



QualityLink

Community Building and Technical Standard Adoption

Standards Consultation Board

Webinars

QualityLink Report on Work Package 4

Authors

Colin Tück (KIC)

Jochen Ehrenreich (DHBW)

Contributors

Members of the QualityLink consortium

Members of the Standards Consultation Board

Layout

Nuša Karo

Copyright

(C) 2026, QualityLink

Project reference

2023-1-DE01-KA220-HED-000161253

Work Package

4 - Community Building and Technical Standard Adoption

Critical to the adoption of any new standard by the educational community, is the idea of building an open governance methodology for the standard, to ensure ownership by the community that will implement it. This work package aims to achieve this by:

- building a board of renowned European experts to participate in the standard setting activities;
- consulting widely with the educational IT standards community to ensure participation in governance and later adoption;
- promoting the new standards with potential implementers, vendors and public authorities to create network effects accelerating adoption

:This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

1 Management Summary	4
2 Standards Consultation Board (SCB)	5
3 Meetings.....	6
3.1 First Meeting: 12 September 2024 (online)	6
3.2 Second Meeting: 28/29 November 2024 in Brussels.....	8
3.3 Third Meeting: 28 January 2025 (online).....	12
3.4 Fourth Meeting: 20 February 2025 (online)	14
3.5 Fifth Meeting: 17/18 March 2025 in Zagreb	16
3.6 Sixth Meeting: 22 September 2025 in Delft	21
4 QualityLink webinars	25
4.1 21 January 2026: Advancing Microcredentials: From Concept to Practice	25
4.2 3 February 2026: Challenges micro-credentials bring and solutions QualityLink proposes ..	25
4.3 29 April 2026: Interoperable course catalogues - bridging data models and standards.....	26

1 Management Summary

The QualityLink project enhances transparency, accessibility and learner choice by improving access to reliable and comparable information on courses and micro-credentials across providers. In line with the EU Digital Education Action Plan 2021–2027, the project contributes to the development of an open, high-performing and interoperable digital education ecosystem.

To this end, QualityLink strengthens the semantic and technical interoperability of course data within the European Higher Education Area and beyond. The project developed common descriptors, quality indicators and technical specifications based on existing standards to support sharing of course data across institutions and national contexts. Building on the European Learning Model (ELM), the framework supports interoperability between ELM, OOAPI, Edu-API and OCCAPI and enables data integration into a shared catalogue.

A central objective is the community co-creation of data specifications and interoperability approaches in close collaboration with experts in the field. A 13-member Standards Consultation Board (SCB), representing public authorities, agencies, EdTech, higher education institutions and university alliances, provided structured feedback through online collaboration and meetings. The extraordinarily high engagement of the experts on the SCB enabled us to co-develop approaches and data specifications that have a high adoption potential in the sphere of EdTech and HE (see also <https://quality-link.eu/about/standards-consultation-board/>).

The SCB had an online workspace for collaboration. Discussions on concepts and data specifications were based on the concept paper “Quality Data Exchange Architecture” (available at <https://quality-link.eu/project-outputs/concept-paper/>).

The data specifications developed in work packages 3 and 4 were the basis for the development of an open data aggregator in work package 5, capable of automatically collecting, harmonising and updating course data from participating institutions. This created the basis for a Europe-wide course catalogue bringing learning opportunities together in a single searchable environment. The catalogue empowers students, employers and recognition officers to discover, filter and compare available offers, thereby supporting the “Discover” use case of the European Higher Education Interoperability Framework.

This report on work package 4 documents the meetings of the SCB through annotated agendas. Towards the end of the project, a series of webinars promoted the interoperability approaches of the QualityLink project and launched the public consultation on the data aggregator and the course catalogue.

2 Standards Consultation Board (SCB)

The members of the Standards Consultation Board are:

1. Tim Couper (1EdTech)
2. Gero Federkeil (EHESO)
3. Ronald Ham (SURF)
4. Sami Hautakangas (Tampere Universities / ECIU)
5. Janina van Hees (Utrecht University / CHARM-EU)
6. Florian Hilfinger (RWTH / ENHANCE)
7. Konstantinos Karaoglanoglou (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki / EPICUR)
8. Janina Mincer-Daszkiewicz (University of Warsaw / 4EU+)
9. Ben Parker (Technical University of Eindhoven / EuroTeQ)
10. Vlad Petcu (West University of Timisoara / UNITA!)
11. Johan Peterson (Linköping University / ECIU)
12. Hanna Reczulska (NAWA)
13. Aleksandra Zhivkovikj (EQAR)

<https://quality-link.eu/about/standards-consultation-board/>

Internal Standards Consultation Board experts are:

14. Kay Berkling (DHBW)
15. Estela Daukšienė (Vytautas Magnus University / EDEN)

Meetings of the SCB were held on

- September 12, 2024 (online)
- November 28 and 29, 2024 in Brussels
- January 28, 2025 (online)
- February 20, 2026 (online)
- March 17 and 18, 2025 in Zagreb
- September 22, 2025 in Delft

3 Meetings

3.1 First Meeting: 12 September 2024 (online)

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introduction Round

- a. Welcome words by the consortium
- b. Short introduction of all participants
- c. Short introduction of the missing board members by the consortium

2. Introduction to the QualityLink Project

- a. Overview of goals and objectives of the project
- b. Summary of planned activities

Followed by Q&A

3. Role of the Standards Consultation Board

- a. Why we have the board and what is expected from its members
- b. How we envision it to work, planned meetings and modalities of collaboration

Followed by questions, feedback and discussion

4. Quality Data Exchange Architecture

Introduction of the 3.4 Quality Data Exchange Architecture [discussion paper](#), what architecture we envision and what we want to develop as part of the project

Followed by experts' feedback and discussion about the overall topic, then briefly about individual components

Question for the experts: to which component are you most interested in contributing?

5. Next Meetings

- a. 28/29 November 2024 - Brussels - begin 13:00 / end 14:00
Overview of the first face-to-face meeting in Brussels in November 2024, expected topics of discussion and results;
- b. 17/18 March 2025 - Zagreb - in conjunction with the Micro-credentials Masterclass <https://masterclass.microcredentials.eu/>

6. AOB

Summary

The opening meeting served to constitute the Standards Consultation Board. After a welcome by the consortium and an introduction round, the consortium presented the goals, objectives and planned activities of the QualityLink project, followed by questions and answers.

The consortium then set out the purpose of the Board: why it had been established, what was expected of its members, and how collaboration would work in practice, including the planned meeting schedule and the online workspace. Members were invited to give feedback on these modalities.

The substantive part of the meeting introduced the discussion paper on the Quality Data Exchange Architecture, outlining the architecture envisaged by the project and the components to be developed.

Experts were invited to signal which component they were most interested in contributing to. It was agreed that further work would take place asynchronously until the following meetings.

3.2 Second Meeting: 28/29 November 2024 in Brussels

Agenda

Thursday, 28 Nov 2024, 13:00 - 18:00

13:00 Registration, Coffee and Snacks

13:30 Introduction

- 1) Name and institutional background
- 2) Choose at least one of the following questions:
 - a) What are your needs for an inter-institutional course catalogue?
 - b) How would your institution/students benefit from such a catalogue?
 - c) What would convince your institution to share their course data with a public database?
 - d) How could you contribute to the development and adoption of standards on courses and credentials?
 - e) What do you expect from this meeting?

Review of the Agenda

14:15 Expected outcomes of the QualityLink Standards Consultation Board

14:30 Expert Group work on the Quality Data Exchange Architecture

Preparatory document: [discussion paper](#)

Miro board: [link is not public]

- Policy on data sources - 30 min
- Policy on data access and usage - 30 min
- Unique Course Identifier - 75 min
- Course Disambiguation Service - 45 min

18:00 End of day 1

19:00 Dinner

Friday, 29 Nov 2024, 9:00 - 14.00

9:00 Registration, Coffee and Snacks

9:15 Expert Group work on the Quality Data Exchange Architecture (cont'd)

Preparatory document: [discussion paper](#)

Miro board: [link is not public]

- Ontology - 45 min
- Conversion and mapping - 30 min
- Management and discovery of data sources - 45 min
- Data exchange - 45 min

12:00 Wrap- up

Next Steps

- Webinars/online meetings with the SCB in Jan and Feb
 - Preference for mornings 9-12
 - Not Mondays
- Webinars with wider community after March
 - One with 1EdTech, one with EUF community
- Reimbursement of travel expenses
 - We will send you a travel expenses form
- Second (and last) F2F meeting of the Standards Consultation Board
 - Start: Monday, 17 March 2025 at 13:30
 - End: Tuesday, 18 March 2025 at 13:00
 - Location: Zagreb
 - Aligned with the Microcredentials Masterclass 19-20 March 2025
 - <https://masterclass.microcredentials.eu/>

12:30 Light Lunch

13:30 End of the meeting of the Standards Consultation Board

Summary

The first face-to-face meeting was devoted almost entirely to expert group work on the Quality Data Exchange Architecture, working from the discussion paper and a shared Miro board.

Policy on data sources

Members favoured use case agnostic standards and saw eventual integration of the standards developed in QualityLink into the European Learning Model (ELM) as the target. The discussion weighed centralised against decentralised data holdings, keeping information up to date against retaining historic course data, and push against pull mechanisms, with the shared aim of gathering information from various sources in one place.

Policy on data access and usage

A clear distinction was drawn between the data held in the database and the different, user-specific views that could be offered on it. Attributes were identified at course level (instance, language, timetable, enrolment constraints) as well as attributes to restrict visibility and transactions such as registration, differentiating an institution's own students, students from an alliance and the general public. A quality rating on data entries was also raised.

The guiding user story was that a university should be able to deliver course data once to a central database from which partners retrieve it, rather than building an interface to every partner system.

Unique course identifier

The main challenges were what exactly is identified — the course, the instance, or both — and how to construct the institutional component, including joint programmes and the possibility of "marrying" SCHAC and OrgReg identifiers. Members were clear that the solution must avoid creating additional central bureaucracy and remain light and decentralised or federated.

Jointly delivered courses raised open questions: whether to allow multiple entries, and how to handle a course offered by several partners where the credential is issued by a separate entity such as a university alliance. A semantic codebook vector was floated as an alternative approach to identification.

Ontology

Discussion covered the relationship between course, outcome and skills, and stackability. Members concluded that an abstract class or concept of a quality indicator was needed, with further additions captured on the Miro board. It was noted that ELM was not designed to carry statistical data on courses such as graduation rates, raising the question of whether these should be kept separate.

Conversion and mapping

Conversion and mapping were considered crucial, since not all vendors and solutions will adopt the QualityLink standards. Course discovery and course registration were confirmed as use cases for the project, while recognition history and verification of credentials were seen as out of scope, and student crowdsourcing — enriching the database with subjective student input — was left as an open question.

Management and discovery of data sources

Members stressed that the approach should be exclusive neither to higher education institutions nor to Europe, suggesting a platform approach based on trusted lists such as DEQAR and providers offering EDC learning accounts.

Auto-discovery of providers listed in the EWP Registry, the EUF HEI API, DEQAR or ETER/OrgReg was discussed, along with whether additional sources are needed. The proposed combination of a DNS record and a .well-known location was examined for flexibility, as was whether one or both approaches should be supported, whether the mechanism makes sense at all, what a good manifest file should contain, and whether it could be integrated into the EWP manifest as an option.

Data exchange

The two main transport options — exposing an API and publishing a static file — were tested against members' expectations, together with how changes can be synchronised efficiently in OOAPI and which access control options are required.

3.3 Third Meeting: 28 January 2025 (online)

Agenda

10:00 Welcome and Introduction Round

10:15 Quick Recap

Related document: [concept paper](#) (revised, previous discussion paper)

- QualityLink project aims and use cases
- First face-to-face meeting of the Standards Consultation Board
- Q&A

10:30 Course Identifier

- Discussion of main challenges and possible approaches

11:00 Data Discovery and Exchange

Related documents: initial drafts/outlines of the [Data Source Discovery Specification](#) and [Data Exchange Specification](#) - sources see [GitHub repo](#)

- Introduction of the initial drafts
- Further process

11:25 Wrap-up and Next Steps

- Reminder: second (and last) F2F meeting of the Standards Consultation Board
 - Start: Monday, 17 March 2025 at 13:30
 - End: Tuesday, 18 March 2025 at 13:00
 - Location: Zagreb
 - Aligned with the Microcredentials Masterclass 19-20 March 2025
 - <https://masterclass.microcredentials.eu/>

Summary

After a recap of the ongoing architecture work, use cases and the outcomes of the Brussels meeting, the meeting concentrated on the course identifier.

It was noted that course identifiers change quite often; the 1EdTech/Edu-API approach of decentralised identifiers (DIDs) with explicit relations between them, such as replacement, sameness and predecessor or successor links, was one solution.

Secondary identifiers were considered important both for continuity over time and to identify duplicates where the same course is offered by different institutions; see Edu-API model of a 'Primary Code' and 'Other Codes', each with identifier and identifier type, suggesting that 'Historical Codes' could be added in the same way.

It was observed that identifiers exist at different granularities — modules, sub-units of a module, examinations — and that study programmes change frequently. The need to distinguish a course from an instance of that course was reiterated.

It was agreed to map the possible relationships first and then decide which fall inside and outside the scope of QualityLink.

The Board observed that ELM is broader than the other data models, which makes it a plausible pivot for data exchange between models and standards; it was agreed that the mapping could be discussed further at the Zagreb meeting.

The initial drafts of the Data Source Discovery Specification and the Data Exchange Specification were introduced and the further process explained, which would be concluded with the Zagreb meeting.

3.4 Fourth Meeting: 20 February 2025 (online)

Agenda

10:00 Welcome

10:05 Updates

- Concept paper published, available at <https://quality-link.eu/concept-paper/>
- Surveys:
 - for students
 - for other stakeholders

10:15 Course Identifier

- Discussion of main challenges and possible approaches

10:30 Ontology

Related documents:

- Previous document: [T3.4 ontologies mapping](#)
- Initial [draft of the SHACL constraints](#) (includes definitions) - source see [GitHub repo](#)

Items for discussion:

- Review of the mapping, next steps (e.g. DESM)
- Introduction of the draft
- Target groups of LOs
- Enrolment links
- Demographic/historical relationships

11:00 Data Discovery

Related documents: initial drafts of the [Data Source Discovery Specification](#) - sources see [GitHub repo](#)

Topics for discussion:

- Important points for manifest file
- Any further thoughts?

11:15 Data Discovery and Exchange

Related documents: initial drafts of the [Data Exchange Specification](#) - sources see [GitHub repo](#)

Topics for discussion:

- Incremental transport in existing API - ideas or existing experience?
- Any further thoughts?

11:25 Wrap-up and Next Steps

- Reminder: second (and last) F2F meeting of the Standards Consultation Board
 - Start: Monday, 17 March 2025 at 13:30
 - End: Tuesday, 18 March 2025 at 13:00
 - Location: Zagreb
 - Aligned with the Microcredentials Masterclass 19-20 March 2025
 - <https://masterclass.microcredentials.eu/>

Summary

The consortium opened with updates on the publication of the concept paper and on the two surveys under preparation, for students and for other stakeholders. The course identifier was revisited briefly before the main item, the ontology.

Ontology

Reviewing the draft SHACL constraints, the Board went through the properties describing the target groups of learning opportunities. Non-full-degree learners, EQF level, capacity per target group, admission, fee and prerequisites were all added. Mode and language were to be kept at learning opportunity level, while year of study and recognition agreements remained open.

On demographic and historical relationships, members found "spun off" too narrow and precise a term and considered alternatives such as supersedes or clone of, and preferred "no longer offered" to "ceased to exist", since any learning opportunity could in principle be revived through new instances. Version numbers for learning opportunities were discussed and a deprecated status was added. Equivalent courses were also added.

Data discovery and exchange

On incremental transport within existing APIs, a pull request for Edu-API was announced by one member. For OOAPI it was noted that incremental transport is not built in, but would be conceivable via an HTTP header.

3.5 Fifth Meeting: 17/18 March 2025 in Zagreb

Agenda

Monday, 17 March 2025

Location: Algebra Bernays University (Sveučilište Algebra Bernays)
[Gradišćanska ul. 24, 10000 Zagreb](#) - Room A9

13:00 Lunch (at the venue)

14:00 Welcome

14:05 Updates and recap

- Concept paper published, available at <https://quality-link.eu/concept-paper/>
 - avoid reference to “competition”, loaded work?
 -
- Overview of specifications at <https://quality-link.eu/technical-specs/> (unpublished page for now)
- [Data Sources and Access Policy](#) (unchanged)

Use cases:

- identify similar/equivalent courses

14:15 Survey on Quality Indicators

- Surveys:
 - for students <https://encuesta.com/r/raFWnY-zwt91u7JYweJ5dg/>
 - for other stakeholders https://encuesta.com/r/3adpCn5ceZcZVhis7UM_vw/
- Presentation of survey results so far

14:45 Course Identifier

Related document: see concept paper sections

Items for discussion:

- Discussion of main challenges and possible approaches
- What do our “recommended business rules” need to include?
- Cover courses + instances

15:30 Coffee Break

16:00 Course Identifier (continued as needed)

16:15 Ontology

Related documents:

- Previous document: [T3.4 ontologies mapping](#) (overview)
- [Mapping between OOAPI and ELM](#) (KIC-hosted DESM)
- [Draft ontology and SHACL constraints](#) - source see [GitHub repo](#)

Items for discussion:

- Presentation of the OOAPI - ELM mapping (Ronald Ham & Colin Tück)
- Discussion of main issues arising
- Review of the mapping, next steps (e.g. DESM)
- Introduction of the revised draft, key issues:
 - New properties for target groups of LOs:
 - Non-full degree student learners - <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#isOpenToNonEnrolled>
 - EQF level - <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#minimumEQFLevel>
 - capacity per target group - <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#enrolmentCapacity>
 - ELM properties added to Learner Group Shape:
 - admission - <http://data.europa.eu/snb/model/elm/admissionProcedure>
 - fee - <http://data.europa.eu/snb/model/elm/priceDetail>
 - prerequisites - <http://data.europa.eu/snb/model/elm/entryRequirement>
 - Recognition agreement/equivalence of LO
 - added as <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#equivalentTo>
 - Suggest to keep at LO Instance level
 - mode of learning
 - language
 - Demographic/historical relationships
 - simplified as <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#superseded> - limit to own courses?
 - added <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#version> - only one
 - added <http://data.quality-link.eu/ontology/v1#isActive>

18:00 End

19:30 Dinner at Magazinska klet, [Magazinska ul. 7, 10000 Zagreb](#)

Tuesday, 18 March 2025

Location: Algebra Bernays University (Sveučilište Algebra Bernays)
[Gradišćanska ul. 24, 10000 Zagreb](#)

9:30 Data Source Discovery

Related document: [Data Source Discovery Specification](#) - sources see [GitHub repo](#)

Topics for discussion:

- Important points for manifest file
- Any further thoughts?

10:15 Data Exchange

Related documents: [Data Exchange Specification](#) - sources see [GitHub repo](#)

Topics for discussion:

- Incremental transport in existing API - further discussion
- general list of required fields
- full load to find deleted
- OOAPI
- Edu-API
- OCCAPI - add
- EWP Courses API - defer
- ELMO - possible future addition

11:00 Coffee break

11:30 Planned Developments

- Overview of software components that will be developed in the next months

12:00 Piloting and Testing

- Overview of opportunities for HEIs and others to participate
- Ideas how to boost interest in testing
 - focus on why?

12:30 Wrap-up and Next Steps

- Consultation on draft specifications
- Future involvement of the SCB

13:00 Lunch

Summary

Updates and recap

The published concept paper and the overview of specifications were presented. On the concept paper, members advised avoiding the reference to "competition" as a loaded term. Identifying similar or equivalent courses was confirmed as a use case.

Survey on quality indicators

Two clarifications to the survey wording were requested: the student questionnaire should make clear that it can be answered without prior knowledge of micro-credentials, and the stakeholder questionnaire should make clear that respondents are asked for their own perspective when judging the quality of a micro-credential, for instance as a recognition officer. Members recommended reaching out to the labour market, to potential learners and through further social networks.

The consortium presented the results received so far. Students attach importance to up-to-date descriptions, the reputation of the institution — though notably not to quality labels — and labour market relevance; stackability matters less to them, and graduation rate and career improvement rank above grade distribution. Among other stakeholders, the qualifications of instructors carry more weight than they do for students.

Course identifier

Members asked for recommendations on the use of did:web where an institution decides to use a DID as its local identifier, and confirmed that multiple identifiers for a single course must be supported. The recommended business rules should define when something constitutes a new course, a new version or another instance, and should link clearly to the different standards. Both courses and instances are to be covered.

Ontology

The mapping between OOAPI and ELM was presented, which will also feature in the MCMC keynote; members emphasised that the mapping must work in both directions. The discussion identified differences in how the two models treat the main concepts and classes, including levels of hierarchy and part-of relations, on which recommendations for institutions would be useful.

A set of properties present in OOAPI but not modelled in ELM was identified: address and location, target group, enrolment capacity, start and end dates, coordinators, and the consumer concept with its extensibility — with address, start and end dates and coordinators marked as actions to follow up.

The Board worked through the properties of the Learning Opportunity Specification (level in NQF, EQF and other frameworks; description; learning outcomes; abbreviations, codes and

identifiers; qualification requirements and resources from OOAPI; workload and credits; mode of study and delivery; OOAPI consumers against the ELM target group; assessment specification; coordinator) and those additional at Learning Opportunity Instance level (enrolment and application dates, duration, student numbers, and whether expected result and grading scale belong to the opportunity or the instance). Education provider and vocabularies, including the distinction between descriptive and classification vocabularies, were also touched on.

On the revised draft, further points were raised: whether to express a requirement to have completed another course; whether target groups should be modelled per instance, which members thought unlikely; the need to keep the target learner group extensible; and capacity, which should also exist at instance level and be complemented by a minimum and the number actually enrolled. An identifier and possibly a description were requested for the Learner Group Shape.

On the recognition agreement and equivalence property, members leaned towards skipping it: the notion of "comparable" was questioned, acceptance only where both sides agree was considered, and recognition history was judged to be considerably more complex.

Data source discovery

On the manifest file, two concrete points were agreed: add .json to the URL and address authentication.

Data exchange

For OOAPI, members advised narrowing the profile down from the native specification, explicitly marking fields as required, recommended or optional, and carrying version information in the manifest with support for v5.

Incremental transport was discussed further, together with a general list of required fields and the use of a full load to detect deletions; OCCAPI was to be added, the EWP Courses API deferred, and ELMO noted as a possible future addition.

The remainder of the day covered the software components planned for the following months, opportunities for institutions and others to take part in piloting and testing and how to boost interest in it, the consultation on the draft specifications and the future involvement of the Board.

3.6 Sixth Meeting: 22 September 2025 in Delft

Agenda

Location: Aula Congress Centre, [Mekelweg 5, 2628 CC Delft, The Netherlands](#)
(pre-conference session of [1EdTech Learning Impact Europe](#))
room **COMM4**

10:00 Welcome and brief QualityLink introduction

- Brief introduction round of attendees
- Project presentation (general intro since we will have a couple of guests)
- Questions and answers

10:30 QualityLink pilot aggregator

- Overview of the architecture
- Update on development
 - Dashboard for HEIs: [prototype](#)
 - Live demo
- Institutions/organisations providing data for pilot
 - ELM
 - OOAPI
 - Edu-API
 - OCCAPI
 - Key vendors/SISes
- Questions, answers and reflections

11:30 Coffee break

12:00 Data governance

Document: [Data Sources and Access Policy](#)

- Scenarios for data sources:
 - One provider, one data source - clear
 - One provider, several data sources - no challenge
 - One data source covering several providers (e.g. alliance) - how to handle?
- Options for data payload:
 - No indication of learning opportunity provider
 - Mandatory or optional indication of correct provider
 - How to handle joint courses/programmes
- Agreements vs general policy?

13:00 Lunch (at the venue)**14:00 Additional documentation**

Draft documents: [Guide for Decision-Makers](#) and [Technical Guide](#) (unpublished pages)

- Review of step-by-step guides (in two sub-groups)
 - Decision-makers
 - Techies
- Which other communication or guidance material would be useful

15:00 Coffee Break**15:30 Technical specifications**

Overview of specifications at <https://quality-link.eu/technical-specs/>

- Feedback and issues raised: <https://github.com/Knowledge-Innovation-Centre/quality-link-specs/issues>
- Possible changes/additions to discuss

16:00 Ontology

Related documents:

- [Ontology](#) (extension to ELM)
- [Application profile \(SHACL constraints\)](#)

Items for discussion:

- Presentation
 - Separate publication of ontology and application profile
 - Useful to include example data?
- Modelling of quality indicators (priority ones)
 - Learning/teaching methodologies - [already in ELM](#)
 - Assessment methods - [already in ELM](#)
 - Virtual learning environment - [added](#)
 - Graduation rate - [added](#)
 - Grade distribution - [added](#)
 - Membership in networks - [added](#)
 - Recognition of prior learning - to do
 - Student ratings - to do
- Other changes
 - Provider required or not?
 - Approach to compatibility with ELM LOQ profile?

16:00 Next steps

16:30 End

18:00 Networking reception of the 1EdTech Learning Impact Europe conference

Summary

The final meeting was hosted as a pre-conference session of 1EdTech Learning Impact Europe, and included a number of guests alongside Board members.

Pilot aggregator

Following an overview of the architecture and a live demo, the prototype dashboard for higher education institutions drew the most comment. Members asked who the intended audience and user is, whether a login should replace a timeout, and whether the rate limit should apply only to the data source.

A second dashboard was proposed for the person who manages actual course data and wants to see what has and has not been fetched, showing information such as the last refresh date, and combining additional dashboard information with metadata on the institution and on each course in the public catalogue.

On archiving, the preference was to keep the record but hide it from the default frontend, and to distinguish deletion from the retirement of a course. Filtering by offering provider and by availability to enrol was requested, and availability was thought generally useful to have.

On institutions and organisations providing data for the pilot, one OOAPI source was confirmed (EuroTeQ, via TU/e).

No ELM, Edu-API or OCCAPI sources were yet confirmed, with ECIU and EPICUR named as ELM candidates, and Aristotle University of Thessaloniki as Edu-API candidates.

Key vendors and student information systems were listed as Canvas Catalogue, CINECA, SIKT, LADOK, Sigma, USOS and national aggregators.

Data governance

Where a single data source covers several providers, such as an alliance, the handling of joint courses and programmes was the open question: whether the lead university publishes, whether only the lead institution or all of them do so, and whether a shared identifier is needed.

On the choice between individual agreements and a general policy, members were clear that the rules need to be the same for everyone, while signed template agreements could possibly be generated. A right to deletion was raised, along with a suggestion to check existing rules such as those of Europeana, and the question of whether one can avoid supporting applications one does not wish to support.

Additional documentation

The two step-by-step guides were reviewed in sub-groups.

For the guide for decision-makers, members asked that it answer "what's in it for me?", address whether participation is desirable for an institution that already has an alliance catalogue, highlight the not-for-profit nature of the initiative and simplify the language.

The message should be that this means little work and no risk with data that is public anyway, that institutions should not miss out on standardisation developments, that it offers exposure for institutions outside alliances, and that it provides a service for institutions without their own software, referencing DACEM.

For the technical guide, members noted that course data is dispersed across different systems, so institutions should pre-aggregate it and apply pre-filtering and access control themselves, and that information on a single course may come from different streams.

The guide should not advertise running an own or custom aggregator instance, should include information on access control and authentication, and should add the IP address and public key.

Technical specifications and ontology

An analysis of security and attack vectors was requested for the specifications.

On the ontology, the modelling of grade distribution prompted two questions: whether a negative value should indicate a fail and a positive one a pass, and what information is relevant for grade conversion.

4 QualityLink webinars

Can course catalogues talk to each other across Europe? That's the question at the heart of QualityLink — and we hosted three free webinars to explore it.

As the European micro-credential landscape grows in Europe, learners and institutions need course data that is open, easy to compare, and reliable. Currently, it often lacks the needed interoperability.

Check the webinar recordings if you work in higher education (in particular for European Universities alliances), digital transformation, interoperability or micro-credentials.

4.1 21 January 2026: Advancing Microcredentials: From Concept to Practice

EDEN NAP webinar (30 online participants)

Slides:

https://quality-link.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/90/2026/08/260121_QualityLink_EDENNAP.pdf

Recording:

<https://quality-link.eu/events/>

4.2 3 February 2026: Challenges micro-credentials bring and solutions QualityLink proposes

Open Education Week webinar (75 online participants)

Slides:

https://quality-link.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/90/2026/08/260302_QualityLink_OEW26-1.pdf

Recording:

<https://quality-link.eu/events/>

4.3 29 April 2026: Interoperable course catalogues - bridging data models and standards

QualityLink webinar (34 online participants)

Slides:

https://quality-link.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/90/2026/08/260429_QualityLink_Webinar_Interoperable_Course_Catalogues.pdf

Recording:

<https://quality-link.eu/events/>