

Consultation - REFEDS Strategy

 This consultation is now closed.

Background

For a number of years, REFEDS has operated solely from an annual workplan, with items being added annually in consultation with the community. Whilst this has allowed REFEDS to be somewhat agile in delivering and highly consultative with its community, it has not addressed issues such as the core purpose of REFEDS and its high-level direction.


To this end, the REFEDS Steering Committee has prepared a draft Strategic Plan for REFEDS and the community is invited to comment on this proposed document.

Overview

This consultation was open from **Monday 27th September 2021 at 17:00 CEST to Monday 25th October at 17:00 CEST**

Participants are invited to:

- consider the proposed Strategic Plan
- propose appropriate changes / challenges to the proposed text, and
- reflect on whether the plan is representative of the strategic position of REFEDS.

 The document for the consultation is available as a [pdf attachment](#). All comments should be made on: consultations@lists.refeds.org or added to the changelog below. Comments posted to other lists will not be included in the consultation review.

Change Log

comment #	Line /Reference #	Proposed Change or Query	Proposer / Affiliation	Action / Decision (please leave blank)
1	28-33	Propose changing Critical Success Factor #1 so it reads more about "engagement" through the meetings, discussion lists, and Slack Channels. "Attendance" feels like just counting people in seats at meetings (unless this factor is defined in a parent document).	Mark Rank - Cirrus Identity	Text revised.
2	28-44	Propose the Critical Success Factor (CSF) "Sustainable Standards Development Process and Adoption" be the #1 CSF. While the others are important, standards development and adoption feels like the most critical (unless this order is defined in a parent document).	Mark Rank - Cirrus Identity	Order changed.
3	12	Request clarification of the term "Research Infrastructures". It is not clear if projects like LIGO or CILogon are "Research Infrastructures" and thereby in the primary audience or are SPs and therefore in the secondary audience.	Scott Koranda - CILogon	The differentiation between primary and secondary has been removed.
4	38	Sudden appearance of the term "academic federation". If this is the same as "R&E ... federation" in line 6 then it should use the same term. If it's different, then the difference needs to be explained	Andrew Cormack - Jisc	Language updated to use the same term.
5	n/a	Things missing - promotion or advocacy of federations	Alan Buxey	
6	7	Lose the word "common"	Jon Agland	I disagree with this; best practice might be out of reach for so many. We're talking about the best that everyone should be able to do.
7	n/a	I'd love to have stronger reference to goals of free inquiry and collaboration in creating and disseminating knowledge.	David St Pierre Bantz	Added "Individuals build relationships and develop common ways of working through solving problems and free inquiry into possibilities."
8		Is it intentional that there is no mention of tools?	Eric Goodman	Yes
9	Values	curiosity, inclusivity, guidance, openness, depth of expertise, transparent (rather than open). Enthusiasm is good, but maybe not mission related. Participation, collaboration, pragmatism	several	Thank you for all the options; some of these are not values as much as they are characteristic of the community.

10	Values	Missing something to do how we choose what to focus on.	Tom Barton	
11	Values	We decide what's going to get done via community consensus and enthusiasm	Alan Buxey	
12	Audience	Don't have primary and secondary audiences	Nicole Roy	Removed.
13	Audience	I'd prefer to have developers instead of software maintainers	David Vagheti	Language updated
14	Goals	To be a forum for trust anchors instead of trust anchor in itself. Audience saw eduGAIN as a trust anchor, not REFEDS	several	Modified.
15	Line 19	Maybe replace efficient with effective in the first bullet?	Ann West	Language updated.
16	Line 16	Change proposal: A critically important forum for maintaining trust among stakeholders.	Tom Barton	
17	Line 23	missing: standards get adopted and widely used	David St Pierre Bantz	This isn't something we can measure.
18	Line 28	missing here: attendees' demographics reflects stakeholders and beneficiaries of REFEDS	David St Pierre Bantz	
19	Goals	Should there be something about expansion of the set of stakeholders? Maybe growing slowly, but not stagnant. New communities, new blood.	Tom Barton	We don't have a marketing /advocacy capacity to include the expansion of our efforts beyond community word-of-mouth.
20	Line 38	Is it really "academic" ? Possibly not directly analogous to R&E	Nicole Roy	
21	Line 37	Wonder if we should note that the process is reviewed/iteratively improved (eg fit for purpose in a changing world)	Alan Buxey	
22	Line 41	Bit unclear whether "training partners" is a noun, or whether we are training "partners"	Hannah Short	The language would be different. It would be "by training partners" if the latter, whereas "through training partners" is the former.
23	general	CSF3 refers to both members and participants. Are they in the Audience statement from earlier? Maybe the CSF and the Audience slides need to be more in alignment.	Andrew Morgan	Language revised
24	general	Add CSF about advocacy.	Tom Barton	
25	general	No Vision?	Alan Buxey	No, we didn't create one.