

Collaborative notes for Session 1 - “Metrics and assessing FAIRness”

Chair: Mike Priddy (DANS)

Rapporteur: Maaïke Verburg (DANS)

Synch Force Team: Sara Plttonet (Trust-IT) Marjan Grootveld (DANS)

Workshop date: Monday, November 27, 13.00-14.30 CET

Session overview

In this session, we looked into the metrics, their associated tests, and tools available for the FAIRness assessment of digital objects, but this time concentrating on research software and semantic artefacts, although information and experience with metrics and assessment tools for data objects is most definitely welcome. We discussed current topics, such as discipline specific metrics for FAIR assessments, harmonisation, benchmarking of metrics and tools, and the most effective use and interpretation of tools and their results.

From the [last Synchronisation Force workshop](#) on metrics and assessing FAIRness these recommendations have been used to guide the discussions and information gathering in this workshop:

- We need to work on a **further convergence of metrics and tools**, which requires further discussion, synchronisation and alignment;
- We need **more domain-sensitive assessment methods**, in order to incorporate domain maturity as well as specific good practices and requirements.
- We need **assessment tools** for other research outputs, like **software and semantic artefacts**.
- The instrument of **FAIR assessment and scoring** should be seen and used as the **starting point** for assistance and improvement.

The [EOSC Multi Annual Roadmap \(MAR\)](#) objectives relevant for this workshop are:

- **Objective 2 - European level priority F** “Focus on community-specific FAIR metrics and data quality constraints (especially on the interoperability of these) by engaging with research clusters to apply FAIR in their contexts. (2025)”
- **Objective 2 - European level priority G** “Support the emergence of a widely representative governance body around FAIR metrics and assessment.”
- **Objective 2 - Institutional level priority L** “Support research communities to adopt both general and domain-specific standards to increase adoption of FAIR practices and reuse.”

Expected outcomes

The cross-workshop expected outcome was to assess the usage of FAIR assessment metrics and tools with a particular interest in domain-specificity and non-data digital objects and the status of implementation of FAIR practices concerning disciplines and domains of the participants.

Preliminary questions and responses received

Project or initiative	1. What does your project or initiative do to implement metrics?
OpenAIRE	OpenAIRE provide fair Assessment validator https://provide.openaire.eu/
GO FAIR Foundation	We are an organization committed to safeguard the implementation of FAIR Supporting Resources compliant with the FAIR Guiding Principles. Therefore we follow activities on this topics addressed by the RDA, CODATA and EOSC.
FAIR-EASE	There is a task dedicated to evaluating and promoting the FAIR principles in the project. In this context, an initial evaluation of the data used and the software created by the use cases has been carried out. Regarding the developments of a interdisciplinary data discovery and access service that allows for data input to a FAIR-EASE Earth Analytical Lab, the focus in development is on the Findability, Accessibility and Interoperability. For the ongoing developments the corresponding metrics are taken into account.
Blue-Cloud2026	BC2026 aims to harmonize the federated Blue Data Infrastructures by coordinating their web services, improving the APIs and achieve a common functionality regarding semantics. Informally there is a lot of attention for FAIR metrics (metadata, semantics, etc), but formal Fairness assessments are not undertaken yet.
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	The IVOA (ivoa.net) Registry WG produces validation reports (a.k.a: weather report of the virtual observatory), such as: https://wiki.ivoa.net/internal/IVOA/InterOpOct2022Ops/20221019-Euro-VO_Registry_Resources_Validation_Report.pdf https://wiki.ivoa.net/internal/IVOA/InterOpApr2022Ops/PADC_Weather_Report_2022-04-29.pdf Other teams has their own reporting tools, like: https://voparis-validation-reports.obspm.fr Those metrics tell about the health of the IVOA Registry (compliance to IVOA recommendations, status of services...)
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways	We are not following any formal FAIR-metrics approach.

Project or initiative	1. What does your project or initiative do to implement metrics?
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	The institution is interested in defining a set of metrics to assess OS practices (both in terms of publications and of FAIR digital objects management), with the objective of establishing a fair system based on combined qualitative/quantitative indicators and not on problematic proxy metrics (such as the IF for publications). The next planned action is developing a monitoring platform, likely based on the Monitor tool developed by OpenAIRE.
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	In the contexts of different projects we have tested and used a number of different FAIRness metrics over the last years, including F-UJI (https://www.f-uji.net/) to check on representative subsets of data objects that we maintain and curate. However, at our Carbon Portal repository we do not deploy any (semi-)automatic regular evaluation of FAIRness on a data object-individual level.
	RDA TIGER supports a research software project. It doesn't deal with metrics, rather: support research performing organisations worldwide to develop, align, and implement policies on research software, as a key component of FAIR and open science/scholarship.
OpenAIRE	OpenAIRE Metadata & FAIR validator
WorldFAIR	Development phase.
FAIR-EASE	There is a task dedicated to evaluating and promoting the FAIR principles in the project. In this context, an initial evaluation of the data used and the software created by the use cases has been carried out. The tools/methods used for the data are FDMM and F-UJI, and metrics have been defined for the software based on the results of the RDA4RS group. A further evaluation will be handled for semantic artefacts using O'Faire, the tool proposed by the Ontoport technology.
ELIXIR	Support and run https://fairassist.org ; work with the EOSC FAIR Metrics and Data Quality Task Force for the 'Apples to Apples' Workshop (see also https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7463420). Here, its FAIR Metrics subgroup are bringing together developers of several FAIR evaluation tools and enabling services for a series of hands-on hackathon events to identify a common approach to metadata provision that could be implemented by all data publishers such as databases, repositories, and data catalogue managers (for the purposes of FAIR evaluation and assessment).
BY-COVID	We are not following any formal FAIR-metrics approach. The BY-COVID project contributes to the FAIR principles by carrying out inter-domain metadata mappings, and by improving data discovery, integration and citation, using tools based on the Covid-19 Data Portal and FAIRsharing. We also enable FAIR and trustworthy publication of end-to-end infectious diseases data analyses and results.
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	We adopted the RDA FAIR data maturity model and regularly assess our infrastructure with this framework

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
OpenAIRE	Explore F-UJI for analysis and adoption in OpenAIRE validator: https://provide.openaire.eu/	No	NA
RDA France			
GO FAIR Foundation	we don't use directly the automated assessments but we use the FAIR Implementation Profile (FIP) approach to make sure that the use of FAIR Enabling Resources by a community is properly declared.	We constantly improve our FIP approach and link it to existing toolings and services such as FAIRsharing and nanopublications.	https://fip-wizard.ds-wizard.org/ - https://sip-wizard.ds-wizard.org/ https://fairconnect.pro/
FAIR-EASE	The tools/methods used for the data are FDMM and F-UJI, and metrics have been defined for the software based on the results of the RDA4RS group. A further evaluation will be handled for semantic artefacts using O'Faire, the tool proposed by the Ontoport technology. For one of the pilots a ro-crate approach is adopted for which the use of fair-assessment tools will be investigated.	-	The current technical developments in FAIR-EASE are not mature yet, such that tools cannot be applied yet. At a later stage, we will investigate the use of automated tools for the software, service and data being used.

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
Blue-Cloud2026	FAIR Implementation Profiles have been used for different federated data infrastructures such as SeaDataNet, EuroBIS and Euro-Argo (https://fip-wizard.ds-wizard.org/). This stimulates the strategy for FAIR improvements and is a method that BC2026 will more widely start using.	-	In previous Blue-Cloud automated assessment tools like F-UJI were not mature enough.

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	<p>The IVOA (ivoa.net) proposes an interoperability framework (community standard, tools, protocols) for astronomy. The IVOA set of recommendations constitutes a FAIR ecosystem. Our astronomy Services and Semantic artefacts are validated against validators, either with command line, like e.g., with STILTS [https://www.star.bris.ac.uk/~mbt/stilts/] or using online validators: https://voparis-validator.obspm.fr The published datasets (including a DOI from Datacite) can also be checked with https://fair-checker.france-bioinformatique.fr or https://www.f-ujl.net</p> <p>For NVS we participated in the FAIR-IMPACT project for FAIRness assesement and we used: O'FAIRE, FOOPS, 10 rules for making vocabularies FAIR, Recommendations for FAIR semantics</p>	<p>With FAIR-IMPACT, we have installed an astronomy OntoPortal instance, where we gather semantic artefacts (vocabularies, thesaurus...) from astronomy (IVOA) as well as 2 other astronomy sub-communities: planetary sciences (IPDA) and heliophysics (IHDEA). Each of the 3 alliances have a different FAIR and semantics ecosystem. Our OntoPortal instance allows us to build mappings between the semantic artefacts of the 3 communities.</p>	<p>We have partly automated FAIR assessment tools (although not named this way): we validate the structure of the record, and partly its content. The focus of IVOA has been technical interoperability for a long time. The semantic interoperability has not been too much assessed, being in a rather homogeneous community. Now this community is opening up and semantic interoperability concerns are rising.</p>
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways			

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
A CRIS system for Open Science and FAIR publications			
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	The FUJI tool has been used exclusively for training purposes, while presenting the opportunity of automated FAIR assessment in the context of some lessons prepared for PhD students. This tool, in our estimation, was the most intuitive one to be presented in an educational context. We are not yet considering its use in research assessment as the discussion on metrics is still ongoing.		
PerSciDo: The French Labex Persyval-Lab	Use of standard vocabularies for the core Ontology and TopBraid Composer software for Ontology editing and checking.	No	The Perscido ontology follows the "FAIR" principles by design.

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	We do not use automated assessment of our digital objects at this time, in the context of running such tests regularly and/or on a majority of the digital objects that we curate and maintain. We are more interested in using metrics tools to periodically check that our overall data management procedures and processes are working, resulting in an overall high FAIRness.	We try to use the most up to date tools and evaluation schemas. Early tools often resulted in "false" low scores as they were not able to correctly interpret complex metadata information from e.g. landing pages. Thus it is important to select appropriately advanced tools that have been developed together with data managers from a number of disciplines.	See above.

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
RDA TIGER			It is worth pointing out that the group will also look at identification of areas where policies are lacking, such as recognition of research software contributions in relation to research assessment reform, to catalyse efforts in this area.
OpenAIRE	Explore F-UJI for analysis and added-value to OpenAIRE FAIR Validator. The FAIR rules we have been incorporating are based on the RDA FAIR data maturity model and on the FAIRsFAIR Data Object Assessment Metrics.	We are building our own tool upon the OpenAIRE Metadata Validator and as described in 2.	
WorldFAIR	We are not using them, but we are surveying these approaches.		Our preference is to gather information from our Case Studies and communities using FIPs. We think this is an important step that needs to precede FAIR assessment.

Project or initiative	2. If your project, initiative, community or organisation use tools for automated assessment of the FAIRness of digital objects, especially for research software, semantic artefacts, or data, which do you use? What informed the decision?	a. Have you changed the tools being used and why?	b. If you are not using tools for automated FAIR assessment, why is that? Please provide any relevant links to the tools used.
FAIR-EASE			
ELIXIR	FAIRsharing provides its content for those tools to perform FAIR assessment. When assessing ourselves, we primarily use https://fairsharing.github.io/FAIR-Evaluator-FrontEnd/#/		
BY-COVID			
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	we do not use automated tools	No	We tried several automated tools, but the architecture of our infra is too complex, with nested levels for metadata and most failed in assessing the Fairness

Project or initiative	3. Is your project, initiative, community or organisation investigating or implementing discipline or community-specific metrics for FAIR assessments?
OpenAIRE	
RDA France	
GO FAIR Foundation	we are not a project using our own data, but we train other people on how to assess their data
FAIR-EASE	-

Project or initiative	3. Is your project, initiative, community or organisation investigating or implementing discipline or community-specific metrics for FAIR assessments?
Blue-Cloud2026	FIP process will be adopted. Marine community wide solutions for compliance to the FAIR metrics will be promoted.
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	The previous state of thinking was that we were "FAIR by design", thanks to our standards: resources and services are Findable (in our registry, with its own API), they are accessible (everything is open access), they are interoperable (services are strongly interoperable), and reusable (a few known format with data and metadata, descriptors, and provenance). We have started using generic FAIR assessment tools to check how FAIR we were in a more generic context.
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways	Reactome is an Elixir Data resource, as well as a Global Biodata Core Resource.
A CRIS system for Open Science and FAIR publications	
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	As mentioned in 1, there is a definite interest in monitoring and assessing FAIRness at the institutional level. At the same time, there is an increasing awareness that assessment must be discipline-specific and must take into account different research practices and communities. Concerns have been raised especially within the Arts and Humanities where research communities are still in the process of finding "domain- and discipline-specific solutions and paths towards responsible and sustainable data-sharing practices". Indeed, if future funding streams were based on (semi-)automated FAIR assessment based on very different data management models, there would be a very real risk of (further) underfunding. (See also Tóth-Czifra, et al. Research Data Management for Arts and Humanities: Integrating Voices of the Community, https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.8059626), pp. 13-14).

Project or initiative	3. Is your project, initiative, community or organisation investigating or implementing discipline or community-specific metrics for FAIR assessments?
PerSciDo: The French Labex Persyval-Lab (a laboratory of excellence bringing together French laboratories, aiming to promote the emergence of ambitious and internationally visible scientific projects) initiated the development of the research dataset shar	
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	We generally apply generic tools, such as F-UJI. At this time, we have not implemented any comprehensive FAIRness evaluation for non-data digital objects, like software or semantic artefacts. However, we are aware of efforts by e.g. the RDA groups that have prepared metrics for software.
RDA TIGER	
OpenAIRE	The FAIR metrics we have been incorporating are based on the RDA FAIR data maturity model and on the FAIRsFAIR Data Object Assessment Metrics.
WorldFAIR	We are investigating and exploring practice, and making recommendataions as a result of this.
FAIR-EASE	
ELIXIR	We are using those developed within EOSC as a result of the workshops here: https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7463420 . Contact Mark Wilkinson for more information
BY-COVID	
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	We are not investigating specific metrics

Project or initiative	4. Do you have any suggestions to improve the (generic or discipline-specific) metrics and tools you use?
OpenAIRE	
RDA France	
GO FAIR Foundation	We are working towards a combination of FIP and FAIR assessment services to be able to assess the FAIR Enabling Resources automatically and add the resulting assessment information as nanopublications in the FIP Wizard.
FAIR-EASE	Are there any discipline specific metrics and tools for FAIR assessment. In the case of FAIR-EASE for the earth-science domain? If yes, please share with us. Can tools generically be constructed such that as input metrics can be provided that are community/domain specific (e.g. darwincore, for the biodiversity domain)?
Blue-Cloud2026	-
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	The result of the use of generic FAIR-assessment tools is that we need to use semantic artefacts in a more robust way (using URI rather than labels), find a way to link the various layers of description and search interfaces (Registry: finding services and catalogs; Services and Catalogs: finding data products; Data products linked to other products).
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways	I don't believe any automated tool can be very useful in assessing the FAIR state of a resource. This requires complex, flexible, human expert assessment, as implemented by Elixir or GBCR.
A CRIS system for Open Science and FAIR publications	
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	Please see answers to questions 1 and 3 above.

Project or initiative	4. Do you have any suggestions to improve the (generic or discipline-specific) metrics and tools you use?
PerSciDo: The French Labex Persyval-Lab (a laboratory of excellence bringing together French laboratories, aiming to promote the emergence of ambitious and internationally visible scientific projects) initiated the development of the research dataset shar	
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	Just a general caution that some automated tools are unable to interpret complex information from e.g. metadata landing pages, even if this is formatted in reasonably standardised ways, that are encountered during “recursive crawling” – thus resulting in “failed tests” although there was per se nothing wrong with the metadata provided. There needs to be a tighter and more agile dialogue between metrics developers and data producers & curators to ensure that the metrics tests can run smoothly and give accurate outcomes.
RDA TIGER	
OpenAIRE	
WorldFAIR	Our suggestion, and ultimately a recommendation coming from the project will be to prioritise understanding domain requirements through FIPs.
FAIR-EASE	
ELIXIR	Follow the recommendations being produced by https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7463420 when developing evaluation tools
BY-COVID	
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	We would appreciate automated tools able to cope with our use case

Project or initiative	5. Do the tools and metrics require further convergence? If so, why would this be useful in your community or organisation?
OpenAIRE	
RDA France	
GO FAIR Foundation	Same answer here: We are working towards a combination of FIP and FAIR assessment services to be able to assess the FAIR Enabling Resources automatically and add the resulting assessment information as nanopublications in the FIP Wizard. In addition the FIP results could inform the FAIR Assessment tools with community specific standards used.
FAIR-EASE	It would be great if evaluation score is similar for one tool to the other as currently results are very different. Furthermore, at current we are not aware of metrics for services, e.g. how can we leverage and expand, where needed, existing ontologies and vocabularies to provide harmonised machine actionable interoperable web service descriptions that provide access to data.
Blue-Cloud2026	It would be great if evaluation score is similar for one tool to the other as currently results are very different. Furthermore, at current we are not aware of metrics for services, e.g. how can we leverage and expand, where needed, existing ontologies and vocabularies to provide harmonised machine actionable interoperable web service descriptions that provide access to data.
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	Semantic interoperability between the 3 communities described in 2a requires convergence (or mapping).
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways	I don't think a one-size-fits all is useful.
A CRIS system for Open Science and FAIR publications	
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	NA

Project or initiative	5. Do the tools and metrics require further convergence? If so, why would this be useful in your community or organisation?
PerSciDo: The French Labex Persyval-Lab (a laboratory of excellence bringing together French laboratories, aiming to promote the emergence of ambitious and internationally visible scientific projects) initiated the development of the research dataset shar	To assess the visibility of a dataset based on the provided metadata: Deposits are described in an unfair manner, which can result in defects in search results, especially through an open query (SPARQL).
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	Not for the tools per se, but we would like to see more convergence of the processes used during FAIRness evaluations. We found that when external parties are using automated tools to evaluate the FAIRness of RI-operated repositories, they only tend to report overall scores, not the possible reasons behind any successes or failures. This is not helpful.
RDA TIGER	
OpenAIRE	
WorldFAIR	I'm not sure what convergence means in this context?
FAIR-EASE	
ELIXIR	See https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7463420
BY-COVID	
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	Do not have an opinion

Project or initiative	6. How is the adoption of FAIR principles being measured in your community or infrastructure?	a. Does your community or infrastructure have a form of governance around FAIR metrics, tools and assessment processes across different digital objects? Please provide any relevant links.
OpenAIRE	FAIR Assessment at the level of the OpenAIRE data sources and not at the level of the digital object.	
RDA France		
GO FAIR Foundation	via the FIP approach	Yes we are training FIP facilitators and are developing a curation pipeline in git. Once finalized we will provide a link to this governance workflow.
FAIR-EASE	By manually and qualitatively testing (meta)data on the FAIR metrics and closely following and investigating the whole process.	Using practical tests and validating using vocabularies. Nothing formal.
Blue-Cloud2026	Sofar by manually and qualitatively testing (meta)data on the FAIR related implementations and closely following and investigating the whole process.	nothing formal
Semantics in Astronomy, Planetary Sciences and Heliophysics	We only measure the IVOA registered services, hence all services are FAIR according to our metric. Not possible to assess further than this at this point.	The governance of IVOA is fully bottom-up with consensus required for any decision.
Reactome database of biomolecular pathways	Elixir and Global Biodata Core Resource are both widely recognised. CoreTrustSeal is considered relevant. This already makes three different assessment schemes, we really don't want yet another one, each of the different "stickers" require significant effort to document the same principles.	

Project or initiative	6. How is the adoption of FAIR principles being measured in your community or infrastructure?	a. Does your community or infrastructure have a form of governance around FAIR metrics, tools and assessment processes across different digital objects? Please provide any relevant links.
A CRIS system for Open Science and FAIR publications		
University of Bologna (FAIR Champion + Data Stewards)	The institution plans to develop a monitoring platform (Monitor by OpenAIRE) to assess the adoption of FAIR principles by the researchers affiliated to the University. The chosen platform will provide key indicators for specific attributes which are fundamental for FAIR management (PID, license, access rights) + composite scores measuring the total FAIRness of the considered object.	

Project or initiative	6. How is the adoption of FAIR principles being measured in your community or infrastructure?	a. Does your community or infrastructure have a form of governance around FAIR metrics, tools and assessment processes across different digital objects? Please provide any relevant links.
PerSciDo: The French Labex Persyval-Lab (a laboratory of excellence bringing together French laboratories, aiming to promote the emergence of ambitious and internationally visible scientific projects) initiated the development of the research dataset shar	Through the increasing provision of optional but valuable metadata for each new deposit on the platform.	No

Project or initiative	6. How is the adoption of FAIR principles being measured in your community or infrastructure?	a. Does your community or infrastructure have a form of governance around FAIR metrics, tools and assessment processes across different digital objects? Please provide any relevant links.
Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS)	In the framework of the recently concluded ENVRI-FAIR project, ICOS - together with ca 20 other research infrastructures in the environmental and Earth science domain – used the FAIR Implementation Profile and FAIRness Convergence matrix methods, developed by GO-FAIR, to report on which FAIR-enabling resources (FERs) that we use towards complying with the FAIR principles. This analysis, performed three times over the period 2019-2023, resulted in a detailed picture of how ICOS approaches making our data objects FAIR. The ENVRI-FAIR study is available as project deliverable D5.6, https://zenodo.org/records/8118948 .	Not sure what you are asking here. In the ENVRI Community, we have agreed on a common FAIR assessment process centered around the FAIR Implementation Profiles approach.
RDA TIGER		The WG will produce Case studies to increase adoption of (standardised) policies.
OpenAIRE	It is measured at the level of the OpenAIRE registered data sources.	
WorldFAIR	We are not aiming to 'measure' the adoption of FAIR principles, but to understand practice in detail using FIPs.	
FAIR-EASE		
ELIXIR		See https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7463420 for EOSC's approach
BY-COVID		

Project or initiative	6. How is the adoption of FAIR principles being measured in your community or infrastructure?	a. Does your community or infrastructure have a form of governance around FAIR metrics, tools and assessment processes across different digital objects? Please provide any relevant links.
Virtual Atomic and Molecular Data Centre	https://doi.org/10.1140/epjd/s10053-023-00649-x	We have a governance on data quality and openness. Not about the FAIR metrics