## Consistent evaluation of trustworthiness across guiding principles and standards is crucial to ensure a robust digital repository ecosystem

David Giaretta, PTAB LTD, UK, John Garrett, Garrett Software, USA, Mark Conrad, Adv. Info. Collaboratory, USA, J Steven Hughes, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, USA, Terry Longstreth, Washington Acad. Sciences, USA, Roberta Svanetti, Deda.Cloud Srl Supporting ESA, Italy, Dawei Lin, NIAID, USA, Robert R. Downs, CIESIN, Columbia University, USA, Felix Engel, FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany, Matthias Hemmje, FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany, Iolanda Maggio, Rhea GROUP Supporting ESA, Italy

This presentation calls for attention to established and emerging principles and standards developed from various perspectives to maintain and improve the robustness of the digital repository ecosystem. While the guiding principles and standards share a common goal to ensure the trustworthiness of digital repositories, a comparison can help identify areas where they may be clarified and strengthened in the future if they are to be used to perform consistent evaluations of repositories. Therefore, a group, whose members individually have participated in developing or revising the OAIS framework, the ISO16363 requirements, the CTS requirements, the TRUST Principles, or NESTOR, attempted to compare those standards and principles.

The effort aims to improve the consistency of audits using any one set of requirements rather than making the audits consistent between sets of requirements since they each serve a different purpose. The approach is to clarify the relationships between the concepts and terminology of ISO 14721(OAIS), ISO 16363, and ISO 16919 compared to the CoreTrustSeal Trustworthy Data Repositories Requirements (CTS), NESTOR, the FAIR Guiding Principles for Scientific Data, and the TRUST Principles for Digital Repositories. The comparison will help improve efforts to revise each of the instruments. Furthermore, such comparisons can improve the interoperability among these instruments and, consequently, enable future auditors or audit teams to have consistent interpretations among all the requirements. In addition, the group examined the auditing methods and will talk about lessons learned that help improve the consistency of audits and have identified specific improvements for the various sets of requirements.