

CESSDA Work Plan 2020

Widening Activities and Journals Outreach 2020

Recommendations for Services to Journals

Deliverable 4. Report on models for coordinated services to journals

Document info

Dissemination Level	PU
Due Date of Deliverable	31/12/2020
Actual Submission Date	23/04/2021
Type	Report
Approval Status	Approved by CESSDA Training Working Group Leader Irena Vipavc Brvar
Version	V1.0
Number of Pages	p.1 – p.18
DOI	10.5281/zenodo.5554441

The information in this document reflects only the author's views and CESSDA ERIC is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. The information in this document is provided "as is" without guarantee or warranty of any kind, express or implied, including but not limited to the fitness of the information for a particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at his/her sole risk and liability. This deliverable is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



Version history

Version	Date	Comment	Revised by
0.1	January 2021	Contributions of co-authors	All co-authors
0.2	March 2021	Peer review by Jindřich Krejčí	Serafeim Alvanides
0.3	April 2021	Revisions by co-authors	All co-authors
1.0	April 2021	Submission to CESSDA MO	Serafeim Alvanides

Author List

Organisation	Name	Contact information
GESIS, Germany	Serafeim Alvanides	Serafeim.Alvanides@gesis.org
ADP, Slovenia	Janez Štebe	janez.stebe@fdv.uni-lj.si
FORS, Switzerland	Emilie Morgan De Paula	emilie.morgandepaula@unil.ch
FORS, Switzerland	Brian Kleiner	brian.kleiner@fors.unil.ch
CROSSDA (FFZG), Croatia	Marijana Glavica	mglavica@ffzg.hr
CROSSDA (FFZG), Croatia	Irena Kranjec	ikranjec@ffzg.hr

Peer-review

Organisation	Name	Contact information
CSDA, Czech Republic	Jindřich Krejčí	jindrich.krejci@soc.cas.cz

Contents

Executive Summary	3
Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
1. Background	5
2. Methodology and data collection	5
3. Analysis: part A	6
4. Analysis: part B	8
5. Analysis: part C	10
6. Recommendations	11
7. Conclusion	13
Bibliography	13
Appendix A: Invitation to selected SPs	14
Appendix B: Detailed structure of focus group	15
Appendix C: Recording of focus group (restricted)	18

Executive Summary

The overall goal of the “CESSDA Widening Activities and Journal Outreach 2020” is to define and promote a collective position statement from CESSDA regarding archival services for scholarly journals. The current report constitutes the third deliverable of *Journals Outreach* subtask 4 resulting from a focus group of selected SPs. The focus group consisted of six participants from the consortium of 22 CESSDA Members (excluding CESSDA Partners). The discussion of the focus group was informed by the findings of the first two deliverables from subtask 4: a series of interviews with scientific journal editors (Alvanides et al. 2021a) and a survey of CESSDA SPs regarding their capacities to support journals (Alvanides et al. 2021b). The discussion of the group focused on the key strategic elements in going forward with SPs developing and promoting services for supporting scientific journals and the participants contributed a range of opinions and ideas, with general agreement around solid recommendations.

For example, the participants proposed a long-term strategy by CESSDA, collecting information on maximum capacities by SPs for providing services to journals and estimates of potential demand for services related to journal data archiving. This should be combined with strengthened collaboration between SPs, so that demand for journal-related services can be redistributed, where possible and appropriate, depending on SP capacities and expertise. Another important recommendation was to improve the visibility of journals in the CESSDA Data Catalogue by indicating datasets linked to specific journal articles and allowing searches of data collections related to journal articles. Overall, the participants felt that CESSDA has an important role to play in coordinating activities related to supporting journals and promoting SP services to journal editors and publishers. The recommendations from this report are feeding into the continuous development of a comprehensive strategy for journals’ outreach by CESSDA and associated SPs.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CESSDA	Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives
DANS	Data Archiving and Network Services, The Netherlands
DOI(s)	Digital Object Identifier(s)
EKKE	National Centre for Social Research, Greece
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable

FORS	Swiss Centre of Expertise in the Social Sciences, Switzerland
GESIS	Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Germany
RDM	Research Data Management
SND	Swedish National Data Service, Sweden
SP(s)	Service Provider(s)
TARKI	The Tárki Data Archive, Hungary

1. Background

The overall goal of the *Journals Outreach* subtask 4 is to define and promote a collective position statement for CESSDA regarding data sharing services offered to journals. The first report (Alvanides et al. 2021a) provided a better understanding of journal practices, requirements and needs regarding timely and reader-friendly accessibility of data used in scholarly publications. The second report (Alvanides et al. 2021b) provided an assessment of CESSDA SP's capacities, policies, and services for responding to the needs of journals with respect to sharing and medium/long term preservation of data and related materials (such as related publications, instruments, documentation, code for analysis etc.).

The current report constitutes the third deliverable of *Journals Outreach* subtask 4 resulting from an online focus group of selected SPs, who agreed to be contacted when responding to a survey related to the capacities of SPs, as reported by Alvanides et al. (2021b). The methodology used for primary data collection is presented, followed by a summary of the focus group discussion in three parts and concluding with recommendations from the focus group that will inform future activities related to *Journals Outreach*.

2. Methodology and data collection

In order to achieve the objective of the third deliverable, a focus group was organised and conducted, inviting selected participants from the current consortium of 22 CESSDA Members (excluding CESSDA Partners). The invitation was emailed to nine CESSDA SPs who indicated in the survey "Assessment of Service Provider Capacities" conducted in August-September 2020 that they can be contacted for a follow-up (Appendix A). Six of the SPs invited to participate agreed to join the focus group which was conducted in early December 2020 with the use of zoom. The planned structure of the 90-minute focus group was informed by the findings of the previous two activities: the interviews of journal editors (Alvanides et al. 2021a) and the survey of SPs regarding their capacities to support scientific journals (Alvanides et al. 2021b). The emphasis of the focus group was to identify and discuss key elements of moving forward with the strategy of CESSDA SPs supporting scientific journals with current and future services (Appendix B).

The discussion topics of the focus group communicated to the panel were:

- capacity building for SPs with respect to handling replication data and materials;
- technical and resource needs of SPs for engaging with journals;
- how to conduct pilot collaborations with journals;
- and how SPs can coordinate efforts to provide services to journals.

The culmination of the discussion was to anticipate what might be expected of SPs regarding services to journals, what CESSDA can do to support SPs (e.g., trainings,

promotion), and how CESSDA can communicate its message to journals that CESSDA SPs are a good solution for them.

In addition to the *Journals Outreach* team members who acted as observers, self-selected participants from six of the nine SPs that were originally invited took part in the focus group: DANS, EKKE, FORS, GESIS, SND, and TARKI. The participants were representatives of SPs with a good understanding of the topics to be discussed. The six participants had been given access to two documents related to *Journals Outreach*: the report from the interviews of journal editors (Alvanides et al. 2021a) and the report presenting the results of the survey of SPs regarding their capacities to support scientific journals (Alvanides et al. 2021b). The focus group was conducted on Friday December 4th, 2020, lasted 90 minutes in total, and was divided into three parts (Appendix B). For all 3 parts, a short introduction was given by the focus group facilitator, followed by open discussion on reflections and views. The recordings of the three parts were subsequently analysed by different members of the team, and the key points of the discussion are presented below.

3. Analysis: part A

The first part of the focus group was concerned with the views of the interviewed journal editors, as reported in Deliverable 1. In particular, the interviewed editors had expressed three “realistic requests” that the focus group reflected upon:

1. Support with designing comprehensive, thorough, and clear data sharing policies, suitable for the social sciences, also in relation to national and European contexts, recognising the complexity and special nature of social science data (especially issues surrounding qualitative data).
2. Support offered to authors for handling the data archiving process, including creation of well-organised and thorough metadata, contextual information, and replication files for the replicability of research and the potential of national/international comparisons.
3. Research Data Management (RDM) training for authors and researchers in all aspects of data collection that is suitable for archiving and sharing: informed consent for longer term storage and sharing of data, methods for anonymization, understanding metadata, obtaining DOIs, controlling distribution, use of data access from secure settings (such as secure data rooms) and appropriate acknowledgement/citation of data.

Reflecting upon these statements, participating SP representatives appreciated the willingness of editors to collaborate with SPs and secondly the request by editors for provision of RDM training by SPs. The reassuring feeling of potential for future collaboration was justified by the fact that all the journal editors interviewed were aware of their national

archives and SPs and to some extent of CESSDA. In fact, as one of the focus group participants observed, the journal editors were expressing these requests from two perspectives: as researchers/authors themselves (e.g. having made available their own data to archives) and also in their role as editors (thus anticipating a certain level of data management skills by authors submitting articles to their journals). As one of the participants pointed out, it was not very surprising that editors expected SPs to deliver RDM training, because this would potentially result in a lower workload for the editors, when handling datasets alongside the submitted articles.

The issue of social sciences consisting of different sub-disciplines and producing different types of data was also highlighted, especially in relation to qualitative data. This reflected concerns from editors on anonymisation and availability of qualitative data and potential legal issues that may arise. This aspect was also discussed in the context of authors unwilling to share data, especially complex datasets, because they are concerned about not archiving them properly (e.g. in relation to anonymisation), or having undertaken problematic analyses that may be identified by other researchers analysing the same data. However, most of the focus group participants observed that the tide is definitely turning, compared to a few years ago, with editors and journals being increasingly interested in open data practices and policies.

The discussion then moved to observing that many researchers and editors may not be aware of the additional value-added services of extended data curation provided by SPs, such as checking validity, making sure datasets are anonymized, long-term preservation, providing DOIs, etc. In effect, researchers/authors and journal editors would like to have the best from both worlds: simplicity of archiving/retrieving data, as well as the essential checks for data validity/compliance. These services are already offered by CESSDA SPs and are invaluable in supporting researchers and editors, making a major difference in relation to SP "competitors", such as commercial generalist repositories etc. It was pointed out and agreed by all participants, that these value-added services should be emphasised more and promoted both by SPs and by CESSDA.

This led to some discussion around CESSDA's role in promoting services to journals and how "enthusiastic" this promotion should be. The consensus was that the past few years have seen increasing demand by social science journals for data availability policies, and that CESSDA should have a major role in furthering this trend by reaching out to journal publishers and editors with professional advice regarding the establishment of data sharing policies, especially those of national/local journals by smaller publishers. However, CESSDA should also be pragmatic about what CESSDA itself and SPs can actually offer to journals. Possibly the most important support currently is on specific aspects, such as DOI provision for datasets, standards for data referencing, lists of recommended repositories with capabilities, and profiles visible for the journals' contributors to choose from. These can be drafted and provided by CESSDA as simple "guidelines for depositing data" so that they are

made available on social science journal websites, alongside the article submission guidelines.

4. Analysis: part B

The second part of the focus group was concerned with the findings of the survey assessing the SP capacities for supporting scientific journals (Alvanides et al. 2021b). In particular, the report highlighted three “major findings” that the focus group reflected upon:

1. Archives are well represented in repository registries (mostly with Re3ata), and fully developed in offering long-term curated data collections, quality control, personalised expert curation support, and links to publications. Also, training on data management planning and promotional activities and material related to data usage: this forms the core of the SPs’ mission, and they can benefit journals and authors (mostly of established social surveys). There exists a general shortage of *replication support services*.
2. Current services and activities of SPs influence the way they perceive the needs of journals and researchers who support open data practices. SPs ranked highly what the archives already offer, e.g. long-term curation of data collections, PID and versioning of datasets, data usage information, citations tracking and links to publications. However, journal editors almost take these services for granted. There is scope therefore for SPs (and potentially for CESSDA’s role) to promote these services to journal editors and publishers, as expectations are gradually moving further in terms of what constitutes open science. Both SPs and editors highlighted *limitations with financial and technical resources in order to fully implement the data sharing and replicability policies envisaged*. This situation leaves a void, but also an opportunity for fruitful collaboration between the interested parties.
3. Positive attitudes in the responses on offering data sharing and replicability services in collaboration with publishers and journals. A majority of the SPs do accept data and associated materials linked to journal articles, although only half of them have already received such deposits related to journal articles. Most of those accepting data linked to journal articles *do not face major technical or policy issues and have plans for expanding their services, which sets a positive precedent for the other archives*.

The discussion started with highlighting the important role of journals in developing and providing comprehensive *data policies* so that the editors, authors, and SPs are all clear about procedures and expectations. It was also pointed out that current “practice” of smaller publishers/journals is that editors simply copy a data policy from another journal that may have certain flaws that render it inappropriate for their specific journal, for example by imposing restrictions that may hinder data archiving/sharing, or requesting unnecessary

restricted licenses (where users need to request explicit access to the data), thus resulting in higher workload for SPs and lower reuse of the data. It was also mentioned that in some cases researchers contact SPs with a specific journal's data policy in hand, where it is difficult to interpret its requirements or how it adheres to FAIR and trusted principles.

There was consensus that CESSDA should be in a good position to support the drafting of clear data policies for journals, reflecting the capacities and services of SPs so as to facilitate understanding and provide a common ground with the journals and their editors. It should be relatively straightforward to develop guidelines that explain what elements a data policy should include in the form of "modules" that journals can then reuse and adapt. It is also essential to explain the implications and consequences of such choices for authors sharing the data and what other researchers can do with the obtained data. CESSDA would provide a valuable service by developing and promoting such guidelines, while more complicated technical solutions, such as replication services offered by SPs, can build upon the solid foundation of clear data policies.

The discussion moved on to focus on SP capacities, in particular "quantitative" evidence of resource-intensive archiving services, such as data curation and data management. If CESSDA develops guidelines for data policies and supports journals in developing their data policies with the view of increasing data deposits to SPs, it is important to know if SPs do have the capacity to cope with the ever-increasing number of article submissions and associated datasets for archiving/sharing. If the development and uptake of even more demanding replication services is also considered, then the resource implications to SPs are very considerable. The participants proposed a long-term strategy by CESSDA, collecting information on maximum capacities by SPs for providing services to journals and estimates of potential demand for services related to journal data archiving. This should be combined with strengthened collaboration between SPs, so that demand for journal-related services can be redistributed, where possible and appropriate, depending on SP capacities and expertise.

Currently, SPs adopt different strategies when dealing with data submissions related to journal articles. For example, SND identifies datasets related to published articles for a "lighter" level of curation and exclusion from the official data catalogue. DANS established in 2016 the *Research Data Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences*¹ (currently published by Brill scholarly publishers), demonstrating how data and articles could be connected, while the data can be published in any trustworthy repository. However, it was pointed out for this journal that, in addition to peer review for the short articles, there is also a process of data review, which can be quite demanding. The data review in that case mainly relies on the data repository selection and appraisal procedures based on collection policies, which can also be seen as one of the added value services of SPs. The discussion closed with

¹ Research Data Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences *Instructions for Authors*: https://brill.com/fileasset/downloads_products/Author_Instructions/RDJ.pdf [21 April 2021]

reflections on the potential for SPs for offering different services, such as “Archiving Basic” and “Archiving Plus” by GESIS², in order to meet the demand for a simpler, self-archiving type of data sharing in cases when data do not meet the highest selection and appraisal criteria.

5. Analysis: part C

The final part of the focus group was concerned with exploring the role of CESSDA in leading a strategy for collaboration with journals and publishers. The discussion centred around three findings from the editor interviews (Alvanides et al. 2021a) and survey of SPs (Alvanides et al. 2021b), summarised here:

1. The interviewed editors were aware of their national SPs and had already communicated with them in order to resolve queries about data sharing, implement data policies for the journals or revise their policies with the view of recommending the national SPs for their journals. They were slightly less aware of CESSDA, but most of them agreed that coordination of data sharing at the European level could resolve some of the issues raised.
2. The majority of SPs responded positively and highlighted the CESSDA “brand” and expertise as driving forces for involvement. The survey respondents also listed various benefits of collaboration in relation to knowledge exchange, good practice and economies of scale, acknowledging the importance of expertise to be shared amongst CESSDA members.
3. SPs pointed out the opportunity cost from CESSDA not coordinating this action and the fact that the current void will be quickly filled by the journal publishers themselves, at the risk of not involving the national archives. This was also a concern raised by the journal editors in their interviews (Alvanides et al. 2021a), in relation to the understanding of policies on data protection, storage and sharing at the national and European levels.

The discussion of part C started with a closing comment from part B related to SPs meeting journal/publisher criteria for their inclusion in lists of recognised repositories, such as Nature’s *Scientific Data*³. Given that some CESSDA SPs are already listed as “recommended” data repositories⁴, there is an opportunity for exchange of experiences, and an evident role

² GESIS *Service packages for preserving data*:

<https://www.gesis.org/en/data-services/our-service-packages/our-service-packages-for-preserving-your-data> [21 April 2021]

³ Nature *Scientific Data Repository criteria*:

<https://www.nature.com/sdata/policies/data-policies#repo-criteria> [21 April 2021]

⁴ Nature *Scientific Data Recommended data repositories*:

<https://www.nature.com/sdata/policies/repositories> [21 April 2021]

for CESSDA to coordinate and support SPs towards their inclusion in such lists. The importance of the CESSDA “umbrella” was reiterated for overcoming challenges of smaller SPs seeking inclusion in journal lists of recommended repositories.

This thread led the discussion to observations related to SP resources, capacities, and potential redistribution of demand related to journals. Examples mentioned were reallocation to other SPs if a contacted SP has limited capacity or does not offer a service, requirements by national funding bodies or researcher institutions to deposit data with specific SPs vis-à-vis recommended repositories by journals, and the role of CESSDA in coordinating such actions. One suggestion that could resolve some of these issues was to improve the visibility of the journal titles in the CESSDA Data Catalogue⁵ by indicating datasets linked to journal articles and allowing searches of data collections related to journal articles. One suggestion was to create a unified common layer for publication-related features at the CESSDA level that could make the catalogue more appealing to international journal editors and publishers. On the other hand, it was mentioned that local journals and smaller publishers may prefer to work more closely with national SPs where they may have personal contacts. In any case, the CESSDA Data Catalogue was considered a good way forward for indicating links between deposited datasets and linked publications.

The discussion concluded with reflections on replication services and a general agreement that the amount of time and resources necessary for such services should not be underestimated by SPs. For those planning or currently developing replication services, it is best to start with journals and editors that they already collaborate with, and to share the accumulated knowledge and good practice amongst CESSDA SPs, for example by contributing a chapter on replication services to the CESSDA *Data Archiving Guide*.

6. Recommendations

The recommendations from the focus group are summarised below in the three parts discussed earlier.

Key recommendations from Part A:

- Consider significant differences between SPs in terms of capacity, specialization etc.
- Qualitative data: not all SPs have capacity for all types of data, and CESSDA could coordinate this.
- Some journals, especially local ones, are not aware of existing services and knowledge: there is a need to reach out and familiarize them with activities and services by SPs and CESSDA.
- Editors/publishers have been increasingly interested in open data policies for their journals and a number have approached SPs for advice; CESSDA can play an important role in coordinating this action.

⁵ CESSDA Data Catalogue: <https://datacatalogue.cessda.eu> [21 April 2021]

- SPs believe that scientific journals do not necessarily expect extensive RDM training courses, but they would welcome support in developing pragmatic guidelines for data sharing.
- Need to highlight and promote the importance of additional data checks undertaken by SPs prior to archiving.
- Advertise list of recommended SPs with services/capacities for journal contributors.

Key recommendations from Part B:

- The most promising area of collaboration with journals is support for developing sound data policies, where SPs' expertise and services can be elaborated, starting with services already provided by most SPs, such as data and metadata checking, DOI allocation and medium/long term data archiving.
- Identify areas where agreement on harmonisation of CESSDA policies and services could benefit the attractiveness of those for journals. Explore the data collection policies, data access policies (licences, access regimes), etc.
- Assess throughput capacities of SPs and design a manageable strategy for supporting data archiving of articles published in scientific journals (e.g. with different processing levels based on assessment of the data deposited).
- Collaboration with journals/publishers for replication services would be very useful but time consuming for SPs with limited resources. One way forward is to share the load by redirecting demand for specific services to those SPs who already offer them.
- Consider the distinction of "project data" from "journal article data". The workflow for journal data can be less demanding and supported by self-archiving services already offered by SPs, without long-term curation offered.

Key recommendations Part C:

- Review CESSDA SP services with the aim of harmonising elements of FAIR and Trusted repository criteria of journals, so that SPs can be acknowledged by journals/publishers.
- A unified and concerted approach from CESSDA would help to address capacity and distribution challenges when considering capacity of SPs with respect to handling journal data and additional services to journals.
- Need to adopt a pragmatic approach towards journal services. For example, it may be adequate to support journals with their data policies and have CESSDA SPs listed in publisher and journal recommended repositories.
- Improve the visibility of the journal titles in the CESSDA Data Catalogue by indicating datasets linked to journal articles and allowing searches of data collections related to journal articles. For example, create a unified common layer for publication-related features at the CESSDA level that could make the catalogue more appealing to international journal editors and publishers.

7. Conclusion

The activity presented in this report aimed to identify important services that can be offered by CESSDA SPs to scientific journals so as to increase the visibility of CESSDA overall and its services in the social sciences community. Overall, the focus group was encouraging of CESSDA taking a more active role in coordinating activities and supporting the development and promotion of services for scientific journals. The focus group participants contributed a range of opinions and ideas, with general agreement around some recommendations. In particular, they proposed a long-term strategy by CESSDA for collecting regular information on capacities by SPs providing services to journals, alongside estimates of potential demand for services related to journal data archiving. Combined with strengthened collaboration between SPs this will result in redistribution of journal-related services, where possible and appropriate, depending on SP capacities and expertise. In addition, improving the visibility of journals in the CESSDA Data Catalogue by indicating datasets linked to specific journal articles and allowing searches of data collections related to journal articles is expected to improve the findability of data related to published articles. Overall, the focus group participants felt that CESSDA has an important role to play in coordinating activities related to supporting journals and promoting SP services to journal editors and publishers. The results of the focus group and recommendations presented here are feeding into the continuous development of a comprehensive strategy for journals' outreach by CESSDA and associated SPs.

Bibliography

- Alvanides, S., Štebe, J., De Paola, E., M., Kleiner, B., Hegedus, P., Glavica, M. and Kranjec, I., 2021a. Assessment of Journal Requirements and Needs. CESSDA Work Plan 2020, Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives, Norway DOI: 105281/zenodo.5554436
- Alvanides, S., Štebe, J., De Paola, E., M., Kleiner, B., Hegedus, P., Glavica, M. and Kranjec, I., 2021b. Assessment of Service Provider Capacities. CESSDA Work Plan 2020, Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives, Norway DOI: 105281/zenodo.5554432
- Štebe, J., Dolinar, M., Bezjak, S. and Inkret, A., 2020. Implementing the RDA Research Data Policy Framework in Slovenian Scientific Journals. *Data Science Journal*, 19(1), p.49. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-049>

Appendix A: Invitation to selected SPs

Subject: CESSDA Journals Outreach Discussion Panel (online) - Please state availability

Dear CESSDA colleagues,

Thank you participating to the "CESSDA Journals Outreach" survey regarding archival services for journals in the context of the current CESSDA-journals outreach project. For the last phase of this year's project, we are seeking interested CESSDA SP participants for a 90-minute informal online discussion panel to talk about key strategic elements in going forward.

The topics have been informed by the survey you completed and will include:

- capacity building for SPs with respect to handling replication data and materials;
- technical and resource needs of SPs for engaging with journals;
- how to conduct pilot collaborations with journals;
- and how SPs can coordinate efforts to provide services to journals.

Discussion of the latter could address what might be expected of SPs regarding services to journals, what CESSDA can do to support SPs (e.g., trainings, promotion), and how we can get our message out to journals that CESSDA SPs are a good solution for them. Since you expressed interest and openness to exchanging further on these issues, we now would like to ask you to participate in this discussion panel. Having your ideas and the perspective of your particular SP would be very valuable for moving forward within CESSDA on this front. The session will last 90 minutes.

Best regards,
Serafeim Alvanides
and the CESSDA journals outreach team

Appendix B: Detailed structure of focus group

Information provided to Focus Group participants

Alvanides, S., Štebe, J., De Paola, E., M., Kleiner, B., Hegedus, P., Glavica, M. and Kranjek, I., 2021a. Assessment of Journal Requirements and Needs. CESSDA Work Plan 2020, Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives, Norway DOI: 105281/zenodo.5554436

Alvanides, S., Štebe, J., De Paola, E., M., Kleiner, B., Hegedus, P., Glavica, M. and Kranjek, I., 2021b. CESSDA Work Plan 2020, Consortium of European Social Science Data Archives, Norway DOI: 105281/zenodo.5554432

15:00 Welcome and request for consent to record the session. The recording will remain with the CESSDA Journals Outreach 2020 team (*confirm if OK to share with the 2021-22 team?*)

15:05 Short introductions for the record (*participants and observers*)

15:10 Quick clarification to any queries regarding D1 and D2 (*reports provided to participants*)

15:20 Part A: Reflections on “3 realistic requests” from interviewed editors (*see Deliverable 1*)

1. Support with designing comprehensive, thorough and clear **data sharing policies**, suitable for the social sciences, also in relation to national and European contexts, recognising the complexity and special nature of social science data (esp. qualitative data)
2. Support offered to authors for handling **the data archiving process**, including creation of well-organised and thorough metadata, contextual information, and replication files for the replicability of research and the potential of national/international comparisons (*consider pros and cons of some editors praised the simplicity of platforms such as Harvard Dataverse*)
3. Research Data Management (**RDM training**) for authors and researchers in all aspects of data collection that is suitable for archiving and sharing: informed consent for longer term storage and sharing of data, methods for anonymization, understanding metadata, obtaining DOIs, controlling distribution, use of SDCs, appropriate acknowledgement/citation of data.

15:40 Part B: Reflections on “3 major findings” from surveyed SPs (*see Deliverable 2*)

4. Archives are well represented in repository registries (mostly with Re3ata), and fully developed in offering long-term curated data collections, quality control, personalised expert curation support and links to publications. Also, training on data management planning and promotional activities and material related to data usage: core of the SPs’

mission and they can benefit journals and authors (mostly of established social surveys). **However, there is a general shortage of replication support services.**

5. Current services and activities of SPs influence the way they perceive the needs of journals and researchers who support open data practices. SPs ranked highly what the archives already offer, e.g. long-term curation of data collections, PID and versioning of datasets, data usage information, citations tracking and links to publications. **However, journal editors almost take these services for granted.** There is scope therefore for SPs (and potentially for CESSDA's role) **to promote these services** to journal editors and publishers, as expectations are gradually moving further in terms of what constitutes open science (e.g. new types of data, diverse datasets, sensitive data that require controlled or restricted access and potentially size limits for larger datasets). Both SPs and editors highlighted **limitations with financial and technical resources** in order to fully implement the data sharing and replicability policies envisaged. This situation leaves a void, but also an opportunity for fruitful collaboration between the interested parties.
6. General positive attitude in the responses on offering data sharing and replicability services in collaboration with publishers and journals. Majority of the SPs do accept data and associated materials linked to journal articles, although only half of them have already received such deposits from authors linking directly to published journal articles. Most of those accepting data linked to journal articles **do not face major technical or policy issues and have plans for expanding** their services, which sets a positive precedent for the other archives.

16:00 Part C: The role of CESSDA (see Deliverables 1 and 2)

1. D1: Interviewed editors were aware of their national SPs and had already communicated with them in order to resolve queries about data sharing, implement data policies for the journals or revise their policies with the view of recommending the national SPs for their journals. However, they were less aware of CESSDA, but most of them agreed that **coordination of data sharing at the European level** could resolve a number of issues raised.
2. D2: The majority of SPs responded positively and highlighted the CESSDA "brand" and expertise as driving forces for involvement. The respondents also listed various benefits of **collaboration in relation to knowledge exchange, good practice and economies of scale**, acknowledging the importance of expertise to be shared amongst CESSDA members.
3. D1+D2: SPs pointed out the **opportunity cost** from CESSDA not coordinating this action and the fact that the current void will be quickly filled by the journal publishers themselves, at the risk of not involving the national archives. This was also a concern raised by the editors in D1, in relation to the understanding of policies on data protection, storage and sharing at the national and European levels.

16:15 Wrap up: anything we have not covered from the intended objectives?

The topics have been informed by the survey you completed and will include:

- *capacity building for SPs with respect to handling replication data and materials;*
- *technical and resource needs of SPs for engaging with journals;*
- *how to conduct pilot collaborations with journals;*
- *and how SPs can coordinate efforts to provide services to journals.*

16:25 Thank you and closure. Confirm consent for recording the session.

Appendix C: Recording of focus group (*restricted*)

Recording accessible in secure environment upon request.