**Data Diplomacy**

**Membership:** Chair, Patricia MUÑOZ Palma. Members: Paul BERKMAN, Mariel BOROWITZ\*, Rocio DUQUE\*, Mercury FOX\*, Raed SHARIF, Paul UHLIR, Joseph WAFULA, YARIME Masaru, ZHANG Lili.

**Scope:** The DPC is establishing several subgroups and activities to carry out its work, including a Data Diplomacy subgroup, which is the focus of this plan.

**Potential Topics:** The Data Diplomacy subgroup can be active in the area of public data for policymakers to more effectively use factually-based evidence and expert advice within a policy framework, perhaps in consultation or coordination with other organizations with similar goals. Such an activity can further define, explain, and encourage transparency from the expert community with regard to open data and data sharing. Examples of the use of data for policy or policy for data from an international or global perspective that have been initially identified by the subgroup members include the following topics:

1. **The influence of open data and data sharing on international agreements.** This relates to a retrospective examination of policy decision making, including for the benefit of governments (across all jurisdictions) from the top down and also for others in the public and private sectors from the bottom up for influencing governments and treaty organizations.  An introductory guide to one or more existing international agreements and how factual or research data already support them could be useful. What are the successes and failures?
2. **The potential use of open data by different stakeholders for policy decision making is another issue area.** For example, using open remote-sensing, Earth observation satellite and *in situ* data for developing, monitoring, verifying, and enforcing international agreements is a rich area of inquiry that has long been underutilized. Examples of treaty regimes in which data could play a greater role include, *inter alia*, environmental (common, non-sovereign areas such as the oceans, Antarctica, the atmosphere/climate, outer space, and sovereign common areas such as the Arctic or other regional land-use agreements), humanitarian (refugees, genocide, disaster response/mitigation), and socioeconomic statistical indicators (national reporting, rankings, UN SDGs). Perhaps treaties and their broader regimes could be analyzed for the applicability of new data sources, uses, and tools. Using data analytics techniques, GIS, and visualization tools can be especially effective. How do governmental and non-governmental groups in each regime take different approaches to the uses of available data and how could that be implemented in a standard, predictable way from a practical standpoint?
3. **Processes are important.** Good data management practices in support of diplomatic objectives need to be better understood and systematized. This includes standards for quality control and assurance, provenance/veracity/chain-of-custody, good organization/metadata, access and reuse, fitness for purpose, and the like. Best practices may include a description and discussion of statements of bias and proactive transparency concepts and responsibilities, which likely go a great deal further than typical conflict of interest statements. The processes should be accurate, verifiable, and engender trust and confidence in the outputs and outcomes for all stakeholders.
4. **Guidance for effectively communicating to the public the ways that data impact society is always necessary.** Data are a robust asset that is vitally important to national security, the economy, and personal freedom; the public should be afforded a better understanding of the fundamental role of data in society. Research and recommendations may include frameworks and terminology that improve the public’s understanding of those roles.

Additional or revised issues will be developed by the subgroup members in their conference call meetings and in discussions with other cooperating organizations, as appropriate.

**Process:** A series of approximately monthly calls by the Data Diplomacy subgroup of the DPC will be held to guide its work. The substantive and procedural aspects will be agreed in conjunction with other similarly-focused organizations. A determination of how each issue/problem will be followed up will be made by early 2019.

**Output and Outcome:** This is to be determined but is likely to include summaries of meetings and reports or statements endorsed by CODATA and other cooperating organizations, such as the International Network for Government Science Advice (INGSA—see: <https://www.ingsa.org/>), as appropriate. All subgroup members who contribute text and remain engaged in the process will be listed as authors in any written outputs.

The subgroup and any other cooperating organization can use this mechanism to propose joint projects, which may include sponsored work and assistance with grant proposals, to draft white papers, journal articles, and other scholarly literature; host or participate in lectures, workshops, and other academic events; propose joint project work; and develop possible consortium activities. Proposals should include a statement about how the activity can contribute to the mission goals of the Data Diplomacy subgroup and of CODATA, and how the involvement of CODATA and its Data Diplomacy subgroup might contribute to the mission of the funding body, among other requirements of the proposal process.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\*  The sub-group members listed with an asterisk are ad hoc members of the subgroup only and not full members of the CODATA Data Policy Committee (DPC).