

**Libraries For Research Data (L4RD) Interest Group Meeting
RDA Sixth Plenary, Paris, France – September 24, 2015
Group Notes**

Chairs: Wolfram Horstmann, Kathleen Shearer, Michael Witt

Recorders: Inma Aleixos, Cheryl Thompson

65 people attended

Agenda

1) Introduction to L4RD – Michael Witt

- began at second plenary as BOF, then third and fourth
- turned into interest group by fifth
- new activities this plenary – joint meetings with other IGs and WGs where they want input from libraries

2) Panel: Developing and Adapting to Research Data Policies in Libraries

Panel chairs: Amy Nurnberger & Birgit Schmidt

Panelists:

Sarah Jones, Digital Curation Centre (UK)

Inna Kouper, Indiana University (USA)

Birgit Schmidt, LIBER/University of Gottingen (Germany)

a) Sarah Jones, U.K. research data policy landscape

- Proliferation of policies on research data at different levels:
- Codes of practice, Statements, Funder policies, etc.
- Very UK talk
- Codes, statement and joint principles go back long time. Examples include OECD principles and guidelines, UKRIO code of practice, RCUK common principles; RCUK draft concordat, G8 science ministers statement, etc.
- Move toward openness – policies rate high in OECD countries
- Policies are driving service development (e.g., Horizon 2020, ESPRC data policy)
- More harmonization of research councils with individual policies but come together for joint principles like concordat
- DCC analyzed policies in UK, similar studies in US
- Track development back to 1990's with infrastructure in place and growth around OECD and 2011
- Policies have changed over time – more pragmatic and enabling – what researchers vs. funder vs. institution needs to do
- Policy focus on data of value – not all data
- Starting to focus on costs but still not good cost models
- Publisher data policies have been growing and more to make sure researchers know
- Institutional research policies – big trend in 2011 and there are over 35 now

- Laurence Horton analyzed institutional policies – 74% have open data requirement and require a DMP; 55% specify retention period in policy; 45% give definition of research data; 23% have data ownership statement and mention cost
- DCC offers guidance on developing policy but real issue is implementing it. Edinburgh example of roadmap for implementation
- Need policies at institutional or disciplinary levels and not so unique for each project
- Policies should be easier to navigate – place for libraries to help
- Open science should be at expense of RDM

b) Inna Kouper, North American perspective

- Based on a study that is still in analysis
- Study of RDMS in academic libraries in US; website review, strategic plan and missions, and interviews with library admin
- Many libraries have web page dedicated to RDMS
- Few policies were listed on RDMS webpages; Most contain DMP, consultation and other support services, information on data deposit and repository
- Question – does your institution have any data policy and what does it cover. Many said yes.
- Preliminary results of data policies covering many topics with few mentions of ownership, security, sensitive data, retention, management, deposit and preservation, institutional data, and open access. Plus funder policies were mentioned
- Advanced stages of RDMS development have more policies
- Maybes – were in the early stage of policy development or rely on external policies
- Us vs. them in policies – is policy at library level, university level, funder level
- Many interpretations and approaches to policies but lack directions in collective efforts
- Institutional policies focus on liabilities and duties
- Library policies are reactionary to external factors – e.g., funders

c) Birgit Schmidt – report on LIBER policy workshop

- Involved in work with LIBER on topic of policies
- Workshop to translate policies into support – what is needed to assist researchers, which units should offer the services (e.g., IT, library) or collaboration
- Participants were asked role for libraries in RDMS and work by LIBER or RDA context
- Policies reviewed during workshop at unit and institutional level from 8-9 different places
- Outcomes – policies need improvements in areas of benefits to researcher, publication of data, deletion of data, legal advice, access regulations,

- responsibilities, long-term preservation, reference to related docs, adequate level of metadata
- Wishlist – more training, models or templates for policies, sharing of practices and programs, indicator of policy effectiveness, role of library in RDMS, use case templates
- Assembled checklist for data policies on structural elements from the workshop

3) Discussion

- Should one policy cover all aspects of RDM – preservation, impacts...is there a range of policies that is needed.
- Yes, should have a range with general overview of open data but then specific preservation policy.
- Policies should be customized for specific audience.
- Who is the responsible institution or minister that has to make the policy? Mention levels but who should it come from? Perhaps we need big picture framework with them spokes
- Countries and institutional context will differ – what are the expectations and consequences of violations. Policies will not be implemented unless there are consequences
- Libraries should not determine consequences. Libraries policies are development reactionary – it's a problem
- Yes, we shouldn't wait until someone tell us what to do. Be more proactive
- How can libraries be more proactive in policy development?
- Recently reviewed DMPTool and 45 different sponsor requirements. A concern for policies is that sponsor is a bare minimum (no state level, small foundations) and changing landscape. Problematic for policy that has meat but responds to changing and conflicting landscape. Research community is crying for best practices – might be better to offer training materials and lib guides to get message out. Policies have to be policed and do policies conflict in terms of compliance
- Need several avenues for policies with variable levels of effectiveness
- Institutional policy are general statement about principles of org. Should link out to more specific documents for supporting policy implementation at institutional or funder levels. Provide more modular approach – not just one policy but how to implement the policies. Research group policy was very specific when LIBER workshop reviewed it – it specified how to handle data and practical
- Website with links for institutional resources and services to engage
- Is general statement with incentive for open science, more aspiring be better than a sticks approach?
- Can play good guy
- What is the policy useful – not communicating with researchers because its too high level and often ignored. In UK policies are used to get funding and its more useful purpose. Pick on local procedures and guidance

- Two challenges – 1) what is a policy – differing meaning at diff levels; 2) what policies apply to the library mission and services – not going outside of domain. Which levels are applicable to the library mission with RDMS
- We as researchers run into policies – it should be relevant to a service – how to use or should use. Policies with no support mean little to researchers
- Structure – policies cannot say everything; need implementation plan
- Important to know who are the stewards of the policies – who can help the library implement policies or have expertise in these areas (e.g., access, preservation)
- Who are the stakeholders – who will be concerned with them. OCLC put out a report on engaging stakeholders
- Edinburg roadmap is very practical and exciting. Have others been involved?
- Policy is tiny steps – it's the implementation that is the big work
- Univ. Kiel - In his experience, the policy was brought to the university and working groups and researchers worked on specific data management plans – where, when what in terms of data
- Practical policy working group – computer actionable rules for RDMS; looked at DMP, digital libraries, and preservation systems. French library implemented three practice policies – storage, access and preservation. Very sophisticated
- Journal research policies – lots of clashes with data publishing. Looking at model for data pubs and issues in policy expressions. Goal is to make it easier for library staff to advise and what is RDA's role and contribution. Linda Allton is person to talk to about this work
- Joint meetings might be good to do panel on journal policies, institutional library policies, and computer actionable policies to look at them at different levels and implementation questions
- Library internal policies for RDMS – several examples that target what researchers should do but not many in US library policies (internal) given new services. Might be able to learn from domain repositories and their policies. Maybe joint session with repository group
- P7 – joint session on policy might be fruitful
- Policies from similar groups and how they align – Purdue looks at policies of peer institutions to find examples but these are largely untested policies. Helpful to map data policies that related to libraries and services that we should be developing.
- Second that – Canadians are talking about it
- Create community in Zonodo to collect and start mapping? Possible WG?
- University of Leiden – has institutional RDM policy but implementation asked what services library offer. Library created web portal of their services and external services positioned with lifecycle phases. Looked at their own policy and which services comply to the policy – researchers were able to see what university or national services that are offered based on their discipline. Linking policies to services

- Agree with policy examples that cover array of alternatives. Definitions – what you mean was not clear. But resources should point to best practices in the community

4) RDA/Sloan DataShare Fellow project update

- Cheryl Thompson, doctoral candidate at University of Illinois and RDA Data Share Fellow
- Project design has changed from survey to more ethnographic
- Preliminary archetypes – nascent initiatives, solo librarian, working group, existing team absorbs RDMS function, specialized teams
- Recruitment of case libraries that represent archetypes
- Go see poster; email Cheryl if you're interested in participating or have a library suggestion (cathmps2@illinois.edu)
- Goal is to present brief paper at next RDA meeting

5) Closing Remarks – Michael Witt

- L4RD interest group has been working – pattern emerged interesting topic and use this topic for meeting agenda. Briefing papers came from meeting discussions – these are outputs such as data skills and solutions in libraries
- Group evolved to help RDA engage with library community (IFLA, ASIST, LIBER, IASSIST) – let L4RD know if you've done something or make suggestion for other groups you can help us engage
- Example is IFLA presentation on 23 Things: Libraries for Research Data – it has been downloaded 800-900 times and was mentioned by Mark Parson in opening plenary session
- RDA/Sloan DataShare Fellowship is an output of last meeting that focused on org models
- IFLA journal special issue on RDMS in libraries upcoming call for papers
- Subscribe to L4RD section of RDA website – listserv, file archive, wiki