NEW GoToMeeting link: https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/705078429
Please add the link to slides here :
- 1_An_Update_of_TRUST_Principles.pdf
- 2_Auditing_an_Institutional_Data_Repository_With_Respect_to_the_CoreTrustSeal_Certification_Requirements.pdf
- 3_Trustworthy_Digital_Repositories_plus_GLAM.pdf

Attendees (Be advised the doc is public)

[Full list of attendees was captured on participant sheets]

Name	Email	Organization
Rolf Krahl	rolf.krahl@helmholtz-berlin.de	Helmholtz-Zentrum Berlin für Materialien und Energie
Yulia Karimova	ylaleo@gmail.com	Faculty of Engineering of the University of Porto / INESC TEC
Geneviève Michaud	Genevieve.Michaud@sciencespo.fr	Sciences Po Paris
Tuomas J. Alaterä	tuomas.alatera@tuni.fi	Finnish Social Science Data Archive and IASSIST
Natalie Harrower	n.harrower@ria.ie	Digital Repository of Ireland
Jan Dvořák	jan.dvorak@ff.cuni.cz	euroCRIS; Charles U Prague [CZ]
Lene Offersgaard	leneo@hum.ku.dk	University of Copenhagen, CLARIN-DK
Marina Soares e Silva	m.soaresesilva@elsevier.com	Mendeley Data/Elsevier
Amirpasha Mozaffari	a.mozaffari@fz-juelich.de	Forschungszentrum Juelich
Ari Lukkarinen	ari.lukkarinen@csc.fi	CSC - IT Center for Science
Ingemar Häggström	ingemar.haggstrom@eisca	EISCAT Scientific

	t.se	Association
Garry baker	grba@bgs.ac.uk	UKRI-NERC
mike brown	mjbr@ceh.ac.uk	UKRI-NERC
Jonathan Petters	jpetters@vt.edu	Virginia Tech University Libraries
Daniel Zdun	daniel.zdun@rfii.de	German Council for Scientific Information Infrastructures (Head Office)
Niek Van Wettere	niek.van.wettere@vub.be	Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Paul Eckhardt	pe@nilu.no	NILU
Leighton Christiansen (remote attendee)	leightonlc@gmail.com	National Transportation Library USDOT
John Wztkins	jww@ceh.ac.uk	UKRI/EDS
Kristin Meier	kristin.meier@zalf.de	ZALF, Germany
Cristina Ribeiro	mcr@fe.up.pt	INESC TEC/ U.Porto

Minutes

Intro by Rorie Edmunds

Part I : An Update of TRUST principles (Dawei Lin)

Dark Data: only 12% of data described in published papers is in recognized repos

Evolution of the Standards for Trustworthy Repository Certification: since OAIS Ref Model (2003), up to Core Trustworthy Data Repos Requirements (2016)

Motivation of TRUST Principles: Aiming for a simple message; Not to replace the standards

V0.02 (17 co-authors from 8 countries: US, UK, NL, DE, …)

T : Transparency
R : Responsibility
U : User community
S: Sustainability
T : Technology

Transparency (Key concepts): Clear mission statement, Policy and governance, Specific claims of capability
Responsability (Key concepts): R is shared (data producers, institutions, ..); Process and workflow documentation to ensure data and service quality; Guidance to content deposition and prospective users
User community (Key concepts): Key user base - designated community; Monitoring need changes overtime; Enforcement of community norms and standards.
Sustainability (Key concepts): Plans for risk mitigation, business opportunity, disaster discovery and succession; Plans for long-term preservation; Credible contingency plans supported by public evidence such as certifications.
Technology (Key concepts): Infrastructure refers to the collection of people, processes, and technologies; Hardware, software technologies, and cybers...

Road map : mapping Trust principle in criteria and practices : such as OAIS, ISO, CoreTrustSeal, …

TRUST principles White Paper V0.02 https://bit.ly/trustprinciples

Questions:
1. Providing people FAIR use policy for repository (Licenses) How communicate this to users? (Name: Gretchen Greene)
    a. Could be construed as falling under Transparency - users aware of what licenses data is under, and Responsibility - data depositors understand their licensing options

2. Jon Watkins - UKRI : It is important to separate the FAIR and TRUST principal and address them differently
    a. It is important to consider community needs since user community trust should be satisfied which may be different from FAIR
    b. Important to identify touch-points between FAIR and TRUST such as embargo periods where the nature of embargo is enabled by a TRUSTed

repository to enable FAIRer data

3. Marina (Mendeley data): What is the relationship between TRUST and CTS ?
    a. Purpose is to be beyond the CTS and it aims to all repositories. Lots of repositories are young and might not meet all TRUST criteria, but they should know where they should head. CTS is one way to implement the TRUST while there will be other principle to do it as well.
    b. Assessment of own TRUST (either internal or external; and community dependent) can be shared with CTS to require certification

4. André Pacheco (University of Coimbra): What is the relationship between TRUST and certification?
    a. TRUST is an overarching guide. The certification is time-limited status. It depends on organizational status, technology changes. CTS is for 3 years.
    b. The purpose of TRUST to raise the profile of a specialized TDR community to general data science audience.

Discussions

Part II : Auditing Institutional Data Repository with respect to the CTS certification Requirements (Jonathan Petters / Naina Pisharoti - Virginia Tech)

General purpose repository and Technical service provider which is out of the scope of the CTS currently. But seems there is a need for the certification and including them in the conversation.

VTechData https://data.lib.vt.edu/

Open access repository
VT researchers can self-deposit
Curators suggest dataset/metadata enhancement by depositors, meeting minimum metadata requirements
74 published datasets since 2016
They have applied the internal assessment of the CTS

Assessment Process

- Interviewed Data services and ITservices personnel
- Rate current practice against CTS standards

VTechData - not yet CTS
Improvements and documentation required

Challenge
- Way To provide access to the data
- Discipline-agnostic
- Curators are not in a position to evaluate the quality/reusability of data/metadata

Data Curation Network being discussed among institutional repositories with domain skills

Definition of Designated Community is problematic at Virginia Tech as this should to a wide (possibly unknown) user community via FAIR data.

Part III : Trustworthy Digital Repositories plus .. GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums) by (presenter name)

CTS is not a stick,... it is a home-grown carrot!
The idea is to be welcoming and not excluding. CTS interest groups getting wider from Social science research data to research data and to data.

What is different between the repository and the service provider (?)

Disciplinary repositories : centered around the context of a disciplinary , not engaging with "customer", getting better with integrating the users

Preservation, Usability

CTS new interest group (GLAM) : the National Archives, The British library , libraries and archives in canada which they are giants and they want to CTS as an assessment.

Providing the designated community is major issue for all these GLAM and Rest.

Replacing the peer review by automated assessments is cheaper and faster

Discussion

1. Marina (Mendeley data) - is FAIR
   How we guarantee
2. Kevin Ashley DCC - (designated community) - Are we creating a problem where none exists, i.e. in worrying about this definition of Designated Community?
3. Jeff Moon from CARL Portage, Canada

Further questions/suggestions (after the session)
1. Does CTS anticipate any requirements for making (meta)data LOD-friendly?
2. I suggest to create a newsletter/ information page for all general purpose-repositories / service provider that are interested to be certified and GLAM concept could be their solution that they can register themselves.