

Registry WG

Closing Plenary

- Markus Demleitner
- Theresa Dower



Topics

- Registry Interfaces 1.1 (PR this year)
- VOSI-capabilities vs. the Registry
- VOResource vs. DataCite
- VOResource 1.1 (PR by Shanghai)
- VO Anomalies
- SimpleDALRegExt (not discussed, ready for Exec)

Registry Interfaces 1.1

Main issue: Do we want extra records for all kinds of searchable registry?

[Background: RegTAP said “look for TAP services with RegTAP in dataModel; this will yield records titled “Cool Datacenter TAP Service”, which is Not Good for, e.g., the RofR]

Conclusion: We'll have vg:Registry-typed records, for RegTAP with aux capabilities

By the way...

The “TAP aux capability” on the last slide has a dependency on the “Discovering Data Collections” note.

Should I put that on the Endorsed Note track before DocStd 2.0 is out?

VOSI capabilities vs. the Registry

CADC has complex capability records (what endpoints with what properties are available where, in particular: with what auth?).

Should these be in CADC's Registry records in their full glory?

Central question as always: are their discovery use cases?

VOResource vs. Datacite

Datacite is the metadata schema used for getting DOIs for data.

If you want to register things that already have VOResource metadata, perhaps

- An XSL stylesheet turning VOResource to DataCite
- An XSL stylesheet turning VOResource to a DOI landing page

VOResource 1.1

Many smaller aspects discussed; main outcomes:

- Matching tables and capabilities: Will try the @tag-thing, but for now this remains a bit of a cliffhanger
- No contributorType for 1.1
- altIdentifier: splitting type out will go to the mailing list
- License URI: Will research existing URI collections for credible, sustainable offerings

VO Anomalies

These would range from disastrous (two registries claiming the same authority) to minor aesthetic defects (authorities claimed but not used).

ESAC has prepared reports (thanks!)

We hope to fix most of these until Shanghai.

See you there!