

RDA Council Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2015

Cap Digital

Paris, France

9:00 Opening — Fran

Patrick welcomed everyone to Cap Digital, and expressed his hope for a fruitful meeting this week, and a successful Futur-en-Seine event the following week.

- Approval of minutes from last time — **files 01a, 01b**

1. Action – within a week of a Council meeting, the Secretariat will distribute informal notes of the meeting; the Secretary General will develop minutes from those notes for approval at the next Council meeting

- Approval of Agenda

Agenda approved as is.

9:15 Standing agenda items — Fran

a) Financial Status — Update from Mark (10 min.)

During the past several Council meetings, there has been regular reporting on the status of establishing the funding processes, financial processes, and associated policies and procedures that support the legal and fiduciary requirements of a UK charity. To facilitate discussions, a Financial Subcommittee has been formed, with Doris as the Chair, and Ross, Satoshi, and Nancy Carter from OAB as members. They will provide updates periodically. One specific action is to obtain the necessary paperwork from the new Council members to ensure they are properly registered as members of the Board of Directors of the RDA Foundation. That paperwork was completed in real time. There might be other needs to support the Financial Subcommittee, and so Mark will make a list of what is needed, with Doris's help.

3. Action: Mark and perhaps Doris to collect information around what is needed regarding financial records in support of the Financial Subcommittee.

The topic of regional participation was raised on and off during the meeting, especially with respect to how the Foundation and any independently-funded regional offices might interact. Fran asked for clarification on what it might mean to have an RDA Foundation office in a region vis-à-vis a regional RDA office (i.e., an RDA/US office).

4. Action: Mark to explore what it means to have a regional RDAF offices, and how those might differ from regional RDA organizations.



b) Future directions — update from **Mark and Fran (10 min.)**

Mark provided a brief update on the status of the Future Directions activities. The survey was successful, with about 300 responses collected (a roughly 10% response rate). The analysis team (Juan, Ingrid, and Francoise and Mark with Larry and Inna) hasn't had a chance to get into the detail. No real themes stood out, and so more analysis is needed.

18 actions were proposed in the survey, but the responses did not indicate any concentration or real weight on any one or few. Initial analysis suggested that the responses slightly favored communication and engagement activities over coordination activities. In looking at the raw data, 'organizing joint events' and 'writing collaborative papers' got the highest responses.

It was noted that organizing events and writing papers might distract from the 'real' work of RDA, which is in the WG and IG activities. There is a difference, though, between doing a coordinated regional or global RDA activity and having the 3000 RDA members talk about their own RDA-related papers or events. The role of the regional offices in such efforts will look different depending upon the region, and might require some additional clarification. For instance, RDA/EU is considering whether to offer itself as a formal advisory board to the EC, and is generating a lot of position papers. That will require clarification of roles regionally and globally.

Existing mechanisms for conversation and sharing and engagement are in use already by individuals. Those mechanisms include the groups themselves, as well as Twitter feeds, press releases, and Newsletters. Perhaps an additional web conversation space might be useful on the RDA site; the area could help stimulate the conversations needed to support RDA work.

The conversation then went off into more discussion of regional efforts, but the question remains as to how to apportion the work being supported by the membership regionally, or globally, and how that would be managed so that no one region or organization has any more privilege than do individual members. It was decided that a discussion of RDA Regions should be added to a future agenda.

5. Action: Mark to add the role of regional RDA's to a future agenda.

c) OAB Report — **Juan, Walter (15 min)**

OAB sent a short report to the Council list. Right now, there are 5 affiliates and 28 organizations. OAB holds monthly meetings, which have good engagement. Updates around OAB roles are:

1 – Clustering. Discussions began using the TAB clustering work as a basis. So far, the TAB clustering is not a good match because OAB wanted to see something that members could relate to {which groups are relevant to them}. A small team met to discuss this. It was felt that having these different lenses is good, and provides RDA with a wider perspective (with the OA point of view being adoption and the TAB point of view being technical).



2 – Adoption. OAB should be involved through the whole process, including review during Community period. They have suggested having a person review the Case Statement or Charter and report to OAB, then put those notes into the Community Review.

3 – Future directions. OAB probably should have a role, but didn't put in a collective response, but want to review the early results as a group

4 – Election of OAB from OA. To be covered later.

The open OAB session at P5 was well received. They would like to continue that at P6. For P6, however, it would be good to coordinate OA meetings so that the most private sector representatives are available to join the open session. Open and closed sessions do not need to be back-to-back. Day 2 is the company day, with demonstrations, and so that might be the most appropriate day for the open session.

Andrew brought up the issue of having a regular structure for coordinating governance meetings. Subsequent discussion centered on the pros and cons of designating days for certain types of meetings. While it would be nice, for example, to say that Council will always meet the day before the Plenary opens, we need to be sensitive to host organizations and their desire to highlight their own initiatives.

Perhaps we should start providing guidance about when some of these things meetings are normally scheduled, and build in a loose structure over time.

d) TAB Report — **Andrew (15 min.)**

Since the last face-to-face Council meeting, TAB has been exercising the process for commissioning new groups, and acknowledging Kathy's role in managing the workflow. TAB has found, though, that the Community Review process is not resulting in many substantive contributions, and so perhaps emails and other notices on review could be worded more as a call to action.

TAB has been discussing a number of subjects, and will hopefully get into more depth on these at their face-to-face meeting in Karlsruhe. Items for discussion include the following:

- What does it mean to be a TAB Liaison?
- There seem to be a disproportionate number of IGs as opposed to WGs.
- There seems to be a lack of WGs in the pipeline.

Discussion on this topic ranged widely from whether RDA should enforce an activity-based time limit on Interest Groups, to whether there is too much focus on discussion rather than action, to the types of Outputs that can reasonably be expected by IGs, to considering a requirement on IGs to produce a WG within a specific time frame, to the nature of the research data sharing gaps themselves.



Overall, the consensus reached was that OAB and TAB should continue to consider the question of adoption, duration, and other constructs, and offer suggestions. There didn't seem to be support for hard and fast rules, but rather a need to clarify expectations for IGs, for Outputs, and the logistics around that. Any ideas from TAB and OAB would be most welcome.

6. Action – Andrew and Mark take the question ‘what you delivering, what are you adopting, what is the timeline?’ as a data gathering exercise, to the 3rd WG Collaboration Meeting, then supplement with those who do not attend. Do not frame the question through any lens. Report at the next telecon and discuss next steps then.

Resuming the TAB report, Andrew continued that

- TAB membership is changing with the elections coming up;
- TAB are thinking about generational renewal, and still talking about including an early career person but have no recommendations right now;
- TAB and OAB have been having conversations on outputs;
- There is concern about effective use of time at Plenaries, including how to get WGs and IGs to make the most effective use of time at Plenaries, so adding to those guidelines;

e) Secretariat Report — Mark (10 min.)

Mark delivered some short highlights of the Secretariat report

- The notion of ‘regional outputs’ is not clear. For example, it isn't straightforward what comes out of the RDA/EU the project, and what comes out of RDA global. Most of the Secretariat members are involved actively in regional activities, and so the regional as compared to global discussion comes up regularly.
- Wanted to follow up on and verify that it is appropriate to pursue an MOU with GEO.

A vote was taken, and it was unanimously approved that RDA pursue an MOU with GEO.

7. Action: Mark to further describe level of effort for RDA wrt GEO, and recommend specific involvement and people, as part of the MoU.

Folks highlighted the importance of the broad scope of RDA and the interactions that RDA has with other organizations. Politically, those sorts of interactions are important, especially when complementary activities can be clearly articulated.

The final topic was that the WDS Scientific Committee. RDA nominated Ingrid Dillo and Lesley Wyborn; Ingrid was accepted.

- f) Plenaries (See item below)
- g) Funder engagement. (See item below)
- h) Decisions, WG/IG, etc. — none pending [IGs on Data Rescue and Ethics and Social Aspects of Research Data are on the way]

10:15 Plan for OAB elections and discussion of OA recruitment — Juan, Walter

The OA will soon be large enough to warrant election of a 12 member OAB. What is the plan and schedule for the election? Who is responsible for recruiting OMs? See document from Walter and Juan (if longer discussion needed push to afternoon)

Context: The current plan is that once OA membership achieves three-times the OAB membership (12), there should be a formal election held for a representative OAB. At the moment, the OAB is a committee of the whole.

It is anticipated that OA will reach 36 members before P7 (Affiliates are equal partners in the OAB, and are reflected in the count). Until the election, OAB intends to continue to make its calls open to all until it becomes unworkable. Because of multiple meetings to accommodate time zones, that has not yet been the case.

Discussion brought up several points.

- OAB should consider balance requirements leading up to the election so that the Board view is representative and not focused on one or a few organizations or organization types.
- At the moment, there don't seem to be any entrepreneurial members in the OA, and so their point of view would not be included.
- Several kinds of balance criteria were offered, including percentages of organization type, or something based on the OAB clustering outcome.

It was agreed that P6 can be a major push for OA members, and in the meantime, balance criteria can be developed.

8. Action: Walter and Juan to go back and discuss and come back at the next telecon with a proposed schedule of how the 12 OAB positions should be allocated.

10:45 Break

11:00 Approval of Revised Governance Document — Mark

The Governance Document has been revised to ensure it is in alignment with other documents and to address Council nominations. It needs formal approval by Council — **file 03a** is the revised document, **files 03b and 03c** describe the changes in summary and detail (respectively).

This governance document is supposed to now reflect practice, and so it should be read with that in mind. The document was developed from the 'bottom up' (how the groups work now), and so should reflect current practice.

9. Action: Council to read the document by 12 June 2015, and submit comments to the Council mailing list. No comment implies acceptance.

10. Action: Upon completion of this review, Mark will announce to the RDA membership that this document has been revised, and articulate the modifications.



11:15 Endorsing and Sustaining Outputs — Ross

The major issue is that the role of the Council is to detect consensus, and so how does one measure consensus on outputs and measure adoption. We should endorse only outputs that have been adopted and have rough consensus. Discussion points included

Decision – ok on the paper

11. Action: Secretariat to make a list of what are Recognized Outputs and what are Endorsed.

12:00 Lunch

13:00 Funder Engagement — John

A draft funding model was developed and Council agreed to use this document as the basis for negotiation, knowing that each instance will be slightly different. The document provides guidelines for use. Eventually, some general guidance on where contributions can go, whether they can be targeted, and the like, will be needed, but for right now, this document can be tested with the current and potential funders. As we gain experience with the document, lessons can be folded in and modifications made.

12. Action: John and Juan to clarify the issue of different currencies, clarify that this is a minimum, and clarify that this is supporting RDA global, then circulate an electronic draft.

Decision – endorse the model

Business models for RDA:

Mark presented what is still very much a draft, and what was just adopted will inform this. This is a review of existing, possibly relevant models, and their pros and cons.

Recognizing that there is only so much that can be done for RDA as a whole, the regions will need to gather the information and arguments they use for funding and make those widely known.

14. Action: Mark to revise the Business Model document to more clearly highlight the RDA business model; the assessment of business models; and the business plan [revenues, budget and services for the money].

15. Action: Secretariat – collect existing arguments on funding within regions; write up what we would be looking for in a consultant regarding marketing materials; ask the membership if there is any expertise there.



RDA would have to rely on regional expertise for this action, and then think about how to boil it down into a couple of broader, useful statements of need for funders.

14:00 AOB or continued discussion

Time available for issues that inevitably arise. Likely discussion topics include OM recruitment, funding strategies, and future directions planning.

14:45 Break

15:00 Presentation on Data Challenge by a representative from Orange Telecom.

Data for Development Results and Next Steps

Zbigniew Smoreda from Orange presented on experience with past data challenges, https://rd-alliance.org/system/files/documents/Orange_D4Dsummary.pdf

15:30 Plenaries and Paris events

P5 lessons **Kathy (5 min.)**

Some lessons and notes - Color code the sessions as Beginner/Intermediate/Advanced in order to convey the expectations for new participants.

Ask ahead of time for an abstract, objectives, and agenda in the Call for Sessions

Joint sessions were well-received

Continue with Women in RDA

Revise guidelines on how to have more effective meetings

P7-9 plans **Mark (5 min)**

P7 – Local organizers identified. March 1 – 3; half day on 3rd; event on Feb 29 in Tokyo; registration fee is 20,000 yen, flat fee; no other committees established. Theme has not been decided. RDA Coming to Asia! Might be a theme.

Request made to have the Council meeting on Feb 29.

P8 – co-convening International Data Week with CODATA and WDS. Conferences will be independent with some common themes and a joint day. The joint day is a place for high-level ministerial attendance. Idea would be to describe the importance of data in the world scene.

It was suggested to provide continuity with the industry involvement on the Wednesday, using WDS data.

P9 – Barcelona – looking at a venue next month

P10 – current rotation would call for Africa or South America. Council preference is to ask for calls from these areas.

16. Action: Kay and Michael to approach their respective governments on the feasibility of hosting P10. John to approach South Africa on the same topic.

P6 plans **Patrick/Romain (20 min)**

Patrick and Romain presented current status and plans.

17. Action: Investigate how to modify the web site to facilitate partnering with SMEs in the data challenge.

Ideally have the funders present on the 23rd, and have the Council meeting on the 22nd.

18. Action: Secretariat to provide information regarding the European meeting on Sept. 22.

Future en Seine and data workshop **Patrick (15 min)**

Patrick presented current plansd.

16:15 AOB

[these topics were not discussed because of time limitations]

RDA Regions

Structured approach to scheduling governance meetings at the Plenaries

16:45 Review actions and determine next telecom date

Early July is the next telecon date.

19. Action: Mark will set up a Doodle poll for a date and time for the next Council telecon.

Decisions:

Create a set of minutes that consists of decisions and actions for the public record

Agree to proceed with the Outputs process.

Agree to negotiate an MOU with GEO so that they can become an Organizational Affiliate of RDA.

Agree to become an Observer, then Participating Organization, within GEO.

Agree to proceed with the Funding Model document, as amended in the actions.

Agree to proceed with the Business Model document, as amended in the actions.

17:00 Close

Actions

1. Action – within a week of a Council meeting, the Secretariat will distribute informal notes of the meeting; the Secretary General will develop minutes from those notes for approval at the next Council meeting 1
3. Action: Mark and perhaps Doris to collect information around what is needed regarding financial records in support of the Financial Subcommittee. 1
4. Action: Mark to explore what it means to have a regional RDAF offices, and how those might differ from regional RDA organizations. 1
5. Action: Mark to add the role of regional RDA's to a future agenda. 2
6. Action – Andrew and Mark take the question 'what you delivering, what are you adopting, what is the timeline?' as a data gathering exercise, to the 3rd WG Collaboration Meeting, then supplement with those who do not attend. Do not frame the question through any lens. Report at the next telecon and discuss next steps then. 4
7. Action: Mark to further describe level of effort for RDA wrt GEO, and recommend specific involvement and people, as part of the MoU. 4
8. Action: Walter and Juan to go back and discuss and come back at the next telecon with a proposed schedule of how the 12 OAB positions should be allocated. 5
9. Action: Council to read the document by 12 June 2015, and submit comments to the Council mailing list. No comment implies acceptance. 5
10. Action: Upon completion of this review, Mark will announce to the RDA membership that this document has been revised, and articulate the modifications. 5
11. Action: Secretariat to make a list of what are Recognized Outputs and what are Endorsed. 6
12. Action: John and Juan to clarify the issue of different currencies, clarify that this is a minimum, and clarify that this is supporting RDA global, then circulate an electronic draft. 6
14. Action: Mark to revise the Business Model document to more clearly highlight the RDA business model; the assessment of business models; and the business plan [revenues, budget and services for the money]. 6
15. Action: Secretariat – collect existing arguments on funding within regions; write up what we would be looking for in a consultant regarding marketing materials; ask the membership if there is any expertise there. 6



- 16. Action: Kay and Michael to approach their respective governments on the feasibility of hosting P10. John to approach South Africa on the same topic. 8**
- 17. Action: Investigate how to modify the web site to facilitate partnering with SMEs in the data challenge. 8**
- 18. Action: Secretariat to provide information regarding the European meeting on Sept. 22. 8**
- 19. Action: Mark will set up a Doodle poll for a date and time for the next Council telecon. 8**