Title	Minutes SCCTC 28 June 2018
Version	2
Author(s)	LS
Date	2018-06-28
Status	Approved
Distribution	Centre Committee
ID	CE-2018-1248

Participants

Pavel Stranak (CZ), Dirk Goldhahn (DE), Lene Offersgaard (DK), Vincent Vandeghinste (DLU), Krista Liin (EE), Daan Broeder (NL), Leif-Jöran Olsson (SE) , Dieter Van Uytvanck (CLARIN ERIC, Chair), Linda Stokman (CLARIN ERIC, minutes).

0 Action points

#	Action	By whom	By when
1	Follow up with EUDAT on the price and policy of B2Safe services.	Dieter (CE)	Asap
2	Make the offers and service that are provide trough CLARIN ERIC explicit. Create a page where we can list all the conditions on a webpage, and where we mention we have our back-up done at B2Safe and refer to their statement.	Dieter (CE)	Next meeting
3	Contact all centres that have been participating in B2Safe uptake plan and see how they see the total picture.	Dieter and Willem (CE)	Asap

1 Agenda

1. The agenda was approved as follows: Agenda point 4 "Short update on core trust seal" was added at the request of Dirk Goldhahn (DE) and the agenda was approved as follows:
2. Agenda
3. Approval minutes last meeting & action point status (CE-2018-1223)
4. Centre assessments
5. Short update on core trust seal
6. Update on the discussion on new centre labels
7. Any other business

2 Approval minutes and action points

The minutes of the f2f SCCTC meeting of 5 June 2018 are approved.

3   Centre assessments

Lene (DK) sent the first part of the assessment report to the centre committee on 27 June and apologizes for the delay. The centre committee will respond to this report by Friday 6 July. If there are no objections by then, the report will be approved.

The last part of the report will be sent by Lene later on and there will be more reviewing time for this one somewhere in August.

The curation module was used for some parts of the assessments. The centres were now provided a longer list of issues because the curation model finds things that we normally would not notice. You will see that the feedback to the centres shown in the report shows is more detailed. Lene suggests to keep testing this and try it out to get some experience and is sure we can conclude we have to completely restructure the checklist. We should be more explicit and see if we demand everything mentioned in the checklist. The aim is to create a new checklist before the next round in the autumn.

Lene (DK): We have some centres that only provide public resources. Since the mission of CLARIN is to share data, it is not an obstacle if these centres have no federated login. We do not want to give them the burden that they be part of the SPF if all the resources are public.

Dieter (CE): From the beginning we have made an analysis, that joining the SPF and setting up a service provider and doing all the work for that is a bit absurd if centres are only hosting open resources. If this is not literally in the checklist right now, we should make it more explicit and have it in place for the next round. Besides, we need to issue an early warning and inform centres that are taking part in the next round that they should use an updated list that will come available in autumn and that they should not use the current one.

Dieter (CE): The curation model might possibly contain some bugs. We should report technical issues about the curation module to Can Özgür Yilmaz, Can.Yilmaz@oeaw.ac.at

4   Short update on Core Trust Seal

Dirk (DE): the DE centres received feedback from CTS. This feedback was discussed in the general developers meeting in more detail. Dieter, Dirk and Thorsten had a meeting with members of the CTS Board. They wanted to present us with more general feedback and we had some questions that came up when checking all the answer received from the reviewers. One of the topics that was discussed was the compliance level. The compliance level is not mentioned, CTS said that generally having several levels is not problematic. Having level 3 is unproblematic, but if you are offering data which includes personal data you need level 4. Offering personal data without making sure it is properly handled, would not be acceptable but otherwise level 3 is ok. It is however expected that you show progress at the next preview round in three years, you should then have moved to level 4.

The second topic was about outsourcing of services, for the reviewers It Is difficult to see what is offered by centres, or CLARIN ERIC or CLARIN-D CTS asked us to make it more obvious and offer more proof. We currently don't have this.

it is decided that CLARIN ERIC provides a central information place where reviewers can clearly see who offers what service.

CLARIN-D will make the contract of the consortium open (or parts of it) and will place this online in a central place together with the workplan so the reviewers can have a look and see certain aspects of it.

Dieter (CE): We need to make many of the things which we know are in place and available more explicit, this is a good exercise for everyone. Good for centres, new members and good for reviewers – since it provides them a more unified way to check the claims by the centres.

Daan (NL): what will the first actions be? will you provide a set of text snippets that the centres can embed in their certification request? That would also make the whole CLARIN Community more coherent.

Dieter (CE): first step is basically, promising the services of https://www.clarin.eu/value-proposition to the centres in the centre registry. We can do this next week already. Making it a nice-looking webpage will take more work. We can also make sure we have a good corpus of CTS assessment documents from completed assessments as a source of inspiration. If there is the need for statements or stories of why centres are connected to the CLARIN mission, we can probably provide some example snippets, but this will take a while.

Daan (NL): what is the vision about B2SAFE? Can this fit in there, if you decide to broker it? Will you come up with one statement that we can also refer too?

Dieter (CE) it depends on what EUDAT can offer, if they cannot offer something concrete it doesn't make sense to put something there.

Daan (NL): but the ambition should be to also push EUDAT forward and CLARIN's voice counts there. They will try to meet the wishes.

Dieter (CE): we will be working on it and try to get something concrete around that because it is a nice service, but we need to get some more concrete statements from EUDAT.

Lene(DK): do you have an idea how long it will take for the CTS process to finalize?

Dirk (DE): There will be just a few reviewers till the end of July, for most of the centres we even had the same reviewer. From our side it will be handled in a few weeks but unclear how long it will take from CTS side.

Krista (EE); CTS tries to do everything in 3 weeks but from all sides it seems to be getting longer. We resubmitted after the second feedback and it can take a bit longer.

Dieter (CE): They informed us in the meeting that they are still taking care of child diseases they are realizing that they are behind on points, with the Summer coming up it will take longer. We will follow up and see how it continues and we can evaluate the state of affairs by our next meeting in September and we have a better overview of how things are moving forward. If you have problems with CTS directly, please inform Dieter.

Dieter(CE): CTS has recently seen some applications that not really meet the minimal threshold, for example, a centre submitted something that did not even refer to their repository. We have to have a mechanism form our side to filter out the immature submissions, also because CLARIN ERIC is paying for it, if submissions are not complete it is a waste of money and time. We have to make sure all is correct. No concrete proposal for filtering mechanism yet. Needs some good thinking, come up with a proposal in our next meeting in September.

5   Update on the discussion on new centre labels

Dieter (CE): Relabelling the centres has been discussed in de SaMBa and NCF meeting. The outcome is that the SaMBa does not see the need to currently rename centre labels, if there is some urgency then we as Centre Committee should provide more arguments in favour of that and we should set-up a broader questionnaire to the centres and back it up with some numbers.

Pavel (CZ): as mentioned in the last minutes "Archive centre" label is impossible to accept. Something like "Core Centre" would be better for us. The other labels as in the document https://office.clarin.eu/v/CE-2018-1204-proposal-new-centre-labels.pdf seem fine to us.

Krista (EE): Current centres are used to the labels, not sure if asking them about relabelling will help. It is more a question for new centres or outsiders.

Dieter (CE): in any case we can make an analysis.

Lene (DK): If it is decided to leave things as they are we should however stop using the "A-services" label, if it does not exist no one can strive for it.

Dieter (CE): We do not have "A" centres yet and we have to make explicit that the "A" label does not exist.

Dieter (CE): As a committee we have currently more urgent things to do, such as updating the documents that are out of date. We can think about sending out a questionnaire but for the short term it is best to first focus on completing the urgent points on our list. The documents mentioned here can be found on the CLARIN website: https://www.clarin.eu/content/clarin-centres

Dieter (CE): The conclusion of this discussion is that for now we will be focussing on getting the description of the centres correct having a look at the old documentation. Getting the b-centre checklist in better shape and for now put the discussion about the new labels for centres aside.

6   Any other business

- Daan(NL): There is a clash between the CLARIN2018 conference (8 Oct-10-Oct) and the DI4R2018 conference in Lisbon (9 Oct-11 Oct). Is there anybody from CLARIN who will not attend CLARIN2018 and is able to go to Lisbon to represent CLARIN at DI4R2018? Is there any news on that?

  Dieter (CE): No responses so far.

  Daan (NL) will ask António Branco (PT) if he knows anyone who can represent CLARIN.

- Pavel (CZ): There seems to be a strong message for us that it would be important to use DOIs for our centre. DOI is further ahead and there would be various small benefits of using DOIs the way we have set-up. Could make some changes to make ourselves interoperable to use DOIs.

  Dieter (CE): It is a reality and it is a demand, we should make changes. Add this to the B-centre requirements. Landing page with the DOI. Make sure we are compatible with top down requirements. Put on SCCTC agenda in the autumn.

- Dirk (DE): GDRP was discussed during our developers meeting. While integrating in the repository we do not know if it has to be in every subpage or not. There are different opinions about that and no court decisions about this yet.
One thing, centres who are part of the SPF typically follow the eduGAIN Data Protection Code of Conduct but there is no compatible GDPR version for this yet. This is just a problem for those centres, and it would be of interest for them to if other centres have done something yet? Has anyone been looking into this?
Leif-Joran (SE): We are looking into this as well, we want to see what the court cases say before we fix anything.
Dirk (DE): We will just wait. It is probably ok as it is.

Next meeting: 5 September 2018, 14:00 CEST via Zoom.