



## **Implementation of the Data Seal of Approval**

The Data Seal of Approval board hereby confirms that the Trusted Digital repository RU-IIEc complies with the guidelines version 2014-2017 set by the Data Seal of Approval Board.

The afore-mentioned repository has therefore acquired the Data Seal of Approval of 2013 on July 31, 2015.

The Trusted Digital repository is allowed to place an image of the Data Seal of Approval logo corresponding to the guidelines version date on their website. This image must link to this file which is hosted on the Data Seal of Approval website.

Yours sincerely,

The Data Seal of Approval Board

## Assessment Information

Guidelines Version:	2014-2017   July 19, 2013
Guidelines Information Booklet:	<a href="#">DSA-booklet_2014-2017.pdf</a>
All Guidelines Documentation:	<a href="#">Documentation</a>
Repository:	RU-IIEc
Seal Acquiry Date:	Jul. 31, 2015
For the latest version of the awarded DSA for this repository please visit our website:	<a href="http://assessment.datasealofapproval.org/seals/">http://assessment.datasealofapproval.org/seals/</a>
Previously Acquired Seals:	None
This repository is owned by:	<b>Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas UNAM</b>
	Mexico
	T (+52-55)5623-0100
	E <a href="mailto:comision-ru@iiec.unam.mx">comision-ru@iiec.unam.mx</a>
	W <a href="http://www.iiec.unam.mx/">http://www.iiec.unam.mx/</a>

# Assessment

## 0. Repository Context

### Applicant Entry

*Self-assessment statement:*

RU-IIEc (Repositorio Universitario - Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas) aims at managing, disseminating and preserving the intellectual production of the Economic Research Institute. This repository hosts different kinds of academic materials, ranging from books, book chapters and formal articles to radio and TV programs, mostly focused on the Economical Sciences, but also on different topics where our academic personnel is involved.

The general description of the repository can be found at <http://ru.iiec.unam.mx/information.html> and its usage policies are at <http://ru.iiec.unam.mx/policies.html>; as mentioned at the beginning of this assessment, all information is in Spanish (as it is the predominant language for the works here presented).

The repository is not outsourced in any way; it is completely hosted in our facilities and hardware in Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, and managed by technicians working full-time for IIEc.

### Reviewer Entry

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

**1. The data producer deposits the data in a data repository with sufficient information for others to assess the quality of the data, and compliance with disciplinary and ethical norms.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

**Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

The repository is open for the academic works of our personnel; being a small community, they are all recognized by their names. Many external work coauthors are mentioned as authors and have objects registered to their names, but only when this is a work done together with IIEc-UNAM academicians.

All submitted works are reviewed by an academic comission formed by six people from different areas in the Institute, avoiding misrepresentations or copyright violations.

The data passed on to data consumers depends on the object — as an example, the Institute's radio program has been digitized and made available since its beginning in 1991 and part of the presentation/closing of each program include acknowledgements for the IIEc; full books carry the Institute's seal and information on them; academic articles include the academic affiliation of the authors. Some less formal objects, however, are not explicit to the consumer in this regard.

**Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **2. The data producer provides the data in formats recommended by the data repository.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

We don't publish a list of preferred formats, as our depositants/users are usually not very tech-savvy.

We do check (and correct if needed) data to be in a widely-usable format, and –in the case of videos– not to be in a codec producing overly long files that would hamper both our archival and interested people's downloads; we have in [our policies](#):

The object type description is indicative, not exhaustive, and includes materials for which the first publication was digital. RU-Económicas reserves the right to manipulate the files, adopting the needed technical measures for them to remain always accessible.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

### **3. The data producer provides the data together with the metadata requested by the data repository.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

#### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Objects are only made public in the repository after the relevant metadata has been captured; most fields are filled in by the user filling EPrints' standard questionnaire. The repository's academic committee, consisting of six people, check the uploaded files before they are made public.

As a means of guidance, we do provide a [object depositing manual](#), linked from the menu present in basically all of the repository's pages.

As the repository is structured on an EPrints software installation, all metadata is DublinCore-compliant, and [available via the OAI-PMH protocol](#).

#### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

#### **4. The data repository has an explicit mission in the area of digital archiving and promulgates it.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

#### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

The *About this repository* page mentions:

[RU-Económicas](#) is the university repository for the Economics Research Institute (IIEc) at UNAM, created to manage, disseminate and preserve, in digital format, the intellectual production of the Economics Research Institute.

This repository's mission is to stimulate academic communication and increase visibility and utilization for contents produced in the Institute. It hosts diverse materials, which can (or not) have been peer-reviewed, such as books, magazines, articles, presentations, databases, audiovisual material, etcetera.

RU-Económicas provides the public in general, students, teachers and researchers, a search and acquisition service for the digital resources produced by the academic community of the Economics Research Institute.

We have had courses and talks on how to deposit material with our academic personnel.

#### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

**Data Seal of Approval Board**

W [www.datasealofapproval.org](http://www.datasealofapproval.org)

E [info@datasealofapproval.org](mailto:info@datasealofapproval.org)

*Comments:*



## **5. The data repository uses due diligence to ensure compliance with legal regulations and contracts including, when applicable, regulations governing the protection of human subjects.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

The repository itself is not a legal entity, but it is managed by a committee of six academics inside a research institute.

We have two standard forms for people uploading works, one for [academics in our university](#) and a different one for [authors not affiliated to UNAM](#). We do not have any kind of contracts for data consumers.

Legal rights are outlined both as a footer for every generated page and delineated in the [policies page](#). If conditions are not complied with, the policies page mentions that i.e. *if the repository has knowledge of copyright violations in the deposited objects, they will be immediately removed*; we decided to take a reactive approach in order not to hamper the ease of depositing with express contract signatures.

All of the documents uploaded to the repository are meant to be publicly accessed, so we do not set disclosure risk or access limitations; the system administrator is well versed in computer security, so the risk for accounts leakage is small; the software is kept up to date with the upstream versions.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## 6. The data repository applies documented processes and procedures for managing data storage.

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

### Applicant Entry

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

1

The repository is expressly built for preservation, although it does not have *per se* a preservation policy (besides the already mentioned reserve we have to manipulate objects so they are always accessible, which could include format conversions). We do have a backup: Every two days, a full filesystem backup is done to a semi-offsite computer (that is, not off-campus, but ~50m away from the production server). Backups are done first as a regular MySQL database dump to stable files, and then via rsync. Backups are kept for two weeks. No long-term backup is made.

Storage media deterioration is prevented by having all data (both on the server and on the backup system) stored in RAID-mirrored volumes; server logs are monitored on a daily basis for I/O warnings.

### Reviewer Entry

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **7. The data repository has a plan for long-term preservation of its digital assets.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Although it is not a concrete provision, being able to convert files to a different format is one of our site's policies. So far, I have only had to recode videos (as they were uploaded in DVD format, which yields a very bad compression rate and are not fit for Internet-delivered content).

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## 8. Archiving takes place according to explicit work flows across the data life cycle.

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### Applicant Entry

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

There are some divisions in our research institute in which the personnel uploads all produced material, such as the radio program, magazines and non-periodical editorial bodies. For all other academics, we require and encourage self-deposit.

Those three areas do have the repository as part of their content-producing workflow.

We have had presentations with the academic groups showing them how to use the repository, and have prepared a short [depositing manual](#) to help with the depositing workflow.

### Reviewer Entry

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **9. The data repository assumes responsibility from the data producers for access and availability of the digital objects.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Our [policies page](#) states:

- Any member of IIEc can request contents to be deposited in this repository
- The depositor will be responsible for the work's content, integrity and pertinence.

As it is restricted to authors being part of our academic community (full-time university employees), our juridic area said we didn't need any further contracts or licenses to be granted, the works belong to the university.

As for crisis management, we have backup retrieval procedures.

Our repository server is backed up in a separate computer (same building, but a separate place) at a database and filesystem level three times a week, and backups are retained for a one month period; in case of data loss or corruption, files and database structures can be restored within a day or two to a fully functioning new server.

### **Reviewer Entry**

**Data Seal of Approval Board**

W [www.datasealofapproval.org](http://www.datasealofapproval.org)

E [info@datasealofapproval.org](mailto:info@datasealofapproval.org)

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **10. The data repository enables the users to discover and use the data and refer to them in a persistent way.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Close to half of our objects are MP3 files (from the [site's statistics](#)), which are naturally not deep-searchable, but the rest is, we have in fact a [collaboration pending to be integrated](#) that uses precisely that properties.

The site does offer [basic](#) and [advanced](#) search facilities and [OAI-PMH harvesting](#).

We do not currently use DOI or the Handle system, as it has so far been outside the needs of our academic community; we are committed to long-time stability of our repository objects' public URLs, but do not use a third party service for this.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## 11. The data repository ensures the integrity of the digital objects and the metadata.

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### Applicant Entry

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

The repository is built using EPrints, which takes care of versioning; it is not publicly viewable, but every object has a full modifications log.

We are not using checksums for data integrity.

As the system administrator (and with some due experience in data security handling), I do not believe the mere fact of storing checksums in a high-level construct such as the database backing our files would mean much as to detecting data gone bad; checksumming is naturally done at the operating system and database levels.

Checksumming is done as part of the filesystem block replication strategy (the repository is stored in a mirrored hard drive), and any discrepancies would raise alarms to a possible faulty disk.

That is, the integrity does use checksumming, but it is not done at a repository-visible level.

### Reviewer Entry

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*



## **12. The data repository ensures the authenticity of the digital objects and the metadata.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Our objects are of relatively simple nature, and do not usually change over time. We could present the object modification history (provided by EPrints) as an audit trail, but I'm not sure whether it satisfies the question.

We do not link to any external datasets.

As for the depositors' identity, we do E-mail validation only.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

### **13. The technical infrastructure explicitly supports the tasks and functions described in internationally accepted archival standards like OAIS.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

#### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

3. In progress: We are in the implementation phase.

*Self-assessment statement:*

All objects are catalogued using the DublinCore fields. For thematic categorization in the Economics research community, we require objects to be classified according to the JEL (Journal of Economic Literature) hierarchy; this can be seen in our [advanced search pages](#).

While our repository was not built based on (or with due knowledge) of OAIS, it aligns quite well with its structure and goals, and in our opinion can be seen at least as being in the "in implementation" phase. Referring, as suggested by the reviewer, to other assessments:

- As the repository is built using EPrints, it follows the basic interactions and models required for OAIS. This can be partially seen on the "[Preservation Metadata for Institutional Repositories](#)" article by [Steve Hitchcock, Tim Brody, Jessie M.N. Hey and Leslie Carr](#); of course, this cannot be seen as a blind statement showing every EPrints repository follows OAIS, but that it is in the right path to.
- Our repository is part of our university's [Digital Archives Network \(RAD-UNAM\)](#), and is conforming as a node in the [University Digital Collections Coordination \(CCUD\)](#). As part of CCUD's stated contributions are "Stability (online and backups)" and "Data standarization", we will have to work towards fully conforming to this archival standard.

As for the mandatory OAIS responsibilities (section 3.1):

**Data Seal of Approval Board**

W [www.datasealofapproval.org](http://www.datasealofapproval.org)

E [info@datasealofapproval.org](mailto:info@datasealofapproval.org)

1. The information is accepted from the *producers* by the means of the self-deposit.

Enough control is obtained, as legal rights are ensured and [our policy](#) states:

Technical validation of the deposited objects is in charge of the technical responsible of RU-Económicas, and the content's validation is responsibility of the Academic Repository Commission, that has the attributions to accept, reject or remove objects according to this policy.

(...)

RU-Económicas reserves the right to manipulate the files as to adopt the technical measures needed for them to always remain accessible.

2.

3. The Academic Repository Commission has determined that any person interested in the academic works of our institute is part of the *Designated Community*; the sometimes technical nature of its contents mean the *knowledge base* will most often require studies in economics and related fields.

4. Information is *independently understandable* in as much as the depositors segment it as discrete entities; most of the objects are self-contained and have been curated/reviewed by peers (in the case of published books, articles and similar objects) or conducted (in radio program transmissions); others, such as presentations and lecture notes are accepted into the repository, and they are often linked to the discourse the author builds around them, but are assumed to carry value by themselves, even if not the full value of having the author teach/present them.

5. No users but the Academic Commission are allowed to remove an object from the archive, and the committee will not do this except in very grave cases, such as copyright infringement. The demise of the archive itself is not contemplated, but part of the integration with CCUD (mentioned before) has the explicit intention of ensuring data survival.

6. The information is available to the *Designated Community* as it is publicly available on the Internet, with explicit licensing terms (already linked to in relevant sections of this assessment) allowing for use and redistribution; files are not currently watermarked to provide a proof of provenance or authenticity, but this can be looked into in the future.

## **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **14. The data consumer complies with access regulations set by the data repository.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

We do not use any EULAs, and all objects are publicly available. We don't have any confidential data. Our objects are shared under licensing terms equivalent to a CC BY-NC-NC licensing scheme.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

**15. The data consumer conforms to and agrees with any codes of conduct that are generally accepted in the relevant sector for the exchange and proper use of knowledge and information.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

**Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

Consumers are passive in our repository, they can only download objects. All objects in our repository are public, so there is no notion of confidential data; consumers do not have to identify themselves. Data consumers basically just agree to using the downloaded information in accordance to our licensing terms, which are broadly speaking similar to a CC BY-NC-ND license.

Producers do share some more data of them as human subjects: At least, depositors' e-mail address, which is always validated (and kept private to the system administrator), as well as –of course– names for the authors of every available digital object. If a given person demands not to be associated with a given work of their authorship, that work is removed from the repository.

**Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*

## **16. The data consumer respects the applicable licences of the data repository regarding the use of the data.**

*Minimum Required Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

### **Applicant Entry**

*Statement of Compliance:*

4. Implemented: This guideline has been fully implemented for the needs of our repository.

*Self-assessment statement:*

All of our repository's page carry the following information as part of their footer:

This page can be reproduced for non-lucrative reasons, as long as it is not mutilated, the full source is cited, and the electronic address is given. For any other usage it requires written permission from the institution.

Legal terms for the reproduction of objects herein deposited are available at our [usage policy page](#).

We have not yet had to confront any licensing breach.

### **Reviewer Entry**

*Accept or send back to applicant for modification:*

Accept

*Comments:*