Data Citation Implementation Pilot (DCIP) Executive Committee Meeting, October 21, 2015

Attendees: Tim Clark (chair), Stephanie Hagstrom, Joan Starr, Regrets: Jeffrey Grethe, Carol Goble, Simon Hodson, Maryann Martone, Jo McEntyre

1. Expectation and Help Provided
   - Draft a set of direct expectations for three teams: 1) Publishers, 2) Repositories, and 3) Experts
     o A fourth team exists to focus on facilitating communication
     o Researchers are the target of the project/pilot participants
     o We also need a representative from the Exec or a delegate from the larger group to work closely with and organize the above teams
       ▪ Representative will need to review expectations with each team and ensure that they are realistic
     o Citation management tools (e.g., Zotero, Mendeley)
       ▪ Tim has contacted someone from Zotero and will contact others
       ▪ We need to make it as easy as possible for researchers to cite data
         • These are software packages – since this is only a one year pilot, all we can do is make them aware of the issue (researchers not citing their data)
         • The response of citation managers is often that this would be a feature request and they need to see a demand for it from the user community
     o How is this pilot different from the data citation implementation group that Tim and Joan worked on last year?
       ▪ It is different because that group published a paper
       ▪ With this pilot, we want to have people implementing what was described in that paper - to have researchers cite their data to validate and bench test what the paper proposed
     o Joan suggested changing the pilot approach to focus on one or two publishers working with one or two repositories to assess what they need to move forward
       ▪ We drafted expectations as a means to assess readiness
       ▪ The reason we have three teams is to assess the readiness of publishers and repositories and to smooth the process with experts
         • They have to be prepared to use the modern JATS revision
           o Debbie Lapeyre, Jeff Beck, and Daniel Mietchen are advising this process
             ▪ Will use Debbie Lapeyre’s white paper
         • Publishers need to determine which repositories are okay to publish data in – we need a list
         • Repositories need globally resolvable identifiers
     o Team Expectations:
       ▪ Publishers must be willing to:
Publish articles with cited data using JATS,
Require data deposition by authors,
Check if data is properly archived,
Format their citation data into JATS format, and
Participate in discussions and share ideas.

Repositories must be willing to:
• Review conformist criteria and document their own status of how ready they are;
• Have a set of mandatory requirements to achieve a bronze status; and
• Use IDs that resolve to the landing page (ideally, the landing page would be human and machine-readable – equivalent to a gold standard).
  o Should be coupled with content negotiation (DataCite uses this as a best practice)
• Joan suggested that it may be a better idea to list repository participation not as “musts” and “shoulds” but as levels (i.e., platinum, gold, bronze, etc.)
  o Would still include terms for exclusion
• Many repositories struggle with domain-specific metadata
  o Data reuse – how often does this happen?

Experts must be willing to prepare, guide, support and help researchers
• The emphasis of this pilot should be on injecting the data into the ecosystem – we should not focus on how to reuse malformed components
• Data reuse is nearly as critical an issue as data citation
  ▪ Primary component of data reuse is the ability to examine a researcher’s data and determine if claims are valid and justified
  ▪ Publisher press releases noting that they have achieved a certain level may be more impactful than publishing a paper – would be a good deliverable
  ▪ Press releases are a good idea, we will still pursue paper publications in addition

2. Organizing responsibilities of the Exec.
3. Critical additions to the team
4. Next Steps
  - **Action:** Tim will define the repository level ranking, refocus the project deliverables, and change project groups to teams
    o He will restructure the project plan and send out for comments
  - How will we engage the Exec and organize the invited project members?
    o **Action:** The group structure should be discussed with the Exec – better to discuss first before inviting more members