

Title	Centre Assessment Report January 2016
Version	1
Author(s)	CAC: Lene Offersgaard
Date	2016-01-20
Status	Approved by CAC, SCCTC
Distribution	CAC, SCCTC
ID	CE-2016-0716



1 Summary

In the following we will report on the sixth B centre evaluation round which was carried out Nov 2015 - December 2015. The sixth evaluation round uses *CLARIN B Centre Checklist* ver. 5 with minor updates compared to ver. 4¹. The checklist tries to be explicit about which information to be provided, and how the criteria can be checked. An extension compared to ver. 4 is the new item 1.d "Resources and services provided", where the centre supplied specific information about what is provided. The centre committee has agreed to aim for more automatic checks of the compliance in the future. Already now the Centre Registry² gives a clear overview of the Service Provider registration with the identity federations in a clear way.

In this round – as in the other rounds – we will not give a graded label indicating the state of the centre. For each centre we will recommend if the centre can be granted/re-granted the label as a CLARIN B Centre, optional give a general comment, and perhaps add a list of remarks for improvements.

Assessment period

This round contains both a reassessment for one centre that already have been accepted as CLARIN B centre two years ago, and assessment of two new centres. We suggest that the evaluation will be valid for three years. However, reassessment can be needed before the three years has passed if changes in the requirements in the meanwhile are agreed on within the CLARIN Centre Committee.

All centres can clarify the points mentioned below by short statements to the Chair of the CLARIN Assessment Committee and to the chair of the SCCTC in case that the remarks or corresponding evaluation results are not agreed on.

This report includes assessment of three centres.

CAC recommends that the centres:

- **CLARINO Bergen Centre**
- **CLARIN.SI at Jozef Stefan Institute**
- **LINDAT, UFAL, Charles University in Prague**

Are certified/recertified as CLARIN B Centres.

CAC also wants to state that centres from the earlier assessment rounds that are still in awaiting final certification³ will have to restart the assessment when ready.

¹ Clarin B Centre Checklist [CE-2013-0095 v5](#) 2015-10-29

² Centre Registry <https://centres.clarin.eu/>

³ CELR, which has decided to restart the DSA procedure

2 General Points

The reviewers in the CAC would like to draw attention to the following general issues.

CLARIN Visibility

There are different ways for displaying CLARIN visibility from the centre web-sites; the CAC suggests CLARIN ERIC to make minimum recommendations for how a centre should refer to either CLARIN ERIC or to the national CLARIN consortium.

Test of access from IdPs

The reviewers cannot always test SP access from both national and non-national IdPs for a centre, but what is tested as the minimum is the existence of CLARIN IdP login and the availability of a discovery service for national and non-national IdPs. In future the assessment committee might ask the AAI taskforce to help with testing authentication. However, some centres do not implement authentication because they offer only publicly available resources.

Quality of metadata

The reviewers do not make statements about the quality of the metadata or the content of the resources. Only random samples of resources were investigated, and only for the existence of CMDI metadata and PID use.

CCR

As the ISOcat registry at the end of 2014 was transformed to the CCR, the checking now focuses on CCR-link completeness. Some profiles do not have 100% completeness but we think that this should not prevent from becoming a B Centre as long as the main part of the CCR-links exists. The option to add CCR-links to public CMDI profiles has to be handled elsewhere.

Use of public CMDI profiles

The CMDI profiles, that a centre uses, have to be public to be accepted in assessment. As mentioned above, in the current version of CMDI, public profiles cannot get updates of links to CCR. We know that the metadata curation taskforce looks into this dilemma. We suggest that in the future the list of profiles used for harvesting is curated by the metadata curation taskforce before being used for harvesting into the VLO. This could transfer the review of usable CMDI profiles for harvesting to a forum where focus is on metadata, as this is a bit overlooked in the assessment procedure currently.

3 Centre Evaluations

3.1 CLARIN.SI at Jozef Stefan Institute

It is recommended that CLARIN.SI becomes a CLARIN B centre as it fulfils the criteria.

3.2 CLARINO Bergen Centre

It is recommended that CLARINO becomes a CLARIN B centre as it fulfils the criteria.

Other remarks:

- Some issues were found about metadata PID links and handles. These are reported to the centre.

3.3 LINDAT, UFAL, Charles University in Prague

It is recommended that LINDAT is prolonged as a CLARIN B centre as it fulfils the criteria.