Subject: Minutes 2nd Meeting of Mandate 2 of the Open Science Policy Platform (OSPP-M2), Brussels, 30 January 2019

1. Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting
The agenda and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Nature of the meeting
This meeting was non-public.

3. Opening address by Jean-Eric Paquet, Director General DG RTD
Main messages and overview:
- The Director General thanked the OSPP for all the work done so far and the current chair of the OSPP, Eva Méndez, for her active involvement in the work of the OSPP. The DG stressed that most of the policy and implementation measures on OS are largely with the organisations represented in the OSPP.
- Work on OS is very important for European science. Commissioner Moedas has made it one of the key features of his work, and DG RTD as well.
- The DG underlined three current developments:
  - the remarkable breakthrough of cOAlition S on Plan S. Modalities are being discussed at the moment.
  - the great progress made on the European Open Science Cloud. The real challenge now is not governance or funding or development of infrastructures, but for scientific user communities to take it up, stakeholders have responsibility here.
  - Europe is leading the way on OS, we should be proud of that and engage international stakeholders. Although not directly related to the OSPP now, but in the next period, we also need to find better balances between practices today and the needs of tomorrow’s innovation and (circular) economy.
4. Introduction and discussion on current state of affairs OSPP and outlook on work of OSPP until May 2020, Eva Méndez (chair OSPP)

- The chair summarized the work done since the last meeting, and what has to be done next.
- The OSPP is now between reports and recommendations and needs to address their stakeholder communities. The OSPP has started to transform/map recommendations to create Practical Commitments for Implementation (PCIs) to achieve real “OS as a practice”. To make this happen, the OSPP needs to reach all members of the European operational ecosystem: stakeholders in the OSPP, but also many other actors, all funded projects that affect OS, e.g. EOSC, SWAFS. The OSPP should also have an overview of this ecosystem on the national level, and internationally.
- The OSPP should advice the EC, but also give practical advice how to implement OS policy. The OSPP needs to come up with ideas for implementation in Horizon Europe (see folder on shared Google-drive and add ideas).
- Mapping of OS initiatives is very important and very complex, see the first mapping of SWAFS. The OSPP is mapping the OSPP-REC and the Expert Groups recommendations on PCIs at stakeholder level. If the OSPP concludes there is an issue with the implementation of a recommendation, the OSPP should report back to the EC if it is not feasible.
- PCIs have to be realistic: the stakeholders addressed need to have jurisdiction to change the system. (Plan S is an example of the first OS PCI: cOAlition S has jurisdiction and money for grants, so they can ask for compliance on plan S).
- Work on PCIs started by addressing a topic/challenge. The OSPP needs to work on institutional level and needs to think how to work on a national level. OSPP should have a joined meeting with national representatives in charge of Open Science, to share ideas and align policies and PCIs. Maybe in Finland, during the Finish Presidency (FIN PCY), Oct 2019.
- Mapping of national initiatives relevant for the eight challenges/pillars of the European Agenda on Open Science: EOSC/secretariat will scan for national initiatives concerning data. OpenAIRE scans for (policy) initiatives in Member States.
- The chair reminded all members to review the list of stakeholder meetings and complete the document on G-drive with all possible events on Open Science.

5. Presentations and discussions on Expert Group (EG) reports

*Expert Group Report on Indicators for researchers’ engagement with Open Science.*

Presentation report and outlook: Paul Wouters.

Main comments OSPP:

- The report is a good summary tackling a key and complex issue, provides valuable guidance.
- This area is the hardest challenge and most critical to move forward.
• Work builds nicely on previous reports, and work of the OSPP.
• Toolboxes are very interesting.
• If we use any indicators, we need to avoid undesirable steering effects.
• We do need some indicators looking at outputs, not just open science behaviours.
• We should link this to other initiatives, like Plan S and EOSC.
• Agree that it should not be only top down, engagement with stakeholders is important, but we do need something tangible to start from, more than just a generic framework.
• About asking funding agencies and RPOs to create steering groups, and to come up with indicators: not sure they have the expertise/knowledge to do this (effectively). And it would need a lot of coordination.
• What are the goals we want to achieve? We need a suite of common goals, then come up with the framework, and then engage with stakeholders to discuss if we have the correct initial goals. They can then be tested/adjusted-expanded.
• We need to think about this in a global context too, engage there too.
• Idea of OS as processes instead of products: avoids a forced choice between Open Science vs Good Science.
• What Science Europe did for Research Data Management (RDM) is great, good example to do something similar (a guide) for indicators.
• The Expert Group’s report is quite generic, could we compile a list of known indicators, and use that to create a more specific toolbox for research communities?
• Cultural change is key in changing research processes towards OS practices.
• Scholarly and learned societies should be involved actively in the steering groups.
• Toolboxes need to be more concrete, so steering groups can easily translate them into appropriate indicators.
• Incentives for scholarly societies should become clear through the toolboxes, pointing towards indicators that would encourage these communities.
• Science Europe will launch a study on research assessment this year. It will review the practices of members’ idea of rewards and incentives. This could be a building block. Science Europe will share it with the OSPP.
• System and cultural change is very difficult in some Member States (MS), also because of legal constraints.
• Why do we want to measure? Then think about what to measure. Three dimensions to measure: individuals, research groups, proposals. Let’s get rid of “bean counting” for individuals.
• Institutions hold the key to promotion, so they have responsibilities. The toolboxes are good instruments, avoids micro management, but are reflection tools. Every institution needs to reflect on their role in the transition towards OS.
• We want something that fosters OS, makes OS practices rewardable. Measuring should be about quality, not productivity of research. Engagement with OS practices on a program/system level was not addressed by the EG.


Main comments OSPP:
• This report is a compromise between multiple stakeholders.
• There is potential to segregate the functions of publishing in the future. It might not be optimal, but it can lead to innovation from different types of service providers.
• The digital age allows these functions to be separate from publishers.
• The report emphasizes the central role of the evaluation system, the role of the Journal Impact Factor (JIF).
• The report states the change starts with a cultural change. It identifies five groups of key actors, with a central role for funders as primary lever for change.
• The report could have given a distinct role to learned societies (acting as both funders and publishers) as they represent communities of practice.
• The road towards change requires more collaboration between all actors in the research ecosystem.
• Many recommendations are already out there, and have been taken up by actors.


• Last November in Vienna, during the Austrian Presidency (AT PCY), the prototype of the EOSC Portal was launched and the Governance structure was announced, which will have the responsibility to steer and implement the activities for the first phase of the EOSC from now until 2020.
• The OSPP working group for FAIR Data has had two online meetings since last September.
• The FAIR Data report has 27 recommendations, each come with a set of actions.
• For each action the affected stakeholders are identified. Initial mapping was done within the OSPP working group, followed by identifying PCIs per stakeholder group. All input was collected in a Google spreadsheet.
• The EOSC Working Group on FAIR, and the EOSC secretariat or FAIRSAIR project can provide support to OSPP to include feedback from other organisations and maintain this work.
• The FAIR Data report mentions the need to develop Disciplinary Interoperability Frameworks. There may be a need for a horizontal instrument at the EU level (like the European Interoperability Framework), which will be generic, with core
ideas and recommendations, which can be applied in a discipline agnostic way. In the next OSPP meeting in Bucharest, this idea could be presented and then validated by the OSPP.

6. General discussion Roadmaps for Indicators for Open Science and Citizen Science

**Indicators for Open Science**

- Purpose of the Roadmap is to show we have little time/meetings to reach the end goal. For Indicators, there is a timeframe of six months, if we want to work towards a “Bucharest declaration”. Final version of report EG Indicators will be circulated. We have the 12th of April to invite research funders in Europe to converge on what we propose.
- EUA will organise a meeting on 14 May, Secretary General of Science Europe will be invited. It is up to the OSPP to propose something for the “Bucharest Declaration” or not.
- Since learned societies represent the individual researchers, they should be involved.
- OSPP needs to plan some skype meetings to create a proposal for Indicators, after Paul Wouters has revised his report (he can join the meetings). OSPP sets up a focus group for Indicators. Jennifer Edmond will lead this group. The result will be discussed at the 11/12 April OSPP meetings.
- OSPP needs enough time to engage with the stakeholders, perhaps there is not enough time to present something in Bucharest in April. OSPP should build upon DORA, not miss the international dimension.
- OSPP will start the process, but OSPP decides if the work done on indicators would be adequate for the expectations of stakeholders, the EC, etc.
- The focus group for Indicators will try to have three skype meetings in February, to have a document ready for discussion by OSPP and stakeholders during March. The document can then be discussed in the 11/12 April meetings.

**Citizen Science**

*Presentation by Linden Farrer (EC-B2)*

- Barriers to the uptake of Citizen Science (CS) requires concerted actions.
- CS links with outreach activities, education, and with policy on responsible research and innovation.
- Long-term vision: CS is recognized as an integral part of OS, and produces trusted data and knowledge, facilitated by specific toolkits.
- OSPP welcomes the policy push for CS and the long-term vision and roadmap.
- CS is already an integral part of many sciences (e.g. biodiversity). High interest/potential for CS projects, when available.
- Working with citizens is not always (initially) cost efficient. Outputs of rigorous science and CS can be different, as well as their reasons/goals.
• There could be possible drawbacks/dangers of CS (e.g. fake info), but CS is performed in collaboration with established scientists and drawbacks are not observed in actual CS projects.
• CS should not be framed as a political solution for problems.
• Concerning contracting experts for a report, an expert from humanities should be included.
• The CS Roadmap seems reasonable, going from a report from experts to a high-level workshop in Helsinki and ending in Berlin, during the German Presidency (DE PCY), with the “Berlin toolkit” on CS.
• In between now and Helsinki the OSPP should organise a stakeholder meeting. Possible end-point for CS: to become a rewardable, fundable and recognizable practice.
• Perhaps it might be organised a Workshop in Helsinki on good practices for CS, where all OSPP members share with stakeholders what they do to promote CS in a practical way. Maike will be in the lead to coordinate this workshop.
• Further feedback from OSPP on this CS document is welcome.

7. Conclusions/recommendations/opinions
• The OSPP is now between reports and recommendations and needs to address their stakeholder communities.
• The OSPP should advice the EC, but also give practical advice how to implement OS policy and provide ideas for implementation in Horizon Europe.
• Mapping of OS initiatives is very important and very complex.
• PCIs have to be realistic: the stakeholders addressed need to have jurisdiction to change the system.

8. Planning of Bucharest meeting 11/12 April
• Bucharest OSPP meeting on 11 April, host is the central university library. Manuela needs to know her role for the preparation of this meeting.
• Stakeholder meeting 12 April: how to market/communicate this event, kind of audience, the draft agenda? Case study would be good. Deadline for sending invitations is 15 Feb. It will be a half-day event in the morning.
• OSPP program committee for Bucharest: Manuela is leading (members of this committee: John Wood, Edit, Eva). What will be the take home message after 12 April? Perhaps set up an online consultation afterwards?
• Visibility of the event: online broadcasting. Press release before and after the event. A TV station will be present.
9. Presentations National OS Coordination in Finland and the Netherlands

- Kristiina and Karel presented the national coordination on OS in Finland and the Netherlands.
- Other MS could learn from the way coordination was set up in Finland and the Netherlands. In the beginning, political commitment was very important.
- Council Conclusions (during a Member State presidency) can serve as a basis for national policy.
- National coordinators are needed to make things happen. MS need to know clearly what works and doesn’t work, it would be good to have a statement from OSPP on what works.
- Not all MS are equal, e.g. in Belgium it is not realistic to consider national coordination (regions). Within OpenAIRE there are national OA desks, in OpenAIRE Advance there are tasks on the policy level, to engage with other OS actors within the country, to help in establishing this kind of coordination.
- An official FIN PCY meeting for National Coordination of OS policy is not possible anymore. But still good to have an informal meeting in Finland and other options could be explored.

10. Next steps

Stakeholders meetings, AOB:

- OSPP mandate finishes during the Croatian presidency (HR PCY) needs to be contacted on time, if OSPP wants to organise something under the HR PCY.
- OSPP should also work well in advance on the final deliverables for Council Conclusions in 2020.
- OSPP outcomes: on Indicators during meeting in Bucharest, on national coordination of OS policy in Finland, and a final overview of the next EU OS Agenda based on PCIs during HR PCY. It would be good to link the PCIs to case studies.

Next stakeholders meetings:

- 14 May Brussels on Indicators, 28 May Madrid on CS, FAIR data and new indicators/metrics (complete the list of stakeholders meetings on Gdrive document).
- CS event in Helsinki? As part of the OSPP meeting. Maike will still organise a CS event before Helsinki, around June. In Helsinki we could have a high-level workshop, ending in Berlin during the DE PCY with the Berlin Toolkit.
- Rene will follow up on the update of the roadmap on Indicators and CS.

11. Next OSPP meetings

- 11 April OSPP meeting and 12 April stakeholder meeting in Bucharest
- 22 Oct OSPP meeting Helsinki (RDA between 23-25 OCT)
- 5th OSPP M2 meeting (probably in Brussels)
12. List of participants

- Inge van Nieuwerburgh, permanently replacing Natalia Manola, for OpenAIRE
- Alain Smolders, replacing for this meeting only Kurt Deketelaere, for the League of European Research Universities (LERU)
- Lidia Borrell-Damian replacing for this meeting only Norbert Lossau, for the European University Association (EUA)
- Carolina Vigo replacing for this meeting only Gioia Venturini, for Business Europe
- Maud Evrard replacing for this meeting only Stephan Kuster, for Science Europe
- Edit Herczog replacing for this meeting only Matthew Scott, for GEANT

- Karel Luyben
- Eva Méndez Rodríguez
- Manuela Epure
- Ernst Kristiansen
- Michela Bertero
- Michele Garfinkel
- Christophe Rossel
- Wolfram Koch
- Sabina Leonelli
- Johannes Vogel
- Michael Mabe
- Catriona J. MacCallum
- Rebecca Lawrence
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- Sergio Andreozzi
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