

## Topic: Data access conditions

### Summary/considerations

The discussion in this group centred around the questions who has access and/or ownership over the data after the researcher left the institution. There should be a procedure in place to still gain access to the data, but what does this workflow look like? If a data support professional responsible for handling requests, how do we make sure that they can make a sensible decision?

### Fold: developing the question

1. Wie heeft alleen toegang tot het sleutel bestand
2. Alleen de hoofdonderzoeker heeft toegang tot sleutel bestand dus kan beter helemaal niet gepubliceerd worden.
3. Alleen de hoofdonderzoeker heeft toegang tot sleutel bestand dus kan beter helemaal niet gepubliceerd worden.
4. Wie beslist welke data gedeeld worden?
5. Wie heeft toegang / eigenaarschap nadat onderzoeker uit dienst is

### Stretch: Wie heeft toegang/eigenaarschap nadat een onderzoeker uit dienst is?

Exaggeration	Wie gaat zich ontfemen over de tonnen zielige weesdata
Inversion	Wanneer de onderzoeker uit dienst treedt, worden de data vernietigd
Extension	Wie is de eigenaar van data met persoonsgegevens tijdens en na dienstverband
Extension	Wie is de eigenaar van data zonder persoonsgegevens tijdens en na dienstverband
Extension	Hoe krijg je toegang tot data waarvan de "eigenaar" er niet meer is
Addition	Welke procedure/flowchart wordt gehanteerd bij afwezigheid van 1 <sup>e</sup> verantwoordelijke
Subtraction	Wie heeft toegang/eigenaarschap tot data (ook tijdens onderzoek)

## Topic: Data re-appraisal

### Summary/considerations

The group started by exploring what form could take guidelines for re-appraisal of datasets. The discussion then broadened towards the selection criteria to preserve data (environmental footprint, cost, quality of the datasets, integrity) and the role(s) bearing the responsibility for making the re-appraisal decision.

### Fold: developing the question

1. What are some guidelines to help determine whether data should be deleted or preserved?
2. Whether data is preserved depends on requirements, and afterwards old DANS guides provide advice
3. Whether data is preserved depends on requirements that can be uniformized and DANS provide advice as mediator.

### Stretch: What are guidelines to help determine whether data should be deleted or preserved?

Addition	What are environmental aspects to consider (footprints)
Addition	Who should determine whether data should be preserved?
Inversion	Should data be preserved?
Inversion	Are guidelines needed to determine whether data should be deleted or preserved?
Exaggeration	Should all data be preserved indefinitely (kostenbesparing, kwaliteit van dataset, digitale footprint gaat omlaag, integer data/bewijs)
Additional question	What are the guidelines used for reappraisal and who reappraises the data?

## Topic: Data deletion after retention period

### Summary/considerations

This group focused on the agents ('who') involved in data deletion, with a focus on the decision making (as opposed to the person actually deleting the data). The main question was who should have the final say if data should be kept, reduced or deleted? This involves a discussion on the quality aspects, or value, of the data, which may be different per domain or discipline. Also in determining what these quality aspects are, it is important to consider who is the person in charge of doing that.

### Fold: developing the question

1. Lack of clarity
2. Who decides when to delete data?
3. Who decides what quality is required to keep the data
4. Who decides what quality and purpose is required to keep the data?
5. Who has the final say on the question if data should be kept or deleted?

### Stretch: Who should have the final say if data should be kept, reduced, or deleted?

Exaggeration	Who should have the final say if <u>all</u> data should be kept <u>forever</u>
Inversion	Who should definitely <u>not</u> have the say about keeping the data
Subtraction	Should data be kept after the retention period?
Extension	What quality aspects should be present so that the data can be kept after retention period?
Addition	Who decides what the quality aspects are?
Addition	Should there be different quality aspects for different research fields?

## Topic: Richness of metadata

### Summary/considerations

In their discussion on the richness of metadata, this group focused on the use of controlled vocabularies. They feel that recommending controlled vocabularies, whether on national, international, or institutional level, contributes to the richness of the metadata, and thus enhances the usefulness and clarity. The question remains whether *requiring* the use of controlled vocabularies is necessary to enforce their use, and thus make the adoption more normative.

### Fold: developing the question

1. Controlled vocabulary versus “open” readme files? Or both combined?
2. Controlled vocabulary on subjects but also for example on characteristics of the data, standardization and completeness combined with readme file makes rich metadata
3. Recommending controlled vocabularies on an institutional or national level and providing templates for README files and other information adds to richness and usefulness of metadata
4. Recommending controlled vocabularies on institutional and on national level and providing templates for Readme files and other information adds to richness, usefulness, and clarity of the metadata
5. Semantic and organizational interoperability leads to richer metadata and higher reuse possibilities

### Stretch: Recommending controlled vocabularies on national, international level and providing templates for Readme file and other information adds to richness, usefulness and clarity of metadata!

Exaggeration	<b><i>Requiring</i></b> controlled vocabularies on national, international level and <b><i>forcing</i></b> templates for Readme file and other information adds to richness, usefulness and clarity of metadata!
Addition	Recommending <b><i>multiple</i></b> controlled vocabularies on national, international level and providing templates for Readme file and other information adds to <b><i>easier/ quicker adoption</i></b> , richness, usefulness and clarity of metadata! <b><i>This results in the restriction of freedom of expression of the individual researcher.</i></b>
Subtraction	Recommending controlled vocabularies on <del>national, international</del> <b><i>institutional</i></b> level and providing templates for Readme file and other information adds to richness, usefulness and clarity of metadata!
Inversion	Would requiring multiple controlled vocabularies and templates for readme files result in <del>better adoption</del> , richness, usefulness and clarity of metadata or would it restrict the richness of the metadata?

## Topic: Data selection

### Summary/considerations

The group envisioned data selection as hard choices to be made by data contributors as responsibility bearers. They focused on how to assist them in this process (support roles, guidelines, policies) which triggered a reflection on how to define what meaningful data is / should be and how it links to the needs of reusers.

### Fold: developing the question

1. The process full of hard choices
2. How to assist data contributors in making the hard choices?
3. How to define what meaningful data is in order to help data contributors in making the hard choices?
4. How to define meaningful data so that data contributors know which data to store and share?
5. What is necessary to know in order to reuse the data?

### Stretch: How to assist data contributors in making the hard choices?

Inversion	Who decides what hard choices are (context)?
Subtraction	How to make (as a data steward) the hard choices (via guide)?
Exaggeration	How to assist data contributors making the hard choices in life?
Extension	what is the necessary to know in order to reuse data?
Addition	How to assist data contributors and stewards in making hard choices?
Subtraction	How to reduce the number of hard choices? (policy, management)
Extension	How to assist data contributors in defining what is meaningful data in their research?
Exaggeration	Why not share everything and let reusers decide what is meaningful?
<i>Unreadable transformation</i>	How to assist data contributors in deciding which data to exclude?