Chats During the GEDE-FAIR-CTS webinar (names removed)

15:31 Slides for the GEDE FAIR-CTS Workshop can be found here: <https://www.rd-alliance.org/groups/gede-group-european-data-experts-rda>

16:07 One comment - FAIR does address the long-term persistence of the *metadata* (principle A2), but not of the data. In my MI test, I look for a persistence Policy predicate in the metadata

16:29 I think we need a "FAIR maturity testing for dummies" book, with extremely clear descriptions and many concrete examples!

16:31 Totally agree with "FAIR maturity testing for dummies" book, and step by step increasing of FAIRness Litteracy. I hope that SHARC work will contribute to that

16:32 GOFAIR is working on it ;-)

16:34 But Life Science and similar is only a small percentage of all research - so we need examples thatr are relevant across communities, disciplines - and continents!

16:37 Another related issue is that many domains do not have community standards for metadata, or for sharing data. Tho this work should help communities make some progress when they're ready to consider it

16:37 Papers are a good start, but I think something even more simplified (and longer) is needed.

16:37 yes... FAIR Evaluation for Dummies would bew a fun document to write!

16:38 @Mark: The ENVRI community will be happy to contribute to such a book!

16:41 https://fairsharing.org. FAIRsharing is also an RDA WG: https://www.rd-alliance.org/group/fairsharing-registry-connecting-data-policies-standards-databases.html

16:46 To Jon, check out M4M Workshops.... is this relevant to your question?   https://www.go-fair.org/resources/go-fair-workshop-series/metadata-for-machines-workshops/

16:48 2-3 weeks of work to get all documents for the CTS check for those who are up to speed is what I experienced

16:49 Yes Erik it does! Definitely moves in the right direction. Whether the participants in the workshop can speak for their communities is a question, yes?

16:51 The FAIR Maturity Indicator "project" doesn't have a formal structure/team. We're just self-selecting geeks who saw this as a need. In that sense, we can easily join with other projects, though formal or informal invitations to get involved.

16:53 I'd also be interested in this CTS-GoFAIR discussion - *prospective discussion

16:55 Please, join the RDA FAIR Maturity WG

16:56 @Jon - Indeed, we think it's enough to be self-identified as a community so long as useful reusable metadata are created. Example: https://preclinicaltrials.eu. I think "community" can be

(should be allowed to be) quite fluid. More authorative communities can always come later for "official" endorsement.

16:57 That's a good strategy Erik; we can always drag the domain authorities along (kicking and screaming) later :)
17:00 There is the risk that tools requiring certain metadata motivate people to just put values in just to pass the test. Empty values would be in that case better than wrong ones.

17:02nSo then we need evaluations of evaluations - a "dislike" button for evaluations, that says "hey, sure, they passed the test, but the data is garbage!" ;-)