1. *Adopt the W3C process for promoting Working Drafts to Recommendations.*

While RDA has a process for promoting outputs to the status of recommendations that is documented on the RDA website (<http://bit.ly/2svpb43> (Working Group Outputs) and <http://bit.ly/2h5yKNX> (Reporting on Outcomes and Adoption Activities), it is not well known within or outside the immediate RDA community and thus does not have the provenance of a process such as the W3C process (working draft, proposed recommendation, recommendation). W3C Recommendations have visibility and credibility equivalent to ISO standards. For RDA to be taken seriously by potential adopters, we need to have a similar imprimatur to our recommendations. Since the W3C process is already well-known and highly regarded, RDA should simply adopt it and use it.

1. *Work to annual roadmap developed with TAB and WG chairs, showing milestones and deliverables, and presented to OA for endorsement; each year’s roadmap would begin with assessment of past year’s progress.*

RDA should prepare an annually updated roadmap that highlights the research capabilities that its Working Group outputs will enable. It might be framed related to several research challenges, updated every year or two, and would show how WG activities support those challenges. The annual roadmap contents would result from the existing group plans and discussions among the WG chairs and the TAB using a common structure and format leading to OA endorsement. By putting RDA’s technical developments into a specific research context it is likely that national RDA projects will be able to make stronger cases for funding for development, thereby helping to resolve the problem that currently almost all development work in RDA is done on a volunteer basis. Funded development work would also help to support item 1 above, assuring, for example, that proposed Recommendations and associated protocols have at least two interoperable implementations. By using existing plans but integrating to one common form there is little additional work for groups. Not all Working Groups need to be involved in a particular year’s roadmap.

1. *WGs and IGs work without specific time limits, except that groups inactive after three plenaries become dormant.*

In the past it has not been uncommon for WG and IG case statements to take more than one year to be approved, and for WGs with a nominal 12-18 month time to live, this has led to challenges in maintaining the inertia of a new WG. Recently the TAB has accelerated the review and approval process, and WGs can be extended if their activities naturally require more than 18 months or must be revised. Still, the 12-18 month time-to-product expectation for WGs can be an obstacle, particularly for projects that are too complex to be completed on such a time scale. WG case statements should instead propose a nominal work plan, schedule with milestones and – as appropriate – deliverables. Specific time expectations should be applied only as nominal guidelines.

Dormant groups with co-chairs ‘camping on the territory’ can be resuscitated by a proposal involving at least two new co-chairs to resuscitate the group. The previous co-chairs can, of course, be group members.

1. *Simple criteria for new IGs: within RDA scope and not redundant with existing activities.*

The criteria for creating new IGs should be simplified, allowing diversity and creativity as long as the topics are within scope for RDA and do not overlap with existing IGs. Where a new IG is proposed that intersects strongly with an existing one, the proposers will be encouraged to contact the existing IG co-chairs to see if the activities can be merged.

In addition, the rules about “at least two but no more than four co-chairs” should be relaxed to a suggestion rather than a requirement. There can be cases where more co-chairs would be desired in order to increase expertise and diversity, and to assure that credit accrues to the organizers, especially more junior RDA members.

1. *The Secretary General position should be more than administrative leadership.*

The position of Secretary General is a very prominent one, and the reputation and skills of the SG reflect strongly on the RDA as a whole. Ideally the SG will be a person of well-established technical and programmatic leadership, someone who can set the intellectual tone and communicate the vision of the RDA widely.

1. *Future TAB members should have home organization’s commitment of ~10-20% of time.*

Although several of the above suggestions would reduce the workload of TAB members, such as simplifying the criteria for IG creation, others such as the annual roadmap will increase it but concentrate the effort on RDA group outputs and RDA visibility. Candidates for TAB should affirm, e.g., through a statement from their home organization, that they will be able to devote the time necessary to carry out their responsibilities as TAB members. TAB co-chairs would obviously be at the higher end of the time commitment.

1. *All RDA bodies post public minutes of activities.*

In order to be successful both for its immediate participants, but also as a more general driver for change in the research community, RDA must be transparent as to its functions, processes, governance, and decision-making. All RDA bodies – WGs, IGs, TAB, Council, OAB, and any subcommittees of the above – should routinely write minutes of their meetings and share those publicly through the RDA website and WG/IG mailing lists. Sensitive issues such as personnel decisions are, of course, to be handled with discretion and need not be publicly documented, though they should perhaps still be recorded in a confidential subset of meeting minutes as is normal for boards of directors, personnel promotion committees, and such.