

# DMP Feedback

## Group 1

### Overall appreciation


Group 1 showed some difficulties with the exercise. Although they complied with most of the minimum information required, it often lacked further detail. It is important to state that no content was presented for step 5.

### Notable points

In step 1, the group correctly identified the main contact of the DMP. However, more information could have been provided regarding the roles of the identified DMP staff.

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. However, it only identified a single cost, which is an indication that the group missed out on the opportunity to further discuss the project.

In step 4, the group did not understand what was being required in the Dataset section. It meant for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or multiple datasets. Groups would then provide information for the mandatory fields for each of the identified datasets. Group 1 managed to identify multiple datasets, but then agglomerated the required information instead of describing each dataset individually.



## Group 2

### Overall appreciation

Group 2 created a canvas that complied with all of the minimum information required. In particular it must be stated that their cost information went well beyond what was required.


### Notable points

In step 1, the group correctly identified the main contact of the DMP. In regard to the DMP staff, the group listed 5 staff members, that cover various responsibilities within the project.

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. By identifying 5 different costs, the group showed that it understood that the Cost section was meant to promote discussion between the group members.

In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 2 managed to correctly identify and describing multiple datasets, however it failed to develop them further in the remainder sections of the step.

Finally in step 5, as most groups, group 2 identified the methods of distribution, licensing and hosting. However, it failed to associate this characterization to any individual dataset. It can, nonetheless, be interpreted as a generic policy.



## Group 3

### Overall appreciation

Group 3 took to exercise with ease. They could have provided further detail on the information displayed on the canvas, in particular during step 5. However overall their canvas stands out as one of the best examples of what was being required in this exercise.


### Notable points

In step 1, the group correctly identified the main contact of the DMP. In regard to the DMP staff, the group listed 6 staff members, however only 3 of those 6 represent distinct roles.

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. The fact that the group identified 3 distinct costs, shows that its members understood that the point of this step was to promote discussion.

In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 3 managed to correctly identify and describing multiple datasets. The group failed to individualize Security and Privacy information for each of the identified datasets, just providing a generic description that would apply to all. By describing 3 metadata items, the group also displayed that it discussed the issue thoroughly.

Finally in step 5, as most groups, group 3 identified the methods of distribution, licensing and hosting. However, it failed to associate this characterization to any individual dataset. It can, nonetheless, be interpreted as a generic policy.



## Group 4

### Overall appreciation

Group 4 had an original take on the exercise. They opted to display all the information using the json data format. The information that was displayed complied mostly with what was required. In particular, their decision to focus solely on a single dataset, in step 4, falls in line with what was envisioned by the organizers.

### Notable points


In step 1, the group correctly identified the main contact of the DMP. In regard to the DMP staff, staff members were grouped into 3 categories, with 2 staff members per category. However, the data listed does not respect the minimum information required, according to the guide.

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. However, it only identified a single cost, which is an indication that the group missed out on the opportunity to further discuss the project.

In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 4 was

one of the groups that managed to correctly identify and describing multiple datasets. The group opted to provide a generic Security and Privacy description that would apply to all datasets. The group also provided a generic metadata description.

Finally in step 5, as most groups, group 4 identified the methods of distribution, licensing and hosting. However, it failed to associate this characterization to any individual dataset. It can, nonetheless, be interpreted as a generic policy.



## Group 5

### Overall appreciation

Group 5 showed some difficulties with the overall objective of steps 4 and 5. In particular they struggled with the License section. Nonetheless their canvas displays the information that was required, and accomplishes the objective of the exercise.

### Notable points


In step 1, the group managed to identify the main contact of the DMP. Some confusion might have played a part in identifying the DMP Staff, for they described not individual staff members, but entities (e.g. the ethics committee, instead of a particular individual).

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. The fact that the group identified 3 distinct costs, shows that its members understood that the point of this step was to promote discussion.



In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 5 was one of the groups that focused on a single dataset. Unfortunately this decision provides no information as to whether the remainder datasets were also identified and discussed.

Finally in step 5, as most groups, group 5 only provided a generic policy, that was not targeted at any dataset in particular.



## Group 6

### Overall appreciation

Group 6 presented one of the most visually appealing canvas. And although it complies with all the mandatory fields required in the exercise, it could benefit from further detail.

### Notable points

In step 1, the group complied by identifying the main contact of the DMP. The group proceeded to list 5 DMP staff members, taking the care to differentiate staff members with the same role name, by listing their responsibilities.

In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. However, it only identified a single cost, which is an indication that the group missed out on the opportunity to further discuss the project.

In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 6 was one of the groups that focused on a single dataset. Unfortunately this decision provides no information as to whether the remainder datasets were also identified and discussed.

Finally in step 5, as most groups, group 6 identified the methods of distribution, licensing and hosting. However, they presented them solely as a generic policy, that is not tailored to any particular dataset.



## Group 7

### Overall appreciation

The canvas of group 7 is a testimony to the difficulties that most groups experienced in steps 4 and 5. Group 7 struggled particularly with the License and Host sections. However it's relevant to point out their creative solution to the Dataset section.

### Notable points

In step 1, the group managed to identify the main contact of the DMP. However, they missed the point of identifying and listing the DMP staff. While the group successfully presented a list of possible roles, and respective responsibilities. They failed to materialize that knowledge into DMP staff members, as was the purpose of the exercise.



In step 3, the group provided the mandatory information regarding the DMP section. The fact that the group identified 4 distinct costs, shows that its members understood that the point of this step was to promote discussion.

In step 4, it was intended for groups to focus on identifying and describing one or more datasets, that would then be further developed in all the sections of the step. Group 7 used the provided cheat sheet to identify the datasets, but did not provide the information regarding any particular dataset, thus missing the point of this step.

In step 5, the group provided very limited information. Particularly in both the licensing and host sections. As most groups struggled with this step, the group's performance can be attributed to unclear instructions in the guide, or lack of support.

