Ratification process
        ■ Specification
3. Next meeting 15 December 2022 15:00 UTC (note change of time!)

MIDS TG Meeting 19, 3 November 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Apologies:
Anke Penzlin
Dagmar Triebel

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Actions
2. MIDS elements
    a. Image -
    b. TypeStatus -
        ■ MD: Say GBIF added an issue flag indicating typeStatus is unclear. That would be an incentive to add more info to it, including "unknown" or "not a type" or even "probably not a type".
3. TDWG website - updating MIDS task group page and info
4. Mapping
    a. Relevant standards to map to
        ■ LIDO?CDOC? different structure
        ■ Dublin core
        ■ Schema.org
    b. Class level, etc
    c. Mapping by dataset for MIDS
    d. Slack channel created in TDWG for the mapping process - all to consider joining and engaging with the discussion there
5. Fundamental questions
    a. Should every specimen have the potential to reach MIDS-3?
    b. How atomised should the variations within MIDS be?
        ■ Are three alternatives sufficient, biology, geology, palaeo?
        ■ Do we need sub-variations?

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

1. Potentially subdivisions could come in at MIDS-3, not earlier

Notes

Planning for Working meeting
- EH to create a very short overview of the elements and some of the main discussion points already considered during their development.
- Main aim to reach decision about MIDS-0, 1 and 2.
-

Chat

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 02:40 PM
https://data-blog.gbif.org/post/gbif-multimedia/
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:19 PM
Say GBIF added an issue flag indicating typeStatus is unclear. That would be an incentive to add more info to it, including "unknown" or "not a type" or even "probably not a type".
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:26 PM
https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator/blob/main/data/schemas/DwC-GBIF_schema_draft.json
From Josh Humphries to Everyone 03:30 PM
https://www.tdwg.org/conferences/2022/working-sessions/#:~:text=Contact-,TDWG%20November%202022%2C%20Working%20Sessions,be%20free%20but%20require%20registration.
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:47 PM
https://github.com/gbif/pipelines/issues/807
From Me to Everyone 03:52 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/62

MIDS TG Meeting 18, 13 October 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen
Claus Weiland
Eirik Rindal
Gary Motz, Indiana University, garymotz@iu.edu
Ben Norton
Josh Humphries

Apologies:
Dagmar Triebel

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.m
Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

[d](#)
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Actions
   a. EH - Edit and update MIDS element in GitHub including a draft summary of Geography and Locality in a comment below
   b. Stratigraphy & Mass need definitions, purpose, mapping
   c. Collector, date, number need definitions, purpose, mapping
   d. Mapping: DC, DWC, ABCD, Wikidata, Schema.org,
2. MIDS-2 elements to consider
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Geography](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Country/Waterbody](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Locality](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Stratigraphy](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - TypeStatus](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectorName](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectorNumber](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectionDate](#)
   - ☐ [Mass information element for meteorites and mineral crystals (gemstones)](#)
   - ☐ Image
3.

NOTES

Collector - generally used, except in Earth Science where they are more likely to record the person who gave the specimen to the collection
Required: Yes (Biological) No (Geo & Palaeo)
Fundamental for biology to place the specimen in place and time
Strong rec to include people identifier
Name or identifier of the entity (Agent)
Title: collector or collectingAgent

Question about separate element for Identifier
Work being done in palaeo and Bionomia to assign ids
Recommendation to include in MIDS-2 as a rec and MIDS-3 as a req
http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/recordedBy Comment"A list (concatenated and separated) of names of people, groups, or organizations responsible for recording the original Occurrence. The primary collector or observer, especially one who applies a personal identifier (recordNumber), should be listed first.

CollectingDate
Required: Yes (Biological) No (Geo & Palaeo)
How do we handle verbatim dates?
We should definitely make a recommendation, perhaps in line with DwC/ABCD date fields?
Could be the same recommendation for all dates in MIDS.

CollectingNumber
Required: Yes (Biological) No (Geo & Palaeo)

Used widely in some fields, but seldom used in other fields (eg entomology)
Missing data = sn
Option to have n/a?

Mass
Required: No (Biological) Yes (Geo & Palaeo)

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1NsEmGFQti6o6cHfCNUtSGMxjG6kQqZ7B7SVPvIuNqEk/edit#slide=id.g141a17cc1f9_0_250

ACTIONS

EH - update MIDS elements in Github
EH - update Googledoc for developing MIDS specification
ALL - check mapping for all MIDS elements MIDS 0, 1 & 2

CHAT

From Claus Weiland to Everyone 02:43 PM
"..set of resources such as OGC Web Feature Service (WFS), Web Map Service (WMS), Web Map Tile Service (WMTS), Web Coverage Service (WCS) and others"
From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:11 PM
I'd say that ABCD (or even ABCDEFG) is much more commonly used in Europe than in the States, where DwC is more widely adopted.
From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:12 PM
EFG is starting to gain traction in the States, but other schemas in use include the System for Earth Sample Registration's schema (SESAR - https://www.geosamples.org/vocabularies)
From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:18 PM
There is a fairly active Paleo data working group that would be very well suited to tackle these geo/pal(a)eo data issues, including Holly Little, Talia Karim, Erica Krimmel, Jess Utrup, Ben Norton, Roger Burkhalter, and more. I've just sent a message to them asking if anyone from that group might be willing/able to contribute to a broader conversation on geo/paleo data for MIDS level 2.
From Wouter Addink to Everyone 03:18 PM
I think location and time of gathering event are important for all specimens
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:20 PM
I gave a presentation about disambiguating paleontological collectors some time ago to the paleo group from idigbio, so it is to some extent a property of note.
From Claus Weiland to Everyone 03:27 PM
http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/recordedBy Comment"A list (concatenated and separated) of names of people, groups, or organizations responsible for recording the original Occurrence. The primary collector or observer, especially one who applies a personal identifier (recordNumber), should be listed first.
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:27 PM
"would a robot have an ORCID? *can* a robot have an ORCID?"
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:28 PM
If it passes the turing test?
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:34 PM

Meeting notes:
 https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

agreed, should be required

yeah, I don't know if collection date matters too much for geo/paleo data? but I would need input from geo/paleo people 🙂

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:35 PM

It's not, at least not in regards to the specimen

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:36 PM

I suppose there may be some fringe reasons, like rocks collected pre the atomic age or close to volcanic eruptions?

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:36 PM

for georef it could be helpful and maybe a scenario where the location underwent an important change (say the site is now underwater or disturbed signicsntly at some point)

fringe is a good term

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:37 PM

Definitely, but these are things that may be ancillary to specimen data and are perhaps broader context. In either regard, they're edge cases and it doesn't seem useful to require the field in the Level 2 specification. It may actually then be an obstacle to adoption of the Level 2 specification.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:38 PM

Here, Collection date cannot be null but can contain anything,correct?

also Collections dates could be very important for meteorites

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:38 PM

...and EVERYONE's got a meteorite!

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:39 PM

physical and chemical weathering can cause significant problems for chemical analysis.

I think that goes without saying Gary.

You never know when you'll need it.

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:44 PM

I mean, I have some meteorite fragments...for uh, good luck.

yeah - collectingnumber is not ubiquitous in my experience. i see it, but not in every single dataset

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:44 PM

Time elapsed since fall date. Regardless, It's a fringe case.

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:45 PM

Paleo/geo collections almost always have a CollectingNumber...harmonizing them with OccurrenceID or other identifiers is useful when connecting specimens with digitized field notebooks.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:46 PM

our Paleo Collections have three field/collecting numbers.

Here collecting number identifies the collection event not the location, correct?

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:46 PM

Indeed. A delimited list is generally how we express them.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:46 PM

I think it should be required for geo/paleo as well.

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:47 PM

We use "s.n." in circumstances when a field number is missing or lost (sine nomine, Latin for 'no number'). Should be required for paleo/geo.

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:49 PM

+1 to the idea of having a way of indicating a term is not applicable/irrelevant

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:50 PM

https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md#443-unknown-values-for-other-information-elements

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:50 PM

Paleo/fish collections/perhaps entomological collections also collect in "lots." Are you also specifying relationship to a collection lot? as a type of collection number?

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:51 PM

I believe some have distinct collector numbers for the collecting trip and for the specific collecting event of a certain organism on that trip.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:52 PM

Has the machine friendly mechanism for declaring collection type/scope been worked out?

From Gary Motz to Everyone 03:53 PM

Sorry if I've mucked things up with "helping" for paleo/bio collections data. I've got to run to another meeting. Thanks all!

MIDS TG Meeting 17, 6 October 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston (RBGE)
Cat Chapman
Dagmar Triebel
Josh Humphries
Claus Weiland
Mathias Dillen
Franck Theeten
Pip Brewer

Apologies: Anke Penzlin

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Actions
   a. Add text to Required for each element to enable categories to be added
   b. Add elements to Milestone 2
      ■ Geography
      ■ Country/Waterbody
   c. Collector
   d. Update elements
      ■ Geography
        Discussions on geographical unit
        Difference Geography / locality

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

<div align="center">
Include watersheds
Possible overlaps
</div>

- ■ Country/Waterbody

2. Review Milestone for MIDS-2

3. MIDS-2 elements to consider
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Geography](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Country/Waterbody](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Locality](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS element - Stratigraphy](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - TypeStatus](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectorName](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectorNumber](#)
   - ☐ [MIDS Element - CollectionDate](#)
   - ☐ [Mass information element for meteorites and mineral crystals (gemstones)](#)
   - ☐ Image

Mathias - option to have quantitative and qualitative geographical terms
Quantitative mapping: IDs, etc
Qualitative mapping: Textual geographical terms or Latlongs (either point or shape) with recommendation to include uncertainty and datum

An interim option could be to use Geography / Locality and encourage the transition to quantitative data including identifiers, in the recommendations, including the idea of a disambiguation process.

4. TDWG Conference

5. TDWG Task Group next meeting & meeting frequency

6. TDWG Working Group meeting

ACTIONS
EH - Edit and update MIDS element in GitHub including a draft summary of Geography and Locality in a comment below
Stratigraphy & Mass need definitions, purpose, mapping
Collector, date, number need definitions, purpose, mapping
Mapping: DC, DWC, ABCD, Wikidata, Schema.org,

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 02:46 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/19
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 02:51 PM
https://data.apps.fao.org/catalog/iso/e54e2014-d23b-402b-8e73-c827628d17f4
From Claus Weiland to Everyone 02:53 PM
BCO has locality description to cover both spatial and temporal aspects: def: An information artifact that is about a spatio-temporal region at which a process (such as collecting process, observing process, or material sampling process) occurred.
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 02:54 PM
I think this the Exclusive Economic Zones
(https://data.apps.fao.org/catalog/dataset/flanders-marine-institute-vliz-geoserver-wms-service-exclusive-economic-zone-200-nm#:~:text=Version%2011%20of%20the%20Exclusive%20Economic%20Zones%20from,over%20the%20exploration%20and%20use%20of%20marine%20resources.
From Claus Weiland to Everyone 02:54 PM

<div align="right">
Meeting notes:
</div>
<div align="center">
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit
</div>

locality description: http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/BCO_0000025
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 02:57 PM
https://www.vliz.be/en/news?p=show&id=478
(interesting repository for marine boundaries : https://www.marineregions.org/downloads.php)
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 03:04 PM
I understand the difference this way : locality are original collection data (bound to the time of the collection) while geography is derived and post-processed, this is a mapping to current geographic areas, but both can have the same type (point coordinates and/or polygon)
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 03:10 PM
Geography should also be easier to link to ontological representation (than localities) requiring persistent identifiers as the reference data comes from "stable" repositories as Elspeth and Claus mentioned. This actually an interesting feature for semantic enrichment and standardized search engines
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:12 PM
+1 Mathias. I was thinking the same.... 🤔
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 03:14 PM
This discussion is also related to the georeferencing method developed by John Wieczorek back in 2006-2010 to enrich data with coordinates :
http://georeferencing.org/docs/GeoreferencingQuickGuide.pdf
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:17 PM
we have opened a can of geographical worms...!
🙃
From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:29 PM
Perhaps we should follow Cat's example, get a load of examples, see what we think should fall in MIDS 2 - see how they map and look at the common minimum features? We are falling down rabbit holes. Maybe a step back would be worth it?
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:30 PM
^^^this is exactly my line of thinking, Pip
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:31 PM
https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:footprintWKT
From Claus Weiland to Everyone 03:32 PM
http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/locationID
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 03:37 PM
This page mentions a project bridging GML (XML schema for geographical units, supported by most OGW WMS and WFS servers) and Darwin Core, but without active link unfortunately
http://wiki.gis.com/wiki/index.php/GML_Application_Schemas
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 03:49 PM
we could replace "qualtitative" by "toponyms" ?
From Franck Theeten to Everyone 04:07 PM
we should maybe distinguish mapping to schema containing data (Wikidata) and mapping with API and schema standardizing the data structure (Schema.org) ? The result of the first kind of mapping is a value while the second one is a path

MIDS TG Meeting 16, 1 September 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Pip Brewer, NHMD, Denmark
Elspeth Haston
Eirik Rindal
Cat Chapman
Mathias Dillen

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Claus Weiland
Anke Penzlin
Lutz Suhrbier

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Actions
   a. Stratigraphy element issue created: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/61
   b. Geography element issue modified: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/27

2. Review Milestone for MIDS-2

3. **MIDS-2 elements to start considering**
   ☐ MIDS Element - PreparationType
   ☐ MIDS Element - TypeStatus
   ☐ MIDS Element - CollectorName
   ☐ MIDS Element - CollectorNumber
   ☐ MIDS Element - CollectionDate
   ☐ MIDS Element - Latitude/longitude
   ☐ MIDS Element - Altitude/depth
   ☐ Mass information element for meteorites and mineral crystals (gemstones)
   ☐ Image

4. Focus on Geography elements

   ● Do we follow the principle in MIDS-1 of a 'generalised' term mapping broadly to DWC and DC terms or do we become more proscriptive and aim to map more exactly.
   ● If we become more specific
     ○ How do we manage missing data? Eg, specimens for which there is just a country included on the label
     ○ How do we manage hierarchical data? Eg, do we insist on every rank in the geographical hierarchy or do we select some key ranks. Again, how would we manage missing ranks above or within ranks that have data?
     ○ One option would be to have two geographical elements:
       ■ Geography or dc:Location: broadly maps to dwc:higherGeography, and down
         ● A recommendation that the most precise locality should be captured, given information available on the specimen (attached to the specimen?), including the latitude and longitude (inc verbatim) if present and should include higher level geography.
       ■ Country/Waterbody/ET (standard recommendation - required in MIDS-3?)
     ○ What is the minimum hierarchical level is acceptable
   ● False positives vs false negatives

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

- - ○ researcher vs curator
  - ● Recommendation to exclude altitude and depth from MIDS

From Ben Norton

Quick notes regarding Geography

In regards to country names, I strongly suggest going with 2-character or 3-character country codes (ISO 3166 A-2 or ISO 3166 A-3). Country names are unreliable given the many standards and languages. See this endpoint: https://data.naturalsciences.org/api/v2/data-products/geography/countries. I can almost guarantee that the reviewers will ask you to do this during ratification.

Latitude and Longitude should always include a datum.

Error is complicated. If coordinates are recorded from a GPS device, then 4 decimal places should be the limit and reporting errors should be encouraged. If the coordinates are derived from the locality and locality descriptions using the Point Radius method, then an error is essential and decimal places is highly subjective.

In regards to 4 decimal place accuracy, here's a quick snippet I wrote for an upcoming camera trap best practices guide (it may not make the final version, but it's pertinent to the current topic).

According to the United States Government, the maximum accuracy of the latest handheld civilian GPS devices under ideal conditions is 4 m with a 95% confidence interval. A study in 2021 found that forest canopies and seasonal changes in deciduous overstories can reduce accuracy to 15 m. Further, Kuhlmann et al. (2020) found that the pitch and roll relative to the horizon can reduce the accuracy of GPS measurements in smartphones. For camera trap studies, differential corrections* are not common practice, nor are they viewed as a necessary level of accuracy for modeling purposes. However, latitude and longitude coordinates reported in decimal degrees should not exceed four decimal places unless a differential calculation was conducted. At the equator, the horizontal accuracy of latitude and longitude coordinates is reported as follows:

Precision	Accuracy
0.001	111 m
0.0001	11.1 m
0.00001	1.11 m

Since handheld devices cannot achieve accuracy below 4 m, latitude and longitude coordinates should never exceed four decimal places when reported. Given that many

environmental variables such as land cover, canopy height, and stand age are calculated using GIS data products and the deployment coordinates, accurate representation of spatial accuracy is fundamental to assuring outcome reliability.

5. TDWG conference

   SYM15 Information session about late-stage Task Group submissions of standards additions

Collector

maps to recordedBy and recordedByID
More important for some groups than others

3 categories identified
- Biological
- Geological
- Paelaeontological

ACTIONS

Add text to Required for each element to enable categories to be added
Add elements to Milestone 2
- Geography
- Country/Waterbody
- Collector
Update elements
- Geography
- Country/Waterbody

Notes from Zoom

From Claus Weiland to Everyone 02:44 PM
http://purl.org/dc/terms/Location
Identifier: http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/locationID
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 02:56 PM
Antarctica *does* have an ISO country code, for what that's worth...
https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:code:3166:AQ
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:13 PM
This is the approach we've currently implemented for "Location" in our MIDS calculations:
https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator/blob/main/data/schemas/DwC-GBIF_schema.json#L87
From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:47 PM
Do we allow verbatim lat and long
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:48 PM
there's also the dreaded township and range system......... 😅

MIDS TG Meeting 15, 4 August 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Elspeth Haston
Mathias Dillen
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB)
Pip Brewer (NHMD)
Claus Weiland (SGN; 16:30 CEST)
Lutz Suhrbier (BGBM)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1. Review Milestone for MIDS-2

2. **MIDS-2 elements to start considering**
   - ☐ MIDS Element - PreparationType
   - ☐ MIDS Element - TypeStatus
   - ☐ MIDS Element - CollectorName
   - ☐ MIDS Element - CollectorNumber
   - ☐ MIDS Element - CollectionDate
   - ☐ MIDS Element - Latitude/longitude
   - ☐ MIDS Element - Altitude/depth
   - ☐ Mass information element for meteorites and mineral crystals (gemstones)
   - ☐ Image

   Notes:
   Aim of MIDS 2 - research vs administration
   Consider Spectrum as driver for institutions data entry
   Consider Nagoya and permit information - Nagoya compliancy?

   Geography:
   MIDS 2 should potentially have a single information element which would map broadly to dwc geographical terms
   A recommendation that the most precise locality should be captured, given information available on the specimen (attached to the specimen?), including the latitude and longitude if present.
   Do we want to include a recommendation for Country to be captured?
   Do we want to recommend use of a standard (eg, GADM (https://gadm.org/index.html) and others)?
   GPS datum - MIDS3?
   Uncertainty - MIDS3?
   Geo standards - MIDS3

3. MIDS calculator tool: https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator

   An example approach: one Location element either mapping to a coordinate pair or to either locality, county or verbatimlocality.
   https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/MIDSCalculator/blob/main/data/schemas/f

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

[ourthschema.json#L86](#)

Could be implemented as a plug-in to the IPT

BioCASE application: https://bms.gfbio.org/
http://biocasemonitor.biodiv.naturkundemuseum-berlin.de/index.php/Documentation_BMS_2.0

Mapping to higher geography e.g. level country; name or code - is that sufficient?

AOB

Will we be able to create a single schema for all collections? We may need to create separate schemas for different collections.

ACTIONS

Create issue for Stratigraphy
Choose Geography issue to use as the MIDS 2 element and update it based on discussion above.

MIDS TG Meeting 14, 7 July 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.
Elspeth Haston, RBGE, e.haston@rbge.org.uk
Cat Chapman (co-convenor), iDigBio, cchapman@floridamuseum.ufl.edu
Dagmar Triebel, SNSB München, triebel@snsb.de
Josh Humphries, NHM, London, j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Pip Brewer, NHMD, pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg/DiSSCo, cweiland@senckenberg.de
Anke Penzlin, Senckenberg, anke.penzlin@senckenberg.de
Ben Norton

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development

1) Review Milestone for MIDS-1
2) Review current draft specification in Googledoc and Github

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

a) Github:
   https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-drafts/MIDS-definition-v0.16-28May2022.md
b) Googledoc version for collaboration:
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mc9sf8X8l8iSc-GO2ZFmgCoOiJNxKRhYeGq5OFmsfw8/edit#
3) Plan for MIDS-2 Milestone
4) TDWG meeting abstract and working group meeting
5) AOB
6) Next meeting

Notes:

TAG and contact (**Ben is co-chair**) - do we need to define any terms (for example element identifier)? How do we do this? Can TAG help? TAG is a stepping stone before you get to ratification. There isn't a formal process yet but TAG are working on it.

MIDS elements information:
Proposal to remove "Required" - there is a possibility that it might be useful at Level 2 and 3 - keep in at present
Mapping: Important, allows users to understand how they should apply the standard. Needs to be kept with some flexibility to ensure we are able to update as terms develop and new standards arise. Also requires regular checks from this group to ensure our mappings are up to date.
Recommendations: make them strong - emphasise the importance of using standards

Element identifier - if an exact mapping is present use the exact match url. If not an exact mapping leave at present for TAG to provide recommendations

Constraint - proposal to remove unless a use can be suggested

Examples - include

Last modified - versions? by element, MIDS level and/or specification

Create Github issue for element mapping checking for exact matches
(https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/49)
When changes/updates are proposed for elements a new issue would be created. (create templates for creating/editing a term)

Licence: include recommendation that application of licence is explicit (ie, what does the licence refer to) and that there should be licence information for everything being published.

Chat

From Ben Norton to Everyone 04:15 PM
http://purl.org/dc/terms/bibliographicCitation
Element Identifier
From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 04:21 PM

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

+1, I think the namespace will be necessary ultimately
From Claus Weiland to Everyone 04:25 PM
At least for "MIDSLevel" there will be no matching term in any other vocabulary (besides openDS, which aims to recycle the MIDS term)
From Josh Humphries to Everyone 04:43 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/issues/new/choose
From ftheeten to Everyone 04:50 PM
It could be indeed interesting to mention "unspecified" or "not yet applied" when aggregating and publishing data from other institutions, e.g. coming from old projects. There could be also an ambiguity on the exact object of the license (e.g. different licences for metadata and images)
From ftheeten to Everyone 04:59 PM
MIDS 2-3 (enrichment with image) encompasses MIDS 1 in term of data model, but not for the license. Maybe we could attach a specific license field to each MIDS level ? It the higher levels do not mention the license but still have data, we could assume that the valid one is the last declared
From Me to Everyone 05:11 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/49

MIDS TG Meeting 13, 2 June 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST 14:30 - 16:00, CEST 15:30 - 17:00, EDT 09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Cat Chapman (co-convenor), iDigBio, cchapman@floridamuseum.ufl.edu
Mathias Dillen, MeiseBG, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Dagmar Triebel, SNSB München triebel@snsb.de
Ben Norton, NCMNS ben.norton@naturalsciences.org

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

Relevant documents:
Working Draft MIDS Specification:
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.15-29Jul2021.md
Proposed updated MIDS Specification development document:
📄 MIDS-definition-v0.16-01Jun2022-development
MIDS Outline proposals for today's meeting: 📄 MIDS Levels

    1)   **Proposals for MIDS**

       MIDS-0

         1. PhysicalSpecimenID – I'd be tempted to change this to SpecimenIdentifier
            ○ Should the scope be mandated?
            ○ How would it be mandated?
            ○ If the identifier is a local identifier vs a global identifier - how would the scope be published?

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

- ○ The scope could be provided by the additional elements in MIDS1
2. Institution - Simplify institution to a single element with a recommendation that people include a human readable term and a PID.
   - ● Risk that institutions will not use this properly if it is just in recommendation
   - ● Would need very clear recommendations and examples
   - ● Difficult to manage the requirements/quality within this framework
   - ● Change to Organisation (Schema.org)
3. Modified – pretty much as it was

Questions:

Should the names of the elements align with DC/DWC/ABCD etc or be independent?

- ● SKO - exact vs broadly matching
- ● If there is an exact match - use the term
- ● If there is not an exact match - do not use the term but indicate/describe the matching relationships.

Do we want to format the names in any specific way?

- ● Camel case

MIDS-1

4. MaterialSampleType – use to delimit the specimens to which MIDS refers
   - ○ If SpecimenType is used it would link directly to the name of the Specification (Minimal Information about a Digital Specimen).
   - ○ Potential to use SpecimenType at a very high level classification - this would help define "What is a specimen?" for the future.
5. ObjectType – use for a general term for the kind of specimen
   - ○
6. Name – pretty much as it was
   - ○ Broadly matching - include mapping
7. License – created a new element for this
   - ○ CC

Questions:

Is it acceptable to have two elements to delimit and describe the specimen?

Should the definitions and requirements of the elements become more prescriptive as the level increases?

If so, the name of the element should be modified to reflect this change.

MIDS-2

8. GeographicCoordinates – as one of only two elements for geographic information
9. Elevation/Depth - as one of only two elements for geographic information
10. Collector - The name(s) of the individual(s) or expedition that collected the specimen
11. CollectorNumber - The number assigned to the specimen by the collector prior to the specimen being accessioned in an institution. For example: collector number, field number
12. CollectionDate - The date/time at which a gathering event occurred. For specimen gathering, this is the date/time when the event was recorded
13. Media - required for all specimens (with some exceptions) - recommendations are for specimen image and/or documentation image

Questions:

Is it acceptable to have two elements to describe collecting locality?

Do we need an additional element to describe the specimen at this level?

Is TypeStatus required at this Level, given that most specimens will have no data for this?

MIDS-3

1. Determination(s) – All determinations attached to the specimen, including information about the determiner(s).
2. LabelInformation – All information from the original collection label not covered by specific elements. For example: description, habitat, associated material.
3. PID links to other data present or information known about the specimen –
4. PID links to annotations
5. PID links to interpretations
6. PID links to provenance

2)   Proposal to include an image as an intrinsic part of the MIDS

3)   Decisions on MIDS-0 and MIDS-1 and inclusion of image

MIDS-0

☑ ~~PhysicalSpecimenID – I'd be tempted to change this to SpecimenIdentifier~~
☑ ~~Institution - Simplify institution to a single element with a recommendation that people include a human readable term and a PID.~~
☑ ~~Modified – pretty much as it was~~

MIDS-1

- ☑ ~~MaterialSampleType – use to delimit the specimens to which MIDS refers~~
- ☑ ~~ObjectType – use for a general term for the kind of specimen~~
- ☑ ~~Name – pretty much as it was~~
- ☑ ~~Licence – created a new element for this~~
- ☑ ~~Image~~

Chat:

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:02 PM

https://www.w3.org/2009/08/skos-reference/skos.html

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:11 PM

LIcense

http://purl.org/dc/terms/license

*LIcense

*License

Sorry misspoke:

https://spdx.org/licenses/

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:14 PM

+1 for "SpecimenType"

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:38 PM

https://www.w3.org/TR/skos-reference/#mapping

From Heimo Rainer to Everyone 04:17 PM

https://kb.osca.work/

MIDS TG Meeting 12, 05 May 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Cat Chapman (co-convenor), iDigBio, cchapman@floridamuseum.ufl.edu
Eirik Rindal, NHMO, Oslo, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no
Franck Theeten, RMCA, Tervuren, franck.theeten@africamuseum.be

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Anke Penzlin, Senckenberg (SGN), anke.penzlin@senckenberg.de
Claus Weiland (SGN), cweiland@senckenberg.de
Ben Norton (NCMNS), ben.norton@naturalsciences.org
Rachel Walcott (NMS) r.walcott@nms.ac.uk
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB), Munich triebel@snsb.de
Laura Tilley (CETAF)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1) **Introduction**

1. Welcome

   - Convenors: Elspeth and Cat.
   - You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub:
     https://github.com/tdwg/mids and the monthly meetings.
   - Check notes/agreements of previous meeting. You can find them below.
   -

2) **Discussion**

1. MIDS-1 proposal feedback

2. Writing in function and purpose to MIDS and the elements

3. Human readability vs machine readability

4. Being explicit about if a term is a direct 1-1 to DwC versus independent

3) **Agreement**

1. Modified

   - Does it have to use ISO 8601extended format (machine-readable version 8601 basic without interpunctuation could be converted). Option: Stay with 8601, but leave the version up to implementation.

2. MIDSLevel

   - Where is this value calculated? Who or what calculates the value? Publisher/portal/CMS? "Human input"?

3. PhysicalSpecimenID

   - Name discussed again (Material / Specimen / …?)

4. Institution

- Two parts - code + referent

  - Do we need the referent?

  - Referent beneficial for machine readability, disambiguation

  - However adds another layer of complexity in what should be *minimum* information about a digital specimen

- Keep institutionID as it stands, consider institutionCode for perhaps MIDS level 2…?

- Maybe separate into two separate elements; one for code, one for the referent?

5. ObjectType

- Highest level classification Type in the circle of preparationType and MaterialType
  → do we need all 3? → 3 are too much for MIDS-1
  → Keep only ObjectType with broader definition?

- (some) Type is given for GBIF entries since BasisOfRecord is required
  Basis of recors
  https://data-blog.gbif.org/post/living-specimen-to-preserved-specimen-understanding-basis-of-record/
  https://gbif.github.io/parsers/apidocs/org/gbif/api/vocabulary/BasisOfRecord.html

6. MaterialType

- Seen together with ObjectType
  → skip to MIDS-2?

7. PreparationType

- Seen together with ObjectType
  → skip to MIDS-2?

4) Next Steps / Actions

Update MIDS elements in Github based on discussions in last two weeks

- Redraft MIDS elements for ObjectType and PreparationType based on discussions
- Split InstitutionCode and InstitutionID into two separate elements
- Write MIDS element issue for Licence
- Add Purpose into table at top of each MIDS element

Contact Steve Baskauf to discuss progressing MIDS standard

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Chat

From Rachel Walcott to Everyone 02:48 PM

Divergence from Darwin Core might be more important in higher MIDS levels

From ftheeten to Everyone 02:49 PM

constraint was maybe intended to define a limited set of possible values ?

From Ben Norton to Everyone 02:50 PM

https://www.w3.org/2009/08/skos-reference/skos.html

From Rachel Walcott to Everyone 02:59 PM

Yes I would be in favour of adding the 'purpose' of each MIDs level added to the definition notes (e.g. specimen id, research on specimen or what have you)

From Rachel Walcott to Everyone 03:00 PM

We don't publish the 'quality' of record - yet… but I expect we will in the future (NMS)

From Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO to Everyone 03:01 PM

+1

From ftheeten to Everyone 03:03 PM

Darwin (database system of Brussels) calculates automatically the MIDS level from 0 to 2 (3 is harder to calculate automatically). It would be indeed useful to document if the level is set manually or by batch process.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:07 PM

Examples would be very helpful

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:13 PM

All of those are physical objects, regardless of the lifetime (tissues are destined for destruction). Examples would help and making sure that all uses cases are covered

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:53 PM

Keep barrier of entry (level 1), then raise the bar (which then begins to leverage a variation of game theory.)

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:54 PM

^I like this Ben

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:54 PM

^barrier of entry low

From Dagmar Triebel (SNSB) to Everyone 03:55 PM

yes three Elements are too much

GBIF has "recordbasis" or similar

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:56 PM

GBIF has (and requires) basisOfRecord to be populated in order to be published + indexed

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:56 PM

I suggest dropping Material Type and Preparation Type for level 1, keep ObjectType, broaden the definition, then go from there

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:56 PM

And provide 14,000 examples for Object Type, use cases for the major types of collections

From Dagmar Triebel (SNSB) to Everyone 03:58 PM

Basis of recors
https://data-blog.gbif.org/post/living-specimen-to-preserved-specimen-understanding-basis-of-record/

https://gbif.github.io/parsers/apidocs/org/gbif/api/vocabulary/BasisOfRecord.html

MIDS TG Meeting 11, 28 April 2022
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Cat Chapman (co-convenor), iDigBio, cchapman@floridamuseum.ufl.edu
Josh Humphries, NHM London, j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk,
Eirik Rindal, NHMO Oslo, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

Pip Brewer, NHMD, Denmark, pip.brewer@snm.ku.dk
Mathias Dillen, MeiseBG, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Franck Theeten, RMCA franck.theeten@africamuseum.be
Anke Penzlin, Senckenberg (SGN), anke.penzlin@senckenberg.de
Claus Weiland (SGN)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

    1)   **Introduction**

        2. Welcome

- Convenors: Elspeth and Cat.
- You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub: https://github.com/tdwg/mids and the monthly meetings.
- Check notes/agreements of previous meeting. You can find them below.

    2)   **Discussion**

        8. MIDS-1 proposal feedback

What is the purpose, function of MIDS-1?

- Who is MIDS-1 aimed at? Who are the target audience?
- Useful for estimating costs of digitization

Ben - focus on specimens

- higher level = more value
- separation of quantity vs quality

Josh - quality not in scope for MIDS - too difficult to measure within MIDS - fields that are expected

Mathias - making MIDS about quality will not work - it's a measure what information we have (presence/absence)

- not about competition - don't want to push people to put rubbish in to achieve numbers

Pip - digitisation journey - what is aimed for the first stage for publication of data and useful for digitisation. FAIR principles.

- Maybe a need for the copyright licence to be in the MIDS
- Concern about unstructured data in the Name element
- Findability - may be a level in between MIDS-1 and MIDS-2

What about data in the dataset metadata

What about data that cannot ever be MIDS-X?

What is the point of minimal?

- Minimum amount of data to create a digital specimen
- Balance of scale/rate of digitisation and information capture
- Comparison metrics between collections
- Strategy for digitisation and assessment of digitisation effort
- Prioritisation of data capture
- Identifying baselines that can be compared
- Opinionated concept of what is useful in a basic digital record
- Some scientific value in the digital record
- A scale
- Potential to use as an audit

Missing values

- Goes into quality territory
- Vocabulary of missing data
  https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.15-29Jul2021.md#45-handling-of-unknown-and-incomplete-data
- Placeholder values should not be sufficient to meet MIDS but can be difficult to measure in a presence/absence system
- A measure of completeness

Add Executive Summary to make the aim of MIDS clear

Make it clear that it is not about improving *quality* of data

9. Discuss ObjectType, PreparationType, MaterialType

ObjectType

Use: filtering of records

Concept: highest level, eg preserved specimen, living specimen, observation

PreparationType

Use: Researchers, digitisation programmes

Concept of herbarium sheet, microscope slide, liquid collection, etc

Specimen level / dataset level = difficult for machines to detect

Latimer Core work in development

MaterialType

Use: more understanding of the specimen

Concept: ?

Should the licence be attached to each specimen record in GBIF?

Is there a rights field in DWC?

Chat

From Josh Humphries to Everyone 02:48 PM

there's also a statement about quality: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.15-29Jul2021.md#8-guarding-against-publication-of-junk-data

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 02:49 PM

we would need some sort of strongly controlled vocabulary (which only really works in some cases...) or some science fiction tier AI to check for quality within the data 🙂

From Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO to Everyone 02:49 PM

+1 M

From Ben Norton to Everyone 02:53 PM

Or at minimum data types/formats

An email must be an email

@Josh Thank you.

From Josh Humphries to Everyone 02:55 PM

np - definitely think we should add what mids won't do into the introduction as well as describing what mids is. Particularly because we say in the intro that mids will "improve the quality of published data" which might give the wrong impression of what mids is aiming to do!

From Ben Norton to Everyone 02:56 PM

100%

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 02:56 PM

+1 Josh

From Pip Brewer to Everyone 02:57 PM

There is an implication about releasing this, that MIDS level 1 is a standard which people will perhaps _aim_ for and so need to know what/who it is for, especially if data stays at MIDS 1 for a long time.

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 02:58 PM

"Determining data completeness"

From Josh Humphries to Everyone 03:00 PM

+1 Cat

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:03 PM

What about a filing name?

From Me to Everyone 03:04 PM

Yes, very important for us at this level

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:06 PM

It would be awesome to get a count on the number of records in a repo like GBIF that currently meet the level 1 standard.

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:07 PM

+1 Ben - I feel like MIDS has a lot of potential in looking at data on a large scale...

From Josh Humphries to Everyone 03:07 PM

I think Elspeth did do some investigation into that at some point in the past!

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:10 PM

We've been working on a MIDS calculation method for GBIF datasets, which we'll present at SPNHC in June. It won't scale well for the whole of GBIF, but it's useful to find the patterns in datasets and why higher levels don't get reached.

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:11 PM

👍

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

https://github.com/tdwg/dwc-qa/tree/master/data/GBIFDistinctValues

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:12 PM

A few years back there were 235k distinct values for dwc:preparations among GBIF preserved specimens.

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:12 PM

enforcement would be fun 🙂

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:20 PM

http://purl.org/dc/terms/license

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:26 PM

There is a lot of power behind a global basic assessment of a digital record using a tiered criteria

From ftheeten to Everyone 03:28 PM

The information on GeoRef (MIDS 2) vs non GeoRef (MIDS 1) is useful to plan projects and orientate digitization effort...the mapping of the geographical regions for MIDS2 is also an interesting, easing reporting and generation of metadata describing collections

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:28 PM

If its a set of benchmarks for assessment then you would need both dataset and specimen level fields. If it was the minimum amount of information needed to provide a basic understanding of a physical specimen, then the dataset level fields would argueable secondary to specimen level fields

From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:31 PM

Yep. It's an audit. Itself massively useful.

From ftheeten to Everyone 03:33 PM

+ mention of the conservation agent in MIDS level 1 is also useful, e.g. to track specimens with DNA

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:37 PM

https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.15-29Jul2021.md#45-handling-of-unknown-and-incomplete-data

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:37 PM

Thanks!

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:40 PM

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

And not to derail, but the unknown distinction will be critical for some higher level MIDS elements, like typeStatus: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/26

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:42 PM

If unknown is allowed for a numeric or datetime field, then you lose technical functionality (such as date range, indexes that require numeric data types) and validation mechanisms.

From Eirik Rindal, NHM-UiO to Everyone 03:44 PM

only one: ObjectType

From ftheeten to Everyone 03:44 PM

@Ben this is true, on the other hand a controlled vocabulary helps filtering out data when aggregating them

From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:45 PM

I think Preparation is the important one

Out of scope of this group, but a controlled vocab for prep is really needed generally

From Josh Humphries to Everyone 03:50 PM

https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/use-cases/Use%20cases%20for%20MIDS.md

From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:50 PM

Use case for reporting on digitization status of different collection types

From Mathias Dillen to Everyone 03:50 PM

Example of an OR approach to location in a JSON schema mapping to Darwin Core (this is from years ago, so dated):
https://github.com/AgentschapPlantentuinMeise/gbifmids/blob/e197692622d328ea4690b7fe3dffe4e508d61376/schemas/firstschema.json#L112

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:51 PM

It will be challenging for Paleo collections to adhere to a single Prep Type field, which could inhibit adoption across the community. Prep Type is often at least 3 fields, which could be combined into a single Prep Type, but not ideal. Values vary widely as well, plaster caster to right femur.

From Pip Brewer to Everyone 03:52 PM

Right femur is a body part and a description, not a prep type

Is how I'm looking at it

From Ben Norton to Everyone 03:56 PM

Its a purely practical consideration

That's what we do

From Cat Chapman - (she/her/hers) to Everyone 03:58 PM

and depending on the portal/software, there might be their own sort of "MIDS"-esque standard being applied to data being submitted to e.g. a Symbiota portal...

From Claus Weiland to Everyone 04:02 PM

https://zenodo.org/record/5123606#.YmqsOjyxUUE

iSamples decision tree

10. Agenda for meeting next week (5 May 2022: 13:30 UTC)

11.

MIDS TG Meeting 10, 2nd September 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Dagmar Triebel, Bavarian Natural History Collections (SNSB), triebel@snsb.de
Eirik Rindal, Naturhistorisk museum, Norway, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1)   **Introduction**

1. Welcome

■   Convenors: Alex and Elspeth.

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

- You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub: https://github.com/tdwg/mids and these monthly meetings.
- Check notes/agreements of previous meeting. You can find them below.

2. Reminder of progress:
- We discussed the mapping template provided by Elspeth during the previous meeting and agreed that a small number of institutions should try filling it in for themselves to see if there are difficulties. A couple of institutions (Meise, RGBE) have done so and we also received SNSB mappings for ABCD. Revisit this today.
- We agreed that clearer guidance needs to be written/given on how to make declarations of conformance using the MIDS ICS proforma. No progress since the previous meeting.

2) Discussion

12. Mapping template with guidance and examples:

- https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/49.
- …

Notes:
- EH: Introduces template again. Test run - see what mapping looks like for each institute. Pertinent for the difficult MIDS elements!
  - Quite different views been coming in from discussions on objecttype/materialtype/preparationtype. Must be practical (*rather than idealistic*). Institutes have to be able to use the MIDS levels if they are to accept them. Need to be able to use quickly in short term without CMS changes.
  - Is about institutes publishing their data and to be able say 'we conform to MIDS level X'. Must work for massive digitization projects already completed, to achieve acceptance of the specification.
- WA: main issue seems to be content that has been digitized pre-MIDS that might not be compliant with the MIDS requirements. For completed digitization, there could be a service in the future that automatically … ….?????
- EH: Values at present might not be direct 1:1 mapping today but might become so in the future as a CMS/datamodel evolves. In meantime other services could make the transformations.
- WA: We need to understand how/why values are used as they are? Eg in Naturalis, preparation types are very fine grained and numerous values are possible. How is such information used? I am not the right person to answer.
- EH: There are lots of reasons/use cases/ways such data is used.
- MD: A service improving this data is something that happens post-MIDS assessment. Main problem here is the different data models in different places and the fact that the standards we do have for common data models are not yet in place. Is not useful/feasible to talk of these three different properties in MIDS level 1 yet.
- ER: Have looked at many databases in Norway. These three properties are going to be a problem. ObjectType=preservedSpecimen doesn't seem helpful to share. Etc. All the digitization work done in Norway couldn't meet MIDS level 1 so that would make it a non-starter at the moment.
- MD: Isn't it possible to infer from the collection level information for some properties?
- EH: Lets go through one at a time? Objecttype has a value when looking across multiple collections.

- WA: Is the easiest one to do! Usually, whole collection is the same. And have been doing anyway for years with basisofRecord.
- EH: MaterialType and PreparationType. Meise are putting kind of specimen at the objecttype level whereas RGBE would be thinking of putting that at the PrepType level. Interesting?
- MD: What do you do when you have an illustration of a plant done with a microscope. These are treated as specimens by Meise.
- EH: Comes down to flexibility of an institute to decide what a specimen is.
- DT: 3 elements on unit level - kindofunit, recordbasis, preparationtype - no examples yet. During process of data publication via ABCD the data in the productive management system were reorganised/ transformed.
- EH: would you be able to map those 3 to the MIDS info elements? DT: Not sure, will have to look in the coming weeks.
- EH: Would be useful to spend some more time on this to see if people can map. Can then look at the problems. Can create additional tabs for each collection type if helps.
- DT: Looks like two of them have the same original source element in the productive database.
- EH: From Norway's perspective are you still seeing real challenges to map these 3 elements?
- ER: working with every kind of collection. Vascular plants - only dried on paper. Insects - only pinned ones are digitized. But also have in alcohol or on a slide. The info doesn't get filled during digitization/
- EH: Begin by digitizing, to achieve MIDS level 1 and then look at data quality later. Keep separate.
- MD: Unknown is an acceptable value if during digitization you tried to determine what kind of specimen it was but couldn't. If you don't know how a specimen is prepared then that also creates an impact - if requested, you might not be able to find it. Therefore is worthwhile to have the info.
- ER: Is interesting to think that no-one in Norway is recording this kind of information. Perhaps has not been seen as important/necessary.
- EH: Is actually helpful to deciding what future guidance to offer.
- DT: Perhaps the information is kept separately in the institution eg in the asset mgmt/inventory office.
- EH: Next steps
  - Please fill in line 1
  - A couple more institutes doing this would be helpful. - Naturalis perhaps? And London. Can ask a few more too.
- WA: Observation - everytime in discussions we see 3 elements coming back, even if named differently. All the different implementations are quite heterogeneous though so we need some automatic services in this area to try to harmonise better. Won't be done by humans. Still many interpretations ….
- EH: ...that needs people taking out of it! There's a bit of an opportunity for a better alignment. May not solve all of it but small steps.

13. WA: Discussion in BCoN on lay definition of DES - direction of being as inclusive as possible, to include observations and other primary data types.

Notes:
- Definition - Zimkus one. Some discussion saying that any primary biodiversity data could be the basis of a specimen but it might give some problems. Although is also important to be as inclusive as possible.
- Different kinds of digital objects might be possible for different kinds of data.
- Is difficult to draw a straight boundary between observations and specimens.

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

- Andy want to be as inclusive as possible but creates problems for MIDS and understanding of what a specimen is.
- Other issue is metadata. Should be as tight as possible connected to the object. Must avoid it being too generic.
- …
- WA: Boils down to whether we have only objects as specimens and to having a concrete definition of what a specimen is.

3)   Any other business

Date of next meetings: 7th October, 4th November, 2nd December.

MIDS TG Meeting 9, 5th August 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Chris Hunter (GigaDB), chris@gigasciencejournal.com
Dagmar Triebel, Bavarian Natural History Collections (SNSB), triebel@snsb.de
Josh Humphries, NHM London, j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg, cweiland@senckenberg.de

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1)   Introduction

3. Welcome

- ■ Convenors: Alex and Elspeth.
- ■ You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub: https://github.com/tdwg/mids and these monthly meetings.
- ■ Check notes/agreements of previous meeting. You can find them below.
- ■ This month we want to review the proposals for MIDS level 1 and identify any open issues that need to be resolved before the September meeting.

4. Reminder of progress:
- ■ We've settled the information elements at level 1 as being:
  - ● Modified
  - ● PhysicalSpecimenId
  - ● Institution
  - ● Name
  - ● ObjectType
  - ● MaterialType
  - ● PreparationType
- ■ We agreed:
  - ● It's useful to provide a mapping template with examples and guidance for use to assist institutions to establish how they meet MIDS level 1.
  - ● MIDS level conformance must be stated in a context, such as 'data delivered to GBIF conforms with MIDS level 1', 'data published on our own data portal conforms with MIDS level 2', etc.
  - ● Today we'll look at both the template and the conformance statement proforma.
- ■ We agreed on a general plan to:
  - ● Revise definitions to make them clear, giving examples of use, and to update the draft MIDS specification to reflect that. That's almost done although examples of use and a few other details are still missing so a further round of editing will be needed.

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit
86

- Stabilise the MIDS 1 proposal over the summer towards a [milestone marking a settled proposal](#) (3rd September). We can then say "MIDS level 1 is done".
  - Today, we must identify any outstanding open issues to be resolved

2)   Decision needed

14. Mapping template with guidance and examples:

- https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/49. Draft available: *Coming soon.*
- …
- (older version, from earlier meetings: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LD2UAGxo-Zy76fXW861PqCW7Jm2nzv5EKx2qaEonDds/edit#gid=0)

Notes:
- Template from EH: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1pvEdHjbZdfCs26a_Q71UzZCtpJtzVIcMtxv8FtJA-Fs/edit#gid=114225612
- Grey cells are headers and guidance. Green cells are for people to fill in.
- Row 1 is to capture the institution, collection, etc. to which this applies.
- Indicate conformance in column G.
- Columns H - K: Is this the correct information to collect?
- EXample tab shows how RGBE is beginning to fill it in.
- MH: Is this declared at record level or collection level?
- DT: What is a collection? Because not always a collection as it is defined in the GBIF registry.
- EH: Define it as you like. A collection shares information you'd be filling in for this specific declaration.
- DT: A certain schema?
- EH: For RGBE, would treat e.g., herbarium collection and living collection as two separate collections and two separate declarations/mappings. And slides, possibly a third kind but could be included. Brings us to what this is for as well. Is not for measuring the number of digitized specimens right now. Is trying to look at whether institutes are able to conform, and if they can't then what are the barriers? Are we seeing the same understanding among several institutes?
- DT: We need to fill some examples, by institute.
- DT: Tried to fill whole SNSB collections into GBIF registry just a few weeks ago. All have their separate profiles. So, at what level is the collection? Even within, say fungi collection, we have multiple data sets published.
- AH: It's the choice of the institution to decide at what level to consider what is a collection or sub-part of a collection. Should match across these declarations, the GBIF registry, CETAF registry, Collections Digitization Dashboard, etc. to avoid confusion and disparities.
- JH: How to group is an important aspect.
- AH: Recall that ultimately MIDS applies at the individual specimen level but can be used with groups of records to make assessments of conformance for a group of specimens.
- MT: Have proposed a MIDS issue with [JSON structure](#) for how to do this. Initial step now is to provide a rough estimates of how close we are at present. It was done before for the CDD: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1H6JGueqCbFTLE_NPc9NuU05LTLURnJF70Ami1GHSBiE/edit#gid=0
- CW: What is column J? GBIF/Geocase?
- EH: Is mapping to Darwin Core or ABCD/EFG - can change column heading.

- AH: My early assumption in creating the proforma is that a declaration is made for a grouping of records with similar characteristics.
- DT: Can have a record of a powdery mildew and a record of the vascular plant (leaf) on which it is found - equates to two occurrences, that are related to each other. In this case, our physical specimens of powdery mildew, say 6000 records have 14,000 records in GBIF. All these records are starting with M. Two occurrences in GBIF of one physical specimen in the collection. The specimen is the combination of the two things.
- EH: Whereas RGBE would have two specimens on one sheet. Each herbarium might do it differently.
- DT: In the database we have two identifiers for a leaf with a mildew on it.
- MD: One consequence might be that multiple names might be needed.
- DT: Each gets a name. Similarly, a fossil split across two stones. Stored separately but related to each other. Id in GBIF concerning stored specimens has 3 parts: A or M number, second is related to taxon, 3rd is reference to the storage. This 3 part id is unique for each occurrence in GBIF.
- EH: Each specimen has a single name. Hopefully, a cross-reference eventually. Don't see us modelling relations in MIDS.
- AH. Agreed. Is in scope of openDS though.
- MD: For this collection specifically, do we want to be able to support two different names.
- JH: For us, we have lots of fields in our CMS that we map down to a single e.g, DwC field.
- AH: No intention to make internal mappings public. Main public interest DwC/ABCD(EFG) fields when making data public.
- EH: would be useful to ask a few institutions to try filling/mapping this to see how it turns out. Let's do with a smaller number of institutes first to see if there are problems, …
- MD: … and to provide some examples for others.
- AH: Claus, Elspeth, Josh, Mathias willing to do. Dagmar will provide ABCD mapping info. Will put in the agenda to discuss at next meeting.
- EH: Just try it and see what happens.

Agreed: A small number of institutes should fill the [template provided by Elspeth](#) with their own examples, to see if there are difficulties. Senckenburg, RGBE, Meise and NHMUK volunteered. Look at the results during September meeting.

15. Implementation Conformance Statement (ICS) proforma:

- https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/50. Draft available: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/files/6894825/ICSproforma-MIDS1-draft-28Jul2021-AH.docx
- Tried and tested approach (ISO/IEC 9646-7).

Notes:
- AH: Covered in much of the earlier discussion (above). Have realised that we need to give clearer guidance on the way in which declarations can be made and this proforma can be practically used.
- CH: Just noting that all the discussion today has been around the 'collection level' when MIDS is supposed to be at the individual specimen level, but I recognise it makes sense to talk about collections or groups of specimens when they all share the same MIDS characteristics.

Agreed: Clearer guidance should be written on how to make use of the ICS proforma, especially how to use for sets of specimen records with the same MIDS characteristics.

16. Outstanding open issues to be dealt with

- ■ Might need multiple instances of Name information
- ■ Controlled vocabularies around objectType, MaterialType, PreparationType - can't solve on our own in this TG.
- ■ Examples - to accompany each information element definition.
- ■ Review of current draft text. All to make comments.

Notes:
- ...

3)   Any other business

Date of next meetings: 2nd September, 7th October, 4th November, 2nd December.

Agreed: ...

Agreed: ...

==

MIDS TG Meeting 8, 1st July 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Mathias Dillen, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Josh Humphries, NHM London, j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg, cweiland@senckenberg.de
Franck Theeten, RMCA (BE) , franck.theeten@africamuseum.be
Dagmar Triebel, Bavarian Natural History Collections (SNSB), triebel@snsb.de

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1)   Introduction

   5. Welcome

   - ■ Convenors: Alex and Elspeth.
   - ■ You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub:
     https://github.com/tdwg/mids and these monthly meetings.
   - ■ Check notes/agreements of previous meeting. You can find them below.
   - ■ Format is to look at issues where decisions are needed by the TG at the present meeting and then to move on to discussions of new items. This month we want to settle MIDS level 1 and move on to the first discussion of the geography-related information elements at level 2.

   6. Reminder of progress:
   - ■ We've settled the information elements at level 1 as being:
       - ● Modified
       - ● PhysicalSpecimenId
       - ● Institution
       - ● Name
       - ● *And after the present meeting something to describe the type of material*

       The next action is to revise the definitions of these to make them clear, giving examples of use and to update the draft MIDS specification to reflect that. The aim is to stabilise that over the summer, in time for a review at the September meeting and to close the related issues. We can then say "MIDS level 1 is done".
   - ■ MaterialType discussion. See below.

2)   Decision needed

   17. MaterialType - At last meeting we proposed five information elements:

   - ■ objectType, materialType, preparationType at MIDS level 1. Supplemented with discipline and preservationMethod at MIDS level 2.
   - ■ We agreed to (summary):

- Separate the decision on information elements from the decision on vocabularies, leaving the decision on the former open until the present meeting.
- Try mapping usages of vocabularies in different collections to the information elements proposed. (This hasn't been done yet. A template is being developed.)
- Make clearer, tighter definitions of the concepts, with examples so it becomes easier to label the concepts meaningfully. (This hasn't been done yet.)
- Focus on MIDS immediate needs, keeping harmonisation (especially with CD) in mind.
- This last agreement has implications we must decide on today:
  - The question is: For data already published (e.g., on institutional/national data portals, via one or more of GBIF, BioCASE, GeoCASe, iDigBio, VertNET, ALA, etc. (how) can an institution today claim/evidence conformance with MIDS level 1?
    a. The two concepts 'what kind of preparation it is' and 'how it is preserved' are the common/main ones in use throughout the natural history community today, albeit with some variability of interpretation/use from one collection to another. There doesn't seem to be (or at least I, Alex cannot find it) equivalent concepts relating to geo/fossil specimens.
    b. Considering the two main publication tools in wide use - BioCASE Provider Software (BPS) and Integrated Publishing Toolkit (IPT) …
       i. BPS publishes according to the ABCD standard, with fields:
          Unit/SpecimenUnit/Preparations/Preparation/PreparationType
          and
          Unit/SpecimenUnit/Preservations/Preservation/PreservationType, maintaining a separation between how something has been prepared and how it has been preserved.
       ii. IPT publishes according to DwC standard, where both types of information are published concatenated under the single term http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/preparations.
  - This might suggest that we make objectType and materialType more optional, perhaps for a transitional period.
    a. This can be achieved with the 'ICS Proforma' conformance approach proposed in section 9 of the current draft MIDS specification.
    b. For a specific value of an information element it can be stated that the presence of other information elements should be mandatory or optional.
    c. This can probably be extended to allow that the presence of certain values creates an inference about what a missing element value might be, if the element would be present.
- Background
  - Info element definition: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14.

- Definition & vocab discussion: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5.
- Alex did some homework leading to a rough spreadsheet and issue 5 comment summary in which five information elements are proposed.

Notes:
- DT: think about distinction between the information that the institution presents on their BPS/IPT server and the information GBIF and other aggregators take from this server
- EH: Good point. MIDS in a context. Not a generalised MIDS. A MIDS level exists in a context eg at a certain level on an institutional portal while at a different level on GBIF because of the difficulties of presenting it at that level in GBIF eg level 2 on institution portal and level 1 on GBIF. The context does have to be stated.
- MD: Have tried to find a way to auto-measure in e.g., a DwC-A. There are some complications but we are going to need a mapping between DwC terms and MIDS properties - institutional specific because institutions do the mapping in different ways.
- AH: TG can help by providing a mapping template.
- DT: Mappings do exist
- AH: Mappings between ABCD & DarwinCore:
  - https://www.bgbm.org/TDWG/CODATA/Schema/Mappings/DwCAndExtensions.htm
  - https://abcd.tdwg.org
  - https://doi.org/10.3897/biss.4.59048
  - https://zenodo.org/record/4067622
- EH: Mustn't forget that some of the info that can go towards MIDS is in the metadata rather than captured in the specimen record. Eg Inst. code often at metadata level in RGBE case.
- FT: In IPT can expand metadata as EML he thinks. Could form an input to the template. Don't know what are the most used fields of EML. I can have a look.
- EH: If an inst. is not recording the objectType, materialType, and preparationType but have digitised 10m specimens, does that mean the inst. has not reached MIDS level 1?
- EH: MIDS is guidance for the future as well as for present assessment.
- AH: More so perhaps. We can loosen the requirement for a transitional period perhaps?
- MD: You most likely know what kind of material it is if you've digitised, even if you haven't explicitly captured/coded that. It can be inferred rather obviously in many cases.
- DT: Guide institutions to make better data curation in the future to include these kinds of information perhaps at the batch level of digitisation.
- AH: We can separate two views of data that conforms to MIDS - i) the more flexible human judgement based view and ii) the stricter machine-actionable view that requires the actual presence of the information.
- EH: Gives an example of a template possibility: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LD2UAGxo-Zy76fXW861PqCW7Jm2nzv5EKx2qaEonDds/edit#gid=2026308347. ObjectType might be a good place to begin.
- AH: Looking across the cells in https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1efJws2a64HZ-lySIKckfu1W5AEmJB0nupwbM0b7kyps/edit#gid=0 we see lots of variation.
- DT: https://gfbio.biowikifarm.net/wiki/RecordBasis
- FT: Sometimes the information is more complete in some areas than others. We know about collector, geography, etc. but not necessarily how it is preserved. Perhaps we should say that the MIDS levels are not cumulative. There might be cases where we have the geographic information but don't have the taxonomic identification.
- MD: At level 1 the name doesn't have to be very specific.
- EH: Missing data facet is dealt with.
- JH: We're almost coming up with the idea of MIDS profiles, which define how institutions interpret MIDS. We could have some default profiles such as GBIF, DwC, etc. that can sit alongside the base MIDS standard.
- AH: These are Implementation Conformance Statements (ICS) proformas. See section 9 of current MIDS draft for example of how this can work:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.14-29Mar2021.md#9-conformance-normative

- EH: If we can crack this, we're going to come across similar issues with geography-related elements.
- MD: For those, we are likely to get logical chains or decision trees as proformas.
- AH: Include proformas work in settling MIDS 1 by September. Shouldn't be too hard.
- EH: Also a mapping template with generalised columns that each institution can use, putting in examples with terms that would be used.
- AH: plus a set of instructions.
- EH: Put one workbook for each MIDS 1 issue in github. Duplicate and fill the sheet.
- MD: Has a JSON format template which is less user friendly but perhaps more friendly.
- MD: Filling a template might be a bigger priority than settling MIDS 1
- DT: Let's use both methods (spreadsheet and JSON) as well. Small steps.

Agreed: The proposal to use objectType, materialType, preparationType at MIDS level 1, supplemented with discipline and preservationMethod at MIDS level 2 was not rejected.

Agreed: The general plan to stabilise that proposal over the summer, in time for a review at the September meeting and to close the related issues so that we can then say "MIDS level 1 is done" was accepted.

Agreed: A mapping template (with examples and guidance for use) is needed between standards like DwC and ABCD/EFG and the MIDS information elements.

Agreed: MIDS level conformance must be stated in a context, such as 'data delivered to GBIF conforms with MIDS level 1', 'data published on our our data portal conforms with MIDS level 2', etc.

Saved chat:
14:33:10 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit
14:52:27 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone:
	Mappings between ABCD & DarwinCore:
	https://www.bgbm.org/TDWG/CODATA/Schema/Mappings/DwCAndExtensions.htm
	https://abcd.tdwg.org
	https://doi.org/10.3897/biss.4.59048
	https://zenodo.org/record/4067622
15:04:39 From Elspeth Haston to Everyone:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LD2UAGxo-Zy76fXW861PqCW7Jm2nzv5EKx2qaEonDds/edit#gid=1147332244
15:07:20 From Elspeth Haston to Everyone:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1efJws2a64HZ-lySIKckfu1W5AEmJB0nupwbM0b7kyps/edit#gid=0
15:10:12 From Dagmar Triebel to Everyone:
	https://gfbio.biowikifarm.net/wiki/RecordBasis
15:16:47 From Dagmar Triebel to Everyone:
	https://terminologies.gfbio.org/search/
15:28:42 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone:

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.14-29Mar2021.md #9-conformance-normative
15:44:01 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone:
    https://github.com/tdwg/mids/labels/isMaterial
15:53:20 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone:

https://github.com/hardistyar/openDS/blob/json-schemas/json-examples-and-schemas/digital-specimen-object/basic-json-example3.md

3)   Discussion needed (as time permits)

    1. Geography-related information elements (GitHub issues 15-21)

Notes:
- ...

4)   Any other business

Date of next meeting: Thursday August 5th, UTC 13:30 - 15:00.

Notes:
- ...

===

MIDS TG Meeting 7, 3rd June 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Rob Cubey (temporary co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, rcubey@rbge.org.uk
Stephen M. Richard, iSamples Project, smrTucson@gmail.com
Eirik Rindal, Naturhistorisk museum, Universitet i Oslo, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Anton Güntsch, BGBM, a.guentsch@bgbm.org
Richard Pyle, Bishop Museum, deepreef@bishopmuseum.org
Dagmar Triebel, SNSB, triebel@snsb.de
Sharif Islam, Naturalis/DiSSCo sharif.islam@naturalis.nl
Franck Theeten, Royal Museum for Central Africa, franck.theeten@africamuseum.be
Gabi Droege, BGBM, g.droege@bgbm.org

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1) **Introduction**

   7. Welcome

      ■ Convenors: Alex and Elspeth. Today Elspeth is unable to attend so Rob Cubey from RBGE will co-convene in her place. You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub: https://github.com/tdwg/mids and these monthly meetings.

   8. Report from most recent CETAF Digitization WG meeting

      ■ There hasn't been one since the previous TG meeting.

   9. Reminder of progress:
      ■ MaterialType discussion. Wouter Addink proposed that six pieces of information are necessary: What kind of object is it? Under which discipline was it described? What is it made of? What does it look like (how is it prepared)? How is it preserved? Is it a whole, a lot or a part? Meeting agreed we need to do some homework; being to create definitions, with some end-to-end examples showing what goes in each information element. Also to bring to the attention of the CETAF DWG for more discussion on how the data that institutes have now would tie in to such a classification.
      ■ PhysicalSpecimenId. Those present were asked to confirm/agree the proposed definition: "whatever the institution uses to uniquely identify the item within that institute". There were no objections to this definition. However, it was noted and agreed that the MIDS specification should guide institutions on how to use the information elements, including this one such that if we give the information back to you, it allows you to give us the object we're interested in.

2) **Decision needed**

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

18. MaterialType - can we agree five information elements:

- objectType, materialType, preparationType at MIDS level 1;
- Supplemented with discipline and preservationMethod at MIDS level 2.

- As suggested at last meeting, let's keep agreement on the needed information elements separate from the agreement on the specific vocabularies for each element. See agenda item (3).1 below.

- Background
  - Info element definition: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14.
  - Definition & vocab discussion: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5.
  - Alex did some homework leading to a rough spreadsheet and issue 5 comment summary in which five information elements are proposed.

Notes:
- AG: separating the two decisions is good thing; on the other hand difficult to separate the semantics of each element when don't have a rough idea of the vocabs behind. A list of example values would be helpful.
- Elspeth's proposal to carry out some tests on basis of concrete collection types before settling the matter.
- SR: For specific objects, how would I answer the questions?
- DT: With good definitions, also give examples in the specification to guide users. Useful as an interim solution before we settle on exact vocabularies. As a part of the definition.
- GD: Take CD examples as a starting point: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1w8DMgUwl7tf-9AXQOpT6IRQeMuUbxUZlJwQinrtUvAs/edit#gid=505543029
- Potential of conflict between different vocabularies
- GD: scope of CD standard is both physical and digital collections
- AG: If the institution considers something to be a curated unit then it is in scope. This curation defines the things we find in MIDS. For example, BGBM has a collection of images of specimens where the physical specimens were destroyed in war but is for BGBM this is clearly a curated collection. Therefore, MIDS can apply to it.
- SR: There are different perspectives perhaps when coming from origins of musuems/collections-holding institutes and from data repositories.
- RC: To include or not include observation records seems to be the issue.
- RP: One can still curate the data once a physical specimen has ceased to exist. If you follow that train of thought you end up with observations where no specimen was collected. There's a grey area.
- DT: also have sound archives and the bird is not collected so is also a kind of observation but the archives are curated. If the institution says it is curating the object then it is ok, a unit that should be defined in the MIDS context.
- RP: dwc:basisOfRecord - has values materialsample or other evidence related to that which is in some way curated. We should say 'is somehow managed in a collection' to qualify for MIDS.
- MD: The distinction between physical and digital realms will become fuzzier over time. In that sense, covering digital representations is definitely in scope. MIDS is a tool that can be used to indicate the level of information available. But we shouldn't go tangentially for now trying to cover all future and unknown cases. Focus on how we are going to use MIDS at present.
- AH: A good moment to ask RC to explain the work he, EH and others at RGBE being doing to think about the main use cases and mapping information they already have.

- RC: We took our herbarium specimens and thought about where these would fit within this structure and how we'd use it. Gave us a feeling of which terms are useful. Would be good to do this process over several different collection types. See the MaterialTypeCalculations sheet in this spreadsheet: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LD2UAGxo-Zy76fXW861PqCW7Jm2nzv5EKx2qaEonDds/edit#gid=1963847683
- AG: My impression is for preservationMethod, my gut feeling is that we may not need a controlled vocab. In almost all cases, knowing the preparationType there is a direct inference of the method.
- RC: But it may have implications for downstream usage. Knowledge of it can be important. For example it's important to know if something is spirit preserved because you probably can't get DNA from it.
- MD: Are these controlled vocabs in scope of MIDS or not? We're not about quality but about data availability. We just want to know that the information has been digitised and made available but covering this might be insoluble for us.
- FT: In the case of loans, it is useful to have a controlled vocab around conservationMeans of the specimen eg in context of Nagoya.
- SR: What's the use case for the vocabs? Might be useful for search facets as a means of narrowing results.
- ...
- GD: there will be a task force for the whole materialType thing anyway. Need to avoid that terms with the same name are used differently in different places.
- GD: To me objectType and materialType are the same.
- AH/GD: We need to make progress. We want to get this done. How? A first step might be for CD and MIDS to get together to rationalise at least these two.
- RP: Try to harmonise parallel efforts by cross-pollination. But also proceed at own pace.
- SR: Critical thing is to have really clear unambiguous definitions. Focus on a glossary to begin so that can tease out the individual concepts and then label those.
- AH: Focus in on the CD/MIDS.
- GD: CD meets in parallel.

Agreed: To separate the decision on information elements to use from the decision on which vocabularies to use for each, recognising that the former requires some understanding of the latter.

Agreed: To carry out more homework to try mapping usages of vocabularies in different collections to the information elements proposed, in the same manner RGBE attempted. In the meantime leave the decision on information elements open until next meeting.

Agreed: Clearer, tighter definitions of the concepts represented by the terms, including examples are needed. It then becomes easier to label the concepts meaningfully.

Agreed: Keep harmonisation across multiple initiatives in mind and aim towards facilitating that but to make progress in the short-term, the focus of work should be on deciding what MIDS needs and harmonising MIDS and CD terms. (*Post-meeting note: No institution wants to describe their collection one way and the individual specimens in that collection a different way!*)

19. Institution (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11). A two part info element containing institutionCode and ROR or similar. Can we agree it?

Notes:
- SI: Smaller institutions that are part of a larger institution can't always have an ROR of their own.

- AG: In BGBM's case we wouldn't want to have the ROR of the Free University of Berlin there. BGBM is part of the university.
- MD: Handle in the same way as physicalSpecimenId perhaps? Provide sufficient information to allow the user to easily identify the institution.
- DT: Need a relation. A hierarchy of institutions. E.g, Bavarian Natural Collections SNSB with several (child) state collection institutions below eg. for botany, zoology and geosciences, each with own director and history. Each has its own acronym (M, ZSM, BSPG) that is well recognised. Could use a hierarchy in the registry of GRID, soon also in ROR? (GBIF?). Perhaps don't need for MIDS. Universities might have multiple institutes within.
- AH: Could omit referent.
- FT: In CETAF registry we use our own hierarchy based on iso cc and institution. Need to align for both CETAF and ROR.
- RC: Suggest use ROR but can use another definer if it exists elsewhere for the institution.
- MD: We need a way to uniquely identify your institution so just give something that someone else can use. Recommend ROR, but alternatives are possible. If so, please provide a registry/lookup service where the unique identifier for the institution can be resolved.

Agreed: Accepted. For referent, recommend the use of ROR but allow alternatives. Give guidance that if an alternative is used, then a pointer to a registry/lookup service should also be provided. MD agreed to have a go at better defining.
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11#issuecomment-854461303

20. Mass - proposal to introduce as a MIDS level 1 information element that must be present for meteorites and gemstones.

   - https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4.
   - Classifications of meteorites use mass to distinguish one specimen from another; in addition to registration name, year found and country (where found). A similar principle applies for crystal minerals (gemstones).

Notes:
- SR: Can be used optionally.
- MD: How is it not part of the physicalspecimenId?
- ER: Having been cleaning geology data recently. Every item has mass. Some of the argument is that is hard to put identifier on gravel so they use weight to differentiate.
- DT: each piece of mineral is measured. That mass number is a kind of identifier. Because is unique. A special kind of code.
- RC: but will need to be a multipart mass will not be enough of an identifier?
- MD: we leave to the institution to provide sufficient information to identify the specimen so if they want to use mass as part of that, that's ok.
- FT: IGSN ?
- AH: And CETAF Stable identifiers

Agreed: Consequent on our decision at the previous meeting (6th TG meeting) around physicalSpecimenId, the mass of a specimen can be provided as part of the information needed to identify the specimen. A separate Mass information element is not needed.

3)   **Discussion needed (as time permits)**

2. Harmonising and adopting vocabularies for information elements such the five proposed above. There are multiple vocabularies possible for each info element. How should we approach this? How should we decide?

Notes:
- See earlier decisions. Nothing new to add.

4)   Any other business

Date of next meeting: Thursday July 1st, UTC 13:30 - 15:00.

Notes:
- No AOB.

===

MIDS TG Meeting 6, 6th May 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Richard Pyle, Bishop Museum, deepreef@bishopmuseum.org
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Matt Woodburn, NHM London / TDWG Collection Descriptions TG, m.woodburn@nhm.ac.uk
Dag Endresen, University of Oslo, GBIF Norway, dag.endresen@nhm.uio.no
Eirik Rindal, University of Oslo, GBIF Norway, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no
Karin Wiltschke, Natural History Museum Vienna, Austria, karin.wiltschke@nhm-wien.ac.at
Chris Hunter, GigaDB, chris@gigasciencejournal.com
Dave Vieglais, University of Kansas, vieglais@ku.edu
Anke Penzlin, Senckenberg (SGN), anke.penzlin@senckenberg.de
Gabi Droege, Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum Berlin, g.droege@bgbm.org
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB), Munich, triebel@snsb.de
Josh Humphries, NHM London, j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg, cweiland@senckenberg.de

(Regrets: Deborah Paul dlpaul@illinois.edu)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1) **Introduction**

10. Welcome

- Convenors: Alex and Elspeth. You can follow and contribute to the work via GitHub: https://github.com/tdwg/mids and these monthly meetings.

- Currently 45 subscribers in mailing list. Not all listed on GitHub yet. Consent being sought. Action: Alex.

11. Report from CETAF Digitization WG meeting, 26th April. Moving forward on the basis of informed implementation of MIDS. (Elspeth)

- Covers practical side and implementation of MIDS and how it might work, alongside the TDWG TG. Complexity of the process becoming clear. At last meeting, reviewed progress. One aspect is that EH is standing down as convenor of that group so needs to think about her role within DWG in future. Will continue to push it forward. Summary of meetings so far available: https://cetafdigitization.biowikifarm.net/cdig/DWG_Meetings_2020-21

- Must focus more on doing some test implementations eg at MeiseBG. For reporting, for prioritization of digitization, ensuring data systems can map to

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

MIDS elements. Is the next stage of work over coming year.
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/2

12. Reminder of progress:
  ■ Last month we had a substantial but inconclusive discussion about disentangling the kind of material a specimen is from how it has been prepared and preserved. In other words, what does it look like and what's been done to it. We'll pick this up again at this meeting.
  ■ We also discussed physicalSpecimenId. The proposal is that "whatever the institution uses to uniquely identify the item within that institute" is what should be provided/allowed for this information element.

2)   Decision needed

21. MaterialType - Hopefully, we will hear a proposal from Wouter, aligning thoughts of MIDS, iSamples, DarwinCore, CD IG. How to proceed? This is not an issue this TG can resolve on its own.

  ■ Info element definition: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14.
  ■ Definition and vocab discussion: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5.

We previously agreed that what a specimen looks like and what's been done to it in terms of preparation and preservation are pieces of information essential in MIDS for discovery and for knowing what digitization technique(s) need to be applied.

There was a suggestion to proceed with an objectType approach, as proposed by Collection Descriptions IG with some additional indication of how the object has been prepared/stored at MIDS level 1. More detailed preservation information should be given only at a higher MIDS level (i.e., 2 or 3).

In the meantime we've become aware of:

  ● Current work by iSamples project on decision trees for MaterialType, SpecimenType and SampledFeatureType.
  ● A proposal for a new Darwin Core term materialSampleType to complement dwc:MaterialSample and dwc:Preparations.

Clearly, alignment across all work groups would be helpful to all concerned.

Ideally, the issue should be solved harmoniously across multiple collection types that include non-biological/geo materials and archaeological artefacts as well as biological materials. We would like to come to an outline solution within a few weeks if possible – at least agreeing what the three or four main information elements are and how they should be used; even if the detailed vocabularies need further study. How can we proceed practically?

Notes:

● WA wasn't able to make a full proposal yet. Multiple terms needed. 6 different ones.
  ○ What it represents, - objecttype

- what info is present (the discipline can influence the type of information), - discipline
- what it is made of, - material
- how does it look like/mounted, - preparationType
- how is fixated and preserved, - preservation method
- is it a whole, a lot or part of an organism. - a separate term is needed

sheets:
Multiple terms needed to describe "what is it":
1. What does it represent (determines what information to expect to be associated with the object)
2. What information is present (under which discipline was it described)
3. What is it made of (important for geological specimen)
4. How does it look like/is it mounted (what can an image recognition algorithm expect to be on the specimen image)
5. How is it fixated and preserved (for biological specimens: which technique is used to prevent physical deterioration of non-living collections
6. Is it a whole organism individual, a lot with individuals, or a part (leaf, muscle, leg, blood)

Proposal:
Include in MIDS1 only terms that a. allow initial selection of digital specimens in a discovery service, or b. aid further digitization. These are: 1, 2, 3,4 where 3 can for biological specimen just be 'biological material' and 1,2 could perhaps be combined.
Reserve MaterialType for describing the physical composition/what it is made of (biological material, gold, rock..) , similar to iSamples
What does it represent is different to describe without overlap of the other terms, we can either work out a SpecimenType with iSamples (which also describes 1 and 6) or describe the 'discipline' as worked out in Synth+ which describes 2, or include both.
Work with a new Task Group within the TDWG Observations & Specimens Interest Group for the specification of a MaterialSample extension to further specify (TG proposal by @tucotuco, https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/issues/345#issuecomment-828872056
See CD excel sheet:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1w8DMgUwl7tf-9AXQOpT6IRQeMuUbxUZlJwQinrtUvAs/edit

- MIDS1- only terms that allow initial selection in a discovery service 1-4 of above list.
- Material type for physical composition only (similar as in iSamples)
- What does it represent (6) - align with iSamples, CD - or both
- Work with new TG on specification of materialSampleType. Lot of discussion on extension.
- All samples in MIDS description or only specimens (curated objects)?

Wouter Addink	TDWG CD	iSample	Definitions	Examples	
	TypeOfCollection				
What does it represent	objecttype				
What information is present	Discipline				
What is it	material				

made of					
How does it look like/is it mounted	preparationType				
How is it fixated and preserved	preservation method				
Is it a whole organism individual, a lot with individuals, or a part	a separate term is needed				

Can a MS that is not a specimen reach MIDS-0?
Sample vs specimen.
RP: tissue samples are curated and looked after.
GD: still need to curate the information that a sample existed, even after it was consumed by analysis. These are important because something happened to the sample.

iSamples aligns reasonably well. Is more focussed on context of gathering whereas MIDS is less concerned with that at this level.

MaterialSampleType - See DwC Github issue - is focussing on lot vs whole specimen vs subsampling

GGBN used MST for many years but not really happy with it. Pretty much equal to objecttype. Objecttype doesn't have to be just physical can be digital.

Create definitions, with some end-to-end examples showing what goes in each info element. Homework action. Use CDD and CD IG and other existing definitions as far as possible.

Bring into DWG to do some more work on how data institutes have now would tie in.

22. PhysicalSpecimenId, https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10 - confirm/agree the proposal: "whatever the institution uses to uniquely identify the item within that institute" is what should be provided/allowed for this information element.

Notes:
- MD: How to manage the mappings? Mass is used as a property to identify eg meteorites, gems.
- RP: Sometimes a single id is used for multiple objects. Therefore materialsampleid is proposed. Will physicalspecimenId follow a similar kind of evolutionary path as occurrenceId did.

- EH: can be a single item, or a lot. Need to focus on how it might be used and think about how to begin to harmonise. How would you move from a single id for a lot, to separate ids for each item in the lot, and what would you tell eg GBIF.
- RP: cat nos are identifiers for humans but not for computers! More inclined to populate terms ending 'id' with machine-readable ids in the future. Give the computer something it can use.
- If it deserves a barcode, is that the level we're working with.
- KW: there isn't one single perfect solution. MD: No institution wants to re-identify everything.
- Several items with the same physicalspecimenID is ok. Along with institution and objecttype this should be sufficient. Give guidance on how to use the info elements.
- Should you put cat no or the uuid
- RP: Sheet number, 1d barcode, uuid qrcode - all equally permanent. Sheet number into cat no. uuid into materialsampleid, not decided yet on 1d barcode. They are all permanent identifiers.
- SR: should the psid be typed?
- JH: should encourage to pick one.
- EH: It's MIDS. Only one is needed as minimum. MIDS is for humans and machines.
- EH: we will say how we're going to calculate MIDS, which implies asking people to map to certain agreed fields in specific ways in the future.
- RP: 'give us a text string, which if we give it back to you allows you to give us the object we're interested in'.

3) Discussion needed (as time permits)

3. Institution (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11). A two part info element containing institutionCode and ROR or similar.

Notes:
- … ...

4. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4) – proposal for an additional/new information element necessary for certain geological specimen categories. No discussion on this as yet.

Notes:
- ...

4) Any other business

Date of next meeting: Thursday June 3rd, UTC 13:30 - 15:00.

Notes:
- ...
-

Saved Chat from this meeting:
14:33:51 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone :
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit
14:39:43 From Elspeth Haston to Everyone : https://cetafdigitization.biowikifarm.net/cdig/DWG_Meetings_2020-21
14:43:28 From Mathias Dillen to Everyone : It's out of date now, but this is the tool for GBIF data I made last November: https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/2

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

14:43:30 From Elspeth Haston to Everyone : I should also have mentioned the implementations and use cases within SYNTHESYS+ and DiSSCo Prepare … they will be important for the year ahead too.

14:55:04 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : This seems entirely arbitrary. "Specimens" that get destroyed in a fire in a museum. They become non-specimens eat that point?

14:55:33 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : +1 John (specimens can also be "consumed")

14:55:37 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : I agree with @johnwieczorek

14:55:55 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : So, can't speak, can only chat.

14:57:40 From Dave Vieglais to Everyone : I also agree with @johnwieczorek

14:57:52 From Matt Woodburn to Everyone : https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1w8DMgUwl7tf-9AXQOpT6IRQeMuUbxUZlJwQinrtUvAs/edit#gid=505543029

15:00:24 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : Individual, part, and how about "environment sample"?

15:04:44 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : Can you "preserve" it (LivingSpecimen) in situ?

15:06:40 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : I think LivingSpecimens can be "curated"

15:10:00 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : @Rich I was thinking if it is "curated" if you leave it in situ, just visit to check on it

15:11:45 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : Yes, I was thinking more in terms of "captive" LivingSpecimens (when I worked at Waikiki Aquarium, my boss was the "Curator") I'm still thinking of examples where this might apply to in-situ living things. Maybe wildlife refuges where organisms have satellite tags attached and/or are otherwise caref-for but still in-situ?

15:11:55 From Matt Woodburn to Everyone : Sorry, have to leave for another meeting but will catch up with Gabi afterwards. Thanks all!

15:13:02 From Mathias Dillen to Everyone : I think curation implies that you can retrieve the specimen. So if you can find it again consistently, then it is curated.

15:14:05 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : (In the example of crop wild relatives, we plan that you can order material and get a sample from the in situ population collected for you - so then you think it is "corrected" and thus a "MaterialSample"??)

15:14:25 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : "Curated"

15:16:58 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : Agree with @Mathias & @Dag

15:17:51 From Wouter Addink to Everyone : @mathias I agree

15:19:05 From Dagmar Triebel, Staatl. Naturwiss. Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB) to Everyone : samples and specimens are perhaps different perspectives on the same Kind of objects?

15:19:52 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : I think there is discussion if "samples" and "specimens" are both "MaterialSamples"?

15:21:12 From Dagmar Triebel, Staatl. Naturwiss. Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB) to Everyone : "MaterialObjects"?

15:21:15 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : @Dag -- I think they are both "MaterialSample" (in my mind, at least)

15:21:25 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : +1 @Rich

15:21:35 From Dagmar Triebel, Staatl. Naturwiss. Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB) to Everyone : +1

15:21:51 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : But I agree that "Sample" implies "not the whole thing"

15:22:35 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : Maybe the stumbling block is the "Sample" in MaterialSample. Are they at least all dc:type = "PhysicalObject"?

15:23:21 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : But the definition of dwc:MaterialSample clearly includes aggregates (e.g., water/soil samples), whole organisms, and derivatives of organisms (subsamples). So even if the term is misleading, I think the definition is clear.

15:23:33 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : Or "durables" (in BUFO or is it SUMO top ontology)

15:24:03 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : +1 @johnwieczorek

15:24:12 From Wouter Addink to Everyone : @dagmar there is no diifference in the objects but the objective is different I think: samples are used for analyses, specimens as representations of a class, as objects you want to be able to go back to and therefore receive preservation treatments etc.

15:25:56 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : Thinking of the "lifetime" of the PhysicalObject. Would you expect to give it an identifier when you collect it, another one when you decide to take it out of the freezer and put a catalog number on it, just because you put a catalog number on it?

15:26:03 From Mathias Dillen to Everyone : For dc:type, there may be confusion with StillImage, MovingImage and Text?

15:26:17 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : And what if there are multiple objectives, or objectives you can't anticipate.

15:26:41 From Gabi Droege to Everyone : have to leave for another meeting, am happy to help with these terms :)

15:27:03 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : @Mahias How could there be confusion with these distinct types?

15:27:28 From Dagmar Triebel, Staatl. Naturwiss. Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB) to Everyone : IGSN sample ID?

15:28:29 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : Is the preservedSpecimenID a materialSampleID or maybe a ctaalogNumber??

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

15:28:55 From Dave Vieglais to Everyone : wrt PhysicalObject lifetime - it seems additional identifiers may be assigned, but not necessarily. If a subsample is taken then it should have a new identifier, and the record should reference the source (i.e. the PhysicalObject from which it was derived)

15:29:38 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : +1 @Dave (parentMaterIalSampleID is proposed by Rich)

15:31:18 From Dave Vieglais to Everyone : 👍

15:32:27 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : And if you're in a hurry to capture those relationships you can do so in the interim with ResourceRelationships using a relationshipOfResource="derived from" or similar.

15:34:26 From Wouter Addink to Everyone : indeed @Dave, although (historically) the person who gathered/recorded the object in the field may use a different identifier system from the museum where it is later stored so often these are different. First one will be unique for the items recorded by the collector, second one will be unique in the museum catalog. If a globally unique identifier is used, they can be the same.

15:36:19 From Dave Vieglais to Everyone : Yes, absolutely. It's almost a certainty that any thing will have multiple identifiers through it's lifetime, and the context of those identifiers varies

15:36:33 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : (In agrobiodiversity plant genetic resources there is a treaty agreement to assign a new DOI each time a LivingSpecimen is distributed)

15:36:59 From Richard Pyle to Everyone : @Dave: Yeah, that's what led me to http://bioguid.org

15:37:09 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : (Yet the PGR "specimen" maintain the same "catalogNumber")

15:49:57 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : otherCatalogNumbers?

15:54:28 From Alex Hardisty to Everyone : notes here: https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

15:54:46 From Dave Vieglais to Everyone : If there's a single identifier chosen by policy at one institution, what happens when a specimen / collection is transferred to a different institution with a different identifier policy?

15:55:18 From Mathias Dillen to Everyone : The physical identifier may change.

15:55:40 From Elspeth Haston to Everyone : with a record of the changes

15:56:03 From Wouter Addink to Everyone : therefore we need a digital specimen identifier too that will not change

15:56:52 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : Digitization may dominantly be done by humans today, but might soon be made by machines/robots without human involvement?

15:57:39 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : So what is minimum today with humans might be insufficient tomorrow??

15:59:02 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : Please participate in the Darwin Core public review.

15:59:21 From Dag Endresen to Everyone : https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/milestone/14

15:59:34 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : At least until 31 May

15:59:44 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : Probably longer the way it is going.

16:00:10 From johnwieczorek to Everyone : Lots of good conversation there as well.

==

MIDS TG Meeting 5, 1st April 2021
UTC 13:30 - 15:00 (BST14:30 - 16:00, CEST15:30 - 17:00, EDT09:30 - 11:00)

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Ha/rdisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Lorenzo Cecchi, NHM, Florence, Italy, l.cecchi@unifi.it
Josh Humphries (NHM, London) j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Donat Agosti, Plazi, agosti@plazi.org
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Deborah Paul, Species File Group, UIUC, dlpaul@illinois.edu
Laura Tilley (CETAF) laura.tilley@cetaf.org
Chris Hunter (GigaDB)
Anke Penzlin (SGN), anke.penzlin@senckenberg.de
Wouter Addink (DiSSCo), Naturalis, wouter.addink@naturalis.nl
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB), Munich, triebel@snsb.de
Claus Weiland (SGN), Frankfurt/M, cweiland@senckenberg.de
Tina Loo (DiSSCo, Naturalis) tina.loo@naturalis.nl

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1)   **Introduction**

    13. Reminder of the work:

        At the least meeting we agreed on 'name' for the name information element, saying that we'd provide a fuller definition and some examples to emphasise the tolerance/wide flexibility of the element.

        Had a discussion on materialType and we must take a decision on the way forward at this meeting. Also, would like to decide on physicalSpecimenId

2)   **Decision needed**

    23. MaterialType (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14) – Noted previously that we need to 'untangle' in this area. Type of the material, how it has been prepared and how it is preserved are three different pieces of information. What is the vision for separation? Can imagine: objectType, preparationMethod and preservationMethod or similar. At which MIDS levels should these first appear?

        ■   https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5 also is relevant.

        ■   SYNTHESYS+ elaboration of 'ObjectType' is quite good even if it needs some improvements. https://github.com/tdwg/cd/issues/64

- - ■ Relevant terms:
    - ● [dwc:MaterialSample](#) and [abcd:Unit/KindOfUnit](#)
    - ● [dwc:Preparations](#) - a list of preparations and preservation methods (mixed list) whereas abcd separates them into [abcd:Unit/SpecimenUnit/Preparations/Preparation](#) (preparation details) and [abcd:Unit/SpecimentUnit/Preservations/Preservation](#) (preservation details).
    - ●

Notes:

- ● EH: Sort out how we relate MIDS information elements to DwC & ABCD terms and the practices institutions and aggregators use. Easiest implementation routes are through GBIF, GeoCase, etc. in which case we need to align with searchable terms in those places. materialType is a good example of this where there are different terms that are relevant. What kind of object is it? Rock, Egg, nest. What kind of preserved thing is it? Jar, microscope slide? How is it preserved? Dried, in alcohol, etc. Not always a clear delineation between these categories in controlled vocabularies. Gradients of grey. Would be good to come up with better distinction. If we were to choose just one option then potentially excluding institutions that describe a different way. We need to be more inclusive.
- ● MD: Is a longstanding unresolved issue, even within DwC. Is coming up again and again.
    - ○ https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/issues/1
    - ○ https://github.com/tdwg/attribution/issues/32
    - ○ https://cetafidentifiers.biowikifarm.net/wiki/CETAF_Specimen_Preview_Profile_(CSPP)
    - ○ https://github.com/tdwg/dwc/files/5198536/Preparation.extension.field.list.xlsx
    - ○ Specimens in GBIF mid 2020: 235.635 unique values for dwc:preparations
- ● DP: Preparations extension likely.
- ● MD: two options i) push for convergence and align ii) for now, align minimally as we can and get information as liberally as possible from existing fields.
- ● WA: agrees. Different proposal: look more at use cases and see what is most useful to include. Would look beyond DwC/ABCD to dashboard implementation in SYNTHESYS and also at TDWG CD work. Also take into account CETAF CSSP. CETAF Specimen Preview Profile includes KindOf Material (see: https://cetafidentifiers.biowikifarm.net/wiki/CETAF_Specimen_Preview_Profile_(CSPP)
- ● JH: A wider thought to get to root more generally. Is MIDS designed as a reporting tool or as guidance to how to do it.
- ● AH/EH: primary objective is the guidance function but it will also be used for reporting.
- ● AH: objectType as elaborated by SYNTH+ has some appeal, especially when recall that name can be something like 'Scottish rock'.
- ● DP: Look at what GBIF has in preparations and preservations and build buckets of terms from those. Is already a kind of use case to extrapolate from.
- ● EH: Is a case where we can provide recommendations on what information people should provide. To reach MIDS-1 there should be data in any (one) of these fields relating to the type of material.
- ● DT: Could we also distinguish living specimen, dead specimen, - a rougher categorisation to avoid 30 or 40 terms.
- ● E.g., see https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14#issuecomment-790704394
- ● LC: already more than >1000 categories in GBIF. We should group and cluster in a more hierarchical fashion so we can state for example a class of materialtype, pres, prep, etc.
- ● LC: Container - in liquid or not, if liquid alcohol or salt/water. Could incorporate every existing definition.
- ● AH: Two clear categories: What kind of material is it. How's it been prepared/preserved.

- EH: Microscope slide = a type of object. And it's the way it's been prepared/preserved. Ditto objects in liquid have similar difficulties.
- EH: Need to record for a) findability, and also b) so know what kind of digitization of it might be needed.
- DT: cultured specimen, preserved specimen for persistent storage, fungal collections, botanical gardens, zoo, nh collections with fossils, minerals, herbarium, etc.
- MD: Distinction between what the object looks like and what's been done to it. Sometimes same but often not. Push this to get resolved in DwC where it's already come up.
- WA: What it looks like. Important for dign questions. What has been done to it is of less importance, so perhaps not at MIDS-1. Also third category: what the object is, what it represents. For the first two, if you use one category such as preparation you can become confused. What it looks like - something in a jar of fluid is important but not important to know what the fluid is.
- WA: Also keep in mind how to represent this information - as simple key/value pairs or a hierarchical approach. Can also be done from different perspectives, which have different relevances for different use cases. Might not be able to cover in a single hierarchical approach.
- EH: See spreadsheet https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/16d8Qpsd3ms4X46xEKl95dsafx1FHFfsypqPE-nX8_l8/edit#gid=0 with an extract below. If you've got info in any of the fields listed under a specific 'what' category, you could be considered to have achieved the MIDS level. Could tie in with a hierarchical approach.
- AH: Is it a mapping approach? Don't want any of the available fields to be inserted but maybe clustered.
- WA: in case of appearance of the object, you can easily figure out what it is from an image. But for many objects, no images!
- EH:
- AH: Suggest to proceed with objecttype like the synth+ approach, and some indication of how its stored/prepared at MIDS1 with much more detailed preservation at higher mids levels.
- EH: At MIDS-1 we want to know information that allows digitization decisions to be made. But also must make sure that a large amount of what's already been digitised can fit into MIDS level 1. Has what the object is already been captured in a large number of cases?
-

24. PhysicalSpecimenId (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10)

Dag Endresen and David Shorthouse suggest dwc:materialSampleID as the proper field for identifying physical specimens (and not dwc:occurrenceId). See this discussion post and the ones immediately before and after it (scroll up/down): https://discourse.gbif.org/t/forcing-the-issue-on-occurrenceid/2577/5

In ABCD the UnitId is the corresponding term.

Notwithstanding how the object identity is represented in either Darwin Core or ABCD, the piece of information that is important is the catalog number of the object. This can be non-unique and so we need at least the identity of the institution to accompany it.

Notes:

- WA: CatalogNumber can be confused with accessionnumber - eg when 3 objects are derived from one collected individual. We want the accessionnumber for each of the objects. Collector/gathering number may be different.
- AH: the id is just the number written on the specimen.
- LC: is usual to give same barcode to different parts of the individual and to number to parts, so can we use a combination?
- EH: talking about being able to uniquely identify the specimen item. In some cases that identification may not be on the label/specimen itself. But it is whatever the institution uses to capture the unique item.
- AH: So we can say to use "whatever the institution uses to uniquely identify the item within that institute".
- MD: Will be complications whatever way we do it. Is a mess in DwC so how are we going to measure?
- WA: What's the information needed to get to a specific requested item in a particular institution? That's what's needed?
- EH: Reporting across e.g, for CETAF, DiSSCo, etc. will be a difficulty. Concatenating/consolidating are ways of solving that as long as we know which fields.
- AH: But also give guidance for going forward on which fields to map to for the future. Eg dwc:materialsampleId, physicalobjectId.
- DT: environmental samples are also included. Metabarcoding approaches. They should also have a unique identifier (eg IGSN) when they come to collections. May also acquire institutional identifiers too.
- LC: Two questions - how many different items from a split, how to identify the whole. In nomenclatural codes, specimen in context of typification has a clear definition (https://www.bgbm.org/iapt/nomenclature/code/SaintLouis/0012Ch2Sec2a008.htm). Three parts of the same type are 3 specimens. But perfectly happy with the MIDS definition that a specimen is anything that can be curated.

3)   Discussion needed (as time permits)

5. Institution (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11)

Notes:
- WA: institutionCode is tied to the collection. It exists even after the institution no longer exists.
- What happens eg to an ROR after organisation disappears.
- CH: renaming institutions

6. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4) – proposal for an additional/new information element necessary for certain geological specimen categories

Notes:
- ...

4)   Any other business

Date of next meeting: Thursday May 6th, UTC 13:30 - 15:00.

Notes:
- Action (Alex+ Elspeth): Prepare a proposal for a MIDS symposium at the TDWG conference: deadline 16 April -

-

	MIDS-1	
MIDS element	**Description**	**DWC terms**
Where stored	Place the specimen is stored to enable someone to locate it	institutionID; collectionID; institutionCode; collectionCode
What taxon	At least one taxon name attached to the specimen, or unknown if not yet identified	identificationID; taxonID; scientificNameID; scientificName; organismName
What kind of object	Some indication of the kind of object the specimen is or the method of preparation, eg microscope slide, herbarium sheet, liquid preserved	type; basisOfRecord; MaterialSample;
How preserved	Some indication of the method of preparation, eg microscope slide, herbarium sheet, liquid preserved	preparations
Which item	An identifer which, combined with the place the specimen is stored, can uniquely identify the specimen	occurrenceID; catalogNumber; materialSampleID
When record created		
When record last modified		modified
Who collected		
Where collected		locationID; higherGeographyID; higherGeography; continent; waterBody; islandGroup; island; country; countryCode; stateProvince; county; municipality; locality; verbatimLocality; decimalLatitude; decimalLongitude
When collected		eventDate; eventTime; startDayOfYear; endDayOfYear; year; month; day; verbatimEventDate
Number allocated		
Type status		
Who identified		
Media		associatedMedia

===

MIDS TG Meeting 4, 4th March 2021

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Chris Hunter (GigaScience Database) chris@gigasciencejournal.com
Josh Humphries (NHM, London) j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Anton Güntsch (BGBM, a.guentsch@bgbm.org)
Gabi Droege (BGBM, g.droege@bgbm.org)
Patricia Mergen (Meise Botanic Garden), Patricia.Mergen@plantentuinmeise.be
Wouter Addink, wouter.addink@naturalis.nl
Dagmar Triebel (SNSB), triebel@snsb.de

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1) **Introduction**

14. Reminder of the work:

At the least meeting we dropped RecordCreator and CreatedOn terms. Retained Modified. Discussion on Name as an indicator of what a thing is. Today we need a decision on that. materialType needs a more atomized vocabulary but also noted this is running into weaknesses in existing vocabularies like DwC.

15. Short report from CETAF Digitization working group, 1st March 2021

Notes:
● Country, Locality
● PM: Many still understand digitization as imaging. People think everything else is not allowed. May have to pay attention when we speak to funding bodies. Correct when arises.
● HS: MIDS by definition is minimum information that should be transcribed/captured. Why don't we capture everything because dig is expensive, once only. Is important to clarify that MIDS is important for transcribing information quickly. Therefore focus on minimum at each stage of digitisation.
● Use term 'mobilisation' and 'enrichment' are easier terms than 'digitization'!

2) **Decision needed**

25. Name (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/12) – pending decision carried over from previous meeting.

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

i. Slight preference from those present to use the label 'Name'. An alternative label, preferred by a few is 'Title'.

ii. Definition of the term is general, "A name given to the specimen". Equivalent to dc:title: "A name given to the resource" (http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/title) and to Schema.org 'name': "The name of the item". (https://schema.org/name).

iii. Map it to dwc:scientificName (http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/scientificName), and abcd:fullScientificName (and adapted discipline-specific terms).

Notes:

- WA: make it a bit more specific label like 'storedUnderName'
- AG: Could be a barcode in future!
- VB: collectionName
- WA: nameinCollection
- Proposal: nameInCollection
- Any string of characters/numbers can be the name.
- Go back to more general 'name' and enhance the definition to say very tolerant. include some examples, 'as stored currently in a collection'. Does not need to be a taxon name. Scottish rock.
- Proposal: labelledAs
- How to map to existing standards to assess e.g., MIDS levels of GBIF records because might not be equivalent in eg DwC. would be dwc:dc:title
- Decision: Name with fuller definition to emphasise tolerance/wide flexibility, and some examples.

3)   Discussion needed (as time permits)

7. MaterialType (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14)

Notes:
- https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5 also is relevant.
- AH: Two parts? - type of material and how preserved
- WA: See email today. We do need two elements : appearance of the item, like dried, assemblage, microscopic slide. What you can expect further information to extracted out of the object eg., the discipline description or collection type. Electronic, audio, etc. Look at what is used in the collections dashboard.
- May be a requirement for materialtype and preservation method.
- WA: Missing a use case supporting digitization and specimen data refining. Is helpful to know in advance what kind of object it is and what kind of information can be extracted from it.
- EH: Aiding further design is important. It's about deciding which pipelines to use - for planning and costing. How does this tie into the CDD as well? And ELViS? When people are looking in to find out which specimens are available for visit, loan, digiti and thinking about what infor they are wanting to know at this kind of level. Makes quite a difference to your expectations. Has been tangled in past so how to untangle them into two clear elements. Is there a clear vision of the separation?
- WA: SYNTH+ elaboration is quite good even if it needs some improvements. https://github.com/tdwg/cd/issues/64
- CH: MaterialType - stone, biological. Preparation and Preservation
- WA: There are quite detailed lists for these things.

- DT: For preserved specimens, need 7 or 8 categories for the description of existing preserved specimens but not the preservation method.
- VB: rock or mineral, or insect slide, etc. If you have that granularity, capture in MIDS 1.
- Action: WA to make a proposal for next months meeting.
- EH: NCD has a lot of useful terms. At that kind of level makes a lot of sense.
- See saved chat below.
- DT: Another related but rough vocab is recordBasis. WA: Perhaps should not use.

8. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4) – proposal for an additional/new information element necessary for certain geological specimen categories

Notes:
- Is different for each object.
- From Rachel Walcott - is important for distinguishing between e.g. gems, meteorites.
- WA: Is important but perhaps not at MIDS 1
- EH: Does it form part of the identifier? If not then perhaps not at this level.
- Apart from the identifier, the elements in MIDS 1 are essentially at a higher level than the individual specimen. Data specific to a specimen come into MIDS 2
- VB: Don't concatenate.
- HS: meteorites most often split apart as they land. Lots of pieces that can be collected. All connected by the landing event. Wouldn't say that the mass of any one particle is important.
- Recognise that mass should appear somewhere.
- Action: AH to gather more information on this from RW.

9. PhysicalSpecimenId (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/10)

Notes:
- Barcode, catalogue number
- Can be the same as Name and vice-versa. State a rule about whether one or both should be filled when is the same.
- Should be unique within the collection.
- Is a hugely important piece of information.
- AG: CETAF SIs. We are asking collections to publish their id in a specific field.
- DWC triplet relevance - do we need the collection code as well?
- identifier for retrieval
- Is a good example of an area where MIDS should provide guidance to the future.
- UUID good for new specimens when you don't know where they might be deposited.
- Linking between identifiers
- DP: Working with an institute to get a set of preassigned identifiers, eg Smithsonian.

10. Institution (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/11)

Notes:
- Two part element: Institution code + ROR Grid etc.
- Multiple authority options
- WA: Encourage the use of a resolvable identifier rather than a code
- We could state a preference to which part is more important
- For institutes that have more than one code?
- WA: Naturalis have a lot of codes in use, eg for the Wageningen, Leiden collections, etc.
- May be difference in advice for newly collected specimens and legacy
-

4)   Any other business

Notes:
- ...

Saved chat:

END.

MIDS TG Meeting 3, 4th February 2021

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg
Anke Penzlin, Senckenberg
Mathias Dillen, Meise Botanic Garden, mathias.dillen@plantentuinmeise.be
Eirik Rindal, University of Oslo, eirik.rindal@nhm.uio.no
Patricia Mergen (Meise Botanic Garden and Royal Museum for Central Africa)
Patricia.Mergen@plantentuinmeise.be
Tina Loo (Naturalis)
Niels Raes (Naturalis/NLBIF), niels.raes@naturalis.nl
Karin Wiltschke (NHMW Vienna, Austria, karin.wiltschke@nhm-wien.ac.at
Josh Humphries (NHM London), j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Gabi Droege, Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum Berlin, g.droege@bgbm.org
Chris Hunter (chris@gigasciencejournal.com) (Sorry I was abit late!)

Agenda (add meeting notes in-line)

1)   **Introduction**

1. New meeting time – half hour earlier from next month, 4th March UTC 14:30
2. GitHub developments – issue labels, status, working procedure
   (https://github.com/tdwg/mids#tg-way-of-working).
3. Reminder of the work – discussion and agreement of MIDS-1 information elements
4. Short report from CETAF Digitization working group, 1st February 2021

Notes:

- Agenda reconfirmed
- Review of GitHub repo structure, focussing on issues, issue structure and labels
- Question about naming of the elements, particularly in the context of existing DWC and ABCD terminology.
  - Should we create new names?
  - CD group are using the DWC term by default
  - Need to consider the alignment work between DWC and ABCD
  - There could be risk in providing additional mapping that is not reflected in the Alignment group
  - Alignment of definitions also has to be considered
- Elspeth reports on progress in CETAF Digitization group:
  - Proposal from WG concerning term title in MIDS1
  - Notes:
    https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eIwPbREbQfjafZAALC4NRcXMZj2ploYZWoNdIbS-SY0/edit#heading=h.95x8ffwkr1c3
- Distinction of tasks for TDWG/CETAF WGs: TDWG defines specification, while CETAF WG focuses on practicality of TDWG WG (in terms of implementation)

Meeting notes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/19ET0p6641ZNzNQG4qNs_jje0LokoKJ9Ls5bhFdUw184/edit

2)   Decision needed

1. RecordCreator (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/13) – decision to remove from MIDS.
2. CreatedOn (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/7) – decision to remove from MIDS.
3. ModifiedOn (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/8) – decision to retain in MIDS and rename to 'Modified'.

Comment: The 3 elements were discussed at Meeting 2, with the conclusion that of the 3, only the date modified is useful publicly.

Notes:

- RecordCreator
  - Internal need vs external use including machine readable and automated access
  - Data should be usable by both humans and machines and vision of DiSSCo is to create a virtual collection in the cloud - mechanism for this is digital specimens
  - There will be information held about the creation of the digital specimen in DiSSCo but this may be different from the information held about the digitisation event within the institute
- CreatedOn
  - If this element is being seen as important for DiSSCo then it would potentially be a required for MIDS-1
  - The definition of the creation date is unclear at present - should we specify a definition and risk institutes making up a date? Is this an issue?
  - DWC does not support this property
- ModifiedOn
  -

Distinction being made between MIDS as a specification for digitisation rather than the digital object infrastructure at this stage.

DECISION

Drop RecordCreator and CreatedOn - with the view that this will come into the DiSSCo Digital Specimen specification in the future.

3)   Decision needed

4. Name (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/12) – decision to split into new elements Title (MIDS-1, MIDS-2) and Name (MIDS-2).

Comment: Meeting 2 agreed to change the title of this info element from ScientificName to Name to generalise it (Issue https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/6 refers). At the CETAF Digitisation WG meeting, 1st February discussion concluded with the proposal that different information is needed at MIDS-1 than at MIDS-2. Proposal is to split this information element into 'Title' at MIDS-1, akin to the Dublin Core Title term (dcmi:title) indicating what has been digitized, and 'Name' at MIDS-2, being connected to a classification of the object. Values for these two information elements can be the same or different.

Notes:

- Mapping issues to DWC and ABCD?
  - Title is not a term in DWC
  - Could be mapped to a group of terms in DWC and ABCD
- How would we share the data on GBIF and GeoCASE
- Name is often used to help find the physical object
- How frequently do objects have no name at any level assigned?
  - For mixed samples, these are often assigned to a sampling event and each object allocated a name

DRAFT DECISION

Use Title[1] or Name, mapped to scientificName [2] in DWC, and fullScientificName (and adapted terms) in ABCD (and disciplines), and to title in DC. (non-binding atmospheric picture: majority prefers to use "name" in MIDS as a label)

4)   Discussion needed (as time permits)

1. MaterialType (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14)
2. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4) – proposal for an additional/new information element necessary for certain geological specimen categories

Notes:

- We will run into issues with the insufficient DWC terminology
- If not in DWC find it in ABCD

5)   Any other business

Notes:

- ...

CHAT

---

[1] http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/title
[2] http://rs.tdwg.org/dwc/terms/scientificName

From Alex Hardisty to Everyone: 03:08 PM
http://bit.ly/tgmids-notes
https://github.com/tdwg/mids
From Me to Everyone: 03:22 PM
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eIwPbREbQfjafZAALC4NRcXMZj2ploYZWoNdIbS-SY0/edit
#heading=h.95x8ffwkr1c3
From Alex Hardisty to Everyone: 03:45 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/12
Dublin core definition of dc:title is "A name given to the resource."
From Claus Weiland to Everyone: 03:46 PM
http://purl.org/dc/terms/title
From Patricia Mergen to Everyone: 03:55 PM
in ABCD they are broken down to the different disciplines actually :
https://abcd.tdwg.org/terms/#group-Identification
See ABCD term : Stored Under Flag : This flag is set to "true" to designate the Identification under
which the entire Unit is stored (in a physical collection) or otherwise preferably referenced.
That's more or less the approach of ABCD, but indeed it was seen as too complicated by users
compared to DarwinCore .. but it allows more flexibility actually if you check all their terms and
properties
From Josh Humphries to Everyone: 04:00 PM
https://dwc.tdwg.org/terms/#dwc:scientificName
From Patricia Mergen to Everyone: 04:01 PM
you can see more on Earth Sciences here : https://geocase.eu/efg
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone: 04:02 PM
https://www.gbif.org/occurrence/2651259809
You can have specimens with no scientific name
From Me to Everyone: 04:04 PM
But that would fall into Missing Data
From Patricia Mergen to Everyone: 04:07 PM
For ABCD, the name is in the Core part under Unit EarthScienceSpecimen
EFG is an extension to describe the specimen
MineralSpecimen is also in ABCD
From Patricia Mergen to Everyone: 04:15 PM
Name sounds good and you can than map it to any apprioate name in ABCD or Darwin Core
From Chris Hunter to Everyone: 04:16 PM
"object identifier"?
From Me to Everyone: 04:17 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/14
From Josh Humphries to Everyone: 04:18 PM
I think using "identifier" implies a PID of some kind too heavily for general use
From Alex Hardisty to Everyone: 04:18 PM
And https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5 for materialtype
From Patricia Mergen to Everyone: 04:24 PM
in ABCD was aligned with Darwin Core see Record Basis : A standard designator for the nature of
the object of the record.
ABCD has also in Specimen Unit : Preservation : A description of the preservation of a specimen.
+ Preservation Type, + properties linking to preservation
From Mathias Dillen to Everyone: 04:25 PM
https://github.com/tdwg/attribution/issues/32
In the agent attribution extension repo there was some discussion on prepared vs preserved as
different specimen properties.

ENDOFCHAT.

Participants:
Please add your name, affiliation and email to the list below.

Alex Hardisty (co-convenor), Cardiff University, hardistyar@cardiff.ac.uk
Elspeth Haston (co-convenor), Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh, ehaston@rbge.org.uk
Chris Hunter, GigaDB, chris@gigasciencejournal.com
Annie Simpson, U.S. Geological Survey, asimpson@usgs.gov
Maarten Trekels, Meise Botanic Garden, maarten.trekels@plantentuinmeise.be
Gabi Droege, Botanic Garden and Botanical Museum Berlin, g.droege@bgbm.org
Patricia Mergen; Meise Botanic Garden , Royal Museum for Central Africa, Patricia.
Mergen@plantentuinmeise.be
Josh Humphries; Natural History Museum, London. j.humphries@nhm.ac.uk
Claus Weiland, Senckenberg, cweiland@senckenberg.de
Deb Paul, TDWG Chair, U Illinois
Wouter Addink, Naturalis

Agenda
1. Introduction
    1. Reminder of the work
    2. GitHub orientation
    3. Short report from CETAF Digitization working group
    4. Others introductory matters
2. Review of MIDS level 1 information elements
    (Table 2 in the current draft:
    https://github.com/tdwg/mids/blob/working-draft/current-draft/MIDS-definition-v0.12-03Nov2020.md)
    1. General discussion
    2. Specific issues

        i. CreatedOn (Issue https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/1)

        ii. MaterialType (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5)

        iii. ScientificName (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/6)

    3. Additional/new information elements

        i. Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4)

3. AoB and date/time of next meeting

Notes

Introduction
- Meeting on monthly basis (1st week every month on Thursday)

- Align with CETAF digitization group (CDG, Elspeth heads this group), synchronize meetings
- Elspeth reports on CDG: Assessment of user stories, use cases and MIDS technical draft. Test case: Analyzing data flow based on GBIF data. Idea: Expand standard based on TG discussion..

    Important to link up with CETAF Earth Sciences group, they are active in the CETAF digitization working group. Reminder mail sent to them and Rachel Walcot contacted. They confirmed they will participate in future. Add laura.tilley@cetaf.org to the mailing list.

    Report to management, to funding bodies, https://bdj.pensoft.net/article/58310/

Reminder of the work

GitHub orientation

Short report from CETAF Digitization working group (Mergen and Hasten)
-

Others introductory matters
- Deb Paul (U. Illinois, chair of TDWG) welcomed group
-

Review of MIDS level 1 information elements
- 8 elements so far
-

General discussion

Specific issues

- CreatedOn (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/1)
- MaterialType (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/5)
- ScientificName (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/6)

Additional/new information elements
- Mass (https://github.com/tdwg/mids/issues/4)

AoB and date/time of next meeting