

Horizon 2020 DMP Compliance rubric

This framework is based on the initial template for a DMP listed in Annex 1 of the European Commission *Guidelines on Data Management in Horizon 2020*.¹ The method adopted is based on the evaluation rubrics approach developed as part of the DART project.² It was developed by the UK Digital Curation Centre.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	PERFORMANCE LEVELS		
	Complete / detailed	Addressed but incomplete	Did not address
1. Is it clear what dataset(s) will be produced?	<i>There is a full listing of datasets with names, references and ID (if available).</i>	<i>Only one dataset is named, or there are insufficient references.</i>	<i>The DMP makes it difficult to understand what data will be created – no summary is given.</i>
2. Is there a full description of the data? <i>e.g. Soil temperature data will be collected via datalogger and exported as tab-delimited text files. About 2Gb of data will be produced in total.</i>	<i>An explanation is given of the data origin, nature and scale. Reference may be made to existing data that could be reused.</i>	<i>A partial description is given but it is vague or difficult for people outside of the project to understand.</i>	<i>The nature and scale of the data isn't described at all.</i>

¹ See Annex 1, p5 in http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-data-mgt_en.pdf

² See <http://dmpresearch.library.oregonstate.edu>

<p>3. Are appropriate standards and metadata being used?</p> <p><i>e.g. Data will be described using Darwin Core Archive metadata, and accompanied by readme.txt files providing information on field methods and procedures.</i></p>	<p><i>A chosen metadata standard is named, or a description of the metadata to be captured is given where no disciplinary standards exists. Appropriate file formats may also be noted.</i></p>	<p><i>Standards or proposed approaches are mentioned in a vague way with insufficient detail to convince you of the approach.</i></p>	<p><i>No standards or project-specific approaches are mentioned. Little thought is given to interoperability.</i></p>
<p>4. Does the DMP specify which data will be openly accessible?</p> <p><i>e.g. The anonymised transcripts and SPSS data will be made openly available for wide reuse. Audio recordings of interviews are identifiable so access will only be provided to bona fide researchers under a data sharing agreement.</i></p>	<p><i>The DMP makes it clear whether access will be open or restricted to specific groups, and for which dataset(s). If the data can't be shared, the reasons for this should be mentioned.</i></p>	<p><i>Some information is given about sharing and openness but it is not clear exactly what will be made open.</i></p>	<p><i>The DMP fails to mention which data will be made openly accessible.</i></p>

<p>5. Is it clear how the data will be shared?</p> <p><i>e.g. the data and associated software will be deposited in Zenodo. The data will be made available under a CC-BY licence while the code is MIT licensed. A 12 month embargo period will be applied to allow research findings to be written up.</i></p>	<p><i>It should be clear how the data will be shared, together with any associated software or tools needed. The licensing position and any embargos should also be outlined.</i></p>	<p><i>Reference is made to data sharing, but more detail is needed on the procedures for gaining access or who will have access and when.</i></p>	<p><i>Data sharing is not addressed.</i></p>
<p>6. Does the DMP state a planned repository for data deposit?</p> <p><i>e.g. since there are no domain repositories available and our institutional data repository is only in the pilot stages, we plan to deposit in B2SHARE. This service is operated by the EUDAT initiative, supported by the European Commission</i></p>	<p><i>A named repository is given, together with an explanation of the service type (e.g. institutional, disciplinary, generic).</i></p>	<p><i>Preliminary ideas are provided but no clear repository plans are stated.</i></p>	<p><i>Data repositories aren't mentioned in the DMP.</i></p>

<p>7. Are the preservation plans described?</p> <p><i>e.g. the data will be deposited with the BODC for long-term preservation and sharing. The NERC data value checklist has been used to assess how long the data should be kept (indefinitely as one-time environmental recordings). There are no costs associated with deposit.</i></p>	<p><i>Plans are outlined (e.g. depositing in repository) and details are given about data volume, period of preservation and associated costs.</i></p>	<p><i>Preservation is touched on, but more detail could usefully be provided.</i></p>	<p><i>The preservation of the data is not covered.</i></p>
--	--	---	--