**RDA-CODATA INTEREST GROUP ON LEGAL INTEROPERABILITY OF RESEARCH DATA**

**Case Study Methodology**

The purpose of the Case Studies is to:

* Provide more specific information on best practices, as well as barriers and constraints in a number of different scientific domains and communities of practice (lessons learned);
* Illustrate the variety of legal frameworks that govern research data, different approaches to intellectual property and copyright across jurisdictions, different disciplinary expectations and norms, and alternative mechanisms to address the legal interoperability of data that have been tried in practice; and
* Identify opportunities for cross-disciplinary, cross-domain fertilization and collaboration and for new initiatives to address key barriers and constraints.

In the fall of 2013, we received several expressions of interest to undertake case studies. Since these are based on volunteer efforts of the contributors, all of them have been approved for further work. See Appendix A with the List of Case Studies on the next page.

In order to achieve the purposes of the case studies, we need to establish a framework for their inter-comparison to facilitate assessment of commonalities and differences among case studies and to identify or develop metrics that are comparable across scientific domains, legal jurisdictions, and communities of practice. The case studies all need to address, at a minimum, the following issue areas in some detail:

1. The legal frameworks and specific policies (or lack of them) governing different types of research data important to a specific scientific domain or problem area important to each case study.
2. The perceived barriers to data sharing or interoperability and perceived needs for increased interoperability that spurred interest and investment in new legal interoperability approaches.
3. A description of any effective legal interoperability processes, techniques and institutions that have been developed or adopted to overcome the barriers that have been identified.
4. The stakeholders involved in developing, testing, and implementing legal interoperability approaches and their roles, level of engagement and investment, and impact.
5. Progress to date in implementing legal interoperability approaches, including identification of criteria or metrics used to assess success or impact, use of technology or other mechanisms to promote adoption, and estimates of funding and other resources provided to support implementation.

**The schedule for completing each case study is as follows:**

March 14: Send a draft annotated outline of each case study to the co-chairs for broad distribution to the IG.

March 26-27: Discuss the preliminary content of the case studies at the RDA meeting in Dublin.

Early August: Submit a complete written draft of each case study for broad distribution to the IG.

September: Discuss the case studies at the RDA meeting in Amsterdam. Agree on the framework for inter-comparison of case studies.

January 2015: Publish all the case studies online. Complete a draft paper on best practices.

March 2015: Complete the paper on best practices.

APPENDIX A – LIST OF CASE STUDIES

1. CLARIN ERIC (Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure; European Research Infrastructure Consortium)
2. iMarine Data e-Infrastructure Initiative for Fisheries Management and Conservation of Marine Living Resources <http://www.i-marine.eu>
3. Polar Information Commons (PIC)
4. All-Island Research Observatory (AIRO), Ireland
5. Digital Repository of Ireland
6. Geomatics and Cartographic Research Centre (GCRC) Traditional Knowledge Atlases and Data Management, Canada
7. Coordination of Research e-infrastructure Activities Toward an International Virtual Environment for Biodiversity (CReATIVE-B)
8. Plazi treatment repository