

Open Science NL FAIR Data Advisory Panel

Meeting Notes

4 November 2024, 13:00 - 15:00 CET (UTC + 1:00)

Location: MS Teams

Attendees

- Andrew S. Hoffman
- Barend Mons
- Bogdana Huma
- Efi Gkoumasi
- Erik van den Bergh
- Hilary Hanahoe
- Jeroen Rombouts
- Joseph (Joey) Burant
- Paula Martinez Lavanchy
- Miaomiao Zhou
- Mark van Assem (MvA), Acting Co-Chair
- Marta Teperek (MT), Chair

Apologies:

- Maria Cruz, Co-Chair
- Marjan Grootveld
- Iza Witkowska

13.00 - 13.05 – Welcome and agenda

Introduction round: members and Mark van Assem, who is the acting Co-Chair, introduce themselves.

13.05 – 13.20 - Work Programme 2024 and 2025: implementation update

MT gave a short update (presentation) on the implementation of the Work Programme 2024 and 2025:

- Due to budget cuts, financial instruments which were not approved or announced yet are still uncertain. The OSNL Steering Board still needs to decide on how to allocate funding to these instruments.
- Points of attention:
 - The funding instrument for training and community platform for data professionals is being awarded through tender. It has been noted that tenders are challenging for academic institutions for organisational reasons, but also due to difficulty complying with strict KPIs for more academic or community-related work. Furthermore, awarding funding instruments through tenders means that ~20% of funding is spent on VAT.
 - After the decisions have been made on all proposals received in the call for proposal “Strengthening local and thematic DCCs”, Open Science NL would like to meet with the community to get input on the call.

- Budget which was not spent in the call for proposals “Strengthening local and thematic DCCs” is used to support the creation of DCCs at universities/regions, which have not yet received funding for this purpose from NWO or OSNL.
- The fact that the outcomes and impacts of the activities launched/to be launched in the Work Programme 2024 -2025 are not yet known (and will not be known for years to come), presents a challenge with regards to the planning of activities for the new Work Programme.

13.45 - 14.55 – Reflections on the community consultation on the new Work Programme ideas

MT gave a short overview (presentation) about the outcomes of the community consultation on the new Work Programme ideas, explained the overall framework for the design of the work programme and opened the floor to comments and discussion from the panel.

Main suggestions and reflections shared by the members of the panel were:

- **Concern about the representativeness of workshop findings:** Did the discussions during the workshop provided a sufficient reflection of the disciplinary practices and needs, in particular from disciplines where FAIR is not yet (sufficiently) implemented? Overall, the perspectives seem to mostly reflect the view of support staff, and not researchers. That said, panel members also noted that getting such input from researchers, and from underrepresented disciplines in particular, is challenging, and is best done through direct interactions between researchers and support staff.
- **Concern about the usefulness of inventories:** doubt was raised as to whether creating more inventories of services and infrastructures is useful. Perhaps inventories could be useful to some specific communities (where the needs are not clear), and an effective way to create such an inventory would be in close collaboration with such communities.
- **Public-private brokering:** a suggestion was made from a panel member that OSNL could consider investing time and effort into facilitating public-private brokering. However, other panel members expressed concerns about possible vendor lock-in risk. Furthermore, it is essential that the IP, as well as outputs and outcomes of publicly-funded initiatives remain open.
- **Supporting sustainability of infrastructures and project outputs is essential, but needs to be adequate and efficient.** There is an overarching agreement that it is essential to support sustainability of infrastructures and of other project outputs more broadly, but it is unclear how this could be done effectively (evidence-based rationale would be needed first). Otherwise there is a concern that some infrastructures, outputs or initiatives receive financial support, but do not in fact provide the most useful solutions for the community. It is important to know what do researchers use and why. Infrastructures need to have a strong user base, so an automated way of evaluating what really works and is reused is needed. Furthermore, sustainability plans should continue to be evaluated as part of grant applications. It is important that any funding for infrastructure helps them to move closer to a model when they can be self-sustained (or become more sustainable at least) in the future.
- **Traineeships / scholarships for open science professionals could be an effective cross-domain instrument.** It has been acknowledged that sustaining free and open source software projects which are of value to the community is important and that the idea of traineeship / scholarship could be a low hanging fruit, that might also help address other challenges, such as supporting professional growth and career paths of open science experts. Hence, it could be a low hanging fruit. In addition, such approach could also be applied to other topic, like Open Hardware.
- **Incentives for open science are needed.** There has been an overarching agreement that further efforts to incentivise the adoption of open science practices are essential for successful implementation of open science. A lot of effort has already been put in place, but this needs to continue, and needs to be done in connection with international developments.

- **Integration of infrastructures has been seen as important** to connect communities and their workflows.
- **Priority areas which have not been (prominently) identified during the workshop consultation:**
 - Providing quality, AI-ready data for AI models, while respecting the rights and wishes of data owners;
 - Gaps in the implementation of metadata standards: while there might be good disciplinary standards, tools and infrastructures are needed so that the use of metadata standards can be implemented. Also, integration between infrastructures could also be most helpful if driven by disciplinary needs and could also help the implementation of metadata workflows;
 - Solutions for sensitive data, or other types of datasets which cannot be shared openly.

14.55 - 15.00 - Meeting close and plans for upcoming next meetings

- Meeting in Q1/Q2 2025:
 - First ideas on how to turn community input into financial instruments, also taking into account what the other Programme Line Advice Panels have said
 - Work Programme 2024 and 2025 implementation update
- Meeting in Q3 2025:
 - Feedback on the draft Work Programme 2026 and 2027

Meeting close

- MT closed the meeting at 15.00 hrs.