

# The International Journal of Digital Curation

## Volume 8, Issue 2 | 2013

### Editorial

Kevin Ashley,  
Digital Curation Centre

This edition of IJDC brings the second and final batch of 15 practice papers from IDCC13, which took place in Amsterdam in January 2013, as well as three research papers submitted directly to the journal. As I remarked in my last editorial, the practice papers are worth your attention, even if you attended that conference, since they allow the authors to explain their work in more detail than is possible in a 15 minute talk.

Eight of these papers describe work carried out under JISC's 'Managing Research Data' programme and other related funding streams in the UK. Although some of the results may be familiar to those who lead in this field, we are aware at IJDC that most research institutions in most parts of the world are still struggling with the early stages of scoping research data management services at an institutional level. We know that making work like this available to a wide audience is thus likely to bring benefits to all those involved.

[Garrett, Gramstadt and Silva](#) describe experience with defining requirements and specifying infrastructure for research data in the visual arts – a field in which the term 'data' itself is not widely recognised as being applicable. They include a useful comparison of a number of repository platforms for this particular use case. Even though your circumstances may be different, their approach is likely to be informative. In a related paper, [Guy, Donnelly and Molloy](#) describe an approach to defining 'research data' in a meaningful way for creative arts researchers and the institutions they work within. It's important to do this to allow research data services to support the greatest possible number of researchers and to identify those times when it is sensible to provide discipline-specific services. I should note that all three authors were DCC staff at the time that this paper was written.

Four more papers provide insights on different aspects of research data service implementation at university level. [Parsons](#) sets out steps taken at the University of Nottingham through the ADMIRE project, including a survey to establish requirements based on the DAF methodology, training for staff and researchers, and the creation of web content to support the services. It ends with reflection on the lessons learned so far in a paper which takes a broad view of work in one university. By contrast, [Pink](#) concentrates on one aspect of experience gained at the University of

Bath during the Research360 project. Her description of how Bath worked to reconcile differing funder requirements with ‘institutional reality’ has relevance far beyond the UK. The paper also contains a useful summary of other results of that project, including the identification of new roles for the emerging research data support service. [Wilson and Jeffreys](#) present a follow-up to the University of Oxford experiences described in a paper presented at IDCC10 (Wilson, Martinez-Urbe, Fraser and Jeffreys, 2011). It is thus a useful insight into how plans develop into service roll-out at a world-class research university and contains a good description of various service components and how different parts of the university have worked together to deliver a more joined-up service. In a related paper, [Rumsey and Jefferies](#) describe just one of those components in more detail: DataFinder, the catalogue of Oxford research data outputs. This is an excellent and concise description of the choices made at Oxford about specific issues, such as metadata for research data, and the rationale behind those decisions. It will be useful for anyone embarking on a similar exercise.

Two final papers are not about specific projects in the UK, but instead assess the situation from a national perspective. [Molloy et al.](#) describe the approach taken to identify and describe the benefits gained from JISC’s funding programmes in this area. It highlights those benefits for which evidence was already apparent, as well as describing future expected benefits for which evidence can only emerge at a later date. That division alone will help others having to undertake similar exercises, whether at institutional, regional or national level. [Pryor](#) describes the effects of the closely-related work the DCC carried out over a similar period (and which continues today) providing direct support to institutions to develop research data management capability and translating the lessons learned for others. It highlights the importance of training and also shows how high-level action, such as the Royal Society report ‘Science as an Open Enterprise’ (2012), can make the process of institutional change easier.

One more paper describes UK work not undertaken as part of the JISC programme. [Rice et al.](#) describe another university’s move from a research data policy framework to a set of delivered services, this time at the University of Edinburgh where this editor is based. It’s a useful framework for others, in particular its recognition that the roadmap for implementation is itself a dynamic plan that is expected to change as a result of its own implementation.

The remainder of the practice papers give us a more global perspective. [Schumann and Mauer](#) describe recent work to undertake a formal evaluation of a long-established social science data archive in Germany: GESIS. As well as providing a useful description of the audit process, the paper contains descriptions of the archive’s workflow and its relation to the audit process. GESIS is similar in form to many long-established research archives, being a distinct organisational entity embedded in a larger organisation on a single physical site. By contrast, [Plale et al.](#) describe a newer approach which is gaining widespread attention: a virtual repository, layered in this case over a number of institutional repositories and potentially using further services, such as cloud storage, to deal with data volumes that the repositories themselves are not designed to handle. The approach taken by SEAD described here has much potential, even if it can only be partially realised. [Oostdijk, van dem Heuvel and Treurniet](#) describe the Data Curation Service that operates as part of



