

	PRINCIPLE	INDICATOR_ID	INDICATORS	PRIORITY	
F	F1	F1-01D	Data is identified by a persistent identifier	Mandatory	F
	F1	F1-02D	Data is identified by a universally unique identifier	Mandatory	
	F3	F3-01M	Metadata includes the identifier for the data	Mandatory	
A	A1	A1-03D	Data identifier resolves to a data file	Mandatory	A
	A1.1	A1.1-01D	Data is accessible through a free access protocol	Mandatory	
	A1.1	A1.1-01M	Metadata is accessible through a free access protocol	Mandatory	
	A1.2	A1.2-01M	Metadata includes information relevant for access control	Mandatory	
	A2	A2-01M	Metadata is guaranteed to remain available after data is no longer available	Mandatory	
R	R1.1	R1.1-01M	Metadata includes information about the licence under which the data can be reused	Mandatory	R
	R1.1	R1.1-03M	Metadata includes licence information in the appropriate element of the metadata standard used	Mandatory	
	R1.3	R1.3-01M	Metadata complies with a community standard	Mandatory	
	R1.3	R1.3-01D	Data complies with a community standard	Mandatory	

Ge Peng 11-Aug-19

Aspect Comments

- F Is it necessary to have two individual indicators from the machine-assessment perspective? If not, perhaps F1-01D and F1-02D can be combined as one: "Data is identified by a universally unique and persistent identifier"
- I There is no mandatory indicator for interoperability. I do not see any mandatory indicator from this list for ensuring data to be interoperable, perhaps R1.3-01D but see my comment below.
- R R1.3-01D is ambiguous. There are well-established community metadata standards. Are there any well-established community data standards? What community standards does it refer to for data to be compliant with: file naming conventions, file formats, file structures, standard variable names, ...? Implementation of this indicator may be extremely arbitrary.