



Reviewing DMPs - what you need to know

Sarah Jones

DCC, University of Glasgow

sarah.jones@glasgow.ac.uk

Twitter: @sjDCC

#fosteropenscience

What is a H2020 Data Management Plan

- A plan on how the data will be managed and shared
- Guidelines provide an optional template addressing FAIR
- Required by month 6 with updates as needed
- No page limit but shouldn't need to be over 5-10 pages

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf


H2020 template

1. Data summary
2. FAIR data
 - 2.1 Making data findable, including provisions for metadata
 - 2.2 Making data openly accessible
 - 2.3 Making data interoperable
 - 2.4 Increase data re-use (through clarifying licences)
3. Allocation of resources
4. Data security
5. Ethical aspects
6. Other issues

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf

Internal assessment framework

- Based on the template
- For each question you are asked to assess the completeness of the response
- Remember that DMPs evolve so some answers may be partial at month 6
- Feedback on framework welcomed

	EUROPEAN COMMISSION RESEARCH EXECUTIVE AGENCY	
---	--	--

**OPEN RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN
ASSESSMENT GRID**

1. DATA SUMMARY

1.a Is header information fully provided (action ID, acronym, DMP version and date, name of the DMP responsible)? Yes Partially No NA

1.b Are the purpose of the data collection and its relation to project objectives explained and comprehensible? Yes Partially No NA

1.c Are data types and formats accurately listed? Yes Partially No NA

1.d Is the expected volume of the data foreseen and estimated? Yes Partially No NA

1.e Is reuse of pre-existing data described including its origin? Yes Partially No NA

1.f Is data utility outlined? Yes Partially No NA

Comments:
.....
.....
.....

Recommendations:
.....
.....
.....

2. FAIR DATA

2.1. Making data findable, including provisions for metadata

2.1.a Will the data be assigned a unique and persistent identifier? Yes Partially No NA

2.1.b Will the data be registered in a searchable resource? Yes Partially No NA

2.1.c Are data naming conventions described? Yes Partially No NA

2.1.d Will the data be described with rich metadata (following standard practises in the field)? Yes Partially No NA

Overall considerations

- Is the plan appropriate?
 - adopting relevant standards
 - practices in line with norms for that field
 - use of support services e.g. university storage, subject repositories...
- Has sufficient information been provided?
- Are restrictions and costs properly justified?

Has the researcher taken time
to reflect on what to do?



Specific things to watch out for


- Storage is not the same as long-term preservation
 - Data should be deposited in repositories not uni servers and websites
- DMPs should cover data, software and other related research outputs. Not publications, marketing, event materials etc.
 - Remember that gold and green open access relates to publications
- Not all data can be shared but where they are they should be as open as possible
 - Beware unjustified non-commercial licenses or restricting access to project

DMP reviewing exercise

In small groups you will review and report on a DMP(s)

Use the annotated Assessment Grid to focus your discussion on six key areas

Please assign a rapporteur to share your group's views on whether the DMP is sufficient or how it can be improved

	EUROPEAN COMMISSION RESEARCH EXECUTIVE AGENCY	Version: 1.0 Date: 17-Oct-2017 Status: final draft (not yet approved) Usage: internal use, send feedback to authors Author: Jarkko Siren (REA.B3) Contributor: Raquel Fernandez Morcajada (REA.A5)
---	---	---

**OPEN RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN
ASSESSMENT GRID**

DMP Review exercise instructions:

Your group will be assigned two DMPs to review and report on. Please agree a rapporteur and write notes on the flipchart to offer your feedback.

Read through each and discuss whether the approach is sufficient for the six highlighted topics:

- 1.c description of data types and formats
- 2.1.a unique and persistent identifiers (PIDs)
- 2.1.d rich metadata
- 2.2.c repository deposit
- 2.3.a data and metadata standards for interoperability
- 2.4.a data licensing

1. DATA SUMMARY

1.a Is header information fully provided (action ID, acronym, DMP version and date, name of the DMP responsible)? Yes Partially No

1.b Are the purpose of the data collection and its relation to project objectives explained and comprehensible? Yes Partially No

1.c Are data types and formats accurately listed? Yes Partially No

1.d Is the expected volume of the data foreseen and estimated? Yes Partially No

1.e Is reuse of pre-existing data described including its origin? Yes Partially No

1.f Is data utility outlined? Yes Partially No

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

Recommendations:

.....

.....

.....

Agence exécutive pour la recherche, B-1049 Bruxelles / Uitvoerend Agentschap Onderzoek, B-1049 Brussel – Belgium.
Telephone: (32-2) 259 11 11.

What to assess?

Using the assessment grid, review your DMP against the main criteria covered here:

- 1.c Are data types and **formats** accurately listed?
- 2.1.a Will the data be assigned a unique and **persistent identifier**?
- 2.1.d Will the data be described with **rich metadata**?
- 2.2.c is it specified where the **data** and associated metadata, documentation and code are **deposited**?
- 2.3.a Is it described how data interoperability will be facilitated e.g. through use of data and metadata **vocabularies, standards** or methodologies?
- 2.4.a Is **data licensing** and its role in facilitating re-use described?

