
title:
“The
Re-
searcher

Pass-
port:
A
Digi-
tal
Cre-
den-
tial
to
Im-
prove
Re-
stricted
Data
Ac-
cess”
au-
thor:

-
name:
Mar-
garet
C.
Lev-
en-
stein
affili-
a-
tion:
Inter-
University
Con-
sor-
tium
for
Po-
liti-
cal
and
So-
cial
Re-
search
email:
ju-
lia.lane@nyu.edu

```
date:
2019
cross-
refYaml:
“./pandoc-
crossref-
settings.yaml”
```

```
...
Problem
State-
ment
```

```
=====
```

In
the
last
two
decades,
re-
search
data
repos-
ito-
ries
joined
li-
braries
and
archives
in
pro-
mot-
ing
ac-
cess
to
and
use
of
data
by
mak-
ing it
avail-
able
di-
rectly
on
the
in-
ter-
net.
While
this
led
to a
radi-
cal
ex-
pan-
sion
in
the
avail-

The
ac-
cess
chal-
lenge
is
mag-
ni-
fied
when
re-
searchers
re-
quire
data
sets
from
mul-
tiple
data
repos-
ito-
ries,
each
of
which
has
its
own
ac-
cess
re-
quire-
ments.
There
is of-
ten
in-
con-
sis-
tency
be-
tween
data
cus-
todi-
ans
in
the
in-
for-

To
bet-
ter
un-
der-
stand
this
chal-
lenge,
the
Inter-
university
Con-
sor-
tium
for
Po-
liti-
cal
and
So-
cial
Re-
search
(ICPSR)
con-
ducted
a
year-
long
study
of 23
re-
stricted
data
repos-
ito-
ries
around
the
world.
The
envi-
ron-
men-
tal
scan
and
in-
ter-
views

-

User
veri-
fica-
tion -
Train-
ing
re-
quire-
ments

-

Terminology

For each of these areas, no two repositories used the same processes or interpretations of legal and regulatory requirements. Data users who need data from multiple sources must negotiate the data access processes, each

Repositories

re-
quire
veri-
fica-
tion
of
dif-
fer-
ent
in-
for-
ma-
tion
about
users
as
they
re-
view
data
ac-
cess
re-
quests.
Some
repos-
ito-
ries
re-
quire
in-
depth
back-
ground
checks,
while
oth-
ers
sim-
ply
vali-
date
the
ap-
pli-
ca-
tion
in-
for-
ma-



To
solve
these
chal-
lenges
and
pro-
mote
a re-
search
com-
mu-
nity
with
a
shared
un-
der-
stand-
ing
of
the
needs
of re-
searchers
and
repos-
ito-
ries,
ICPSR
is de-
vel-
op-
ing
the
Re-
searcher
Pass-
port.
This
digi-
tal
iden-
tifier
cap-
tures
veri-
fied
in-
for-
ma-

Researcher

pass-

port

=====

The
foun-
da-
tion
of
the
Re-
searcher
Pass-
port
is
the
level
of
trust
that
data
repos-
ito-
ries
place
on
their
users:
the
more
the
repos-
itory
trusts
the
user
to
use
data
in
ac-
cor-
dance
with
the
data
use
agree-
ments,
based
on
data
use
ex-
peri-

The first time that a user requires restricted data from a participating institution, the user submits an application to ICPSR for a Researcher Passport. ICPSR conducts the in-depth identity verification process and is-

This
Pass-
port
does
not
re-
place
the
au-
thor-
ity
of
repos-
ito-
ries
to
im-
ple-
ment
their
own
addi-
tional
re-
quire-
ments
for
in-
for-
ma-
tion
about
users
or
the
project
pro-
posal,
nor
does
it
man-
date
that
any
user
who
is is-
sued
a
Pass-

Within
the
Re-
searcher
Pass-
port
sys-
tem,
the
Visa
is
what
au-
tho-
rizes
ac-
cess
to
the
data
in
the
repos-
itory.
Over
time,
as
users
ac-
cess
data,
the
Pass-
port's
visas
also
serve
as
the
record
of
prior
data
use
that
some
repos-
ito-
ries
al-
ready

ICPSR
is de-
vel-
op-
ing
this
sys-
tem
within
the
ICPSR
in-
fras-
truc-
ture.
In
Novem-
ber
2018
ICPSR
will
launch
phase
1 of
the
Re-
searcher
Pass-
port
as
part
of its
ICPSR
My-
Data
user
ac-
counts.^a
The
sys-
tem
will
be
pi-
loted
at
three
re-
stricted
data
repos-

Open Badges

An innovative component of ICPSR’s Researcher Passport is the use of Open Badges¹ as the mechanism for embedding user characteristics—identity information, academic qualifications, professional experience, training completion—within the Passport. The Passport is the digital container for these badges. As part of the initial Passport issuing process, select badges will be identified as “verified.” Verified badges will include the components of data access requests that were identified as most important for developing trust in potential users (Levenstein, Tyler, and Davidson Bleckman 2018). Badges can be used by repositories in defining their access requirements. If an applicant does not meet the badge requirements for specific data sets or access methods, then further review is required to determine which access method would be appropriate, or if access should be granted at all. Beginning in 2019, ICPSR and the University of Michigan School of Information will build and integrate ICPSR badges into the Passport.

Community Norms

In addition to the benefits to repositories and data users in terms of more efficient data access request evaluation and user authorization, the Researcher Passport project seeks to establish shared norms and expectations around the access and use of restricted data. The Researcher Passport is most useful if it is widely accepted by the repository community; the more it is accepted and implemented, the more standardized the expectations will be. Our analysis of existing repository practices identified three specific areas where this standardization is needed and for which the Researcher Passport provides that standardization:

- User evaluation criteria
- Data evaluation criteria
- Data management training

User evaluation criteria

First, we propose a point-based user evaluation process to determine the Passport level eligibility. Passport applications are reviewed and points assigned based on the highest academic degree earned, the professional position (with separate attributes for non-academic researchers, e.g., media, non-profit, for-profit, and government employees), possession of a government-issued clearance, history of federal grants, publication history, and restricted data use experience (Appendix B). Badges will indicate these attributes, as well as additional attributes relevant for access to specific data sets but not necessary for the Passport level determination (e.g., nationality).

Data evaluation criteria

Similarly, we propose standardizing the data security level assignment process. Currently, as discussed above and in Table 1, there are a wide variety of terms and interpretations of data security levels, based on repository naming conventions and the specific needs of the data set in question. We recommend

¹Open Badges: <https://openbadges.org/>

a spectrum of Low, Moderate, High, and Highest, each of which has a point evaluation range comparable to the user evaluation criteria. Data sets will be reviewed for different characteristics including sensitivity, disclosure risk, and legal or statutory limitations; total points map to a data security level. An example of this metric can be viewed in Appendix C. This metric provides flexibility for repositories to add additional evaluation criteria (e.g., detailed geography, additional legal requirements); the data security score range is adjusted accordingly. This will build a common understanding of the meaning of data security levels, even as repositories maintain use of additional requirements for access to particular datasets.

Training

ICPSR evaluated the training requirements for access to restricted data at the 23 repositories in our study. Most repository training requirements refer to Human Subjects Research and Responsible Conduct of Research, in accordance with IRB requirements. We also evaluated the content of trainings required by repositories; we found only two that included content specifically focused on restricted data. In both cases, the training modules on restricted data were developed for use only at their specific institutions. Even in these training modules, data protection and data handling topics are discussed only briefly. No training program exists that covers all topics to which repositories said they wanted their restricted data users exposed. As part of the development of the Researcher Passport, ICPSR will develop training modules to meet the requirements and expectations of repositories. We will also continue to try to identify other training programs that meet these requirements. Completion of training will be identified through appropriate Badges on the Passport.

CONCLUSION

We live in a data-intensive world. We create data as we sleep and walk and eat, with every purchase we make, every email we send, every camera we stroll by. These data are valuable for research and evidence-building. Analyses of such data are used to inform more science and more policy making than ever. But it is also easier than ever to identify individuals, or use data inappropriately or inconsistently with the expectations of those being measured.

Given the unprecedented availability of digital data and the continuing need to interrogate “old” data, secure and efficient mediation of data access is a priority for the research community. ICPSR’s development of the Researcher Passport, a digital researcher credential based on shared norms about users and about data, represents our contribution to the challenge of balancing access and privacy. The process begins with developing a shared understanding of how data are classified and how users are evaluated and authorized to access that data, and then turns to the design and implementation of a system that operationalizes the trust imbued in those users in a digital identifier.

For further details about the researcher credentialing research project, please consult our May 2018 report to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, available at <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/143808>.

Principal Investigator (PI) Access Matrix					
PI SCORE	DATA SECURITY LEVEL				
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	HIGHEST	
8+	unrestricted	secure download	secure download	VDE / physical enclave	Platinum
7	unrestricted	secure download	virtual enclave	physical enclave	Gold
6	unrestricted	secure download	virtual enclave	no access	Silver
5	unrestricted	virtual enclave	no access	no access	Bronze
4	unrestricted	virtual enclave	no access	no access	Copper
0-3	unrestricted	no access	no access	no access	Tin

Figure 1: Researcher Passport Access Matrix²

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

References

Levenstein, Margaret, Allison R. B. Tyler, and Johanna Davidson Bleckman. 2018. *The Researcher Passport: Improving Data Access and Confidentiality Protection*. ICPSR White Paper Series No. 1. Ann

²Levenstein, Tyler, & Davidson Bleckman, 2018, p. 23.

³Levenstein, Tyler, & Davidson Bleckman, 2018, p. 21

⁴Levenstein, Tyler, & Davidson Bleckman, 2018, p. 22.

USER ATTRIBUTES	POINTS ATTRIBUTED
Highest degree earned	
Doctoral/terminal degree	3
Graduate degree (non-terminal)	2
Undergraduate	1
No degree	0
Professional Position (choose one of the following two options)*	
Academic faculty/staff: Highest institutional appointment/affiliation	
Full/Associate professor	3
Assistant professor	2
Student	1
Research staff	1
Non-profit, for-profit, government, or media staff: Years of relevant experience	
5+	3
3-4	2
0-2	1
Other	
Recognized Federal clearances	4
Current (2 pts) or recent (1 pt) Federal grant	2/1
Research publications (1 or more publications)	2
Restricted data use experience (1 or more projects)	2
Potential dataset- or repository-specific user requirements	
Country- or region-specific citizenship or residency status	specify
Affiliation with Carnegie-classified academic institution	yes/no
Badges earned and verified	
Trainings	
Data security — Levels I-III	specify
Research conduct — Levels I-III	specify
Other	specify
Specific expertise	
Restricted qualitative data use	specify
Other	specify
Contributions — data stewardship	
History of data sharing	citation/DOI
History of metadata enhancement	citation/DOI
History of code/syntax sharing	citation/DOI
Confirmed research misconduct (unintentional procedural violations and/or intentional data disclosure or misuse)	yes/no

Figure 2: Proposed Researcher Passport User Attributes Evaluation Metric³

DATA CHARACTERISTICS	POINTS ATTRIBUTED
Sensitivity level	If yes, then add...
protected population	+ 3
proprietary data	+ 4 to 6
potentially harmful personal information	+ 4
Disclosure risk level	
sample size	+ 1 to 4
geographic region size	+ 1 to 4
rare sample attributes	+ 1 to 4
link to public data	+ 3
Legal or statutory limitations	
HIPAA	+ 6
FERPA	+ 6
other legislated restrictions	+ 3 to 6
<hr/>	
Data security score <i>(after totalling above)</i>	Range
Low	0-3
Moderate	4-5
High	6-9
Highest	10+

Figure 3: Proposed Data Characteristics Evaluation Metric⁴

Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.
 Accessed May 21, 2019. <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/143808>.