

# Standing Committee on CLARIN Technical Centers (SCCTC) and CLARIN Center Assessment Committee (CCAC) meeting

---

**Date:** 2012-10-16

**Time:** 14:00-15:45

**Place:** Hilton Sofia, 1 Bulgaria Blvd., Sofia, Bulgaria

## Participants:

1. **CCAC: Peter Wittenburg**, Lene Offesgaard, Tomas Krilavičius
2. **SCCTC: Dieter Van Uytvanck (DE)**, Bartosz Broda (PL), Jan Hajic (CZ), Krista Liin (EE), Marc Kemps-Snijders (NL), Karlheinz Mörth (AT), Lene Offersgaard (DK), Petya Osenova (BG), Alexander Simov (BG), Remco van Veenendaal (DLU), Savolainen Ville (Fi), Paweł Myszkowski (PL)

**Excused:** Daan Broeder (Standards Committee parallel meeting), Kiril Simov (National Coordinators Forum parallel meeting), Jan Gruntorad (not in Sofia), Martin Wynne (not in Sofia), Tobias Blanke (not in Sofia)

## Meeting

1. Introduction.
  - 1.1. Peter and Dieter start the meeting, welcome participants and give short introduction.
  - 1.2. Participants introduce themselves.
  - 1.3. Tomas Krilavičius (TK) is selected to take minutes.
2. Dieter Van Uytvanck (DVU) gives introduction on the SCCTC.
  - 2.1. SCCTC bylaws and goals are presented and discussed. SCCTC is seen as mediator between national CLARINs and CLARIN boards.
  - 2.2. DVU proposes further plan of the meeting - after Peter Wittenburg's (PW) presentation to continue with *initial centres list updates* and *centres assessment procedures* discussions.
  - 2.3. SCCTC members are asked to provide a paragraph on the current state of the centres of each member until November 2. They agree. They main questions that should be discussed in the reports.
    - 2.3.1. Centres in the country: how many planned and what types.
    - 2.3.2. State of development.
    - 2.3.3. Short technological overview.
      - 2.3.3.1. Repositories and metadata.
      - 2.3.3.2. AAI.
      - 2.3.3.3. PIDs.
      - 2.3.3.4. Federated Content Search (FCS).
      - 2.3.3.5. (Web) services.
      - 2.3.3.6. Data Seal of Approval (DSA) audit (it was added to list later during the discussion).
    - 2.3.4. CCAC related question are postponed to PW presentation and discussion.
3. Peter Wittenburg (PW) gives introduction on the CCAC.
  - 3.1. Lene Offersgaard (LO) is member of both, CCAC and SCCTC. DVU proposes, that LO is not going to participate in the assessment of DK centres. LO and others agree.
  - 3.2. PW presents his vision on A/B/E centres certification/assessment.
    - 3.2.1. Basically, it is based on the *trust*. Therefore, assessment procedures are supposed to help to establish it as well, as helping to improve centres quality.
    - 3.2.2. Assessment of the centres will be based on the Data Seal of Approval (<http://www.datasealofapproval.org/>) or ISO 163636:2012 (RAC) procedures, one procedure is enough, and then additional CLARIN assessment.
    - 3.2.3. DSA procedure goes as follows:

- 3.2.3.1. Centre applies for DSA by giving statements about the centre.
  - 3.2.3.2. DSA checks compliance of the statements and the centre.
  - 3.2.4. ISO 16363:2012 (RAC) is very formal, expensive and bureaucratic, and was not discussed in depth.
  - 3.2.5. Overall assessment procedure will be as follows.
    - 3.2.5.1. Centre applies for DSA.
    - 3.2.5.2. Centre applies for CCAC assessment (DSA and CCAC assessments can go in parallel).
    - 3.2.5.3. CCAC starts asking questions.
    - 3.2.5.4. Centre answers.
    - 3.2.5.5. Iterative QA sessions goes until things get clear. However, the idea is to keep things as lightweight as possible.
    - 3.2.5.6. Outcome of assessment is grading. PW proposes the following grades:
      - 3.2.5.6.1. Fully Trusted (+comments).
      - 3.2.5.6.2. Mature (+comments).
      - 3.2.5.6.3. Developing (+comments).
      - 3.2.5.6.4. SEAL corresponding to the grade is given. Colours and seal names should be discussed further, potentially they can be gold, silver, bronze.
  - 3.2.6. Requirements for A/B centres are not operational yet. Moreover, it is not clear, are additional national requirements are going to be included.
  - 3.3. Duration of assessment - it should start ~1 week after submission and should not last long, however strict duration is not set, it may depend on the number of centres that have applied for assessment.
4. Discussion on the initial centres list.
- 4.1. DVU: Germany centres will start applying by the end of the year, therefore, procedures may go slower at the moment. PW: we can start assessing centres in parallel with DSA, lets avoid bureaucracy.
  - 4.2. Marc Kemps-Snijders (MKS): should we start as soon as possible? PW: CCAC still should get ready to work, i.e. make procedures operational. PW is going to work on it. It is better to start in the beginning of 2013. DVU adds, that procedures are still not ready, and should be finalized.
  - 4.3. Petya Osenova (PO) asks, how centre declaration and requirements are related? PW: declaration=requirements, however provide us not only with claims, but with examples and means to check your claims.
  - 4.4. Savolainen Ville (SV) asks to add him as a national contact instead of Kimmo Koskenniemi. DVU is going to take action.
  - 4.5. Bartosz Brodo (BB) asks about re-assessment. PW - it will be done regularly, but CCAC still have to discuss it. DVU proposes and expects to make the process automatic.
  - 4.6. Krista Liin (KL) - Estonia is going to apply only with one B centre, the contact person will be KL.
  - 4.7. Tomas Krilavičius (TK) asks to put his name on the list instead of Tadas Juknevičius.
  - 4.8. Remco van Veenendaal (RVV) is contact person for Dutch-Flemish HLT agency.
  - 4.9. DVU will fix the list for assembly.
5. Centre types document (V 0.2)
- 5.1. DVU asks for comments.
  - 5.2. LO and RVV clarify, that these centres are for CLARIN members.
  - 5.3. DVU asks to look at the indicated parts and proposes to include federated content search (FCS) as advise, and potentially later - as a compulsory.
  - 5.4. PW comments, that it is not yet clear how to evaluate services.
  - 5.5. MKS, PW and DVU discuss external centres (C centres). The idea is that these centres are not going to be assessed, but they still to comply with some of requirements, e.g. provide OAI PMH. It is not clear, how to choose centres, which we trust (data and metadata quality).

- 5.6. MKS, PW, DVU, LO discuss types of data - in some cases you can see only metadata, but data is not accessible. Centres (search) so differ between different types of accessibility, and provide such interface that allows to see:
  - 5.6.1. Freely accessible on-line data.
  - 5.6.2. On-line data accessible with authentication.
  - 5.6.3. Data, which is not accessible on line.
- 5.7. MKS, PW, DVU, LO, Jan Hajic (JH) on using external data.
  - 5.7.1. Integration with METANET - we should look how can we do it. If they provide only aggregated metadata, we can integrate on such level, but the duplicates should be removed. Moreover, METANET uses proprietary protocols and software, therefore probably it is not possible to interoperate with Metashare technically.
  - 5.7.2. We can interoperate with all C centres, which provide at least OAI PMH, and all metadata should be free. However, centres should somehow take care of removal of duplicates. CCAC is not going to assess data quality, only centres infrastructure.
- 5.8. Other comments of the document: we need to read it and comment on it until November 7.
- 5.9. Why SSL certification is necessary? DVU - because we need it for AAI.
- 5.10. PW, DVU, LO on how PIDs are assigned:
  - 5.10.1. Metadata.
  - 5.10.2. Data.
  - 5.10.3. Separate PIDs for in-data pointers.
- 5.11. MKS asks for more exact definitions and details on repositories. Is AOI PMH is enough? Do we differ between Fedora, databases and DSpace repositories. Should we make *human browsable* repositories advisable or compulsory? Requirements on repositories should be a part of DSA, but we still have to decide on it in CCAC.
- 5.12. Karlheinz Mörth (KM), PW, DVU, Petya Osenova (PO) on SLA agreements. What kind of SLA we will need? How to control risks - document is in progress. What to do with K centres? SLA applies for A and E centres, while with K only SLA on PID may suffice.
- 5.13. KL asks on the document format, PW proposes to preserve current structure, with more general main document and operational details in the appendix. RVV is going to send some comments on document readability to DVU.
- 5.14. BB: do we always need to connect to nation identity federation? PW - we need it for future compatibility. However, it will be clarified in the document (advisable and necessary components).
- 5.15. RVV proposes to circulate document with all changes accepted and new changes requested.

6. Meeting is closed.

## Action Points

1. PW : make centres assessment procedures operational.
2. DVU: correct the initial centres list
3. SCCTC members: prepare short overviews of the current country centres state.
4. CCAC and SCCTC members: read CLARIN Center Types document (version 0.2) and comment on it until November 7.
5. DVU: start CCAC mailing list
6. DVU/PW: send CLARIN Center Types document with comments to CCAC and SCCTC mailing lists.
7. DVU and others: opportunity to organize workshop on the DSA and CCAC.