RDA Council Meeting – 27-28 May 2014

Participants:

Fran Berman – RDA Council
Juan Bicarregui – RDA OAB
Patrick Cocquet – RDA Council
Hilary Hanahoe – RDA Secretariat
Mark Parsons – Secretary General
Beth Plale – RDA TAB
Kay Raseroka – RDA Council
Walter Stewart – RDA OAB
Doris Wedlich – RDA Council
Ross Wilkinson – RDA Council
John Wood – RDA Council

Participants:
Blue Text: highlight / point to be noted
Green Text: Decision
Red Text: Action

Welcome, approval of agenda, additional agenda items or relevant news
Regional Update
TAB report • **Approval of new IG definition. TAB has prepared a broader definition of IGs that more accurately reflects current activity and also makes clearer that they need to forward RDA's goals and not promote a particular tool or technology. Recommend Approval** *[See File 01a]* • **Proposed change to IG review process. A task force has been working with TAB and the WG chairs to refine the WG and IG review process. The current thinking for IG reviews is that they should be lightweight, but also involve community comment. The proposal is that IG charters would have a ~1 month public comment review, then a TAB review. Council would be informed throughout but would only need to do a formal review if they saw an issue or if there was disagreement within TAB. This is not finalized, but I would like to get the sense of Council on this.**
DECISION: look hard at IGs from "doing rather than talking" organization. Sunset clause. Go back to TAB that tightens up definition. Should be put out to IGs and consult them as we are changing the definition. Then publish and make available for comment. **RDA is about delivery and Council can send out to all with a note on delivery focus.**
• **Final approval of outstanding Case Statements. There are several case statements that have been revised after the discussions at P3 and afterwards. TAB is satisfied with all the revisions and recommends approval.** ***[File 01b** **summarizes and there is a folder of case statements and reviews in the meeting packet.]***
DECISION: Data Description Registry Interoperability—ACCEPTED (confirmed) **DECISION: DSA-WDS working group on Certification—ACCEPTED (confirmed)** **RDA/WDS Publishing Data: Data Publication Services**

DECISION: approve if 2-3 adopters are committed and show intent in the case statement
RDA/WDS Publishing Data: Bibliometrics Working Group
DECISION: due to lack of concrete deliverables and adopters then the decision is that TAB should pay lots of attention to adopters and tighten up the wording (reviewers go back to chairs) for this. Ask for 2-3 expressions of intent of adoption by data centres and revise the deliverables and then the IG is approved subject to this revision and TAB approval.
DECISION: Who is responsible for ensuring that Decisions & Recommendations from Council are indeed implemented? Accountability part is important. So accountable body must be TAB.

ACTION: Checklist to ensure higher level of confidence when it arrives to Council / Board to avoid multiple levels of discussion and interaction
RDA/WDS Publishing Data: Cost Recovery for Data Centres IG
Decision: Approved
RDA/WDS Publishing Data: Workflows Working Group—TAB RECOMMENDED APPROVAL
DECISION: to be discussed tomorrow

- Technical strategy towards addressing gaps and overlaps (the technical road map).
    - Briefing from Beth followed by discussion this closely relates to the discussion after lunch.

Lunch

Discussion of forthcoming outputs. We seek to develop a strategy to define the following items.
- **What are the initial deliverables and schedule coming forward?**
- **What can we do to make deliverables of WGs more effective?**
- **Who adopts and Why?**
- **How do we monitor who is using the outputs?**
- **This may segue into the engagement with industry session**

Background items:
- *[File 02a]* **Very early effort by WG chairs to summarize with a page for each WG.**
- *[File 02b]* **Summary Table of forthcoming outputs by Herman and Fran**

Presentation from local entrepreneurs
- **Dissemination activities we have on big data http://www.alliancebigdata.com/fr/ and the result of a workshop on research industry collaboration.**

- **teraLab platform https://www.teralab-datascience.fr/en/home**

Break

Follow up discussion on **Outputs and industry** engagement

DECISION: Presentations at Plenary 4 need to focus on implementation activities and existing adopters.

Items from the floor and closing for the day

ACTIONABLE ITEMS:
1. **Show additional adopters of deliverables at P5 based on teams identified**

Group dinner

Wednesday, 28 May

Presentation of Futur-en-Seine and the place we give to the data economy. **http://www.futur-en-seine.fr/fens2014/en/**
ACTION HILARY: contact Jean François about programme / activity for digital literacy.
Continued discussion of industry engagement.   • **Desired outcome: a clear engagement strategy with specific target audiences, actions, and milestones.**
ACTION: focus on adopters at P4. **ACTION: prepare tiger team call / announcement at P4** **ACTION: define messages for industry and packages for Patrick to test / initiate process, this includes timing on when outputs are "industry" ready** **ACTION: at P5 tiger team challenge, target commercial partner** **DECISION: we need to have a group to do this and go out as ambassadors. Include Tony in a task force. RDA EU (Trust-IT) as part of the Secretariat Communications & Engagement activities to lead.** **ACTION: engagement plan draft to be presented at next RDA Council meeting (Sept 2014) in collaboration with OAB and** **ACTION: Trust-IT to analyze participation of private sector members in plenaries etc.** **ACTION Mark: Venture Capitalist - Brad Feld (TechStars) in Boulder, Mark will talk and refine message and see how we can engage with start-ups.**
Criteria for Organizational Affiliation (Mark) – 45 min   • *[File 03]* **lays out the issue.**
DECISION: change criteria based on discussions •   *have a related mission to RDA and directly or indirectly contribute to data sharing & interoperability,* •   *currently works globally,* •   *define and implement explicit points of collaboration with RDA in an MoU such joint WG/IGs, adoption agreements, shared services, etc. which would deliver mutual benefit* •   *not disciplinary specific (broad within a domain is OK)* •   *provide an equivalent affiliate role for RDA in their organization (preferably with voting rights)* **DECISION: two step council decision. 1. provide initial approval and then subsequently (2.) approves the MoU** Therefore timing is 1 year for signature **DECISION: Mark has been approved to generate MoUs with IODE and GlobalHealth and will get back to TERENA, ESIP & iMENTORS to propose OMs.**
Lunch

Plenaries
   • **Update on P4 and P5 —15 min**
       ○ **Any particular Council needs?**
   • **Develop plan to seek bids for P6-P9.**
       ○ **Review and approval of call for Bids document** *[File 06]*
       ○ **Possible plan….**
           ▪ **P6 or P7 in Japan or Brazil**
           ▪ **P7 or P8 in Europe**
           ▪ **P8 Canada**
           ▪ **P9 Australia**

Emphasis of RDA components in the programme – must be included.
What gets paid for & what doesn't should also be included.

Section 4.4 puts a negative cast on Co-located events --- so rephrase.
ACTION Hilary: Revise the document and circulate to Council
DECISION: P7 will take place in Europe (RDA EU hosts)
ACTION: P8 in North America (Mexico, Canada or US) Walter to take forward the discussions in Canada

TAB ELECTION @P4
How can we promote it?
1 slide – 20 photos & info on where you can find out more details. Meets the needs for informed democracy.
Flyer – for elections to be produced and paid by RDA EU

Break

December Meeting
- **We planned to have the meeting in Melbourne and it would be good to build relations with Australian ministers and funders. There will, however, be a meeting in Rome the same week that may include the new European Commissioners. We need to discuss what works best and is most strategic for RDA.**

DECISION:
9th & 10th December Council meeting in Rome
RDAC 11th & 12th December
Next 2 council meetings
May / June 2015 – Germany for meeting & Futur en Seine mid June 2015
Nov / Dec 2015 – Melbourne, Australia

Business items (Mark)
   a. **Items for review and approval. 30 min**
      i. *Operations plan*—**High-level secretariat plan for 1 year. Are there major items missed?** *(File 04a)*

      ii. *Budget*—**included in operations plan** *(File 04a)*

      iii. *Risk register*—**an initial, evolving document. Is it on the right track? Major gaps** *(File 04b)*

      iv. *Modified TAB election process*—**The original process called for three-year terms with a 1/3 being elected every year. When we made the announcement for candidates last year, we said two-year terms. To be consistent with expectations, we modified the policy after consulting with Council Chairs and TAB. We recommend approval of the following approach.**
         1. **TAB terms are for two years.**
         2. **Council will make their remaining appointment to start at P4 for a two-year term.**
         3. **To maintain continuity one of the Chairs will remain for another year (Beth and Andrew can figure out how to decide)**
         4. **The remaining four appointees step down (and hopefully run for election)**

5. **The fall election is for four members**
[Files 04c, 04d, 04e] **provide the original policy, the revised policy, and a summary of changes.**

b. **Determine Council rotation and nomination committee – 30 min** *[File 05 summarizes the issue]*
   i. **Desired Outcome is a defined rotation for and election process to move through the current Council to steady state.**

TAB ELECTION PROCESS
   i. *Modified TAB election process—The original process called for three-year terms with a 1/3 being elected every year. When we made the announcement for candidates last year, we said two-year terms. To be consistent with expectations, we modified the policy after consulting with Council Chairs and TAB. We recommend approval of the following approach.*
   1. *TAB terms are for two years.*
   2. *Council will make their remaining appointment to start at P4 for a two-year term.*
   3. *To maintain continuity one of the Chairs will remain for another year (Beth and Andrew can figure out how to decide)*
   4. *The remaining four appointees step down (and hopefully run for election)*
   5. *The fall election is for four members*

DECISION: Appointees (with exception of 1 chair) come off at this election
5 open slots left and next election should be a 3-year term.
Next year 2 remaining appointees – 1 chair + non US / EU appointee stand down.
ACTION: Mark to follow up with CODATA whether China has been formally invited?
COUNCIL ROTATION NOMINATION
Term expectations are different
Annual basis 3 terms rotate
DECISION: get to 9 council members and then define the terming once they are on-board, depending on expectations and what terms they can do.

OPERATIONS PLAN
High-level secretariat plan for 1 year. Are there major items missed?

DECISION: document approved but with the addition of a bullet on the coordination of new funders
Agenda point for next council meeting: relationship between RDA Council and RDAC
ACTION Juan: to circulate to Council the RDAC document and list of recipients
CONNECTION BETWEEN GROUPS
TAB:
Well connected to WG/ IGs
More connection to Council with both chairs present
More connection to OAB
Members interaction
Culture that could be passed on – e.g. Council more interaction at Plenary between TAB & Council might improve understanding
Joint meetings with common goals could be productive
SEC GEN
OAB
Report from TAB to OAB at next meeting.
DECISION RDA Business day – all TAB, OAB, Council meetings organized on the day after to

avoid clashing with plenary activities starting with P5. Have a reception for RDA leaders the night before. The general topic is "next phase of RDA".