

OBO Operations Meeting PUBLIC Rolling Agenda (2024-)

(Zoom: see calendar invite)

This document is **world readable**. For **write** access, sign in to the same account you use for the OBO Operations Google Group (<https://groups.google.com/g/o-bo-operations-committee>)

Important Documents

- [Instructions for Meeting Chairs](#) Please read before chairing a call
- [OBO Operations Standard Operating Procedures](#)
 - [Onboarding new OBO Operations Committee members](#)
- [OBO Operations Members and Duty Rotation](#)

Older (2023-2024) meeting notes:

[ARCHIVE: 2023-2024 OO Operations agenda/minutes \(PUBLICLY READABLE\)](#)

Chairs for Upcoming Calls

2023

(Note: 2023 agenda/meeting notes are here:

[2023 OO Operations agenda/minutes \(PUBLICLY READABLE\)](#))

- (Jan 3: RO meeting)
- Jan 10: Nomi (switch to [new public minutes doc](#) (this doc))
- Jan 24: Alex
- Feb 07: Bill D.
- Feb 21: Hande
- Mar 07: Jim
- Mar 21: Darren
- Apr 4: Jie
- Apr 18: Lynn
- May 2: Bjoern
- May 16: Deepak
- May 30: Nicole
- June 13: Ray
- June 27: Nomi
- July 11: Jim
- July 25: Damion
- Aug 8: Alex
- Aug 22: Hande
- Sep 5: Jie
- Sep 19: Shawn

- Oct 3: Nico
- Oct 17: Bill H.
- Oct 31: Nomi
- Nov 14: Deepak (make 2024 list)
- Nov 28: ~~Mathias~~ **Bill D**
- Dec 12 (last meeting of 2023): Jie

2024

- Jan 9, 2024: Darren
- Jan 23, 2024: Lynn
- Feb 6, 2024: Paul
- Feb 20, 2024: Hande
- Mar 5, 2024: Nico
- Mar 19, 2024: Jim
- April 2, 2024: Hande
- April 16, 2024: Nicole
- April 30, 2024: Nomi
- May 14, 2024: Anita
- May 28, 2024: Ray
- June 11, 2024: Deepak
- June 25, 2024: Shawn
- July 09, 2024: Damion
- July 23, 2024: Alex
- Aug 06, 2024: Jie/Alex
- Aug 20, 2024: Bjoern
- Sept 03: Bill Duncan
- Sept 17: Bill Hogan
- Oct 1: Nicole Vasilevsky
- Oct 15: Cancel due to GO consortium meeting
- Oct 29: James Stevenson
- Nov 12: Bjoern - *Bjoern to give an update from COB workshop*
- Nov 26: Nomi
- Dec 10 (last meeting of 2024): Hande McGinty

2025

- Jan 07, **2025**: Shawn
- Jan 21: Damion
- Feb 04: Jie
- Feb 18: Lynn
- March 4: Alex Diehl
- March 18: Deepak
- April 1: Ray
- April 15: NICO (forced into it)

- April 29: Jim
- May 13: Jie
- May 27: Shawn
- June 10: Bjoern
- June 24: Sebastian
- July 8: Hande
- July 22: Bill H.
- Aug 5: Alex
- Aug 19: Nomi
- Sept 2: Lynn
- Sept 16: Paul
- Sept 30: Hande
- October 14: Jie
- October 28: Deepak
- November 11: Cancelled
- November 25: (holiday?) - US Thanksgiving week
- December 9:
- (December 23: holiday)

Chairs may wish to quickly review our [Standard Operating Procedures](#) before the call, including SOPs for [Chairing the Operations Call](#).

2025-09-30

Chair: Hande

Attending: Darren, Lynn, James S., Nicole, Sebastian, Alex, Nomi, Deepak, Jie, Jim B, James O., Bill H.

Apologies: Damion (holiday), Paul

Agenda:

- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - EMPTY ([#2753](#)) Submitter action needed, last update weeks ago
 - Submitter asked for a couple more weeks.
 - RTO ([#2683](#)) Submitter action needed, last update 1 month ago
 - No answer from submitter
 - Check in again next meeting
 - PBPKO ([#2563](#)) New update from submitter
 - Alexander will get back after reviewing the last modifications
 - ([#2766](#)) Not sure yet if it will be a new ontology request, ongoing discussion with submitter and Nico
 - Alex Diehl had another request from a different person
 - Jie - in the past this is handled with a separate file, but we are not sure if there is a rule/regulation around this or a standardized approach we have for now; using Robot templates in the workflow has worked previously

- Lynn -
 - For those wishing to contribute translations, they should contact the ontology owners to provide alternative labels for different languages, to define their collaboration
 - Precedence so far is that the ontology owners/maintainers are involved in the process of translation of labels efforts
 - Create an international version of the ontology and then allow then work with collaborators to incorporate this version with the main file
 - Make file brings together the separate language files with the edit file to create the final version that has multiple language labels.
 - Hande - With bulk translations getting easier should we try and set up guidelines/policy around translations?
 - Maybe there is a need for a policy, can lessons learned provide a base line?
 - For those who are interested, please contribute to the GitHub issue and we can discuss more next time.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Continued work on Guidelines pages (to be discussed below)
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James S)
 - Update broken link in OBO resources page ([#2768](#))
 - Somebody needs to approve the pull request – no rush
- ‘Guidelines’ pages discussions (Darren):
 - update needed: referring to taxa not in NCBITaxon ([#434](#))
 - From Damion: FoodOn adopts NCBITaxon wherever possible, we now have need for many plant cultivars that are at **sub-species** level and no NCBITaxon IDs exists for them. We...use WikiData to reuse or add cultivars/varietyals, and use wikidata URI's directly. <snip>Getting new entries into WikiData turned out to be pretty easy.
 - Should we recommend WikiData going forward to teams who have similar problems?
 - James O. - we have a long list of transgenic mice that NCBI won't add, it is a good idea to link to other things like WikiData, but there may be other problems due to axiom injections; Updating NCBI Taxon with WikiData may be problematic too ; WikiData is probably a good idea but may need further discussion
 - Other taxonomy resources:
 - International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV)
 - Conclusion: Leave off guidelines for now
 - imports: recommend against full ontology import if not needed? (no issue)
 - DN: We have the tooling to handle this (OntoFox, ROBOT)
 - Alex: in favor of editorial freedom; shouldn't make any recommendations one way or other.
 - Hande: I think this recommendation may create more confusion than guidance
 - Jie: has concern about full imports since these will import imported terms

- James: I think this is a good recommendation: You shouldn't import a full ontology into your OBO project unless you know you need to. There's handful of exceptions, which are small ontologies designed to be imported whole: COB, OMO, BFO, RO core.
 - What if we added some mini-guidance along the lines of 'this is something to work towards if resources permit'?
 - Would need to be specific about what 'if not needed'
 - **ACTION:** DN to create a ticket: **DONE**
<https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/issues/2769>
- imports: recommend imported terms always be drawn from the original 'defining' ontologies? (no issue)
 - Problems may arise when an imported ontology itself contains terms imported from another ontology
 - Alex D: when people don't understand imports well enough, this may be a problem
 - James O: I agree with this one too: It's a good idea to import a term from the source ontology that defines it. Otherwise it's easy to get multiple versions of a term, causing all sorts of problems.
 - Axiom injection issue may be related to this
 - Jim B : There was a time before base files when ontologies were accidentally importing their own terms - Chris called it "ontology autophagy"
 - Jie: There is a paper around this too:
<https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2025.08.18.670933v1.full.pdf>
 - Jie: OBO Foundry reference ontologies may contain terms referencing external ontologies. For example, the CL ontology uses GO, PRO, and UBERON to define a cell by specifying its function, expressed protein on the membrane and the anatomical structure to which it belongs. Using the OntoDog and OntoFox option 3 approach to extract a subset of an ontology may result in inclusion of terms defined in external ontologies. For terms in the source ontology imported from external ontologies, both textual and logical definitions in the retrieved subset were removed to avoid possible conflicts as they may have diverged from the original definitions. Terms of interest from the same source ontology were combined and retrieved together. NOTE FROM DN: I think removing the textual definition is a reasonable way to minimize potential clashes, but I see that the recommendation of Principle 1 for term import says to "include any annotations for term or definition editors from the original ontology". Perhaps this implies that definition import is expected?
 - **ACTION:** will add this recommendation to the Guidance page. Will need to address the practice of omitting text definitions and/or logical definitions.
- **TABLED** imports: recommend that imported terms be tagged with the ontology from which they were directly imported? (no issue)
 - Terms can be imported from the 'source' ontology or a third party ontology
 - **P1** says 'imported from' (<IAO:0000412>) should be used "to link back to the group (i.e. ontology) maintaining it"
 - Which method would provide the most benefit to iend users? To term re-users?

- **TABLED** imports: standardize how imported ontologies are noted ([#424](#))
 - For individual terms there is 'imported from' ([IAO:0000412](#)), recommended as part of [P1](#). (Note: the above discussion might change what is said there.)
 - Question for this meeting: regardless of how it could be indicated (for example, using a yet-to-be-minted metadata tag such as 'imports' or 'has import'--not to be confused with the directive 'owl:imports'), do we want to make a recommendation to this effect? The context is within an already-merged ontology (which would not have any import statements).
- **TABLED** subsets documentation ([#466](#))
- Review additional [open issues](#)
- Other items to discuss:
 - Website, OBO Dashboard, last update was August
 - <https://dashboard.obofoundry.org/dashboard/index.html>
 - Manual step needs to be performed by Nico, James S will ping Nico to clarify about this
 - Lynn had updates that she was hoping to see updated on the dashboard
 -
 - Still working on a draft for the paper, will need at least another month before we can share a draft (Hande)

2025-09-16

Chair: Paul

Attending: James S., Lynn, Darren, Sebastian, Deepak, Jie, Anita, James O., Alex, Nomi

Apologies: Jim, Nicole

Agenda:

- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - EMPTY ([#2753](#)) Submitter action needed, last update weeks ago
 - Ask update from submitter
 - RTO ([#2683](#)) Submitter action needed, last update 1 month ago
 - Ask update from submitter
 - PBPKO ([#2563](#)) New update from submitter
 - Alexander will get back after reviewing the last modifications
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - More 'guidelines' work; see discussions below for this weeks topics
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James S)
 - Nothing this week
- 'Guidelines' pages discussions (Darren):
 - Exemplar classes ([#899](#))

- This is so that users will have a better(?) idea of what's in a particular ontology, a way to highlight, for example, very important classes. Comments are mostly in favor of being able to show these, but there doesn't seem to be much enthusiasm for implementing ("low priority" etc). Should we close with "Won't do"?
 - Decision taken to close the issue, Darren will do.
- Ontology root term annotation (#2149)
 - This would allow ontology browsers to hide certain upper-level ontology terms that are outside the scope of the ontology in question. So far, this is definitely implemented in OLS. Doesn't seem to be used by Ontobee or BioPortal at this time. To discuss: does anchoring in COB reduce/remove the need for this?
 - A: Not really. Can still be useful.
 - Straw man text:
 - Some ontology browsers make use of an ontology-wide annotation property, 'has ontology root term' (IAO:0000700), that governs how the hierarchy is displayed. This helps shield users from having to navigate through not-specific-enough parent terms (such as BFO:0000040 "material entity"). To enable this feature, an ontology SHOULD specify one or more appropriate root terms like so:
 - OWL format:

```
<obo:IAO_0000700 rdf:resource="http://purl.obolibrary.org/obo/*root term ID*" />
```
 - OBO format:

```
property_value: IAO:0000700 *root term ID*
```
 - DECISION: Include in guidelines
- Minimal ontology-level metadata fields (#1365)
 - This would specify the recommendations and requirements for ontology metadata (as opposed to term metadata)
 - Would like to see which we have consensus for so that a page can be created.
 - See table:
 - ☰ OBO Foundry minimal and recommended ontology-level metadata (2024)
 - DECISION: leave Optional field off from the table. Discussion to be continued about the use of dcterm:date.
 - 2 tables: 1 with must and recommended, the other with other potential fields (including those NOT to use) with guidelines indicated (would include the list items given in the file, below the table)
 - James: push for recommended format for optional field (ex. ORCID for creator/contributor).
- Review additional [open issues](#)
- Other items to discuss:
 - OBO Dashboard: when do the results propagate to the website?
 - Anita: should be immediately (range of minutes)
 - Dashboard on site is updated 1x/month, update takes a lot of resource/time (more than a day)

2025-09-02

Chair: Lynn

Attending: James S., Sebastian, Darren, Nicole, Hande, James O., Leila, Alex,

Apologies: Damion, Jie

Agenda:

- Quorum for meeting: in SOPs - there is no quorum requirement.
- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- Review [new ontology requests](#) - no updates yet this week
- Dashboard update: <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/obo-nor.github.io/pull/179>
 - Check your report - DO http vs https
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - More 'guidelines' work; see discussions below for this weeks topics
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James S)
 - Make it official? <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/pull/2763>
 - Darren - merging
- 'Guidelines' pages discussions (Darren):
 - Re: language tags, the following has been proposed and need ratification (see [#479](#)):
 - For **rdfs:label** and **IAO:0000115** annotation assertions, we discourage the use of datatype declarations such as ``xsd:string``. It is important to note that ``xsd:string`` is essentially redundant in OWL/RDF, so "assay" and "assay"^^xsd:string should be the exact same thing. However, a lot of tooling may be confused by the difference, xsd:string datatype assertion SHOULD be omitted in general for all annotations, but MUST be omitted for rdfs:label and IAO:0000115.
 - Q: Is there an easy way to identify these to evaluate the scope?
 - Q: Do current tools (Protege, ODK, etc) support this?
 - - To designate rdfs:label, and IAO:0000115 annotations in a language different from English, a [valid RDF language tag](<https://www.w3.org/TR/rdf11-concepts/#section-Graph-Literal>) MUST be specified, for example, "Krankheit"@de.
 - - rdfs:label and IAO:0000115 annotation assertions for English content MAY be annotated with an English language tag. If the ontology chooses not to use language tags, a **protege:defaultLanguage assertion** MUST be added as an ontology annotation.
 - Q: Is there an easy way to determine if the use of defaultLanguage is widespread?
 - Should we suggest/enforce consistency for **short ontology descriptions** on the main OBO Foundry page? See [#1968](#)
 - No real support for the idea that this is a problem; However, going forward, no objections to this as a SHOULD.
 - Add guidance for new ontologies to utilize a common format. This would appear on the YAML template https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/blob/master/.github/ISSUE_TEMPLATE/new-ontology.yml

- **Next step:**
 - Evaluation of ontologies that have been translated, do they fit this criteria, have things changed ? How does this impact this plan?
 - James:
 - Good summary, perhaps a few technical items to change
 - OWL, RDF representations, 2 versions, 1.0 and 1.1:
 - in RDF 1.0 there is a distinction between plain literal and xsd:string; OWL specification is given in RDF 1.0, and that's what the OWL API uses.
 - Best practice: utilize language tags
 -
 - **Next steps:**
 - 2 ways this can be checked, OntoBee, check via SPARQL queries, or OBO Dashboard
 - Measure the usage of these things
 -
 - [Darren]: Post this summary as a comment on this thread – along with the questions
 - The defaultLanguage idea is not the best way to do this
- Review additional [open issues](#)
 - <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/issues/2753>
 - Experimental Measurements, Purposes, and Treatments ontology #2753
 - Waiting on updates from submitter
 - and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”
 - No requests currently
- Other items to discuss:
 - ??

2025-08-19

Chair: Nomi

Attending: Darren, James S., Paul, Jim, Shawn, Anita, Alex, Hande, Jie, Bill H

Apologies:

Agenda:

- [Fireflies.ai](#) notetaker started by Vinicius is joining calls that he's not on; Nomi kicked it out
- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- [ICBO 2025](#) main conference submission deadline extended to Aug 31
- Review new ontology requests
 - [EMPTY \(Experimental Measurements, Purposes, and Treatments ontologY\)](#):
 - Bjoern reviewed it and recommends NOT accepting it. “there is massive overlap in scope for the whole ontology - but the ontology just chooses to ignore all prior work, so it does not show up in the technical tests.”
 - The ontology author responded yesterday; we'll see what Bjoern says

- [Request for new ontology Radiation Therapy Ontology - #2683](#)
 - Awaiting submitter revisions (they said they're still working on it but should be done in a few weeks)
 - Exercise Medicine Ontology - [#2615](#)
 - What is the status of this?
 - Accepted; closed issue
 - Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling ontology (pbpko) - [#2563](#)
 - Alex said 3 weeks ago "I hope to finish [my review] this week" but he didn't end up getting to it. He will do it soon.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Continued working on pages with little guidelines that don't rise to the level of Principles (see below)
 - Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James O?)
 - TWG lacks a permanent lead at the moment. James O facilitated it one time. TWG needs a lead. James S hasn't volunteered previously because he has a conflict for this slot most weeks. Nomi suggested that maybe the TWG lead doesn't need to be present on the OBO Ops meetings and can just add a report to the meeting agenda ahead of time.
 - DECISION: James S is going to be the TWG lead 🎉
 - 'Guidelines' pages discussions (Darren):
 - We previously decided that ontologies can 'ignore NCIT', but what exactly does that mean? Minimally this means that any dashboard complaints get ignored, but anything else? Does it imply that terms in NCIT can be re-made in a different ontology?
 - Alex, Darren: We do exactly that. The definition might be based on the NCIT term, but can be modified. In such case, we linkout to the original term via skos:closematch.
 - Jie uses NCIT terms but with different parent (if necessary). Example: an NCIT term was placed under an OBI term within VO.
 - Proposal: if there is a clash with (or desire to use) an NCIT term, and there is some fundamental issue (such as inadequate definition or misplaced position in the hierarchy), consider minting a new term in your own ontology (if it belongs) or making a request to another. In such cases, if the new term mostly reproduces the definition, it MUST be linked to the original term to conform to the NCIT license requirements. Note: this does not apply to reuse of term labels.
 - Let's pin down a decision on using 'term tracker item' (see [#1097](#)); it was suggested (*AND ACCEPTED*) that the target be restricted to a URL (see IAO [#175](#)). Here is the proposal being considered:
 - Terms SHOULD be linked to any pertinent discussion(s) on an issue tracker
 - it was suggested to change "discussion(s) to issue(s) or item(s)
 - The appropriate annotation property for this link is 'term tracker item' (IAO:0000233) as opposed to adding notes in a free text comment.
 - The range for 'term tracker item' SHOULD be solely an IRI, without additional text or comment (Alex asks: could this IRI be a link to a publication? A: no, use definition source for that)

- We agreed this was reasonable; Darren will work with EWG on the wording
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”
 - docs/CompletedReviews doesn't actually list any completed reviews #2747
 - Can merge PR (done)
 - Add responsibilities of TWG Liaison #2743 - <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/pull/2743>
 - James S will review
- Hande: Sept 30, will present progress on OBO Foundry paper (about how OBO Foundry ontologies have been used by/in AI). Gathering references to cite; if you have a paper that you think should be cited, email Hande.
 - Author list - Nomi will help (see [How to use the AuthorArranger tool for managing author/affiliation lists](#))
 - Add “OBO Foundry community” as a consortial author?
 - Intending to submit to *Bioinformatics*

2025-08-05

Chair: Alexander Diehl

Attending: Darren, James S., Sebastian, Deepak, Bjoern, Damion, Hande, Anita

Apologies: Jim Balhoff, Nicole Vasilevsky, Jie Zheng

Agenda:

- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- Reminder of [ICBO 2025](#) deadlines
 - Direct to Journal (JBMS) submissions, August 10
 - Main Conference submission deadline: August 17
- Review new ontology requests
 - [#2753](#) - Request for new ontology [empty] (Experimental Measurements, Purposes, and Treatments ontology)
 - Still needs a reviewer assigned; Anita will take care of this
 - Anita: Bjoern assigned as the reviewer
 - [#2683](#) - Request for new ontology Radiation Therapy Ontology
 - Still awaiting response from submitter
 - [#2615](#) - Approved, can we close the issue?
 - Awaiting merging of [metadata creation PR](#) (failing checks). Added review with necessary fixes. James S. addressed the issues with the failing check.
 - [#2563](#) - Request for new ontology pbpko
 - Still under review by Alex
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Continued work on ‘guidelines’ pages. Need to move some stalled issues forward (see below)
 - “Uncertain acceptance”
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James?)
 - James Overton not on call today

- Darren says no one is really serving as head of this group. Talk about on later call with more people present.
- For 'guidelines' pages, review issue [#482](#).
The following questions arose, along with discussion points:
 - "Every ontology SHOULD provide a [base](#)"
 - **Q:** "Base" ontology is not defined (link is dead)
 - **To discuss:** What should such an artefact be called? NS-base.format?
 - **To discuss:** Related to this, we should once and for all indicate what artefact types are expected/desired. Supposedly the 'main' release (the one indicated by NS.owl) is a full-import, already-reasoned version, but what others should/must be released?
 - "Every ontology primary release MUST be consistent and coherent"
 - **Q:** What does 'consistent' refer to here? That is, what makes an ontology 'consistent'?
 - **Q:** Presumably 'coherent' means logical coherency? As in "won't make a reasoner complain"?
 - **To discuss:** Does passing the OBO Dashboard already indicate that this requirement is satisfied?
 - **To discuss:** When assessing "coherency", which reasoner? They behave differently. Some don't handle cardinalities, for example.
 - "Every ontology MUST be coherent when classified together with RO, BFO, and COB"
 - **Q:** It is not spelled out as to what this really means: NS with RO, plus NS with BFO, plus NS with COB, each pair tested separately? Or NS with RO with BFO with COB (all four at once)?
 - Damion suggests it means (or should mean): Every ontology must be coherent when classified with RO and either COB or BFO.
 - Bjoern points out that a particular ontology may possibly cause a conflict between COB and BFO.
 - "Every ontology SHOULD be coherent when classified together with all its base-dependencies"
 - **Q:** What does "base-dependencies" mean? Import terms only? The entire ontology from which one or more imported terms derive?
 - **To discuss:** Is this already handled by the dashboard?
 - **To discuss:** If not, how to test this?
- Non-profit discussion (pushed from last meeting)
 - Bjoern: there have been no objections, will push forward with LJI after his vacation is over.
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled "attn: OFOC call"
 - docs/CompletedReviews doesn't actually list any completed reviews [#2747](#)
 - Pull request is waiting for review [#2755](#) – a check is failing, James S. checked into it and fixed it.
 - Mark CARO as obsolete [#2756](#) – a check is failing. Deepak suggested changes to fix this.

2025-07-22

Chair: Bill Hogan

Attending: Darren, Barry, Bjoern, Jie, James, Sebastian

Apologies: James Stevenson, Alex

Agenda:

- Volunteers to lead upcoming meetings
- Announcement: CTSOC and [September 17 hybrid meeting](#) (Bill H. and Barry S.)
- Review new ontology requests
 - [#2753](#) - Request for new ontology [empty]
 - NOR manager to assign reviewer (Anita)
 - James will follow up
 - [#2683](#) - Request for new ontology Radiation Therapy Ontology
 - Awaiting response from submitter
 - [#2615](#) - Approved, can we close the issue?
 - Awaiting merging of [metadata creation PR](#) (failing checks)
 - PURL file PR was created and merged already
 - [#2563](#) - Request for new ontology pbpko
 - Submitters made requested changes and pinged reviewer (Alex Diehl) for re-consideration
 - Bill will email Alex
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - All 'detail' issues have now been categorized and placed into appropriate file (DevelopmentGuidelines or StandardizationGuidelines). Next will go through to see which seem accepted, which not, and which need further discussion.
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (James)
 - Replacement for Ray as TWG liaison is pending
 - Nothing new otherwise
- Policy question (continued from previous): is it permissible to delete OBO website files that aren't in use? (see [#2748](#))
 - Keeping them helps with tracking old things, history, reference
 - Can we move them elsewhere?
 - That also breaks the URLs (as does deleting them outright)
 - Plus they're still there in the GitHub history
 - At present, no links to the pages exist on the OBO site (although there might be other pages on the Web that have them, as well as things like search engines, internet archive)
 - If we move them to an archive folder, web crawlers will still find them and link to them, and people can locate them and potentially get misinformation, and what will AI do?
 - Git has search options that enable finding old things
 - Decision: delete them, people looking for them can use Git search features
 - HOW-TO (courtesy of James O):
If you know the exact name of the file, this is pretty easy. If you are just searching for strings in the file contents, it's harder.

1. GitHub search (on this website) is the most convenient. It (mainly) searches the content of current files; all issues and PRs and their comments; the commit history and comments. It does not search all the content of all files in the history.
 - a. If you know to look for "ReviewCriteriaPolicies" then you can find various commit and issues about it, and use the normal history tools.
 - b. If you know when the file existed, you can use the commit history to go back and browse all files at that point.
 2. The `git` command line tool has more powerful ways to search the full history.
 - a. You can search the full content of all files in the history with `git grep <regexp> $(git rev-list --all)`
 - b. You can search the commit history with `git log -SReviewCriteria` or variations on `git log ... | grep ...`
 - c. If you know when the file existed, you can checkout that commit and search files as normal.
- Review additional open issues and pull requests that are labeled "attn: OFOC call"
 - [#2747](#) - docs/CompletedReviews doesn't actually list any completed reviews
 - This issue is related to previous agenda item.
 - Non-profit
 - Plan from last time was to think about it, discuss again (consensus was that it was premature for a vote)
 - Bjoern got no feedback, so there has been no pushback
 - Alternatives were discussed
 - Given low attendance today, pushed to next meeting
 - Ideally, we would give Bjoern vote of confidence to go forward or someone else steps up

2025-07-08

Chair: Hande

Attending: Bjoern, Darren, Sebastian, Bill H., Alex D., Deepak, Jim, Anita, Randi, James O., Jie, Lynn

Apologies: Nomi, James S.,

Agenda:

- Resurrecting an old issue: OBO funding through a not-for profit (Bjoern)
 - We have been discussing this for a couple of years now, here are some points that may help us remember why we have been thinking about this:
 - With having OBO as a non-profit, we'll be able to ask for money, have governance ([OBO governance](#) final report also have information on this), and ensure continuity
 - Technical work can have dedicated staff, similarly admin work might have dedicated staff with funding and resources
 - Funding landscape is changing rapidly, should we rekindle the discussion so we can continue funding long-standing members and developers who have been working on the projects

- Previous discussions suggested many follow-up items, but no concrete steps were taken
 - Bjoern: We need someone to take the lead and push this forward; he is happy to do this through his institute, but are there other options? Any other leads who are willing to take the next steps
 - Darren: reminded us of the previous discussions leading to clarifying governance efforts
 - Alex: we have a lot of good things happening at OBO, is it worth the effort? Do we have good informants to lead us in the right direction and help ensure the current good is also maintained while we are trying to achieve other goals?
 - James O. : It is an actual worry with everything changing (funding landscape, policies, etc.) how we can continue operations and projects, we need to be a bit more flexible than we have already been
 - Bjoern: What are our next steps? Do we want to have more meetings and discussions? Should Bjoern go ahead or let the higher-ups at his institute know?
 - Hande suggested we should have other meetings, but we should have a deadline for when we will stop having meetings and start taking action. We should decide on this deadline today ideally.
 - Darren: Will be important to have any 'precursor' steps overseen by someone active in these meetings so that we don't lose momentum.
 - Lynn: runs a non-profit, suggests that we should have a board for the non-profit
 - There needs to be a governance,
 - Hande: The report also outlines some suggestions and points
 - Bjoern: in 2017 the institute would have supported a non-profit but we don't know what will happen today.
 - Alex: Has there been another non-profit under LJI? Bjoern: there is nothing he knows that is comparable.
 - Lynn: offered to help Bjoern
- OBO Foundry in the age of AI presentation and discussion (Hande & Team)
 - Soheil presented [a set of slides](#)
 - Hande and team are actively looking for feedback and suggestions, ready to take the lead to make this an operations team publication in the end.
 - This is a positioning paper that talks about work created with OBO ontologies and by teams who are OBO Foundry members
 - Jie - He group has publications around tools and Hande knows other teams have publications around this too
<https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.11.25.625209v1>
-
- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- [Review new ontology requests:](#)
 - [EMPTY - Experimental Measurements, Purposes, and Treatments ontologY](#) - Reviewer needs to be assigned.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Continued work on Guidelines pages.

- Policy question: is it permissible to delete OBO website files that aren't in use? (see [#2748](#))
 - Jim: Can we use Git to ensure versioning? Jim wants them deleted, create a static version for historical preservation? Everything is in Git in case we need to recreate a historical version
 - Bjoern: Can we use a label similar to “obsolete” and keep it
 - James: The documents are wrong and misleading
 - Sebastian wanted to help avoid confusion about the documentation
 - Darren suggests that we can keep everything in an archive and mark the documents accordingly
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Paul)
 - This was not discussed, we ran out of time
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”
 - This was not discussed, we ran out of time
- term obsolescence workflows/tools in the context of transitioning to COB (James, time permitting)
 - This was not discussed, we ran out of time

2025-06-24

Chair: Sebastian

Attending: Darren, Nicole, Jie, James, Bjoern, Alex, Nomi, Hande, Bill H., Anita

Apologies: James Stevenson, Deepak, Damion

Agenda:

- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- [Review new ontology requests:](#)
 - Exercise Medicine Ontology (Sebastian)—Ready for final decision. Sebastian recommends acceptance. No objections were raised during the meeting, so EXMO was accepted. Sebastian will follow up with EXMO with next steps.
 - PBPKO (Alex)—Review is in progress.
 - RTO (Shawn)—Submitter is working on changes in response to review.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Continued work on Guidelines pages.
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Paul)
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”
 - Drafting an SOP for the Technical Working Group Liaison to the OBO Operations Committee [#2736](#)
 - Overall in agreement with Nico's list of duties for the TWG liaison; proposed some minor edits.

- Bjoern and Hande discussed offering publication co-authorship as an incentive to get students involved in TWG/broader OBO duties.
 - Sebastian tentatively volunteers to be TWG liaison if nobody more qualified volunteers within one month (2025-07-24)
 - operations.yml has the fields in an annoying order for humans [#2727](#)
 - It's worth keeping the alphanumeric checks in place
 - AI: Sebastian will review Pydantic solution proposed by James S. in that thread
 - Add info about expectations of OBO Operations members [#2588](#)
 - AI: Nomi will take a look at this issue; some of the work mentioned here may have been completed in the past year
 - Add "Onboarding Session" to the SOP for New OFOC members [#2548](#)
 - Nomi will add info on onboarding session and slide deck to the SOP. [done, <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/issues/2548>]
 - Other issues
- Bjoern proposes planning an "OBO Foundry in 2025" paper
 - Hande offers to take the lead on organizing the publication/establishing a committee to work on it in next OBO call

2025-06-10

Chair: Bjoern

Attending: Bill H., Jim ,Paul, Nomi, James, Deepak, Jim, Anita, Hande, Jie, Darren

Apologies: Sebastian

Agenda:

- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- Review new ontology requests:
 - <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/issues?q=is%3Aissue%20state%3Aopen%20label%3A%22new%20ontology%22>
 - Exercise Medicine Ontology (Sebastian)
 - Pbpko (Alex) - Follow up needed. (Bjoern emailed him)
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Worked on two files that will contain 'in the weeds' guidelines that don't fit on Principles pages due to either being too-detailed or only peripherally related.
 - Ontology Development Guidelines: e.g., "Imports should be merged into the main release file"
 - Ontology Standardization Guidelines: e.g., "Every ontology should provide a base"
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Paul)
 - Created a new [issue](#) to update the SOP of TWG liaison with this committee.
- [OBO Ops group cleanup](#) (Nomi)
 - Last time we met, we agreed on who to move to alumni (assuming they don't object, which none have done so far): see spreadsheet
 - 📄 OBO Foundry Operations Committee members (2025-05)

- PRs to move the former OBO Ops members from operations -> alumni: <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/pull/2731>, [2732](#)
- Nico will check with Pier and Vinicius about whether they want to stay active
- Google drive: now only obo-operations-committee@googlegroups.com (rather than a long list of people) has edit access, but I haven't yet removed View-only access from the whole world. Are we ready for that? When I do that, those who try to access the drive with a different address from the one they use in the google groups will not be able to see it.
 - No objections. Nomi will email obo-ops that this is happening and then do it
- Other issues (especially unassigned) that got thumbs-up votes:
 - Define if and when it is OK to inject axioms into an external ontology [#1443](#)
 - Add a metadata tag to indicate whether an ontology adopts terms or puts terms up for adoption [#2324](#)
 - Adding adoption declaration as a requirement to principle 8 (original suggestion: P3) [#2330](#)
 - Document OBO Foundry decision making processes [#2213](#) - isn't this already done? Let's check the status and consolidate the documentation
 - Define some key OBO Foundry concepts [#1448](#) - add Nico's table to FAQ? (Check whether it needs updating)
 - Hande volunteered to work on this
- AI: Nomi to shorten this meeting notes gdoc by moving 2024 notes to [archive](#) [done]

2025-05-27

Chair: Shawn

Attending: Bill H., Darren, Lynn, Sebastian, Alex, James, Damion, Bjoern, Nomi, Jim, Nico, Anita

Apologies: Jie, Paul, Nicole

Agenda:

- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- Review new ontology requests: [new ontology requests](#)
 - 3 new ontology requests, all at stage 'submitter action needed'
 - [Request for new ontology pbpko · Issue #2563 · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io](#) - submitter has updated, Alex will get on it when he can
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Fixed a formatting issue in P19 (though some lingering issue remains; being addressed)
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Paul)
 - No item
- [OBO Ops group cleanup](#) (Nomi) <- see link for notes
 - Suggestion to use OBO ops Google group to manage access to drive and calendar
 - No one opposes - we will do this
 - Nomi will email the group to give instructions on how to add other emails if needed
- OBO ops slack chat is public at the moment

- Should it be private?
- Leave it open so people can ask OBO ops members questions
- OBO ops list
 - Decision - alumni or active will be the only categories for OBO Ops members (i.e., no special “founding member” or “advisor” category)
 - email the ops mailing list that everyone who does not come to a meeting within 6 months is moved to alumni, and they can simply come to a call to be moved back
 - Nico to write, and share with Nomi to proofread it
 - For now move the non-participating-for-6-months people to alumni (can always move back)

Email draft regarding Alumni status

Dear OBO Operations Committee members!

Moving forward, OBO Operations Committee members will be separated into two groups in order to streamline duty allocations and voting processes:

1. Active OBO Operations members
2. Alumni

We want to inform you that we will move anyone who has not either attended or otherwise contributed to the biweekly Operations call within the last 6 months to "Alumni".

You will not automatically be unsubscribed from the Google group (which is used for this mailing list), but you can manage your own subscription by going to <https://groups.google.com/g/obo-operations-committee/>.

Thank you for your contributions to the OBO Foundry!

The OBO Foundry Operations Committee

2025-05-13

Chair: Jie

Attending: Alex, Sebastian, Jim, Darren, Paul, James, Anita, Shawn, Lynn, Bill H.

Apologies: Nomi, Damion

Agenda:

- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- Review new ontology requests: [new ontology requests](#)
 - 3 new ontology requests, all at stage ‘submitter action needed’

- **EXMO:** Sebastian did the second round of review; almost all the issues raised by James S. in his initial review have been fixed by EXMO. Sebastian recommended some comparatively minor changes and another attempt to move some remaining out-of-scope terms out of EXMO's namespace. Otherwise, the ontology is in pretty good shape.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - **NEWSLETTER** PR for major revision to P7 wording awaits approval **DONE**
<https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/pull/2709>
 - Updates the layout to conform to standard for principles
 - Provides clarification of requirements
 - Adds implementation details (that is, how to adhere to the principle) regarding both relation reuse and new relation creation
 - Spells out criteria for review
 - On the call, James approved the pull request, Darren merged it.
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Paul)
 - Nothing to report this time
- OBO Slack management
 - Recently, someone ("Charlie" - not Charlie Hoyt) joined the OBO Slack, installed a bulk-DM app (we have now set the permissions so people can't add apps to the Slack without approval), and private-DMed people to advertise his product. There are other apps installed: <https://app.slack.com/apps-manage/T01BAB621JR/integrations/installed>. Do any of these seem dubious?
 - Ask the Slack users to check any dubious app. AI: Alex will send a message OBO Operation mailing list.
 - #general channel restrictions (need nicolas.matentzoglu@gmail.com for this conversation)
 - Nico limited posting in #general to workspace admins
 - This type of change would benefit from OBO Ops discussion, prior to the changes being made
 - In discussion at the OBO Ops meeting today the general consensus is that we would like the "general" channel on Slack reopened to all members. While we recognize the channel has had some inappropriate posts, the scale of the problem is small, and it seems counter-productive to limit access to this channel to just a few individuals.
 - Nico has reopened the #general channel in response to our request (happened during the call).
 - Darren proposed renaming #general -> #announcements
 - Or we could make a separate #announcements channel, and leave #general (but open it)
 - Should we also have a #meetings channel?
 - Nomi suggested putting a pinned post in #general that tells people what #general is for and how to look for other channels

- We updated the description of #general to “Only for content broadly relevant to the OBO community - use more specific channels when possible”
 - Many of the people who post non-general things in #general are new LinkML community members. Maybe LinkML should have its own separate workspace? Maybe before the [ISMB CollaborationFest](#), to make it easier/less cluttered for participants to make new channels about LinkML projects?
 - There are several LinkML channels. We may let them know they should post on the LinkML channels.
- Update of the coming ICBO 2025: call for submission will be sent soon. It will be a virtual meeting. The ICBO 2025 organizational committee is considering using a different platform to publish the paper than CEUR-ws.org, such as arxiv.org. But the papers will still be peer-reviewed.

2025-04-29

Chair: Jim (late - Nomi took over)

Attending: James, Lynn, Ray, Darren, Alex, Anita, Deepak, Nicole, Sebastian, Jie, Bjoern, Nomi

Apologies: Damion

Agenda:

- Assign chairs for upcoming meetings
- Review new ontology requests: [new ontology requests](#)
 - 3 of the 4 are marked “submitter action needed”
 - PRIDE: <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/issues/2652>
 - Submitter asks, “Would you recommend closing this issue for now, or should we continue refining the ontology and addressing the remaining comments?”
 - We agreed they should close the issue but then can reopen the same issue when they’re ready for re-review
 - Reply? “Your question was discussed by the OBO Operations Committee on 2025-04-29. We will close this issue for now, in part for our own bookkeeping purposes. When ready to proceed again, please RE-OPEN this issue, rather than create a new one, so that all discussion is in one place.”
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Working on Principle #7, Relations. Redone, better.
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - Issue [#2701](#): Broken License.md link on fp-001-open.html
 - was fixed in PR [#2702](#)
 - Issue [#2703](#): Missing page in FAQ > [How do I cite the OBO Foundry?]
 - will be fixed in PR [#2704](#)
 - Member status updates in PRs [#2705](#) and [#2706](#)
- OBO Slack #general channel restrictions question (Jim)
 - discussion on who is allowed to post; seems limited to workspace admins

- Nico set that - why? This should be discussed by OBO Ops (maybe next meeting, since Nico isn't here today)
 - This type of change would benefit from OBO Ops discussion, prior to the changes being made
 - Darren proposed renaming #general -> #announcements
 - Or we could make a separate #announcements channel, and leave #general (but open it)
 - Should we also have a #meetings channel?
 - Nomi suggested putting a pinned post in #general that tells people what #general is for and how to look for other channels
 - Jim pointed out that the description of #general, "Company-wide announcements and work-based matters", is not very good
 - We changed it to "Only for content broadly relevant to the OBO community - use more specific channels when possible"
 - Many of the people who post non-general things in #general are new LinkML community members. Maybe LinkML should have its own separate workspace? Maybe before the [ISMB CollaborationFest](#), to make it easier/less cluttered for participants to make new channels about LinkML projects?
- Offboarding Bill Duncan and Chris Stoeckert
 - Removing them from the OBO Ops web page (now done) is only part of the offboarding process. That's step #1 in the offboarding SOP at the end of this doc:
 - ☰ OBO Operations Onboarding and Offboarding
 - Suggestion to use OBO ops Google group to manage access to drive and calendar; will discuss further in later (May 27) meeting
- Review of Relations principle (Darren):
 - <https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/blob/nataled-patch-2-1/principles/fp-007-relations.md>
 - Suggestion to also mention OLS in searching for existing relations
 - Suggestion that newly defined relations SHOULD have a domain and range (not MUST)
 - Jim: if so consider adding a comment that this should be done with care not to be overly specific
 - Suggestion: "MUST be submitted" instead of "MUST be added"

2025-04-15

Chair: Nico

Attending: Sebastian, Darren, Nico, Jim, Anita, Damion, Ray, Alex

Apologies: Shawn, Paul

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs [x]
- Review new ontology requests
 - RTO [Request for new ontology Radiation Therapy Ontology · Issue #2683 · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io](#)

- Shawn has given review, require submitter to clarify some stuff before any decisions can be made
 - Not discussed in meeting
 - EXMO [Issue #2615](#)
 - The ontology has been resubmitted, currently in the NOR technical review process.
 - Not discussed in meeting
 - PRIDE: reviewed, Damion can report.
 - DECISION: All present agree that PRIDE should not be accepted in its current form
 - Damion will craft a detailed response
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - (relation ontology principle discussion, see below)
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - Principle 19 on OBO Foundry page related issues and PRs (issue [#2695](#), [Update all.yml to add P19 #2698](#), [Update fp-000-summary.md to add P19 Stability #2697](#))
 - Darren: thats been taken care of, all public now
 - PR to create bmont.md [#2694](#)
 - PR to update fp-007-relations.md [#2696](#)
 - PR to update PrinciplesReviewWorkflow.md to add missing steps [#2699](#)
- **Additional discussion on Relations (Darren)**
 - See agenda item 3 from 2024-10-29 minutes
 - The pertinent part:
 - *If the domain (but not range) of the proposed relation is a class in the same ontology as the relation, it is fine to keep in the ontology--but with a RO parent (if one exists)--but only if the relation is not invertible.*
 - *If the domain (but not range) of the proposed relation is a class in the same ontology as the relation, ??it is fine to keep in the ontology??--but with a RO parent (if one exists)-- if the relation is invertible.*
 - *Bjoern's take is that both domain and range must be in the same ontology as the relation. This due to inverse relations. (James agrees)*
 - Question: how to handle cases with/without inverse relations
 - Discussion:
 - When does a proposed rel have to be in RO vs stay in a domain specific ontology
 - If domain is in ontology that is proposing rel, then it could stay...
 - ... but during that discussion it became clear that domain and range has to be contained in t
 - Nico:
 - I dont think its practical to use invertibility as a criterion.
 - This could be a good proxy:
 - domain range and must be in domain ontology
 - either domain or range MUST be in the domain ontology
 - else go to RO

- Jim: I think this (nicos comment) goes to far as a requirement.. See BSPO - neither domain nor range is in BSPO for many of the rels in there; also consider effort of getting things into RO
- Darren: I dont want to provide another rule, I wanted to clarify to provide guidance
- Its never a bad idea to put your relationship into RO
- Jim: That sounds good to me
- Darren: What are the conditions for something to be justified to stay out of RO?
 - I will make another draft
- Nico: Quick show of hands for a comprehensive bioinformatics prefix map standard ([issue](#))
- Review additional [open issues and pull requests](#)

2025-04-01

Chair: Ray

Attending: Lynn, Darren, Paul, Alex, Damion, Anita, Deepak, Jim, Nicole, Sebastian, Shawn, Nomi, James, Bill H., Jane

Apologies: Bjoern

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review new ontology requests
 - Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling ontology (pbpko) new ontology - reviewer response required - [issue #2563](#)
 - Radiation Therapy Ontology needs reviewer – [issue #2683](#)
 - Shawn Tan will do the review, however a subreviewer with an expertise in the domain is needed.
 - Proteomics Identification Ontology (PRIDE) – Damion Reviewing - [#2652#issuecomment-2666322930](#)
 - submitter action needed: Data Modality Ontology - [2678#issuecomment-2729463284](#)
 - Issue to be closed
 - submitter action needed?: Biomarker Ontology - [#2604](#)
 - submission approved
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - NEWSLETTER. Principle 19 will go live today after a two week public commenting period (no comments, only 4 indications of approval on Slack). Last chance to comment!
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - Leila's affiliation has been updated in operations.yml - [#2691](#)
 - The metadata of the Ontology of Biological Attributes (OBA) have been updated in PR [#2692](#)
- Review additional [open issues and pull requests](#)
 -

2025-03-18

Chair: Deepak

Attending: Jie, Bill H., Ray, Darren, James O., Sebastian, Paul

Apologies: Nomi, Anita, Alex, Damion (drop in!)

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - [PBPKO](#)
 - Waiting on review from Alex (nothing to report – Alex)
 - [Biomarker Ontology](#)
 - the submitter has shown interest and made efforts to address comments and concerns
 - the submitter is in contact with other ontologies (like OBCI) to work together
 - there is a commitment to redefine their relations when OBCI relations are in RO
 - Question for the OFOC:
 - can we consider the commitment as strong and thus accept the submission?
 - do we wait until OBCI relations are in RO and BMONT defines their relations according to OBCI?
 - [PRIDE](#)
 - Last comment: “Awaiting Damion’s Review”
 - [TOSO](#)
 - Waiting on submitter to modify the license annotation of the ontology to match the one in the submission form
 - [RTO](#)
 - From the last OFOC meeting: “Policy is that namespace should be in place at time of submission even if the IRI do not resolve”
 - This needs to be communicated to the submitter
 - [OLAS](#)
 - Any news from Pier Luigi Buttigieg?
 - [MODAL](#)
 - No response from submitter; Needs follow up
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Principle 19 has been approved by Operations
 - Announced on obo-discuss and OBO Slack ‘General’ channel for two week commenting period
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - Ontology metadata updates:
 - Updated contact for NCI Thesaurus OBO Edition - [PR #2684](#)
 - Updated license for the Informed Consent Ontology (in ico.md) - [PR #2688](#)
 - Update Obstetric and Neonatal Ontology metadata (in ontoneo.md) - PRs [#2686](#), [#2687](#)
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”

2025-03-04

Chair: Alex

Attending: James O., Darren, Sebastian, Anita, Jie, Bill D., Bill H., Nomi, Damion

Apologies: Paul, James Stevenson, Deepak, Leila, Bjoern, Ray

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - [MODAL](#) - No response from the submitter. I suggest waiting another week before following up.
 - [OLAS](#) - This ontology has passed the technical review. I've contacted Pier Luigi Buttigieg for the review.
 - [RTO](#) - This ontology has nearly passed the technical review. The only remaining issue is that the submitter deliberately chose not to use OBO-compliant term IRIs to avoid presuming the ontology's acceptance. This raises a question regarding Principle 3: Must submitters use OBO-compliant IRIs as a prerequisite for review, or can this be addressed after the ontology is accepted?
 - Darren says policy is that namespace should be in place at time of submission even if the IRI do not resolve.
 - [TOSO](#) - This ontology has nearly passed the technical review, just a license annotation to fix. However, I believe this submission specifically requires discussion in the meeting. As it stands, the ontology is merely an aggregation of about thirty existing ontology classes without any original terms. The submitter's stated goal, as outlined in the form (cf. "Overview of TOSO and how it will relate to other OBO ontologies"), is to develop their own terms under the guidance of the OBO Foundry. Notably, their [issue tracker](#) includes nearly 85 candidate terms for which they seek our input, which, in my view, extends well beyond the standard review process.
 - [PRIDE](#) - Last comment: "Awaiting Damion's Review"
 - [Biomarker Ontology](#)
 - Waiting on additional comments/revision from submitter
 - Darren will meet with developer on March 5 and will pass along questions
 - [PBPKO](#) - submitter provided updates, Alex - is re-reviewing
- Report from Editorial Working Group (Darren)
 - No report, as there was no meeting last week due to conflicts
- Report from Technical Working Group (Ray)
 - No report as Ray is not on the call
- Further discussion of Voting **SOP #2680**
 - Tabled until next meeting with hopefully Nico's attendance
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled "attn: OFOC call"
- Related to Principle #3 URIs: resolvability of term IRIs [#2679](#)

- Darren states that identifiers for ontology classes external to the OBO Foundry do not have to resolve, per the OBO Foundry ID policy.
- 1) OBO IRIs do not have to resolve.
- 2) Pointers to external terms do not have to resolve.
- James points out that IRI resolution is important for proper compliance with the FAIR principles.
 - This should be free for OBO purls.
- Bill, term IRI from external ontologies should not be required to resolve.
- Darren, James: we have no policy excluding use of non-OBO Foundry ontology terms.
- Darren has used UniProt IRIs in the Protein Ontology since the beginning.
- James: asking for trouble if external IRIs are used external IRI in axioms.
 - There's no such restriction right now.
 - OBO purls should resolve.
- James advocated for a strong statement about resolving
- Under all circumstances we want additional clarification about what we mean by resolve in the ID policy.
- Whatever final decision is made may require a change in the ID policy.
- The discussion remains open for now.

2025-02-18

Chair: Lynn

Attending: Darren, Sebastian, Bjoern, Deepak, Bill H, Jim, Alex, Paul, Ray, Anita, Jie, Nomi, James

Apologies: James Stevenson, Nico, Leila, Nicole

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - MODAL [#2678](#) - Paul sent updates to submitter last week
 - [PRIDE](#) - submitter responded Monday, working on the updates
 - Comments today
 - [Biomarker Ontology](#) - (Ray)
 - Comments today
 - [PBPKO](#) - submitter provided updates, Alex - is re-reviewing
- Report from Editorial Working Group
 - All comments for [P19](#) have been addressed; need new review
- Report from Technical Working Group (Ray)
 - There are no updates from the Technical Working Group at this time.
 - James: PURL server maintenance on Feb 11 went smoothly
- Voting SOP [#2680](#) (Darren)

- To define what we vote on?
 - Website?
 - Policy?
 - Asking Operations for their input:
 - What is the purview of the OBO Ops to make decisions?
 - Review of ontologies to join OBO Foundry
 - On the Ops call:
 - Decision making
 - Ops:
 - How a Principle is worded
 - Accepting/not accepting an ontology
 - Vote during call
 - Looking for consensus
 - Suggestion to then post these votes (in these minutes/GitHub)
 - In two weeks the vote is finalized (thus giving time for community feedback)
 - What needs to be addressed at the community level vote?
 - On an Ops call - discuss - does this need Community input?

Email from Bjoern in 2014, the origin of OBO operations, and initial ‘vote’ process: *“During ICBO we had several discussions on how to fix the decision making process in the OBO foundry. A fix is needed because, despite all the progress by the various working groups, some important decisions are not being made. This became clear in the OBO Foundry workshop where questions relating to establishing standard practices could not be answered.*

Right now it is not completely clear for which decision the coordinating editors should be consulted and how people who are doing more hands-on work should enforce decisions. This situation is very similar to the one the OBI project was in several years ago, in which a 'coordinating committee' made up of community representatives was making higher level decisions, while the 'developers committee' consisted of people actively contributing to the ontology. Ultimately, the problems thereby caused were resolved by merging the coordinating committee with the developers committee, which led to a much less complicated politics and faster decision times.

*We propose to do the same for the OBO foundry: Let's create a single board of members of the current Coordinating board the Operating Committee and various sub-committees (Technical, Outreach and Editorial). The new board would have regular phone calls and make decisions on policy. **Our proposal is that normally decisions should be made by consensus. If that cannot be reached, a formal vote can be asked for, which is carried out on a wiki (or some other electronic solution) where all active members can participate and decisions are made by majority.** Membership in one or more of the committees and the board would rest on active contribution to the foundry work, participating in phone calls or meetings, etc. Many of these ideas have been discussed already at operations committee meetings, and those of us here at ICBO would like to see the foundry move forward on them”.*

For a decision, let's make a decision on how widely the vote needs to be.

Q: Broadly, what should be eligible for an Ops decision?

A: Any change--website, policy, principles, new ontologies, etc.

Q: Specifically, what should be voted on?

A: Anything that attendees of a given call request. Only a single(?) person needs to make such a request. If no one thinks a vote is necessary, then no vote is needed.

Q: Should the scope of the vote (within Ops call, within Ops by GitHub, full community) be decidable by attendees of a meeting?

A: Yes.

(1) On the Ops call, decisions can be made as follows:

- (a) **1st: go for consensus**, and if all agree with an action and no one thinks that broader input is needed, we just do it. In this, people on the call should consider who is not on the call, and what their objections might be. Especially if attendance is low.
- (b) If an objection could reasonably be expected, the issue / action should be described in the minutes / on a ticket, and input gathered for decision after a waiting period of at least 2 weeks. The goal is again to reach 100% consensus
- (c) **Voting**: If no consensus can be reached, a vote is scheduled over a 4 week period, which will be decided by majority of active OBO operations members

(2) Community Vote

- (a) Licences
- (b) Non-trivial website updates
 - (i) Outward facing website, ontology representations
- (c) COB integration
- (d)

Asking the OBO Ops call:

- Is there a specified Quorum?
- Possible guidance on quorum found in [SOP](#): "Wait until approximately 8-10 people have joined. Begin no more than 4 minutes after the hour regardless of how many people are present."

Open Questions:

- What can we decide based on consensus during an Ops call.
- What goes to a community vote?
- Include in minutes for each call:
 - What was approved, and ready for 2 week review
 - What is open for community input.
 -

Issue tracker item: [SOP #2680](#) (Darren)

- [open pull requests](#)
 - DRAFT: New Principle 19 - for OBO Operations Review #[2668](#)
- [recent tracker items:](#)
 - Related to Principle #3 URIs: resolvability of term IRIs #[2679](#)
- Discussions:
 - Any plans for an OBO talk at Biocuration? (Sounds like no)

2025-02-04

Chair: Jie [may have internet issues]

Attending: Alex, Nomi, Deepak, Bjoern, Darren, Paul, Ray, James, Nico, Bill H, Damion, Ray, Leila

Apologies: James Stevenson, Hande (class overlap until end of May)

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - [Biomarker Ontology](#) - feedback from Deepak see: <https://groups.google.com/g/obo-operations-committee/c/Cgr93dzanoQ>
It is an application ontology aiming to be used in text mining.
Assigned Ray as second reviewer and focusing on ontology logic meaning.
 - [PBPKO](#) - submitter action needed, submitter replied but have not provided the updated the ontology for review yet
 - [PRIDE](#) - submitter action needed, no repose lately
- Report from Editorial Working Group
 - Progress made on P19. EWG just has one set of concerns (Nico's) to discuss and address.
- Report from Technical Working Group (Ray)
 - An update to hp.md to explicitly mention the HPO prefix - [PR #2670](#)
 - Creation of 2025-01-22-7th-issue-newsletter.md - [PR #2671](#)
 - Updates the contact for the Mass spectrometry ontology (ms.md) - [PR #2673](#)
- Need details on what decisions are brought to a vote (i.e. ops members attending a call can do it) how to announce a vote / vote duration and scope (operations or community). Need to get that in SOP. (We may have discussed this before. Darren will try to find the document.)
 - Related issue: [Drop Social column from obofoundry.org home page tabular display : Issue #2408](#)
 - Proposed to develop a second vote on whether or not to display GitHub stars:
 - https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qyh3Lq0bzTvb0eEsAuYczzrhqnbX1GCAanK_amsjh8HY/edit?tab=t.0#heading=h.fdgy0wifuvv0 setup github vote for all community
 - https://groups.google.com/g/obo-operations-committee/c/liSK7LoGrbQ/m/p-DixW8DDwAJ?utm_medium=email&utm_source=footer&pli=1

- Darren will make the vote form and Nico will do advertising, obo-discuss, obo slack, ops
- New COB Development Call (James): I just added the new COB Development Call to the OBO Foundry Google Calendar. The first meeting is Monday, February 10 at 11 AM Eastern. It repeats every four weeks. I added links to a Google Docs agenda and Zoom link. Let me know if I need to change anything. I'll announce this on OBO Discuss.
- COB paper: submit to ICBO meeting that will be held in mid November.
- Discussions:
 - **OBO in 2025 and beyond - some blue sky brainstorming**
 - Suggestion for progressing on COB mission (Nico):
 - Request a new OBO Proposal called COB-compliance or “Upper Level Alignment with COB”
 - Ship the alignment check with ROBOT and / or ODK
 - Develop a few “blocked” classes like disease/phenotype etc which do not yet have to be aligned with COB (to make it possible for disease ontologies to still have a green box)
 - Require a COB alignment through subclass of in the release file “every class in the base has to be a child of a COB class in the primary release and base release” (union of some subclasses)
 - Make this a requirement by 01.01.2026.
 - We begin to draft the OBO principle: the OBO ontologies are required to align with COB.

2025-01-21

Chair: Damion

Attending: Paul, Darren, Lynn, James, Sebastian, Jim, Ray, Nicole, Leila, Alex, Jie, Nico, Anita, Bill H

Apologies: Shawn, James Stevenson, Jane

Agenda:

- Assign Chairs
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - Nico emailed and slacked Deepak today to check for status
 - One note - allowing application ontologies in OBO Foundry has been discussed in past, and allowed. But we discussed point that if an application ontology only brings in a handful of terms on its own prefix, then should find better homes for them in foundry ontologies if possible.
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)
 - Created PR for Principle 19; currently working through suggestions.
 - Made some small progress on Principle 12 (naming) assessments
 - Corrections are fine (no obsolescence necessary). As long as intent preserved. If meaning is preserved, deprecation not necessary.
 - One case: relatively new term obsoleted because axiomatization was very problematic. OBO vs OWL differences can show up here.

- Nico: preserving referent in reality may be the fundamental crux of matter; changes in axiomatization may reflect [improved modelling] around entity but referent still meant to be preserved, avoiding overhead of deprecation and replace.
 - “Gross semantic shift” requires?
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - There are no updates from the Technical Working Group at this time.
- Review additional [open issues](#) and [pull requests](#) that are labeled “attn: OFOC call”
 - Nico: aside from usual OFOC calls, what should we be prioritizing? Vision, stretch goals. Message out to community
 - James points out need for those with different goals to take charge of them in open source dev.
- [Drop Social column from obofoundry.org home page tabular display · Issue #2408](#)
 - Make decision on ops only or public
 - Make decision on updated timeline based on above
 - Discussing history of website change, but realizing social feature not discussed as a separate decision.
 - Notes about column, to influence vote
 - Alex: trouble interpreting column, not realizing that stars not quite related to e.g. obo dashboard. Would need to advertise its pros/cons.
 - Darren: on issue of vote scope Operations vs Community? Was vote broadcast beyond operations, e.g. on slack or obo discuss? If beyond, lets redo vote q. Also vote is contentious!
 - Suggest 2 part question:
 - **When you see github repo stars do you view this as indicator of**
 - Popularity
 - Usage
 - Quality
 - All
 - None
 - **Do you think the obo website should show them?**
 - Suggest create new issue with full OBO / Slack exposure
 - Nico: was sent to slack, and everyone subscribed to OBO issues.
 - If retained, clarify its role publicly, i.e. OBO attitude about its effectiveness.
 - Allow opt-out
 -
 - Suggest
 - Darren:
 - Was decided that operations committee self-mandated decisions would be based on who was attending call. “Vote” not mentioned in SOP. Will look up.
 - Lynn: would like it more prominent. In SOP?
 - James: need details on when to discuss/ how to announce a vote / vote duration

2025-01-07

Chair: Shawn

Attending: Bill D., Nomi, Nicole, Pier, Darren, Anita, Lynn, Hande, Paul, Sebastian, Alex, Damion, Nico, Jie, Jane, Jim, Bill H., Ray

Apologies: James Stevenson

Agenda:

- HAPPY NEW YEAR :D
- Do people still have meeting invites or is it just me that's missing it now?
 - Fixed now for me :) seems to all be fixed
- Zoom link is opened
 - While mostly zoom bombing is not an issue, sometimes can be bad
 - Important to let people know
 - Take off for now to lower any risk - if complains happen we will re look at it
- Assign Chairs
- Use non-OBO PURLS ([issue 2667](#)) - Bill D wants to discuss
 - Do we allow imports of non-OBO purls (or other IRIs)?
 - There has always been ontologies with these
 - We want to ensure links and interoperability
 - We do not however maintain anything with non-OBO purls
 - We agreed that it is allowed
 - Do we allow non-resolved purls?
 - Resolution is definitely a quality metric
 - Clear documentation needed
 - We need to look at rule 3 of principles regarding imported stuff
 - Discussions on points should be placed in the ticket - will discuss this again next round
- Review [new ontology requests](#)
 - MEMON ([Request for new ontology MEMON · Issue #2661 · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io · GitHub](#))
 - Added to dashboard, seems to be ready to go for review
 - Paul will be the reviewer
 - PRIDE ([Request for new ontology \[PRIDE\] · Issue #2652 · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io · GitHub](#))
 - Submitter action needed
 - Biomarker Ontology ([Issues · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io · GitHub](#))
 - Discussion and next steps needed
 - Reviewer and/or submitter presence needed for decision
 - Nico will reach out to Deepak and from there get discussions in a call
 - PBPKO ([Issues · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io · GitHub](#))
 - Submitter action needed
- Pull requests ([Pull requests · OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io · GitHub](#))
 - A few open ones that need review
- Report from Editorial Working Group (EWG) (Darren)

- P19 ready for OFOC review:
<https://github.com/OBOFoundry/OBOFoundry.github.io/edit/nataled-patch-50/principles/p-019-term-stability.md>
- Suggest mode on PR as a method for suggesting changes etc.
- Darren to send out a mail regarding this too
- Report from Technical Working Group (TWG) (Ray)
 - A typo has been fixed in COB description PR [#2663](#).
 - JSON products have been added to the description of CL in PR [#2665](#).
- Review additional [open issues](#)
- [Drop Social column from obofoundry.org home page tabular display · Issue #2408](#)
 - Darren will make an issue for opt-out
 - Wait for results of vote before doing this though
 - For fully dropping - this needs to go to a vote
 - Reasons: will metrics be misinterpreted - popularity vs quality
 - OBO operations email to be sent out regarding the vote
 - Shawn to send an email

2023-4 meeting notes:

 **2023 OO Operations agenda/minutes (PUBLICLY READABLE)**