



## Research Libraries, Researchers and the EOSC -How do they interact?

Stichting LIBER / Scientific Knowledge Services AG

### Technical Report regarding KPIs

Additional report, responding to the technical review of the project.

This report is measuring the performance of our project against the key performance indicators that were accepted in the grant submission.

#### **a) Number of research/academic libraries involved**

The participants were from approximately 110 different institutions well spread across Europe. We didn't target exclusively the EU region, but the participation outside this area was rather lower. Out of five workshops, three were regional (Northern Europe, Central and Eastern Europe and Southern Europe). We intentionally didn't organise a workshop for Western Europe because we anticipated a big number of Eastern European participants in the thematic workshops (the rest of two workshops). Indeed, the additional two thematic workshops (Multidisciplinary Universities and Technical Universities) gathered a good representation of Western Europe participants. Around 60% of the institutions were university libraries and 40% of the institutions were research management offices, research infrastructures and consulting companies.

#### **b) Number of researchers involved**

The actual number of researchers involved was 150 (Workshop 1 -19, Workshop 2 -33, Workshop 3 -34, Workshop 4 -30, Workshop 5 -34). The total number of registrants for the workshops were 200 (Workshop 1 -42, Workshop 2 -44, Workshop 3 -36, Workshop 4 -48, Workshop 5 -30), the number of unique registrants across all workshops was 143.

Therefore, the average turn up rate was 75%. That can be assessed as an above-average participation rate according to other workshops we've been involved in.

#### **c) Number of domains/disciplines addressed**

Through 5 workshops involving directly researchers and librarians, we were able to address a variety of disciplines. Both groups, *Natural Science* and *Social Science and Humanities* were represented in the workshops, although the later had a better representation.



The distinctive lines between the participants and the speakers in respect to their representation of disciplines is not easy to make, but we can make an educated estimation, by looking to their institution and their roles.

Hence, our participants came from approximately 20 disciplines, including: IT (including data science), linguistics, business, management, economics, neuroscience, library and information science, physics, engineering, life sciences, agriculture, history, military studies, clinical medicine, pedagogy.

In addition, research management offices and large research infrastructures were represented in a number of our workshops.

**d) Number of European countries represented**

By having a targeted communication campaign and promotion for our workshop series we were able to reach a very diverse audience from all over Europe. In total 24 European countries were represented in our workshops:

- |                   |               |                     |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. Austria        | 9. Germany    | 17. Portugal        |
| 2. Bulgaria       | 10. Greece    | 18. Romania         |
| 3. Croatia        | 11. Hungary   | 19. Serbia          |
| 4. Czech Republic | 12. Italy     | 20. Slovenia        |
| 5. Denmark        | 13. Lithuania | 21. Spain           |
| 6. Estonia        | 14. Moldova   | 22. Sweden          |
| 7. Finland        | 15. Norway    | 23. The Netherlands |
| 8. France         | 16. Poland    | 24. United Kingdom  |

**e) Reports produced after each activity to be distributed to the EOSC Secretariat, EOSC WGs and publicly disseminated to ignite further discussion, collaboration, and active participation at European/regional/national level.**

A designated reporter was assigned to each of our workshops in order to capture and summarise the discussions that took place during the live event in an intermediary report. All of our five intermediary reports are published on Zenodo. Pending the final approval of the EOSC Secretariat we will launch a communication campaign to further the discussion and promote the outcomes of our workshop series.

1. Blagaić Kišiček, Mihaela. (2021, March 31). RESEARCH LIBRARIES, RESEARCHERS & THE EOSC: HOW DO THEY INTERACT? Southern European Landscape. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4744819>



2. Sipos, Gergely. (2021, March 31). Research Libraries, Researchers & the EOSC: Central-Eastern European Landscape. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4744947>
3. Lindelow, Camilla. (2021, March 31). Research Libraries, Researchers & the EOSC: Northern European Landscape. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4744953>
4. Labastida, Ignasi. (2021, March 31). Research Libraries, Researchers & the EOSC: Multidisciplinary Universities. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4744965>
5. Sipos, Gergely. (2021, March 31). Research Libraries, Researchers & the EOSC: Technical Universities. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4744996>

**f) *LIBER discussion paper with recommendations to be distributed to the EOSC Governance Board.***

In order to create our final report, we employed a designated Grand Reporter, Ignasi Labastida, who attended all five workshops and authored the final report for our workshop series including clear cut recommendations both for Research Libraries and the EOSC Association. The final report is the main outcome of our workshop series and was created with the involvement of both SKS and LIBER research teams, the grand reporter and also the help of our special advisor, Paolo Budroni.

The recommendations outlined correspond to the lively discussions that took place during our workshops and provide clearly defined actions both for research libraries and the EOSC Association.

***FINAL REPORT:***

Labastida Ignasi. (2021, March 31). RESEARCH LIBRARIES, RESEARCHERS & THE EOSC - Final Report. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4740098>