



5th meeting (online)

June 22, 2020

Attending: Iris Alfredsson, Karla Anaya-Carlsson, Michelle Barker, Rob Carrillo, Carlos Casorrán, Ieva Cesevičiūtė, Miroslav Dobrucky, Judit Fazekas-Parragh, Sonja Filipovska, Katherine Flynn (replacing Annette Fillery-Travis), Vinciane Gaillard, Vasso Kalaitzi, Iryna Kuchma, Emma Lazzeri, Dunja Legat, Natalia Manola, Ana Portugal Melo, Caterina Petrillo, Jaume Piera, Jerzy Proficz, Fotis Psomopoulos, Lennart Stoy, Anne Sunikka, Susan Trinitz, René van Horik, Angus Whyte, Vassia Diochnou, Carthage Smith, Jacco Konijin, Ignacio Blanquer, Helen Clare, Celia van Gelder.

Apologies: Vera Matser, Michael Svendsen, Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra, Annette Fillery-Travis (will be represented by Katherine Flynn), Ellin Stangeland

Rules of participation (RoP) update

- Federica Tanlongo, Jaume Piera, Natalia Manola, Iryna Kuchma - any other volunteers? - Helen Clare joined the TF
- Call on Jun 25, 2020 at 11:00 AM CEST at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87446973275?pwd=K2ITSU1CRU5xOUxGcXZCdkxLSkJSUT09>
- Task is to create stand alone RoP for training service providers - see two RoP documents in https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1aPk4GnNJUnIBKnM5j-Zaef_cCD4ZLia

Skills and competencies centers update

- [the list of organizations/networks that we want to interview](#) and [draft interview questions](#)
- [related activities in our notes document](#)
- next TF call doodle <https://doodle.com/poll/rbecxfqpwz6ng3wm>
- How far do we want to go? Universities have different competence centers e.g. some are large centrally organised/funded endeavours; others may be smaller, discipline specific and more embedded in research teams. Shall we profile a range of these to show different models? And to identify commonality of approaches?
- What will EOOSC do with the advice we give? A list of competence centers on the EOOSC portal? What's the next step and broader context?
- Competency centre work is isolated from broader digital skills agenda of countries, could interview to ask how these are connected – are they working in silos, should they be?
- Awareness raising (at different levels e.g. national) is first step, future work could be what competence centres should be etc. Awareness raising involves setting the scene on what different levels are

- RIs provide some good examples of competence centers who also work together to achieve common standards in training (especially for data). ICDI (???) might be a good starting point in Italy to find who to interview
- Need to talk to organisations who have set up similar things to competence centers to ask them what works, what doesn't, why did they make those choices, what are characteristics of underlying structure, what has been set up and which organisational structures work, what is wishful thinking. Also could ask questions about commonality/interoperability of methodologies.
- Would be useful to liaise with EOSC Nordic re their knowledge hub - Iris Alfredson is part of EOSC Nordic
- It could be possible that other EOSC WG collect information about e-infrastructure in respective countries. Landscape WG has send a survey that collects this information
- Need to finalise definition of competence centre, version in SRIA (footnote 9) <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hBdKJbxSeadC5dMNILtI6faq751TdVl43gdGQt7tHSA/edit#> needs some refinement. Also see glossary https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1rDiGYiotFzv2n2uz5oa1QthqdfCTRGOBnClctdbIFxg/edit?usp=drive_web&ouid=110728526725133567728

Actions:

- Iryna will check with Inge about the EOSC-Pillar project guidelines for competence centers for data stewards.
- Iris will check with the EOSC Nordic (Knowledge Hubs that are supposed to be online centers, not physical centers).
- Iryna will email 10 current terms from the Glossary to the EOSC Glossary team.

SRIA process

- The Executive Board is working to deliver the whole SRIA document. Our draft has been submitted. Carlos has made some comments for consideration.
- The Executive Board must deliver it to the governing board by 1 July. Work to consolidate the different parts is underway.

Catalogues TF update

- RDA has some WGs of relevance.
- Is the aim of this group creating a catalogue of training resources, a catalogue of catalogues, or a training platform? There are already some lists of available catalogues, and metadata standards that contributions are welcome to.
- There is value in EOSC at least connecting the various training catalogues already available addressing technical, semantic and quality interoperability.
- User journeys - for EOSC users and trainers - collecting use cases
- EOSC portal will have a catalogue of training materials (which you could reach via the catalogue of catalogues) - But to make that possible we need to make the current catalogues of training materials interoperable
- How to make training materials interoperable
- Are users the same as TF1 roles? For the use cases. And do we include the EOSC level use cases?
- Quality and updates of materials are a must
- Indexing training materials individually? We need a way to index catalogues and training materials
- What is the goal - build interoperability architecture or build the EOSC catalogue of training materials?
- Interoperability between catalogues is implicitly about interoperability of the training materials in the existing training catalogues because in the end the "user" is looking

- for specific training materials
- And there also needs to be some form of registry of providers that meet the RoP and the EOSC workshop in The Hague provided the first iteration of these RoP.
- Specifications for a training resources catalogue that will be built within EOSC catalogue, we are looking into technical, semantic and quality interoperability; also guidelines for training service providers who would like to be included in the catalogue. Quality will be a responsibility of the training repository (where the content sits).
- Think about ratings as well?
- Related to quality: who is going to access the quality? In the TF we discussed that it may be good to put the guarantee of the quality on the training content providers themselves. They are the experts in the training in their own field. Just provide guidelines.
- Are we measuring the quality of the source or the quality of the material?
- Training Content providers can become trusted content providers when they follow the RoP. Being a trusted provider is however different from the quality of the material. But it could be one of the indicators. E.g. timeliness. But with all the thousands training materials out there I do not think it is feasible nor desirable to put a quality stamp on it by some EOSC level entity, so the responsibility could be with the original training content providers/catalogues who are responsible for the quality of the materials in their catalogue.
- The EOSC catalogue should not be a repository but a registry. There is no need to upload materials that are spread over the EOSC ecosystem in one portal. Why should we want to do that? A user will find a DOI of the training material in the EOSC catalogue and access the training material where it sits.
- Should we also look at the industry? Curation is one of the answers here.
- Quality principles for the users/communities
- E.g. the EOSC catalogue won't include training materials older than five years
- People might go first to the EOSC portal because EOSC is the leader. Also from the sustainability point of view (when EOSC evolves). Multidisciplinarity is another driver. The central portal could have a role in supporting cross-discipline sharing of resources/practice - not sure how we'd do this but would be good to discuss!
- We should try to model different approaches. Some users may come to the central portal, some may not. That's why interoperability is so important.
- If the catalogue = the set of harvestable materials that meet interoperability requirements, then maybe it can be embedded in any domain or institution level site that can harvest that metadata?
- Not all research communities are well organized and researchers from those communities might use EOSC as the first entry point.
- Our aim is to be as inclusive as possible and make it searchable and findable.

Scoping of study

Scoping of the study will be finalized this week (make sure that it includes what we need for the skills and competences centers)

EC-driven national digital skills coalitions (operating for two years) don't include research data yet and research and academia were missing as stakeholders, e.g. in Greece - an opportunity to align our activities, establish connections in other countries, cross-sectors.

Actions:

- Natalia will share SRIA version (before it goes to the Governing Board), and finalise

the scoping study terms of reference.

- TF1 will finalize the diagramme. Should we have an open consultation at the EOSC secretariat website? A webinar could be another option to solicit feedback.

Next meeting in July (TBC)