This document is to be used to collect ESIP Data Stewardship Committee member comments and suggestions for the Belmont Forum's Actionable Outcomes document. See Actionable Outcomes. Nancy Hoebelheinrich & Shelley Stall have offered to coordinate and submit committee responses to the document.

-- Matt Mayernik notes that there is a noted lack of discussion of the roles of data professionals. I see this gap in two senses. First, for any of this educational/training noted particularly on the first page, who will be doing the training? In most cases that I am aware of, it is either data-focused library staff at universities, or data professionals like those who participate in the ESIP DS Committee. Second, researchers should be encouraged and enabled to connect with data professionals to do data management tasks. There is an obvious scaling problem here, as there are more researchers than data professionals. But nonetheless if the goal is to have data archived with robust metadata and in quality repositories, data professionals are key to achieving that outcome.

In short, it seems to me that this report should at least acknowledge that a) somebody will need to be doing the training, and b) working with data professionals leads to better data archiving outcomes.

-- Nancy Hoebelheinrich notes that there seems to be an obvious place to make reference to the ESIP DMT Clearinghouse in the first paragraph of the Observations section of the document since there is discussion about the existence of many courses that are available for researchers (and data professionals per Matt's comments above).

In addition, there is discussion within that same section observing that courses which "are considered valuable by the data community are more important than certifications". This statement argues strongly for the findings that we have already gathered from users of the DMT Clearinghouse that some kind of annotation or ranking of the resources in the Clearinghouse would be very well received, and thus, high on a list of enhancements. While my observation may not be appropriate to add to the comments as such, I would think that our affirmation of the comment in the Actionable Outcomes would be appropriate by relaying our findings that people would find recommendations or annotations valuable for given educational resources.

-- Sophie Hou notes that in addition to what Matt and Nancy pointed out, one of the "Premise statements/Assumptions" stated in the "Actionable Outcomes" document is to "train to/adhere to FAIR Data Principles." However, current studies have shown that FAIR Data Principles could be difficult to interpret and implement (e.g. please see: http://libereurope.eu/blog/2017/02/23/liber-webinar-fair-data-principles-fair/). As a result, it would be helpful for Belmont Forum to clarify how its e-Infrastructures and Data Management program would interpret the FAIR Data Principles and implement the data management training/education accordingly.

Additionally, the document currently has not discussed who would be the target audience for such a training/education program. Similar to what Matt pointed out in terms of roles and responsibilities, depending on who the program is intended to certify, this could influence how the program (including training/education delivery mode, content, and certification process) could be built in order for the program to be effective for its intended community.

-- Shelley Stall notes that to adequately train and adopt good practices that support “reuse” (the “R” in FAIR) there needs to be some inclusion of the research steps taken to integrate/transform/aggregate the datasets being used to support the research. This includes documentation of the software, algorithms, models, or other code necessary to create the results that support the research outcomes.