

SHARE Proposal

General Notes on SHARE Proposal from ARL/AAU/APLU

 This page includes general notes on the [SHARE proposal from ARL/AAU/APLU](#), in response to the White House OSTP memorandum entitled "[Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research](#)".

It is not a formal statement from DuraSpace, but just a way to gather feedback (which will be passed along to ARL). As such, members of the community are welcome to comment on these notes or help to enhance them.

General comments/questions are made throughout the below summary (in italics) and are marked as such.

For additional software-specific notes, see the child pages:

- [SHARE Proposal - DSpace Notes](#)
- *Fedora notes will be coming soon*

- [The Proposal](#)
- [High Level Summary](#)
 - [Minimum SHARE metadata fields](#)
 - [In Support of Principal Investigators](#)
 - [General Repository Functions](#)
 - [Requisite Conditions](#)
 - [Phase ONE \(12-18 months\)](#)
 - [Phase TWO \(6-12 months after phase one\)](#)
 - [Phase THREE](#)
 - [Phase FOUR](#)

The Proposal

The full text (PDF) of the proposal is available at: <http://www.arl.org/publications-resources/2772-shared-access-research-ecosystem-share-proposal>

High Level Summary

The SHARE proposal suggests a number of functions and metadata fields that would need to be captured by repositories. We've attempted to briefly summarize them below. But, the full text of the Proposal has additional details.

Minimum SHARE metadata fields

These are the listed minimum SHARE metadata fields as noted near the beginning of the "How SHARE Works" section of the proposal:

1. author
2. article title
3. journal title
4. abstract
5. award number
6. Principal Investigator ID (ORCID or ISNI)
 - http://www.isni.org/isni_and_orcid
7. designated repository number

In Support of Principal Investigators

As described in the paragraph about requirements of Principal Investigators (PIs), repositories may need to be able to "capture" or log the following:

1. "Sufficient copyright licenses to enable permanent archiving, access, and reuse of publications"
 - **General Comments**
 - *Many repository platforms do have an option to require a "deposit license" which often covers these scenarios. However, the text of the "deposit license" is decided by the institution. There may need to be "recommended copyright license language" provided by a central entity, to help ensure locally created licenses are "SHARE-compliant".*
 - *Does this need to be machine actionable / verifiable?*

General Repository Functions

As described in the "SHARE workflow" paragraphs, a repository would need to support the following functions:

1. Be able to accept XML versions of manuscripts from Journal publishers
 - "Journal submits XML version of final peer reviewed manuscript to the PI's designated repository"
 - **General Comments**
 - *Who defines this XML format? It would need to be defined by a central entity.*
 - *Is there a reason why XML is chosen as the transmission format instead of a protocol like SWORD (with a common packaging format)?*

8. Core Usage Statistics - "Reports to authors (and agencies, if desired) include statistical data on usage activity and downloads of their publications."
 - **General Comments:**
 - *What type(s) of statistical reports are expected? Would there need to be some "minimal required statistics" to capture/report? How would the reports be made available to the authors and agencies?*
 - *Is this a "pull" (authors/agencies can visit the repository and view/request necessary reports), or a "push" (reports are automatically sent from the repository to the author / agency by some means)?*
 - *As far as repositories are concerned, obviously a "pull" is easier. A "push" would require the repository to know where to send such reports (up-to-date email addresses or similar)*
9. Metadata Exposed to Search Engines
10. SWORD
 - **General Comments:**
 - *We would need to standardize on a SWORD submission profile / packaging format. As a protocol, SWORD just transmits content and doesn't require a specific format.*
11. OpenURL
12. Some connections to Digital Preservation Network (DPN) - "All phases connect with and take advantage of the Digital Preservation Network (DPN)"

Phase TWO (6-12 months after phase one)

We have not added any comments on Phase TWO yet, as its vision is still vague. Much of the Phase TWO listed features refer to requirements that are yet to be determined. Others refer to possible enhancements to Phase ONE features, based on usage needs.

Required in support of phase two. Begun "concurrently with Phase One activities".

1. Submission Workflow - "Development of software to automate and optimize article submission from author through repository and to publisher"
 - Requires publishers to comply with single, standardized submission mechanism
2. Usage Metrics
3. Reporting
4. Incorporate OAI-ORE
5. Certification
6. Adoption of Best Practices

Phase THREE

We have not added any comments on Phase THREE yet, as its vision is still vague. Phase THREE features don't have very specific use cases defined, and seem to be almost "brainstorms" of possible future interactions with SHARE.

Phase Three envisions "more complex interactions with SHARE", and includes:

1. Text and Data Mining
2. Bulk Harvesting
3. Semantic Data
 - Relationships among publications
4. API Specifications
 - In support of interaction with repositories
5. ResourceSync
 - <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/resourcesync/>
6. Open Annotation
 - Web-centric annotation framework

Phase FOUR

We have not added any comments on Phase FOUR yet, as its vision is still vague. Phase FOUR features refer to the yet-to-be defined "data requirements of federal agencies". They seem to almost be "brainstorms" of possible options based on those unknown requirements.

Phase Four involves "development of infrastructure relationships to support data requirements of federal agencies"

1. Data Curation and Associated Software
2. Linked Data
3. Shared Distributed Resources in Repositories