

Minutes of the 3rd exploitation meeting, 16th March 2018, physical meeting in Iasi

Participants: Lionel Nicolas, Nina Gorovaia, Anabela Barreiro, Costanza Navarretta, Tanara Kuhn, Vidas Daudaravičius, Ildiko Pilan, Inguna Skadina, Claudia Borg & others.

Minutes: Nina Gorovaia & Lionel Nicolas

As several enetcollect members joined this meeting, the discussions were less focussed than in previous meetings. The points considered during the previous meeting were retaken and discussed without defining new tasks or affecting them. The next meeting should take into consideration the ideas mentioned here as well as the ideas and todos mentioned in the minutes of the previous meeting.

1. Making available created datasets

Lionel reminded that during the previous meeting, it was agreed that we should directly inquire to the members the kind of portal/methods they use to publish datasets and also inquire what type of datasets members foresee to produce in the context of enetCollect.

The group should think about what kind of datasets could be produced and shared within enetCollect (dictionaries, games, materials?). Members should write descriptions of the datasets and extend them later. The datasets should be relevant to the action. We could inquire members through a form or directly at a special session during a future event.

2. Defining IPR

Lionel reminded the discussion regarding IPR in the previous meeting and explained that they got in touch with the European “IPR helpdesk” which provided some input that they still haven’t had time to go through. The problem is that we have little knowhow on IPR unlike other research fields. Indeed, in computer science for example, most things are open source. Some people have signed IPR agreements when publishing a paper in Springer. In the context of enetCollect, this is different, however, because we are talking about data, resources, and tools, and this is much more complex than a paper.

Anabel commented that in the US the rules are very different from the EU. In the US they use patents more than in Europe. Costanza commented that we work with videos and people have to sign an agreement that we can use them for research purposes. Inguna said that Clarin has different options/licenses and license types are designed by a person owning the resources. It could thus be a good starting point. It was also recorded that resources could belong to the University that employs the researcher, or a particular research group. Tanara suggested to get in touch with *Lexical computing* (*Sketch Engine*) since they would have a better understanding about these questions.

Ildiko said that in Sweden to guarantee anonymity one has to follow procedures where and how to store data. We might want to publish data for free but we might not be able to do so, because the data includes personal information of the participants or it could be easy to track participants

who produced the data (e.g. students essays). One contact person to clarify this issue is Elena Volodina.

A strategy for IPR could be that whatever datasets are produced within enetcollect—they are free for all the partners within enetcollect, outsiders have to apply for the rights to use them. If it is for research purposes it is for free, when there is a commercial purpose they might have to pay. We should consider whether any data will be produced within enetcollect for the industry.

The COST Action PARSEME could also be a good starting point. We should check how they shared data, and about any restrictions for sharing data.

3. MCIF proposals

MCIF and COST Actions are natural allies: MCIFs are independent projects, they are very generous both for grantees and for the hosts and generous on the travelling side. MCIF grantees do not have expenses on the COST action, because they have their own money. A dedicated MCIF training session is being held after this meeting. The training session will explain the knowledge on the most important things when applying for the MCIF grants. Since every MCIF proposal encodes a research idea that can be used for the objectives of enetCollect, team of hosts and applicants are encouraged to make an STSM to foster the development of the research idea through the writing of an MCIF proposal.

The deadline for MCIF is mid-September every year. It's better to get started in May-June. Proposals are highly competitive - 15% acceptance rate... The proposal has to be meaningful for the applicant and should allow to improve the career opportunities. Surely the project should also be interesting, but developing the capacity of the MCIF grantee is the first priority of a MCIF project !

Unfortunately, COST does not allow us to make a training school on the subject of MCIF proposal writing. The COST Administration wants to ensure that the resources of the action are being used for initiatives that directly benefit the action. We believe that's the case here since every proposal is a research idea and can thus be used for the outputs of enetCollect but the COST administration see it differently for the time being.

4. Fostering project proposals

After presenting the discussion of the previous meeting on the subject, Lionel detailed the information gathered on the "Autonomous funding opportunities" webpage of the website:

- COST-related (Contact your COST CNC to see if there are opportunities for your country)
- Projects, which require limited effort: Amazon research awards, Bloomberg, Ubuntu, VW Stiftung, crazy ideas etc.
- Marie Curie individual fellowships (MCIF)
- Marie Curie co-funded fellowships. Similar to MCIFs but at local levels and thus less competitive. There are relevant calls for Flanders, France, Ireland, Spain for Catalonia, Sweden, UK for Wales...

5. Proposal sharing

Submitting the same proposal to different science/research foundations, because we come from different institutions and we do not compete when submitting proposals. There is now a folder proposal sharing on the ilias intranet. As soon as you join, you can see the proposals that have been submitted so far.

http://www.enetcollect.net/ilias/goto.php?target=grp_441&client_id=enetcollect

Most attendees of the meeting would be willing to share a proposal. One should avoid copy-pasting an existing proposal, but it is possible to update, extend and modify it. If you already have funded projects, do share your proposals, if they are relevant to enetcollect!

Anabela has been developing a proposal which, according to her, was not very well written. She suggested to share the final report of it. Lionel suggested to cc either Magali, or himself +Verena, or Corina, when sharing the proposal.

Lionel reminded that one need to make sure that partners on the project are ok with sharing it! Magali and Lionel sent an email with the survey about sharing proposals but got little reaction from members.