FAIR Metric FM-F1B

Mark D. Wilkinson, Susanna-Assunta Sansone,
Erik Schultes, Peter Doorn,
Luiz Olavo Bonino da Silva Santos, Michel Dumontier

January 11, 2018

FIELD	DESCRIPTION
Metric Identifier	FM-F1B: https://purl.org/fair-metrics/FM_F1B
Metric Name	Identifier persistence
To which principle does it apply?	F1
What is being measured?	Whether there is a policy that describes what the provider will do in the event an identifier scheme becomes deprecated.
Why should we measure it?	The change to an identifier scheme will have widespread implications for resource lookup, linking, and data sharing. Providers of digital resources must ensure that they have a policy to manage changes in their identifier scheme, with a specific emphasis on maintaining/redirecting previously generated identifiers.
What must be provided?	A URL that resolves to a document containing the relevant policy.
How do we measure it?	Use an HTTP GET on URL provided.
What is a valid result?	Present (a 200,202,203 or 206 HTTP response after resolving all and any prior redirects. e.g. 301 -> 302 -> 200 OK) or Absent (any other HTTP code)
For which digital resource(s) is this relevant?	All
Examples of their application across types of digital resource	for each of the 'canonical' data types, examples, if available. @todo FAIR principles (scholarly publication in Nature Scientific Data) https://www.doi.org/overview/DOI_article_ELIS3.pdf http://www.nature.com/developers/ documentation/metadata-resources/doi/ FAIR Principles (computable representation): https://github.com/FAIRDataInitiative/ FAIR-principles#fair-principles For DSA-certified repositories (example below of 3TU-Datacentre at Delft) the identifier persistence policy is described in the self assessment: https://assessment.datasealofapproval.org/ assessment_187/seal/pdf/ DOI Handbook - ensuring persistence: http://www.doi.org/doi_handbook/ 6_Policies.html#6.5}
Comments	A first version of this metric would focus on just checking a URL that resolves to a document. We can't verify that document. A second version would indicate how to structure the data policy document with a particular section (similar to how the CC licenses now have a formal structure in RDF). A third version would insist that that document and section is signed by an approved organization and made available in an appropriate repository.