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This was the 8th in the series of RDA Working Group / Interest Group Collaboration meetings, primarily attended by self-selected WG/IG Chairs. Over the entire two full days spread over three we had a total of 25 attendees, although a few of those were not able to attend all sessions. Detailed notes and links to presentations can be found at the RDA web site for the meeting:

<https://www.rd-alliance.org/groups/8th-wgig-collaboration-meeting-nist-january-10-12-2018>

The theme of the meeting, as recommended at the conclusion of the 7th meeting in Gothenburg mid-2017, was roadmaps, considered broadly. This was seen as one of a number of related activities considering the state of RDA as the organization approaches Plenary 11 and looks back over five years of intense activity and enormous growth. The beginning of RDA is clearly over and the primary aim of this meeting was to consider the relevance of a roadmap process to the maturation of RDA and relate WG/IG activities to such a process.

We began the substantive part of the meeting with overviews of roadmaps in other organizations, including activities at NIST, IVOA, and EarthCube. Subsequent discussion addressed ways to connect existing and future RDA activities to a structured set of topics. This was further pursued by one of the breakout groups at the end of the meeting.

The remainder of our first half-day was spent looking at the current state of RDA as summarized in multiple ways including a text analysis of WG/IG descriptions, an analysis of WG/IG timelines and connections, and a topic analysis of RDA activities. These all represented substantial effort by an organizing committee including Gary Berg-Cross, Stefan Kramer, and Siri-Jodha Khalsa. This session also included a report from the RDA Mapping the Landscape WG, which is attempting the same sort of analysis across organizations like RDA. The discussion that followed looked at efficient ways to maintain this sort of information over time, with the understanding that it is difficult to connect groups and plan ahead without knowing the current state of RDA activities.

Day two started with looking at the business of RDA, with perspectives from TAB (Francoise Genova), the current but soon to depart SecGen (Ingrid Dillo), and the newly minted Exec of RDA/US (Leslie McIntosh). This was followed by high level overviews of two projects that will address multiple RDA outcomes and, from an RDA perspective, can be thought of as large adoption projects. The two projects described were the AGU Arnold Foundation Enabling FAIR Data project and the C2CAMP project. Details can be found in the detailed notes.

We then moved to WG/IG updates. Each presenter was urged, to the degree possible, to relate the group activities to the preceding discussion. Updates, which extended over into Day 3, included the following groups:

Data Type Registries WG

PID IG

Chemistry Data IG

Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems Data IG

The set of Active Data Management Plans IG/WGs

Data Discover IG

Health Data IG

Archives and Records Professionals IG

Data Foundations and Terminology IG

Repository Platforms for Research Data IG

From Observational Data to Information IG

Data Rescue IG

Mapping the Landscape IG

Links to the presentations are available on the meeting web page.

Drawing on the discussions over the past two days, the meeting broke into three groups, each taking a different approach to roadmapping, again considered very broadly.

**Group 1**

**Purpose:**Consider group categorization as a method/process to address the following issues:

* Help RDA members and non-members to understand the activities within RDA and more efficiently contribute their expertise
* Identify connections across groups to support interoperable outcomes
* Help RDA (organization) identify gaps and overlaps among groups
* Help to communicate the objectives of RDA to outsiders/funders

**Attendees:** Rebecca Koskela, Steve Diggs, Kevin Ashley, Mark Parsons, Siri Jodha Singh Khalsa, Rainer Stotzka, Sarah Ramdeen, Lynn Yarmey

**Activity:** Draft a list of categories in which to classify RDA Interest and Working Groups (IG and WG) and determine how closely each group is aligned with the category (Y - yes, it is aligned; S - somewhat aligned; N - no, it is not a focus of the group). The initial category list based on stakeholder use cases includes:

* Discovery of data
* Linking data and scholarly literature
* Data for decision making
* Interoperability between research infrastructures
* Data preservation
* Workforce development for data professionals and researchers
* Reusability

**Outcome:** The group prototyped the categorization approach by determining if each IG and WG touches on the ‘discovery of data’ area. Within the breakout session, they determined that 29 groups include data discovery components, 10 groups have a non-primary focus on data discoverability, and 44 groups do not focus on this topic. The full list can be found here: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DlSiaIIWmfJhmjtpe8wmmF-3CKV1GkomVUwG2pj1f0U/edit#gid=1461107855>

The prototyping exercise proved this approach is feasible in a low-resource organization and could offer multiple functions based on strategic categories and level of granularity. The approach is lightweight enough for straightforward application, though the topics chosen as categories and the maintenance of categorization would need to be carefully considered before a broader implementation.

**Group 2**

**Purpose:**Identify key RDA IG and WG activities, dependencies, and milestones that can be abstracted into a higher-level roadmap.

**Attendees:** Bob Hanisch, Jay Pearlman, Dave Martinsen, Paul Uhlir

**Activity:** Using the same questions asked to different groups (e.g., purpose, alignment with RDA mission), they assessed the theme of ‘data discoverability’ within each group looking for potential for cooperation, collaboration, and dependencies. The group selected IG and WG based on the familiarity of the attendees with these groups, and had responded to the following seven questions for each group:

1. Brief recap of purpose of WG/IG and planned outcomes/aims?
2. What has been accomplished to date?
3. What issues, challenges, problems, have been encountered (technical and/or operational)?
4. Are these issues sufficient to require modification of the outcome, schedules, scope?
5. What is the plan for completion/progress for the coming 6-12 months?
6. Is your work related to/coordinated with other WG/IGs?
7. How does your work fit into the RDA mission?

**Outcome:** Looking across three groups (Materials WG, Chemistry IG, Brokering Framework WG), there are multiple common threads that could inform RDA outputs and future needs for data sharing and discoverability. For example:

1. Metadata schema development and mediation across disciplines are critical for meeting high level RDA goals.
2. Outputs from one WG can be repurposed for other WGs and disciplines, but awareness is not obvious from RDA web alone.  WGs and IGs should be adopters for other groups’ outputs. For example, Chemistry IG could spin up WG that would modify Materials discovery schema and work with NIST for deployment.
3. Exposes milestones necessary for intergroup collaboration.  Exposes schedules where there are dependencies.
4. Registry is fundamental capability for discovery, that needs to be repurposed for different disciplines.

**Next Steps:**

In coordination with an RDA group interested in adoption, a survey of RDA chairs and co-chairs will be conducted to continue this work across more IG and WG. The outcomes and next steps will be presented at the P11 in Berlin, March 2018.

**Group 3**

**Purpose:** Understand the operational metrics needed to characterize RDA Work.

**Attendees**: Larry Lannom, Francoise Genova, Robert Downs, Ingrid Dillo, Francoise Pearlman, Gary Berg-Cross, Leslie McIntosh

**Activity**: The group used the ‘expert panel’ approach to brainstorm the metrics needed for better characterization of RDA work.

[**Outcome**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Q69ftI0bvfFlQIgaDuRCjgku4byjglUT8FSNKM-q4oc/edit#bookmark=id.35841ztz55qi): RDA could be characterized by its Groups, Formal Outputs, Meetings, and People. Each of these have more granular metrics and can be quantified by time (e.g., start, duration). Tracking this would impose more load on the Secretariat, and is a challenge from that POV, but the resulting information would be quite valuable and, given the right group and meeting registration and maintenance systems, could be highly automated.

**Follow-On Activities**

The outcomes of these groups will be discussed at the P11 TAB/Chairs meeting and, given agreement there, work will continue at the next WG/IG Collaboration meeting, to be held in Vienna, 13-15 June, 2018.