



4th meeting (online)

May 26, 2020

Attending: Iris Alfredsson, Michelle Barker, Rob Carrillo, Carlos Casorrán, Ieva Cesevičiūtė, Miroslav Dobrucky, Suzanne Dumouchel, Judit Fazekas-Parragh, Annette Fillery-Travis, Vinciane Gaillard, Iryna Kuchma, Emma Lazzeri, Dunja Legat, Natalia Manola, Ana Portugal Melo, Eleni Petra, Caterina Petrillo, Jaime Piera, Jerzy Proficz, Fotis Psomopoulos, Lennart Stoy, Anne Sunikka, Michael Svendsen, Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra, Susan Trinitz, Sadia Vancauwenbergh, René van Horik, Angus Whyte and Vassia Diochnou

Apologies: Karla Anaya-Carlsson, Jacco Konijn, Elin Stangeland, Celia van Gelder, Ignacio Blanquer

Agenda and notes:

Welcome and new members introduction:

- Annette Fillery-Travis, FNS-Cloud project <https://www.nextfood-project.eu/>
- Rob Carrillo, EOSC Enhance: <https://www.eosc-portal.eu/enhance>

Rules of Participation for training service providers (suggestions from EOSC Training workshop in the Hague)

Actions:

- Iryna to follow up with RoP WG on cross WG task-force.
- All: volunteer if you want to work on this.

Task force 1: Validation of the diagram (on slides 12-14 in [pptx](#))

Discussion

- Data curator and data steward descriptions seem the wrong way round
- Change the rings - a data steward would have more discipline specific knowledge.
- Indeed, data stewards can be more discipline specific, but it is not always like that, therefore I suggest 50/50% color
- I see the data curator more as a librarian and acting at repository/metadata level. Whereas Data Steward has more deep knowledge about the data payload
- Perhaps add 'preservation' to the curator role?
- Yes, curator comes from GLAM sector and definitely has the element in it closely related to preservation institutions

- If it helps, I agree that a data curator is the more central institutional role concerned with keeping data FAIR and steward closer to researchers and the preparation of data to be FAIR.
- If we want to include the “Open Source” community (some of them out of the academia), we should include some “green” in the “Citizen” circle
- I’d suggest a research software engineer have at least 1/4 of their circle be orange (and the rest stay green) as there is huge variation in how much discipline expertise they have
- I’d suggest Citizens also have some orange in their ring.
- To follow up on the previous point, maybe TF1 could consider retitling Citizen so that it is broader, so it could include the open source community, commercial companies undertaking research, others? It wouldn’t change the definition. But it would change their ring colours, which would become part green, part red, part orange. But it would change their ring colours, which would become part green, part red, part orange
- I agree on this - having the Citizen as an extra role would help capture additional aspects.
- I see the open source community already embedded in all 4 roles explicit in the diagram and even so commercial vendors. So it should be something that must be highlighted in context
- I agree and I was suggesting the same point concerning Citizen focus on the commercial companies and industry in general
- It reinforces the idea to have a more active role of Citizens in EOSC

Action: discuss in smaller group a revised version

Task force 1: Start of the mapping of existing frameworks (including the [2019 data skills framework from the Open Data Institute](#)) - one month timeline - e.g. FAIRsSkills, EDISON, OECD skills report, ODI

- Discuss methodology, use a google doc

Action: All: volunteer if you want to work on this. Vinciane will coordinate

Task force 2 Options for organizational models for regional/thematic/EU competence centers and their coordination (slides 15-19 in [pptx](#))

- e-Infrastructure, national & institutional competence centers - ideal vs current set up

Feedback:

- This definition could enable every institution to be called a competence centre. Is there a minimum requirement to be a competence centre? Eg do they train people outside their network? Would a research life cycle and actor centered approach would work better?
- Should projects be included? These may be not be sustainable but some projects play a coordinating role
- Cos4Cloud project could provide the Governance example

- Focus should be on what is an EOSC competence centre. What are the elements of it that differ from other competence centres? On the other hand, how many organizations would set up EOSC specific competence centers
- How do we define coordination? Perhaps alignment would be a better word. What do we mean by EOSC compatibility?
- Do you imagine there will be a call for becoming a competence center with a selection mechanism based on some criteria? and is there funding for this? is it in their scope to also be a EOSC competence center as something additional w/o some funding. I'd doubt the engagement without. There needs to be a carrot somehow...
- I think many centres could say they provide some or all of the 6 functions, but the ones we are interested in for EOSC are those that can define a mission to deliver identified competencies for an audience beyond their own institution. Having a registry of competence centres would allow monitoring of gaps

Task force 3 EOSC skills/training in national digital skills policies/strategies (slides 20-25 in pptx)

- Points of intervention: Data skills in ICT, cross-sectoral jobs
- Scoping of study - commission the study by June 15, have first draft before EOSC symposium, final draft at end of this WG

Discussion:

- What do we mean by socio-economic value of implementing FAIR data? A new study? - It's about going through existing studies.

Task force 4 Specifications for training catalogue(s)

- Kick-off call last Friday

Discussion:

- Invite representatives of other WGs?

SRIA: current draft

Action: Natalia will add to What types of skills the text from Ignacio's diagramme; needs help with the leadership programme.

A mentoring & training program for Open Science ambassadors in Life Science: The Open Life Science program helps early stage researchers and potential academic leaders in becoming Open Science ambassadors <https://openlifesci.org/>. And also Innovation Leaders 2020: <https://elifesci.org/InnovationLeaders> and Mozilla Open Leaders <https://foundation.mozilla.org/en/initiatives/mozilla-open-leaders/>. Question: what would be the recommendation in this 4th priority? How could it be structured and phrased to be implemented by the SRIA reader? Would there be an uptake among the policy makers? Should all actors in Ignacio's diagramme have access to this programme? Leadership needs a community.

Would also highlight university association's programmes on open science leadership: YERUN, LERU, IARU etc.

Collaborate with existing communities - e.g. citizen science projects platform - for communication, outreach <https://eu-citizen.science/>: the platform for sharing knowledge, tools, training, and resources for Citizen Science.

Next steps

Next WG meetings:

- Set up the dates for the next three WG meetings before the Executive Board meeting (next one is on June 25-26) - e.g. the fourth Tuesday of the months.
- **Action:** Vassia will send out a doodle for June 22nd and 23rd, July and September.

Studies, milestones and timeline, etc

- Study to frame the digital skills required in EOSC - is a part of the Scoping study already

AOB: New WG blog post published:

<https://www.eoscsecretariat.eu/news-opinion/minimal-eosc-skill-set-competence-centers-and-national-digital-skills-strategies>