

FORCE11 - DCIP Executive Meeting
November 18, 2015 08:00 AM Pacific Time

Invitees: Maryann Martone, Tim Clark, Carole Goble, Jeffrey Grethe, Jo McEntyre, Joan Starr, Simon Hodson, Martin Fenner

In Attendance: Maryann, Martin, Carole, Jo, Stephanie, Cassie

AGENDA

1. Finish Review of [Slides](#)

a. Goals

- i. Help early adopters achieve publication of biomedical articles citing robustly archived data within 1 year
- ii. Achieve common use of JDDCP implementation guidelines with focus on primary data
- iii. Provide expert guidance and clarification on what these guidelines mean and how to follow them
 1. We would provide an advisory role
- iv. Publicize the results of our group efforts in coordination with other related projects and organizations

b. Strategy

- i. Four teams: publishers, repositories, “experts,” outreach
- ii. Define/document expectations and levels for each group
 1. Targets toward implementing data citation
 2. Good, better and best efforts on path to full compliance (replaces previous bronze, gold, etc. levels)
 - a. We may not achieve full agreement on what the best is, but the obstacles to compliance will show themselves along the way – will help us understand why they’re having trouble achieving higher levels
 3. Capture info about obstacles to compliance
 - a. What does it take to move up? Provide shining examples of what this looks like – leaves a roadmap
- iii. Experts provide advice, communications, support
 1. Patterned on RRID project
 2. Topics include: JATS, repo selection, identifier use
- iv. Outreach via web, conference calls, F2F, articles, and reports
 1. We can advertise within the BD2K project and European projects as well

c. Organization

- i. Website – used to gather all materials
- ii. Publishers Team, Repositories Team, Experts team

1. Would it conceivable to have teams centered on the topics (i.e., JATS, repository selection, etc.)?
 - a. We might not need a team but rather a discussion group
 - b. We should focus on publishers that can do JATS as soon as possible
 - i. We should limit the number of participants
 - c. Is this going to be about deposition of data or data that needs to be cited?
 - i. Former is going to be a bigger challenger than the latter
 - d. We want to make sure that we have a few use cases that have clear results
 - i. For example, Chun-Nan Hsu's (bioCADDIE PP 3.2 co-leader) difficulty in performing a citation analysis of PDB
- d. Publisher expectations
 - i. Good: endorse the JDDCP principles
 - ii. Better: provide us w/ the steps it will take you to adopt new JATS as well as obstacles you'll face
 1. Main obstacles are technical
 2. Would be okay to have data citations starting on the article level – would look at the social issues with doing it
 - a. Perhaps focus level 2 more on what you can do up to and excepting JATS
 - iii. Best: publish articles with cited data using JATS 1.1d3
 1. Require data depositions by authors
 2. Check data is properly archive
 - a. Move these first two to “Better” category
 3. Incorporate citation info in JATS XML
 4. Properly render JATS data citation in HTML
 - iv. All levels: participate in workshops and discussions
- e. Repository expectations
 - i. Good: endorse the JDDCP principles
 - ii. Better: reliably archive data
 - iii. Best: assign PIDs that are machine actionable, globally unique and widely used by a community to deposit datasets
 - iv. All levels: participate in workshops and discussions
- f. Repository next level
 - i. Use PIDs that resolve to landing page then to data
 - ii. Provide human AND machine accessibility
 1. Via RESTful web services
 - a. The single most important things that repositories can do is use html meta tags

- b. Landing page that is machine-readable - does not need an API. Lowest hanging fruit: parseable/harvestable metadata
 - iii. Provide a persistence policy statement
 - iv. Vend human and machine readable citations
 - v. Provide terms of use/ licensing on landing page
 - vi. The requirements aren't necessarily linearly achievable, perhaps use a "star" system
 - 1. Not a line but more of a matrix
- g. Expert team
 - i. Prepare guidance with outreach team: peer reviewed articles, FAQs
 - ii. Provide support: email web forum, TBD
 - 1. Not 24/7 support, but provide daily monitoring of forums or provide a timely response
 - 2. We should determine how large a role the publisher should play here
 - 3. Journals are actively trying to achieve data citation - it shouldn't be difficult to get them to encourage it
 - iii. Work to resolve glitches and problems
 - iv. Participate in workshops and discussions
- h. Exec. Team
 - i. Publishers: determine basic level of readiness; get commitment; help organize their participation and serve as a resource during pilot
 - ii. Repositories: determine basic level of readiness; agree on goals; help identify repositories participation in pilot
 - iii. Experts: identify experts on JATS, any other topics, appropriate repo lists (w/ BioSharing) and identifier resolution to provide guidance during pilot
 - iv. Outreach: beyond the pilot participants, via discussions, working with other projects and organizations, & principal writing tasks
 - v. Would be nice to build a community where everyone is in the same room and working together
 - 1. The workshops should have everyone together instead of separate publisher workshops, repository workshops, etc.
 - 2. Would provide coherence of practice
 - a. For example, what databases should they recommend?
What is the triage system
 - b. Each discipline has it's own quirks
 - 3. Enduring social structure
 - 4. [COPDESS](#): effort in the geosciences; publishers and repositories working together – important to include
 - 5. Speaking of the workshop: we should discuss a date, rough agenda, location, etc.
 - a. **Action:** add the workshop as an item on next week's agenda

- b. **Action:** also add a discussion of slides 5 and 6 (repository and publisher expectations) to the agenda

< Meeting adjourned >

2. Next Steps

- a. See last slide – is this a complete list?
- b. Open issues
 - i. Agreement on goals
 - ii. Decision on a short-term PID strategy for repositories
 - iii. Role of the reference management vendors – is there an ask?
 - iv. Identifying the list of repositories
 - v. Identifying the list of publishers
 - vi. Identifying the experts

DCIP Action Items:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1LfkAq34qvC5Su_4cM9dH-8pCYi6wGNyWSw58ao7mlc/edit?usp=sharing