Science. Set free.

Now in our third project phase ...
EC Open Access Mandate Progression

FP7 (2008)
- 20% programme areas
- Deposit in Repositories
- APC payments during project
- ERC OA Guidelines

Horizon 2020 (2014)
- 100% programme areas
- Deposit in Repositories
- APCs during and after project
- Open Data Pilot (100% from 2017)
... fosters the social and technical links that enable Open Science in Europe and beyond.
Human Infrastructure

• Local support for Europe’s diverse research landscape

Human support network

• 33 expert nodes all over Europe to helping with:
  • OA training and support
  • OA policy alignment (PASTEUR4OA)
  • Technical assistance
Building Bridges: Global Alignment via COAR
Result: Integrated Scientific Information System

- 13.9 million unique publications
- 7 million authors
- 690+ data providers
- 202,000 publications linked to projects from 5 funders
- 5,500 datasets linked to publications
- 35,000 organizations
New in OpenAIRE2020

Open Research

Data Pilot
Open Research Data Pilot

• Started beginning of 2015
• A limited, voluntary pilot (initially 7 programme areas)
• Easy opt-out and strict safeguards
• Participating projects must:
  • Keep a data management plan, to be updated at regular intervals
  • Deposit in an open access repository:
    • the data, including associated metadata, needed to validate the results presented in scientific publications as soon as possible;
    • other data, including associated metadata, as specified and within the deadlines laid down in the data management plan
OpenAIRE RDM Training & Support Materials

• Briefing papers, factsheets, webinars, workshops, FAQs
• Information on:
  • Open Research Data Pilot
  • Creating a DMP
  • Selecting a data repository

• https://www.openaire.eu/opendatapilot
• https://www.openaire.eu/support
Official! From 2017 no more pilot: #open #research #data will become the rule (with opt out) ec.europa.eu/digital-single ...
New in OpenAIRE2020

FP7 post-grant open access pilot
What is the FP7 Post-Grant Pilot?

- Pilot runs for two years (i.e. until Apr 30th, 2017)
- Provides funding to cover the OA publishing fees for publications arising from completed FP7 projects
- 4 million euros are made available by the EC to fund the OA “post-grant” publications of over 8,000 completed FP7 projects
- No hybrid journals; 2000 EUR cap on APCs; max 3 pubs per project

https://postgrantoapilot.openaire.eu/
FP7 Post-Grant Pilot
Alternative Funding Mechanism

• Aims to fund OA journals that charge no APCs to their users
• Since there's no APC to fund, an alternative funding mechanism has been devised to support technical improvements in the publishing workflows
• A call for proposals was recently issued to collect bids from these journals/publishers on the basis of a list of recommended technical enhancements
• Bids currently being considered – awards soon!
Research and development into new trends in scholarly communication

- Linked Open Data
- Legal issues in Open Data
- Data Citation

- Literature-Data Integration
- OA Metrics
- Open Peer Review
From Open Access to Open Science

**Aim:** To open up scientific processes and products from all levels to everyone …

- Open Access (publications, data, software, educational resources)
- Open Methodology (open notebooks, study preregistration)
- Citizen Science
- Open Evaluation / Open Peer Review
Why Open Peer Review?

Problems with traditional peer review ...

• Time
• Accountability
• Bias
• Incentive
• Wasted effort
Open Peer Review, broadly defined …

Traditionally, peer review is …

• **Anonymous**: reviewers unknown to authors, or both authors and reviewers unknown to each other
• **Selective**: reviewers selected by editors
• **Opaque**: neither the process nor the reviews are made public

Openness in peer review can refer to …

• Absence of anonymity (**open identity**)  
• Self-selecting reviewers (**open participation**)  
• Public processes and reviews (**open access**)
Encouraging experimentation

• Use OpenAIRE infrastructure to seed experimentation
• Stakeholder survey (to come)
• Call for Tenders in 2015
  • Small grants
  • Investigate how OPR might integrate with OpenAIRE
  • Provide case studies for wider evaluation
• Encourage technological experimentation
• Francophone environmental sciences journal
• Using the blog platform hypotheses.org for OPR
• Using hypothes.is for open commentary
• Treating OPR as a social rather than a technological problem
Tone: Overwhelmingly cordial and constructive debate, but authors and referees reported difficulties finding the right tone

Ethical question: One author asked for text to be removed after receiving critical review

Mediation in Open Commentary: Just because you build it, does not mean they will come! (Mediation needed to finding commentators willing to engage)
• Incentivizing post-publication peer reviews (with $$$!)
• Capturing reviews from “journal clubs”
• Platform for reviews of Zenodo content
• Author survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I benefit from being peer reviewed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others benefit from my reviews of their work</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews DO count for career advancement in my current position</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(salary reviews and/or tenure and promotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews should count for career advancement in my current unit</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(salary reviews and/or tenure and promotion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would making reviews open require a lot of work?

- A great deal: 10%
- A lot: 10%
- A moderate amount: 30%
- A little: 20%
- None at all: 15%

Reasons that would incentivize scholars to make their peer reviews publicly available.

- Nothing could make me do it: 3%
- Something else: 4%
- The journal editor gave me positive feedback on my review: 16%
- My performance review/tenure committee explicitly recognize published reviews: 27%
- My peers published their reviews: 26%
- I was paid in-kind (e.g., free access to journal, waived article processing fee, etc.): 17%
- I was paid a small honorarium (cash): 7%

Open Peer Review Module for repositories

open scholar

- OPR plug-in for (DSpace) repositories to convert them into functional evaluation platforms
- Includes published reviews, disclosed identities, reviewer reputation system
- Complete code, with full documentation, available on Github under an open license:
  - https://github.com/arvoConsultores/Open-Peer-Review-Module
OPRM (3): First researcher reactions

- A long awaited service in the repository
- It is a great idea that merits success as currently peer review is not credited in researchers CVs at all due to its anonymity. But researchers will not have time to review and comment on other peers works as long as this activity remains outside of CVs recognition and lacks strong support from the research institutions.
- The functionality may be also used to evaluate, accept and comment conference contributions before the event.
- The project seems very interesting but I decline to participate right now due to lack of time and current demands (preparation of proposals for a national research call).
- I have contacted 3 reviewers: one has no time available, another is against any type of peer review as reviewing is a subjective activity in such a reduced scholarly discipline and the third one has accepted to do it.
- The service should promote spontaneous discussion by anybody willing to send comments.
- Inviting peers to an open evaluation may place people in an uncomfortable situation, the module should work 100% open.
- The service is great for preprints and other unpublished works but has limited applicability for works that have been already evaluated and published.
- Moreover, the service has a difficult application for very recent publications as publishers reserve an exclusive exploitation for a period of time.
- How does open peer review operate in relation to “finished” pieces of work (i.e., a book)?
- How will the service compete with Academia.edu open review/comments?
Future directions: A call for common standards

• Uncouple peer review from “publishing”
  • Repositories are more than pre-/post-print servers!
  • Federate OPR services

• We need to agree:
  • What OPR is (standardization of vocabulary)
  • How we measure its effectiveness (standardization of experimentation)
  • How we describe it for machines (standardization of metadata)
Thank you!

- www.openaire.eu
- @openaire_eu
- facebook.com/groups/openaire
- linkedin.com/groups/OpenAIRE-3893548
- ross-hellauer@sub.uni-goettingen.de