

RFC-023 Response 1

1. *Please provide your name, organization and contact information, including email address. (This information will not be shared.)*

2. *Are you answering for your entire organization, for a smaller group, or individually?* _____ a) Entire organization b) Smaller group (please specify) Responsible for data management for IPY in the Netherlands; member of Data Management Group at NIOZ _____ c) Individual response

3. *Are you a data producer, data consumer, or both?* _____ a) Producer _____ b) Consumer _____ c) Both

Neither: I work with scientists at various universities and scientific institutions (in their role as data producer) to archive, describe and publish their data.

4. *Please describe how the DIF is used in your organization.*

In co-operation with scientists I create DIFs to describe datasets. This because IPYDIS has requested that descriptions of IPY datasets be added to the GCMD and to make the datasets findable.

5. *Does this technical note contain internal inconsistencies? If so, please provide details.*

I read this document: http://www.esdswg.org/spg/rfc/esds-rfc-023/GCMD_DIF_ESDS-RFC-023v0.2.pdf

On page 2, under "DIF Changes" there is a mention of an Appendix B – Release Notes 9.8.2. In the document there was only an Appendix A (I did find the release notes on the server).

6. *Is any part of the technical note ambiguous or poorly explained? If so, please provide details.*

No. Perhaps it might be a bit more concise; description of the change not in a 'narrative style' but rather in some table stating for instance "field", "situation prior to change", "situation post change" (i.e. new fields: names, formats, required or not etc.), "notes" (e.g. transation/conversion of DIFs in old standard, etc.).

7. *How will your organization or group respond to the DIF changes documented in this technical note? In particular, do you plan to update existing DIFs to take advantage of the new*

sub-fields available for publications / references?

We had three DIFs in concept in the DocBuilder tool, those we have adapted to the new structure as much as possible. I don't expect we'll update many existing DIFs; not so much because of the change itself but rather because I don't expect scientists will want to invest the time.

8. Should the SPG endorse this RFC as a Technical Note – why or why not?

I'm not sure if I understand this question correctly. If this is about whether SPG should use this format to describe future changes – perhaps look at what information could be left out (e.g. screenshots of the GCMD).