DIRECTORATES-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (RTD) AND COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS, CONTENT AND TECHNOLOGY (CONNECT)

Public Consultation:
'Science 2.0': science in transition

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Information about the Respondents

1. Are you responding to this questionnaire on behalf of/as: * (compulsory)

- o Individual
- o Organisation
- o Company
- o Public Authority
- o Other

2. Please enter your name or the name of your company/organisation: * (compulsory) (max. 50 characters)

3. Please indicate your principal country or countries of residence or activity: * (compulsory)

Austria	Hungary	Slovenia
Belgium	Ireland	Spain
Bulgaria	Italy	Sweden
Croatia	Latvia	United Kingdom
Cyprus	Lithuania	Other (please specify): free text box
Czech Republic	Luxembourg	
Denmark	Malta	
Estonia	Netherlands	
Finland	Poland	
France	Portugal	
Germany	Romania	
Greece	Slovakia	

4. Received contributions together with the identity of the contributor may be published on the Commission's website. Do you agree to your contribution being published under your name? * (compulsory)

- o My contribution can be published under the name indicated.
- o My contribution can be published anonymously.
- o I do not agree that my contribution is published.

B. Recognition of the issue

Do you recognise the trends described in the consultation paper as 'Science 2.0'?

- o Yes
- o Yes, but with a different emphasis on particular elements of 'Science 2.0' (Please specify)
- o Yes, but some essential elements are missing,(Please specify)
- o No, not at all because (Please specify)

C. Drivers

What are the key drivers of 'Science 2.0'?

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Availability of digital technologies and their increased capacities					
Increase of the global scientific population					
Public demand for faster solutions to Societal Challenges					
Public demand for better and more effective science (replicability of research results, avoidance of duplication of research etc.)					
Researchers looking for new ways of collaboration					
Researchers looking for new ways of disseminating their outputs (including publications)					
Growing criticism of current peer-review system					
Citizens acting as scientists					
Growing public scrutiny with regard to research integrity and accountability of science and research					
Scientific publishers engaging in 'Science 2.0'					
Public funding supporting 'Science 2.0'					
Other (please specify):	(free text box)				

D. Implications of 'Science 2.0' for society, the economy, and the research system

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	don't know
Science will become more efficient, e.g. by accelerating discovery and avoiding duplication.					
Citizen science practices could help reconnect science and society.					
Crowd-funding could become an important funding source for research.					
Research could be become more responsive to society through crowd-funding.					
Data-intensive science can become a key driver of economic growth and development.					
Science will become more reliable, e.g. by facilitating the re-use of data.					
Science will become more responsive to demands for scientific integrity.					
Science will result in faster and wider innovation.					
Science will become more responsive to societal challenges.					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

On what specific issues within 'Science 2.0' do you see a need for policy intervention? Please indicate a ranking ranging from the highest need (11) to the lowest need (1).

	Ranking: 11 (highest need) to –1 (lowest need)
Open access to publications	
Open access to research data	
Open code	
Open source	
Text and data mining	
Data-intensive science	
Citizen science	
Research metrics	
Assessment of quality of research	
Alternative reputation systems	
Research infrastructure	
Other: please specify	(free text box)

With regard to the first three priorities you indicated above could you please specify what kind of policy intervention would be desirable?

Please note here:

Scientific disciplines

1. Are there specific disciplines with more potential than others to engage with 'Science 2.0'? Why?

Please note here:

2. Are there specific disciplines with potential to engage with 'Science 2.0', but where uptake so far has been slow? Why?

Please note here:

3. Are there specific disciplines without real potential to engage 'Science 2.0'? Why?

Please note here:

E: Implications of 'Science 2.0' for researchers

Acknowledgement of 'Science 2.0'-based activities

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
'Science2.0'-based activities (including data curation) should be taken into account for career progression of researchers.					
'Science 2.0'-based activities should not have any impact on the recruitment practices of research performing organisations.					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

What are the most effective channels for awareness-raising of 'Science2.0'?

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	don't know
Organising debates at universities					
Engagement of learned societies					
Funding of specific actions by research funding organisations					
Awards for specific initiatives					
Integration in career promotion procedures					
Integration in research training					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

F. Opportunities for and barriers to 'Science 2.0'

What are the opportunities for 'Science 2.0'?

Potential opportunities at the level of the individual scientist:

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Wider dissemination and sharing of research outputs					
Greater publication opportunities					
Involvement in extended, international networks of researchers					
Involvement in more multidisciplinary research					
Enhanced career perspectives					
Possibility to revise the peer review system					
Research on problems that could not be addressed otherwise					
Engaging with a wider public and with society at large					
Other: (please specify)	(free text box)				

at the institutional level:

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Driving economic growth					
Facilitating accountable and collaborative research modes					
Promoting better science					
Better value for money through avoiding duplication					
Better value for money through accelerating the research process					
Creating scientific output to underpin public policy					
Fostering new forms of research					
Supporting new forms of research-based teaching					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

What are the barriers to 'Science 2.0'?

Potential barriers at the level of the individual scientist:

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Lack of acknowledgement / credit-giving for 'Science 2.0' activities (e.g. curated data, science blogs, etc.)					
Limited awareness about the potential benefits of 'Science 2.0' for researchers					
Concerns about quality assurance of new and non-traditional research outputs					
Lack of new research skills necessary in the context of 'Science 2.0', e.g. data management skills					
Lack of financial support					
Legal constraints (e.g. copyright law)					
Lack of incentives for early-stage researchers specifically to participate in new science and research practices					
Lack of integration in the existing infrastructures					
Uncertainty / doubts about the potential benefits of 'Science 2.0' for research					
Uncertainty / doubts about the potential benefits of 'Science 2.0' for the economy and society					
Concerns about ethical and privacy issues					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

at the institutional level:

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Limited awareness of 'Science 2.0' and its potential benefits					
Concerns about quality assurance of new and non-traditional research outputs					
Concerns about ethical and privacy issues					
Uncertainty / doubts about the potential benefits of 'Science 2.0' for research					
Uncertainty / doubts about the potential benefits of 'Science 2.0' for the economy and society					
Other (please specify)	(free text box)				

G: Development of research metrics and quality assurance

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	don't know
The determination of research metrics cannot be left to private actors, such as Mendeley or Research Gate.					
The recent developments in metrics (e.g. altmetrics) are well known within the research community.					
Altmetrics should be further developed and take into account impact beyond academic context, e.g. 'market impact'.					
Altmetrics should take into account the involvement of civil society.					
Altmetrics should take into account researchers' degree of openness (e.g. practicing open access) and their engagement in collaborative research practices.					
The European Commission should fund research to advance altmetrics.					
Data and formula/algorithms for metrics should be transparent.					
Altmetics should supplement conventional metrics					
Altmetrics should replace conventional metrics					
Research needs to be done in order to advance quality assurance procedures.					
Other: (please specify)	(free text box)				

H: Role of research funding organisations, Member States, and the European Union

Public authorities could facilitate the uptake of 'Science 2.0' by:

	I totally agree	I partially agree	I partially disagree	I totally disagree	I don't know
Developing policies on data sharing for research purposes					
Developing policies on facilitating public access to scientific publications					
Reviewing evaluation criteria of research proposals					
Reviewing procedures of quality assessment of research					
Increasing acknowledgement of 'Science 2.0'-based research output					
Public authorities should increasingly take into account 'Science 2.0'-related activities by setting benchmarks.					
Public authorities should focus on implementing framework conditions enabling the uptake of 'Science 2.0' activities.					
There is no need for any initiatives of public authorities to encourage the up-take of new science practices since it is a bottom-up driven process happening anyway.					
The European Commission should promote 'Science 2.0' under Horizon 2020.					
The European Commission should dedicate specific actions under the European Research Area to 'Science 2.0'.					
Which 'Science 2.0'-based activities would be desirable to be taken into account under the European Research Area? (Please specify)	(free text box)				
Other: (please specify)	(free text box)				

I: Terminology of the phenomenon 'Science 2.0'

Which of the following options is the most appropriate term to use for what is described as 'Science 2.0' in the background document?

- Science 2.0
- Open Digital Science
- Digital Science
- Open Science
- Networked Science
- Enhanced Science
- Other (please specify):

Overall Comments

Do you have any additional comments? (Open question, 500 characters max)

(free text box)