# First thoughts regarding input on the Scientific Plan, Hilde

## What would be most important to focus on

The high level goals and other strategic actions mentioned in the ‘Standards and Work Products’ chapter in the draft Strategic Plan of April 2021 should be guiding principles for the work of all of the groups.

This includes cooperating with other standardization groups, align with the FAIR principles and providing means for efficient use of the standards. Portability of DDI metadata between- and outside specifications is important in the current global standards environment. Modularization and use of specification parts together would be in my view be an important goal for the DDI Alliance and to achieve to a larger extent. Monolithic specifications should no longer be the goal.

Efficient ways for use of the different specifications parts together and common ways to use together with external standards should be chosen, and sought implemented. This requires cross-group collaboration. How can the SB help with this?

The ‘Standards and Work Products’ chapter in the draft Strategic Plan contains lots of useful points to address. Sections 2 and 3 requires to a large extent that groups collaborate, exchange ideas and seek common solutions. Section 4 needs further planning. Perhaps a task for the SB?

## What in the proposals of each of the groups would be realistic and doable within the suggested time frames and group size?

### TC

The plan of the TC is good but extensive for the group of people currently involved. The high level goals of the draft Strategig Plan, like modularity and collaboration with other DDI teams on solutions for how to use the different work products together is important and need to be addressed.

Questions:

COGS: Given the amount of responsibilities is there time to prioritise the COGS environment and testing?

Moving Forward work: Should the Moving Forward review work be a separate activity (in a research environment, for example)? The work should be done with modularization in mind.

CDI users feedback: CDI is about to be published in the near future. Usecases are currently being explored by the MRT. Is a user analyses to early?

### Training

The proposal from the group basically looks fine. Slide review and production of slides should continue. The Training Group needs to follow the ongoing specification development in order to be able to teach new things.

Could procedures to review slides could become more sprint like in the future, in order to speed up the quality checks and finalization of slide decks?

The idea of a paid trainer (currently in the Strategic Plan, section ‘The DDI Alliance as an organization’) is a good one.

#### Training opportunities sub-group

The proposal looks fine. Training at live events becomes important when this is again possible.

#### Website sub-group

The proposal looks fine. A question is how the review process of the web-pages should be? Currently this is done by the group, as well as by some colleagues new to DDI.

The group is not responsible for the Dagstuhl pages of the Events pages.

#### Controlled Vocabularies

The proposal looks fine. As DDI is going cross domain, focus could usefully be put on development of more general rather than more social science related content first? Comments were made at the last SB meeting regarding the technical accessibility of the CV content. This needs to be addressed but is out of the competence of the current group members.

#### SDTL

The proposal looks fine. The group should continue to keep in touch with the other groups regarding use together with the different products, and the focus of content development.

#### MRT

This sounds good. Many of the points in the draft Strategic Plan is incorporated is this plan, including modularization. The group also stresses the importance of collaboration with the TC and other groups, that is important. The collaboration with other standards, and the general outreach to the research community is also good. The group currently forms temporary sub-groups within itself to solve specific tasks or problems. Sub-groups could usefully bring in people with specific expertise to solve specific problems.

## What would be useful collaboration points between the groups?

Things that have to do with Sections 2 and 3 sould be discussed across groups.

## Do you have suggestions for other activities for the groups to focus on than what they suggest themselves?

A next step could be to go through the points in the scientific plan to check if all is covered, and assign task to groups?