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Abstract

With the growth of the field of industrial ecology (IE), research and results have increased significantly leading to a desire for better utilization of the accumulated data in more sophisticated analyses. This implies the need for greater transparency, accessibility, and reusability of IE data, paralleling the considerable momentum throughout the sciences. The Data Transparency Task Force (DTTF) was convened by the governing council of the International Society for Industrial Ecology in late 2016 to propose best practice guidelines and incentives for sharing data.

In this article, the members of the DTTF present an overview of developments toward transparent and accessible data within the IE community and more broadly. We argue that increased transparency, accessibility, and reusability of IE data will enhance IE research by enabling more detailed and reproducible research, and also facilitate meta-analyses. These benefits will make the results of IE work more timely. They will enable independent verification of results, thus increasing their credibility and quality. They will also make the uptake of IE research results easier within IE and in other fields as well as by decision makers and sustainability practitioners, thus increasing the overall relevance and impact of the field.

Here, we present two initial actions intended to advance these goals: (1) a minimum publication requirement for IE research to be adopted by the *Journal of Industrial Ecology*; and (2) a system of optional data openness badges rewarding journal articles that contain transparent and accessible data. These actions will help the IE community to move towards data transparency and accessibility. We close with a discussion of potential future initiatives that could build on the minimum requirements and the data openness badge system.

Introduction

A core mission of industrial ecology (IE) is to contribute to the scientific basis of sustainable development. The value of this contribution depends on the quality, timeliness, and relevance of the scientific insights discovered in IE research. These insights include qualitative and quantitative assessments of: life cycle impacts of products, shifting of environmental burdens between economic sectors, factors that shape the development of

\textsuperscript{1} “Nullius in verba” is the motto of the UK Royal Society. It roughly translates as ‘take nobody’s word for it’. It is an expression of the determination of the Society to withstand the domination of authority and to verify all statements by an appeal to facts determined by experiment (Royal Society 2017).
industrial symbiosis, and the opportunities for and effects of closing resource loops. IE research is often data intensive and characterized by ongoing improvements to its analytical tools.

The issue of data transparency was identified by the council of the International Society for Industrial Ecology (ISIE) as an important concern. The Society convened the Data Transparency Task Force (DTTF) in late 2016 to develop guidance on best practices and incentives for sharing IE research data and documenting research workflow (see supporting information SI 1 for the mandate). The goal of the DTTF is to develop guidelines and incentives that encompass the whole research process, ranging from documenting input data and assumptions, to methodological aspects such as accessible software code, to providing access to generated output data. A proposal for such guidelines was presented to the society at the 2017 meeting in Chicago, and feedback was solicited through a survey, a special session, from the Journal of Industrial Ecology (JIE) editorial board, and the ISIE council. The proposal focused on quantitative research. The DTTF recognizes the diversity of the IE research community—in tools, topics, domains and expertise. The society is eager to receive feedback on data transparency for qualitative research as well. The present document summarizes the findings of the DTTF, incorporating the feedback received from the IE community, and presents new, draft editorial guidelines for data transparency.

We start by reviewing data sharing in other fields, academic journals, and funding agencies. Current use, provision, and sharing of data within IE is then summarized, mapping out possible improvements and benefits, and also showing examples of good data management practices. We then present the DTTF proposals for best-practice guidelines for transparent, accessible, and reproducible IE research, and a minimum requirement for IE publications that we have suggested be adopted by the Journal of Industrial Ecology (JIE). The JIE has agreed to implement these suggestions. We close with a discussion of future efforts to progress towards our goal of fully transparent IE research.

Current trends in data openness

The scientific method builds upon reporting and sharing of research results. Sharing allows scientific results to be independently tested and scrutinized; it enables the accumulation of data, findings, and insights and thus leads to an advancement of research over time. With much of IE research being computer based, the ability to acquire or develop, store, and utilize large data sets invariably is having a significant and increasing influence on our field.

Trends across scientific fields

Data sharing requirements and practice vary across research fields; they also change with progress in data processing and storage opportunities. Recent decades have seen a massive increase in the collection of scientific data, its storage in electronic format, and the inclusion of electronic supplementary materials with many articles (Kenyon and Sprague 2014). Despite the ease of storing and exchanging data, which was brought about by computers and the internet, there is an increasing concern within the scientific community regarding the accessibility of research data. For example, in a 2010 survey across scientific fields, a majority of researchers indicated that a lack of access to research data hinders
progress in science and almost half of the respondents stated that this lack of data access limits their ability to answer scientific questions (Tenopir et al. 2011). According to a survey conducted by *Nature*, more than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist’s experiments, and more than half have failed to reproduce their own experiments (Baker 2016), often due to problems with accessing data from the original studies (Van Noorden 2015). Pfenninger et al. (2017) give a detailed overview of the barriers to and benefits of data and model sharing. They also suggest that institutional and personal inertia play a role in maintaining the attractiveness of closed models and data.

Without sufficient access to data, scientific analyses cannot be replicated and subsequent research cannot build upon previous results, both of which undermine the foundation of scientific progress. As a consequence, data archiving and sharing have become a cross-cutting issue across all scientific fields, including:

- physics (Hey and Payne 2015);
- political science (Gherghina and Katsanidou 2013);
- bioinformatics (Hothorn and Leisch 2011);
- ecology and biodiversity research (Michener 2015; Costello et al. 2013);
- medical research, neuroimaging, and genomics (Walport and Brest 2011; Warren 2016; Poline et al. 2012; Kaye and Hawkins 2014; Farber 2017); and
Cross-disciplinary open data guidelines


FAIR – Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Re-usable

The FAIR Guiding Principles define a fundamental set of four attributes of open data; they should be: (1) findable; (2) accessible; (3) interoperable; and (4) re-usable. It is envisaged that these attributes can be achieved if authors publish appropriate sets of metadata alongside their specific datasets. Here, we summarize the specific guidance provided in [Wilkinson, M. D. et al. The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. Sci. Data3:160018 doi: 10.1038/sdata.2016.18 (2016)] for data to meet FAIR criteria:

(1) findable – indexing or archiving (meta)data with unique identifiers (e.g., DOIs) at a searchable resource;

(2) accessible – (meta)data use an open standard for machine readability and are made permanently available.

(3) interoperable – (meta)data use standard data vocabularies, in a formal, open, and broadly applicable language, and include references to connected data.

(4) re-useable – (meta)data are defined with relevant attributes for re-use such as a clearly defined license statement.
Importantly, FAIR Guiding Principles can usually be fulfilled by archiving data together with an appropriate metadata set in most of the public repositories indexed in re3data.org, a recently established catalogue of such repositories (see the ‘Data repositories’ section below). For example, the general purpose data repository Zenodo is fully compliant with FAIR [Zenodo, accessible at: https://zenodo.org/, accessed: 21 October 2017].

**TOP – Transparency and Openness Promotion**


1. **Citation standards** – how are data cited?

2. **Data transparency** – how are data reported?

3. **Analytic methods (code) transparency** – how is code reported?

4. **Research materials transparency** – are all materials used in the research methodology reported?

5. **Design and analysis transparency** – how transparent are the reported research procedures?

6. **Preregistration of studies** – ensuring the existence of the study in a public registry.

7. **Preregistration of analysis plans** – certification of ‘hypothesis-testing’ versus ‘hypothesis-generating’ research.

8. **Replication** – how will replication studies be published?

As our community moves forward with data transparency incentives tailored to the specific data characteristics of our field, care should be taken to ensure maximum long-term compatibility with major cross-disciplinary guidelines such as the FAIR and TOP principles listed above. It is worth noting that the notions of pre-registration and of replication studies are most applicable to fields that rely primarily on statistical confidence tests.
The perspective of funders

Driven by a debate about the role of publicly-funded science in society, funding agencies are increasingly requesting open access to data generated and used in sponsored research. For example, the European Commission asks Member States to ensure that “research data that result from publicly funded research become publicly accessible, usable and re-usable” (European Commission 2012). Similarly, the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) now requests that all data resulting from NSF-funded research be deposited in appropriate data repositories (National Science Foundation 2015). ‘Harnessing data’ is also one of the ten major strategic directions for future NSF investment.


Data repositories

A number of repositories have been developed in response to the growing need for data storage. The data repository registry re3data (http://www.re3data.org/) now lists over 1500 individual data repositories from multiple scientific fields ranging from general purpose ones such as Figshare (http://www.figshare.org), Zenodo (https://www.zenodo.org/), and Dryad (http://datadryad.org/) to subject specific ones such as GenBank for genetic sequence data (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/), PANGAEA for Earth and Environmental Science (https://pangaea.de/), or the Interdisciplinary Earth Data Alliance (IEDA) (http://www.iedadata.org/).

Persistent and indexed repositories provide three major advantages relative to the practice of scientists publishing their work individually or through their institutions. First, data hosted at these repositories usually receive a digital object identifier (DOI) which creates a static and persistent reference to a specific dataset including version information. Second, an analysis of research data availability on journal homepages has shown that availability declines (i.e., links become broken) at a rate of about 17% per year (Vines et al. 2014); archiving data in dedicated repositories prolongs their use. Third, datasets in repositories are often independently indexed by search engines and are thus more readily findable.

Therefore, we support the use of persistent and indexed repositories.
Academic journals

In parallel with the development of common data repositories, academic journals have also sought to increase data availability, recognizing the basic scientific need for data availability and the requirements of funding agencies (McNutt 2014). Such actions include increasingly stringent requirements for datasets to be published alongside journal articles. In early 2017, Nature implemented a requirement for a data availability statement at the end of articles summarizing whether / how the data necessary to replicate, interpret, and build upon the findings of the paper are available to readers (Nature 2016). Nature also recently established Scientific Data, a new journal dedicated to publishing and describing openly accessible datasets (https://www.nature.com/sdata/about). Science requires authors to deposit large datasets at an official repository prior to publication (http://www.sciencemag.org/authors/science-editorial-policies), and similar policies exist, for example, for PLOS journals (http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/data-availability) and biomedical journals as with, for example, Cell and Neuron from Cell Press (http://www.cell.com/cell/authors). Additionally, as mentioned above, there are also ongoing efforts to characterize and promote journal publication policies that increasingly facilitate open science, e.g., through implementation of the TOP guidelines [B. A. NOSEK, G. ALTER, G. C. BANKS, D. BORSBOOM, S. D. BOWMAN, S. J. BRECKLER, S. BUCK, C. D. CHAMBERS, G. CHIN, G. CHRISTENSEN, M. CONTESTABILE, A. DAFOE, E. EICH, J. FREESE, R. GLENNERSTER, D. GOROFF, D. P. GREEN, B. HESSE, M. HUMPHREYS, J. ISHIYAMA, D. KARLAN, A. KRAUT, A. LUPIA, P. MABRY, T. MADON, N. MALHOTRA, E. MAYO-WILSON, M. MCNUTT, E. MIGUEL, E. LEVY PALUCK, U. SIMONSOHN, C. SODERBERG, B. A. SPELLMAN, J. TURITTO, G. VANDENBOS, S. VAZIRE, E. J. WAGENMAKERS, R. WILSON, T. YARKONI SCIENCE, 26 JUN 2015 : 1422-1425].

Data sharing in industrial ecology

IE research builds on a substantial amount of secondary data, which is often based on prior IE research, such as life cycle inventories (LCIs) and (multi-regional) input-output (IO) databases, or external sources, such as official government statistics and market surveys. Physical-chemical properties of materials and processes or the manipulation of such secondary data are often used and combined to create new data and insights. Quantitative research methods used in IE include various computational techniques such as linear algebra, geographic information systems (GIS) data analysis, statistical analysis, and optimization. IE research encompasses a wide range of approaches and, as a result, different data formats and system representations have developed. The establishment of a common data format would thus be desirable, but is currently challenging. There is, however, a growing convergence or at least hybridization of the approaches of material flow analysis (MFA), IO analysis, and life cycle assessment (LCA). Additionally, as IE researchers often work closely with companies, the issue of data confidentiality is important and may restrict data sharing.

While there has been some success in compiling databases for aggregated data such as country-level material flows, generic LCIs, and impact assessment characterization factors, a pervasive culture of sharing case-specific data along with the publication of new research
results appears to be lacking. The problems of inadequate data transparency and accessibility within the IE community has triggered calls for more reproducibility (Frischknecht 2004), better digital communication (E. Hertwich 2007) and use of interlinked data (Davis et al. 2010), and improved programming practices and data sharing (Pauliuk et al. 2015). The proposals developed by the DTTF represent an effort to find feasible solutions to these challenges.

**Benefits of data transparency and long-term costs of business as usual**

The inaccessibility of detailed results in IE research presents a significant lost opportunity. Inaccessible details cannot be used or fully understood by others, nor cross-checked, replicated, and verified, nor become part of larger meta-analyses. The lack of standards for the consistency and comparability of data disclosures is particularly evident in life cycle assessment. For example, in the application of LCA to climate change mitigation, the U.S. National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) undertook a project to produce a comparable set of LCI data for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report on renewable energy. However, collecting, extracting, and harmonizing these data to provide a broader assessment required a painstaking amount of effort. The JIE special issue on harmonization of LCA which documented the NREL work indicated that approximately half of the LCA studies reviewed had to be discarded because the LCI data were not published or so poorly documented that they could not be unambiguously interpreted (Heath and Mann 2012). A recent review of data quality of electricity LCAs discusses this lack of consistency and transparency and suggests that it adversely impacts not only the usefulness, but also the quality of LCA results (Astudillo et al. 2016). In the case of IPCC's 5th Assessment Report, concerns by participating scientists about the quality of the LCA results negatively impacted the degree to which the results were trusted by the IPCC, and thus also the way that they were communicated in the report and used to support the subsequent policy making process (E. G. Hertwich 2014).

Although sharing and documentation of data require additional effort, it is an effort that advances the field and can offer rewards and immediate benefits for the individual researcher. Recent studies suggest that publishing open access datasets may widen their use, thus enhancing their status and increasing citations (Piwowar and Vision 2013; Drachen et al. 2016). Furthermore, supply of the underlying data and intermediate results contributes to validation and quality control. Other researchers may add to the data or re-use it in their own work. As the accessible knowledge base grows, it provides the opportunity for follow-up work, such as meta-analyses, resolving potential disagreements, and providing more robust insights. It may also provide the opportunity for researchers to join together in larger efforts that lead to more high profile publications. Some fields, such as climate sciences, earth systems modeling, and energy scenario modeling, have a tradition of carrying out projects to reconcile individual model results, which help to provide common benchmarks, create acceptance for new research questions, and model-oriented papers, and tend to result in joint high level publications by the whole community (10.5194/gmd-9-2973-2016, 10.1038/nclimate2475, 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.05.009). Although model and data comparison occurs within IE, its strategic potential is by no means exhausted (Owen 2017; Moran and Wood 2014; Speck et al. 2015).
We therefore corroborate the need to improve data transparency as identified by the council of the ISIE which we believe can:

- improve research communication;
- enhance accumulation of IE knowledge;
- speed up scientific progress within IE;
- enable independent verification of results, thus increasing credibility, reliability, and quality; and
- increase the significance of IE research by facilitating uptake of IE research results by other fields and decision makers.

Examples of data sharing in the IE community

We have compiled a list of good examples of data and procedural transparency within IE building on community input solicited via email exchanges and forum posts. This list is now too long to be shown in full in the paper; this list of examples is available in the supporting information (SI2).

Defining data transparency for industrial ecology

Transparency is key for fostering collaborative science. The task force is convinced that a change towards new data management practices and data transparency are required in the current publication practice worldwide. Incentives are necessary to create an environment that facilitates data contributions and processing. Here we describe practical recommendations of the DTTF that the JIE - the society’s journal - will apply to increase data transparency in its publication and review process. We expect discussion of ways to improve data transparency to continue and anticipate a further evolution of the publication standards and practice as the IE community learns from these first efforts. We also hope that other journals in the field follow suit. Our recommendations include modest mandatory requirements to ensure all JIE publications meet basic data transparency requirements and propose a series of data openness badges to reward authors that supply well-documented data.

The IE community faces two fairly unique key challenges with regard to data openness and reuse:

1. the central role of industry data in some IE research and associated confidentiality issues; and
2. the variety of data types and analysis methods used, which stems from IE’s interdisciplinary and broad-ranging scope, and which in turn leads to questions of methodological consistency, interoperability of data, and ease of data reuse.

These issues make it challenging to develop general guidelines on data formatting and documentation. The proposal for publication requirements and incentives was devised to reflect the characteristics of IE research.

We follow a multi-layered strategy: First, we propose minimum publication criteria which focus on clear citation of secondary data and reusability of results (labeled with an asterisk (*) in Figure 1, as neither are restricted by confidentiality of primary data, i.e., the
observations reported in the paper. For the publication and reuse of intermediate models and detailed system descriptions (labeled with two asterisks (**) in Figure 1), we propose a progressive badge system for published articles to reward higher levels of data availability and accessibility.

As further clarified below, these criteria and incentives for data openness are planned as an initial step to be complemented by additional incentives for higher procedural openness at a later date (labeled with three asterisks (***) in Figure 1). Our vision is that the implementation of each of these aspects will progressively lead to high levels of transparency, accessibility, and reproducibility in all research steps, from raw data to final results.

**Figure 1:** The scope of the proposed minimum transparency criteria (red*) and the proposed data openness badges (blue**) within a conceptual representation of IE research and publication process (flow chart), with data and manipulations respectively in pale parallelograms and dark gray rectangles. The scope of a future iteration of the badge system is also outlined (italic***).
As discussed in the section “Community engagement”, the DTTF pursued an inclusive approach soliciting feedback from participants of the 2017 ISIE Conference, the ISIE sections, the \textit{JIE} editorial board and the IE community at large. Survey results are reported in the supporting information SI3. The \textit{JIE} editors have agreed to implement the DTTF proposal as part of the \textit{JIE} publication process.

**Minimum data transparency criteria**

We propose minimum data publication requirements for IE research. These aim to be applicable to all IE research regardless of the confidential nature of the system description or its underlying data, and therefore aim at facilitating the inspection and reuse of results (rather than the more demanding process of replication of the analysis). We identify two key issues that often make inspection of IE research difficult: 1) digital data are typically inadequately identified; and 2) data extraction is often more difficult than necessary. The requirements below are intended to address these two issues.

**Minimum Publication Requirement 1 – Data citation:** All secondary data and databases used in the analysis must be cited in accordance with the journal's citation style. This information can include database version, database settings (e.g., allocation), date accessed, and digital object identifier (DOI), if pertinent. This requirement both clarifies data sources and provides incentives for publication of reusable and citable data. Data may be cited in the main section of the paper or in the supporting information.

**Minimum Publication Requirement 2 – Enumerate primary results:** The data that are represented in each graph or figure in an article must be published in numerical form, clearly referenced in the text, and labeled. For example, a simple spreadsheet containing the quantitative data shown in figures and tables in an article fulfills this requirement; such data can be provided in supporting information or in a publicly accessible repository. This requirement should facilitate the unambiguous inspection and usage of quantitative information contained in all key results presented as figures and graphs. The underlying quantitative data would become directly accessible, avoiding the need to visually estimate them from figures or manually copy them from tables and thus avoiding any uncertainties or errors introduced from this process. This requirement aims to facilitate increased citation, reuse, and meta-analyses of published work.

In all cases, the data supplied should be published in the supporting information or archived in a trusted repository, preferably an official repository which assigns DOIs, and cited accordingly in the original article. We expect practices in this regard to evolve as scientific publishing continues to address data transparency and accessibility.

We believe that these two simple criteria will greatly improve the transparency and usefulness of IE publications while avoiding confidentiality issues or cumbersome alterations to the workflow of IE researchers. Overall, we consider these requirements to be relatively modest and to reflect good practice of scientific publishing in general. Nevertheless, we have explicitly stipulated them here to provide a first step towards full data transparency of IE research.
Data openness badges

To reward authors whose articles exhibit higher levels of data openness, accessibility, and interoperability between data formats beyond the strict minimum for publication, we have proposed that an optional data openness badge system be introduced into the JIE publication process. It addresses the primary data that underlie the analysis and modeling, rather than the derived results, which are covered by the minimum publication requirements. Eventually, we envision more badges to recognize other contributions such as methods development, harmonization, or the development of free software tools.

Authors will be able to request a data openness badge upon submission of their manuscript and reviewers will be asked to verify its applicability. Once a badge is granted, it will be visible on the publication (see Figure 2) to reward and showcase author efforts towards data openness. The badge system aims to be progressive and flexible, with two dimensions and two levels to accommodate the diversity of research in the IE community. The first dimension addresses data contribution, while the second concerns data accessibility, the latter meaning the interoperability and reusability of the data supplied. The criteria for both dimensions need to be met at least at the silver level to be eligible for a badge. Although further criteria have been suggested, e.g. as part of the TOP guidelines discussed above (Nosek et al. 2015), these were not adopted in this initial proposal as it was our goal to focus on those criteria most relevant to IE research while being the least disruptive to the established practice in the community.

Criteria for the data contribution badges

Data contribution -- Gold

This badge indicates that the entire system description is published at the same level of resolution and completeness as was used by the authors to calculate their results.\(^2\)

- These system descriptions notably include, as applicable, the descriptions of all processes, activities, agents, objects, flows, stocks, exchanges with the biophysical environment, system boundaries, and behaviors and actions, along with links to external or secondary datasets (including licensed databases).
- All the primary data and the necessary data citations are made available such that the results can be reproduced; although the authors are not required to share all detailed calculation and analysis steps that were performed using the system description.
  - Example 1: A global input-output footprint analysis links to an open and accessible system description including the matrix of technical requirements, exchanges with the environment, final consumption, and value added.
  - Example 2: An LCA study makes available its foreground (all process descriptions based on own research and primary data) and also publishes all the links to a published dataset (e.g., Ecoinvent) for all secondary data used.

---

\(^2\) It should be noted that the gold level for data contribution in our progressive badge system is well aligned with the “Open Data” badge of the COS [Open Science Framework, Badges to acknowledge open data practices, available at: https://osf.io/tvyxz/, accessed 21 October 2017]. In our badge framework, we rather opted for a more progressive approach to data contribution, with two levels to reflect IE’s focus on industrial processes that can prove proprietary. We also stress accessibility as a second dimension because of our community’s reliance on databases with diverse formats and focus.
- The data is published under a free, open-content license that explicitly allows use, distribution, and production of derivative work, such as Creative Commons’ Public Domain (CC0), Attribution (CC-BY), and Attribution-ShareAlike (CC-BY-SA) licenses.

Data contribution -- Silver

Option 1: In situations where authors cannot share their entire system description, for example, when facing confidentiality issues, they should nonetheless be commended for sharing the detailed description of the non-sensitive parts of the system under a free, open-content license.

- Published datasets would include, for example, complete process descriptions, extensive descriptions of stocks and flows, and tabulated product compositions.
- The intent is that a significant portion of the system is described in a self-contained and useful manner with clear metadata allowing for unambiguous interpretation of each data point within this part of the system.
- Example 1: An LCA study of Li-ion battery use may be unable to fully describe the assembly of battery cells because the data on energy requirements to do this are commercially sensitive. This analysis may nonetheless usefully characterize unit processes describing at full resolution the production of the anodes, cathodes, and electrolytes, thereby contributing useful primary data to the community.
- Example 2: The publication of an extensive MFA model may similarly be unable to include the whole system description. Nonetheless, the authors are able to share an extensive table of the mass and elemental composition for many of the stocks and flows in the model, which will likely prove useful to other research.

Option 2: The second approach to fulfilling the objective of the silver level applies to studies that link a technological system to a damage or an impact (e.g., global warming) through multiple types of interactions with the environment (emissions and resource use, e.g., releases of CO₂, CH₄, N₂O). Because of the diversity of characterisation methods to translate interactions into impacts, the badge recognizes the benefits for the community of publishing the total interactions of the technological system with the environment in a readily reusable and uncharacterized format.

- Example 1: An IO analysis calculating the carbon footprint of nations would provide the results not only in terms of characterized CO₂-equivalents, but also in terms of the total emissions of the different greenhouse gases (CO₂, CH₂, N₂O, etc.)
- Example 2: In the case of an LCA study, a complete LCI of elementary flows would be published at the systems process level. That means, the study would contain the cumulative total for the whole life cycle of each type of emission flow and each type of resource use.

Criteria for data accessibility badges

Accessibility Gold

For this badge, the system description must be formatted and archived such that it is both human readable and directly importable into free software capable of completing the relevant IE analysis.

- Human and machine readability: The system is described such that it can be read and understood by humans in plain text files. Examples of such file formats include plain text, csv, json, and xml files, but compressed versions of these formats are also accepted, such as xlsx and ods spreadsheet formats, but not the proprietary xlsb or
xls formats. The system description should also be *machine readable* in the sense that a relevant software can readily distinguish words from numbers, recognize table structures, etc. For example, a system description in a spreadsheet is machine readable, whereas a system description in PDF or word processing formats (.docx, odt, etc.) is not.

- **Direct imports in relevant free software:** The relevant analyses can be directly performed on the system description without requiring payment for software. Many situations fulfill this objective, for example:
  1. A system description is exported in a non-proprietary structured format (e.g., ecospold XML files) that can be imported directly into free software (e.g., openLCA and brightway2) which can perform the relevant analysis (e.g., LCA calculations).
  2. Both the data and the calculations of the study are fully embedded in a spreadsheet (e.g., ods, xlsx file). If this spreadsheet can be opened in a free office suite (e.g., LibreOffice) without loss of functionality, it fulfills the requirement.
  3. A study publishes not only the data but also the (free) software to parse and analyze it (e.g., a Python script).

**Accessibility Silver**

For this badge, the system description must be formatted such that it can fulfill at least one of the two criteria of the **Accessibility Gold** badge: it must either be directly readable by humans and machines, or be directly importable in a relevant free analysis software.

In order to obtain a badge, it is necessary that the authors respect at least the silver level of both dimensions, data publication and accessibility. Our proposed design for the badges is presented in Table 1 and Figure 2.

Table 1: Summary of the two dimensions and two levels of the Data Openness Badge system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data contribution</th>
<th>Data accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire system description is contributed</td>
<td>Human &amp; machine readable, <strong>and</strong> directly importable into free analysis software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silver</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Option 1:* Detailed, useful, and self-contained descriptions of significant parts of the system  
*Option 2:* Total exchanges of the technological system with the environment published in an uncharacterised form | Human & machine readable, **or** directly importable into free analysis software |
By proposing the data openness badges we seek to incentivize the publication of any data that is formatted such that it can be directly imported into a free analysis tool. We expect that more exchange of data will promote convergence in terms of data formatting and a greater interoperability with free analysis tools.

Similarly, as it is challenging to describe systems in IE research in a standard way, we refrain from prescribing a specific manner of describing the studied system. Rather, the data openness badge system aims to reward disclosure of the system description (or part of it) as it was used by the authors to generate their results. We hope that this specification leads to maximum flexibility and applicability in rewarding badges.

In addition to promoting the aforementioned publication of system descriptions, the data openness badges also aim to incentivize another type of useful data disclosure: the provision of uncharacterized elementary flows. IE studies typically describe technological (sub)systems that interact with the environment or society. These interactions are often represented as exchanges of substances, energy, money, etc. These exchanges are then typically characterized to translate them into impacts (global warming, resource depletion, consequences on human health, etc.). However, as science generates knowledge on the response of systems (e.g., natural and social) to these exchanges, characterization factors are continuously updated (e.g., ReCiPe2008, ReCiPe2016, CML2001, ImpactWorld+, etc.).

The choice of characterization method has a significant influence on the results of the study. Without the publication of the uncharacterized emissions data, however, these IE results are incommensurable with those that rely on older or different characterization methods. We thus seek to reward any study that publishes the total of each exchange of the technological system with the environment in an uncharacterized manner with a data contribution badge.

The badges signal to the reader that the detailed data and system descriptions underlying the published work are open and accessible. We believe that our gold level badges will allow for recognition of the effort it takes to contribute datasets in an accessible manner. For example, consistent use of the badge system may guide meta-analyses to select studies with levels of transparency sufficient to harmonize system boundaries and assumptions. The inventories supplied by those studies may also be consolidated in IE databases at a later stage. We emphasize that our proposal is to make the badges optional, not a requirement for publication.

Figure 2: The four possible combinations of the Data Openness Badge
The data openness badge system is clearly not applicable to all IE research. Qualitative research and methodological research without detailed case studies, for example, may contain no quantitative system description and have no relevant data to share, and are therefore not covered by the badges. If the badge system is found to be effective, it could be extended to recognize other contributions to research transparency.

Implementation and next steps

With this proposal, the DTTF presents to the IE community its recommendations for greater data transparency. Implementing the suggestions made here affects journal policies, the reviewing process, and, not the least, the workflow of IE researchers. We used a community engagement and expert consultation process, described in section xx and SI3, to refine our proposal. Further feedback will be required in the implementation and for addressing additional aspects of moving towards open science. To facilitate communication we created the permanent email address data@is4ie.org as well as the web page www.is4ie.org/opendata, where additional information and material on data openness is supplied. Here we describe the first implementation of the badge system in the JIE, the future development of data referencing, data formats, and databases, and the link between data and procedural transparency (SI4). We sincerely hope that these actions and this proposal engage a constructive and sustained dialogue within the IE community on the important topic of data availability and open science.

Implementation in the Journal of Industrial Ecology

Based on the feedback obtained, we submitted a refined set of recommendations to the ISIE council in December 2017, including a proposal for the minimum requirements and the badge system to become part of the regular JIE review process. We also created and submitted to the editorial board suggested text for the JIE author, editor, and reviewer guidelines regarding the introduction of the minimum publication requirement and data openness badge system into the publication process of the JIE. It is our goal that authors who wish to obtain a data openness badge will be able to indicate so in the JIE manuscript submission process and editors and reviewers will receive clear instructions for the review of the different data contribution and accessibility criteria. The status of the implementation of our proposals can be followed on the JIE website.

We encourage the Editors-in-Chiefs of other journals of the field to consider implementing the requirements and incentives proposed here or elsewhere, e.g., the COS-led TOP guidelines.

Data referencing

During our work we realized that practices for data referencing, i.e., the reference to or citation of individual datasets or parts of larger databases, are diverse and not formalized. Clearly, there must be an evolution of practices in data referencing, and a development of procedures for giving credit to underlying contributors. The process of data referencing
should be considered as parallel to the evolution of data structures and databases for industrial ecology.

Data structure and database development in IE

One of the most important opportunities arising from data openness is that it facilitates data processing in follow-up studies, e.g., for meta-analysis. Our current proposal aims at making data available in some convenient form, but does not specify the data format itself. Data providers are aware of the benefit of supplying their and using other researchers’ data in widely accepted and standardized formats, and there is a clear need in the different subfields of IE to continue the process of data format development. We see the methodspecific data format development as being the responsibility of individual ISIE sections or other, related organizations.

Ultimately, structured data from a wide spectrum of studies could be integrated into a common database so that researchers have the opportunity to query multiple relevant datasets at the same time. However, such an approach requires that data are sufficiently harmonized, e.g., by using compatible classifications, across several major IE techniques (e.g., IO, LCA, and MFA). Care must be taken, however, when developing harmonisation processes, as authors may perceive a data harmonization step in their work as an undue burden without tangible benefit. Moreover, as analysis methods evolve (e.g., from LCA to hybrid IO-LCA), strict data formats may become inadequate for studies presenting novel methodology, which may therefore become an obstacle for innovation. We believe that the further development of data structures and their harmonisation across the different subfields of IE presents a clear opportunity to substantially advance IE research and that should play a central in the process towards data openness.

Linking data transparency with procedural transparency

Another major barrier to achieving transparency of results is the absence of clear documentation of a method or procedure by which the results were generated. Open results alone are often insufficient to allow researchers to infer the underlying procedures and assess their correctness and validity. Therefore, open data need to be accompanied by a transparent description of procedures in order to achieve full reproducibility of study results.

In practice, the steps required to organize data sources, process data, and extract results are study-dependent and nuanced. As a consequence, even studies with high degrees of data openness can be difficult to compare. To progress beyond pure data contribution and towards validation, verification, and reproducibility of results, a higher transparency of methodology documentation is needed.

We ultimately believe that the IE community needs to move beyond the summary descriptions often presented in methods sections of papers, and towards the publication of detailed research procedures and computational scripts that fully reproducible research requires. This shift in documentation and publication practice, however, comes at a cost. Apart from concerns about disclosing information to competitors, IE researchers may object to the workload that would be associated with the relatively high level of documentation
required attain this goal. Here, we note that data and procedural transparency go hand in hand, and so the latter is inevitably needed to attain fully reproducible research. We believe that fully reproducible IE research can only be achieved through a step-by-step process, and that this document provides an important preliminary step towards realizing this aim.

The future of the ISIE data transparency task force

As part of their current mandate the members of the DTTF will continue to develop and improve guidelines for achieving higher levels of data openness based on the experience gained during the coming implementation process. The focus of our work for 2018 is to facilitate the implementation of data openness in the JIE. The ISIE council will review the mandate of the task force in regular intervals and adjust it to keep pace with the development of data openness in the field and the requirements set by society.

Final thoughts and conclusions

The effort for higher data transparency and accessibility has just begun, and our proposal for minimum requirements and the data openness badge system will continue to be open for debate and revision. We believe that the contribution of IE research cannot be wholly realized until results become more readily comparable, integrated, citable, and reusable. In order to achieve fully reproducible IE research, the data contribution and accessibility standards suggested here would further require data openness to be linked to procedural transparency and harmonization of data structures and - to some extent - computational methods. The upcoming changes will affect the workflow of each of us as IE researchers. They will likely also have consequences for data ownership, which may entail legal and institutional considerations, and implications related to competitiveness, which requires careful evaluation of the disadvantage of sharing data versus the advantage of access to other researchers’ data. Free-riding on the willingness of others to share their data should be frowned upon; conversely, developing a highly collaborative and integrated IE community should be viewed as the gold standard in our collective ability to deliver high impact research that provides tangible and valuable scientific contributions to society. A more reproducible scientific workflow in IE research therefore also has profound ethical consequences, including the valuation of our own work, our role as recipients of public funds, and the contribution of IE research to grand challenges such as sustainable development and improved social, economic, and cultural well-being.
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SI1. Data Transparency Task Force mandate

This is the text of the mandate given by the governing council of the International Society for Industrial Ecology for the Data Transparency Task Force (DTTF).

Proposal ISIE Task Force – Open Access Industrial Ecology

Documentation and publication of industrial ecology data

Within the ISIE there is a need for better documentation and accessibility of the work of industrial ecologists, to be able to aggregate, validate, and contribute it to the public, policy makers and companies. IE currently lacks harmonized procedures, standards, and a platform to share open access data, as well as a tradition of publishing the data along with research results. These deficiencies represent some important missed opportunities:

i. It hinders the systematic exploitation of IE results for the greater good of society.
ii. The contribution of IE to international assessment efforts, such as those of the IRP, IPCC, and IPBES, are hampered.
iii. Collaboration within the community is made difficult.
iv. Research results of the different members are ‘incompatible’ to one another, limiting comparability and building upon previous work.

This lack of properly formatted, documented, and comparable data is nowhere more evident than in the most detailed and specifically focused on IE methods, life cycle assessment, where longstanding efforts have not lead to work that can easily be contributed to the IPCC assessment process.

It is therefore suggested that ISIE sets down a task force charged with coming up with a set of guidelines and propose or develop a data repository for the publication of data in industrial ecology that could become part of the policy of JIE and would be recommended to other journals. It should address life cycle inventories, but also of material stock and flow data, supply and use tables, and other quantitative information about socioeconomic metabolism.

The policy should address following issues:

● Requirement of publishing and giving access to underlying data for relevant papers where admissible in a community-wide data repository.
● Document and publish the code on a repository (such as Github) in a form that makes results reproducible.
● Encourage the use of ISIE tools & code, fostering its continued development.
● Encourage the use of open source tools formats (e.g. R / Python instead of Matlab) and open data (csv instead of Excel), to avoid copyright issues, facilitate reproducibility and offer interfaces to other tools.
● Options to improve transparency, citation of data, providing credit for making data accessible.
Suggestions, where appropriate, for data formats and nomenclatures.

Following questions should be considered in this work:

- What is the current state of documenting IE studies and making accessible data, considering the entire universe of academic and corporate/consultancy work?
- What do available databases or repositories contain and how are they assembled?
- Are available data formats widely used and sufficient?
- What can we learn from open access or subscription-based repositories used in other fields?
- What are opportunities offered by big data approaches?
- What degree of documentation and standardization of published data is desirable?
- What copyright and legal issues need to be solved when distributing data to the community?
- How can published data be critiqued and a learning process implemented?
- Can and should we still give room to publish case studies which do not reveal the underlying data? Under what circumstances is this desirable? How can we work with confidential data?
- What incentives can we provide academic and corporate members to contribute?
- Do ISIE member have data from previous work available that could be gifted to the initial efforts?

The task force should come up with a proposal or a set of recommendations to be presented at the ISIE meeting in Chicago, June 2017 and an editorial piece or column in JIE that goes along with it.

Founding members of the task force: Niko Heeren (ETH), Brandon Kuczenski (UCSB), Guillaume Majea-Bettez (CIRAIG), Rupert Myers (Yale), Stefan Pauliuk (Freiburg), Konstantin Stadler (NTNU).
Niko Heeren and Edgar Hertwich
Zurich/New Haven, September 2016

SI2. Examples for transparent publications in IE

Bulk data

Many IE research projects would be futile without the use of bulk data for industrial processes, material flows, and multi-regional input-output tables (MRIO). Transparency and availability varies greatly across the bulk IE databases. Process and life cycle inventories are made available in life cycle databases, such as ecoinvent or GaBi, and the most complete collection of both free and proprietary databases can be found at https://nexus.openlca.org/. Ecoinvent, the most widely used database for scientific LCA research, is a proprietary process inventory database. The compilation and processing of ecoinvent data, however, is documented in detail.

On the other side of the spectrum, most of the six currently available MRIO databases (Tukker and Dietzenbacher 2013) provide open access but the transparency of data harmonization steps is often insufficient (Lutter and Giljum 2014).
A database for national material flow accounting is available in an aggregated free version and a proprietary high-resolution section (http://www.materialflows.net/). A bulk database of elemental and substance flows and stocks does currently not exist. Other examples of large open datasets/inventories in ISIE community include enipedia, a semantic data store of energy production and flows (http://enipedia.tudelft.nl/wiki/Main_Page) and openei, which gathers energy related data (http://en.openei.org/wiki/Main_Page).

Journal publications and technical reports

Despite the difficulties in providing data, a number of good examples of partial or complete supply of research data exist in our community.

Detailed life cycle and process inventories have been published along with a number of recent articles, including a battery manufacturing inventory (Ellingsen et al. 2014) and several inventories for passenger vehicles (Hawkins et al. 2013).

Complete datasets for material and energy flow analysis and accounting were published, amongst others, by Kennedy et al. (2015) for the metabolism of megacities by van Eygen Van Eygen et al. (2017) for an MFA of plastics, by Zoboli et al. (2015) for an MFA study on phosphorus, by Northey et al. for an overview of copper, nickel, and lead/zinc mines, by Hoekman and Blottnitz (2016) on the urban metabolism of Cape Town, and for product lifetimes by Murakami et al. (2010) (http://www.nies.go.jp/lifespan/sic search e.php)

The Social Ecology Group at Alpen-Adria University frequently provide whole datasets as additional information at https://www.aau.at/sozialeoekologie/data-download/. A new material flow accounting dataset (http://uneplive.org/country/res tab1 7) was published in support of a new UNEP report on global material flows and resource productivity (Schandl et al. 2016).

Within IO, a transparent IO model for the US, USEEIO, is now available including the model builder software (Yang et al. 2017). Lenzen et al. (2017) compiled and provide a time-series (2008-2015) of balanced sub-national, multi-regional supply-and-use tables (MR-SUTs), integrated with a set of socio-economic and environmental accounts, for Australia.

SI3. Survey results

An introduction of minimum publication requirements and the data openness badges requires acceptance by the IE community; therefore, the DTTF and JIE have undertaken a community engagement process.

In a first step, we solicited feedback on our proposal and on other options to enhance data transparency and accessibility from the entire IE community during the summer of 2017. To that end we created the permanent email address data@is4ie.org and posted the topic on IE social media channels and announced it during the 2017 ISIE-ISSST conference in Chicago. Furthermore, we invited all interested parties to participate in an anonymous online survey posted on www.is4ie.org/opendata. JIE editors and section board members were consulted as well. We were particularly interested in hearing about whether the level of ambition of the badge system was reasonable, how the measures proposed would affect the
workflow, preferred licensing and storage places, and whether there are ongoing data or procedural transparency and accessibility efforts in other communities to which we should link our efforts. We received 33 mostly positive responses, with around 15 respondents of the MFA, IO, and LCA communities, respectively (double-affiliations were allowed). We list the opinions polled in Table x and the main items of critique and our response to them in table y.

The survey results may not be representative of our entire community but they gave us the confidence to move forward and the specific feedback to refine our suggestions. In particular, it became clear that more specific guidance and examples are needed to specify the exact changes that are needed in publishing process, to make the whole procedure predictable and void of surprises.

Based on the feedback obtained, we submitted a refined set of recommendations to the ISIE council in December 2017, including a proposal for the amendment of the JIE publication requirements regarding the introduction of the data openness badge system.

Table S3.1: General opinion towards the data openness guidelines among the survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that there should be a minimum data openness requirement for all JIE articles publishing quantitative results?</td>
<td>Yes: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes: do you agree with the minimum requirements proposed by the DTTF (proper citation of all secondary data and databases and delivery of all primary results in spreadsheets or the like) or should there be fewer or more requirements?</td>
<td>More: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OK: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fewer: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that the JIE should establish an optional data openness badge to distinguish particularly open data-driven research articles?</td>
<td>Yes: 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes: Do you agree with the proposed structure of the badges (two dimensions: data availability/transparency and data accessibility, two levels for each dimension) and with the requirements for the different levels?</td>
<td>Yes: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the requirements for the minimum standard and the different badge grades clear and unambiguous?</td>
<td>Yes: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see any potential conflicts between the requirements for data openness and your current workflow (funder, software, ...)?</td>
<td>Yes: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see a benefit in applying for a data openness badge for your own research published in JIE?</td>
<td>Yes: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your preferred way of making data stemming from your published research available? (multiple answers were possible)</td>
<td>Public repositories: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community repos.: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you describe the current state of data openness within your specialisation of industrial ecology? | Problematic: 15  
Some improvement needed: 13,  
sufficient: 2

How will industrial ecology, according to your opinion, benefit most from data openness? | Faster progress: 25  
Higher impact: 16  
Cumulative Research easier: 22

Where do you see the main responsibility for data openness? | Authors: 25;  Editors and reviewers: 13;  Funders: 10;  Community: 5

Table S3.2: Overview of core feedback items on the data openness guidelines proposal and our response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback (ordered by no. of times mentioned)</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to resolve IN DETAIL the distinction between proprietary or licensed data that cannot be published and data that can be published with proper citation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>We checked the pertinent copyright laws and the end user license agreements of a major database of the field to refine our guidelines regarding what constitutes a fair use of data from a licensed database. We discussed the results with the database providers and have adjusted the draft author guidelines. Also, our proposed framework promotes citing and linking to data from external sources, rather than reproducing or “re-publishing” these data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing compatibility with badge requirements may be too much work for reviewers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>We agree that reviewers will have an extra effort when becoming familiar with the badge criteria. We formulated a set of detailed guidelines to make the work of the reviewers as easy as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a problem of subjectivity when applying badge requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>We agree and suggest the following mitigations of that risk: a) Detailed guidelines with specific examples are provided for author, reviewers, and editors. b) A JIE data editor has been appointed to address and manage these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data openness may be hindered through data formatting problems, software constraints, lack of metadata etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>That is true and there will be cases where a data openness badge cannot be obtained because certain data required cannot be extracted from proprietary software. For the majority of all cases the relatively flexible formatting requirements posed by the badge system should not be a significant obstacle to data supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good scientific practice requires researchers to make data available upon request, that interaction also is valuable feedback on who is interested in research. How does that relate to the badge system?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The requirement to publish certain results and data along with each paper makes it easier for readers with no personal connections to the authors to access this information, and we therefore see the minimum requirements and the badge system as a fairer solution than personal contact. Of course we encourage readers to personally contact the authors to clarify further questions and provide feedback on the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to provide detailed examples of good practice and detailed guidelines.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During revision of this document and author guidelines, we made a significant effort to provide good examples of data citation, data formatting, and a description of the requirements of the different badge levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The badge system may be too complicated.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree that data openness has many dimensions and aspects, and covering most of them could stymie the publication process. We are confident that our two-dimensional approach, encompassing data availability and ease of access, currently is the best compromise between ambitious data openness and ease of integration in the workflow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to combine open data with open access.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree that this combination is a very attractive one, but have to point out that copyright law treats data and the research articles built on them very differently. The <em>JIE</em> is currently a hybrid journal with subscription-based access and some articles published open access, with options for self-archiving. Members of the task force are engaged in the open science movement, which may eventually facilitate a major change regarding open access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The badge system may not work if only <em>JIE</em> does it.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree that data openness badges should be widely applied. But we also see <em>JIE</em> in a special situation, both as journal of a community that will benefit enormously from open data and as journal whose board has the ambition of gaining experience as first mover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The additional workload may be prohibitive.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When drafting the guidelines we were careful to keep the additional work required to meet the minimum publication standard acceptable. The amount of extra work required for the optional badges largely depends on the toolbox that is being used. We firmly believe that the benefits industrial ecology scholars will reap from the openness movement will far outweigh the work that each of us has to put in their own publications, especially when the decision to aim for a certain badge level is made at an early stage of the research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional support, e.g., by a data editor and an early announcement is needed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree and decided to appoint a data editor for the <em>JIE</em> (link!) and publish the description of the badge system in the first 2018 issue of <em>JIE</em> so that the new guidelines can become effective soon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SI4. Procedural transparency and workflow automation in IE

While documentation of laboratory procedures is a core part of science, the era of data-intensive science has brought about a new approach to "digital" methods: the scientific workflow (Lud"ascher 2006). Derived from transactional workflow management developed in the business world (Singh 1996), scientific workflows provide a way to repeatedly and consistently apply a sequence of processing steps to input data in order to generate scientific results. A signal characteristic of a scientific workflow is the generation of provenance information—in simple terms, indicating how the data were processed—which provides structured documentation of how a scientific result was generated (Davidson and Freire 2008). A number of scientific workflow management systems have been developed which enable users to perform repetitive tasks by constructing step-by-step procedures. Ultimately these tools will help to automatically document and reproduce results. Many procedures in IE can be described precisely enough to automate. For instance, in LCA:

- **Inventory lookup**: Lookup exchanges, LCI results, or LCIA scores for specific processes
- **Emission Characterization**: Lookup the characterization factor for an emission into a given environmental compartment

in MFA:
- **Mass balance**: Given a set of known flows and one unknown flow, into and out of a particular node and including accumulation (i.e., net additions to stock), compute a mass balance and assign it to the unknown flow
- **Stocks In use**: Given a time series of flows and a set of parameters for a lifetime distribution, estimate stocks in use
- **Assumption**: apply an assumption to estimate the magnitude of one flow from another.
- **Aggregation by region**: Given a set of material flows over small spatial scales, compute the total over a larger region

in IOA:
- **Data reconciliation** of partial or conflicting information in national IO tables or trade data.
- **IO model building** by applying a construct to a supply and use table.
- **Footprint calculation and structural path analysis** with IO tables.

Moreover, as observed above, major data sources are increasingly available online, so there is no reason why data retrieval must remain a manual task.

More research is needed to determine whether IE studies can be described consistently enough to be automated. If so, then it will change the meaning of authoring a study. Instead of manipulating spreadsheets and data columns in specialized software, a researcher may spend time precisely identifying data sources and specifying rigorously how data points are combined to compute results. It becomes possible to imagine studies that can be (a) instantly reproduced by another party, and (b) automatically updated when background data are changed.
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