

# In your perspective, how best to avoid duplication of efforts in particular in the EU and EOSC context?

I guess that is unavoidable as everything is very connected. Good communication and clear strategy / plans are paramount

Publish the work? Not directly involved in any FAIR work but somewhat aware.

Make sure efforts are easily findable and commincated to other initiatives (alsof: interproject collaborations)

good communication in between large projects. open presentation of results / planned work

Be proactive with promoting the developments and results, especially with communities of practice in universities, research organizations, and repository organizations, which have the most practical interest to follow them, and then disseminate them

pretty difficult, communication?

Focus om finding synergies

Working together with different initiatives

You may only reduce it, by connecting and bringing people together. They might collaborate, but given size of the European community duplication can not be avoided completely.



# In your perspective, how best to avoid duplication of efforts in particular in the EU and EOSC context?

Communicate, collaborate

It may not be good to oblige everybody to use a single solution for a given issue and accepting some level of diversity can be good, but when EC funds projects which work in the same topic there is an absolute need to organise cross-project coordinat

Stop funding 'coodination' projects that are either too high level or actually reinventing because do not have a domain expertise

the new EOSC Association AGs should be the place where the different stakeholders come together and ensure that efforts are complementary and not duplicated

It's impossible to avoid duplication completely! But communication and openness is a key.

Early adopting users, share ideas from the begin

This is unavoidable; the EU Member States will always develop solutions in line with their national strategies.

No problem as long as they strenghten each other

Communication - as well as knowledge transfer and training resources



# In your perspective, how best to avoid duplication of efforts in particular in the EU and EOSC context?

Does it matter if there is duplication? There may be different perspectives/approaches that need to be considered. There needs to be ways to share results and information to learn from the different efforts.

My suggestion would be to start looking more outwards to real use cases, how EOSC and implementations of FAIR are actively supporting open science in practice. Not suggesting that this isn't done but at least 90% of energy is currently inwards.

Duplication on knowledge creation should not be a problem. Duplication of facilities, infrastructure is a problem of wasting resources.

Broad stakeholder collaboration

Transparency and openness are fundamental, there should be obligatory tasks within all EOSC EU funded projects for synergistic and collaborative activities.

Change the focus from (passively) avoiding duplication to (actively) encouraging collaboration. The latter will require more effort and resource, but should be a pre-requisite.

EU staff to maintain oversight of portfolios of funded projects, and to connections across projects

A portal centralising all project outputs

# Do you know of any models or good examples which could help make progress for the governance of semantic interoperability frameworks?

no

International agreement is essential

OBO Foundry

Don't really understand what 'semantic interoperability' means!

No

Look into community framework such as OBO Foundry, Industry Ontology Foundry and agree on common practices across disciplines...

[schema.org / bioschemas](https://schema.org/bioschemas)

No

No



# Do you know of any models or good examples which could help make progress for the governance of semantic interoperability frameworks?

The OntoPortal Alliance (repositories of FAIR ontologies for diverse scientific communities)

Abstracting and indexing services have a lot of experience in this area.

No

This requires a sort of editorial board that has authority (and is acknowledged as such) in a given field and can "proclaim" a standard (with acronym and version)

Make semantic vocabularies discoverable easily for reuse and integration, e.g.  
<https://lov.linkeddata.es/dataset/lov/>

Collaboration with domain experts or communities to endorse ontologies and standards.

controlled vocabulary using DataCite Metadata schema?



# In your opinion what is the right balance between disciplinary richness and solutions for cross-disciplinary metadata integration?

Again, the main steer should come from realistic use cases

:-s

Don't know

As long as data is well documented and structured it can be (re)used . Quality first.

the balance can be in have first the data in, then get more and more. So ask for few data at the begin, so less interoperability problem, and then add data.

as much as possible richness without compromise the friendliness, keeping it easy and straightforward for researcher to use it

complicated. if too generic, the metadata is completely useless in a scientific use case. If too specific, datasets might still be impossible to find. One option would be a divided metadata template with a very generic half, getting into more detail

In the past the concept "application profile" was minted (for a discipline specific metadata scheme) and that can be mapped with cross-disciplinary metadata (ref. Dublin Core application profiles). Maybe take a look at this again....

Reuse success stories from domains, don't restart from scratch. Research communities continuously redo things to customize them for their world.



# In your opinion what is the right balance between disciplinary richness and solutions for cross-disciplinary metadata integration?

Metadata application profiles that meet use cases for specific cross-disciplinary communities, reusing terms for disciplinary vocabularies

Difficult to balance but maybe some core metadata which are common combined with a greater richness depending on the discipline

First we need to teach our researchers about semantic interoperability and data linking. Then they should use standards of relevance for their own discipline.

The general framework should be very generic, preferably even bigger than science (e.g. schema.org / JSON-LD is an emerging industry standard). But then it's up to domain communities which share similar use cases. Bioschemas is a good example.