

RDA ESES CoP interest meeting

📅 Mon, Feb 06, 2023 10:25AM 🕒 1:19:12

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

rda, community, groups, outputs, practice, shelly, recommendations, data, working, discipline, membership, organizations, people, connie, identify, science, interest groups, updated, thinking, space

SPEAKERS

Shelley Stall



00:27

Hi Shelley, how's it going?



Shelley Stall 00:29

It's good. How are you? It's good to see you.



00:32

Hang in there.



00:33

Good, good.



Shelley Stall 00:36

I'm gonna just run and grab this place is in the lobby to rise up. I'm gonna go grab some some more. All right they'll start without me



00:52

I think you're sick.



02:41



Hello everyone hello



Shelley Stall 02:51

oh wow like we're having a reunion Hey everybody Are you it's an adorable What do you call it a jumper sweater?



03:09

Thank you.



Shelley Stall 03:10

That's adorable.



03:11

All too often I've probably watched it several times on calls with you but



Shelley Stall 03:16

it's not sure I don't think I paid attention till today so I'm really sorry.



03:21

That's okay



Shelley Stall 03:25

I haven't seen you in forever. It's so nice that I'm thank you for coming. I keep trying to



03:33

figure out how to work my way into RDA. I haven't quite cracked that nut. Yeah, and I'm hoping that this will help.



Shelley Stall 03:38

Oh, you're in the right place.



03:45

They care for what you volunteer for.



03:51

Oh, I think I'm firmly anchored in E sip. So at this point, I'm looking for bridges to additional community as opposed to being an anchor organizer myself.



Shelley Stall 04:01

Let's go with bridge. Okay. Reading bridge. I love it.



04:08

Hi, Shelly. Hi everybody.



Shelley Stall 04:12

Oh, did you hear your ears burning this morning? We were talking about oh dear, that can't be good. Open Science and data helped us. So eg you and you want to volunteer on? Oh gosh. Christina. What do they do? Give them give them a path. Hmm, looks like we have to give them a pat before the end of the meeting. We need to give them a path. Should they write to Meghan? Maybe they should write to Megan I guess. Yep, I think so. Or or Martina. Or Yeah. Yep. Martina



04:48

are Yen's is probably the best bet. Just please don't write to me because I have a torrent of email into my inbox as you might imagine right now.



Shelley Stall 05:00

Yeah, well, we'll say it again. We'll say it again. Oh, that is Megan's coming in right now. Okay, cool. So Shelley, are you coming to Vienna this year? Yeah. I'm so excited. You'll get to me Christina to Christina is coming with me.



05:22

Fantastic. After I missed Chicago. I'm delighted that you're going to be in Vienna.

 S

Shelley Stall 05:27

We are. So there we are. So so they're in so excited.



05:33

Good. I'm really happy about that.



05:36

Yeah. Hi, Monica Lee. This is to the year I think I decided to join in this our first time joining so excited about to hear what you guys talked about today.

 S

Shelley Stall 05:45

Great. Hello. Because it's the first time for everybody. So yeah, yeah. I'm glad you're here. Thank you. Oh, gosh, it is like oh my goodness. It is like



06:00

just like having a reunion.



06:02

All right. There's a lot of familiar faces here, Shelley?

 S

Shelley Stall 06:06

Oh, it's such a it's so wonderful. I'm so glad. So we're the goal is to do a thing that you all want to be part of. So that is definitely So Christina is sending me vibes to make her a co host. I'm going to do that right now. Okay, here it comes. Christina. And I'm going to unpause our recording because you know that we did this last minute and everybody couldn't make it and I'm sorry about all that. So hello, everybody. I'm Christina, do you want to do you want to start the Do you want me to show the slides or you got there it goes,



06:47

Yeah, I got it. Yeah. And maybe. Thanks, everyone for coming. If you haven't met me yet. Which is probably many of you. I'm Christina brown builder. I joined hu in September. I'm the new program manager for open science. Really happy to be here and to meet all of you. And the meeting that we would like to that we invited you all today to is to discuss the possibility of forming an Earth space environmental science community of practice. And so we have Shelley

stall here who's going to explain her vision for what this might look like. And, but with an emphasis on we really want to know what this group might mean to you, what it might mean for the community and what kind of outputs what kind of activities it might really enhance. And then later on, we'll hear from Connie Claire, who's the Community Development Manager at the Research Data Alliance, and she'll really be giving us the details on what a community of practice means to RDA, what the formation would look like and what kinds of activities that I think one community of practice that they already have formed. has been engaged in. I'm also going to drop a link to the survey that we've put together in the chat. So if you wouldn't mind when you get a chance, we'll have five minutes later during this meeting. We are looking for feedback on the on what the topics were discussing any information that you can put in about what kinds of areas you think a community of practice might work on. Any feedback, positive or negative on whether or not you think a group like this would be helpful. And also just so that we can have your contact information. If you're interested in taking this forward with us. That'd be really great. So I'm going to go ahead and drop that Lincoln share the meeting agenda. Again, we'll be having about 10 minutes from Shelley discussing the motivation for this kind of group. Then we'll have five minutes where if you'd like to, you can go ahead and fill out the survey. And then we'll hear from Kati and have time for questions and discussion. Here is the link to the feedback and interest survey. And I'm going to let Shelley take it away.

S

Shelley Stall 08:51

Fantastic. And Christina. You're coming in as multiple Christina so I hope I've made one of you around keep making some of your co hosts. Okay,



09:03

I think that's our fellow open sides. Remember Brian's the door we have some shared zoom licenses at AGU. Sometimes we have some name confusion.

S

Shelley Stall 09:14

So, gosh, you know, I love that Christina said it's Shelley's vision and I you know, maybe maybe some of it is but many of you are having have actually expressed you know, why isn't it easier? Why can't we somehow collaborate better? You know, where, where can we go to do this and I'm not going to put words in your mouth. I really want this to be a very broad conversation. For the for those of you who thought this was going to be an interesting conversation, I want it to be an interesting conversation. So this slide here, and if you could go to the next one, Christina. You many of you who've worked with ag you know that we have a position statement on data. Some of you on this call, actually helped write it. And it 2023 is its year for being updated. So if anybody secretly would like to be part of the revision of this statement, please send a note to myself or Christina and we'll put you into the bucket of of the team. It's time again. And what is really relevant here is hu its members see the data that's associated with our work as a world heritage. It's just not repeatable. And we're talking about observational data here. The you know, the the phenomenons across the earth and the universe. They're just, it's just precious. And it's important for us to understand our world, in that data is is fundamental. I believe I'm talking to the choir, and we need to treat it appropriately and it's a really fantastic position statement. So please take a moment there's a there's a link here and take a look. It's it's ready

to be made current and we look forward to the team that's going to work on that this year. Next slide. The other the other thing I usually have in a lot of my talks is this image from nature, they did this in 2019 at their 150th. Marking 100/50. And I this is actually an updated image I took this morning I what I really want you to see here are a couple things. They're linking papers, they're not linking data, they're not linking software. Maybe the next time they do this, they'll do that. For us because the knowledge graphs will get better. But they're doing papers, and yellow, which you can see here on the far right is the green greenish yellow is the earth and space sciences. And we have of course all of our own research. But if you if you look across the this really cool interactive diagram, you can see that it touches so many of the other colors. And our research is really critical for many other disciplines, and that's quite relevant to this conversation, how we interact with others. And if you go to the next slide not only are we relevant but within research today, multinational papers are by far the majority of the papers being published. This is true within ag use journals as well these this is data from that same interactive diagram showing single authored papers which are nearly gone, statistically nearly gone. single country papers, domestic papers are on the downward path, and multinational papers or internet or teams that are international is continuing to increase. And I think this all would make sense to everybody. You know, science doesn't get easier, it gets harder. And it really especially in the earth and space sciences, that seismic activity didn't happen in in the borders of one country. It happened and impacted the world. And we know that and so to do our research, we have to be international. And I for for for the folks that I talked to you I'll bring up this next slide, which is by the way, rather bold of me to tell the world that I know what the future of research is. So please, please, no it comes from a place of of collaboration. That teams are not single researchers. They are international collaborations. In order to do your research, you have to be able to get to the relevant work worldwide. You need to be able to understand that relevant work. You it needs to be that the data no matter what team creates it needs to be interoperable. No matter what software is generated, it has to be accessible to you. And I took great liberties with the eye and a a fair of course you're all seeing that this aligns to fair and that and yes, you you know, I'll be happy to buy you a drink as you say to me Yes, but surely that data set needs to be accessible to Yes, it's a simple slide. Don't give me a hard time. I'm just trying to make a point here. You're of course right. And certainly there's more tools than Jupyter Notebooks. Yep, sure, you're right. But this is a simple slide and we're trying to make a simple point. And don't forget we need the licensing to be support, reuse and openness. So this is this is how I usually begin to talk to lay the groundwork of why things are super complicated and why it matters to everyone that we care about our datasets. We care about our software, they are important research products, and we need to work internationally. Okay, that's the spiel. That's the motivation. So, Christine, I think the next slide is the next appropriate slide. So I'm just gonna I'm gonna wait you're thinking here. It could. Could someone please put that link in the chat to make it easy for everyone to get to? Thank you. So go check out the chat. But also please watch our next speaker on Khan. He's going to talk about the Research Data Alliance Community of Practice this so don't get hung up on the term they use. It's, it fits within the hierarchy within RDA. And it really Oh yeah, Kara. Thanks. It really does fit a need within disciplines and we're exploring this as a place where we can bring many of you participate in E sip, oh my gosh, a critical partner when it comes to the informatics portions of the earth and space sciences, but also recognizing that they are oriented domestically here in the US. And when we work together, we're going to need a lot more folks. We're going to need isa plus we're going to need to cook into what's happening across the world, and that's hard. That's really hard to do. And how how can we make that happen? And so if you you know, the forum is to collect your thoughts to make sure that this is a relevant conversation for you and that the outcomes are relevant, and the outcome being standing up a community of practice. But at the moment, Connie, if you could please take the stage and help everyone realize what that is in the eyes of RDA.



17:05

Thank you, Shelley. No, it might be actually better if I can share my own screen if that's okay. Just because I've got few animations and it'll be easier if I don't have to say next all the time. I'll just share the screen so hopefully everyone can see my slides. Can everybody see Okay, looks good? Yeah. Wonderful. Thank you so much. So thanks so much for inviting me today here to this meeting such a fantastic turnout and I'm delighted to be able to talk a bit about the RDS communities of practice. So for those of you who don't know me, my name is Connie Claire, and I started working at the RDA as the Community Development Manager for the RDA foundation. So I take quite a global position. I'm not really affiliated with any of the particular regions, but I am part of the Secretariat with the RDA and I liaise with the different governance bodies. So the Technical Advisory Board region Advisory Board, the organization advisory board, and also the council. But I do a lot of my thinking in terms of bringing the different community groups together, and that's where talking about communities of practice is going to be quite important. So, for those of you well I'd first of all, just tell you what we're going to cover today I want to give a little bit of background about the RDA for anybody that is new to the organization. And then I'll talk about the different kinds of groups that we have. And then we'll focus in on communities of practice. Talk about the value of communities of practice and why they're important, how to set one up what the membership and the leadership might look like. And then some key expectations and what what's required. So, a bit about the RDA. So we're actually celebrating our 10th anniversary, which is quite exciting. So it was established in 2013. And I think it's nice just to reflect back and think about what the RDA has actually become over the past 10 years. So it's a global consensus based and community driven organization and it comprises more than 13,000 international data experts. So it's quite a large organization, a large community and the RDA is supported by more than 70 organizational and affiliate members and 35 regional networks from 145 different countries. So we're spanning a large geographical area, and those affiliate and organizational members and the regional networks have this shared vision and see the importance and the value of data sharing and reuse. And the community work is achieved by 100 different community groups. So we have working groups, interest groups, and now communities of practice. And the community and the community groups are responsible for these flagship recommendations and outputs which are openly and publicly accessible. We have 75 of those. So just to share the broad mission and vision. So the RDA creates a neutral platform to bring various different stakeholders, researchers and innovators together to build the social and technical bridges to enable data sharing and reuse occur across geographical, technological and disciplinary boundaries. And I think that's really key to think about with this community of practice. And just to share our guiding principles because they're also very important and at the heart of the RDA, openness means that the membership is open to anybody who wants to be part of the RDA that will adhere to the guiding principles and the meetings and also the community work is always open. It's consensus based. So that means that processes and procedures in place are agreed with consensus we're inclusive and take a broad and balanced approach to the membership and also the community work. We want to harmonize where possible data policies, standards, infrastructure, technologies and communities. Were community driven. So it's a bottom up grassroots community of volunteers that are supported by the secretariat. And then finally, just a reminder that we're nonprofit and technology neutral so we don't promote, endorse or sell any commercial products. And the emphasis here is being placed on making sure that all the recommendations and outputs are open and reusable. So at the heart of the RDA, we have three different mechanisms whereby the community work is achieved. The first one is working groups. So these are finite groups that last roughly for around 12 to 18 months and they're

working on concrete deliverables. So the development and implementation of tools, policies, practices and products related to data management that can be really adopted and implemented in a real world setting. Then we have interest groups, which is a slightly broader focus, but still focusing on solving a specific data sharing problem and developing infrastructure and solutions. To tackle those issues. And this time, the working group can be alive as long as the group is really active, so there isn't a cut off point like there is with the working groups and interest groups can actually create their own recommendations and outputs. But a lot of the time it leads to the evolution of new working groups to take that on. And finally, I think it just useful to paint the picture of how it all works. But what we're focused on today really are communities of practice. So this is a fairly new type of group that was established in December 2020. And the communities of practice take a more disciplinary focus. So it's more of a coordination role linking what happens within the RDA to external communities and external organizations to really raising awareness of the work that's been done in those different types of organizations. So this is why it's called an umbrella group really because it's much larger in scope. And it kind of encompasses some of the interest groups and working groups within the RDA. So again, the timing is indefinite. It can last as long as the community of practice is running for but there is a review process every 18 months and I'll talk a little bit like about that at the end of the presentation. And, as Shelley mentioned, or Christina mentioned at the start that we do have one community of practice already improving global agricultural data and I'll just share a slide with some more information about what they're doing. So the idea as I mentioned is to build bridges within and across the RDA and also externally and through a community from through a community of practice, give rise to new interest groups and working groups where possible. So the I got Community of Practice currently have four co chairs. This group is a forum for sharing experiences and really getting visibility to different data challenges within agricultural data. So promoting best practices sharing experiences within the domain, but also promoting the RDA recommendations and outputs and establishing a robust network of organizations external to the RDA to be able to really disseminate and promote those RDA deliverables among a wider research community. So you can see the achievements here in the top right have come from two working groups within the RDA. So we've got the wheat interoperability, working group recommendations, and the agro semantic Working Group recommendations and the kinds of things that this work at this community of practice are involved in going forward is a World Fair European project, which is an RDA also partnered with CO data supporting pollinator data interoperability framework. And also they're interested in increasing engagement within eastern Europe and they are actually running a session at the 20th plenary in Sweden in Gothenburg where they'll be thinking about the next steps and what they're going to be doing. So just a few more details about communities of practice. The aim of course is to investigate, discuss, provide a place to exchange knowledge and skills within a specific discipline. So within, in this case, the Earth space and Environmental Sciences, and again, serve as the coordination focal point for that discipline. So the idea would be that this community of practice within the RDA would be reaching out to other organizations externally creating those connections and links and making sure that any work that is done within the RDA can be disseminated and also fed back through to the RDA if necessary, so that there's a commitment either directly or indirectly to enabling data sharing exchange interoperability. And the idea of communities of practice kind of evolved because there was already some disciplinary work going on within the RDA community and I can show this by sharing some of the discipline specific interest groups that already show a bit of a window from the RDA to the outside world. And these are three that I've just picked out today. But there are other working groups obviously, we've got the East IP space and Environmental Sciences interest group. There's a geospatial interest group and the water Global Water information interest group but as I say, this list is not exhaustive and there are others that are also working within this domain.




26:12

So the value of community the practice really for its members, I think you can probably already see that having this kind of global forum and having an open forum for discussion, development and maintenance of various different data solutions can really help in a disciplinary context. Members can really learn about disciplinary trends and they get a real like international view of things. They can exchange knowledge, experiences and best practices from around the world and troubleshoot solutions with a global community, which I think he's quite helpful. And hopefully, you know, and I'm speaking quite generically here and I'm sure you can think about this in your own context, but really being able to overcome some personal challenges within your own disciplines and implement solutions and think about how the current RDA recommendations and outputs can possibly be adapted and changed and implemented in real world different contexts. And of course, we hope that communities of practice can also help its members to grow and expand their professional network. So how to create a community of practice, like with the working groups and the interest groups where there is a formal process, it's the same for a community of practice. Whoever sets this up, when the idea kind of comes to fruition, they have to draft an agreement. And this is then sent to the Secretariat via email or it can be submitted via the web platform and I've added the links in here so surely you can share the slides around and people can have a look and read some more. And the criteria is that a community of practice should really evolve from at least one current RDA interest group or working group and preferably one that has RDA endorsed recommendations and supporting outputs. But we've already seen that there are a few interest groups and working groups within this area. And then the agreement would then go under a six week community review so it goes to the technical advisory board organization Advisory Board, the Regional Advisory Board, it goes to the wider RDA community for comments before then go into the RDA councils so it's quite heavily reviewed. And within that agreement, this is a very high level itemization of what's included but obviously identifying the domain or the discipline that you want to tackle and any goals and objectives and outcomes that you see the community of practice should focus on. And it should also include like milestones and a timeline of how how this is going to be achieved. So a strategy for how you will increase membership and how you will engage external stakeholders, for example, and how you'll identify new members and who the co chairs might be and kind of the level of community support. So who's going to help to drive and maintain the community at least over the first 18 months? So in terms of membership, and also leadership, there should be at least three co chairs from three continents so we want to really encourage diverse geographical balance of leaders and the co chairs would serve as the point of contacts who are responsible for driving the Community of Practice overall and being responsible for engaging with others and making sure that the communication is key within the membership, but also external organizations. They're also responsible for maintaining that organizational structure to make sure that the quality the scope, the timeliness, the usefulness and the progress of the work is achieved. Membership as with everything with RDA, it's open to anybody who's interested as an RDA member, anyone could join the community of practice. But we would like to see a membership spanning 10 countries from three continents just to again get that diverse geographical representation and this can include the organization and affiliate members of the RDA regional members, and also members from lower and middle income countries. So focusing on the global south. So finally, just some key expectations of what we'd like these are quite general so you can kind of interpret these as what you think within your own discipline. But it's makes sense really, that the first one would be raising awareness about open and fair data. And software and research outputs in general. We expect that the community of practice should focus on advocating and

implementing good research data management practice within the discipline and policies and also not forgetting again, I keep saying it but trying to get those RDA recommendations and outputs to be used within the discipline, highlighting the need for various different technical social infrastructure to help and this might lead to the development and the emergence of new working groups and interest groups. Another expectation is to link with existing communities and initiatives. So not forgetting there are other fantastic communities within disciplines that are doing great work. So how can the RDA also collaborate with and harness those and build the social technical and disciplinary bridges with those organizations and thinking about industry also, you know, governmental organizations, as well a different kinds of associations, all sorts of different kinds of organizations there. And the community of practice should offer insight into disciplinary challenges and solutions should welcome and engage new members to the RDA. And also think about pursuing discipline specific funding opportunities. So the final slides you'll be pleased to now coming to the end of the presentation, but once the community practice has been established for 18 months, there is a review process as I mentioned, and this really entails a public report that is drafted by the Community of Practice, and then it's submitted. via the web platform. And it's then reviewed by the technical advisory board and also the council. It's a two week process. And essentially, this report should give an update on how the community of practice is developing over time, whether it's achieving its goals and objectives, the different types of engagement and outreach opportunities and activities as well as any metrics, how the membership has grown over time. And it should also identify any significant interactions with key stakeholders and how the community of practice has been supported or is supporting. So, on that note, I'll stop speaking and we'll stop for questions and if I can answer as many as possible I will do. If not, I will also take things on board and get back to everybody.

 32:34

Thank you. I'll stop sharing. Thanks so much, Connie, and thanks Shelley for getting us started. So I want to highlight to any to everyone. Please do. Let us know what you think. Through the feedback and interest forum. It's a good way for us to stay in touch with those of you who might be interested in potentially taking this forward. Enter now we have an open floor for questions and discussion. We'll try to answer and discuss whatever comes up.

 Shelley Stall 33:11

Lena pointed out something that's really humorous we actually don't have ourselves represented in RDA disciplines and I have explored that and it really just somebody just has to write something. So Lina if you want to go ahead

 33:31

Catherine you had your hand raised.

 33:35

Hi, Hi, Connie. So you mentioned in your in your spiel that rd is consensus based. And one of the sticky things with consensus space is how you deal with blocks. So can you talk a little bit

the sticky things with consensus space is how you deal with blocks. So can you talk a little bit about that? governance mechanism and how RDA resolves conflict around decision making?

 33:58

That's actually a really good point, Kathy, and I'm not sure I can really answer it as well as you might hope but I do know what we have got online. We've got some information about like code of conduct and the guiding principles and how to deal with that. I mean, what we do hope is that everybody that obviously joins the RDA in its involved in the work does just adhere to the guiding principles and has some knowledge of the code of conduct and like we do have a process for how to report a breach, which then goes on to not myself but Higher, higher. What how can I call it Pete members of the Secretariat and management basically, so not it wouldn't get it wouldn't go by myself or anything. It's very tricky, though, because I think your comment is, like you say, based on consensus, and how do you really identify where the consensus is reached at times. I mean, we've got we've got co chairs who are kind of involved in directing certain aspects, but obviously, the membership of some groups is quite large and how do you make sure that everybody is on the same page? So I mean, I don't know if maybe Shelley you've got anything to add from being part of, you know, being a co chair yourself, some of these groups, but I imagine it's quite a difficult process in some of these groups, but apart from having like the form, the formal channels, you know, to get to go through, sorry,

 Shelley Stall 35:18

I see that that Marx put his hand up as well as being a former Secretary General. For RDA there. I would say that for RDA, it's the best possible situation for an international group to come together. It is not perfect. By having co chairs from multiple countries, you're getting different visions, but sometimes you do get a block and you know, it's sadly it's recognized because you've got one group is like, no, no, I'd rather do it this way and another group and then and I'd rather do it this way. However, we're in hell and gloves is also on having just finished her tenure on tab that technical advisory board. All of the recommendations have to go through the technical advisory board. And this is where problematic blocks can be identified. And the and the tab is excellent, the quality of the folks that are giving their time and energy to review all of these and provide feedback to the working groups is really good. And I'll stop there because I've not been on tab nor have I been a secretary general so

 36:30

great, Maggie, I think you had your hand up Yes.


 36:35

So I don't know. If Mark has something to say on this. What were the topics that we were just discussing now? I would let him go first. My comment is about the recommendations and outputs.

 36:40

 36:49

Okay, thanks. Maybe Yeah, I was just so I haven't been involved with RDA governance for I don't know five years or so. But I was Secretary General. And there were even fewer formal mechanisms like we didn't have a code of conduct, unfortunately, when I was secretary general. And so that's a really, I think, a big improvement. As Shelley mentioned, the tab is really useful tab is a I think a well respected body within RDA, people don't always agree with them. But that so that I think helps. But for me, the biggest thing was, well, one I always told the Secretary and myself we are neutral in all things that you know that as Secretary General, I felt that and I think Hillary feels the same way. That that that's part of the job is to facilitate the operations and so you have to be neutral. And to what really helped me is the principles that if you go back to the principles if you're negotiating a conflict, which I had to do a number of times, sometimes there were clashes within co chairs or, you know, inappropriate behavior within groups. The principles are really helpful in terms of, you know, saying, you know, Joe, I just don't think you're following the principle of inclusivity here. And you know, that's not necessarily a good example. But But that, I think, is an underlying so those underlying structures really help but you're absolutely right, Kathy, you know, consensus based groups struggle at times and there there are times that things are fraught, but I think our view has been pretty good at negotiating through those in the last 10 years. So that's just my my my perspective.

 Shelley Stall 38:34

Go ahead. And yeah, thank

 38:37

you. Yeah, so I just put my comment also in the chat to keep a record of it. So I think it's a great thing that the groups that want to come together and form a community of practice are showing some kind of maturity in the way that they have been working and that they have actually produced good record recommendations. or other forms of output that are endorsed and recognized by the RDA as such. But I do note that even though we haven't been around for more than a decade as at least some of the reports of recommendations, of which I've been a co author myself have sort of now become outdated because everything is moving at such a fast pace everywhere, isn't that in RDM, and it and overwhelming in open science, so but they are still and remaining, of course as official outputs of their work. But I think that newcomers are suffering from this because they tried to read and browse through all this wealth of information, and then they come up with things like oh, hey, I don't recognize this or this seems wrong and we moved on from this and this metadata standard or proposal for a standard is no longer appropriate because some things have changed or whatever. And so I think that there is an overall needing to have some kind of process in place that can look at and revise and go back and maybe quality assured some of these documents and maybe that is something that the community of practice can also participate in. I should just add that I have been in some working groups in the last couple of years where there has been a strong resistance to actually going through when use previously produced outputs with exactly these arguments that why should we try to, to adapt this or even look through these because we know better what's going on right now. So there's no use for anchoring things in what has been done before. Or indeed to even reach out to neighboring groups, to the chairs that may lead to ask questions, but still instead people have said no, we know much better than everybody else who will just go on like

that. And I really wonder how much of this was for this culture has been formed by the COVID times so it's just a way that I mean, people seem to be less and less. We're all using social media, but we're becoming less and less social in the way that we are interacting with each other. So I hope that the communities of practice can really broaden the base here that we can get more people involved.



41:33

Thank you, Mikey. I think those two comments or your several comments are very useful. The first one if I can just maybe add about like the maintenance almost of recommendations and outputs and making sure that they still have some value. I think it's very difficult to do, especially with the resources that the community has and like working groups can you know, they wrap up and then they move on to the things and it can be quite difficult. I don't know like whether maybe Helen on tab has got our own views on on how how you know, to maintain outputs mean we do have as well. This year we should be having a new website at some point which might help to also enable us to give the RDA recommendations and output some more visibility because I think that that would also help because often they're not even easy to find. First of all, and so they're certainly not easy to then build upon and to update and to to use. But this is a comment that I will certainly bear in mind and think about when we have discussions within the secretary app because it does seem like a lot of the value can be lost if either they're not able to be located and found but also you know, they've become outdated. So it's something that we should really think about going forward and maybe like you say the Community of Practice could take some of that on as well. And think about you know, any recommendations and outputs that could possibly be of use, how can they be maintained or updated or, you know, because there are some generic outputs some domain agnostic recommendations and outputs that could be translated into a disciplinary context, which would mean obviously revamping but also getting in contact with old, old members that have created them but that might be something that we can think about going forward. I think Helen and Cassie, I can't remember what order hands were raised. Sorry.



43:20

Yeah, I suppose I just wanted to jump in here really and agree with you Connie, because I think having been around RDA for a very long time. This issue of visibility of outputs is one that we come back to but I don't think we ever actually move forward. So I think visibility is really important. But I also think the ownership issue because you're absolutely right. One of the real issues now is the fact that some of those, particularly the early outputs, I think they've been around for quite a long time. And it would be really good to think about you know, whether they're still fit for purpose, how we could actually seek to to update them as well because the other issue is some of the interest groups and working groups that were responsible for generating them in the first place. They finished their work. This is always the issue with having these outputs that come out of working groups. Working Groups have a life cycle of a wrap around 80 months. But their outputs are, you know, they they've been delivered, you know, in perpetuity. So there should be you know, some strategy for making sure that they're not only not lost, but also that they're regularly updated. And this is something that's missing within the Brda ecosystem, is that plan for how the outputs continue to be relevant, but also continue to be updated in a way that maximizes the benefit of all of this work. Thanks, Helen.

 44:59

is something I can also say is going to be featured in AD 2024 onwards strategy. So I guess it depends how we now tackle this and what we can do to make make sure that it's actually feasible and follow through and it's not just written and we don't do anything about it. So I think that's that's really good feedback. Thank you.

 45:20

Cassie. Yeah, the risk of of continuing down this governance rabbit hole. I think that thinking about sort of the these types of feedback mechanisms in this revision process. It's something that's on like a year and a half, two year time cycle like that's a grant cycle. That's something that a different community could pick up. But I think this this sort of longer term support and revision is something that I think would be really fascinating to try to get right or to try to experiment with a little bit more as a society that's sort of volunteer engaged. Yeah, lots of buzzwords in there. Hopefully some of them made sense. Mark

 46:13

All right, my name my buttons. Just a caution that I don't think that we want to try and solve all of our TAs problems. And RDA does has this concept of maintenance groups, which I'm part of one the dynamic data citation we're working group has been a maintenance mode for a long time and has been very effective at that but it really relies heavily on the on the router and the router basically. But it's kept the I've kept the recommendation relevant but what I think I saw with Shelley's comment that I would just like to amplify, I think this is something that the community of practice could be very, very helpful to is looking at how RDA outputs which tend to be pretty abstract and esoteric and seeing how they can actually be applied in our sciences, you know, and they relevant to a science data practitioners and researchers, I think that can be actually a very helpful thing for the community of practice to do.

 47:14

I think that would be great Mark and I actually because we've only got one of the community of practicing agricultural data. So this is almost kind of like a test and pilot to see how this works for one discipline and how these different recommendations abstract as you say, an esoteric recommendations and outputs can be used in a different context.

 47:35

Yeah, thank you.

 47:39

Kathy. Hello, I'm the other Catholic I think. Good to see everybody that I already know and nice to meet everyone. Back when I was an RDA when RDA was a baby we one of the things that

was emphasized was understanding the differences between each of the new groups that were proposed and where the overlaps were, or were not. Not just identifying the value which which you did. Very nicely, Connie, thank you. But also understanding what unique piece of the landscape this particular group fills that no other group is filling. And is it worth this level of group? It's almost like figuring out what PhD your research you're going to do. Right? What's What's the niche that hasn't been filled yet? Has that been done for this proposal?



48:44

So if I can just say, because my I started this role six months ago, and that was the first thing now that was the first thing actually on my mind at the time was like we've got 100 different community groups, and they're all doing something different possibly, or not so different. And I imagine there's quite a lot of overlap between the different domain agnostic and disciplinary groups and how do we identify exactly what you say like a USP or a niche? Where are these groups settling in that niche and like, how do they relate to one another? One of the things that has evolved as part of the RDA 10th anniversary this year is my colleague, Catherine Barker, who's the new Community Development Manager in Australia, and myself, we're running these cross fertilization workshops once a month. So one of the ideas there was to bring groups together by theme, to share some challenges and some initiatives. So it's not so much a presentation of what the group is doing. Although we have tried to include that slightly. It's more bringing groups together to exchange knowledge and share experiences and think about actions going forward within the RDA. When I say theme I'm not talking just about disciplines that I'm talking like, for example, data management planning, or it could be fair data and software, which we've got this this month in February. So we are thinking about trying to sort of match make groups or at least get a better grasp of what the groups are doing. But the Community of Practice is kind of also tackling that on a bit of a larger scale, I think because within the umbrella of the community of practice would be the interest groups and working groups that are working on things within that's another way I guess that we can get to know a little bit more about the domain, the domain specific work within the RDA.




50:30

That's Yes. And as you were talking, I was also thinking that it is possible to define a niche as I'm taking the outputs that have been developed in all of these particular specific categories and then adopting them in a new community. And I know adoption has been a key role for RDA not just development but adopting outside the first the initial development community so there are a lot of ways to define Nish.



51:01


Yeah, absolutely. And also, just going back to what Helen was saying about visibility and impact of the recommendations and outputs. Adoption is one thing that we also struggle to be able to measure in a way and to know who's adopting the outputs and for what purpose so I guess a community of practice that's disciplinary could also help to get a grasp of of that. Because I guess it's up pioneering and lead lead in some of that work. I guess, though, it's, it would help. Some really good comments in the chat as well. So I need to export this before we chat closes

 Shelley Stall 51:38

we'll be sure to save the chat. I you know, I'm I this sense I

 51:45


have is give it a go.

 Shelley Stall 51:50

Exactly what our objectives are still forming initial at you know, the first 18 months

 51:59

What do you think about

 Shelley Stall 52:02

like trying to find are trying to get the niche of what are discipline needed, needs and already exists in E soup in RDA in you know, I believe you were cut I'll name other organizations that are working on you know, the Fair's fair folks, the fair impact folks. What if what if we have a gap? Would you be willing to consider like the when we initially got on there was a whole ontology conversation? What would you be up for things like standing up a working group to figure out God, figure out and the word ontology usually are not in the same sentence that ends well, but make progress towards nobody's laughing? Maybe one person's laughing Yeah, apps like like would you be willing to stand up working groups to deal with gaps in conjunction with whomever's working on that I would think that would be a core purpose

 53:09

is identifying relevant working groups is like trying to implement the outputs of existing working groups and identifying what he's a gaps where so where you might want to spin up a new working group. I also think that you know, looking at the Ag folks who have been a model for how to work RDA since the outset. This notion of a international network of organizations is not part of RDA. That's been a driving force for the Ag folks since day one because agriculture is very political, and they found it really helpful to come to RDA as a neutral forum and avoid some of those politics. I don't think our science is quite as political can be. But I liked that idea of of networking, the international organizations, and then while I had the Florida just want to throw out one other thing is that I think we need to we're talking Nish we also need to talk scope. Oh Kathy beat me to it. Earth Science is a huge domain and we've through an environmental and space. I'm not sure states belongs honestly. What do we mean by space? I mean, I think from an EU perspective, it's largely planetary and heliophysics. I can see including heliophysics maybe not the planet, certainly not astronomy. So I think you know, really defining

and then when we say environmental sciences, how far How broad is that Go is that you know, because that includes social environmental. Sciences, ecology. So I think you know, scoping is is also important.

S

Shelley Stall 54:45

I'm certainly open to that. The Space Sciences has been working internationally for a long time and I'm not sure that I think they're, I think they're in good shape. Or as good as they are right now. And March working in that, that space, so. Well, you're right



55:12

I see your comment, Helen, I think that's the point but this isn't an age view or edu or jpgu group. So we need to we don't and those who and honestly AGU and EG you have a legacy that they have to deal with we don't so we can define our discipline in a in a new way and it's a planetary people get upset then Okay, then get them involved, but and maybe it's because the planetary folks don't have a clear poem and so they, they, you know, go to the geoscience unions and so forth, but



55:44

is there any,

S

Shelley Stall 55:45

any planetary people here? I like? I'm from a planet. Okay, funny. Any anybody who aligns planetarium or astronomy? Okay, all right. You're maybe you don't meet it out. You



56:06

just got to play them so quickly that

S

Shelley Stall 56:11

if, if you think we should not I'll tell you what we do need to scope conversation, but we're gonna need it for the charter to be submitted. So if you would like to see planets included, please say something somehow either email me or put it in the chat or make sure it's in the form. I, I think, yeah. trade offs. Yeah. Yeah, yeah. And planets have their own repository. So they're pretty separate. However, they have some of the same issues. So yes, they're in the boat with us. Earth is a planet. I could argue both sides.




56:58

Mikey's got a hand very shallow. Yeah, I

 57:02


just want to make the comment that so I'm speaking from a sort of fair point of view. When I'm in the fed into the logic fabric group. We recently had an extremely interesting presentation which was from some German people who are working both with space and planetary research and even beyond planets and deep sea oceans, and they were finding so many synergies between these types of cases in order to describe them etc. Metadata models what have you. So and I had been completely unaware of this spatial and that really meaning space context. So I think we could lose out on a lot of people who are doing doing brilliant things, but I do see Mark's point at the same time. But I think any people if we start thinking about Jupyter notebooks and stuff then maybe people from Jupiter will be upset that they can't join us.

 Shelley Stall 58:05

Maybe I think you just made a joke.

 58:06

Yeah, with that she just might dropped and went off screen. I noticed.

 Shelley Stall 58:11

That was brilliant. And Mark arguing back to keep space. I did have a conversation with some of the folks that we're working with that you're familiar with. And the they could benefit from this. Yeah, I'm not

 58:30

necessarily arguing to exclude the sun or planets. I am arguing not to include astronomy. I think they look at the world in a very different way. And so keeping within our solar system at least but I think it's interesting because the geosciences do have a history of close collaboration with the planetary sciences because they're there you know, it's there's similar problems like you know, trying to understand the ocean on on a different level, right. It helps to understand our ocean. Definitely the case with ice sheets. Profound lecture, I saw early in my career was an old glaciologist telling, telling the marsh Mars people that they were not learning the lessons that we learned from Antarctica when Antarctica was as remote as Mars. So there's that connection, but then as we I think as Earth science, as opposed to geosciences has evolved, it's trended, in some ways more towards the environmental sciences. And so then there's sort of system science where we think about, you know, sort of climate systems and then the climate systems relate to everything else. And so I just think we need to get a handle on where we're going because there's a lot of different places we could go and I'm not necessarily are advocating one way or the other. And we could try and be everything, but that has its own risks.



59:48

So I wonder if sort of, again, if it might be helpful to develop some sort of rough taxonomy, you know, of what we've got and you know, without getting into too much detail, you know, in terms of but at least start with how the various could is it is a huge domain and including all the rather sub domains and I think it is important to think about it that trade off as was mentioned, inclusivity versus kind of the scope of things and, you know, where's that balance going to be made? And sometimes it's a tough call, but I think having an idea for everyone you know, of where things kind of, generally map out might be useful for that discussion.



Shelley Stall 1:00:37

We have, Kathy, just one second. We have four minutes left. And I, my takeaway from the conversation is we have a really positive path forward exactly what the path is. We're still have work to do. Those that are those that are participating, those that are enthusiastic, those that want to observe those who want to get their bag of popcorn and watch you know, wherever you are on that continuum, you are welcome. Make sure you have the link to the form if you want a particular object objective on the docket. It's going to depend on who wants to participate on how how you can get if we if we don't have anybody to deal with an issue, we're not going to get anywhere. So depending on who comes who participates, who's part of the who wants to sign up, who wants to come to the early meetings, will matter on what we select for the first 18 months. So this is where you weigh in. What do you care about what would you show up to deal with what matters to you in your community? You know, if you've got a block that this group could solve, and we'll take whatever definition of block you want, let's let's get it out there. I know there's a bunch. So please weigh in either in the chat preferably in the form, but we'll take the chat as well. Or email if you don't want to be in either place. And we have your emails because you signed up for registration. So we'll keep you engaged in there's a second meeting this afternoon, where we'll start from the top and go all the way through again and get their input and then we'll start to have yes we can meet we can meet in Gothenburg. If you're coming Yes, we can find out you can squirrel away some time. There's nothing formal at the moment. But we'll talk to Connie and see if she has recommendation. And just saying thank you. We'll leave this this forum open for a bit after the top or after a couple minutes. But for anybody who has to hop off thank you all for coming.



1:02:43

Go ahead, Kathy. Thanks. I was just gonna say that the proposed name of this community of practices Earth and Environmental Science something something. It can be whatever we want, which kind of took out the geophysical part of it just by definition. So if we want to have our have the group name, drive it then we've kind of already scoped but I would suggest we go the other way around. We talk about what's what's the likely scope and then maybe change the name.



Shelley Stall 1:03:21

Yep, there are a number of folks that were having trouble with the name so the name is open

for change



1:03:28

shall be named later.



Shelley Stall 1:03:33

Yes, Earth space environmental is where it is right now.



1:03:37

That's every that's like the universe and everything so we can make whatever we want out of it.



Shelley Stall 1:03:41

Apple pie based off groups, very US centric terms.



1:03:47

Yep. ballclub ah



Shelley Stall 1:03:53

Yep. For you too. Thanks, guys carry it but it is also nice to see everybody. Thank you all for coming. Thanks for thinking this was worthy of your time. Thank you for the conversation. The comments



1:04:07

this is



1:04:08

this is fantastic



1:04:15

you so Shelly Can I grab you for two minutes to talk all things data help desk?

 S

Shelley Stall 1:04:22

Oh, wow. Yeah. Oh, and by the way, we're gonna have a day to help desk and if you want to volunteer, you can do that



1:04:34

can I stay for that?



1:04:36

Yeah, absolutely. Sorry, are you were you on a different screen on my computer? I didn't realize you were Yeah. Hi. Good to see you

 S

Shelley Stall 1:04:46

in Jonathan Petters. I don't know if you're listening or if you stepped away but I'm I'm I'm trying to get institutional. I had a conversation on institutional repositories and courthouse seal, that I might have sent some people your direction so that there was a Alaska was the Alaska webinar last week.



1:05:08

Okay, cool. Yeah. We'll be happy to talk to him and how we fit in, of course. Wonderful.

 S

Shelley Stall 1:05:14

So I just You were on my mind last week in case you caught the vibe.



1:05:19

I'm sure I'm sure Jake will appreciate hearing that as well. Wonderful. Thank you.



1:05:23

Good to see you. Hi, John, by the way.

 S

Shelley Stall 1:05:25

