# 1st LEARN Workshop, Embedding Research Data as part of the research cycle
# London, 29th January 2016

## Paul Ayris, UCL (University College London)

**LEaders Activating Research Networks** aims to identify Best Practice in policy and the implementation of secure research data management practices in research organisations.

The 1st LEARN Workshop in London attracted 83 attenders, who broke into four Groups in the afternoon sessions to consider a series of question prepared by the LEARN Team, and other questions (agreed by the Chair of each Breakout Group) which arose in the course of discussion. Separate Reports from each of the Breakout Groups have been prepared, but this Summary Report attempts to pull together the main strands of discussion.

### Leadership

The Breakout Groups spent much time in discussing Barriers and Drivers. Chief among these were leadership (or lack of it), the need for discipline-specific approaches and skills development (or the current lack of it). The lack of leadership was seen as a critical factor by many. One European country reported that none of its universities had a Research Data Management Policy. Another European country reported that leadership had been asserted by a regional consortium which was advocating for action at university level.

### Skills Development

The importance of Skills Development was emphasised by practically every group. There was a general consensus that starting with early career researchers was a good place, as researchers early in their research careers are tomorrow's senior researchers. Events such as the LERU (League of European Research Universities) Doctoral Summer School were highlighted as models of good practice and the 2016 LERU Summer School in Leiden is on the topic of research data management.

### Drivers for changed researcher behaviour

There seemed to be consensus amongst the groups that selling the benefits of research data management was key to getting researchers to embrace change. One group identified three sets of drivers: external drivers (such as funders); internal drivers (the needs and wishes of researchers themselves) and institutional drivers (such as compliance with institutional policies). In terms of selling the benefits of well-founded research data management and open data, one group suggested that the most important issue for researchers was the visibility of their data outputs and its correct citation. Another group highlighted incentives such as Awards and Prizes for incentivizing researchers. It was interesting that no group suggested that higher salaries as a reward *per se* would break down barriers to sharing data.

### Open Data

Where the groups discussed the question, there was consensus that not all data could be open; and indeed that some research disciplines would find it a challenge to make their data open for sharing and re-use because such sharing was not part of their traditional research culture. It was agreed that one size would not fit all, and that there were sensitivities around disciplinary practice which were a significant barrier to open data. There was a need to describe what 'open' in the phrase 'open data'

actually means; and indeed not all research areas yet recognise that they even produce or use data. So there is a need to define 'research data' more precisely.

**Legal Issues**

One group spent time on looking at the legal issues around sharing data. Participants discussed the use of licenses and general legal issues. Particular attention was paid to the notion of agreements which could support the sharing of data, as well as templates which could help establish a legal framework for the sharing of data. One European University has already introduced a "data access committee" to address this topic. Since this committee was created following the request of a commercial publisher, this information led to the question "Who controls the data publication processes?" The agreement was that researchers and institutions should take responsibility, instead of leaving it to third parties. Interestingly, the group looked to licences and agreements as the way forward rather than The Hague Declaration,[1] which stresses that data should not be subject to copyright restrictions.

**Costs**

LEARN is not primarily a project looking at financial issues, but nearly all the groups highlighted that lack of clarity on the costs of research data management were a handicap. A number of suggestions were made as to how the issue of costs could be tackled in the final LEARN Report. One was to work with a university to devise a costing model which would result in funds being transferred from project grants or central university resources to a research data management fund. This fund could support a basic layer of infrastructure and service which research organisations could reasonably be expected to provide, although some thought that an alternative model would be for a subject community or funder to provide such infrastructure and services. A second suggestion was for LEARN to work with a research funder to agree a model for costing research data management storage and archiving and to see if this model could be inserted into the funder's grant application process.

Paul Ayris

23.2.16

---

[1] See http://thehaguedeclaration.com/.