

| FAIR self assessment for project: TD31 Macroalgal Essential Ocean Variable (EOV) data processing and workflow | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Completed 07/11/2019 | | | | | | |
| Questions for each FAIR component ↓ | Answer options: Increasingly FAIR --> | | | | | |
| FINDABLE | | | | | | |
| Q1 | Does the dataset have any identifiers assigned? | No identifier | Local identifier | Web address (URL) | Globally unique, citable and persistent identifier (e.g. DOI, PURL, or Handle) | |
| A1 | Start of project | No identifier | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q2 | Is the identifier included in all metadata records or metadata files describing the data? | | | | | |
| A2 | Start of project | No | Yes | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q3 | Is the data described by a metadata record? | The data is not described | Brief title and description | Brief title and description, and multiple other fields filled out, albeit briefly. | Comprehensively (a min metadata template will be provided) using a formal machine-readable metadata schema. | |
| A3 | Start of project | no | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q4 | What type of repository or registry is the metadata record in? | The data is not described in any registry or repository | Local institutional repository | Domain-specific repository | Generalist public repository | Data is in one place but discoverable through several places (i.e. other registries, RDA, Google Data Search) |
| A4 | Start of project | no | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| ACCESSIBLE | | | | | | |
| Q5 | How accessible is the data? Note: The access method (s) must be explicitly stated in the metadata record, e.g. if any authentication is needed, or there are any restrictions to access. | No metadata record | Access to metadata only | | Embargoed access after a specified date; or A deidentified version of the data is publicly accessible | Fully accessible public, or to persons who meet and follow explicitly stated conditions and processes, e.g. ethics approval for sensitive data |
| A5 | Start of project | | | Unspecified access conditions e.g. "contact the data custodian to discuss access" | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q6 | Is the data available online without requiring specialised protocols or tools once access has been approved? | No access to data | By individual arrangement | File download from online location | Non-standard web service (e.g. OpenAPI/Swagger/informal API) | Standard web service API (e.g. OGC) |
| A6 | Start of project | No access to data | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q7 | Does the repository/registry agree to maintain the persistence of the metadata record, even if the data product is no longer available? | No (or not applicable, if no metadata record exists) | Unsure | | | |
| A7 | Start of project | | | Yes | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| INTEROPERABLE | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Q8 | Are the data available in (an) open (file) format(s)? | Data are mostly available only in a proprietary format | Data are available in an open format | | | |
| A8 | Start of project | | | Data are available in an open, documented, widely-used standard format (i.e. NetCDF, CSV, JSON, XML, etc) | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q9 | Are the data is machine readable? | The data are unstructured | | | | |
| A9 | Start of project | | The data are structured and machine-readable (i.e. csv, JSON, XML, RDF, database files, etc) | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q10 | What best describes the types of vocabularies/ontologies/tagging schemas used to define the data elements? | Data elements are not described (i.e. fields or objects are labelled with codes or not at all) | Data elements are described (so that a human user can correctly interpret the data), but no standards have been used in the description | | Published vocabularies using resolvable identifiers linking to explanations are used, so that the data can be read and understood by machines as well as humans. | Published vocabularies using persistent resolvable identifiers linking to explanations are used, so that the data can be read and understood by machines as well as humans. |
| A10 | Start of project | | | Recognised standards have been used in the description of data elements, but no published vocabularies with resolvable URIs are used | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q11 | How is the relationship to other data and resources (e.g. related datasets, services, publications, etc) described in the metadata, to provide context around the data? | | The metadata record includes URI links to related metadata, data and definitions | Qualified links to other resources are recorded in a machine readable format, e.g. a linked data format such as RDF | | |
| A11 | Start of project | There are no links to other metadata or data | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| REUSABLE | | | | | | |
| Q12 | Which of the following best describes the license (usage rights) attached to the data? | | Non-standard license applied, without a license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record | Non-standard license applied, WITH the license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record | Standard license applied (e.g. Creative Commons), without a license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record | Standard license applied (e.g. Creative Commons), WITH the license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record |
| A12 | Start of project | No license is applied | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |
| Q13 | How much provenance information has been captured to facilitate data reuse? i.e. project objectives, data generation/collection (including from external sources) and processing workflows. | | Partially recorded | Comprehensively recorded in a text format (i.e. TXT or PDF) | Comprehensively recorded in a machine readable format (i.e. in metadata record's schema or PROV, or in RDF, JSON, NetCDF, XML, etc) | |
| A13 | Start of project | No provenance information is recorded | | | | |
| | End of project | | | | | |
| | Two years time | | | | | |