**Data summary:**

* Are we following any standards/conventions for data type classification? (socio-demographic vs environmental in project proposal) Should we ask for this to every partner in order to have this info for later harmonization?
* Should be send exhaustive surveys about data description to each data owner eg. one survey per data type (omics, imaging, clinical parameters) including data nature, storage location, accessibility conditions, security levels, or will they provide this info through Mica?

**Data interoperability**

* Is a WG in charge of interoperability? or..
* Should we ask data owners for info such as metadata and data documentation, standards for variable naming conventions? (info such as in Table 1 and 2 for later harmonization purposes).
* Should we ask each data owner their considerations for a minimal required metadata for each data type? \*(to generate a minimal required metadata for comparison between cohorts, and eventually multi-cohort analysis)

**Data flow**

* Do we have an “as-for-today” ideal general data flow for data deposited in centralized repositories?
* Do we have an ideal of what the data owner- data controllers’ relation should be? (owners sharing metadata through Mica, duplicated raw data, updatable links to owner repositories?)
* Should we include in DMP, and can we ask data owners with their own platform of their procedures for new data submission, grant access, accessibility from euCanSHare’s platform, etc (info such as in Table 1 and 2)

**Security levels**

* Should this be decided by each cohort owner, specific to dataset or a consensus be reached? What will be readily visible on the platform from each study (variables names, number of data available per variable, aggregate statistics?) should be decides and asked to data owners individually or will they provide this info through Mica?