Title	Minutes Centre Committee 16 October 2015
Version	2
Author(s)	HW
Date	2015-12-07
Status	Final
Distribution	Centre Committee
ID	CE-2015-0650

Participants

Krista Liin (EE), Lene Offersgaard (DK), Marcin Pol (PL), Dirk Goldhahn (DE), Andrius Utka (LT), Martin Matthiesen (FI), Jan Hajič (CZ), Oliver Schonefeld (DE), Leif-Jöran Olsson (CLARIN ERIC), Juli Bakaginni (GR), Matej Durco (AT), Francesca Frontini (IT), Daan Broeder (NL), Twan Goosen (CLARIN ERIC), Dieter Van Uytvanck (CLARIN ERIC, Chair), Hetty Winkel (CLARIN ERIC, minutes)

0   Action points

#	Action	By whom	By when

1   Agenda

The following agenda was accepted:

1. Agenda
2. Approval minutes last meeting & action point status (CE-2015-0644)
3. Report from the assessment committee (Lene)
4. Preparing an A-service assessment procedure (CE-2014-0401 version 4, draft for procedure : CE-2015-0640) Dieter
5. Reports from the task forces (Task force coordinators)
    1. CMDI
    2. Metadata curation
    3. Federated Content Search
    4. AAI

6. Status update per country/member
7. Any other business

First a brief round of introduction, since we have new members in our midst; representatives from Italy and Greece. Both countries still have to decide who will be the official member for this (and other) committees. The CLARIN ERIC office will contact the national coordinator.

2 Approval minutes and action points

Approval of the minutes of the last meeting (CE-2015-0644). Updates from Lithuania and Poland updates are missing, and will be sent to CLARIN ERIC office (Hetty) to be included. Minutes of these meetings are made public.

3 Report from the assessment committee (Lene)

The committee had a meeting this morning, and discussed the last round of B centres assessment. The aim is to develop a more automatic checking procedure, and also being more transparent. The centres can they do it themselves, before applying. A small change in the assessment form is that all centres will be asked to give a description of what they are providing. Up to now, this was not really clear. The URLs in the check list need to be updated [done].

November 19 is the deadline for the B centres assessment; so they can report on the centre meeting in mid-December. The A centre assessment is a special point on the agenda. The committee decided to decouple this from the B centre assessment round.

The committee would like to have two new members on board to deal with the growing amount of work. The update of the B centre checklist will be ready by the end of October [done].

What about the automatic checks? Will these take place at regular intervals? The committee would like to get feedback from the different task forces. The check would be two levels: a very basic check, e.g. as a OAI plugin, and more in depth tests, e.g. about metadata quality. Then it would be nice to have dashboard, where the centres can find more detailed information, but this will take a bit more time. Lene stresses that the committee wants to integrate this work as much as possible with the work of the task forces.

4 Preparing an A-service assessment procedure

Preparation of the A service assessment procedure is underway, see CE-2015-0401, version 4, and CE-2015-0640. This list was also discussed at the assessment committee meeting, and is was agreed to take this as the basis for a first pilot of A Service assessment, to see how it works and maybe also improve the text. The procedure is to solicit centres to apply for A status, run the assessment, and then before the next B centre assessment round, the committee has time to decide on the applications. Dieter explains the different criteria have been set up, and asks if there any centres who would like to participate in this pilot.
LINDAT would like to submit the LRT inventory, but will first have to discuss what it means to replicate it. Daan: maybe later. Dieter: CLARIN ERIC could offer A services, maybe three could go into this pilot. Matej: is there an idea where it would be reproduced? The idea is, that the people who assess, also have to set up the technical procedure to do the testing. It should be easy to reproduce. Matej volunteers to set up mirror services, in case the committee cannot do it.

Martin: although Finland is still no member (but hope to join soon), CSC considers offering REMS. Even so, they can opt to become an A centre.

Summarize: LRT inventory, REMS from CSC, centralized CE service which has been dockerized; this makes three pilots to start with.

5 Reports from the task forces

1. CMDI (Twan). Plans for CMDI 1.2 were presented in NL; progress is slightly slower than planned. Integration of the toolkit in the component registry: task is pending as work on the component registry front end is still going on. Will start early next year. Next task force meeting is Saturday at lunch time. On CLARIN Concept Registry (on behalf of Menzo): successor to ISOcat. Work has been done by the Meertens institute, based on Open SKOS, to meet the CLARIN requirements. See also the report of the CCR meeting. During the meeting there will also be a presentation and a demo from the CCR group. Daan asks if the documentation has been adapted and cleaned from ISOcat references? The CMDI has been updated, and also the FAQ has been fixed. Daan was looking at the Dutch website, and there are quite a lot of references to ISOcat there. According to Dieter most updates have been done. This will also be documented correctly in the manual to be made in CLARIN-PLUS. There may also be tools around that refer to ISOcat. Plans of linking to vocabularies? Is part of CMDI 1.2.

2. Metadata curation (Matej). Quite active in curation, with new colleagues in the institute. Outcomes: concentrate on the VLO, as metadata catalogue of CLARIN. Analyzed many issues of the VLO on different levels and there are recommendation on how to deal with them. Pressing issues: design and usability, functionalities, data, and non-technical issues. General idea would be to rework the design, to make it more in line with the CLARIN website, make it more consistent. Dieter: also a task in CLARIN PLUS. We have to be aware of the need for harmonization of design front. A tool to experiment with some of the new features is now also available. Main problem is a lot of variety in the facets of data. Proposed and tried out an approach for normalization in a collaborative matter. We need to agree on a controlled vocabulary. There are currently about 200 values for a resource type, this should be reduced. The plan is to make a curation model, and together with this an integrated application. Available both to the centre assessment committee, and to the data providers. So that after every harvest, you can get a curation report. Maybe install a metadata taskforce, and integrate it with the CLARIN-D VLO taskforce? Let's first finish CMDI 1.2, and then decide if it is a good idea to join the two task forces. Andrius asks about license categories. Matej: yes. Information on availability should be more prominent. See how LINDAT does this. Per resources type we should have a best practice, or recommended profile. One argument is the coverage of the facet in the VLO. Would be the starting point on discussion to which profiles you recommend. Jan: most useful feature they found, is the existence of data for the item. You can get inspiration from e-shop websites. The problem may be that you find too many resources. We should think about issues, as how many times resources are downloaded. Dieter; we do not own the data, so there is a limit to what we can do here. We need some guidelines how to make this visible. This is also in the document prepared by the Austrian colleagues.

3. AAI (Martin Matthiesen). Testing AAI in CZ, DK, FI, NL an EE. Would be nice to have more countries and institutions volunteering. LINDAT has done a user survey, they would like to have some traceability of user; this is addressed in the AARC project. They have been following developments in eduGAIN, but things are going slow there. Tübingen found a way to release attributes to CLARIN, which opens up the whole of Baden Württemberg. This could

be an example for other countries IDP's. AAI is part of CLARIN-PLUS, headed by Jozef Mišutka. The idea is to strengthen the SPF profile, and more clearly specify the CLARIN requirements for AAI. Would also help in approaching eduGAIN; if eduGAIN can offer what we want, we do not need SPF. See for the survey:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/17THRllM2VKuV-NDivSoJZmUDpmtAJM-nOMihnPv74JU/edit#gid=1619541889

The testing AAI link is here: https://trac.clarin.eu/wiki/ServiceProviderFederationLoginTest

4. Task force on FCS (Oliver and Leif-Jöran). Presentation of the work plan 2015. Most important part is to make more interesting data available through the search federation. Aim is to have a specification ready by the end of October; a draft, which will then be tested. Final version of the aggregator and all libraries should be ready by April 2016. Dieter suggests to organize a hackathon. Leif-Jöran will go to Prague in November, for input. And have the previews out for testing in December. The task force is interested in existing use cases they can look into, to adapt them and see if they work with the new version 2. Dieter: we need a formal approval of the work plan for FCS. Everyone agrees and the work plan (CE-2015-0629) is approved. The task force is preparing a dissemination poster, in order to get more visibility.

6   Updates per country

(also mentioning willingness to participate in the next centre assessment round)

Austria: new staff, consolidating the servers.

Finland: close to joining, also interested in becoming a B centre, can be part of the next round.

Estonia: work out on the SPF. Lots of server trouble.

NL: CLARIN work in new CLARIAH work is starting up, improving metadata is an important part of this. Centres are dynamic; question is what happens with certification after changes. Dieter: right now we do not have a continuous evaluation, but have to rely on a cyclic assessment. At the same time we are moving towards a continuous evaluation. If you encounter a problem with a (certified) centre, the first step would be to go to the Centre Committee.

Greece: want to be a B centre, but not clear yet when. Maybe in January,

Sweden: looking at applying for cross border K centre about historical resources. Came up at the Nordic CLARIN meeting.

Italy: not much to report. We will aim at B centre, but not yet.

Poland: have some website issues to connect all the tools from partners in Poland. Are still waiting for the government funding for next year.

Czech republic: Busy negotiating with the university and ministry about budget for next year. Organized a big seminar for digital humanities users, important to bring people together. First time in Czech republic. Quite successful.

Denmark: still waiting for creating easy deposit, working on user involvement, it is going slow.

Germany: all centres have been reassessed, preparing project application for next CLARIN-D Phase.

Lithuania: new project in July, funding for this year and next year. Want to apply for B centre. Procurement procedure for repository. Website is under construction. We can link to it from the CE website.

7   Any other business

Martin: CSC is interested in offering this web service. Could they have the A centre check list? The requirements are on the centre committee website.

Next meeting by mid November. Dieter will set up the Doodle.