1. Data should be considered citable products of research.

I. Status of Data: Data citations should be accorded the same importance in the scholarly record as the citation of other objects.

1 and C-I are similar as to intent, but C-I goes a bit further, and emphasizes the need to elevate the status of data citations to that already accorded citations to other types of objects that comprise the scholarly record.
2. Such data should be held in persistent public repositories.

III. Persistence: Citations should be as durable as the cited objects.

F-2 and C-III both mention persistence, but differ in that F-2 specifies the mechanism of “public” repositories (which is partly about access), while C-III is agnostic about the nature of the repository and mode of access (open or not). There is a legitimate debate to be had over the value of open access, but citation practices need to be applicable to data stored in repositories that are either open or subscription, public or privately owned (and even to data not stored in a repository.)
I. Status of Data: Data citations should be accorded the same importance in the scholarly record as the citation of other objects.

II. Attribution: Citations should facilitate giving scholarly credit and legal attribution to all parties responsible for those data.

V. Discovery: Citations should support the discovery of data and their documentation.

VI. Provenance: Citations should facilitate the establishment of provenance of data.

3. If a publication is based on data not included with the article, those data should be cited in the publication.

We can infer that the reasons for using the mechanism specified in F-3 are those referred to in C-I, C-II, C-V, and perhaps C-VI.
4. A data citation in a publication should resemble a bibliographic citation and be located in the publication’s reference list.

I. Status of Data: Data citations should be accorded the same importance in the scholarly record as the citation of other objects.

F-4 is about the means rather than the purpose. We can infer that this is a means to enforce the purpose mentioned in C-I. The degree to which a data citation should resemble a bibliographic citation is debatable. It might be better to specify the purposes and functions that the citation should fulfill or facilitate, and leave the details of implementation to the communities who will need to implement them.
5. Such a data citation should include a unique persistent identifier (a DataCite DOI recommended, or other persistent identifiers already in use within the community).

III. Persistence: Citations should be as durable as the cited objects.

IX. Metadata Standards: Citations should employ widely accepted metadata standards.

F-5 goes beyond C-IX in recommending a DOI as the specific type of persistent identifier, which is a means rather than a purpose. The purpose of using registries of persistent identifiers such DOIs, ARKs, or other handles is to provide persistence of findability if the location of a digital object changes. (Purpose stated in C-III.) Many communities of practice have already developed systems of persistent identifiers, some of which pre-date the existence of DOIs. Some people argue that proper use of URIs (and the redirect mechanism that is already a part of HTTP) could accomplish persistence without the intermediate step of a PID registry. While use of widely-accepted metadata standards (See C-IX) helps to ensure interoperability, it seems presumptuous to specify DOIs over other PID systems already in use.
6. The identifier should resolve to a page that either provides direct access to the data or information concerning its accessibility. Ideally, that landing page should be machine-actionable to promote interoperability of the data.

IV. Access: Citations should facilitate access both to the data themselves and to such associated metadata and documentation as are necessary for both humans and machines to make informed use of the referenced data.

F-6 specifies a both a purpose (actionability by both humans and machines) and a particular means (a landing page). C-IV specifies only the purpose. The best means for accomplishing this purpose may evolve over time.
7. If the data are available in different versions, the identifier should provide a method to access the previous or related versions.

VI. Provenance: Citations should facilitate the establishment of provenance of data.

VII. Granularity: Citations should support the finest grained description necessary to identify the data.

VIII. Verifiability: Citations should contain information sufficient to identify the data unambiguously.

F-7 refers generally to the need to identify the specific version of the data being referenced. C-VI, C-VII, and C-VIII refer to distinct aspects of version: Provenance, Granularity, and Verifiability. The distinction among these aspects is useful.
8. Data citation should facilitate attribution of credit to all contributors

II. Attribution: Citations should facilitate giving scholarly credit and legal attribution to all parties responsible for those data.

F-8 and C-II both address the function of attribution. C-II draws the subtle distinction between legal attribution and scholarly norm of giving credit to others for work they have performed. These are similar concepts, but there are some important differences between them, and what is necessary to accomplish them.
X. Flexibility: Citation methods should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the variant practices among communities, but should not differ so much that they compromise interoperability of data across communities.

Principle X refers to two important values in the development of citation practices: ability to accommodate differences across communities; and the preservation of interoperability. The Force11 Manifesto does not mention these explicitly.