

RDA Council Meeting

Melbourne, Australia, 24-25 May 2016

Participants: Bernard Minster, Doris Wedlich, Patrick Coquet, John Wood, Kay Raseroka, Fran Berman, Ross Wilkinson, Amy Nurnberger (OAB), Francoise Genova (TAB), Andrew Treloar (TAB), Mark Parsons (Secretary General), Stefanie Kethers (minutes).

Support: Jenny Bone (Ross's EA)

Remote attendees: Michael Stanton (Tuesday until lunch break)

Tuesday, 24 May

Meeting Chair: John Wood

Welcome to the meeting

- Ross thanked everyone for a good session with the Chief Scientist and representatives from the Australian Government on Monday, 23 May. They were all very appreciative.
- Welcome to Bernard, and welcome back to Ross and Fran
- Additions to the agenda:
 - Industry engagement
 - The RDA approach to education.
- **Minutes of the last meeting approved.**

Council co-chair selection

- After email discussion, John had nominated Fran to serve as co-chair. Ross seconded. There was no objection and little discussion.

Decision: Fran Berman approved as a Council co-chair for the next two years.

- Prior to the recent election, John and Fran were initially appointed by the original funding agencies as co-chairs. While the Articles of Association and the Governance Document provide some guidance, there is not yet a formal process for determining co-chairs.
- Mark presented a proposal that seeks to identify co-chairs primarily through a consensus process.
- There was some discussion on whether there should be term limits for the co-chairs. It was agreed that a co-chair serves a maximum of two terms unless there are exceptional and extenuating circumstances as agreed by the Council.
- There was discussion of how much alignment there needs to be with OAB and TAB processes and it was agreed that alignment is not necessary because the groups have different missions.

Decision: Chair selection process approved as modified and added to the Organisational and Process Plan

Nominations Committee

- John explained that there has been no real definition of the Nomination Committee. For this, we need globally distributed representation coupled with "gravitas". The last Nomination Committee (NC) consisted of the three funders. In the future, we will also have other funders.
- Mark explained the proposal to appoint a NC of 4-7 individuals with diverse representation every year. The NC should have broad stakeholder representation: One representative of the funders, one RDA member (e.g. recommended by TAB), one organisational representative (recommended by OAB), one former Council member. The NC could have more members if required.

- Subsequent discussion raised the following points:
 - There needs to be a balance of funding perspectives on the committee.
 - While TAB may suggest members from the general membership, they need not be and perhaps should not be TAB members
 - OAB should suggest OA members
 - Industry members should also be considered
 - RDA does not do board seats – i.e., a funder puts money in, and gets a board seat. This may be considered.
 - The process must be seen to forthright and not “feathering our own nest”
 - Having 4-7 NC members gives some flexibility, and allows for balancing.
 - We don’t want to overdefine the process.
 - The Council is currently limited to 9 core Council members – and that there is room for more. There are currently 3 members from Europe, 2 from the US, 1 from Australia, 1 from Africa, 1 from Asia, and 1 from South America - how would we do this with representatives from more different regions?
 - the NC needs some continuity, and that the NC should not be changed around every year. The document needed a sentence to this effect.
- Outcome from the discussion: The current document is roughly ok; it needs something added on membership – NC members should not be representing TAB, or OAB, but those bodies should facilitate the representation. Example: TAB ensures that one or more nominations are received from the WG / IG chairs, OAB does a similar thing. Council then decides on the NC.
- Council needs to be more open and forthright in its communications around these issues.

Action Mark: Modify the document; Mark will provide revised a version tomorrow, to be signed off. CLOSED

- We also need to send out a Call for Nominations for the NC, then at Denver need to send out a Call for Nominations to Council, and announce the NC.

Action Mark, Stefanie, and possibly others: Draft NC guidelines by August.

Encouraging adoption – file 4

- Mark explained that this needs to be agreed by Council; the document comes from lengthy discussions with TAB, OAB, IG / WG chairs at the last Gaithersburg meeting, the Adoption task force, and the Secretariat. In a nutshell: We can’t define the difference between minor / major updates, this depends on the specific recommendation. Groups have different options after completion: a) Continue as a Maintenance group, which has no time limit; b) Develop version 2 of the recommendation – this would mean a new WG, time-bound as usual, but with different approval criteria. Example: DTR 2 will provide version 2 of their recommendation. The task force will review this in a year. To continue support, the proposal is to form a group of volunteers to provide support to recommendations. This can come from the original group, from adopters, etc – this is dynamic, and can change as recommendations change.
- This needs approval from Council, as this changes dealing with groups. Ross asked if we could call Maintenance groups a special type of IG, and WG2 groups a new type of WG. Stefanie pointed out that maintenance groups don’t have a review process (which IGs do). Françoise wanted less review. Ross thought this was OK, but he wanted to keep the number of types of group low. Mark agreed.

Decision: Document Approved

Break

Engagement & Communications Subcommittee – Amy

- The report was accepted as presented
- Discussion:
 - The new Communications plan will help define response to committee recommendations.

- The ambassador program needs particular attention and support.
- Need demonstration programs of RDA Recommendations, especially for Industry. Need also to demonstrate economic impact
- Industry engagement remains a challenge not well addressed by the RDA bottoms-up approach. More discussion tomorrow.

Operations and Coordination subcommittee (OCC) - Andrew

- Report accepted
- There have been 2 recommendations from OCC meetings so far, with input from Council requested:
 1. Ratify Larry Lannom as new member of the OCC – **agreed by Council**
 2. The TAB election document does not fully address the situation when a TAB member steps down before their term ends. This will happen at P8.

Decision: Revision to TAB election document approved with modification that Council decides on how/who to fill the slot after the election.

Action: Stefanie to revise election document. CLOSED

Strategy subcommittee - Bernard

- Report accepted
- Council agreed that the issues around the role of RDA in education, standardisation, and policy were timely and appropriate and look forward to future committee work.

Lunch

OA(B) report (Amy)

File 08

- OA has an ever growing membership – currently 42 organisational members, 6 affiliates

ACTION Stefanie: Talk to Fotis to set up RDS correctly (not as University of Queensland) CLOSED

- There are two industry member slots vacant on OAB at this point. There were no (self-) nominations, but there has been interest from the newest RDA members – Wiley and Elsevier. Balancing needs to be looked at.
- What OAB is working on
 - Filling industry member seats
 - Value & engagement (the value statement is SO important!) Some suggestions have been made, in the absence of a statement (e.g. a voting OAB member on Council, and an OAB representative on TAB).
 - Currently establishing a process for an OA commentary on, and assessment and improvement of
 - Adoptability of outputs
 - Applicability of newly proposed groups
- Items for Council consideration (draft, only first one discussed)
 - Rewards / recognition. Andrew pointed out that there is research literature on digital badges being positive. Stefanie to talk to Amy about reward systems in an online community.
 - General concerns
 - Processes for WG formation
 - Engagement with particular pain points
 - Trust in, respect for, appreciation of volunteer expertise
 - Let WGs fail – be less stringent about reviews
 - Effective messaging to a variety of audiences
 - Responsiveness to community-based requests

- Be responsive & be perceived to be responsive

Discussion

- There was much discussion on balance criteria for OAB. The general consensus was that there needed to be a larger number of private sector members (6?) before filling the remaining two slots.

TAB – Francoise

File 09

- Four new members were elected to TAB in September 2015. Francoise was elected co-chair.
- TAB tries to induct members to get them up to speed quickly.
- The upcoming elections have already been discussed today.
- This September, there are 4 members at the end of their term, and Peter Wittenburg will be stepping down after P8.
- TAB has a subcommittee lead by Peter Fox to identify candidates. There were great candidates last time for the single European slot, so TAB is hoping to get good candidates this time, too.
- Regarding the Future Direction actions, Francoise is leading these within TAB. Can discuss with others what can be done.
- Reviews of proposals is a very, very long process in some cases. There are long delays when groups are asked to revise. The TAB review process has been improved, and is now in parallel with the community review. Afterwards, TAB spends some time to consolidate the review.
- TAB is also in contact with WGs and IGs. There are more and more groups, each has 1-2 liaisons in TAB.
- There is a TAB / WG and IG chairs meeting at each plenary, which exposes the chairs to the global RDA landscape. The chairs can also talk to each other and discuss interactions. At the last meeting, the group discussed types of outputs. TAB is trying to understand the relationships between groups; some Tab members attend collaboration meetings, e.g. the upcoming meeting in Nottingham in June 2016. TAB wants to understand how to best support bottom-up process. There is also the clustering activity to understand the landscape and different relationships, e.g. technical vs social groups, and how to build up these relations. This will be discussed with the WG / IG chairs in Nottingham. TAB is also trying to understand types of outputs, especially aside from expected WG outputs. Mark can say more.
- Fran asked Andrew and Francoise to let TAB know that their efforts are much appreciated. Andrew and Francoise pointed out that effort is not always evenly shared.

Secretariat report – MP

- Alternative organisational membership models these were not for discussion at this point, but just to show these issues are percolating:
 - have core package and optional extras;
 - different levels of membership and recognition;
 - link in plenary sponsorship somehow (though this could be seen as double-dipping – sponsorship fees vs organisational membership fees)
 - linked to value discussion in OA(B)
- RDA has a largely overqualified Secretariat, which could use some administrative support; e.g. if we become more involved in proposal writing, we need to make sure we follow the rules.
- Communications plan is meant to provide clarity on responsibilities, hand-overs, etc.
- There will be a regular monthly newsletter on 1st of month
- Regarding social media, we will delete the RDA Facebook page, and not use Instagram
- The RDA magazine is to become the annual report
- Fran: Not all content is created equal – what about priorities etc? Mark responded that the priorities etc are defined in the Communications plan; this will also go to the Engagement and Communications

subcommittee. Short, rotating Governance updates will be reported monthly (instead of fuller quarterly reports, as suggested in the Future Directions document). We will plan every month what to put into the newsletter, and what to focus on. Fran: This will work for communications, but not for marketing – we need a marketing campaign. We suffer for lack of a marketing plan. Mark responded that the Communications plan covers especially internal communication – there is a strong need for this. Should we do something on Marketing with organisations, maybe getting in-kind support from them? Ross and John agreed that this should be done professionally or not at all.

- Mark has produced a Future Directions actions spreadsheet. This is to be replaced by a tracking system (Stefanie is working on this).
- RDA EU mapped their activities to Future Directions actions.
- There are 3 types of output. Mark sent out a call for supporting outputs – but none were received yet.

ACTION: TAB liaisons to talk to their groups about supporting outputs in response to Mark's call.

Discussion on Endorsement of recommendations

- The first four recommendations have been endorsed, another 4-6 are to be endorsed. We used to look for consensus represented by adoption. The OAB is working on what they may want to do. The Secretariat did an experiment to produce adoption reports – which depend on type of recommendations. Stefanie wrote one for the DDRI WG Output, the RD-Switchboard, which is code. It's quite clear to see if this has been adopted (implemented). Mark looked the adoption of the RDA/WDS Publishing Data Workflows WG recommendation, i.e. a reference model. Mark interviewed two adopters. It was harder to define what was meant by adoption in this case. Meanwhile, the community wants their recommendations endorsed. An adoption report from OA won't be like the Secretariat adoption reports – the OA members won't go to the lengths that the Secretariat did. They may only check adoptability. At this time, we should look at who is using this, not if it's adoptable in general. The OA should perhaps look at actual adoption, but looking at adoptability is easier. Mark commented that the adoption reports need some level of expertise he was not sure he could have done some of the others. Also, this approach is not scalable, it needs expertise, time, and willingness. The endorsement is currently a one-size-fits-all; there may be room for a softer version. There are two waves of adopters in RDA/US – it would be good to have an adopters' forum on the Web so that people could talk about their experiences, and this would also show adoption is real. This was discussed in a TAB meeting. Each output should have a page with comments open so that people can comment. For example the DSA/WDS group are uncertain on what they need to do to get endorsed. This requires effort that we don't have. Where can we get effort that can be applied routinely?

Decision: Mark will send round the adoption reports that we have for Council's thumbs up / down. If there are no better ideas, will continue to work with OA and see what we can do.

Regional support and activity

- The European Open Science Cloud is supported by DG Research, RDA is supported by DG Connect.
- Open question is how an incorporated RDA US would interact with the RDA Foundation. For example, how to distribute leadership (Fran is Principal Investigator, RDA/US Chair, and RDA Council member). The RDA/US leadership meeting was very active. There is a real commitment that RDA US does not want to go broke. RDA/US is developing a hopefully actionable plan. In years 5-10, if RDA/US can provide some reasonably stable support. There is a model, which may involve bridging grants and other funders who can't send money to a UK foundation. RDA/US is considering elected community leadership, Principal Investigators on grants, and other types of leadership – they are trying to find a synergistic structure. They admire Europe – there are a lot of people taking leadership there.
- In Europe, there were 28 Director-Generals, they all have their own policies. We deal with DG Connect and DG Research. DG Connect supported RDA from the start, and see ownership of the success. Carlos Moedas – OOO

(Open Innovation, Open Science, Open to the World) – RTD. They want jobs and growth, also sustainable development goals, e.g. engagement with Africa etc. DG Connect wants a baseline – supporting the Secretariat, not any EU projects. Funding can be continuous, but cannot have any projects attached. They have requested a proposal. This needs to be discussed, but we have 2 years to sort this out. After the next round of funding, we need to have this done. Also, there is a reorganisation of DG Connect, which does not affect most, but they are moving this to Luxembourg. The Commission goes until the end of 2020. They are looking for what happens afterwards. The Foundation needs to be heavily involved in whatever is next.

- The UK has promised 50k pounds for Mark's salary and an RDA UK workshop. Ross stated that RDA should take this very seriously. Andrew explained that this would be JISC, and that Tony Hey will coordinate everything.

Regional coordination – slide

- Trademark – is this worth pursuing? John pointed out that RDA probably can't defend a trademark, anyway, as that would be too costly. Groups claiming to represent RDA, while not endorsed, is a bigger issue, and needs to be addressed.

Decision: Not pursue trademark.

- Meetings suggested for Council in Denver: 13 September: Funders' Forum, 15 September: Council meeting.

Afternoon tea

Sustainability

- Kay talked about the engagement with Africa (=54 countries). Kay has tried to find leverage – an organisation with connection to African Union and regional coverage. The African Union is important. She spoke to the African Academy of Science (AAS); will also investigate geophysical organisations.
- For last 2 years, she has worked with Fran, Mark, and Ross to interest AAS. They want to have Nobel Prize winners from Africa. Not just people, but also data on which research sits. Breakthrough: The Executive Director invited Kay to join in their collaboration activity in Nairobi, where they were bringing together the Great Challenges group, funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates foundation. Kay presented on the importance of data, with a panel of medical, health, agricultural experts. People may not come to Denver, though. AAS is holding its own regional General Assembly in Botswana, from June 20-24. Kay was hoping to get a few RDA leaders to come to the meeting. Policy issues need to be discussed. The organisers are the Botswana Institute for Technology (BITRI), whose Executive Director Kay knows very well, and who is very interested in RDA. Kay will be running workshops with librarians and computer scientists to show they can work together. BITRI also want a workshop on data. Now that the researchers have mastered the peer-reviewed journals, they are asked to go to open science the researchers feel like the goal posts are moved to prevent them from getting recognition. BITRI want to bring together all the difficult pieces to bring things out in the open.. John: This is a fantastic opportunity – the biggest impact on the Sustainable Development Goals can be driven by data sharing. This is a huge issue. Françoise: ICRI will be in Cape Town later this year. Ross suggested to hold a workshop in Cape Town before ICRI, then afterwards another meeting / workshop in Botswana. John suggested the need to talk to Peter Wittenburg. As an aside, RDA was born at ICRI in Copenhagen.
- Bernard: There is also a geophysical organisation: AfricaArray. His experience with African colleagues is that there is a lower density of scientists. There are several organisations to take into account: the ICSU regional office, Africa, the Belmont Forum. John will be talking to the other Belmont Forum co-chair. Ross, possibly Françoise, John, and perhaps Mark can do something post-ICRI on the 7th of October. John: We also need to talk to National Advisory Council on Innovation (NACI) - the Vice Chancellor of the University of Pretoria chairs this; highly influential in policies in South Africa. John: There are also ongoing discussions with India, Japan, and China, ebbing and flowing.

ACTION: John, Mark to investigate if they can go to the June meeting.

ACTION: Ross, Kay to talk about a post-ICRI meeting in Botswana.

Sustainability discussion - Ross

- How do we sustain the finances of the organisation – this came out of Tokyo discussions. Ross proposed to talk about this on Wednesday.
- Leadership sustainability
- Organisational sustainability – structures that need to be in place
- Regional sustainability – how do we ensure regional support, and at the same time a strong RDA Global. See Fran's comment: strong global and lightweight Global, or vice versa
- Community sustainability

Leadership sustainability – Ross

Discussion

- We are not short of potential leaders – this is a good thing, but we are a bit constrained in how we use the leadership in this space. Also, sustainability of Council – there is tension between the community and the relationship to funders. In the past, Council has probably been more about the relationship with key stakeholders than about community leadership – that's more what TAB does.
- This was not discussed in the Sustainability Subcommittee – this comes from the discussion in Tokyo.
- Thoughts on what could be done will be taken back to the Sustainability Subcommittee, and then will come back to Council.
- We should be a little bit sophisticated about this, and take this seriously. There is also a difference between people putting themselves forward, and them being brought forward. We should avoid perception that Council only lets certain people through.
- Peter Fox is heading a task force trying to encourage people to nominate themselves as candidates for TAB. This does not mean TAB endorses them. TAB is concerned about renewal. If Council has any suggestions for TAB nominees, please get in touch with Peter Fox.
- We need both renewal from within and – possibly harder – from the outside. How do we get the right level of involvement with the funders, whoever they may be? How do we counter perceptions of “insiderness” – that the leaders don't listen to the community?
- People with influence may not be in RDA. Strategy can be to find someone influential, and teach them about RDA.
- We have to be careful not to put too many laws around this, we need flexibility in different situations. The key thing is openness to new leadership, regardless of how that happens. Also, influence only goes so far – people change roles, etc. It's dynamic. What else can we do?
- Distinguish between influential persons and organisations we would like in RDA.
- There are different types of people in Council leadership. Some were grown from within RDA, some to target particular funders, or to target particular organisations. People also need to have the respect of the community.
- We need new ideas coming in, but also to encourage people from within. May have a stronger applications or industry focus rather than computer science – this may shift things.
- The history of the Council subcommittees – is that Council wanted to make Council meetings more relevant, but also to grow new leadership; the Subcommittee chairs and members were selected accordingly.
- John had previously suggested a Shadow Council made up of younger people. We could do something informal, e.g. select a dozen people to look at some issues for us.
- We need balance, and a bit of time to think this through. The discussion about people was not easy last time. John suggested to set up a group of under-35s, and let them meet at plenaries.

John: This was a useful meeting today, with quite a few issues discussed. More tomorrow.

Wednesday, 25 May 2016

Meeting chair: Fran Berman

Industry Strategy - Patrick

- Slides: Cap Digital - RDA Melbourne.pdf
- There was a lot of back and forth discussion and open brainstorming of how to better engage industry.
- We have to understand first what industry does and wants to do.
- We need to start with listening, not with our “products”. There could be value in having a meeting on “what are your problems”. However, we’d need to get the right people.

ACTION: Patrick to set up a meeting with companies on “What are your data problems?” and invite some relevant RDA people.

- We could set up an “International Data Experiment” program, taking advantage of this program. The next Program of RTD will have a call for companies etc – the Foundation could look at projects in this context. We need to deliver to industry, otherwise we’re toast.

ACTION: Subsequent to the industry meeting, explore Data Experiment or similar projects, including in other jurisdictions. This could involve Patrick, Ross, and possibly Bob Hanisch.

International Summaries

- Round the table on where things are at – 5 mins max. What’s happening in the community, with government, is there interest around plenaries?

Brazil - Michael

- Slides: mstanton-p10-in-south-america-20160525.pptx
- As potentially interested in RDA
- The situation with Brazil government; the financial situation (for research funding) is worse than it was 2 years ago. It’s a strange period. This has reduced Michael’s mobility. He expects this to be a limited period before the situation improves again.
- Michael has been working on identifying groups – researchers, institutions – who may be interested, e.g. the Instituto Brasileiro de Informações Científicas e Tecnológicas - IBICT (Brazilian Institute for Scientific and Technological Information), run by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. Prof Leonardo Lazarte from IBICT has participated in the last 2 Plenary meetings. Michael is trying to provide a list of research groups to approach. The aim is to engage with WGs, to inform about activities in RDA. Tony made contact with Carlos Brito of the São Paulo Research Foundation.
- There is a data community in Brazil, we could have a plenary here, but we’ll need to do some legwork.

France - Françoise

- There are different activities in Europe, e.g. training on different aspects of data sharing in Germany. Françoise has organised several meetings. She usually explains what RDA is at the beginning; Mark attended one such meeting. Françoise is reluctant to speak about outputs, as they are few and technical. Françoise has a mailing list with people at the organisational level, from ministry, from research organisations, practitioners. About half overlap with RDA members. Several talks have been held at the main science agency. She also invited to the French geological survey – who asked, why should we care. The meeting was prepared very well; she got 4 BoF proposals for Paris out of this. Now they are proposing an IG, and have the best proposal Françoise has seen so far. Françoise was also invited to speak in front of a national meeting of s/w developers for research. Françoise talked about certification, and about how and why to participate in RDA. People contacted her for this meeting, not the other way round.

- Fran asked if there was movement towards RDA France, as there has been in the UK. Francoise would like it if organisations joined the RDA OA as research organisations. She was not sure France will join RDA.

RDA UK – John

- The UK government have decided that universities need more competition, and are opening up to the private sector for cut-price degrees. They are also reviewing how research should be supported – this is being resisted by the research council. We need to look at a variety of stakeholders: government, JISC, research councils – they all have different programs. Tony Hey is now the co-chair of the E-Infrastructure leadership Council together with Jo Johnson, Minister for Universities and Science. This is a talking shop mainly, but involves industries. DCC has just been told it is not getting more public funding, which is an absolute disaster. Research funding in the UK has been slashed. A lot of research now has to be done on grand global challenges. This links in to the RDA WG on Data for Development – they can do stuff with this money. It is rather Europe-centric in its delivery, John is trying to get them to work with Kay and others. The RDA UK group is chugging on; the new head off JISC is very supportive of RDA, and has offered to host RDA Europe. Rachel Bruce at JISC will also continue to be supportive. The UK Data Forum (not RDA UK). John chairs another project, ATTRACT, to go live at the end of next month, with a variety of organisations, including European Synchrotron, EMBL, CERN. The project is trying to use sensors, monitoring and data to help innovation. It is trans-European, with CERN, not just EU.

Plenaries - Mark

- Talking about Plenary 10 and future Plenaries.
- We need to work out where to go for P10. According to the Plenary rotation plan, P10 will be “other”. We may need to reconsider that.
- There was agreement that we need a credible organisation that has a serious understanding of RDA behind the bid. This is not about individual(s). It’s almost to the point where the RDA foundation could write a contract with the organisation to run the conference.
- Plenaries are the key marketing activity of RDA. It is really important to have an organisation that is able to manage a plenary.
- It is also desirable and helpful for the organisation’s national government to be involved and contributing.

ACTIONS:

Mark to approach the Academy of Sciences in China and the Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology.

Mark to approach Ted Hewitt in Canada

Everyone to send any other contacts to Mark.

ACTIONS:

Mark to delete the two paragraphs on plenary rotation from the Web site and from the plenary guidelines.

CLOSED

Hilary to update the plenary guidelines with the criteria for being a host, then bring them back to Council to check as this can be politically sensitive.

ACTION: John, Mark and Michael to work on Argentina and Brazil coordination and visit.

RDA/US - Fran

- The US doesn’t have money for the next plenary after P8 – they will need to sort this out.
- The community is doing great.

RDA/DE - Doris

- This is organised by members of TAB and OAB
- Includes Max Planck Computing Centre and Helmholtz office
- There are workshops three times a year, including librarians and others in Germany, to feed back to them about what happened at Plenaries.
- Once a year, there is a RDA/DE meeting in Potsdam (organised by Doris/Rainer/Raphael); they bring in government people to present.
- Doris has an invitation to go to DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) next month.
- There could be a Plenary in Berlin – we should keep this in mind.
- There are evaluation programs coming up in 2018, and 18 Helmholtz national centres will also be evaluated in 2018, which will be very busy.

Africa - Kay

- Upskilling of data professionals, librarians, and of relating data scientists and data professionals. There is a schism in Africa – data scientists say, here are the tools, get on with it – data professionals have no clue how to do this. What can RDA do to fill this gap, and to find partners so that we can make “skilling” an area? Kay was looking at John as the Secretary General of ACU – the University Librarians are entry points, as they deal with research at all levels, but they have nowhere to meet on this. The “23 things” may be something that could be adopted.
- Ross: The 23 things in Australia was about local groups, not about travelling – it all happened via Internet. Fran: We can also help with Webinars. Kay: This is difficult, there are electricity issues. Amy: One of the 23 things is the University of Edinburgh’s MANTRA module, which includes only 5 things, and could be an easy entry point.

ACTION: John to talk to Kay about adoptability of 23 things to support data professionals in Africa, and in particular the University of Edinburgh’s MANTRA module, which could be an easy entry point

Australia - Ross

- Australia is still committed to RDA, but there is no RDA Australia. That is not the model. See discussion from Monday.

Sustainability - Ross

- This was a very lengthy and complex discussion that went in many different directions. The value proposition of RDA was again discussed, as was the general business model.
- Ultimately, the group identified some initial core services that RDA as an organisation must provide for the community and groups to actually do the work. We also began to spell out how these service are currently supported and how we would prefer they be supported.

ACTION: Ross (owner), Amy, Patrick, Fran to turn the discussion on what the business into a Council-friendly 1-page description.

- What are our Core Services needed for the business to run?
 - Running plenaries | registration fees by members, sponsorships (organisations), cash and in-kind support (Hilary, Yolanda, etc) (govt agencies via grant investments through Secretariat and region)
 - Facilitate, advise on the creation & operation of the groups | effort: grant – Secretariat, grant-local, employer in-kind; travel:
 - Organisational governance |
 - Dissemination of outputs |
 - Communication, collaboration, discussion tools for RDA |
 - Supporting recommendation adoption |
 - Evaluating things |

- Administration of global organisation to support all of this |
- Business development |
- Reporting to stakeholders (membership. Funders, organisers, etc) |
- We need to tighten this and get this into a language that is shared

ACTION: Ross (owner), Amy, Patrick to tighten outcomes from discussion on what our core services needed for the business to run are into a document aiming at shared language.

ACTION: Mark in consultation with Finance SC to go through the spreadsheet (“Who pays now, how much, for what, how”) and complete it, then take it back to Council.

- How much / What are the sources of funding (in-kind, cash) and flows? (As of today-ish – 2016x3)

ACTION: Mark to put numbers to this as a first cut, then to engage with Sustainability and Finance Subcommittees (specifically Doris and Ross) to see how we can use this.

Questions from Sustainability Subcommittee:

- Plenaries could be a vehicle for funding people supporting the plenaries (i.e., the foundation) – we could add US\$ 100 to registration fees. Comments?
 - Much discussion. No clear consensus as of yet
 - Words to be provided by Ross on an approach

Project funding - Ross

- There was a decision to actively explore more project funding opportunities in RDA
 - Two recent examples:
 - H2020 call on e-infrastructure, which stated “Collaboration with RDA is encouraged”. Two groups approached RDA. There is a) the Earth Observation project, which may involve data from Copernicus, and b) the Infrastructure for SKA in Europe
 - The RDA Foundation is now a registered agency that can participate in EU calls as partner. RDA Foundation is now a partner on both projects (which may be an issue, as the Foundation has no employees). Both pay 1 month of Mark’s time each. Mark is hoping he can identify someone to help with this.

How do we effectively manage the relationship between RDA and RDA regions?

- There are two proposals:
 - A Regular forum for coordination between regions (and national)
 - Pre-coordination. We can refuse letters of support, and make it known. If a body is proposing to put in for a grant for an RDA activity, they should ask for a letter of support from the RDA Council.
 - Branding is important. Part of brand management is also to say no for things that don’t have the right level of coordination.

ACTION: John, Fran, and Mark to come up with a missive that explains our intent on using the RDA brand and supporting letters and that Council is happy to agree with, then work out how to communicate this.

The next Council meeting will be in Denver, at P8. The Funders’ Forum will be on Thursday.

ACTION: Mark to talk to Clare about her situation. CLOSED

Mark would like to send out an announcement to the funders ASAP.

ACTION: Mark to send "save the date" email to funders. CLOSED

ACTION: John, Fran to think about how to give some recognition to previous contributors.

The next Council meetings are:

- Denver (P8)
- Barcelona (P9)
- Roughly in a year's time from now, perhaps in the US? Fran would be happy to host.