

## Charter Review

Interest Group Title: National Data Services IG [Charter]

Proposers: Kevin Ashley, Adrian Burton

Date Received by TAB: 25 Jan 2016

Date Review Completed: 26 Jan 2016

Date Review consolidated with TAB comments: 15 April 2016

TAB Reviewers: Ingrid Dillo and Peter Wittenburg

### Summary:

Relevant to RDA but requires some revisions.

### Focus and Fit:

*(Are the Interest Group objectives aligned with the RDA mission ? Is the scope too large for effective progress, too small for an RDA effort, or not appropriate for the RDA? Overall, is this a worthwhile effort for the RDA to take on? Is this an effort that adds value over and above what is currently being done within the community?)*

The idea and intentions of the IG are very good. It is extremely helpful to establish such a peer support mechanism for exchanging ideas and information between national data services.

The objectives of the group are in line with the intention and goals of the RDA. However, one important element is lacking: how can national data services help to put RDA output in place or in broader terms help in achieving interoperability?

Response: A new paragraph has been added to the objectives of the group: "The group will also help RDA achieve its objectives by investigating how national data services can adopt or promote RDA output or in broader terms help in achieve interoperability." It should also be noted that the charter already contains the following paragraph in the Participation section: "*The proposed IG will also leverage the work of many RDA working groups, **validating and applying their outputs through the medium of national data services**.* For example the proposed IG will investigate how the outputs of the PID IG can be applied by national-level identifier services (e.g. through national DataCite registration agencies or national ORCID consortia)."

The term national is unclear. Many big and important centers are not national, but regional or organizational/national (in Germany one has several quasi national centers, in the US you also have several centers, regional is OpenAIRE and EUDAT etc.), i.e. the term national either needs an

explanation in the charter or the name needs to be changed. However, TAB notes that EUDAT and OpenAIRE are involved, and this recognises that the need for diversity is present in the membership.

The Introduction now includes the following paragraph: “The word “national” too is not meant to exclude regional or partially national approaches. The IG is inclusive of and acknowledges a variety of configurations, consortia, and approaches to delivering national multi-discipline data services. Indeed documenting the various types and configurations of national data services is one of the objectives of the group.”

#### Capacity:

*(Does the initial membership list include sufficient expertise, and disciplinary and international representation? Are the people involved in the Interest Group sufficient to make tangible progress? What individuals or organizations are missing?)*

The current IG members are not typical centers for large scientific data sets, but do include a number of relevant participants. The group is encouraged to have among their initial objectives to include other relevant centres, with a few examples listed in the updated charter.

The charter now includes the following paragraph under Participation: “The group will actively pursue participation of national data centres that hold large scientific datasets (such as the National Computational Infrastructure in Australia and the equivalent services in other jurisdictions).”

#### Impact and Engagement:

*(Is it likely that the Interest Group will engage the intended community? Is there evidence that the research community wants this? Will the outcome(s) of the Interest Group foster data sharing and/or exchange?)*

The current situation with national data services is clearly evolving towards an increased role given by the authorities to this kind of centres with a 'national' or similar mission, and it is particularly important that this is well articulated with the disciplinary data centres (and more generally with disciplinary expertise) which will continue to have a key role to play.

One challenge for National Services in China as a consortium is to evaluate performance of comprising repositories and suggest funding intensity. If this is a more general issue, this could be included in the discussion scope of this IG. Having said that, a potential weakness of the IG is the vast array of issues and topic they have already identified. They should be very careful to focus on a limited number of these topics in order to be effective and create an impact.

Acknowledged. Before adding another area of focus officially to the charter we will table this idea with the interest group to gauge interest in joint action area.

One TAB member, Wenbo Chu has offered help with engaging with E-science China, which is listed as potential member of this group.

This offer is much appreciated. The co-chairs will follow this up with the TAB member.

Finally, the IG is very closely related to a number of other RDA-groups, in particular the IG Domain Repositories, that is dealing with many of the same topics. Close collaboration and alignment is important.

Acknowledged. The interest group is committed to work collaboratively with existing RDA groups.

Recommendation:

Charter is Sufficient \_\_; Charter Requires Revision X; Charter is Rejected \_\_

Comments:

<if conditional, state revisions ... e.g., TAB recommends that the IG charter be conditionally approved subject to the following change to the IG charter:>