

OPEN RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT PLAN ASSESSMENT GRID

1. DATA SUMMARY	
1. DATA SUMMARY 1.a Is header information provided (action ID, acronym, DMP)	version name of the DMP
responsible)?	Yes □ Some □ No □
1.b Are the purpose of the data collection, its relation to project utility outlined (to whom will the data be useful)?	t objectives explained? Is data Yes □ Some □ No □
1.c Are data types and formats specified?	Yes \square Some \square No \square
1.d Is the expected volume of the data estimated?	Yes \square Some \square No \square
1.e Is data reuse described including origin of data?	Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:	
2. FAIR DATA	
2.1. Making data findable, including, provisions for metada	ta
2.1.a Is data discoverability described, including role of metada	ata? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.1.b Are data identification and naming conventions described	1? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.1.c Are metadata standards and conventions described?	Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.1.d Will the data be searchable?	Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:	

2.2. Making data openly accessible
2.2.a Are open access to the data and reasons for access restrictions (if any) described? Are there instructions on how to gain access to restricted data? Yes □ Some □ No □
2.2.b Is it described where (e.g. repository) and how (e.g. methods and software) the data can be accessed? Is relevant documentation mentioned? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.2.c Is it specified where the data and associated metadata, documentation and code are deposited? Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:
2.3. Making data interoperable
2.3.a Is it described how data interoperability will be facilitated, e.g. through use of data and metadata vocabularies, standards or methodologies? Yes □ Some □ No □
2.3.b Is inter-disciplinary interoperability facilitated, e.g. by using standard vocabularies for all data types? Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:
2.4. Increase data re-use (through clarifying licences)
2.3.a Is data licensing described including impact on data reuse? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.3.b Are there clear justifications for licence restrictions, e.g. reuse by third parties, periods of restricted use? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.3.c Are data quality assurance processes described? Yes \square Some \square No \square
2.3.d Is it specified for how long will the data remain re-usable? Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:
3. ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES
3.a Are the costs for data management estimated? Yes \square Some \square No \square
3.b Are data management responsibilities identified Yes \square Some \square No \square
3.c Are the costs and potential value of long term preservation described? Are procedures to decide what data will be kept and for how long outlined? Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:

4. DATA SECURITY
4.a Are procedures for data recovery as well as secure storage and transfer of sensitive data specified? Yes □ Some □ No □
Recommendations:
5. ETHICAL ASPECTS
5.a Are there references to the relevant ethics aspects described in the GA or ethics
deliverables? Is complementary information provided, e.g. on consent for preservation and sharing of personal data as well as data anonymisation? Yes Some No
,
Recommendations:
6. OTHER
6.a Are other relevant data management, data sharing and data security policies described (e.g.
national, institutional or research field specific policies)? Yes \square Some \square No \square
Recommendations:

Overall comments:
Date of submission to the project coordinator:
Deadline for the next version of the data management plan:
Signed Project Officer: