

Enabling technologies and infrastructures

to build the culture of the scholarly commons

This project is being redesigned, as it was conflating two aspects of the overall work of WG4. Much of the what is currently written here will be subsumed into the topics project. But there is something here that will remain that will serve as a high-level synthesis of all that we will be doing in this group, so stay tuned. ;-) [CC]

Update 2019-09-03: the topics project is being subsumed into a more general research plan. See [the research plan document](#) for more information.

This is a place to list (and analyze?) technical efforts, early-stage or well underway, that could support scholarly commoning. The idea here is not as much to catalog existing tools that could be manually pieced together into ad hoc workflows, but efforts that could contribute to a cohesive, coordinated future system of research communications.

This initiative is to support the ongoing work of [Working Group 4](#) of the [Scholarly Commons Working Group](#) of FORCE11, of finding or creating working technical implementations based specifically around the principles of the scholarly commons. With this goal in mind, part of what we need to do is simply to take an idea and try it out. In many cases, we won't know how well it will work until we try it out, allowing the time necessary to see what happens and how it affects things. At any given point in time, we'll likely have conflicting ideas at the table, which is okay as long as we can openly talk through them together to find out where the conflict is and what could be done to reconcile differences. There may be many different approaches that we find are actually complementary, even though we may not see the connection at first.

These ideas will be tested for fitness against the rubric of culture that is being developed as part of the topics work.

We will discuss these technologies and infrastructures deeply, including testing those approaches that seem most promising or that may help inform and drive the [scenarios](#) and [questions](#) that we are developing in this group.

Analytical characteristics

- Related [scenarios](#): [1, 2, 3, ...]
- Related [questions](#): [1a, 2b, 2a, ...]
- Challenges: [adoption, ...]
- Project leads: [Ivar Martin, ...]
- Orientation: *vertical, horizontal, both*

- Sustainability: *self, grants, ...*
- [Paradigmatic context](#): *institutional journal article co-op, anarchist's cryptohaven, ...*
- ...

Technical ideas and efforts

{Ivar} known.org: a mix of Wikipedia (open part) and collaborative tool (private part), with a simple algo for reputation (similar to Stack Exchange). The reputation of contributors can obviate the need for external pub reference that Wiki relies upon. The collaborative projects (networks of “knowledge nodes”) can over time enrich the public graph.

Related scenarios: 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20

Challenges: broad adoption :) , hack-proofing reputation (blockchain?), multifaceted reputation
