DARIAH JRC-HaS WP5 Workshop on

assessment criteria of DARIAH contributions

Introduction	2
Preparation	2
General information	2
Types of contributions	2
Core metadata for contribution	3
Services - General Assessment Criteria	4
Services - Additional Type specific Assessment Criteria	9
1.1 Data hosting service	9
1.2 Processing Service	12
1.3 Support service	13
1.4 Access to resources	13
Activities - Type specific Assessment Criteria	16
2.1 Event	16
2.2 Consulting	17
2.3 DARIAH Coordination / Cooperation	18
2.4 Resource creation	19
2.5 Software development 21	

Introduction

Goal of the workshop

In this workshop, we need to reach an agreement on the assessment criteria as formulated in the HaS project. The criteria are an essential and vital part of the process for (in-kind) contributions.

Tentative workshop programme

June 29

13:00-17:30 - discussion of Assessment Criteria 18:30 diner

June 30

09:00-12:00 - presentation of workflow

Preparation

As preparation for the workshop, we hereby send you some preliminary readings on the risks that may need to be taken into account when assessing an in-kind contribution, as well as the assessment criteria that have been suggested so far.

Your tasks as a reviewer of DARIAH contributions

- To verify that the interested contributor has the expertise, technical means and (financial) support to deliver the proposed contribution;
- To assess whether the quality is guaranteed;
- To investigate if the contribution makes sense for the infrastructure

General information

Types of contributions

Types of contribution	Subtype	Remarks
1. SERVICE (repeatable upon demand or continuous) -> visibility to community		
	1.1. DATA HOSTING SERVICE (IT based)	e.g. hosting software or data.
	1.2. PROCESSING SERVICE (IT based)	

	1.3. SUPPORT SERVICE	e.g helpdesk, software maintenance
	1.4 ACCESS TO RESOURCES	e.g. educational resources, data resources metadata creation & enrichment
2. ACTIVITY (one-time discrete action) -> reporting		
	2.1 EVENT	e.g. summer school, webinar, training
	2.2 CONSULTING	
	2.3 DARIAH COORDINATION	
	2.4 RESOURCE CREATION	e.g. educational resources, data
	2.5 SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT	

Core metadata for contribution

The following core metadata is required to be able to disseminate, assess and review the contributions made to DARIAH.

- Identifier (created by tool)
- Country
- Submission date (Year of approval of contribution)
- Year (year of submission as in kind)
- Contribution subtype
- Title
- Description in English
- URL to contribution
- Contact person name
- Contact person email
- Related contributions arbitrary (typed?) links between contributions
- "tags/keywords" (a simple folksonomy way to classify the contributions)
- TADIRAH activities
- TADIRAH objectives
- TADIRAH techniques
- Disciplines
- <u>Value</u>
- Linked existing resource(s):

- we could simply default to dublincore terms http://dublincore.org/2012/06/14/dcterms#
- Nice to have but not in project scope unless there is time:
 - Possibility for the user to provide feedback (for general public and/or between the producer of the resource)
 - Possibility when searching for contributions have an option to show results in your region.

More information can be found in the concept and procedure document: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1x5Q9QqJNhEHmYqHhaB7k-owjUMkydkTdtHAjm3TE6jc/edit?usp=sharing

Services - General Assessment Criteria

- Extra metadata:
 - Support Contact -> provide contact details (email address, or other means of soliciting support, like issue tracker, helpdesk, feedback form)
 - Underlying software. (If the software itself is being developed and maintained than it is a separate contribution: "2.5 Development of software") -> Free input or link to in-kind of type software

Maturity Level

Score	Level	Description
0	Experimental	Proof of concept
2	Non-stable service	Best effort basis, could change or go offline
4	Stable	running stable + commitment to support for extended period

• Support Level

Score	Level	Description
0	None	Т
2	Partial	There is a defined Support Contact, but served on best-effort basis with no dedicated capacity
4	Comprehensi ve	There is a defined Support Contact, with dedicated capacity to process support requests

- Documentation available (in english, relates to the software underlying the service)
 - a. For the user (ideally as contextual help in the application or online)

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No usable user documentation available
2	Partial	Some user documentation available, potentially not complete or not fully up-to-date
4	Comprehensive	Comprehensive up-to-date user documentation available (online or as contextual help in the application

 b. For the developer (inline in the code and/or comprehensive documentation of the system architecture, functions and APIs as part of the software package or online)

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No usable developer documentation available
2	Partial	Some documentation of the system, its APIs and architecture available, potentially not complete or not fully up-to-date
4	Comprehensive	Comprehensive up-to-date developer documentation available

c. For the administrator - installation, deployment, monitoring

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No usable documentation regarding installation, deployment or monitoring
2	Partial	Somedocumentation for administrators available
4	Comprehensive	Comprehensive up-to-date administrator documentation available

 Multilingual User Interface (possible), support for localisation, multi-script (allowing switching scripts in one input field) and right-to-left text (where applicable)

Score	Level	Description
0	None	(Almost) no support for multingual UI, localisation etc. UI text is hard-coded in the application and there is no simple way to change the language.
2	Partial	Underlying software supports localisation / multilingual UI, but the service is available only in one language; OR the localisation/multilingual support is not implemented systematically and may be difficult to extend to other languages.
4	Comprehensive	Underlying software supports localisation / multilingual UI in a systematic manner (dictionary files), it is clearly defined and documented how to add further languages. (only applies if there is an UI) Where applicable the application also supports right-to-left text and multiple writing systems for the UI and for the input

• Is there an Impressum (+ Info on use of cookies) & Terms of Use

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No, Impressum OR info on use of cookies missing
4	Complete	Yes, Impressum, Terms of Use AND info on use of cookies present

• Services exposes an API - programmatic access to (read and write) data; typically RESTful web service, OAI-PMH endpoint, Feeds, but also an option to call the service/application via URL passing data as parameter

Score	Level	Description
0	None	no structured API exposed
2	Partial	An API is available, but it is experimental/incoherent/unstable, or the documentation is missing or incomplete
4	Comprehensive	a well-documented standard-conforming (ideally RESTful) API offering read and possibly write access to data (or

		invocation of the service) available
X	Not applicable	Given the nature of the service there is no programmatic access possible/sensible

• The service is monitored, ideallythrough DARIAH monitoring services

Note: When up-to-date status about the service up-time is exposed publicly, it is
helpful information for the user, for the service provider (can act quickly upon
downtime) and the infrastructure administration (gets overall picture of the
status of the services constituting the infrastructure)

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No automatic/systematic monitoring in place
2	Partial	The service is being monitored automatically locally (either directly by service provider, or the corresponding computing centre or similar)
4	Comprehensive	Monitored by DARIAH monitoring service (added value of being monitored by DARIAH is the sense of the service being part of one coherent infrastructure and an independent control instance)

User statistics - ideally through DARIAH piwik
 Note: User statistics via DARIAH allow to view the service in the context of the bigger infrastructure.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No user statistics are being collected
2	Partial	Own solution for user statistics
4	Comprehensive	User statistics via DARIAH piwik

• Service supports federated login (Single-Sign-On,AAI) via Shibboleth (including eduGain), and/or via OpenID

Score	Level	Description
-------	-------	-------------

0	None	No AAI (just local login)
2	Partial	OpenID or Shibboleth login with DARIAH account OR some institutional accounts possible, however comprehensive coverage missing
4	Comprehensive	Shibboleth (and/or OpenID) login possible with DARIAH account and any institutional account (in one of the eduGain countries)
X	Not applicable	No login required

Services - Additional Type specific Assessment Criteria

1.1 Data hosting service

Hosting or depositing service, i.e. the ability and willingness to store and (optionally) provide/publish/expose/give access to data of other partner for a defined period of time to enable his platforms/his repositories

scopeNote: This covers mainly traditional repositories for publications and research data, but also any other service that allows to enter, store and publish/present resources/content of any kind, including physical repositories and archives., (in a broad sense, they can be physical or digital repositories) to host data from other partners. For example: Cléo's platforms (Calenda, Hypothèses, Revues.org, OpenEdition)

Apart from taking responsibility for the contents it hosts, a platform may:
Inform users or other platforms about the contents it hosts (via OAI-PMH for instance)
Provide views of the contents. That is somehow, publish the contents.
Provide interfaces for other platforms or tools to connect and access the contents
Manage mechanisms of access control

- Core metadata for contribution
- Services General Assessment Criteria
- There is help provided by the repository/platform describing what information is needed for others to assess the quality of the data, compliance with disciplinary and ethical norms and (alt)metrics about the use of the information. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 4, 11 & 14]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• There is a list of the formats accepted or promoted by the repository/platform. So that data producers are able to provide the data in formats recommended by the data repository. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 8]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• There is a description of the means the repository/platform uses to ensure compliance with legal regulations and contracts including, when applicable, regulations governing the protection of human subjects. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 2&4]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• The processes and procedures for managing data storage are documented [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 9]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• The ways provided for data re-users to discover and use the data and refer to them in a persistent way are described. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 11&13&14]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• The maximum reaction time for reacting, accepting, processing etc. a request regarding hosting data is indicated.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	<mark>??</mark>
2	Partial	<mark>??</mark>
4	Comprehensive	<mark>??</mark>

• The responsibility of the platform/repository manager, regarding data continuity, intellectual property (types of licence), reuse, etc. are clearly mentioned.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	<mark>??</mark>
2	Partial	??
4	Comprehensive	??

Examples:

OpenEdition, HAL, EHRI, CENDARI, EASY (DANS), <u>NARCIS</u>, <u>GAMS Graz</u>. Cléo's platforms (Calenda, Hypothèses, Revues.org, OpenEdition), hosting services for digitized content/assets

1.2 Processing Service

A (digital) service that applies some algorithmic processing (statistic analysis, annotation) on given data, or provides means to edit/curate data (e.g. web interface for collaborative editing).

scopeNote: Processing service is distinct from content hosting service in that it does not store data, but generates new data based on given input.

Ideally, processing services are connected seamlessly with hosting service to appear to a user as one (virtual research) environment.

Assessment criteria:

- Core metadata for contribution
- Services General Assessment Criteria
- Provide sufficient information to assess the quality of the software, its compliance with disciplinary and ethical norms and (alt)metrics about the use of the information. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 4,11 &14]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• Use due diligence to ensure compliance with legal regulations and contracts including, when applicable, regulations governing the protection of human subjects. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 2&4]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

Examples:

Conversion services (oxgarage), Digitisation/OCR, Stylometric analysis, Annotation & Enrichment, Collaborative text editors (etherpad, wiki), tokenEditor@ACDH-OEAW, Enrichment

1.3 Support service

Helpdesk services.

Assessment criteria:

- Core metadata for contribution
- Services General Assessment Criteria

1.4 Access to resources

(Online) access to resources (datasets). This can be raw data, (web) applications offering rich access to data, or web services that allow a programmatic access to the data (API). The granularity of the described resources is up to the content provider, but we encourage a high-level description of whole coherent collections of resources. scopeNote: This type of contribution does not include (national or domain-specific) aggregators, or metadata catalogues, i.e. services that collect information about resources from multiple providers and allow to browse and search in it. These will/can ideally become a source of information about contributions.

It also does not include web services processing data (see Processing services contribution)

- Core metadata for contribution
- Services General Assessment Criteria
- Provide sufficient information for others to assess the quality of the data, compliance with disciplinary and ethical norms and (alt)metrics about the use of the information. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 4, 11 & 14]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• Use due diligence to ensure compliance with legal regulations and contracts including, when applicable, regulations governing the protection of human subjects. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 2&4]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• Enable the users to discover and use the data and refer to them in a persistent way. [CoreTrustSeal-Requirement 11, 13 & 14]

Score	Level	Description
0	Theoretical (initial)	We have a theoretical concept.
2	In progress (partial)	We are in the implementation phase.
4	Implemented (comprehensive)	This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our service.

• Terms of use, Availability, License Conditions of access to and reuse of the resource(s) are clearly indicated, and ideally support/encourage open access and reuse.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No license information available
2	Partial	Restricted license applies
4	Comprehensive	Under open or standard licence

Activities - Type specific Assessment Criteria

Unlike with the Services, Activities have no General assessment criteria just subtype specific assessment criteria and /or extra meta data fields.

2.1 Event

Events organised in the field of digital arts and humanities and cultural heritage, whose aim is to:

- offer a theoretical insight of the methods, practices, history and future developments in the field of digital arts and humanities
- showcase case studies in the field of digital arts and humanities
- offer training and guidance in the application of digital methodologies in traditional humanities curricula

The duration of the event doesn't represent a selection criteria: events of the duration of few hours (e.g. workshop) or few weeks (e.g. summer schools) can be submitted as DARIAH contributions, as long as they meet the requirements stated above.

Please note that english is the preferred working language for the events. While DARIAH recognises the importance of a multilingual development of the digital humanities, these DARIAH contributions represent nonetheless an invaluable resource for international researchers and institutions. The adoption of english during your event and its documentation, could help to disseminate your work among other communities.

- Core metadata for contribution
- Extra metadata:
 - o Date of the event
 - Location of event
 - o Duration of event
 - Number of participants at event

- Documentation or report on Targeted public is provided. The documentation includes:
 - o Documentation is in english
 - o main discipline/ area of participants
 - level of expertise
 - Nationally/ Internationally oriented

Score	Level	Description
0	Initial	No information or report about the targeted has been created and provided

2	Partial	Partial information about the targeted audience has been created and provided
4	Complete	The audience has been fully documented and reported as part of the inkind contribution

- Documentation of the event is provided:
 - o Documentation is in english
 - o A stable URL where the documentation is available
 - Documentation can include: abstract, programme, slides, blogs etc...

Score	Level	Description
0	Initial	No documentation of the event available
2	Partial	Partial documentation of the event available online
4	Complete	The event has been fully documented; it is fully available for reuse at a stable link

Examples:

Lecture, symposium, workshop, conferences, training day(s), summer/ spring/ winter school, academic course, academic program, MOOCs and other forms of online education

2.2 Consulting

Expertise offered as a service to another DARIAH member or the DARIAH community. This may cover advice including consulting, audit, design or other activities where expertise forms the basis of the service. Transfer of knowledge activities should be only considered if they do not fit in the training (2.1 Event (Training / Summer school)) or 2.4 Creating Resources categories.

- Core metadata for contribution
- Extra metadata: If the project has been completed also indicate a targeted public (user, producer, repository manager, etc.) that could make use of the results in the future.

- Indication of the consumer of the service:
 - Name of the corresponding institutions and their national affiliation,
 - Name of the contact persons OR DARIAH-EU including the name of a contact person

Score	Level	Description
-------	-------	-------------

0	Initial	No or only very generic information is available
2	Partial	Only partial information (e.g. only the name of an institution/national affiliation) is available
4	Complete	All the required information are provided

• If the contribution is still in process please provide a description of the existing results in English (summary, problem, table of content, content (type of formats, metadata, etc.)) and draft the next steps as well as the final delivery date.

Score	Level	Description
0	Initial	No or only very generic information is available
2	Partial	Only partial information (e.g. only the name of an institution/national affiliation) is available
4	Complete	All the required information are provided

• If the project has been completed provide the existing documentation about software, methods, etc., which should ideally be in English or in English and any other relevant language(s), that specifies the results.

Score	Level	Description
0	Initial	No or only very generic information is available
2	Partial	Only partial information (e.g. only the name of an institution/national affiliation) is available
4	Complete	All the required information are provided

Examples:

- DARIAH.eu wants to assess the overall impact of IKC within the DARIAH community and asks DANS to perform this evaluation as well as to provide a final report.
- The Austrian Academy of Sciences wants to implement a new single-sign-on solution and asks DAASI for advice on choosing the appropriate solution. The result of this consultation is documented in a final report

2.3 DARIAH Coordination / Cooperation

This type of contribution involves the coordination of DARIAH activities. For instance coordination of or cooperation in:

- The different governance bodies of DARIAH
- Central offices (DCO, CIO)
- National Coordinator includes: national coordination at the financial, administrative or communication level done by the National Coordinating Institution
- VCC Head
- Working Group
- Ambassadors

Assessment criteria:

• Core metadata for contribution

2.4 Resource creation

The contribution is the creation of any kind of resource. This could be educational resources accompanying an training event, or digitisation of historic material. The outcome is a new resource (made available to the public as the service contribution 1.4.)

Examples for this type of contribution are:

- Tutorials
- Guidelines
- Teaching material
- Software documentation (users)
- bibliography or registries of digital humanities resources
- New representation of existing historic material (cultural heritage objects)
- Structured metadata for resources.

The new resources can be practically in any format, such as:

- text (as a Word or PDF document)
- audio/video recording
- interactive resources (e.g. quizzes, interactive maps and diagrams etc.)
- code
- images
- structured data (TEI, 3D-objects)

Please note that English is the preferred language for the contents of (educational) resources. While DARIAH recognises the importance of a multilingual development of the digital humanities, the DARIAH contribution represent nonetheless an invaluable resource for international researchers and institutions. The adoption of english for your training material could help to disseminate your work among communities.

- Core metadata for contribution
- Extra metadata field: Type of the Resource (e.g. video recordings; digitized manuscripts)

- English (verbose) description of the resource (as opposed to structured metadata that could also include a verbose description) created:
 - o context (organisational, research)
 - what research need it answers (motivation)
 - o how the resource is organized and presented

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No description of the resource is provided
2	Partial	Partial description of the resources is provided
4	Complete	The description of the resource is fully provided and contextualised

• Terms of use, Availability, License Conditions of access to and reuse of the resource(s) are clearly indicated, and ideally support/encourage open access and reuse.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No licence information available
2	Partial	Restricted license applies
4	Comprehensive	Under open or standard license

• A stable URL where the resource is available

Score	Level	Description
0	None	URL is not provided
2	Partial	A link to the resource is provided, but the URL is not stable
4	Complete	A stable URL is provided (PID, DOI)

Metadata about the resource is provided (in a structured format) (Note: we don't
want to prescribe here any specific format. We will be happy if there is anything
available. If we would want to prescribe/propose a minimum then it is obviously
dublincore.

Score	Level	Description
-------	-------	-------------

0	None	No metadata available
2	Partial	Metadata available just via web interface or in an unstructured format (word document, excel sheet)
4	Complete	Metadata conforming to a (any) metadata schema is publicly available and machine readable

2.5 Software development

Availability of software, i.e. executable code that can be installed and run by other partners. The contribution should include the source code (not just the binaries). ScopeNote: We distinguish between software and service as separate contributions. Every (digital) service is an activation of some software. If both a service and the underlying software are provided, then it counts as two distinct (though related) contributions.

The code can be in any programming language, it can also be only a simple script dedicated to one specific task, as long as it is working and documented.

Assessment criteria:

- Core metadata for contribution
- Terms of use, Availability, License Conditions of reuse of the software are clearly indicated, ideally open source licenses apply.

Score	Level	Description
0	None	No licence information available
2	Partial	Restricted licence applies
4	Comprehensive	Under open or standard licence

• Code is maintained under version control (and available via a public repository)

Score	Level	Description
0	None	There is no defined way of code versioning and sharing with a broader audience
2	Partial	a) There is a code repository with versioning, but it is not available to the public.

		b) The source code (or just the executables) is shared online, but not via a code repository.
4	Complete	The code is available via a public code repository (sourceforge, github, etc.). It could be also institutional repository, but making the code available without restrictions.

• Specification/Documentation available

Score	Level	Description
0	None	no (shareable) documentation of the application is available
2	Partial	There is some documentation (either online or packaged with the software), which can be incomplete, or partly outdated, but should still be at least somewhat useful information about the service
4	Complete	There is comprehensive up to date documentation for users, developers and maintainers available (either online or packaged with the software)

• Commitment level

Score	Level	Description
0	None	This is an abandoned/orphaned project, which still may be useful for someone to take up, but there is not really anybody to talk to about it.
2	Partial	A prototype or a project, we may work on in the spare time, but (currently) don't have dedicated resources to commit to. Though there is someone knowledgeable of the code, who can be contacted by interested parties and might implement bug fixes. And we are interested in cooperations on this.
4	Complete	This is a critical piece of software for us, we (and others) use it actively, we have resources available to maintain and further develop. We have developers knowledgeable of the software available as contact persons.

Examples:

XSLT-scripts, Java applications, source code of web applications, software newly developed for or during the digitization enrichment