

<https://www.rd-alliance.org/group/data-repository-attributes-wg/case-statement/data-repository-attributes-wg-case-statement>

## **FAIRsFAIR Project<sup>1</sup> Comments on RDA Case Statement Data Repository Attributes WG<sup>2</sup>**

The FAIRsFAIR project would like to thank the authors for the opportunity to respond to this Case Statement. Requirements and attributes related to data objects, data services, including data repositories, are at the heart of the FAIRsFAIR project. We much appreciate this proposal coming from a wide variety of key stakeholders (as is reflected in the co-chairs).

Below we provide a general response that at the same time identifies alignment with ongoing FAIRsFAIR work.

Our main general response focuses around the validation and management of common descriptive attributes of a data repository. In addition to a standardised method of versioning and monitoring the adoption of the future data repository attributes the community would benefit from a clear approach to maintenance and ongoing consultation including clarification on the organisations and roles needed to achieve this.

In addition, some more suggestions:

- Throughout the Case Statement the authors use both 'data repository' as well as 'research data repository'. This distinction is important as community expectations, e.g. a data repository used to store other research outputs than data (e.g. software, semantic artefacts) might have different attributes to that of a research data repository. We feel that data repositories for other research artefacts should also be taken into account, as well as metadata repositories (e.g. re3data, FAIRsharing).
- For community efforts such as these, we would stress the importance of defining and meeting the needs of key actors (authors, publishers, funders, institutions, curators, data stewards) and entities (papers, research data, repository metadata). It would be helpful if the case statement could go beyond the current general terms: 'users and user agents'.
- Work on the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC) and FAIR data has demonstrated that we need to provide generally applicable standards and ontologies but also to cater for the more specific needs of disciplinary and domain repositories. It would be useful to the community if the case statement stated the goal of addressing characteristics that would support recommendations that data be held in trustworthy *and* discipline-specific repositories.

FAIRsFAIR work (ongoing until February 2022) includes requirements for FAIR objects and FAIR-enabling services, including repositories. FAIRsFAIR input to this WG can be taken

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.fairsfair.eu>

<sup>2</sup>

<https://www.rd-alliance.org/group/data-repository-attributes-wg/case-statement/data-repository-attributes-wg-case-statement>

from a variety of sources and works, e.g. FAIR-enabling repository features<sup>3</sup>, improved description of data repositories and tools to identify FAIR-enabling repositories<sup>4</sup>, mappings and capability maturity models of repository requirements with FAIR data elements<sup>5</sup> and a report on metadata integration catalogues<sup>6</sup>. FAIRsFAIR (and FAIRsFAIR partners who will participate in future successor initiatives as part of the Horizon Europe and EOSC) is eager to contribute to community dialogues as part of the this WG.

---

<sup>3</sup> FsF D2.7 Framework for assessing FAIR Services, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5336234>

<sup>4</sup> FsF M4.8 Introduce additional components and practices to metadata schema and align them with FAIR data practices, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5473107>. Repository Finder integration into Datacite Commons to be delivered end of February 2022.

<sup>5</sup> FsF M4.3 CoreTrustSeal+FAIRenabling, Capability and Maturity, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5346822>

<sup>6</sup> FsF D3.7 Report on integration of metadata catalogues, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5744913>