

# CompLeap Framework Architecture Deployment Plan

Our Aim is to make CompLeap Framework Architecture suitable across EU in other words CompLeap Framework Architecture should be able to integrate and “work together” with other reference architecture in this sector.

The piloting and deployment of the framework architecture is implemented through a series of evaluations, which in turn are carried out through interviews.

Compleap Framework architecture: <https://wiki.eduuni.fi/display/csccompleap/Framework+architecture+design>

Responsibility: Shared CSC and EDUFI Ari Rouvari and Sami Mäkinen

Piloting EU countries are Finland, Netherlands and Germany ?.

Contact persons: Erik (NL),

Related Architectures in Finland

- AMOS reference architecture, not published (Coordinator: Ministry of Education and Culture)
- KOHVI reference architecture (Coordinator: Ministry of Education and Culture)
- OPI Higher education institutions reference architecture, in progress (Coordinator KOOTuki)
- EDU.FI enterprise architecture
- KAPA service architecture

The order of the interviews with the key informants and actors is the following:

- Reference Group members:
  - Ministry of Education and culture of Finland: Tomi Kytölä with his colleagues
  - Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment of Finland: Kari Rintanen and Teija Felt
- Partners:
  - EDUFI: Erja Nokkanen, Annika Grönholm, Ulla Kauppi, Raakel Hiltunen, Minna Taivassalo, Paula Borkowski, Pauli Sutelainen and Laila Puranen
  - University of Oulu: Hanni Muukkonen and Egle Gedrimiene
  - Gradia: Jaana Virtanen, Hanna Rajala and Rauni Gyldeén
- Associated partners representing education providers in Finland (14.3. Helsinki):
  - The Oulu Region Joint Authority for Education OSAO
  - Rovaniemi Municipal federation of Education Redu
- Associated partners in other EU-countries
  - Die EU-Geschäftsstelle der Bezirksregierung Köln, Germany
  - the Cooperation Organisation for Vocational Education, Training and the Labour Market (SBB), the Netherlands
  - other countries via innoVET network (via Gradia) – meeting in March 2019

Themes and subjects to be discussed during the evaluation process:

Themes	Subjects (Topics) of Discussion	Descriptions and Definitions
<b>1. Strategic Level</b>		
1.1. Related architectures	Can you identify and name architectures which have or should have been mentioned?	
1.2. Drivers	Are the identified drivers valid and can you identify some not yet named drivers?	A driver represents an external or internal condition that motivates an organization to define its goals and implement the changes necessary to achieve them.
1.3. Capabilities	How should we gain or acquire these identified capabilities?	A capability represents an ability that an active structure element, such as an organization, person, or system, possesses.
1.4. Requirements	Can you identify other requirements beside these?	A requirement represents a statement of need that must be met by the architecture.
1.5. Leading and steering	How should we lead this kind of EU-level development based on common framework architecture?	

1.6. Architecture principles	Have we paid enough attention to the architecture principles?	A principle represents a qualitative statement of intent that should be met by the architecture.
<b>2. Learner path (Business architecture level)</b>		
2.1. Learner path	Validation of the Learners path	Aim: Common understanding of the EU level learner path
2.2. (Business) Services	How should we gain these services?	A business service represents an explicitly defined exposed business behavior.
	Have we focused on right selection of development targets? Are we missing any other important development targets?	
<b>3. Information</b>		
3.1. Conceptual model and information flows	Discussion about the conceptual model and information flows	Aim of the discussion:  common and shared understanding
<b>4. Implementation/realisation solutions of the services</b>		
4.1. Initiatives and Projects	Do you already have some initiatives or projects for deploying and improving these kinds of services in your country or area?	
4.2. Implementation models and solutions	Discussion on the implementation models of services and their principles and interoperability. Which one models should be integrated into the CompLeap mapping service?	Will the implementation of mapping services be purely EDUFI's responsibility, or will e.g. private third-party actors be involved?
		Are enough methods disclosed from a guidance point of view?
<b>5. Learning analytics</b>		
5.1 Risk management	Can you identify any risks in this kind of use of learning analytics as a guidance tool for learners?	
5.2 Risk management	How to prepare and control the risks?	