

**PRESS RELEASE****May 16 2022**

The [INCF](#) Infrastructure Committee's "Recommendations for repositories and science gateways from a neuroscience perspective" has been published today, May 16, as a [Comment in Scientific Data](#).

The project, initiated by the INCF Infrastructure Committee, aimed to develop an inclusive set of criteria that could apply to a wide and diverse range of digital services, including repositories, science gateways, data, and software.

*"We set out to develop criteria that were specific to neuroscience, but we realized during the process that our end result would be applicable to other data-heavy disciplines as well", says Malin Sandström, coordinator for the Infrastructure Committee. "When you look at the problem closely, it turns out that many of the criteria have to do with best practices for how a service is run and governed, rather than with which types of data and other content it contains".*

The work began in October 2020. A draft version was presented to the community at the INCF Assembly in April 2021, in a workshop with representatives from organizations engaged in similar projects, including FAIRSharing, FORCE11, and the Coalition of Open Access Repositories (COAR). A public first version of the criteria checklist was made available on the INCF portal in late 2021.

With these criteria, INCF wants to help neuroscience researchers and students choose good services for their specific use cases and help service providers make good and future-proof decisions for setup and operations. Former Chair Wojtek Goscinski, now Chief Executive Officer at the Australian National Imaging Facility, explains:

*"Data repositories and scientific gateways are critical, but often underappreciated, components in the scientific workflow. It's important that researchers can navigate the digital landscape to find the services that they need and to understand which services are fit-for-purpose. Likewise, repositories and gateways have increasing obligations to their users".*

The recommendations published in the Comment are intended to guide users through the reasoning and considerations that went into the criteria development process.

**Recommendations**

1. Ensure discoverability and transparency in ownership and service usage statistics
2. Clearly communicate access and reuse conditions
3. Consider ethical requirements for authorship transparency and sensitive data
4. Follow best practices for licensing and responsibility
5. Ensure accessibility and interoperability
6. Build capabilities for reproducibility, replicability, reuse
7. Excel in documentation and user support
8. Be transparent in governance and operations
9. Involve community in governance and decision making
10. Be transparent on sustainability - financial and technical

*The International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility ([INCF](#)) is an international non-profit devoted to making neuroscience FAIR, Open and Citable by endorsing and promoting the use of neuroscience community standards and best practices. The INCF community consists of neuroscience researchers, tool developers and infrastructure providers worldwide, working to increase the reproducibility and reusability of neuroscience research.*

*The INCF Infrastructure Committee (IC) is formally a sub-committee under INCF's largest governing body, the Council for Science, Training and Infrastructure, and is composed of INCF members with a strong professional interest in research infrastructure. The IC has a mandate to choose projects that interest its members and are of strategic importance to the INCF community and the field of neuroscience.*

**Contact**

IC coordinator Malin Sandström  
malin@incf.org  
0736968909

**Link to publication**

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-022-01334-1>



enabling open and  
FAIR neuroscience