FOR2026

Book of Abstracts

The Future of Open Research

Reliable - Responsible - Equitable

4-6 May 2026 | Munich

FOR2026 CONFERENCE

The Future of Open Research: Reliable, Responsible, Equitable

Munich, 4-6 May 2026

Book of Abstracts

Organized by
The Technical University of Munich
and
The Philosophy of Open Science for Diverse Research Environments

Organizing and Program Committee: Desantila Hysa, Sabina Leonelli, Paola Castaño, Rena Alcalay, Richard Williams, Nathanael Sheehan.
Funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation program [Grant Agreement 101001145]

PREFACE

The future of open research is uncertain. On the one hand, decades of activism and institutional support have placed the value and significance of intelligent strategies and formats for open research (and its dissemination) beyond doubt. Openness is central to the development of trustworthy, accountable, collaborative, and socially engaged knowledge. On the other hand, open research measures need to be tailored to diverse research conditions around the globe and across domains, which in turn requires substantial investment, local engagement, responsiveness to the ethical and social dimensions of inquiry, and attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion. While the implementation of open science principles is certainly facilitated by ever more accessible digital technologies and training programmes, for many researchers around the world, acquiring the expertise and skills to engage in open research practices remains elusive. Exposure to open research initiatives often happens as an end-user rather than as an active contributor. This is because well-resourced environments produce the tools, set the research goals, define the standards and methods, which leads to them benefiting disproportionally from the opportunities. This makes even the best-intentioned projects into opportunities for the best-resourced environments (which are often in charge of producing open science tools) to impose their own understanding of research goals, standards, and methods on everybody else. Therefore, without domain- and location-specific input, the risk is that open research amplifies existing inequities and discrimination in the production, use, and evaluation of knowledge, thereby inflicting damage to the research system instead of the promised improvements. And this is not to mention the ongoing debates over how politically unpalatable open science may be, the extent to which open research has been appropriated by commercial entities such as large publishing companies and digital platforms, the fraught intersection between open science and artificial intelligence, and the ongoing difficulties in supporting and maintaining open research activities and tools in the long term. This conference brings together scholars, activists, and policymakers to address these challenges and explore the future of open research. A key outcome is the *Munich Manifesto for Equitable Open Research*, aimed at fostering reliable, responsible, and inclusive practices.

Table of Contents

FOR2026 CONFERENCE PROGRAM

TUM - INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES BUILDING, GARCHING
LICHTENBERGSTRAßE 2A, 85748 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN, GERMANY
GROUND FLOOR LEVEL- AUDITORIUM NO. 0.001

1. DAY – 4 MAY 2026, MONDAY

9:30-9:45 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**.
Professor Gerhard Kramer - Technical University of Munich: Vice-President
Dr. Ulrich Marsch – TUM-IAS Managing Director
Sabina Leonelli - Technical University of Munich and PI of PHIL_OS

9:45-10:30: **FIRST PLENARY: The Munich Manifesto for Equitable Open Research.**
Sabina Leonelli

10:30-10:50: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

10:50-13:05: **SESSION 1: INFRASTRUCTURES**
Chair: Paul Trauttmansdorff (Technical University of Munich)

1. **"Towards a political economy of open science infrastructure."**
Sarah Davies (University of Vienna, Austria)
Laura Koesten (Mohamed Bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, and University of Vienna, Austria)
Kathleen Gregory (Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands)

2. **"UB Discover - making research (results) open (again)."**
Alexander Berg-Weiß, Martin Spenger, Vanessa Finger, Andreas Frech, Jaime Penagos, *Laura Meier* (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany)

3. **"Resilience through relationships: Sustaining open science infrastructures."**
Kathleen Gregory, Louise Bezuidenhout, Andrew Hoffman (Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands)

4. **"Rise-open: Building a repository of psychological instruments and fostering a culture of open science in North Macedonia."**
Katerina Naumova, Vaska Leshoska, *Daniela Nedelkova* (Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia)

5. **"Open Infrastructures for Responsible Research Assessment: From Principles to Practice through MyResearchFolio powered by OpenAIRE."**
Angeliki Tzouganatou, Zenia Xenou, Giulia Malaguarnera, Natalia Manola (OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece)

6. **"The place of equity and justice in valuing OS in institutional policies, an overview of 23 pilots in the Netherlands."**

Andrea Reyes Elizondo, Inge van der Weijden (Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands)

7. **"Open, careful and community-led: infrastructures to support Humanities and Social Sciences in hostile times."**
Lucía Céspedes (Érudit, Montréal, Canada; École de bibliométrie et sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada)
Suzanne Beth (Érudit, Montréal, Canada)

8. **"Openness as "(un)controlled exposure": interrogating responsibility, directionality and democracy in living labs"**
Julia Backhaus, Barbara Grimpe, Stefan Böschen (RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany)

9. **"GATE as a Living Infrastructure for reliable and equitable Open Science?"**
Marie Alavi, Julia Priess-Buchheit (Kiel University, Kiel, Germany)
Anika Müller-Karabil (Bremen University, Bremen, Germany)

13:05-14:00: LUNCH BREAK (Faculty Club, 4. Floor Level)

14:00-16:15: SESSION 2: DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT
Chair: Kim Hajek (Technical University of Munich)

1. **"Solutions for responsible sharing and reuse of qualitative data"**
Agata Bochynska, *Kirsti Klette, Torgeir Christiansen* (University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway)

2. **"Introducing OpenREL: Rights Expression Languages for Open Science and International Data Spaces – A Practitioners' Approach"**
Prodromos Tsiavos, Melios Michail Katsamakis (OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece)

3. **"Open Data and Biodiversity Conservation"**
Federica Bocchi, *Joeri Witteveen* (University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark)

4. **"Open Research Software - From Open Source to Open Science?"**
Florian Mannseicher, *Frank Löffler*, *Jan Linxweiler* (de-RSE e.V. - Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany)
Robert Speck (Jülich Research Center, Jülich, Germany)
Guido Juckeland (Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Dresden, Germany)
Frank Löffler (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Jena, Germany)
Jan Linxweiler (Technical University of Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany)

5. **"The Reuse Potential of Open Government Data for Open Science: Lessons from Socio-Demographic Research in Milan, Lombardy, and ISTAT"**
Tatiana Lysova (University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy)

6. **"And the winner is... Alphafold!"**
Alexandre Hocquet, *Frédéric Wieber* (Archives Poincaré, Nancy, France)
Marcus Carrier (TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany)

7. **“Negotiating Openness in Fragmented Data Ecologies: Computational Social Science between Platforms, Infrastructures, and Public Interest”**

Katja Mayer (University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria)

8. **“From Values to Work: Defining Roles and Spaces of Open Research.”**

Alexander Schniedermann, Judith Hartstein, Clemens Blümel (German Center for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Berlin, Germany)

9. **“The Impact of Research Data Management Training in the Short and Long Term: A Mixed-Method Study”**

Francesca Morselli (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands)
Paula Martinez Lavanchy, *Narmin Rzayeva*, *Nikki Grens, Gargi Kulkarni* (Delft University of Technology-TUDelft, Delft, Netherlands)
Carla Strubbia (Health-RI, Utrecht, Netherlands)

16:15-16:40: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

16:40-18:10: PLENARY PANEL I: INTELLIGENT AND RESPONSIBLE DATA SHARING.

Chair: Rachel Ankeny (University of Wageningen)

Carole Goble (Elixir, University of Manchester)
Simon Hodson (CODATA)
Paul Groth (Professor of Algorithmic Data Science, University of Amsterdam)
Stephan Guttinger (Ethical Data Initiative, University of Exeter)
Cameron Neylon (Barcelona Declaration for Open Research Information)

18:10-20:00: RECEPTION AND POSTER SESSION

2. DAY – 5 MAY 2026, TUESDAY

9:00-11:10: SESSION 3: PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Chair: Emma Cavazzoni (Technical University of Munich)

1. **“Open Research and Public Engagement: What Citizens Want to Know about Preliminary and Evolving Science.”**

Chelsea Ratcliff (University of Georgia, Athens, United States)
Lars Guenther, Janise Brück, Jana Egelhofer (LMU, Munich, Germany)
Kayli Jamieson, Rackeb Tesfaye (Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada)
Kaylee Byers (University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada)
Alice Fleerackers (University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands)

2. **“Decolonizing Open Research Through the Performing Arts: Towards Equitable, Participatory, and Locally Rooted Knowledge Production.”**

Safieh Shah (IGDORE, Karachi, Pakistan)

3. **“Upskilling the Community: The Importance of Informal Training and Mutual Learning.”**

Elena Giglia (University of Turin, Turin, Italy)
Mauro Paschetta (Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy)
Giulia Caldoni (University of Bologna)
Valentina Pasquale (IIT Genova)

4. **"Global OER Graduate Network: Building Capacity for Open Research Practices.”**

Robert Farrow, Beck Pitt, Carina Bossu (The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom)

5. **“EcoWeaver: Making “Open” Science Really Open for Users.”**

*Phyllis Illari (*University College London, London, United Kingdom)
Carlos Alberto Arnillas Merino (University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada)
Tina Heger (Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany; Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany; Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany)

6. **“From Consultation to Institutional Practice: Policy Recommendations from a Pan-European Policy Support Action on Public Engagement in R&I.”**

Marzia Mazzonetto (Stickydot srl., Brussels, Belgium)
Angela Simone (Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy)

7. **“A Novel Approach to Mapping the Elusive Emerging Communities Behind Open Research.”**

Sven Arendt Ulpts, Jesper Wiborg Schneider (Center for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark)

8. **“Exploiting Biases Inherent to AI to Responsibly Co-Design Digital Futures.”**

Regina Sipos (Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany)

9. **“Open Science as a response to research inequities stemming from the disregard of scientific agendas relevant to marginalized groups.”**

Ismael Rafols (INGENIO (CSIC-UPV), Valencia, Spain; CWTS, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands)

11:10-11:30: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

11:30-13:00: PLENARY PANEL II: EQUITY AND JUSTICE IN OPEN RESEARCH IMPLEMENTATION.

Chair: Barbara Prainsack (University of Vienna)

Louise Bezuidenhout (University of Leiden)
Tony Ross-Hellhauer (Graz University of Technology)
Antonia Schrader (Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany)
Rachel Ankeny (University of Wageningen)
Aleksandra Lazić (ABRIR: Advancing Big-team Reproducible Science through Increased Representation)

13:00-14:00: LUNCH (Faculty Club, 4. Floor Level)

14:00-16:10: SESSION 4: OPENNESS AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION.
Chair: Rena Alcalay (Technical University of Munich)

1. **"Navigating a Fragmented Landscape: A Functional Taxonomy of Online Venues for Scholarly Communication."**

Jacopo Ambrosj and *Frédérique Bordignon* (École nationale des ponts et chaussées, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Marne-la-Vallée; LISIS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel, CNRS, Marne-la-Vallée, France)

2. **"When Journals Stand Still, Scientists Step In: The Rise of Post-Publication Peer Review."**

Paolo Vincenzo Leone (NOVA SBE, Lisbon, Portugal)
Philipp Tuertscher (VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands)

3. **"Diamond Grassroots and Commercial Publishing."**

Ties Nijssen (Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands)
David Teira (UNED, Madrid, Spain)

4. **"MORPHING-Open Peer Review in the Humanities and Social Sciences."**

Samuel Moore, *Miranda Barnes* (University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom)
Jenni Adams (University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom)

5. **"Publishing Without the Market? Infrastructural Logics in Publishing Chemistry."**

Marianne Noël (LISIS: CNRS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel; Marne-la-Vallée, France)

6. **"Positionality in Time and Over Time: Moving from Static Reflexivity to Dynamic Reflexivity."**

Chris Hartgerink (Liberate Science GmbH, Berlin, Germany)
Sarahanne Field (University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands)

7. **"From Access to Equity: Sequential Bibliometric Analyses of Open Access, Funding, and Policy Across Israel, Austria, and Mexico."**

Shlomit Hadad (Ashkelon Academic College, Ashkelon, Israel)
Daphne Raban (University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel)
Noa Aharony (Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel)

8. **"Evaluating the frontiers of Registered Reports infrastructure: Lessons from the Cancer Research UK Funding Partnership."**

Pen-Yuan Hsing, *Anushka Kafle*, *Marcus Munafò, Jackie Thompson* (University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom)

9. **"Matching Peer-reviewed Outputs to Preprints at Scale: What the Links Reveal About Global and Disciplinary Adoption (1991–2023)."**

Narmin Rzayeva (TU Delft, Library, Delft, Netherlands; Leiden University, CWTS, Leiden, Netherlands)

Stephen Pinfield (University of Sheffield, Information School, Sheffield, United Kingdom; Research on Research Institute, London, United Kingdom)
Ludo Waltman (Leiden University, CWTS, Leiden, Netherlands; Research on Research Institute, London, United Kingdom)

16:10-16:40: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

16:40-18:10: PLENARY: "ON OPENNESS, TRANSPARENCY, SECRECY, AND REVELATION."

Plenary Speaker: Brian Rappert (University of Exeter)
Commentator: Helen Longino (Stanford University)
Chair: Sabina Leonelli (Technical University of Munich)

18:10-19:30: RECEPTION AND POSTER SESSION

19:30-21:30: CONFERENCE DINNER
(Invited speakers and PHIL_OS team only, gather in front of the IAS to go together at 19:15)

3. DAY – 6 MAY 2026, WEDNESDAY

9:00-10:20: PLENARY PANEL III: THE FUTURE OF OPEN RESEARCH

Chair: Benedikt Fecher (Wissenschaft im Dialog)
Oskar Xavier Guerrero Gutiérrez (GYA: Global Young Academy)
Stephanie Jurburg (GYA: Global Young Academy)
Ema Avdic (Cochrane Early Career Professional Network, University of Sarajevo)
Daniel S. Katz (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign & Research Software Alliance (ReSA))

10:20-10:50: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

10:50-12:50: WORKING GROUPS: MUNICH DECLARATION FOR EQUITABLE OPEN RESEARCH.

10:50-11:10: Summary of Manifesto and circulation of text

11:10-11:40: Working groups on various sections of the manifesto

Chairs: Fotis Tsiroukis, Joyce Koranteng-Acquah, Emma Cavazzoni, and Nathanael Sheehan

11:40-12:10: Working groups (switch table)

12:05-12:50 Plenary discussion with reporting from WGs

12:50-13:50: LUNCH BREAK (Faculty Club, 4. Floor Level)

13:50-16:20: SESSION 5: OPENNESS AND METRICS IN THE ACADEMIC SYSTEM.

Chair: Richard Williams (Technical University of Munich)

1. **“Towards a New Ethos of Science or a Reform of the Institution of Science? The Prospects of Institutionalizing the Research Values of Openness and Mutual Responsiveness.”**

Rene Von Schomberg (RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany)

2. **“Open Research and Academic Capitalism: Areas of Opposition and Alignment.”**

Thomas Hostler (Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom)

3. **“Beyond Metrics: Qualitative Approaches to Open Research Monitoring in Social Sciences and Humanities.”**

Maike Neufend, Maaike Duine (Open Research Office Berlin, Berlin, Germany)
Maxi Kindling (Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany)

4. **“Responsible Open Science: Research Ethics and Integrity in Practice.”**

Maria Strecht Almeida, *Ana Sofia Carvalho* (ICBAS, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal)

5. **“Beyond the League Tables: Contesting Global Rankings in the Move Toward Open Research.”**

Quoc Tan Tran (University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany)
Angeliki Tzouganatou (OpenAIRE, Attiki, Greece)

6. **“Co-evaluation for open research: lessons from the #DiscussAI Think-Ins.”**

Michael Creek, Marzia Mazzonetto (Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium)

7. **“Enabling A Commons - The Challenges EOSC will Encounter for Equitable Access.”**

*Hugh Shanahan (*Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, United Kingdom)

8. **“Evidence for Equitable Open Research with the EOSC Open Science Observatory.”**

Tereza Szybisty (OpenAIRE AMKE, Athens, Greece)

9. **“In Trust We Build: Engaging Disciplinary Communities in Service Development - Early Experiences from Base 4NFDI.”**

Sandra Zänkert (ZBMED – Information Center for Life Sciences, Cologne, Germany)

10. **“RIECS - Concept: Shaping Tomorrow's European Research Infrastructure for Excellent Citizen Science”**

Franziska Stressmann, *Carolina Doran*, *Kai-Ti Wu* (European Citizen Science Association (ECSA), Berlin, Germany)

16:20-16:40: BREAK (Foyer-Ground Floor)

16:40-17:00: FINAL DISCUSSION AND CLOSING
Chair: Sabina Leonelli

POSTER PRESENTATIONS

All posters will be displayed simultaneously during the poster session, throughout both days of the conference. However, they are divided into two groups: Group 1 will present on the first day, and Group 2 on the second day. The order in the list has been randomized and does not indicate any specific sequence.

18:10-20:00: 1. GROUP: 4 MAY 2026, MONDAY

1. **Open Science Communication and Evaluation: Co-creative Paths Between Research and Society.**
Monica Déchène, Julia Serong (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München / Munich Science Communication Lab, Munich, Germany)

2. **Analyzing Law's impact on European scientific data governance through the experience of the European Open Science Cloud.**
Miguel Garcia Fernandez (European University Institute, Florence, Italy)

3. **From Stage to Society: An Arts-Based Approach to Open Research and Responsible AI.**
Franziska Poszler (University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Munich, Germany)
Anastasia Aritzi (MoralPLai - TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Munich, Germany)

4. **From Local to Systemic Implementation: Embedding Open Research in Institutional Practices.**
Malika Ihle, Sarah von Grebmer zu Wolfsthurn, Sara Lil Middleton, Felix Schönbrodt (LMU Munich, Munich, Germany)
Flavio Azevedo (Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands)

5. **Training for Open and Equitable Research - The Digital Research Academy.**
Ankita Dolai, Heidi Seibold, Joyce Kao (Digital Research Academy, Munich, Germany)

6. **Creating a Data Management Plan for Infrastructures to Increase Fairness of Data Output.**
Ida Taberman, Hanna Lindroos (SLU University Library, Uppsala, Sweden)

7. **ROBOPSY: Contributions from the Arts to Open Research on Ethical AI.**
Boris Abramovic (The Institute for Philosophy at the University of Vienna, University of Applied Arts Vienna, Wien, Austria)
Margarete Jahrmann (University of Applied Arts Vienna, Wien, Austria)

8. **Valuing Data in, around, and through Biodata Infrastructures.**
Roman Hansen, Sarah R Davies (Universität Wien, Wien, Austria)

9. **Policy Pathways to Inclusive Open Science in Indonesia: Practice-Based Insights.**

Ria Ariani (Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany)

10. Towards a Constitutional AI: Testing Language Model Accountability Through Open Legal Norms.
Cindy Delage (JustAI, Évreux, France)

11. From the Umbrella to the Forest. Exploring Open Science through Images.
Francesca Di Donato (CNR, Pisa, Italy)

12. Fostering Cultures of Responsible Data Work: The Ethical Data Initiative.
Paul Trauttmansdorff, *Kim Hajek, Lena Sindel, Nathanael Sheehan* (Technical University of Munich)

13. The Impact of Data-Intensive Methods on Plant Science Research.
*Emma Cavazzoni (*Technical University of Munich)

14. A Typology of Open & Proprietary Software in Science.
Nathanael Sheehan, Technical University of Munich

15. Opening Agricultural Research: Boundary Organizations, Institutional Mediation, and the Science–Policy Nexus in Ghana.
Joyce Koranteng-Acquah (Technical University of Munich)

16. Researchers' Views on an E-Infrastructure Landscape: A Survey of Swedish Researchers' Current Needs and Future Dreams for Data Management.
Madeleine Dutoit, Swedish National Data Service, Gothenburg, Sweden

17. Liberata - Open Access Academic Publishing with Incentivized Quality Controls.
Han Zhang (Duke University, Durham, United States)

18:10-19:30: 2. GROUP: 5 MAY 2026, TUESDAY

1. **The Possibilities for Graphic Art to Support Open Research on Health Data Justice.**
Amelia Fiske, *Paula Hepp*, *Jonas Fischer* (Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine, Department of Preclinical Medicine, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Munich, Germany)

2. **Responsible Openness? Qualitative Researchers' Experiences with Open Science and Alternative Practices of Openness.**
Agata Bochynska, *Anette Bringedal Houge*, *Åshild Lappegard Hauge*, *Luca Tateo*, *Sigrun Marie Moss, Guro Brokke Omland* (University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway)

3. **Open Science, Blockchain, and Network State: An Empirical Study of Decentralized Science (DeSci).**
Lidia Yatluk (University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands)

4. **Building Capacity for Open Research: Insights from Stickydot's Training Program.**
Alexandre Torres, *Michael Creek*, *Marzia Mazzonetto* (Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium)

5. **From Platforms to Practices: Training and Infrastructures for Responsive Open and Responsible Research in Europe.**
Angela Simone (Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy)
Marzia Mazzonetto, Benjamin Valcke (Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium)

6. **Transparency in Open Science: An Actionable Principle?**
Roberto Cruz Romero, Leipzig Universität, Leipzig, Germany

7. **Making Science Public – Emerging Approaches from the TUM Public Science Lab**
Desirée Hetzel and Elis Jones (Technical University of Munich**)**

8. **Who Conceals the Provenance? Descriptions beyond Data.**
Alina Mierlus (Autonomous University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain)

9. **Equality Impact Assessments in Open Research: A Tool for Change?**
Ruth Davies (King's College London, London, United Kingdom)
Alice Howarth (University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom)

10. **Open Research – Why You Need Academic Libraries to Support You.**
Alexander Berg-Weiß, Laura Meier, Martin Spenger, Pauline Aldenhövel, Stefan Gebhardt (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany)

11. **Taming the Open Science Transformation of Humanities and Social Sciences.**
Mateusz Franczak, Gabriela Manista, Maciej Maryl, Marta Świetlik, Cezary Rosiński, Tomasz Umerle, Magdalena Wnuk, Piotr Wciślik (Digital Humanities Center at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland)

12. **Challenges to Solutions: Addressing Math Education Needs and Usability Insights in Low-Resource Primary Schools in Bangladesh.**
Chandra Shekhar Roy, Data and Design Lab, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Sarker T. Ahmed Rumee, CSE Dept, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Shiplu Chandra Kar, RK Software (Bangladesh) Ltd, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Nanno Hossain, Labcom Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh

SESSION I: INFRASTRUCTURES

Towards a political economy of open science infrastructure

Sarah Davies[1], Laura Koesten[2,3], Kathleen Gregory[4]

[1]University of Vienna, Austria, Austria. [2]Mohamed Bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. [3]University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. [4]Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

Open data is central to contemporary science. As support for data sharing, visiting, and other forms of data re-use has grown, new forms of research infrastructure have emerged, from university repositories to public and private data- and knowledge bases. Research has documented the practices involved in these activities, showing that data management and re-use are never straightforward but involve a range of journeys, transformations, and invisibilised labour. Resources such as databases are complex sociotechnical entities that require collective organisational work, while also profoundly shaping how research in particular fields can be carried out.

Given national and regional policy emphasis on open science and funder mandates for data sharing and re-use, research has generally focused on public databases and on the practices involved in the creation and maintenance of freely accessible (data) resources. However, concomitant with the rise of open science as a policy mandate there has also been increased attention to what has been termed academic capitalism: "how commercial logics transformed the public interest mandates of universities and academic research" (Birch 2025, 7). Such dynamics impact research (and teaching) in at least two ways: first, the increased integration of logics of competition and accumulation into academia (what Fochler has termed 'epistemic capitalism'; 2016); and, second, pervasive privatisation of diverse academic services. Critical analysis of 'EdTech', for example, has shown that datafication of universities "is currently being driven mostly by Big Tech, legacy software, and incumbent edtech companies" (Birch et al 2025, 1878) and that such datafication frames data from universities as a resource to be monetised. Academic capitalism has thus involved the integration of profit generation as a central motive into multiple aspects of academic work.

In this paper we draw together these lines of research to start to develop an analysis of the political economy of open science infrastructure. Building on recent work in constructivist political economy that "entails a concern with the allocation of societal resources, the ideas and epistemologies that inform and justify that allocation, and the impacts and implications of both the allocation and the legitimating ideas on our societies" (Birch 2025, 5), we explore the landscape of open data, exploring what kinds of data sharing and re-use practices are afforded (or performed) by different models for open science. The project we will present involves a number of empirical interventions, including examining conceptual data models underpinning different

infrastructures and how this affects data discovery, use, and interpretation, and assessing the economic logics of different infrastructures and the extent to which tech monopolies are populating this space. Based on these findings, we will make recommendations for best practices in developing research infrastructures that aid open science. The paper will give an overview of the project - which merges approaches from computer science and qualitative and quantitative social science - as well as providing early insights into the question of what contemporary models for creating and maintaining open science infrastructure afford. How are such infrastructures instantiated, what logics drive them, and what forms of value generation are at play?

Narrative CV

Sarah R Davies is Professor of Technosciences, Materiality, and Digital Cultures at the Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Vienna. Her recent work includes the books Science Societies (2024) and Revisiting Reflexivity (2025), as well as articles on data work in the biosciences. Laura Koesten is an assistant professor at the Mohamed Bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence in the UAE, and affiliated with the University of Vienna, Austria. Her research focuses on improving human-data interaction by exploring sensemaking with data and visualizations, data discovery and reuse, as well as the ethical and collaborative aspects of data-centric work. She is the Principal Investigator of the WWTF Digital Humanism project Talking Charts and the recipient of the 2024 Hedy Lamarr Prize awarded by the City of Vienna, Austria. She earned a PhD in Computer Science from the University of Southampton, UK, in collaboration with the Open Data Institute, London, UK. Kathleen Gregory is a social scientist working within the fields of Science and Technology Studies and Library and Information Science. Her research focuses on critically examining scholarly communication practices and infrastructures, including those related to open science, (research) data, and research evaluation. She is a Researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University and a Research Fellow at the Research-on-Research Institute (RoRI).

UB Discover – making research (results) open (again)

Alexander Berg-Weiß, Martin Spenger, Vanessa Finger, Andreas Frech, Jaime Penagos, Laura Meier
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany

Abstract

In recent years, University Library of LMU Munich has been developing a new platform to make research from Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU) München more open and findable. Originally designed as a platform to collect research data from all disciplines and supporting project-specific needs (e.g. listing research data on a very granular level or supporting subject-specific authority files), Discover now allows the integration of all research output. Still, many resources and research results are not as open and FAIR as we wish – files and important documents are shared on fragile and short-lived project websites, physical objects and texts lie in dark storage rooms and a variety of research output is scattered throughout an unknown number of repositories around the globe.
This is where Discover sets in. With a highly flexible infrastructure based on Fedora Repositories, Apache Camel Routes, streamlined Metadata models and a user interface based on Project Blacklight/VuFind, the platform relies completely on open-source components and is designed to allow the change of one component without touching the whole platform as it would be the case with most out-of-the-box solutions. In addition, the Oxford Common File Layout (OCFL) is used to fulfil long-term availability standards.
The poster will showcase the diverse resources (often not visible to the public), and how they experience a transformation through the software stack until they are presented in their full glory in Discover. With making research available and open (again), there is also a variety of mechanisms like APIs to allow disseminating the objects bundled through one channel (Discover) to other platforms.

Narrative CV

The authors work at the University Library of LMU Munich in the Digital Services Department. The teams Research Support Services and RDM Information work closely together to offer important infrastructure for researchers and to make research results open.

Resilience through relationships: Sustaining open science infrastructures

Kathleen Gregory, Louise Bezuidenhout, Andrew Hoffman
Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

How can open research infrastructures remain resilient in times of change? How can their content/data be sustained so that they are accessible and usable in the future? Drawing on ongoing ethnographically-oriented work, this paper explores the concept of "resilience through relationships" as a pivotal component in sustaining open research infrastructures.

Open research infrastructures, ranging from data repositories to DOI-assigning agencies to government portals, underpin how open research is practiced across communities. Such infrastructures are often taken for granted and seem invisible until moments of crisis bring them to the fore (Star, 1999). Now is one such time, as open infrastructures (OIs) grapple with changes related to funding streams, dominant political ideologies, and emerging technologies – changes which seem to threaten the sustainability of the infrastructures upon which open science relies (Gregory et al, forthcoming).

The actions of the current administration in the United States serve as an example. Critical health data have been edited or removed from federal websites (Wu, 2025), long-running open databases have been shut down (Levenstein & Kubale, 2025), and funding for the institutional and human infrastructure needed to collect and maintain data have been greatly reduced (Choi et al., 2025). This is not the first time that geopolitical forces have impacted the sustainability of knowledge infrastructures, and it won't be the last (Bezuidenhout & Shanahan, 2025).

Knowledge infrastructures themselves are webs of complex sociotechnical relationships between people, technology, content, and policies (Edwards, 2010). They are situated within broader networks and systems, where changes in one aspect can shape and affect the stability of others. This creates a constant state of evolution and reconfiguration of the social, technical, and political elements composing an infrastructure. Sustaining infrastructures therefore requires ongoing, critical attention to these relationships (Edwards et al., 2009; Gregory et al., 2025). In times of crisis, the need to reconfigure such relationships can be a critical limiting factor, although it is one which is rarely acknowledged.

Relationships are also central to the practice of open science. Rather than being a simple process of making content freely accessible or processes transparent, open science is a matter of trusted relationships, in part because of the very personal connections people have to their data (Gregory et al., 2025). Openness is realized by forging "judicious connections" between human actors to make careful choices about

what to share, with whom, and when. (Leonelli, 2023). These connections are moderated by technology, standards, and the other infrastructural elements.

This paper further explores the role that these types of "judicious connections" (Leonelli, 2023), as well as more serendipitous ones, have in sustaining open research infrastructures. We draw on our ongoing work investigating the sustainability of open data infrastructures and data rescue efforts to explore how forming, curating, reconfiguring and severing human relationships can impact resilience. We focus our discussion along three sustainability challenges which are especially pertinent at this moment: the role of relationships in business and funding models; in maintaining "agile" human infrastructure; and in navigating the tensions between centralisation and diversity.

Narrative CV

Kathleen Gregory is a social scientist working within the fields of Science and Technology Studies and Library and Information Science. Her research focuses on critically examining scholarly communication practices and infrastructures, including those related to open science, (research) data, and research evaluation. She is a Researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University and a Research Fellow at the Research on Research Institute (RoRI). Her current work, funded by a Veni grant from the Dutch Research council, explores the sustainability of open infrastructures. Louise Bezuidenhout is a social science researcher who specializes on issues relating to Open Science, data sharing and access. Her research is broadly oriented around themes such as justice and access, inclusion and marginalization and equity. She is a senior researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) and a co-chair of the UNESCO Chair on Diversity and Inclusion in Global Science. Dr. Andrew S. Hoffman holds the title Service Scientist - Research Data Management at Leiden University in the Netherlands, where he is an affiliate of Cultural Anthropology & Development Sociology (CADS) and the Centre for Science & Technology Studies (CWTS). On the 'service' side of his work, Andrew provides hands-on research data management and scholarly communication support to CADS and CWTS researchers, from proposal development through to study completion. On the 'scientist' side, he carries out his own research on research policy, data practices, and data management/scholarly communications infrastructure with an eye towards fostering greater openness, inclusion, and epistemic diversity in these domains. Among the many activities he's involved in, Andrew keeps busy as the (Co-)PI of three ongoing projects, inaugural Co-Chair of the RDA Infra4NTROs IG, as a member of the Open Science NL FAIR Data Advisory Panel, and guiding researchers through the myriad levels of data bureaucracy.

Rise-Open: Building a Repository of Psychological Instruments and Fostering a Culture of Open Science In North Macedonia

Katerina Naumova, Vaska Leshoska, Daniela Nedelkova
Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia

Abstract

The potential of open science to create a more inclusive research culture is often undermined by a significant disconnect between its global rhetoric and the on-the-ground realities of under-resourced contexts. While affluent academic systems often dominate the production of open science tools and standards, researchers in smaller or underfunded contexts remain largely passive consumers, ultimately limiting the inclusive promise of openness.

RISE-Open (Repository of Instruments and Support for Engagement in Open Science) is a grassroots initiative developed at the Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia. Its dual goal is to build the first centralized repository of psychological instruments in Macedonian and to cultivate open science literacy and engagement among early-career researchers.

Our empirical work with 237 undergraduate psychology students revealed a paradox: strong endorsement of traditional scientific norms (critical thinking, hypothesis-driven research, transparency of methods) coexists with very low awareness of contemporary open science practices. Only 12% of students had ever encountered the term open science, and knowledge was mostly limited to open access publishing. Students expressed ambivalence toward preregistration, open data, and preprints, highlighting a gap between global discourses on openness and local perceptions.

RISE-Open responds to this gap by developing a repository of translated, adapted, and locally created psychological measures, ensuring visibility, reuse, and alignment with FAIR principles. Alongside the infrastructure, training workshops introduce preregistration and open workflows using the Open Science Framework. In parallel, a Delphi process with faculty members is establishing a preregistration template tailored to local needs and disciplinary standards, creating normative practice for transparent and reproducible research.

This initiative demonstrates how open science can be adapted to emerging research contexts in ways that are inclusive, sustainable, and community-driven. Beyond providing local benefit, RISE-Open offers a transferable model for strengthening equitable open research practices in under-resourced settings worldwide.

Keywords: Emerging Research Communities, Open Science Capacity Building, Psychological Instruments Repository, Preregistration.

Narrative CV

Prof. Katerina Naumova, PhD, is Professor of Clinical and Health Psychology at the Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje. Her research addresses stress, trauma, coping, and transdiagnostic approaches to mental health. Vaska Leshoska, MA, is a PhD student and teaching assistant in Social Psychology at the same institute. Her research focuses on social cognition, social neuroscience, and open science. Daniela Nedelkova, MA, is a PhD student and teaching demonstrator at the Institute of Psychology. Her doctoral work explores metacognition, cognition, and psychosocial functioning during matrescence, with a focus on neural changes in pregnancy and postpartum. All three authors are co-founders and co-developers of RISE-Open (Repository of Instruments and Support for Engagement in Open Science), a grassroots initiative designed to foster equitable open research practices and infrastructures in North Macedonia and other emerging research communities.

Open Infrastructures for Responsible Research Assessment: From Principles to Practice through MyResearchFolio powered by OpenAIRE

Angeliki Tzouganatou, Zenia Xenou, Giulia Malaguarnera, Natalia Manola
OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece

Abstract

Reforming research assessment is a defining challenge for research systems in Europe and globally. Legacy practices, heavily shaped by publication counts and venue prestige, undervalue diverse scholarly contributions, constrain interdisciplinarity, and perpetuate inequities across languages, fields, and career stages. The Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA) Agreement has set a clear direction toward qualitative, context-aware, and values-driven evaluation that recognizes Open Science, collaboration, and societal impact. Turning this agenda into daily practice requires infrastructures that are open, trustworthy, and governed for the public interest.

The Working Group *Towards Open Infrastructures for Responsible Research Assessment (OI4RRA)* addresses this need with an infrastructural lens. Its work distills principles and characteristics of infrastructures "fit for RRA," including openness and transparency of data and code, equity of participation and access, long-term sustainability and governance, interoperability with global PIDs and standards, and auditability of provenance and processing. The group complements principles with practical instruments, actionable checklists and a conceptual architecture, that support institutions and funders in moving from policy statements to operable workflows.

This contribution presents the forthcoming OpenAIRE MyResearchFolio as a concrete implementation path aligned with the OI4RRA framework. The service models the breadth of research activity; publications, datasets, software, peer review, teaching and mentoring, openness practices, engagement, and policy impact, and situates evidence within narratives supported by responsibly used indicators. The OpenAIRE Graph provides the data backbone with transparent provenance, traceability to trusted sources, and compatibility with persistent identifiers such as DOIs and organizational registries. Reliance on open, non-commercial, and verifiable data strengthens accountability, reproducibility, and portability across institutional contexts.

Design choices explicitly reflect guidance from DORA, UNESCO, and the CoARA Agreement: narrative-first assessment; calibrated, field-sensitive indicators; representation of team science; and researcher agency in curating and contextualizing contributions. The profile supports configurable policy templates, machine-readable exports, and integration points for institutional CRISs and funder workflows, enabling

local adaptation without sacrificing comparability or transparency. Evaluation scenarios include hiring and promotion, grant reporting, and recognition of open research practices, with attention to equity across disciplines and languages.

The paper will share the service architecture, data model, and governance approach; illustrate user journeys for researchers, research offices, and funders; and discuss unresolved challenges: signal-to-noise in open data, normalization across fields and languages, attribution and contribution roles, privacy and consent, and incentives that reward quality over quantity. Evidence-informed recommendations will outline how institutions can phase implementation, build capacity, and monitor effects through reflective, community-owned infrastructures.

The synergy between OI4RRA's work and the OpenAIRE MyResearchFolio demonstrates a viable route from principles to practice. Rather than a new metric or dashboard, the approach advances a transparent, participatory, and values-aligned infrastructure that helps research organizations enact responsible assessment at scale, and evolve it as norms, policies, and community expectations advance.

Narrative CV

Angeliki Tzouganatou specialises in research infrastructures, open science, responsible research assessment, and knowledge equity. She He holds a PhD in Cultural Anthropology from the University of Hamburg, completed within the Horizon 2020 – MSCA POEM network (Participatory Memory Practices). Her dissertation, Openness and Fairness in the Digital Ecosystem: on the Participation Gap in Cultural Knowledge Production, investigated how digital infrastructures shape openness, participation, and fairness in cultural knowledge production. Tzouganatou previously earned an MSc in Digital Heritage from the University of York, where she contributed to European projects on user-centred design and participatory engagement in cultural heritage. Since 2024, she has been Research Project Manager and Open Infrastructure Specialist at OpenAIRE, where she coordinates EU-funded projects, advancing open science services, pilots new approaches to research assessment, and translates policy frameworks into actionable practices. She also serves on the OPERAS Research Infrastructure Scientific Advisory Committee, and acts as an Expert Evaluator for the European Commission. Her career bridges digital heritage and open science, bringing a unique perspective on how infrastructures can foster inclusive, ethical, and sustainable knowledge practices. Zenia Xenou is an Engagement and Training Officer at OpenAIRE AMKE, where she plays a central role in supporting researchers and institutions in embracing open science practices. She holds an MSc in Biomedical Engineering & Regenerative Medicine and a Bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering from the Cyprus University of Technology. With extensive experience as a researcher in numerous R&D projects, Zenia has contributed to product design, prototyping, and manufacturing, while also driving organizational development in diverse professional environments. Currently, Zenia serves as the Product Manager for the MyResearchFolio by OpenAIRE, an innovative tool designed to empower researchers to showcase their contributions beyond publications and to promote RRA. Giulia Malaguarnera works at the intersection of Open Science infrastructures and research assessment reform, leading engagement and exploitation activities at OpenAIRE. Her work focuses on aligning infrastructures with evolving policy frameworks, ensuring that researchers, institutions, and funders can adopt transparent, responsible, and practical solutions. Within the CoARA Working Group Towards Open Infrastructures for Responsible

Research Assessment (OI4RRA), she contributed to shaping a vision for assessment practices grounded in openness, inclusiveness, and sustainability. Building on these principles, she supported the development of MyResearchFolio. This work connects directly with the European project GraspOS (Next Generation Research Assessment to Promote Open Science), where she co-lead exploitation and training tasks. Natalia Manola is CEO of OpenAIRE, a major European e-Infrastructure for open scholarly communication, and co-chairs the CoARA Working Group on OI4RRA. Natalia holds a Physics degree from the University of Athens, and an MS in Electrical and Computing Engineering from the University of Wisconsin at Madison and has worked for several years as a Software Engineer and Architect in the Bioinformatics commercial sector. She has expertise in Open Science policies and implementation, having served in the EOSC Executive Board 2019-20, and in the Open Science Policy Platform (2016-17), an EC High Level Advisory Group provide advice about the development and implementation of open science policy in Europe.

The place of equity and justice in valuing OS in institutional policies, an overview of 23 pilots in the Netherlands

Andrea Reyes Elizondo, Inge van der Weijden
Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

The Open Science (OS) movement in the Netherlands has seen a more robust institutional backing since the establishment of the Open Science NL (OSNL) programme which allocates funding for infrastructure development and initiatives that support collective culture change in research. In 2024 OSNL launched a call for initiatives to develop and implement policy plans at Dutch universities, university medical centres, and research institutes to recognise and reward OS practices. The 23 one-year initiatives that were awarded vary per institution depending on their progress on the Reward and Recognition roadmap *Room for Everyone's Talent in Practice* (UNL et al., 2023) and on the OS practices they focus on. The initiatives provide opportunities for furthering the awareness and uptake of OS practices at the various institutions through the development of policies and advice in recruitment and promotion processes. At the same time and despite the general acceptance of OS as an aspirational good, the initiatives face several challenges, from institutional support to looming national budget cuts. Many institutions also face the challenge of translating the monitoring and recognising of Open Science practices into a fair and equitable rewarding system without falling into the creation of tick boxes or quantitative indicators that would substitute informed and meaningful assessment. Midst this social, political, and economic context, the meaning of OS and what it entails has become a recurring if fundamental question throughout the various initiatives.

Demarcating Open Science

While definitions of OS abound (UNESCO, 2021), operationalising it for policy purposes remains a challenge. There is an inherent tension between OS as outputs and OS as judicious connections (Leonelli, 2023), especially when connected to monitoring and evaluating. Further, global discussions around OS have interrogated the direction of the movement and the place (or lack thereof) of equity and social justice in it (Dutta et al, 2021; Radical Open Access III conference 2025).

The 23 Dutch initiatives navigate the main challenges of demarcating what OS means and its practices according to the knowledge, experiences, and needs from their own communities with their different disciplinary and epistemic traditions. While the notion of openness in research is seen as inherently good, the considerations and connections to equity and social justice are generally not made explicit. This project focuses on 23 conversations with the project managers of each initiative and explores

how OS is defined, operationalised, and whether equity and social justice is considered in it.

References

Dutta, Mohan, Ramasubramanian, Srividya, Barrett, Mereana, et al., Decolonizing Open Science. Southern Interventions, Journal of Communication, 71(5), October 2021, 803–26, https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqab027

Leonelli, Sabina. Philosophy of Open Science. of Elements in the Philosophy of Science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.

UNESCO, UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science, UNESCO General Conference (Paris: UNESCO, 2021), https://doi.org/10.54677/MNMH8546.

UNL, NFU, KNAW, NWO and ZonMw (2023). Room for everyone's talent in practice. Road map: How are we shaping a new system of recognition and rewards. https://recognitionrewards.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Room-for-everyones-talent-in-practice-Road-map-Recognition-Rewards.pdf

Radical Open Access Collective, Radical Open Access III: From Openness to Social Justice Activism (Conference, 10-11 April, 2025, Cambridge)

Narrative CV

Inge van der Weijden is a researcher and PhD coordinator at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University. At CWTS, Inge's work is on researcher careers, recognition and reward strategies, and mental health in academia. She is currently involved in projects on Recognising and Rewarding Open Science (national coordination), Career Pathways of Doctorate holders (incl. postdocs) and Career Development of PhD candidates. Inge is a coordinator of the EARLI Special Interest Group (SIG)-Researcher Education and Careers. Andrea Reyes Elizondo is a researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University. At CWTS, her work has focused on academic health science systems, research integrity, and citizen science. Currently she is working on two Open Science projects: GraspOS (Horizon) and the national coordination for Recognising and Rewarding Open Science (Open Science NL). A book historian by training, she is also a self-funded PhD at the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS) working on the reconstruction of reading possibilities in New Spain during the eighteenth century. Inge and Andrea work together in the coordination of the Evaluation and Culture focal area at CWTS which is concerned with the development of responsible research assessment practices and on fostering healthy and open research cultures. They also work together in the national coordination of the 23 Recognising and Rewarding Open Science initiatives funded by Open Science NL. The national coordination seeks to provide the necessary support to each institutional project paying attention to their different needs and to ensure alignment between institutions and with international reform movements, a. At the end of it, a collective Zotero library with policies, webinars, trainings, and other resources will be shared publicly. There will also be an Open Access publication documenting the development of the different policies, the challenges for their implementation, and the future opportunities.

Open, careful, and community-led: infrastructures to support Humanities and Social Sciences in hostile times

Lucía Céspedes[1,2], Suzanne Beth[1]
[1]Érudit, Montréal, Canada. [2]École de bibliométrie et sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

Abstract

In a context of growing authoritarianism, governmental budget cuts and austerity measures affect scientific research unevenly: following an instrumental rationality, applied sciences, or those disciplines which are perceived to have potential immediate economic returns, are privileged *vis à vis* those considered less impactful, less commodifiable, or simply "useless".

The Social Sciences and, especially, the Humanities, often fall into this category. They are also often targets of politically and ideologically charged discourses aimed at discrediting their methods, epistemologies, projects and objects of study. These disciplines must, then, fight a daily fight to justify their existence and their relevance in the field of scholarly knowledge production.

As priorities change and funding dwindles, the question about the sustainability and governance of research infrastructures vital to the work of thousands of HSS scholars is raised. While open research infrastructures, as part of the broader push for open science, have plenty of advantages per se, they often fall prey to the many paradoxes of open: the possibility of for-profit capture of public, collectively developed research; data extractivism from not necessarily ill-intended but well-resourced regions or institutions towards their less affluent counterparts; and a tendency to standardization, necessary to ensure interoperability and data flow, but at the risk of reducing the epistemic and methodological diversity of the HSS in order to meet technical requirements. To paraphrase Donna Haraway, it matters what infrastructures structure our knowledges, it matters what infrastructures we deploy to support, disseminate and value our scholarship. Thus, re-imagining infrastructural design can be a powerful way to reclaim agency in defining the value of knowledges in non-commercial, non-economic, non-extractivist terms.

In this presentation, we want to explore alternative models of infrastructure development and governance that would facilitate the continuity of research practices such as data management, archiving, text annotation, or scholarly publishing. Rather than focusing only on case studies, we share reflections and (partial) conclusions based on our experiences as providers and users of HSS scholarly communications infrastructures. We propose that open, careful and community-led infrastructures constitute a model (or at least an ideal type) for the specific needs and idiosyncrasies of the HSS.

Narrative CV

Lucía Céspedes holds a PhD in Latin American Social Studies from the Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina. She is a research counsellor at Érudit, and a member of the UNESCO Chair on Open Science (École de bibliométrie et sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal) and the Chaire de recherche du Québec sur la découvrabilité des contenus scientifiques en français. Lucía's research brings together sociolinguistics, social studies of science and technology, and scholarly communication, in order to analyze conditions of production, circulation, and openness of scientific knowledge in centres and peripheries. Suzanne Beth is Senior Coordinator, Research Communities and Partnerships, at the Canadian digital research infrastructure for the social sciences and humanities Érudit. A key actor in the scholarly publishing landscape of Canada and an advocate of diamond open access, Érudit's core activities revolve around the dissemination and sustainability of noncommercial journals hosted in Canadian institutions.

Openness as "(un)controlled exposure": interrogating responsibility, directionality and democracy in living labs

Julia Backhaus, Barbara Grimpe, Stefan Böschen
RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

Abstract

Calls for *open research* often presume openness to be a rather unproblematic state facilitating or accompanying more normative goals and virtues such as reliability, responsibility, and equity in knowledge production. However, from an STS perspective, openness is not a neutral design principle but a situated and contested practice, always accompanied by selective closures: choices about whom to include, and about what to open up for negotiation and participation. Living labs, i.e., experimental settings where universities, industries, municipalities, and sometimes civic actors jointly collaborate on socio-technical innovation, provide fertile ground to study these ethical and political dynamics. Often celebrated as infrastructures for open and collaborative innovation, living labs simultaneously embody the ambiguities, exclusions, and negotiations of open research.

This contribution draws on more than 40 case studies of living lab initiatives in and around RWTH Aachen University. It asks: how is openness enacted in practice, and in what ways do these enactments shape the directions of innovation? Rather than treating openness as a singular property, the study traces empirically tensions and issues that touch on its multiple dimensions, including openness of data, processes, and outcomes, as well as the participation of knowledge actors beyond the university. Preliminary analysis suggests that living labs embody different kinds and degrees of openness across multiple dimensions. Whereas technical actors often equate openness with interoperability and transparency, social scientists tend to emphasise methodological rigor or participation, and public actors appear to strive for diversity and inclusion. Across all cases, civil society engagement frequently seems confined to downstream feedback. To put it pointedly, openness emerges, on the one hand, as "controlled exposure", in the sense of different experimental settings exposing the variety of actors involved to different levels of agency and responsibility. Amongst other things, the fact that civic actors are often only invited as testers rather than agenda-setters gives rise to delicate questions on the democratic legitimacy of emerging innovations. On the other hand, there are examples of shifts in control and exposure, for instance, when (un)organised civil society actors demand – and achieve – an opening up of debates and decisions, or when uncontrolled openness emerges from interaction, i.e., beyond individual or even collective steering.

Building on this, and drawing on Stirling's (2024) argument on the *directionality* of innovation, this study highlights how openness can serve as a directional force. By framing certain pathways as transparent or participatory, living labs can normalise pre-

selected ends and stabilise privileged interests, while side-lining alternative possibilities. As such, living labs remind us that openness is always oriented, and entangled with institutional priorities, economic incentives, and societal imaginaries. Seen in this light, the future of open research will depend less on formal commitments to sharing, participation and transparency, and more on cultivating reflexive practices that expose and address the closures hidden within openness. The task, then, is not to perfect openness as a "conceptual fix", but to experiment with it as a political practice that embraces plural directions, acknowledges exclusions, and negotiates responsibilities in ways that render research genuinely more equitable.

Narrative CV

Julia Backhaus is coordinator of the Living Labs Incubator at the Human Technology Center of RWTH Aachen University, funded under the Excellence Strategy of the German Federal and State Governments. Her work focuses on multi-conceptual and multi-method perspectives on transformative change, inter- and transdisciplinary approaches to research and innovation, and the co-production of knowledge in living labs. She holds a BSc in Liberal Arts and Sciences and an MPhil in Science and Technology Studies. Barbara Grimpe holds a PhD in Sociology and is Managing Director of the Human Technology Centre (HumTec) at RWTH Aachen University, Germany. She has conducted qualitative research on different topics (e.g. digital technologies, public debt management, global microfinance, trust, collaboration) and has published in the fields of Science & Technology Studies (and the related Social Studies of Finance), Cultural Sociology and Responsible Research and Innovation. Stefan Böschen is professor for Society and Technology at RWTH Aachen University. Stefan is sociologist of science and is working in the fields of Science and Technology Studies and Technology Assessment and Theory of modern societies. He is spokesperson of the Human Technology Center as well as co-director of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg Cultures of Research (funded by BMFTR), both at RWTH Aachen University.

GATE as a Living Infrastructure for reliable and equitable Open Science?

Marie Alavi[1], Julia Priess-Buchheit[1], Anika Müller-Karabil[2]
[1]Kiel University, Kiel, Germany. [2]Bremen University, Bremen, Germany

Abstract

As open research practices proliferate, while advanced digital and AI tools, new research techniques and political environments guide today's research, the challenge is no longer whether openness is desirable, but *how* it can be realised in accordance to Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR), effectively applied within Open Science (OS) communities, and supported by profound policy-making. The Open Science Learning GATE (GATE) is an infrastructure supporting research communities to advance OS effectively, responsibly and with a constant knowledge on OS development. In this paper, we present GATE while addressing three dimensions central to FOR's themes:

1. **Ethics and research integrity in the context of open research:** GATE's lifecycle is designed for continuously capturing (GATE Service), reflecting (GATE Research), and disseminating (GATE Report) community-based knowledge about the current status and development OS guiding thoughts and practices across stakeholder communities. By combining a participatory GATE Service with an annual Report, GATE provides an ongoing feedback loop between practitioners, educators, researchers, infrastructures, funders, policymakers and the wider community on how the current research landscape understands openness while underpinning the premises of research integrity (RI) and research ethics (RE) as constitutive foundations of OS.
2. **Training and capacity building for responsive and responsible open research:** GATE treats capacity building not as one-size-fits-all training but as a dynamic, contextual conversation. By inviting knowledge creators to submit their knowledge on OS, and self-assess their materials' alignment with OS guiding thoughts stressed by the community (and based on RI & RE), GATE fosters reflexive, self-responsible and continuously optimising capacity building: training that adapts to community-acknowledged standards and emergent changes. Acting as a gateway to aligning training, RCR and evidence, GATE also conducts co-creative workshops where stakeholders – inspired by GATE knowledge – collaboratively develop targeted solutions advancing OS in their communities. These solutions are equally reported to the community and range from individual activities such as code checks reducing mistakes, thus enhancing reproducibility and sharing to institutional solutions like federated data systems supporting confidential data analysis.

3. **Policy-making initiatives and recommendations for equitable open research:** The annual GATE Reports synthesise insights across communities into a living resource informing practitioners, institutions, funders, policy-makers and (data) infrastructures and allowing individual actions such as optimising own OS materials, developing and upscale (institutional) infrastructures and repositories, or align policies. Because the Report is built from bottom-up, community-curated inputs, it offers a grounded counterbalance to top-down policy mandates and is a unique resource for reliable and equitable open research while taking relevant developments into account. Policies motivated by GATE insights could, for example, encourage funders to support local infrastructure enabling FAIR practices, or require openness with context annotations rather than blanket mandates. Policy-makers could align their policies such as the European Research Area policy agenda or standards for AI-usage in open research according GATE's insights to advance but also ensure reliable open research.

We believe that GATE fosters reliable OS practices anchored in RI and RE, so that informed stakeholders can bridge communities, surface current and future developments, and help guide open research and informed actors.

Narrative CV

Marie Alavi is a research associate at Kiel University. Her main research focus is the intersection of Responsible Conduct of Research, Open Science, Intellectual Property and AI. She is the co-developer of the GATE and member of the Network for Education and Research Quality (NERQ), co-leading the special interest groups on Open Science (where GATE has its origins) and Open Science & Intellectual Property. Marie is currently involved in the IP4OS project. Prior to that, she was involved with Path2Integrity (www.path2Integrity.eu) and HAnS, where she conducted research focused on research integrity and the role of AI in higher education. Anika Müller-Karabil works as research staff at Bremen University / the Language Centres for the Universities in Bremen. She is an expert in the field of language teaching, learning and testing, and her research interests include academic language requirements in higher education, language education in the context of AI, and open science. Anika is a co-developer of GATE and member of the Network for Education and Research Quality (NERQ). Julia Priess-Buchheit (Prof. Dr. phil.) is an expert in learning open science, ethics and integrity, and social technologies. She leads the Zentrum für Konstruktive Erziehungswissenschaft and conducts her research at Kiel University. Before this transition, she was a professor of Education and Didactics at the University of Applied Sciences Coburg (Academic Centre for Sciences and Humanities), implementing an interdisciplinary study program for all faculties. In 2020, she became the Dean of Studies at the Academic Centre for Sciences and Humanities and founded the (German-speaking) Teaching and Learning Scientific Practice network. She coordinates IP4OS, a HorizonEurope project on Open Science and Intellectual Property (€ 2 million). She is one of the few coordinators of a Horizon2020 project (Path2Integrity, € 2.5 million) associated with a university of applied sciences in Germany (and Europe). The University Kiel awarded her the Innovative and Trendsetting Teaching prize; she won the Genius Loci-Preis with the Coburger Weg team. Her digital learning settings for students and pupils are open source, and she won both the #WeForSchool Hackathon (Germany) and the #EUvsVirus Hackathon.

SESSION II: DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT

Solutions for responsible sharing and reuse of qualitative data

Agata Bochynska, Kirsti Klette, Torgeir Christiansen
University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

Abstract

Qualitative data are difficult to share and reuse. They are typically contextual, here-and-now specific and often person-identifying, which raises a multitude of ethical and legal challenges for the use of data outside of one specific study or one specific research group. As a consequence, these challenges can become a barrier to transparency and reusability of qualitative research. Additionally, because researchers and students who work with qualitative research are often not oriented towards data sharing and reuse, and training in that area is rarely provided by institutions, the knowledge is still lacking on what responsible sharing and reuse of data would be in qualitative projects.

Here we present a guidance for responsible data sharing and reuse in qualitative research that has been developed through a local QualiFAIR project: a hub-node infrastructure at the University of Oslo in Norway in years 2021-2025. This university-wide project focused on making qualitative and context-sensitive data more FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) as well as raising awareness about both the need for sharing and reuse of qualitative data as well as its possible limitations.

The guidance is built around ten main recommendations for increased and responsible data sharing and reuse in qualitative research, starting with 1) Careful assessment and planning for how data could be reused and 2) Thorough consideration of ethical and legal regulations before the project has started, followed by 3) Balancing data anonymization with the usability of the material and 4) Using the right storage and software for qualitative data processing and analysis as well as 5) Documenting context-specific information and 6) Appling discipline-specific metadata. We also point out the need for 7) Better understanding of the rights and permissions for the use (and reuse) of research materials and 8) Using appropriate and internationally recognized licenses for reuse. Finally, 9) Finding appropriate long-term storage for research data is critical but often challenging in qualitative projects; however,10) Community support can help: both academic as well as technical and administrative staff at universities, libraries and data repositories can provide more specific advice on making responsible decisions for long-term preservation of qualitative data.

The recommendations have been developed based on mapping existing landscape in qualitative data management, sharing and reuse at our local institution, as well as working with training, institutional support development, and with case studies across academic disciplines. Throughout the project we have involved both academic as well as administrative and technical staff from a variety of fields, including anthropology,

political science, medicine, linguistics, psychology, music research, theology and education, so the project outputs, including developed guidance and recommendations, can serve the community across the fields and levels of expertise. We believe that this guidance, based on concrete recommendations from the QualiFAIR project, can be relevant to both qualitative researchers and research support staff as well as open science community more broadly, and inform next steps towards more responsible open research.

Narrative CV

Dr Agata Bochynska is a researcher and a research librarian currently working with investigating and implementing open research and reproducibility practices across disciplines at the University of Oslo in Norway. Her academic background is in experimental psychology, cognitive science and linguistics with a special focus on the relationship between language and cognitive abilities in children and adults, including both neurotypical and neurodiverse populations. She completed her PhD in language and linguistics at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Norway in 2015 and a postdoctoral fellowship in psychology at New York University in the USA in 2021. Starting in 2021, she has been working at the Section for Open Research at University of Oslo Library where she has been teaching a variety of courses on open and reproducible research, research data management and sharing, research ethics, and digital research skills. She has been also coordinating various open research events and initiatives at the university, including a ReproducibiliTea Journal Club for early career researchers and national Open Science Lunch webinars. In 2022, together with several other researchers in Norway, she took initiative to start a Norwegian Reproducibility Network (NORRN) and she has been serving on NORRN Steering Board since. In years 2022-2024 she has been coordinating a university-wide project QualiFAIR: Making qualitative and context-sensitive data more FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable). In the project, ran locally at the University of Oslo, she worked with a large team of researchers and research support staff from several different academic disciplines on developing new solutions for qualitative data reuse as well as raising awareness on the challenges and possibilities for more reusable qualitative research. Building on that, and together with researchers in psychology, criminology and education, in 2025 she started in a new project exploring tensions between Open Science and qualitative research methodologies: ReDemOS: The Unintended Undemocratic Consequences of Open Science practices: Rethinking the Democratisation of Knowledge Production. In ReDemOS, the project team is investigating the perceptions, assumptions and possible unintended consequences of the current Open Science movement. Her most recent research interests focus on meta-scientific assessments of research transparency, reusability and reproducibility as well as on investigating assumptions, implementations and consequences of more open and reproducible research.

Introducing OpenREL: Rights Expression Languages for Open Science and International Data Spaces – A Practitioners' Approach

Prodromos Tsiavos, Melios Michail Katsamakis
OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece

Abstract

As Open Science infrastructures evolve, it is increasingly evident that traditional open license structures no longer meet the complex needs of Research Performing and Funding Organizations (RPOs/RFOs). Today's research ecosystems require more nuanced and layered approaches to data access, sharing, and reuse—particularly within international data spaces, discipline-specific workflows, and AI-driven environments. Researchers and infrastructure providers now need clear, machine-actionable mechanisms to express complex rights, regulatory restrictions (such as GDPR), intellectual property allocations, terms of use, and licensing conditions.

To meet these challenges, the EOSC Beyond project has developed OpenREL, a new Rights Expression Language (REL) vocabulary and toolkit tailored for Open Science. Building on standards like ODRL and CCREL, OpenREL introduces advanced features for representing conditional access, role-based reuse, dual licensing, and the articulation of both legal and ethical rights and obligations. OpenREL supports EOSC's mission to enable FAIR, secure, and trusted data reuse across diverse access models. This 90-minute hands-on workshop will begin with an introduction to OpenREL's structure and logic, followed by collaborative group work. Participants will engage with real-world scenarios involving datasets, services, and research software. In small teams, they will use simplified OpenREL templates to address key questions: What are the conditions for reuse? How can ownership be traced? Who holds which rights and responsibilities? How can these be represented in a machine-readable way? The session aims to open community dialogue on rights governance in Open Science and collect feedback to shape this vocabulary and toolkit.

Narrative CV

Prodromos is a Legal Counsel at OpenAIRE and Athena Research Centre and the Head of Digital and Innovation at the Onassis Group as well as the director of Intellectual Property Rights and Innovation Institute (IPR-i) at the European Public Law Organisation. He serves as the president of the supervisory board of the European Patent Academy of the European Patent Office. He read law and Information Systems in Athens and London and holds a PhD in Law and Information Systems from the London School of Economics.

Open Data and Biodiversity Conservation

Federica Bocchi, Joeri Witteveen
University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract

Transparency, accessibility, reproducibility, and interdisciplinarity are pillars of the Open Science (OS) movement that have inspired legislation, recommendations, and infrastructures. These spaces encourage practices such as open access, open data, open code, and open protocols—aiming to enable reuse, peer scrutiny, and public engagement. Yet "openness" remains elusive (Santana 2024; Elliott & Resnik 2019), a "vague mix of ideals" (Ross-Hellauer 2022). Despite OS promises, practices often rely on narrow conceptualizations, reinforce epistemic inequalities and uneven ethical burdens (Carroll et al 2020).

Scholars have thus argued that openness is not inherently positive but involves epistemic and ethical trade-offs, and that its assessment must be *contextual* (Levin & Leonelli 2017). While investigations have been primarily developed in the domains of biology and biomedical sciences, the specifics of openness and its enactment in biodiversity science and policy remain underexplored. We address this gap by investigating OS practices around biodiversity data, where decisions on how to handle species occurrence information create a dilemma between openness and closeness.

Here is the dilemma. Major conservation organizations (GBIF, the IUCN Red List, iNaturalist) handle valuable occurrence data about species facing extinction. While making location data available on their platforms can support conservation, the same data can be accessed and exploited by collectors, hunters, or tourists. For example, public data that helps conservationists reach and protect endangered succulents, also guides smugglers and illegal collectors (Welz 2017). Current protocols and recommendations on how to handle the dilemma are organized around a straightforward principle: if a taxon is threatened, data about its location should be restricted; if not, data should be open.

Here is the complication. These protocols and recommendations are often insufficient to make robust and ethical decisions about data disclosure. Cases of individuals vulnerable to ecotourism, culturally-significant species, and rediscovered specimens demonstrate that data may need to be withheld for reasons unrelated to threat status, or conversely shared despite a species being threatened. Better guidance can come from a contextual, rather than ready-made, view of openness and decision-making that accommodates a plurality of beneficiaries, proximate and distal actors, axiologies, material circumstances, revisability criteria, and temporal frameworks.

Building on Leonelli (2016, Preprint), we argue that the nature of openness in the context of biodiversity data is relational and contextual. From this perspective, openness is understood as perspectival, purposeful, temporary, and revisable. Data

are not simply open or closed, but open or closed for particular actors, purposes, and timeframes.

Attending to the dynamics of biodiversity data disclosure highlights the significant epistemic and ethical burdens placed on data providers and curators, who face institutional pressures toward default openness while navigating a complex decision-making landscape under insufficient contextual framing. These burdens are often bypassed within current governance discourse and its technocratic configuration of decision-making practices regarding data openness.

Narrative CV

Federica Bocchi is currently a postdoc at the History and Philosophy of Science Unit at the University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Science. She graduated from Boston University with a dissertation titled "Philosophy of Biodiversity: Conceptual and practical issues in measurement, data, and conservation." From July 2026, Federica will join the Department of Philosophy at the University of Calgary (Canada) as tenure-track assistant professor in Transdisciplinary Environmental Ethics. Her research focuses on environmental philosophy, particularly the philosophy of biodiversity conservation and environmental ethics. She investigates how biodiversity quantification—the methods scientists use to measure and represent biological diversity—shapes both epistemic outcomes and questions of environmental justice. Her work examines whether current measurement practices promote or undermine ethnic and cultural diversity, and how seemingly technical decisions about data and metrics can have profound justice implications. Federica adopts a practice-oriented philosophical approach and relies on qualitative research methods.

Open Research Software - From Open Source to Open Science?

Florian Mannseicher[1], Robert Speck[2], Guido Juckeland[3], Frank Löffler[4,1], Jan Linxweiler[5,6]
[1]de-RSE e.V. - Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany. [2]Jülich Research Centre, Jülich, Germany. [3]Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Dresden, Germany. [4]Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany. [5]Technical University of Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany. [6]de-RSE e.V. – Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Although research software has emerged as an essential research output, its openness remains under-explored in current policy discussions. This contribution examines the tension between the ideal of openness and the practical realities of developing and maintaining research software within the German research ecosystem.

Research software — software created during or for the purpose of research — embodies a dual understanding of "openness": developer-focused advocacy for licences to enable reproducibility and reuse, and user-focused demands for cost-free and continued accessibility. This duality creates challenges for the sustainability of software, as software requires continuous maintenance and community engagement — activities that existing funding mechanisms inadequately support.

Our analysis of Germany's research software ecosystem reveals a new perspective on the openness of research software, which could promote reproducibility and policy regarding research software development and use practice. Key challenges include insufficient support for reusability, a lack of organisational structure for users and developers, and the absence of services for licensing and publication. Funding mechanisms often prioritise initial development and neglect long-term maintenance, creating hidden costs and wasting resources through parallel developments across institutions and research domains. Furthermore, the limited recognition of work on research software hinders the establishment of independent career paths for research software engineers within academia. These challenges are amplified by Germany's heterogeneous research ecosystem, which lacks a cohesive governance structure for critical research software. Furthermore, concerns about data protection and fears of uncontrolled reuse create additional barriers to openness, which limits the incentives for stakeholders from other sectors to contribute to sustainability efforts.

The challenges in open research software practice and policy represent more than a technical challenge; they threaten the foundational promise of open science to democratise knowledge production. Nevertheless, we observe an increased adoption of open-source licences among researchers, indicating a bottom-up momentum that policy frameworks have yet to harness effectively. Using this momentum, openness of research software could play a central role in its recognition as a legitimate research

output, for example by applying comparable quality dimensions as for text publications. Thus, “open science” can fulfil the “open source” requirements and build upon them. However, if only well-resourced actors are able to develop and maintain research software, open science risks exacerbating existing inequalities rather than eliminating them. Without sustainable governance and systematic approaches, open research software may remain mere rhetoric. The FutuRSI project has set out to address these challenges by developing concrete solutions and conceptualising a German research software institution.

We propose a reconceptualisation of openness that goes beyond mere accessibility to encompass the idea of responsible and empowered ownership. We advocate for policy frameworks that explicitly consider software lifecycle costs, encourage the participation of various stakeholders, and establish governance mechanisms that balance openness with security and sustainability. By examining the intersection of academic, technical and social factors, our work contributes to the development of a more equitable and resilient open research software ecosystem by building on existing frameworks such as the FAIR for Research Software principles and the Amsterdam Declaration on Funding Research Software Sustainability.

Narrative CV

The Society for Research Software in Germany (de-RSE e. V.), is Germany's leading organisation for advancing research software engineering within the scientific ecosystem. The society promotes sustainable software development practices, enhances recognition of software as a foundational research component, and champions open science principles. Through conferences, workshops and advocacy, de-RSE professionalises research software development and establishes RSE as essential scientific competence. The organisation facilitates RSE team creation at institutions, develops community-driven policy positions, and ensures software sustainability and verifiability. By linking software publications to academic reputation systems and supporting career development, de-RSE bridges research and professional software engineering. de-RSE coordinates the FutuRSI project(https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17047066), a joint initiative supported by six partner institutions to conceptualise a German research software institution. Forschungszentrum Jülich (FZJ) is one of the largest interdisciplinary research centres and a founding member of the Helmholtz Association. Researchers from all over the world contribute their expertise in major future fields such as energy, information and the bioeconomy. In these highly relevant areas, FZJ seeks to find solutions to the challenges facing the modern world through basic research using globally unique infrastructure, as well as developing practical applications. The Jülich Supercomputing Centre and the Jülich RSE Community of Practice (JuRSE) are contributing to the FutuRSI project. The Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf (HZDR e. V.) is part of the Helmholtz Association of German Research Centres. It strives to gain new insights in order to preserve and improve the basis of our existence. To this end, the HZDR conducts research in the fields of energy, health and matter in Dresden and at other locations. Large-scale facilities at the HZDR also enable external researchers from around the globe to find answers to some of society's most pressing questions. As part of the Helmholtz Federated IT Services (HIFIS), the Software Engineering Group supports researchers throughout Helmholtz in the field of research software engineering. The Competence Center Digital Research (zedif) at Friedrich Schiller University Jena is the contact point for researchers

concerning all questions relating to the management of research data and software, and the use of digital tools in research. zedif offers consultancy services on digitalisation in research to researchers from all scientific disciplines, as well as training on digital research with a focus on research data management and software engineering. zedif collaborates with local, national, and international stakeholders in these fields.

The Reuse Potential of Open Government Data for Open Science: Lessons from Socio-Demographic Research in Milan, Lombardy, and ISTAT

Tatiana Lysova
University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

Abstract

Open science has become a global movement aiming to make scientific research more transparent, reproducible, and accessible to everyone (UNESCO, 2021). Its goals include accurately verifying findings through peer review and replication, reducing duplication in data collection, and encouraging citizen involvement in science. Open government data (OGD) supports this agenda, as it should be made available by government agencies for use and reuse (Jetzek et al., 2013), including for research purposes. Therefore, this paper argues that OGD is not only a valuable resource for the social sciences but also a practical tool for achieving the aims of open science. Nonetheless, significant challenges remain in fully unlocking OGD's potential for open science.

The paper illustrates this argument by using the example of reusing Italian OGD, specifically socio-demographic datasets provided by the Open Data of the Municipality of Milan, the Open Data of the Lombardy Region, and ISTAT Demo. These datasets provide publicly accessible information on indicators such as sex, age, place of residence, educational attainment, family composition, and foreign-born populations. The development of the Italian OGD for reuse is assessed following the model proposed by Kalampokis and colleagues (2013).

The opportunities provided by OGD are considerable. Firstly, data are accessible at various levels of detail, from neighbourhood to national records, enabling analysis across different scales. Secondly, the released data cover extended time periods (up to 25 years), facilitating longitudinal studies. Consequently, the large volume of available information supports comparative research and policy evaluation, whilst reducing duplication in data collection.

Yet, several challenges remain that hinder the integration of OGD into open science practices. A recurring problem is the lack of comprehensive metadata, which complicates replication and reduces transparency. Inconsistencies between datasets, caused by differing definitions, classifications, and collection periods, create incoherencies that impede integration and comparability. Territorial challenges also arise: some indicators are accessible only at higher levels of granularity, while others can be analysed at the neighbourhood level. Another territorial issue is that not all administrative changes are promptly reflected in the datasets. Finally, there is a need for data harmonisation concerning indicator names and string indicators that

can be spelt differently across datasets, while referring to the same phenomenon. These issues obstruct longitudinal and comparative research, ultimately diminishing the reliability of findings.
The paper argues that, although the Italian OGD has completed the initial stage of OGD development for reuse, specifically in aggregation and publication, additional work is needed to complete the second stage of OGD integration. To better support open science, governments should harmonise data, provide more comprehensive metadata documentation, and adopt standardised formats that allow data integration and cross-dataset comparability. For researchers, overcoming these obstacles would mean more opportunities for replication, collaboration, and the development of cumulative knowledge.

The paper has been developed within the Excellence Project - OPEN GOVERNMENT DATA. Understanding Society through Public Administration Data - financed MUR 2023-2027 Nota 15659 on 28/12/2022

Narrative CV

Tatiana Lysova holds a PhD (2022) in Sociology from the University of Milan-Bicocca. Currently, she is a Postdoctoral researcher on the Excellence Project “Open Government Data: Understanding Society through Public Administration Data” at the University of Milan-Bicocca. Specifically, she works at the Open Data Observatory. Her activities involve transforming Open Government Data into ready-to-use data for scientific research, including data cleaning and validation, dataset integration, and creating detailed metadata that explains how the data is constructed, its informational content, cleaning procedures, and other aspects. The ultimate goal of Tatiana and her colleagues’ work is to ensure that the OGD data collected within the project adheres to FAIR principles and is discoverable at both national and international levels.

And the winner is... Alphafold !

Alexandre Hocquet[1], Frédéric Wieber[1], Marcus Carrier[2]
[1]Archives Poincaré, Nancy, France. [2]TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

The acknowledgment of AlphaFold by the 2024 Nobel Committee ironically underscores a particular approach to science that revolves around contests. AlphaFold is an AI system designed to predict protein structures with high accuracy. Unlike the ubiquitous generalist chatbots, Alphafold is an exemplar of AI performing a specific scientific task and performing it well. It also underscores a peculiar relation to open science. In our talk, we will focus on Alphafold in order to shed light on a process of end-userisation of the relationship between scientists and their computational tools and its importance for what openness means. Deepmind, the company behind Alphafold, is a Google subsidiary. AlphaFold is a corporate endeavour designed to spark Big Pharma's interest for drug discovery. We regard this techno-scientific promise regime, which associates Big Tech and Big Pharma, as a recurring pattern in the history of computer-aided drug design. Alphafold is succesful in a corner of science accultured to contests such as the so-called CASP, a biennial competition involving puzzle solving since 1994. Thus, as Deepmind was specializing in competitions such as the media-covered AlphaGo vs the best human Go players, the CASP contest revealed to be the ideal vector for their success. We highlight the connection between the gaming-like strategy of Deepmind and scientific problem-solving which aligns with the "demo culture" in the tech industry and the predictive culture of CASP. Alphafold's success also relies on an open scientific infrastructure. The Protein Data Bank as an academic and open database of experimental protein structures has been existing (and growing) since the 1970s as a way to share structural data in the structural biology community, a pionneering initiative in open science. It is now available as a dataset on which to train algorithms for whoever has the computational resources. It has always been a core strategy, for Google and the Silicon Valley in general, to benefit from an open database or source code and then navigate through the minutiae of being open or closed at chosen points in time. The "open" self-branding of Alphafold and other projects is a subtle game of defining (or not disclosing) what (code, datasets, training weights...) is open and when, in order to gain or keep a competitive advantage. Several limitations on the uses of Alphafold are imposed by the end-user license agreement (EULA) to which the scientist willing to use Alpahfold must abide to. These limitations in turn cause frustration in the structural biology community. We conclude that this end-userisation amounts to a kind of dispossession of scientists' agency in their relationships with their tools. Big Tech has a proven savoir faire when it comes to flood users with their tools to make them unavoidable, and science is no exception, as at odds with open science initatives as it seems. It is also

in this sense that Artificial Intelligence is invading Science and we argue that the issue of the agency of scientists as users is central to understand what openness of science could mean.

Narrative CV

Marcus B. Carrier, Frédéric Wieber and Alexandre Hocquet are historians of science. Marcus works at TU Berlin while Frédéric and Alexandre are members of the Archives Poincaré lab at the Université de Lorraine. Their work focus on tools used in computational scientific practices. Their common case study deals with the relationship between the field of computational chemistry and software. **Frédéric** holds a PhD in HPS from Université Paris Diderot. His works include papers and chapters on the history of computational chemistry and on the calibration of scientific instruments. He is more generally interested in the tools used in theoretical and computational scientific practices. **Alexandre**'s focus is on STS, particularly the relationships between software and production of knowledge with works on computational chemistry but also Wikipedia and Football Manager. Methodologically, his works rely on the analysis of threaded conversations in web forums or mailing lists. After having studied history and chemistry (B.A., 2013) as well as History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science (M.A., 2016), **Marcus** received his PhD from Bielefeld University in 2022. His research so far has focused on the history of chemistry, the history of expertise, and the history of experimental practices in science. For his dissertation, he worked on the history of forensic toxicology and chemical expertise in poisoning trials in 19th-century Germany and France. Since 2022, he has been working on the history of computer simulations and the relationship between experiment and simulation in chemistry since the 1970s.

Negotiating Openness in Fragmented Data Ecologies: Computational Social Science between Platforms, Infrastructures, and Public Interest

Katja Mayer
University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

Abstract

The presentation creates a kaleidoscope of my habilitation project *Politics of Openness*, which explores how computational social science engages with open data practices across diverse domains. Framing openness through the complementary lenses of politics and ecologies makes it possible to capture both the struggles over access, accountability, and control, and the situated interdependencies, care, and maintenance that sustain research practices. Rather than presenting openness as a stable principle, I follow it through shifting data journeys and ecologies (Star & Ruhleder 1996; Bates et al. 2016; Milan & Treré 2019; Leonelli & Tempini 2020): citizen science projects emphasizing participation and collective learning, academic infrastructures maintaining and standardizing data, and social media research shaped by commercial platforms and proprietary restrictions. These glimpses highlight openness not as a technical solution, but as a political field of contestation and a relational practice of ontological politics (Mol 1999), where different enactments of data and openness are at stake.

The project foregrounds the invisible and undervalued work that keeps openness alive - documentation, governance, and long-term maintenance - and the inequalities that shape who can share, access, and reuse data. It also addresses ethical tensions: informed consent, long considered foundational in qualitative and citizen science research, is increasingly strained when data travel across repositories or are repurposed for artificial intelligence. Such shifts reveal how traditional practices of accountability are unsettled in data-hungry environments. At the same time, open infrastructures themselves are under strain, facing mounting pressures from excessive requests, automated scraping, and the unintended exploitation of services that were designed to foster scholarly collaboration rather than industrial-scale extraction. These developments also sharpen debates on research security, where concerns about misuse and vulnerability collide with commitments to openness and academic freedom. The rise of generative AI amplifies these dynamics once more. Open data, once mobilized as a tool for democratizing knowledge, now risks being absorbed into extractivist logics of training and commercial exploitation (Couldry & Mejias 2019; Alcoff 2013). At the same time, the call for transparency and reproducibility is re-emerging in debates on generative AI, where the boundaries of responsible openness are being renegotiated (Ross-Hellauer et al. 2024).

At stake is the question of what forms of openness are possible - and for whom - in an age when data-hungry AI, research security concerns, and infrastructural strain redefine the conditions of open research. The presentation will situate computational social science within these shifts, showing how researchers and practitioners adapt, resist, or reframe openness under such pressures. By offering a series of situated perspectives, the presentation will contribute to ongoing debates in open science, STS, and critical data studies. It should not only demonstrate that openness today is less a universal mandate than an ongoing negotiation between platforms, infrastructures, and public interest, but also highlight the need for alternative visions of openness - ones that remain fair, actionable, and oriented toward the public interest. In times of shifting public priorities and increasingly extreme politics, the challenge is not only to advocate for openness but also to safeguard open knowledge itself against capture, misuse, or erosion.

Narrative CV

Katja Mayer is a sociologist working at the intersection of science, technology, and society. She is a senior postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Science and Technology Studies at the University of Vienna, supported by an Elise Richter Fellowship of the Austrian Science Fund. Her current work examines how open science and open data are reshaping research practices, with a particular interest in computational social sciences, citizen science, and artificial intelligence. Mayer's academic journey reflects a long-standing engagement with the relationship between methods, technologies, and society. For her master's degree she studied the social construction of speech recognition technologies, and her PhD investigated the visual cultures underpinning social network analysis. She has also examined questions of scientific integrity and reproducibility in social media research, including work on the reliability of Twitter's data interfaces. Before dedicating herself fully to academia, Mayer gained practical experience in the IT industry as a consultant and knowledge management specialist and later worked in information retrieval. She also served as research advisor to the President of the European Research Council, supporting the social sciences, humanities, and arts. Following this role, she joined the newly established Chair of Computational Social Sciences and Big Data at TU Munich, where she emphasized the importance of critical perspectives on data-driven research. In Vienna, Mayer combines her academic research with contributions to science policy and infrastructure. She has acted as rapporteur for the European Commission on the future of open science and co-led the Open Access Network Austria's working group tasked with developing a national strategy for the transition to open science. In 2024 she was selected as an Open Science Fellow of the Berlin University Alliance, where she led an initiative on AI, digital commons, and open research. Teaching and outreach play a central role in her work. She has taught sociology, science and technology studies, and web sciences at several universities in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland. In her teaching, she experiments with participatory formats such as Collaborating on Wikipedia, Data Walks and critical AI exercises, encouraging students to reflect on the social and ethical dimensions of data practices in an experiential way. Through these combined efforts, Mayer has established herself as a voice in debates on the politics of open science. She emphasizes that openness is not a neutral technical solution but a political project that raises questions of access, responsibility, and public value. Her current focus is on how principles of openness can be sustained in ways that strengthen democracy and serve the public interest, particularly in the context of artificial intelligence and digital research infrastructures.

From values to work: Defining roles and spaces of open research

Alexander Schniedermann, Hartstein Judith, Clemens Blümel
German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

The involvement of users has been characterized as a critical component in the construction of large-scale digital research infrastructures that are reliable, responsible, and equitable. But how are collaborative and interdisciplinary modes to be organized and situated to be successful? Is the more technical concept of "user engagement" adequately representative of the meaningful connectivity that is essential for open research? The space and scope for collaborative interaction, as well as the definitions of "users" and "providers," often remain arbitrary and uncertain. Moreover, several developments towards open research imply a redefinition of established roles and categories. In our presentation, we will address the practicalities and uncertainties in defining roles and spaces of collaboration with regard to two important developments in the German open research transformation.

Our first example is the development of the German National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI) that spans all major scientific disciplines, which involves over 300 German research organizations in different consortia, and which is publicly funded with a 900 million Euro budget. On the one hand, NFDI and its development must be as inclusive as possible to make its adjacent infrastructures representative of and adopted by different academic cultures. On the other hand, however, its success as a large-scale endeavor depends much on traditional hierarchizations and communicable categorizations such as users, providers, and processes.

The second example is the emergence of research software engineering (RSE) as novel professional community in German academia. The wider trend towards open research has drawn substantial attention towards software products in science but also fueled questions of quality control and proper funding. Defining products, roles, and responsibilities has become an important form of boundary work in legitimizing RSE as a professional community within academia. However, such boundary work contrasts the collaborative, interdisciplinary, and often seamless blend of research and development that is fundamental to research software development.

The examples will show how collaborative and non-collaborative modes shape the emergence and development of open research measures in practice. Since both modes are fundamental to the aims and goals of infrastructure and software development, we argue for a greater awareness about the why, when, and how of interdisciplinary engagement.

Narrative CV

Our research group at the German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies focuses on studying the transformation towards open science and the wider digitization of modern academia. Recently, the group was involved in mapping the use of “Open Research Tools” in Germany and currently performs accompanying research (“Begleitforschung”) for the German National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI). Situated between sociology of science, bibliometrics, STS, and research policy studies, our group draws on a broad range of theoretical and conceptual knowledge, as well as on a methodological toolbox that spans qualitative research, survey research, bibliometrics, and computational social science.

The impact of Research Data Management training in the short and long term: a mixed-method study

Francesca Morselli[1], Paula Martinez Lavanchy[2], Narmin Rzayeva[2], Carla Strubbia[3], Nikki Grens[2], Gargi Kulkarni[2]

[1]Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands. [2]Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, Netherlands. [3]Health-RI, Utrecht, Netherlands

Abstract

Research Data Management is one of the pillars of open science (OS) as it provides the foundations to researchers to conduct an open and equitable research (Ramachandran et al., 2021; Borghi & Gulick, 2022). Research Data Management (RDM) training provides researchers with fundamental tools to structure their studies, organize results, and deposit data in suitable repositories for secure, long-term, and accessible storage (Griffin, 2021; Oo et al., 2022). Although RDM training is recognized as an essential part of the universities' educational offer, organizing an ad-hoc training for all students and researchers is complex: it requires in fact large resources and a complex organizational effort by the faculties or central units such as the university library.

This study draws from the experience of the TU Delft Library, which has organized blended RDM training for PhD candidates since 2020, both with in person and online class sessions.

Despite positive reactions from participants, the necessity of investing in intensive, learner-trainer interactive training was questioned, especially in a context of budget cuts across universities and expanded MOOC-based self-learning options.

With this study we aim to show the impact of blended RDM training on researchers and their research practices, both in the short and the long term.

To this aim, we set up mix-method research (including a qualitative and quantitative component), to assess the short-term (*what knowledge and skills participants acquire after the training?)* and long-term impact (*what changes in RDM practices does the training produce*?). Using feedback data from each course run, pre/post-course surveys from four runs, and 13 semi-structured interviews including 11 course alumni and 2 data stewards, we evaluated short- and long-term impact of the skills that the course provides.

Key findings show substantial short-term gains: awareness of institutional RDM support rose from 45% to 98%; reliance on secure institutional storage increased markedly with 90% of learners expressing they changed their storage strategies after the course and 81% established new backup strategies; 98% reported being better equipped to start or improve a Data Management Plan (DMP), frequently citing the usefulness of the Data Flow Map (DFM). Learners' FAIR understanding shifted from only naming the meaning of the acronym to implementing practices (documentation, metadata, README files). The intention to publish research data and code increased

from 76% to 95%, with repository choices shifting markedly toward trusted infrastructure.

Concluding, we suggest that RDM training not only introduces foundational concepts (e.g., data management) but also equips participants with practical knowledge and skills that can be directly applied to their research workflows. We also observed a lasting shift in mindset, with many participants coming to see RDM as an integral part of the research process. Although this study is limited to one university, we believe these results to be transferable to other research institutes. For this reason, participating at the OS conference is essential for our research, and we look forward to receiving feedback from the OS community.

Narrative CV

Francesca Morselli is a postdoctoral researcher at the Athena Institute, based at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Francesca's research interest lies at the intersection of data studies and the social sciences. She currently works in transdisciplary national and international projects, where she designs and leads co-creation sessions with societal actors to approach systemic challenges (e.g., loss of biodiversity, climate change). She is also active in the field of Research Data Management and Open science, given her background in research policy at the Royal Academic of Science of the Netherlands (DANS-KNAW) and her PhD research in one the leading European Research Infrastructures for the Humanities (DARIAH-ERIC). Paula Martinez Lavanchy is the Research Data and Software (RDS) training coordinator at TU Delft Library. With a background in biotechnology and a PhD in microbiology, she transitioned into research data management at the Technical University of Denmark (DTU), where she helped establish support services aligned with the university's data policy. At TU Delft, she leads the development and implementation of the RDS training vision and programme, supporting researchers in managing their data and software effectively. Narmin Rzayeva is a trainer in Research Data Management and Digital Skills at TU Delft Library, where she designs and delivers courses that enable researchers to implement the FAIR principles in daily work, adopt open-science habits, and streamline analysis pipelines. Beyond teaching, she leads and co-leads initiatives that turn training feedback and usage data into data-driven course improvements and scalable offerings, supported by reproducible workflows and lightweight dashboards. With a background in computer science, Narmin is also an external PhD candidate in Leiden University. Her research focuses on the evolving role of preprints in the scholarly publishing system. Carla Strubbia is a Project & Community Manager at Health-RI, working on digital competence for Life Sciences and Health. She holds a Ph.D. in Health Science from the University of Otago in New Zealand, where she researched digital technologies in healthcare systems. At TU Delft, she developed creative RDM training programs and interactive learning formats for researchers. Carla co-chairs the RDA Education Group and is passionate about connecting people in the Open Science community to advance FAIR data practices. She loves fostering collaboration across research disciplines to make data work better for everyone. Nikki Grens is a master's student in Aerospace Engineering and a student assistant with the Research Data & Software team at the TU Delft Library. She conducts quantitative and qualitative analyses of attendance and feedback from courses and workshops and builds reproducible data pipelines to support reporting and evidence-based decision-making. In parallel, she works as a Data Scientist at ML Analytics, where she is

completing her master's thesis, combining space and machine learning." Gargi Kulkarni is an MSc student in the Design for Interaction program at TU Delft. Before her master's, she has worked as a Product and UX designer with design studios in India. She is deeply interested in research-driven design that explores the intersections of human behavior, technology, and systems.

PLENARY PANEL I: INTELLIGENT AND RESPONSIBLE DATA SHARING

Chair: Rachel Ankeny (University of Wageningen)

Plenary Spekaers: Carole Goble (Elixir, University of Manchester), Simon Hodson (CODATA), Paul Groth (Professor of Algorithmic Data Science, University of Amsterdam), Stephan Guttinger (Ethical Data Initiative, University of Exeter), Cameron Neylon (Barcelona Declaration for Open Research Information)

SESSION III: INTELLIGENT AND RESPONSIBLE DATA SHARING

Open research and public engagement: What citizens want to know about preliminary and evolving science

Chelsea Ratcliff[1], Lars Guenther[2], Janise Brück[2], Jana Egelhofer[2], Kayli Jamieson[3], Rackeb Tesfaye[3], Kaylee Byers[4], Alice Fleerackers[5]

[1]University of Georgia, Athens, United States. [2]LMU, Munich, Germany. [3]Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada. [4]University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. [5]University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Abstract

In the recent Recommendation on Open Science (2021), UNESCO proposes that scholars not only make results and data freely available but also "open the processes of scientific knowledge creation, evaluation and communication to societal actors beyond the traditional scientific community" (p. 7). This argument—that members of the public have a role to play in Open Research (OR)—is increasingly recognized (Benson Marshall et al., 2024, 2025; Chtena et al., 2025). Yet, research into the public's engagement with, and preferences for, communication about OR outputs is lacking (Fleerackers et al., 2024, 2025). It remains unclear how the scholarly community can fulfill the UNESCO Recommendation and truly make research processes and outputs *public*.

To shed light on this overlooked aspect of OR, this presentation develops a meta-view and combines quantitative and qualitative data from individual studies in three countries: results from two online survey studies conducted in the United States (US) and Germany and a qualitative interview study from Canada to provide insight into the public's preferences for access to preliminary and evolving research. Understanding these preferences is crucial, as public engagement with preprints, open peer review reports, and other forms of "science-in-the-making" (Latour, 1987) is a crucial part of opening the processes of science to society. Yet, such engagement also brings potential risks related to misinformation, misunderstanding, and (dis)trust in science (Benson Marshall et al., 2024; Sheldon, 2018).

Results from the preregistered survey studies (US, N=1351; Germany, N=1352) show that participants generally reported strong interest in learning complete information about research including caveats and limitations of research methods (US: Mean=4.26 out of 5; Germany: Mean=4.06). Participants also reported interest in learning about preliminary data (US: Mean=3.82 out of 5; Germany: M=3.46). However, for both samples, preferences for complete information were higher than interest in learning about preliminary data (*p*s < .001); these preferences were correlated with age, education, and political affiliation, showing that individual differences play a role.

Complementing these findings with results from 30 People with Long Covid (PwLC) in Canada, interviewed about their experiences seeking information about their

condition, showed that PwLC shared the value of accessing preliminary research results, given the urgency and severity of their new condition. Participants stressed that scientific evidence was one of the most reliable, trustworthy information sources available to them, but they often struggled to access it due to paywalls, jargon, and the slow, iterative nature of the academic process. In the absence of published research, they turned to other forms of OR, such as webinars and social media communication from researchers and medical professionals sharing evidence as it emerged.

Collectively, our findings point to the value of making science-in-the-making *materially accessible* (Kelly & Autry, 2013) by removing paywalls and sharing outputs publicly. More importantly, the findings underscore the importance of ensuring research is also *conceptually accessible* (Kelly & Autry, 2013), for instance, by using understandable language, clearly communicating caveats and uncertainties, and providing opportunities for citizens to contribute to and learn from research on their own terms.

Narrative CV

CHELSEA RATCLIFF (PhD, University of Utah) is an associate professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Georgia, where she leads the Communicating Uncertain Science to the Public (CUSP) Lab. She is also vice chair of the Science Communication Interest Group of the International Communication Association. A former health journalist, her research examines how scientific evidence is communicated in the news and how public audiences navigate this information. LARS GUENTHER (PhD, Friedrich Schiller University of Jena) is Professor of Communication Science at LMU Munich's Department of Media and Communication in Germany, and Research Fellow at the Center for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology at Stellenbosch University in South Africa. He is inaugural Chair of the Science Communication Interest Group of the International Communication Association and interested in public perceptions of (controversial) science, science and health journalism, trust in science, as well as the public communication about risks and scientific (un)certainty. JANISE BRÜCK is a PhD candidate at the Department of Media and Communication at LMU Munich and part of the project "Copy and Paste in (Digital) Science Communication (CoPaDiSC)", funded by the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space. Her research focuses on science communication (online), particularly on the relationships between diverse science communicators and their processes of selecting science information. JANA LAURA EGELHOFER (PhD, University of Vienna) is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Media and Communication, LMU Munich, Germany. Her research focuses on the intersection of science communication and political communication. KAYLI JAMIESON is a Master's Student in the School of Communication and Long COVID Research Fellow in the Faculty of Health Sciences at Simon Fraser University, Canada. Her research focuses on Long COVID healthcare navigation and news media representations of the condition and pandemic. Online, she is also a science communicator on COVID/Long COVID. RACKEB TESFAYE (PhD, McGill University) is a Senior Scientist and Knowledge Mobilization Lead within the Faculty of Health Sciences at Simon Fraser University. With a background in clinical neuroscience and neuroethics, she now focuses on mobilizing research knowledge into societal impact through co-creation with diverse experts. KAYLEE BYERS (PhD, University of British Columbia) is an assistant professor in the School of Population and Public Health at the University of British Columbia. She is interested in strengthening communications across the spheres of human, animal, and environmental health. ALICE FLEERACKERS (PhD, Simon Fraser University) is an assistant professor in the

Department of Media Studies at the University of Amsterdam. She is also a research associate of the Scholarly Communications Lab, a research affiliate of the Public Knowledge Project, and the vice president of the Network for the Public Communication of Science and Technology (PCST). She studies the intersections of journalism, health and science communication, and scholarly communication.

Decolonising Open Research Through the Performing Arts: Towards Equitable, Participatory, and Locally Rooted Knowledge Production

Safieh Shah
IGDORE, Karachi, Pakistan

Abstract

While open research promises greater accountability, collaboration, and public value, its current implementation often risks reinforcing global inequities. Dominant open science initiatives—frequently shaped by well-resourced institutions—can impose research standards, goals, and methods that marginalise local epistemologies, echoing historical patterns of colonial extraction and knowledge control. This presentation argues for decolonising open research by centring methodologies and formats that challenge these hegemonies and amplify diverse ways of knowing, rooted in pluralism, aligned with the principles of open research.

Drawing on research at the intersection of global health, social justice, and the arts, this contribution examines how the performing arts—particularly music, poetry, and stand-up comedy—function as decolonial, community-rooted methods of inquiry and dissemination. These art forms, grounded in local lifeworlds and often shaped by marginalised experiences, offer vital alternative formats for capturing and circulating knowledge. They do not merely supplement conventional research outputs but redefine what counts as valid knowledge, by engaging embodied memory, oral traditions, and collective critique. By analysing these performative practices as participatory and narrative-rich modes of open research, the paper demonstrates how they contribute to social memory, contest dominant historiographies, and nurture "imagined communities" resistant to state-enforced legacies of colonialism, patriarchy, and nationalism. The work foregrounds how such artistic interventions can cultivate inclusive academic freedom, particularly among adolescents and youth, enabling them to reinterpret dominant narratives and contribute to socially responsive research from the grassroots.

This approach speaks directly to the conference's aim of developing equitable open research practices: it advances openness not as a technical fix, but as a cultural and ethical imperative grounded in local engagement, diversity, and social transformation. It also highlights the transformative potential of performance-based methods for capacity building—especially in under-resourced contexts—where digital infrastructure alone is insufficient to democratise knowledge production.

Ultimately, this contribution offers a model for open research that is not only reliable and responsible, but deeply responsive to varied contexts and publics. It calls for a research ecosystem where knowledge is co-produced, accessible in alternative

formats, and rooted in epistemic justice—advancing the collective effort to reimagine open research as a truly inclusive global commons.

Narrative CV

Dr. Safieh Shah is an interdisciplinary researcher working at the intersection of global health, decolonial methodologies, and creative expression. With over a decade of experience spanning humanitarian operations, open research infrastructure, and cultural activism, she brings a critical, practice-informed perspective to questions of equity, ethics, and accessibility in open science. She holds an Bachelors in Medicine and Surgery from Baqai Medical University and an MSc in Public Health Research from the University of Edinburgh, alongside certifications and mentoring studies across policy and practice worldwide, in Operational Research from The World Health Organization, Health Services Management (MSF), and Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (2021–2023). She is currently an Affiliated Researcher at IGDORE and contributes to open science policy discussions through her membership in the CoARA-ERIP Working Group on Ethics and Research Integrity in Responsible Research Assessment for Data and AI. Dr. Safieh's work as an Operational Researcher with WHO and MSF (2014–2019) has been instrumental in advancing equitable and transparent knowledge infrastructures. She co-developed the first Ebola Open Access data platform (IDDO), grounded in FAIR principles, and designed Pakistan's first national ethics review application form. Her advocacy extends to improving migrant housing in Serbia and supporting psychosocial care for asylum seekers. These engagements reflect her deep investment in ethical, inclusive research ecosystems responsive to diverse geopolitical realities. Equally significant is her contribution to decolonial artistic practice. As Strategy Lead for Patari Tabeer, she supported marginalized musicians—including producing the acclaimed single "Amma Chahay Thi"—while ensuring artists retained rights over their work. She also created "Behenchara Diaries," a podcast elevating feminist and queer voices in Pakistan, exploring how creative formats can subvert epistemic injustice. Her cultural critiques and music reviews in outlets like Dawn, Global Voices, and Medium (2011–2024) analyze artistic production through a decolonial and Sufi lens, offering counter-narratives to dominant knowledge regimes. She regularly contributes to public and scholarly dialogue on the gendered dimensions of knowledge production. Her letters in the Journal of Sexual Medicine (2013, 2017) challenged biomedical framings of female anatomy and received international media coverage. Her recent SSRN publication, "Unraveling the Threads Controlling Pakistan's Gender-Nation-Building Ideology" (2024), critiques the instrumentalization of gender within state epistemologies and supports the theoretical grounding of her current research. Her ongoing work explores how open, community-rooted creative practices—including oral storytelling, music, and performance—can function as decolonial methods of inquiry and dissemination. These forms often lie outside dominant scholarly infrastructure yet are vital to democratizing research participation and representation. Her upcoming guest appearance on the "Living Decoloniality" podcast further reflects her engagement with these conversations. Fluent in English and Urdu, Dr. Safieh has led and collaborated on projects across South Asia, Europe, and East Africa. She brings expertise in mixed methods, ethical and participatory research with marginalized groups, and open access policy. Her work bridges formal institutions and grassroots communities, helping to reimagine open research not just as a technical fix, but as a space for justice, co-creation, and cultural renewal.

Upskilling the community: the importance of informal training and mutual learning

Elena Giglia[1], Mauro Paschetta[2]
[1]University of Turin, Turin, Italy. [2]Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

Abstract

Upskilling the community is the overall target of the Italian Competence Center within the framework of ICDI, Italian Computing ad data infrastructure, via two complementary initiatives.

The Open Science café is a monthly online broadcast specifically tailored to the Italian research community. The format is easy: 30 minutes presentation by an expert on different components of Open Science, followed by 30 minutes Q&A. In 2025 we started the 5th edition, having reached more than 5000 listeners, who appreciate the quick and practical format. All the cafés are recorded and available. They are a valuable example of informal learning paths.

The Italian Community of Data Stewards (CIDS) was established in 2023 within the broader process of consolidating research data management (RDM) practices and promoting Open Science in Italy. Its creation was preceded by a national survey aimed at mapping the presence and skills of professionals supporting RDM in universities and research organizations, which revealed the fragmented recognition of the data steward role and the need for a dedicated forum to consolidate professional identity.

The first in-person meeting of CIDS (Rome, November 2023), brought together fifty professionals from diverse institutions and disciplinary backgrounds. It marked the community's founding moment and highlighted the urgency of formalizing the role of data stewards, supporting their professional growth, and providing them with visibility, along with the need for continuous training, and coordinated initiatives to foster the adoption of FAIR principles in everyday research practice.

CIDS progressively structured its activities through regular online and in person meetings, webinars, thematic working groups, and the creation of collaborative tools. These initiatives strengthened the community, fostering mutual learning and enabling members to respond collectively to the emerging challenges of RDM.

A significant milestone was the publication of the CIDS Manifesto in March 2025 to set out the community's vision, mission, and strategic objectives. The Manifesto defines the distinctive profile of data stewards in the Italian context and positions the community within the European Open Science policy framework, particularly in relation to the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC).

The strategic objectives of CIDS can be summarized in four areas: 1) to valorize and consolidate the role of data stewards, promoting their institutional recognition and sustainable career development 2) to define professional profiles and competencies, ensuring consistency across disciplines while adapting to domain-specific needs 3), to raise awareness of responsible data management, countering the perception of RDM as a bureaucratic task and reframing it as a valuable scientific practice 4) to foster mutual

learning, through professional development opportunities, workshops, mentoring, and inter-institutional collaboration.

CIDS represents an innovative example of community building in the Italian research landscape. By bridging the gap between policy recommendations and daily practices, it provides concrete support to researchers and institutions, while contributing to a more open, transparent, and sustainable scientific ecosystem. Through its alignment with European initiatives, CIDS also enhances the visibility and impact of Italian contributions to the international Open Science movement.

Narrative CV

Elena Giglia, PhD, Masters' Degree in Librarianship and Masters' Degree in Public Institutions Management, is Head of the Open Science Unit at the University of Turin. She has been part of the European Open Science network since many years, attending national and international conferences, and writing and lecturing on Open Access and Open Science. She takes part as invited expert in several EU Workshops on Open Access and Open Science, and she serves in several Scientific Committees and Advisory boards. She never stopped learning and attends training courses and workshops. Since 2017, she has been a partner in 8 EU-funded projects on Open Science (Horizon Europe and Horizon2020). She was a member (2019-2020) of the Committee on Open Science at the Ministry for University and Research (MUR), in charge of drafting the National Plan Open Science. She is now vice-representative for Italy within CONOSC – Coordination of Open Science coordinators. She actively collaborates with ICDI – Italian Computer and Data Infrastructure Competence center on Open Science, EOSC and FAIR data, organizing the Open Science café and collaborating with the editorial board of open-science.it. She is the delegate of OPERAS, the Research Infrastructure for Open Science in the Social Sciences and the Humanities in the EOSC Association.Mauro Paschetta works at the Polytechnic University of Turin as a domain expert for Open Science, providing support and training to researchers on research data management according to FAIR principles and Open Science practices. He holds a PhD in Evolutionary Biology and Biodiversity Conservation from the University of Turin. He then served as project manager at the Department of Oncology at the University of Turin, with responsibilities in research support and European project management. During this experience, he took several courses in Open Science, research data management, FAIR principles, and data stewardship. He is a member of the coordination group of the Italian Data Stewards Community (CIDS), a member of AISA, and a member of the National Chapter of CoARA.

Global OER Graduate Network: Building Capacity for Open Research Practices

Robert Farrow, Beck Pitt, Carina Bossu
The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom

Abstract

The Global OER Graduate Network (GO-GN, https://go-gn.net/) is an international community of doctoral and early-career researchers who investigate issues of open education, open scholarship, and digital equity. Established in 2013, GO-GN has evolved into a vibrant and supportive research network spanning 30 countries. Its core mission is to build capacity for open research by providing mentorship, resources, and opportunities for critical exchange among 450+ researchers at different stages of their careers.

This contribution explores how GO-GN serves as a living case study in the implementation of open research practices. First, we situate GO-GN within broader debates about openness in research, highlighting the importance of community-driven initiatives in making scholarship more equitable, accessible, and socially responsive. We then examine how GO-GN supports its members in adopting and embedding open research practices through concrete activities:

- Capacity building: training workshops, peer review exchanges, and open publishing guidance that empower researchers to align with open science principles while being attentive to contextual diversity (Farrow et al., 2024 https://go-gn.net/gogn_outputs/go-gn-at-10-strategic-review/).
- Open infrastructures: the development and dissemination of openly licensed research resources, methodological toolkits, and collaborative outputs that lower barriers to participation (Farrow et al., 2023 https://go-gn.net/gogn_outputs/open-research-handbook/).
- Equity, Diversity and Inclusion: examining how open research communities can meaningfully incorporate EDI as a foundational principle. This includes supporting scholars from underrepresented regions (especially the Global South), developing DEI guidelines tailored to specific cultural / linguistic / socioeconomic contexts, ensuring open research infrastructures and practices are accessible (language, format, cost), creating mentoring and funding pathways to reduce structural barriers, amplifying marginalised voices, and engaging in participatory processes to co-define EDI (Bossu et al., 2023 https://go-gn.net/gogn_outputs/edi-guidelines/; Iniesto & Bossu, 2023 https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2023.2267472).
- Community and care: a distinctive emphasis on social support, mentoring, and recognition of researchers as whole persons, which challenges extractive or instrumental models of academic networking and centralises a care ethic (Farrow et

al., 2024 https://go-gn.net/gogn_outputs/go-gn-at-10-strategic-review/; Iniesto et al., 2023 https://doi.org/10.21556/edutec.2023.85.2839).

Our analysis demonstrates how GO-GN contributes to training and capacity building for responsible and responsive open research, while also offering insights into the infrastructures and social practices that sustain such work. We argue that the network provides an alternative model of scholarly community that complements more formal institutional or policy-driven approaches. In doing so, GO-GN illustrates the potential of open research to be a practice of care, inclusion, and solidarity.

We will present empirical examples from GO-GN activities and member experiences, drawing on evaluations, surveys, and published outputs. These examples illustrate the challenges and opportunities of cultivating open research practices across diverse cultural, linguistic, and disciplinary contexts. We invite conference participants to consider how the principles and practices developed within GO-GN might be adapted to other fields and contexts, and how community-driven models can enrich and democratise the future of research using openness as an organising principle.

Narrative CV

The authors bring together complementary expertise in open education, critical pedagogy, and international research capacity building, shaped through their shared leadership of the Global OER Graduate Network (GO-GN). Collectively, they have established GO-GN as a vibrant, values-driven community of practice that supports doctoral and early-career researchers across more than 30 countries. Their professional trajectories demonstrate a sustained commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion in research and to embedding openness as a cornerstone of responsible and socially engaged scholarship. Dr. Robert Farrow is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Educational Technology, The Open University, UK. His research lies at the intersection of openness, ethics, and technology-enhanced learning. With a background in philosophy and critical theory, Robert brings a distinctive lens to debates around digital equity, research integrity, and the politics of knowledge production. As co-director of GO-GN, he has led the design of openly licensed resources, methodological toolkits, and training opportunities that enable researchers worldwide to engage with open research practices. Dr. Beck Pitt is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Educational Technology, The Open University, UK. Her expertise spans open education, participatory research, and the development of innovative evaluation methods. Beck has played a leading role in advancing GO-GN's focus on community, care, and inclusive participation, ensuring that members' diverse experiences shape the network's activities. She has co-authored numerous open education guides, research reports, and peer-reviewed publications, and is a passionate advocate for researcher development, particularly for those navigating the challenges of early career scholarship. Dr. Carina Bossu is Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Educational Technology, The Open University, UK. Carina's research focuses on the role of open educational resources and practices in advancing social justice, particularly in contexts across the Global South. Within GO-GN, she has co-led the development of the Guidelines for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Open Education, with a specific focus on Africa and Latin America. Her expertise ensures that the network's strategies are sensitive to regional needs and responsive to structural inequalities.

Open Science as a response to research inequities stemming from the disregard of scientific agendas relevant to marginalized groups

Ismael Rafols
INGENIO (CSIC-UPV), Valencia, Spain. CWTS, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

Research equity can be conceptualised in various ways. Equity in Open Science is often discussed in terms of people from different communities and geographies having equal access to knowledge (e.g. with OA publications). Another perspective of equity is about having equal opportunities to share and make knowledge visible (e.g. with reporsitories or indexing in research information databases). While these perspectives are important, in this presentation to share a complementary approach to research equity which focuses on for whom the knowledge produced is relevant. We propose that one of the dimension of research inequity is the relative scarcity of research on topics which are relevant to marginalised populations.

The most commonly studied case of inequities in research topics is the distribution of research efforts (publications and funding) across diseases. For example, there is relatively ten times more research for the diseases affecting High Income Countries (HICs), than those affecting exclusively Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs) (Yegros et al. 2020). Moreover, even research in middle income countries is more focused on some of the diseases of the HICs such as cancers than on the diseases affecting highly affecting their own population, such as respiratory diseases (Kumar et al. 2024). Similar misalignements have been found in agriculture between research efforts and societal needs (e.g. on studies for nutrition) (Ciarli and Rafols, 2019). Another widely known case is the relative lack of efforts on women's health research.

In the face of these inequities, a transformation towards Open Science along the UNESCO Recommendation of more equal and stakeholder participation in science, could help in reshaping research agendas. In particular, I would stress the need to move beyond scientific interests, consider diverse social needs and foster societal participation in agenda setting.

References

Kumar, A., Koley, M., Yegros, A., & Rafols, I. (2024). Priorities of health research in India: Evidence of misalignment between research outputs and disease burden. Scientometrics, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04980-x

Yegros-Yegros, A., van de Klippe, W., Abad-Garcia, M. F., & Rafols, I. (2020). Exploring why global health needs are unmet by research efforts: The potential influences of geography, industry and publication incentives. Health Research Policy and Systems, 18(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-00560-6

Ciarli, T., & Rafols, I. (2019). The relation between research priorities and societal demands: The case of rice. Research Policy, 48(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.027

Narrative CV

Ismael Rafols is a senior researcher at INGENIO (CSIC-UPV, Univ. Politec. València) and UNESCO Chair on Diversity and Inclusion in Global Science at CWTS, Leiden University. He studies S&T evaluation, foresight and research strategies., in particular on epistemic pluralism, broadening participation, and widening the distribution of the benefits from science. He is interested in funding portfolios and priority setting for societal challenges such as bird flu or obesity, and issues related to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly in health and agriculture. Ismael has been involved in policy initiatives 'responsible metrics', such as the implementation of UNESCO's Open Science Recommendations, the Leiden Manifesto, the EC Expert Group on Open Science Indicators, or discussions on biases against research topics from the Global South in assessment and databases. Previously, he had developed indicators and mapping methods for the evaluation of interdisciplinary research, e.g. in emergent fields such as bio and nanotechnology. He received an MSc in Science and Technology Policy from SPRU (Sussex), a BSc in Physics from the Univ. Barcelona, a PhD in biophysics from Tohoku University (Sendai, Japan) and was a postdoc in nanobiotechnology at Cornell University. He later was researcher and lecturer at the Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU) at the University of Sussex (2005-12). In between academic positions, he has worked on international cooperation in Oxfam and the City Council of Barcelona.

EcoWeaver: Making “Open” Science Really Open for Users

Phyllis Illari[1], Carlos Alberto Arnillas Merino[2], Tina Heger[3,4,5]

[1]University College London, London, United Kingdom. [2]University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. [3]Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany. [4]Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. [5]Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany

Abstract

In this paper, we will discuss the open sciences challenges of the EcoWeaver project, which has the goal to make “open” ecological knowledge functionally accessible and usable.

We will begin by explaining our project vision, which is to use state-of-the-art computational technologies to extract information, initially from open access published papers but then extending to more diverse sources, and to weave them together to create the **EcoWeaver**, an openly accessible ecological knowledge base and a set of tools to create, manage and access this knowledge base, such as clickable visualisations or ‘chat bot’ answers. The EcoWeaver will (i) support generating novel insights, (ii) enhance ecological understanding and (iii) empower people to make informed decisions. Importantly, it will adhere to the FAIR and CARE principles and will be fully open. The first application of EcoWeaver is the **Toolkit for Restoration Knowledge (TReK)**, aiming to enhance ecological restoration. We will engage diverse teams of practitioners and other users during the development of TReK and EcoWeaver.

As our project both begins *and* ends with knowledge that is in some sense open, it raises a plethora of questions about what open science is and is for. Our aim is to make ecological knowledge accessible for real users, who are very diverse, working with different conditions, languages, technological barriers, resources, and expertise. While our efforts therefore involve synthesising and transforming knowledge to make it usable, our discussions have identified key things important to maintain. Integrating information and offering accessible visuals or condensed answers risks homogenising what we present too much, and risks investing it, or parts of it, with unwarranted authority. To offset this, we are prioritising ensuring that uncertainty, bias and context dependence present in the knowledge base are communicated in the answers for users. For example, we imagine the chat bot interface to offer advice that clearly communicates how well the ecological context of interest to the user match that of the information present in the knowledge base. Further, we are developing ways to identify and represent unintended consequences of restoration actions, which are particularly challenging for ethically responsible environmental management.

Our presentation will point to remaining challenges, including accessing other knowledge in multiple languages, non-open access papers, documents such as

government and NGO reports, and traditional local knowledge, and improving accessibility for example to speakers of multiple languages, or those who might need different visualisation options. We will finish by raising some reasons to restrict openness. First, we ultimately hope to include traditional knowledges, but this needs to be non-extractive, and therefore for its collection and sharing to be extremely carefully negotiated with those sharing their knowledge. Second, related, our tool will also hold private information such as user logins and contact details, as well as sensitive information e.g. on the location of endangered species locations. EcoWeaver and TReK will have to balance these challenges in order make ecological knowledge available in a just and meaningful way and at the same time avoid misuse.

Narrative CV

Phyllis Illari is a philosopher of science in practice, initially trained in Philosophy and now in the Department of Science and Technology Studies at University College London. She works on causality and evidence, particularly all the various challenges of finding good evidence of causality. She has argued, for example, that multiple sources of evidence are desirable in medicine, because so many different people use medical evidence for so many different purposes, and recently began collaborating on the EcoWeaver project. Carlos Alberto Arnillas is an ecologist trained in Peru and Canada. He works at the University of Toronto at Scarborough, modelling different types of ecosystems, from landscapes to microbial communities. His main interests revolve around simulating plant communities and how ecosystems affect human well-being. He also works on ways to integrate two-eye sighing principles into modelling tools and strategies to support ecologists in making more ethical decisions in their practice as researchers, practitioners, and other roles that they take in society. Tina Heger is an ecologist by training, with a focus on knowledge synthesis, ecological effects of global change and future approaches to nature conservation. She is engaged in cross-disciplinary research including computer scientists, philosophers and artists. In several projects at the Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB) in Berlin, Germany and at the Center for Interdisciplinary Research (ZIF) in Bielefeld, she pursues the vision to develop a digital "atlas of knowledge" in which scientific knowledge would be accessible in an actionable form at no cost. Based on these ideas, she founded the EcoWeaver & TReK collaboration. The EcoWeaver & TReK collaboration is an international, interdisciplinary community of experts from restoration, ecology, computer science, AI development, philosophy of science and related fields. This community of experts is committed to jointly working towards realizing the EcoWeaver and TReK. Especially during a 6 months period as a Resident Group at Bielefeld University’s Institute for Advanced Study, the team has developed concrete ideas for EcoWeaver and TReK’s architecture, which involved continuing discussions on the challenges presented in the paper.

From consultation to institutional practice: policy recommendations from a pan-European Policy Support Action on public engagement in R&I

Marzia Mazzonetto[1], Angela Simone[2]
[1]Stickydot srl, Brussels, Belgium. [2]Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy

Abstract

Equitable open research requires more than infrastructures and technical skills; it depends on policy frameworks that establish mandates, distribute resources, and embed accountability within research governance. Across the European Research Area (ERA), approaches to public engagement (PE) in research and innovation remain fragmented, with many activities limited to consultation exercises that are disconnected from institutional decision-making. This raises a central challenge: how can PE be transformed from a series of episodic interactions into a routine and institutionalised practice supported by coherent policy frameworks?

This paper draws on evidence from the Mutual Learning Exercise on public engagement in R&I, a Policy Support Action of the European Commission implemented between 2024 and 2025. The exercise brought together ministry representatives, funding agencies, and research organisations from across the ERA in a structured process of peer learning. Through four thematic meetings, country visits, and extensive exchanges of documentary evidence and national experiences, participants jointly identified obstacles, examined successful practices, and co-developed recommendations for policy and institutional reform. The legitimacy of the outcomes rests not only on the breadth of evidence reviewed but also on the active involvement of national authorities and policymakers who will be responsible for implementing the recommendations in their respective contexts.

The analysis shows that durable public engagement depends on the alignment of three interrelated dimensions. First, clear governance frameworks and mandates are required to ensure that engagement has defined roles, adequate resources, and formalised channels through which citizen input can influence agendas, evaluations, and funding decisions. Second, sustained investment in capacity and incentives is necessary for PE to move beyond ad hoc projects: training must be modular, role-specific, and practice-oriented, while career progression and assessment systems should reward meaningful engagement. Third, robust evaluation and accountability mechanisms are needed to demonstrate the value of PE. Indicators must go beyond numerical participation to capture inclusivity, deliberative depth, and evidence of influence, while transparent feedback loops should communicate to citizens how their contributions shaped outcomes.

By situating these findings within the broader policy debate on open and responsible research, the paper argues that policy frameworks can act as a critical lever for embedding PE as a routine element of research governance. The MLE demonstrates how structured, cross-national policy support actions can generate recommendations that are both evidence-based and politically legitimate. It illustrates that, when ministries and national authorities are directly involved in the design and endorsement of outcomes, recommendations are more likely to be taken up and adapted within national systems.

The contribution thus provides a case study of how policy-making initiatives at European level can accelerate mutual learning, strengthen institutional commitment, and establish the conditions under which public engagement becomes a durable and accountable feature of open research.

Narrative CV

Marzia Mazzonetto is founder and CEO of Stickydot, a Brussels-based SME specialising in multi-stakeholder engagement in research, innovation, and policy. With over twenty years of experience in citizen and stakeholder engagement, she has built her career at the intersection of science communication, participatory governance, and European research policy. Her academic training in communication and public engagement is complemented by extensive hands-on practice in designing and facilitating co-creation processes, ranging from citizen consultations to deliberative dialogues and large-scale participatory experiments. Marzia has coordinated and contributed to numerous European projects that advance open and responsible research practices. She leads the Horizon Europe project CO-VALUE, which introduced the concept of co-valorisation to strengthen the uptake of research results through citizen and stakeholder participation, and coordinated MOSAIC, which developed and tested a co-creation methodology for climate-neutral Mission Cities. In addition, she has played leading roles in high-profile initiatives such as REINFORCING, COALESCE, and ECS, focusing on systemic approaches to public engagement, science communication, and citizen science. Beyond project implementation, she has been repeatedly entrusted with policy support roles by the European Commission. Most notably, she acted as expert and rapporteur for the Mutual Learning Exercise (MLE) on Public Engagement in R&I (2024–2025), commissioned by the Policy Support Facility. In this role she led the thematic area on institutional conditions for public engagement and served as main author of both the thematic report and the final synthesis report of the exercise. Her work involved close collaboration with ministries, funding agencies, and research organisations from across the European Research Area, providing her with a unique vantage point on how public engagement is conceptualised, resourced, and institutionalised in different national contexts. The legitimacy of the MLE's policy recommendations rests on this structured process of mutual learning among national authorities, a process which Marzia both facilitated and documented. Her earlier contributions to European policy support include serving as an expert in the MLE on Citizen Science Initiatives (2021–2023), where she co-authored thematic reports and recommendations on scaling citizen science across Europe. She also played a key role in the creation of citizenscience.eu, the EU's central hub for citizen science resources and community building. Marzia has authored numerous publications, policy briefs, and methodological toolkits on public engagement and open science, including the MOSAIC Co-creation Methodology Toolkit (2023). She is frequently invited to speak and moderate at international conferences, contributing to the European debate on open and responsible

research. In her current work, she continues to explore how policy frameworks and institutional conditions can support the transition from consultation to practice in public engagement, contributing empirical insights and actionable recommendations for embedding engagement within the evolving policy architecture of the ERA.

A novel approach to mapping the elusive emerging communities behind open research

Sven Ulpts, Jesper Schneider
Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

Abstract

Open research, open science, metascience, or meta-research is invoked across fields, yet their social and intellectual structures and boundaries remain unclear. Are we looking at consolidated inter-connected research specialties, or rather emergent domains, or simply loosely coupled discourse communities, or perhaps social movements (Peterson & Panofsky, 2023), or a combination of these? It is crucial for our understanding that we undertake a more thorough empirical mapping of these structures.

In a new project, we seek to clarify these challenges to provide a better basis for understanding and analysing these communities. To move beyond terminological ambiguity, which hampers current inquiries into "open" or "meta" communities, we present a novel bibliometric mapping strategy tailored to examine diffuse domains that elude standard journal- or keyword-based delineations. We conjecture that our approach will demonstrate that previous attempts at mapping open research communities have been wanting.

Our sociology-of-science lens reconstructs communities through their scholarly communication patterns, traces intellectual lineages, and examines their potential knowledge exchange and social connectedness, or lack thereof (Morris & Van der Veer Martens, 2008). We assess the degree of institutionalisation versus decoupling across "open" labels and examine to what extent "open" functions primarily as an umbrella term for practices or as a coherent scholarly endeavour. This structural perspective clarifies who contributes, how they connect, and what binds them, providing an empirical basis for theorising the contemporary "open" landscape.

Our focus in this abstract is to present our novel approach; in a later oral presentation, we will also present main results. Our first bibliometric lens is co-citation analysis (Small, 1973), traditionally used to depict "intellectual structures" (White & McCain, 1998). Crucially, these structures are not self-evident: data never simply "speak." Results reflect analytic choices—above all, how the input corpus is delineated. From a pragmatic stance, identification and selection must therefore be tailored to the purpose at hand and be fully transparent. Standard inputs—core journals or title/abstract keyword searches—either presuppose institutionalisation of a domain or suffer natural-language noise and cross-field heterogeneity, and are therefore ill-suited to diffuse, loosely coupled discourse communities.

Instead, we propose a multi-step workflow. First, we conduct a domain analysis—a socio-cognitive examination of a domain's socially grounded epistemic practices—to clarify key actors, concepts, paradigms, and modes of knowledge production (Hjørland, 2004). The domain analysis commences from programmatic works and evolves in an exploratory manner. Next, we identify seeds of core papers and core

actors. Once these authoritative sets are established, we conduct citation and co-citation analyses based on entities (e.g., actors, documents), and finally network analyses, which will map the social structures emerging from citing patterns. This allows us to map the topology of "open research" and its name-variants, and to assess how far these communities are tied together through citing norms. We further examine the citing relations using citation context analysis to be able to distinguish what binds entities together: perfunctory/rhetorical positioning citations from normative/engagement citations (Small, 2004); the former would indicate looser coupling and more social positioning; the latter a stronger scholarly kinship.

Narrative CV

Narrative CV: Jesper W. Schneider I am a Professor at the Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University (AU). I am currently chairing the AU social science faculty's ethics committee and am one of two ombudspersons at the faculty for responsible conduct of research. I consider myself a meta-researcher who has specialised in quantitative science studies (scientometrics), research evaluation, science policy, sociology of science, scholarly communication, research integrity and inferential statistics. I have published substantially within these topics for 25 years. More specifically, I study social and reward structures in science; scientific norms; research practices and knowledge production modes; how and why researchers cite; how researchers report and publish their claims; evaluation practices and citation impact; notions of reproducibility and openness, as well as science funding and incentive structures. I have specific research interests in research funding, performance-based funding systems and peer review; how we measure science, explicitly the concepts of interdisciplinary and disruption; citing practices and patterns; questionable research practices; and the conceptual confusion around reproducibility. But foremost, I have a long-standing interest in the ritualistic use of "null hypothesis significance testing" - the main culprit behind decades of pathological knowledge production in the soft sciences. This research culminated in the ISSI Best Paper Award in 2017. I am currently the President of the European Network of Indicator Developers and was recently a Berlin University Alliance Fellow at the Robert K. Merton Centre for Science Studies at Humboldt University in Berlin (2022-2023). In 2025, I jointly received a four-year grant from the Volkswagen Foundation's "Researching Research" initiative titled: Reforming Science: Investigating the Reflexivity & Reflectivity of (Non)Academic Actors Advocating for Science Reforms. An overview of my scholarly production can be seen at: https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=rlZGQaUAAAAJ&hl=da. Narrative CV: Sven Ulpts I am a Science Studies scholar who recently handed in his PhD dissertation entitled "From the Researcher to the Integrity of Knowledge Production?", based on an ethnographic approach to studying research integrity and Open Science as experienced and interpreted by researchers in the context of the research realities in social, behavioural and cognitive science labs in Europe. As part of this work, I, for instance, explore preregistration (and registered reports) as literary technologies that serve as credibility management strategies in the process of social persuasion within specific research communities. This work was part of the Carlsberg Foundation-funded project ETHOS – Exploring Research Integrity Policies and Practices in the Houses of Science. My main research interests revolve around forms of and issues with research quality, research integrity, research assessment, research evaluation, peer review, research funding, notions of reproducibility, epistemic diversity, science reform,

and the emerging communities associated with designations like Science of Science, Metascience, Research on Research, and Meta-Research. I have organised and moderated an online symposium to critically reflect on metascience, hosted by the COS (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7o6Cabkj8lk) and co-organised two other events dedicated to the investigation of Open Science, Metascience, and related endeavours (https://markrubin.substack.com/p/lets-talk-about-science-reform; https://doi.org/10.52843/cassyni.qf5965).

Exploiting Biases Inherent to AI to Responsibly Co-Design Digital Futures

Regina Sipos
Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of generative AI (genAI) presents both opportunities and significant risks for the co-design of our collective digital futures. While these tools offer new avenues for creative expression and participation, their inherent biases can reinforce sterile, technosolutionist visions. This creates an urgent need for novel methods that move beyond treating AI as a neutral tool and instead engage with it as a partner in critical and reflexive inquiry. In this paper, we introduce and present two cases of the Critical Participatory Co-Design (CPC) method, a novel approach developed to facilitate socially responsive and responsible forms of open research by deliberately leveraging AI's limitations to foster co-creation.

This paper will outline the CPC method, a hybrid, three-phase process combining the tangible, collaborative nature of paper prototyping with speculative approaches to human-AI co-creation. The paper describes the process through which its validity was assessed: first, through an initial expert validation, a workshop with 15 urban designers in Switzerland, and with 25 design researchers in Taiwan, utilised as case studies. This paper will detail how these practitioners, exploring large-scale technology development into future infrastructures and research, used the CPC method and a custom-built genAI device. The process involved collaboratively building physical paper mock-ups of desired urban scenarios; using the AI tool to generate speculative future visions from images of their creations; and collectively analyzing the AI-generated outputs through guided, reflexive questions.

This paper will present the findings from the workshops, demonstrating how the CPC method effectively fosters critical reflection with and for society. It underlines that a key result is that the deliberate strategy of *exploiting* inherent biases within the genAI model effectively catalysed dialogue and contributed to critical thinking. By confronting the stereotypical, flawed, or unexpected visions produced by the AI, participants were able to challenge their own underlying assumptions, demystify the technology, and engage in a more democratic and politically aware conversation about equitable sociotechnical futures. This paper will report on how the process was found to be an accessible and engaging format for tackling complex, wicked problems without succumbing to dystopian despair.

This research contributes a validated, practical method for harnessing genAI not as an oracle for the future, but as a tool for critical inquiry. The results indicate that the CPC method offers a tangible pathway for urban designers and design researchers, and communities to navigate the complexities of emerging technologies through open

research methods. By turning the inherent biases of AI into a resource for reflection, the method empowers stakeholders to more responsibly and equitably co-design our increasingly digital world. The paper concludes by suggesting a robust and socially-aware approach to participatory design, ensuring that the development of our digital environments is a more open, inclusive and critically-informed process.

Narrative CV

Dr. Regina Sipos is a postdoctoral researcher and founder at the intersection of design, technology and society. She wrote her PhD thesis focusing on intrinsic and collaborative technology design and innovation in grassroots communities in the Global South. As a postdoctoral researcher at the Chair for Design and Transdisciplinarity, Technical University of Munich, she is responsible for developing the Chair's research strategy, focusing on transition design and translational design, enabling cross-disciplinary collaborations on Social and Societal Futures and Emerging Technologies. Previously, Dr. Sipos developed and managed the EU-funded Critical Making project, a transdisciplinary participatory research consortium at the Technical University of Berlin. Dr. Sipos is the Founder and Director of the Social-Digital Innovation Initiative, a social enterprise that she developed and manages. This initiative facilitates the cross-pollination of open source technology and social innovation, demonstrating her leadership and entrepreneurial skills. She also designed and managed the United Nations' first global co-creation and incubation platform for social entrepreneurs working with technology at the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) before moving to Berlin to advise Ashoka Germany on their Digital Fellowship strategy. She speaks frequently at international conferences and has published multiple peer-reviewed papers. She is the Chair of the United Nations Working Group on Digital Public Infrastructure,, a program committee member of the International Conference on Communities and Technologies and IMPETUS4CitizenScience, a member of The Design Society and Association of Internet Researchers, a Steering Committee Member of the Centre for Internet and Human Rights at the European University Viadrina and Executive Board Member of Appropedia and the Global Innovation Gathering.

Plenary Panel II: Equity and Justice in Open Research Implementation

Chair: Barbara Prainsack (University of Vienna)
Plenary Speakers: Louise Bezuidenhout (University of Leiden), Tony Ross-Hellhauer (Graz University of Technology), Antonia Schrader (Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany), Rachel Ankeny (University of Wageningen), Aleksandra Lazić (ABRIR: Advancing Big-team Reproducible Science through Increased Representation)

SESSION IV: OPENNESS AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

Navigating a fragmented landscape: A functional taxonomy of online venues for Scholarly Communication

Jacopo Ambrosj[1,2], Frédérique Bordignon[1,2]
[1]École nationale des ponts et chaussées, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Marne-la-Vallée, France. [2]LISIS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel, CNRS, Marne-la-Vallée, France

Abstract

The landscape of Scholarly Communication (SC) has become extremely vast and fragmented, with new publishers, journals, repositories, and other previously unimaginable venues such as overlay journals coming to the fore. As a consequence, the choice of where to share one's research and how to access the research of others has become extremely difficult. On the one hand, researchers must comply with the open access requirements of funders and institutions. On the other hand, the appropriation of open research by commercial entities has complicated this decision, with, for example, predatory publishers flooding the SC landscape with a myriad of open access journals (including numerous special issues)1. Moreover, it is not always easy to distinguish the publishing strategies of these actors from those of traditional publishers2.

To this day, this fragmented landscape lacks a systematic classification. We thus set out to develop a theoretically robust and empirically informed taxonomy of online venues for SC, as a first step towards a deeper and clearer understanding of this complex reality. Our goal is to provide the research community with a powerful and flexible tool to move beyond simple labels and understand the functional roles of different venues within the context of SC.

We employ the multi-stage iterative Taxonomy Development Method3, which combines bottom-up and top-down approaches, starting from a dataset of 485 online venues we have collected. In developing the taxonomy, our guiding question is: **what are the different ways in which different online venues contribute to SC?** Accordingly, we use the four functions of SC4 as the main dimensions along which online venues vary: *registration* (establishing intellectual priority and assigning responsibility, e.g. connecting records to ORCiDs); *awareness* (ensuring dissemination, e.g. making the content open access); *archiving* (ensuring preservation, e.g. relying on infrastructure like *CLOCKSS*); and certification (ensuring quality or validity, e.g. peer-review). We identify taxa in patterns of similar characteristics clustered around specific actors. The description of taxa allows us to address critical questions for open research: do commercial and non-commercial actors cluster into different functional patterns? Can we map specific Open Access models (Diamond, Green, Hybrid, Gold…) to distinct functional roles in SC? This, in turn, will help detect problematic behaviours. For example, the taxonomy can reveal incongruities between a venue's open access policy (awareness) and its restrictive reuse licenses (archiving). At the conference, we will present the final

version of the taxonomy and demonstrate its analytical power with illustrative examples for each taxon. We will also show how it serves as a foundational tool for further research by presenting preliminary results from a parallel study on the discursive strategies about open research of online venues for SC and their use of formal references (hyperlinks) to open science guidelines and standards.

(1) Hanson et al. The Strain on Scientific Publishing. *Quantitative Science Studies* **2024**
(2)https://the-strain-on-scientific-publishing.github.io/website/posts/discover_nature/#springer-nature-discovers-mdpi
(3) Kundisch, et al. An Update for Taxonomy Designers. *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 2021
(4) Roosendaal & Geurts, Forces and Functions in Scientific Communication: An Analysis of Their Interplay 1997

Narrative CV

Jacopo Ambrosj is a philosopher of science with experience in empirical qualitative research. They obtained a joint PhD at KU Leuven and UAntwerpen with a thesis on values in science and research integrity (2024). Since March 2025, Jacopo has been working as a postdoctoral researcher on the ROR2 project at LISIS (Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Sciences Innovations Sociétés) in Paris-Est. Their latest research interests include open science, scholarly communication, polarisation in research, and the recent introduction of sex and gender analysis in scientific practice. Frédérique Bordignon, PhD in linguistics, is a member of LISIS, where she conducts research on linguistic aspects of scientific texts and mechanisms for correcting science by contributing to research on publication practices, knowledge construction and dissemination, and ways to make science more open. She is the research integrity officer at École nationale des ponts et chaussées (ENPC), where she is also responsible for bibliometrics and international rankings. She is a member of the ERC-funded project Nanobubbles, which focuses on how, when and why science fails to correct itself. She leads one of the two teams of project ROR2 . The ROR2 project (Recherche Ouverte et Responsable X Research On Research), funded by the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR), aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of researchers' open science practices in relation to research integrity. Frédérique Bordignon and Jacopo Ambrosj form one of the two research teams of the project. They work together on developing a taxonomy of online venues for scholarly communication, tracing their strategies, including discourse, announcements, and functionalities they offer, in relation to open science and research integrity. The other team is located at ELICO (Équipe de recherche de Lyon en sciences de l'Information et de la Communication) in Lyon. Here, PI Chérifa Boukacem-Zeghmouri and post-doc Guillaume Silhol are developing a topology of research practices around open science and research integrity based on focus groups with researchers. The overarching goal of the project is to unravel the intricate mechanisms that shape and transform open research and integrity practices by combining the results of the two research teams (i.e. taxonomy of online venues for scholarly communication and topography of research practices) by relying on research on research methodologies. In addition to the two teams, the ROR2 project can count on the multidisciplinary expertise of its consortium members. These are both researchers and professionals from different fields, including information and communication scientists, a sociologist with expertise in scientific publishing, a philosopher of science whose expertise is in ethical issues, a medical doctor involved in the fight against fraud, a geographer and an economist with skills in scientometrics, and two professional experts in scholarly communication who have been working for many years to open up science.

When journals stand still, scientists step in: The rise of post-publication peer review

Paolo Vincenzo Leone[1], Philipp Tuertscher[2]
[1]NOVA SBE, Lisbon, Portugal. [2]VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Abstract

ABSTRACT
Science is often seen as a self-correcting enterprise, yet research pathologies—including systemic errors, biases, and misconduct—expose the limitations of traditional scientific evaluation systems. While institutional stakeholders like publishers, journals, universities, and funders have been reluctant to implement reforms, responsibility has increasingly shifted to scientists themselves. This study draws on qualitative methods to investigate how a loosely coordinated community of science sleuths has driven the emergence of post-publication peer review (PPPR). Our findings reveal how they built a socio-technical system of evaluative practices and tools that became integrated into the workflows of publishers and journals. We demonstrate how PPPR represents a shift in scientific evaluation, complementing traditional peer review with an ongoing, transparent, and distributed mode of assessment. This shift carries significant implications for the scientific community's ability to detect and address research pathologies, potentially strengthening scientific integrity while also introducing risks such as reputational harm from unverified claims.

Narrative CV

Paolo V. Leone is an Assistant Professor of Social Innovation at Nova SBE. His research focuses on the organizational dynamics that drive social innovation processes. Particularly, he explores how open forms of organizing can generate system-changing innovations in scientific and knowledge-intensive collaborations. His research is situated at the nexus of organization theory and innovation studies, and has appeared in journals such as Academy of Management Review and Research Policy. Paolo teaches innovation courses at the master level and philosophy of science at the PhD level. He received a PhD in Management from McGill University, an MPhil in Innovation, Strategy and Organization from the University of Cambridge, and a JD from Università Roma Tre. Philipp Tuertscher is Professor of Collaborative Innovation and a member of the KIN Center for Digital Innovation at the School of Business and Economics, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam since 2013. Philipp obtained his PhD at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland in 2009. During his PhD, Philipp was awarded a prestigious Fellowship from the Swiss National Science Foundation, and his dissertation research on large-scale scientific collaborations received funding from the US National Science Foundation. He has also been a visiting scholar at the Pennsylvania State University's Smeal School of Business. After his PhD, Philipp joined WU Vienna, Austria, as an assistant professor at the Institute for Entrepreneurship and Innovation. Philipp's research explores organizational mechanisms and social practices for collaborative innovation in a variety of settings. Besides studying large-scale scientific collaborations at CERN, Philipp has been studying innovation processes in collaborative communities such as Linux and Wikipedia.

Diamond Grassroots and Commercial Publishing

Ties Nijssen[1], David Teira[2]
[1]Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands. [2]UNED, Madrid, Spain

Abstract

Historians and philosophers of science have different models to explain why scientists are committed to peer-review. Advocates of diamond open access publishing often assume that those same models explain why scientists should run their own journals to validaet and disseminate minimizing the participation of for-profit actors. We argue that publishing and editing a journal has a completely different set of incentives and requirements than only reviewing a paper. These incentives explain the difficulties Diamond Open Access initiatives often encounter and question why scientists should do editing and /or publishing work, instead of outsourcing it. Drawing on our contrasting experience in the publishing world (a corporate career and a diamond open access academic editor), we are going to defend that running scientific journals today is a full-time job that the academic community does not have to do alone.

Narrative CV

David Teira is professor of philosophy of science at UNED, Madrid. He has edited diamond open access philosophy journals (Theoria) and book collections (BSPS Open). He is also a board member of the Phil-Sci Archive, the leading OA repository in philosophy of science. He has done OA advocacy for several international scholarly societies in his field (PSA, EPSA, BSPS) and is current president of the Spanish Society for Logic and Philosophy of science. He has also produced reports and scholarly articles on the future of OA philosophy in the Spanish speaking world. Ties Nijssen is Executive Publisher Humanities & Law at Springer. He manages a large journal portfolio and started several new subscription and open access journals.

“MORPHING” open peer review in the humanities and social sciences

Samuel Moore[1], Jenni Adams[2], Miranda Barnes[1]
[1]University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom. [2]University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Abstract

Materialising Open Research Practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences (MORPHSS) is a three-year research project funded by the Wellcome Trust, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the Research England Development Fund. A collaboration between the Universities of Cambridge, Sheffield, Coventry and Southampton, MORPHSS is exploring the different meanings of open research in HSS disciplines and will advocate for researchers to take ownership of the turn toward open research and experiment with openness in their own disciplines. This talk will introduce the project’s work around open peer review in HSS disciplines.

Open peer review is an increasingly common practice in academic publishing. Although the practice remains ill-defined, open peer review tends to refer to a process in which the reviewer identities are known to the authors, reviewer comments are made available for readers to access, or participation is made open to greater range of participants (Ross-Hellauer 2017). Despite this imprecise definition, many approaches to open review are grounded on the assumption that openness and transparency are closely related and that open review may therefore shed light on reviewer biases and a lack of accountability in the review process (Enslin and Hedge 2018). While this may be the case, open peer review practices often adopt an understanding of the publication process in which transparency is a higher goal than other less overtly teleological values such as experimentation or community knowledge generation.

The MORPHSS work package on open peer review sees open review as a chance to explore collective and generative forms of review in HSS research. Rather than adopting an open-closed approach, MORPHSS is complicating this binary by conceiving of a process of ‘opening out’ research to different communities as part of the publication process. This talk will focus on our current work on open review through two different ‘open’ review processes we have designed for a special issue of the *Journal of Electronic Publishing*. We will introduce and detail these processes before sharing reflections and evaluation from participating authors and reviewers. In doing so, MORPHSS hopes to arrive at a more expansive definition of openness for the humanities and social science that better reflects the multifarious working practices of our disciplines.

References

Enslin, P. and Hedge, N. (2018) 'On Peer Review as the "Gold Standard" in Measuring Research Excellence: From Secrecy to Openness?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 52(3), pp. 379–396. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12312.

Ross-Hellauer, Tony. 2017. "What Is Open Peer Review? A Systematic Review." *F1000Research* 6. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5437951/.

Narrative CV

Dr. Samuel A. Moore is the Scholarly Communication Specialist at Cambridge University Library and Principal Investigator of Materialising Open Research Practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences (funded by Wellcome Trust, AHRC and the Research England Development Fund). He is also an Affiliated Lecturer at Cambridge Digital Humanities and a College Research Associate at King's College Cambridge. Dr. Moore's research sits within the digital humanities and focuses on topics relating to academic publishing, research practices in the humanities and social sciences, and critical issues relating to research communication. He has a Ph.D in Digital Humanities from King's College London and is also one of the organisers of the Radical Open Access Collective. Miranda L. Barnes is a Postdoctoral Research Associate within Cambridge Digital Humanities and the Cambridge University Library's Office of Scholarly Communications. She joins the Materialising Open Research Practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences (MORPHSS) Project, funded by Wellcome, AHRC and the Research England Development Fund, and led by Dr Sam Moore. Miranda will contribute towards encouraging and embedding innovative open research practices within the humanities and social science disciplines. Miranda was previously Research Associate in Archiving & Preserving Open Access Books at Loughborough University, as part of the Open Book Futures and COPIM (Community-led Open Publication Infrastructures for Monographs) projects, including facilitating the creation of the Thoth Open Archiving Network and the National Libraries Network around Legal Deposit and preservation. Miranda is an interdisciplinary researcher interested in open scholarship, meta-research, collaboration, the epistemological possibilities of creative practice, and interdisciplinarity. Dr. Jenni Adams is currently a Research Associate on the MORPHSS (Materialising Open Research Practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences) project. A collaboration between the Universities of Cambridge, Coventry, Sheffield and Southampton, the project seeks to surface and document open practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences and to create guidelines and frameworks to encourage adoption of open practices in these disciplines. As well as contributing to the project as a whole, Dr. Adams' role has a particular focus on investigating open practices in the Social Sciences, especially around the sharing of data generated through qualitative and mixed methods research.

Publishing without the market? Infrastructural logics in publishing chemistry

Marianne Noël
LISIS (CNRS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel), Marne-la-Vallée, France

Abstract

The proposed paper focuses on publishing infrastructures, a term that encompasses all the technological components and rules governing the production and dissemination of journals, which enable the formal system of scientific communication. Based on a doctoral thesis in sociology defended in 2023, it focuses the analysis on one discipline (chemistry), understood as a social and above all organizational unit, rather than an intellectual or epistemological one. The thesis, which brings together historical and more contemporary approaches, is based on five distinct but complementary empirical studies. The perspective adopted is that of the social construction of markets: through the study of editorial work, its value, valuation and access devices in different spaces and times, it examines a few key points in complex markets with the aim of studying a complexity that would be difficult to grasp otherwise.

The presentation draws on two of these empirical studies. Adopting a historical perspective enriched by a sociology of valuation and pricing, I first describe the work of “price setters” and show that they operate within an organizational continuum specific to the American Chemical Society (ACS) and entirely internalized. I present the long-term trajectory of the article's entry (as a form of publication) into the market and show that at the turn of the 2000s, the respective statuses of the journal and the article changed considerably, with the establishment of contractual relationships between the ACS and institutions that were extended to the author. In the second study, I look at the dynamics of the recent restructuring of the chemistry journal market, focusing on new "challenger" journals (a term suggested by Fligstein & McAdam's theory of strategic action fields of action) promoted by the Springer Nature group. In very concrete terms, I illustrate the consequences of the rise of the article format, in particular the Fordist and Taylorist conception of the publisher's role as a consequence of the industrialization of scientific publishing in chemistry. This work highlights the rise of the article format, a process referred to in this work as articlization, a term originally proposed by Simon Paye and Yann Renisio in their work on the Research Excellence Framework in the UK. It shows the incremental trajectory of articlization, with a growing tension between journal forms and article forms in the contemporary period. The reasons are many and varied: the massification of knowledge, the multiplication of the number of journals (in chemistry, 2277 journals are active since 2001), increasing publication rates, difficulties in finding reviewers, etc. I also argue that the construction of a global market for scientific publication in

highly differentiated national contexts (scientifically, economically and politically) and in the absence of national regulation due to the flexibilization of distribution networks, notably via the web, has created the structural conditions for a counterfeit market, whose multiple expressions have recently become apparent.

Narrative CV

Marianne Noël is a sociologist/historian trained in STS, with an original background (PhD) and industrial experience in chemistry. She is currently CNRS Research Engineer at Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire Sciences Innovations Sociétés (LISIS, UMR CNRS 9003), Université Gustave Eiffel. In her PhD work in sociology, she developed a socio-historical approach centered on periodicals and circulation of concepts in chemistry journals to understand the economic foundations of Open Access policies, including the mechanisms of APC. She is member of NanoBubbles ERC Synergy project.

Positionality in time and over time: Moving from static reflexivity to dynamic reflexivity

Chris Hartgerink[1], Sarahanne Field[2]
[1]Liberate Science GmbH, Berlin, Germany. [2]University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

Abstract

Humans are dynamic, evolving beings, whose changing perceptions influence how we classify the world over time. In this talk, we discuss static positionality statements in relation to article publishing, introduce the practice of process-based publishing, and the potential of dynamic positionality statements as allowed by such alternative publishing formats. With this talk, we seek to link positionality practices with publishing practices.

Reflexivity is increasingly recognized as critical, with positionality statements becoming accepted as part of the publication. A white researcher from continental Europe writing about the Quechua people in South America is positioned in a very specific way. If the researcher thinks about this positioning, it can help them weigh their perceptions more carefully and identify critical limitations. An increasing use of positionality statements helps to raise awareness of such reflexivity, and ultimately, collectively train the reflective work in our field.

Yet, over the course of time an individual's perception can change drastically. As researchers, our findings are relative to our position in time. One's stance, identity, and relationship to the research can be in a constant state of flux. This becomes especially salient for longer projects. With research projects spanning years and sometimes decades, we posit that articles include only static positionality statements that fail to capture that change. A white researcher from continental Europe may learn about colonial history over the course of their research project, which evolves how they perceive and assess the subject of their research. A dynamic approach to sharing this position can provide deeper context to help understand the origins of research findings.

However, we also recognize that static positionality statements is what article-based publishing has on offer. Static publishing is accompanied by static reflexivity. With alternative publishing formats being introduced that are more dynamic in nature, there is an opening for dynamic reflexivity.

One alternative publishing format is process-based publishing, in which each research step is published as its own output. Our own experiences with the publishing service ResearchEquals, have introduced the idea that with each step, the positionality statement can be updated in relation to the practice of doing research. A white, continental European researcher may formulate a theory while never having visited the Quechua people, but in their field work learn first-hand about the history of how the

Quechua people have been used for research purposes. By the time they publish their raw observations, the researcher's position can be deeply moved (or not). This is as much part of the research finding as the methods applied, and we argue, informs the methods considered as viable.

Narrative CV

Starting in psychology, Chris pivoted to applied methodology during the epistemological concerns surrounding reproducibility in the early 2010s. During their PhD, they contributed to projects such as the Reproducibility Project Psychology and explored how improved practices by researchers could contribute to more sustainable science. Identifying the publication system as the bottleneck through which all improvements have to go, they decided to design and realize an alternative publishing format around the research process. Conceptualized in 2017 and brought to life after five years of work as ResearchEquals, Chris pushes for process based publishing that is author-controlled every step of the way. In 2019, they founded Liberate Science GmbH to nurture this work outside of the confines of academia. ********** Sarahanne's research and teaching is grounded in qualitative reflexivity as a way to become a better researcher. After being introduced to reflexivity as an undergraduate and studying the concept as a means of improving research quality during her research master, Sarahanne now teaches and mentors students in its practice as a tenured assistant professor. As a champion of reflexivity and positionality, Sarahanne unearths its changing form and function in her research as we progress in our efforts to improve science as a system. As the editor-in-chief of the award winning Journal of Trial and Error, she engages with a wide array of researchers on the topic in the context of learning, spreading the practice beyond the confines of her own research field.

From Access to equity: Sequential bibliometric analyses of open access, funding, and policy across Israel, Austria, and Mexico

Shlomit Hadad[1], Daphne Raban[2], Noa Aharony[3]
[1]Ashkelon Academic College, Ashkelon, Israel. [2]University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel. [3]Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel

Abstract

While open access (OA) is often promoted as a democratizing force in scholarly communication, its benefits remain unevenly distributed across countries, disciplines, and institutional contexts. This paper presents findings from two sequential bibliometric studies that explore how national policy, funding structures, and collaboration networks shape citation impact—an increasingly important currency of academic value. Together, the studies examine whether open research practices fulfill their promise of equitable visibility or reproduce existing disparities.

The first study analyzed over 260,000 publications authored by Israeli researchers from 2013 to 2023. It examined how authorship patterns, OA publishing routes, subject areas, and funding status intersect to influence citation metrics. Green OA—typically available through repositories and without article processing charges—consistently yielded the highest citation advantage, particularly when combined with external funding and collaborative authorship. Regression analysis confirmed that collaboration, funding, and access type each independently predicted scholarly impact, with significant interaction effects.

The second study extended this analysis to a cross-country comparison of Austria, Israel, and Mexico—three countries with comparable research output but varying levels of OA infrastructure and policy support. These differences offered a productive lens for exploring how structural conditions affect academic visibility. Austria ranked highest on an "OA Engagement Score," reflecting its extensive policy mandates and transformative agreements. Mexico demonstrated strengths in Diamond OA and repository infrastructure, while Israel showed lower institutional support but achieved relatively strong citation performance in several fields.

Across both studies, patterns emerged that echo broader concerns in global science: citation advantages accrue disproportionately to better-funded disciplines (like health and life sciences), while fields like the social sciences remain marginalized in both output and visibility. This imbalance underscores that bibliometric indicators function as a symbolic currency—one that circulates unevenly and risks widening global gaps in academic recognition.

Because research is a public good—produced with societal resources and intended for collective benefit—market-driven mechanisms alone cannot ensure fair access or representation. These findings point to the critical role of public intervention through national policy, infrastructure investment, and indexing reform. Without such efforts,

open access may reinforce the advantages of already well-resourced institutions and countries rather than narrowing disparities.

Drawing on an analysis of OA practices across disciplinary and geopolitical dimensions, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of equity in open science. It offers evidence-based insights for designing responsible and inclusive frameworks that can better align the ideals of open research with its actual outcomes in the global knowledge ecosystem.

Narrative CV

Shlomit Hadad is a Senior Lecturer in the Departments of Social Sciences and Health Sciences at Ashkelon Academic College, Israel. Her research focuses on open science, digital literacy, e-communication, technological innovation, and digital learning technologies. She employs both qualitative and quantitative methods, including bibliometric, altmetric, and big data analyses. Dr. Hadad has published in international journals and is actively engaged in interdisciplinary research at the intersection of information science, innovation in learning, equity, and social resilience.; Daphne Raban is a full professor in the School of Business Administration, Academic Head of the Library, University of Haifa, and Chair of CODATA Israel National Committee. She founded the Department of Information & Knowledge Management and was a member of LINKS, the Israeli Center of Research Excellence on Learning in a Networked Society. Her areas of expertise include the information society and the information economy; specifically, she studies the perceived value of information, information markets and business models, knowledge sharing, information diffusion, bibliometrics, social media and serious games. Her work has been published in refereed journals including JASIST, Scientometrics, JCMC, EJIS, ICS, CHB, JIS, PLoS One, Internet Research, Simulation & Gaming and more. She co-edited the book: The Elgar Companion to Information Economics (2024).; Noa Aharony is a full professor at the Department of Information Science of Bar-Ilan University in Israel. Prof. Aharony is the editor of Meidaat (LIS journal in Hebrew). She has published more than 110 referred articles in top LIS journals. Her research interests are in social media, information literacy, AI literacy, bibliometrics, and technological innovations and the LIS community.

Evaluating the frontiers of Registered Reports infrastructure: Lessons from the Cancer Research UK Funding Partnership

Pen-Yuan Hsing, Anushka Kafle, Marcus Munafò, Jackie Thompson
University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

Abstract

Registered Reports (RRs) are an academic article format where submissions are peer reviewed based on methodological rigour *before* data collection, with successful submissions granted "in-principle acceptance". This means a journal will publish the final article if the authors have conducted their work as described in the RR (and explained any deviations from the plan), regardless of results. In recent years, funders and journals have formed RR funding partnerships (RRFPs), where review processes for funding applications and manuscripts are combined to varying degrees. RRFPs assure funders that funded projects are carried out as planned, are highly likely to be published, and can be done without the additional time and effort of submitting to multiple journals before acceptance. RRFPs could improve the robustness of scientific research by improving methods before data collection, prevent the cherry-picking of results, and reduce the bias towards only publishing "interesting" results. Since 2020, Cancer Research UK (CRUK) has piloted an RRFP involving a consortium of journals—a significant departure from previous one-funder-one-journal models. This consortium model allows funded researchers to choose from multiple participating journals and does not mandate RR submission. Here we report on the first evaluation of this consortium-based RRFP. We conducted qualitative interviews with CRUK RRFP stakeholders including RR experts and advocates, staff at CRUK and other funders, editors at consortium journals, and researchers participating in the RRFP. These interviews identified markers of research quality from diverse perspectives, explored barriers to RR and RRFP adoption, and informed the development of evaluation tools. Our interviews revealed several implementation challenges. For example, researchers often cannot wait for in-principle acceptance before commencing their work, making RRs impractical for many time-bound funded projects. Additionally, despite the intent to streamline review processes, substantial duplication of effort persists between funder and journal reviews. Interviewees identified opportunities for closer coordination and more efficient and devolved review workflows. We will present these findings with recommendations for improving RRFP design and implementation. We also developed two evaluation instruments refined through multiple rounds of expert feedback. First, a rubric allows funders to assess research quality of research presented in publications from funded projects (both RRs and traditional articles), covering methodological rigour, transparency practices, and subjective dimensions such as novelty and importance of findings. Second, a questionnaire captures the qualitative, intangible experience of researchers who have published a complete RR:

changes to workflows, pain points in the RR process, and shifts in attitudes toward open science practices more broadly. These tools provide a template for ongoing evaluation efforts by funders and institutions implementing similar schemes.

Beyond the evaluation findings, we discuss the scope and limitations of RRs and RRFPs. Not all research can be easily conducted with fully pre-specified methods, and the suitability of RRs varies across research epistemologies and disciplinary contexts. By examining both the promise and limitations of RRs and RRFPs, we aim to inform more nuanced implementation of open research practices that considers methodological rigour with practical feasibility and epistemic diversity.

Narrative CV

The authorship team comprises metaresearchers at the University of Bristol with diverse expertise in the policy and practice of open research, research culture, and responsible research practices: (1) Dr Pen-Yuan Hsing - Pen conducts metaresearch ("research on research") on systemic issues facing the academic research community. In 2024, Pen led the UK Reproducibility Network's (UKRN) STAR project to understand the lived experiences of Research Management Professionals across UK universities as they implement open data policy and practice. He also contributed to the METEOR project, which examined how university decision-making affects research culture in the UK. This builds on Pen's experience assessing barriers to open research for academics for the Octopus open research publishing platform in 2023, and his contributions to major open science initiatives such as the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science and the NASA Transform to Open Science mission. Pen is also a board member of the Open Science Hardware Foundation, advocating for the inclusion of open source hardware in open science discourse. (2) Ms Anushka Kafle - Anushka was a work placement student at the University of Bristol who conducted a comprehensive review of the current Registered Reports landscape, including a literature review of published metaresearch on this subject. Anushka also helped develop the methodology for this evaluation and participated in the interviews we conducted. (3) Professor Marcus Munafò - Marcus is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Provost at the University of Bath, and previously served as Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research Culture at the University of Bristol. Marcus has a long-standing interest in the factors that influence research quality, and the implementation of approaches at multiple levels of the research system that can improve this. This led to Marcus co-founding the UK Reproducibility Network (UKRN; www.ukrn.org) in 2019 and acting as its Executive Director, and leading a major project funded by Research England to accelerate the uptake of open research practices across the UK higher education sector. (4) Dr Jackie Thompson - Jackie is a Senior Research Associate at the University of Bristol, focusing on metaresearch projects. Her main research interests are evaluating interventions to improve funding and publishing systems, and better understanding what responsible research means across disciplines. This work emerged from the larger context of a growing 'reproducibility crisis' (or 'credibility opportunity') in psychology, where many researchers realized how misaligned incentives and unexamined research practices had led to research in the discipline being much less reliable than desired. Jackie is also a UKRN Open Research Coordinator and Administrator (ORCA) at the University of Oxford, working with the Open Scholarship team (Bodleian Library) and Research Practice team (Research Services).

Matching Peer-reviewed Outputs to Preprints at Scale: What the Links Reveal About Global and Disciplinary Adoption (1991–2023)

Narmin Rzayeva[1,2], Stephen Pinfield[3,4], Ludo Waltman[2,4]

[1]TU Delft, Library, Delft, Netherlands. [2]Leiden University, CWTS, Leiden, Netherlands. [3]University of Sheffield, Information School, Sheffield, United Kingdom. [4]Research on Research Institute, London, United Kingdom

Abstract

Preprinting has become an increasingly important component of the scholarly communication system, facilitating rapid open dissemination of scientific knowledge. This study investigates a methodological task that underpins credible indicators of open research: linking peer-reviewed publications to their corresponding preprints at scale to measure adoption of preprinting across diverse scientific communities. Although preprinting has expanded rapidly, reliable comparisons across fields and regions are hindered by limitations of bibliometric databases and heterogeneous preprint platform practices. We address this by constructing a harmonized workflow for linking peer-reviewed outputs and preprints to map preprint adoption patterns and differences across different disciplines and regions.

Previous research demonstrates that preprint servers often lack robust mechanisms for linking to the corresponding peer-reviewed outputs (Berg et al., 2016; Cabanac, Oikonomidi & Boutron, 2021; Avissar-Whiting, 2022; Eckmann & Bandrowski, 2023). Although some publishers provide links to Crossref, significant gaps in the metadata persist (Tkaczyk, 2023a). Other research groups (Eckmann & Bandrowski, 2023; Bloch, Rückert, & Friedrich, 2023; Cabanac, Oikonomidi, & Boutron, 2021; Akbaritabar, Stephen, & Squazzoni, 2022) relied on fuzzy matching of titles/authors/years/DOIs and embedding-based similarity on titles and abstracts. These approaches are constrained by sensitivity to metadata changes and inconsistencies. We therefore introduce a new linkage pipeline by integrating multiple bibliographic sources (Dimensions, OpenAlex, Crossref) and implement a step-by-step workflow that: (1) searches for and combines links across diverse datasets; (2) deduplicates multiple versions of the same output; and (3) conducts a manual audit to estimate link precision across datasets. We captured ~105M peer-reviewed outputs from 1991–2023 and ~4M preprints. Our algorithmic approach yielded ~2.2M links between these peer-reviewed outputs and these preprints. We also identified sources of underestimation of links, including limitations originating from both bibliometric datasets and preprint platforms (e.g., challenges in classifying peer-reviewed outputs and limited use of persistent identifiers (PIDs)).

With the links established, we chart global and disciplinary preprint adoption. Adoption is consistently high in mathematics and physics and shows strong recent acceleration in information and computing and life and medical sciences. By contrast,

many fields in the humanities and social sciences remain at a low preprint adoption, reflecting both genuine differences in preprint practices and limitations of bibliometric data. Regionally, Western/Northern Europe and North America lead in preprint uptake, while several parts of Eastern Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Eastern Europe exhibit lower uptake. Combining field-based adoption with regional patterns highlights areas for improvement where development of policies or infrastructure provision could yield significant gains.

Overall, our study shows that preprint adoption depends on the interplay of scientific discipline and geographical region, and it helps reveal where additional policy, infrastructure, and community-promotion efforts are needed. At the same time, it underscores how bibliometric data limitations and inconsistencies in metadata practices can obscure the true picture. For the specific problem of linking peer-reviewed outputs and preprints, targeted improvements, including standardized use of PIDs and finer-grained document-type taxonomies, would produce a clearer and more realistic view of preprint adoption across scientific communities.

Narrative CV

Narmin Rzayeva is an external PhD candidate at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS), Leiden University. She works as a trainer in Research Data Management and Digital Skills at Delft University of Technology, where she designs and delivers courses that help researchers manage their data in line with the FAIR principles and Open Science practices, and work efficiently and reproducibly. With a background in computer science, Narmin is exploring preprints as a means to accelerate the sharing of scientific knowledge. She began her research journey during the COVID-19 pandemic, contributing to the COVID-19 Rapid Review Initiative. Building on this work, her research focused on the evolving role of preprints in the scholarly publishing system—from authors' perspectives to patterns of their adoption across disciplines and regions worldwide. Currently Narmin continues to investigate how the efficiency of scientific knowledge exchange can be improved, with preprinting as one of the key dimensions in this broader transformation. She examines the potential, benefits, and challenges of integrating preprints into journal publication workflows with varying peer review models. Ludo Waltman is scientific director and professor of Quantitative Science Studies at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS) at Leiden University. He is co-chair of the Research on Research Institute (RoRI). Ludo's work focuses on studying and developing infrastructures, algorithms, and tools to support research assessment, science policy, and scholarly communication. Ludo is open science ambassador of Leiden University, president of ASAPbio, and one of the initiators of the Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information. Together with his colleague Nees Jan van Eck, Ludo has developed the well-known VOSviewer software for bibliometric visualization. Ludo serves as Editor-in-Chief of the MetaROR (MetaResearch Open Review) platform. Previously he was Editor-in-Chief of the journal Quantitative Science Studies. Stephen Pinfield joined the School in 2012, having previously worked as a senior information practitioner in the UK Higher Education sector. Latterly, he was Chief Information Officer at the University of Nottingham with responsibility for a large converged IT and library service supporting Nottingham's campuses in the UK, China and Malaysia. Stephen has experience of leading a wide range of research-and-development projects and participating in national policy initiatives, and brings this

experience to bear on my research and teaching. His main research and teaching interests focus on scholarly communication, research data management, open access and open science, digital scholarship, research policy, and managing information and technology services in organisations. Stephen is now Senior Research Fellow at the Research on Research Institute (RoRI), an international collaboration carrying out translational research on the research system.

PLENARY TALK: ON OPENNESS, TRANSPARENCY, SECRECY, AND REVELATION

Plenary Speaker: Brian Rappert (University of Exeter)
Commentator: Helen Longino (Stanford University)
Chair: Sabina Leonelli (Technical University of Munich)

PLENARY PANEL III: THE FUTURE OF OPEN RESEARCH

Chair: *Benedikt Fecher* (Wissenschaft im Dialog)
Plenary Speakers: *Oskar Xavier Guerrero Gutiérrez* (GYA: Global Young Academy), *Stephanie Jurburg* (GYA: Global Young Academy), *Ema Avdic* (Cochrane Early Career Professional Network, University of Sarajevo), *Daniel S. Katz* (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign & Research Software Alliance (ReSA))

SESSION V: OPENNESS AND METRICS IN THE ACADEMIC SYSTEM

Towards a New Ethos of Science or a Reform of the Institution of Science? The Prospects of Institutionalizing the Research Values of Openness and Mutual Responsiveness

Rene Von Schomberg
RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

Abstract

I will explore how the underlying research values of 'openness' and 'mutual responsiveness', which are central to open science practices, can be integrated into a new ethos of science. Firstly, I will revisit Robert Merton's early contribution to this issue, examining whether the ethos of science should be understood as a set of norms for scientists to practice 'good' science or as a set of research values as a functional requirement of the scientific system to produce knowledge, irrespective of individual adherence to these norms. Secondly, I will analyse the recent codification of scientific practice in terms of 'scientific integrity', a framework that Merton did not pursue. Based on this analysis, and illustrated on the case of COVID-19 as a case in which the institution of science was challenged to deliver urgently on societal desirable outcomes, I will argue that promoting open science and its core norms of collaboration and openness requires broader governance of the institution of science in its relationship with society at large, rather than relying solely on self-governance within the scientific community through a new ethos of science. This conclusion has implications for re-evaluating research assessments, suggesting that the evaluation of the scientific system should take precedence over evaluating individual researchers, and that incentives should be provided to encourage specific research behaviour rather than solely focusing on individual research outputs.

Narrative CV

Dr. Dr.phil. René von Schomberg has Ph.D.'s both in Philosophy and STS, while being an agricultural scientist by training. He is currently a Senior Research Fellow at RWTH Aachen University. He was an European Commission official from 1998-2021. He chaired the Mutual Learning Exercise (2024-2025) on 'Bridging the Gap between Science and Policy (with cooperation of 16 EU Member States) on evaluating science for policy ecosystems. He has been a European Union Fellow and Guest-Professor at George Mason University, USA in 2007-2008 as well as Guest-Professor at the Technical University of Darmstadt (2018-2024). He is author/co-editor of 15 books, among other, the first editor of the International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource (2019). He has worked extensively on the issues open science and responsible innovation, deliberative democracy, technology assessment, science policy, ethical and socio-economic aspects of emerging technologies and the precautionary principle. He is running a blog/webpage with OA resources: http://renevonschomberg.wordpress.com.

Open Research and Academic Capitalism: Areas of Opposition and Alignment.

Thomas Hostler
Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom

Abstract

It is a time of great financial strain for the higher education sector in the UK, where competing for funding and research prestige is seen as paramount to the survival of universities. As a result, many universities increasingly adopt organizing principles based on neoliberal ideology: using organizational and management strategies from the private sector to run themselves like competitive businesses. This is known as 'academic capitalism' and is an established topic of research in the higher education literature. At the same time, there is increasing interest in open research and universities are investing in staff and infrastructure to support open research practices and adopting policies to encourage its uptake among researchers. The present research utilises the perspective of academic capitalism to consider how open research reforms may interact with the priorities and practices of the capitalist university. Three manifestations of academic capitalism are considered: the development of a highly competitive job market for researchers based on metricized performance, the increase in administration resulting from university systems of compliance, and the reorganization of academic labour along principles of "post-academic science". The ways in which open research reforms both oppose and align with these manifestations is then considered, to explore the relationships between specific reforms and academic capitalist praxis. Overall, it is concluded that open research advocates must engage more closely with the potential of reforms to negatively affect academic labour conditions, which may bring them into conflict with either university management, or those who uphold the traditional principles of an 'all round' academic role.

Narrative CV

I am a senior lecturer in the School of Psychology at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK. My interest in open research stems from two sources. First, as a researcher in psychology, I observed the "replication crisis" during the 2010s and subsequent debate around problematic research practices in the discipline, which led me to becoming an advocate of open research as a solution to these problems. I believe that open research practices such as data sharing and transparency of methods and code can help to combat fraud and reveal errors in research, contributing to greater epistemic reliability of the field. I am the local network lead at my institution for the UK Reproducibility Network (UKRN), and in this role promote open research practices across my school and institution at a grassroots level. However, despite being an advocate of researchers adopting open research practices in their work, I am also concerned at the way in which they may be promoted or incentivized at an

institutional level through policies and governance. As part of my professional development, in 2023 I completed a Master's degree in Higher Education, during which I researched the phenomenon of academic capitalism and the influence of neoliberal ideology on higher education in the UK. I united my interests in open research and academic capitalism to research how the changing nature of research governance and organization in UK universities may both align with and contradict the principles and practices of open research. This work was published in Collabra: Psychology in 2024 under the title "Open Research Reforms and the Capitalist University: Areas of Opposition and Alignment" and forms the basis of my proposed contribution to this conference. I have also developed a more specific interest into how open research policies and research governance may impact on researchers work, in particular their workload, which I wrote about in my paper "The Invisible Workload of Open Research", published in the Journal of Trial and Error. I have subsequently given talks on this research at various conferences including the UKSG Conference 2024, University of Sheffield OpenFest 2024, and the Metascience 2025 preconference event "Critical Metascience: Does Metascience Need to Change?"

Beyond Metrics: Qualitative Approaches to Open Research Monitoring in Social Sciences and Humanities

Maike Neufend[1], Maaike Duine[1], Maxi Kindling[2]

[1]Open Research Office Berlin, Berlin, Germany. [2]Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

To contextualize open research indicators, we aimed to develop discipline-specific metrics within our project "Open Science Magnifiers," focusing on the Social Sciences and Humanities. However, after initially concentrating on outputs such as journal articles, book chapters, conference papers, blog posts, and open data, we encountered challenges due to a lack of available data sources, making the process more complex than anticipated. Although data sources are limited, we still observed a variety of open research practices that differ among researchers and research communities.

Inclusive and flexible indicators for open research monitoring purposes are essential to increase visibility of such practices, and by that enabling the sharing of best practices across communities. Without well-developed indicators, many outputs and open research practices may be overlooked and go unrecognized. Rafols et al. (2024) note that open research processes, such as collaborative practices (including societal engagement), are not yet included in open research monitoring frameworks. In light of current efforts to reform research evaluation, there is an increasing risk of perpetuating the belief that all open research tools and practices are universally applicable across various research methodologies.The development of qualitative approaches to monitoring becomes more important to avoid introducing new inequalities into the academic system.

In this paper/presentation we would like to shift the focus from monitoring open research outputs to monitoring open research processes and contribute to the development of open research as a broad concept related to values. Few studies introduce the concepts of open research case studies and narratives for monitoring open research uptake (Bezuidenhout et al. 2024; Pownall 2025). In our project "Open Science Magnifiers," we explore existing studies to develop an approach for conducting interviews and participant observations with researchers in the Berlin research landscape.

Our goal is to adapt qualitative methods for monitoring open research by carefully documenting conversations with researchers and reflecting on their narratives and blind spots. Conversations will focus on the very concept of openness, practices of openness and its contextualization in the researcher's professional biography. By presenting and discussing the framework and methodology of our approach, along with initial results based on our empirical data, we aim to support diverse and critical

perspectives on monitoring open research practices —spanning from the researcher's initial idea to published results. The "Future of Open Research" Conference would offer an important opportunity for us to discuss this approach within the professional community, helping us to further develop our methodology.

References

Bezuidenhout, L., Castaño, P., Leonelli, S., Rafols, I., & Vargiu, A. (2024). Introducing Case Studies in Monitoring Open Science. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14174180

Rafols, I., Meijer, I. & Molas-Gallart J. (2024). Monitoring Open Science as transformative change: Towards a systemic framework [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]. F1000Research 13:320. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.148290.1

Pownall, M. Bridging qualitative methods and open research. Nat Rev Psychol (2025). https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-025-00477-3

Narrative CV

Maike Neufend is a sociologist specializing in knowledge and culture. With degrees in sociology, Islamic studies, and philosophy from Hamburg and Damascus, she earned her PhD in sociology in 2021. Her research examines the social dimensions of knowledge, focusing on intellectual, aesthetic, and scientific practices. Since 2020, Maike has worked at the Open Research Office, Berlin's state coordination office, and has led the office since 2025. She has conducted extensive research on open research policy making and is herself coordinating Berlin's open research strategy. She is particularly interested in various practices of scholarly communication, including radical and decolonial approaches to open research. She is a co-lead of the BUA Open Science Magnifiers project. Maaike Duine studied linguistics at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. She worked in academic publishing in the Netherlands, and in 2014 and 2015 she co-organized, together with INASP among others, workshops on scholarly publishing in Tanzania. At ORCID, she supported the promotion of persistent identifiers for all types of research outputs. Since 2022, she has been working at the Open Research Office on the BUA Open Science Dashboards project and the subsequent BUA Open Science Magnifiers project. This project aims to develop discipline- and community-specific indicators for inclusive open research monitoring purposes. She is also a working group member of the global Open Science Monitoring Initiative. Maxi Kindling is an information scientist and open research enthusiast for many years. She worked as a researcher and lecturer at Berlin School of Library and Information Science at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and led Berlin's Open Research Office until 2024. Since 2025 she is leading the department of publication services at TU Berlin's university library. In her work she has managed many open research projects, especially in the areas of open access and research data infrastructures and services. In her PhD research she studied data quality assurance at research data repositories and data journals. She is a co-lead of the BUA Open Science Magnifiers project.

Responsible open science: research ethics and integrity in practice

Maria Strecht Almeida, Ana Sofia Carvalho
ICBAS, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal

Abstract

This communication aims to explore aspects of ethics and integrity in the context of open research/science. To this end, we undertook a semantic mapping of scientific publications – indexed in Web of Science and with publication date up to the end 2024 – following standard bibliometric procedures, specifically through co-word analysis. This mapping focuses on the thematic areas within the literature, illustrating the ethical and integrity-related concepts used by the scientific community in the context of open science. Our study addresses the following questions: What are the topics, their interconnections and their evolution over time? How can we portray responsible open science? Which different areas of expertise are invoked? Narrowing our focus, we are interested in the specific case of research in drug repurposing/repositioning and, thus, we may also ask how responsible open science matters in this context. Finally, we discuss how this semantic mapping sheds light on the dynamics of responsible open science in its multiple dimensions.

Narrative CV

Maria Strecht Almeida holds a PhD in Sociology (Sociology of Culture, Knowledge and Communication) by the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra and a degree in Biochemistry by the University of Porto (U.Porto). Currently, is Assistant Professor at the Molecular Biology Department of the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (ICBAS) of U.Porto. At ICBAS, teaches both basic and laboratory biophysics and science and society. Her current research interests focus on the dynamics of the life and health sciences as well as on research ethics and/or research integrity. MSA has been actively involved in organizing science outreach events, most of which emphasizing discipline crossovers. Was the coordinator of the Communication and Image Office of ICBAS, in 2023-2025, and co-coordinator of the thematic section Knowledge, Science and Technology of the Portuguese Sociological Association, in 2018-2022. Ana Sofia Carvalho is Full Professor at the School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (ICBAS) of the University of Porto and the Ethics Consultant at CUF Hospitals. She is also the PI of ELSI WP of the Horizon Europe Project REPO4EU. She was Associate Professor with Aggregation in Bioethics until May 2021 and the Chairholder of the Portuguese UNESCO Chair in Bioethics of Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP). She also was until 2019 director of the Instituto de Bioética. She was the coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Bioethics (till 2021) and of the Office of Ethical Evaluation and Science Integrity in the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology from (2012-2018). She has been honored with the award “Mulheres na Ciência 2023”.

Beyond the League Tables: Contesting Global Rankings in the Move Toward Open Research

Quoc Tan Tran[1], Angeliki Tzouganatou[2]
[1]University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany. [2]OpenAIRE, Attiki, Greece

Abstract

Starting in 2026, Sorbonne University will cease providing institutional data to Times Higher Education (THE), leading to its exclusion from the World University Rankings, Subject Rankings, and Impact Rankings. Similar withdrawals by Utrecht University, the University of Zurich, and the University of Lorraine signal an emerging discourse: rankings are increasingly criticized as opaque algorithmic systems that privilege reputation, scale and financial resources over academic quality, inclusiveness, and societal impact. Many of these institutions, already engaged in initiatives such as the Leiden Ranking (2007), DORA (2012), CoARA (2022), and the Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information (2024), present withdrawal as part of a broader shift: from reliance on proprietary systems toward more open and equitable forms of evaluation. Drawing on discourse analysis of institutional statements and policy documents, this paper argues that this transition is not sudden but the culmination of a longer trajectory of critical engagement with research assessment.

Following Latour's (1987) notion of the black box, university rankings can be understood as devices that conceal the sociotechnical work underlying their production. Built on paywalled databases such as Scopus and Web of Science, they favor English-language journals and elite institutions. Participation obliges universities to pay high fees, supply standardized datasets, and accept opaque outputs that influence hiring, funding, and reputation. Far from neutral, rankings reproduce inequities and reinforce the dominance of well-resourced environments. Once stabilized, rankings circulate as authoritative outputs (league tables, scores, prestige signals) while their methodologies remain invisible. What becomes visible are the inputs (institutional data, survey responses, bibliometric indicators) and the outputs (ordinal positions), not the contested decisions of what to count, how to weigh indicators, or which sources to include. In this sense, rankings exemplify a form of algorithmic black-boxing in higher education: their legitimacy rests precisely on the opacity of their methods, which shields them from scrutiny while presenting the final numbers as objective and neutral.

The analysis identifies three mechanisms of institutional disentanglement. First, data withholding, whereby universities stop submitting information to rankers, breaking the cycle of dependency. Second, database decoupling – as seen in Sorbonne's decision to unsubscribe from Web of Science and turn to open bibliometric infrastructures such as OpenAlex and OpenAIRE Graph. The latter shows how transparent, community-governed and interoperable research information systems can provide

alternatives for evaluation and collaboration that are not tied to proprietary ranking models. Similar concerns about dependency on commercial databases have also been raised by the League of European Research Universities (LERU), which has called for greater investment in open infrastructures. Third, internal refocus, which reallocates staff time and subscription costs toward open repositories, shared infrastructures, and improved internal evaluation systems. Together, these steps show how “losing the rank” can mean gaining institutional sovereignty and advancing a vision of open research information: universities reclaim the ability to define excellence in ways that align with openness, responsibility, and the public good.

Narrative CV

Quoc-Tan Tran is an information scientist whose research explores the intersections of open culture, data infrastructures, and the sociology of scientific knowledge. He holds a PhD in Cultural Anthropology from the University of Hamburg, completed within the Horizon 2020 POEM network (Participatory Memory Practices). His dissertation combined multi-sited ethnography and interviews with cultural heritage professionals in Germany, Sweden, and Scotland to analyze how museum infrastructures shape participation in heritage representation. Tran previously earned an MRes in Library and Information Science from the University of Lille, where he also worked as a project engineer managing a crowdsourcing platform to compile a parallel corpus of global translations of Mark Twain’s Huckleberry Finn. This early experience reflects his long-standing interest in collaborative, data-driven approaches to knowledge production. Since 2025, Tran has been a postdoctoral researcher at Bielefeld University in the ROARA project (Repercussions of Open Access on Research Assessment), where he investigates how open science policies and infrastructures reconfigure practices of research evaluation. His latest book, Negotiating Digital Heritage Infrastructures: Setting the Scene for Participation (Routledge, 2025), explores the socio-technical negotiations underpinning everyday museum work, showing how infrastructural practices shape the capacity of cultural institutions to support participatory and socially inclusive missions. Angeliki Tzouganatou is a digital heritage researcher specialising in research infrastructures, open science, responsible research assessment, and knowledge equity. She holds a PhD in Cultural Anthropology from the University of Hamburg, completed within the Horizon 2020-MSCA POEM network (Participatory Memory Practices). Her dissertation, Openness and Fairness in the Digital Ecosystem: on the Participation Gap in Cultural Knowledge Production, investigated how digital infrastructures shape openness, participation, and fairness in cultural knowledge production. Tzouganatou previously earned an MSc in Digital Heritage from the University of York, where she contributed to European projects on user-centred design and participatory engagement in cultural heritage. She also holds a degree in Archaeology and Art History from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Since 2024, she has been Research Project Manager and Open Infrastructure Specialist at OpenAIRE, where she coordinates EU-funded projects, helps advancing open science services, pilots new approaches to research assessment, and translates policy frameworks into actionable practices. She also serves on the OPERAS Research Infrastructure Scientific Advisory Committee, and acts as an Expert Evaluator for the European Commission. Previously, she held research and project management roles cultural heritage institutions, while teaching seminars on openness and digital culture at the University of Hamburg. Her career bridges digital heritage and open science, bringing a unique perspective on how infrastructures can foster inclusive, ethical, and sustainable knowledge practices.

Co-evaluation for open research: lessons from the #DiscussAI Think-Ins

Michael Creek, Marzia Mazzonetto
Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium

Abstract

Open research requires not only transparent methodologies and accessible outputs but also participatory evaluation approaches that ensure accountability, inclusivity, and responsiveness. This paper draws on Stickydot's evaluation of ADAPT's *#DiscussAI Think-Ins:* a series of public engagement events on artificial intelligence funded by Science Foundation Ireland. The Think-Ins provided multi-stakeholder forums for dialogue between researchers, policymakers, civil society, and citizens, including underrepresented groups, on the social and ethical implications of emerging technologies. The evaluation process itself was co-designed with organisers and participants, embedding reflexivity and shared ownership into the assessment of outcomes.

The co-evaluation combined formative and summative tools, including surveys, semi-structured interviews, observation, and participant diaries. It was adapted iteratively to accessibility needs and diverse participant profiles. This adaptive approach allowed the evaluation to balance methodological rigour with inclusivity, for example by simplifying questionnaires for participants with lower literacy levels. While this limited comparability across datasets, it ensured representation of voices often excluded from research assessment processes. Findings highlight that the Think-Ins established "safe spaces" for dialogue, enhanced participants' understanding of digital technologies, and empowered them to articulate personal perspectives on how AI affects their lives. Importantly, participants reported increased confidence to engage in discussions with researchers and policymakers, while stakeholders gained richer insights into public concerns, particularly regarding ethics, privacy, and social equity.

The study underscores both the potential and the challenges of co-evaluation for open research. On the one hand, involving stakeholders in defining evaluation outcomes enhanced relevance, legitimacy, and alignment with values of openness, equity, and inclusion. For example, participants prioritised metrics on how underrepresented groups were engaged and how respectful dialogue was maintained, shifting the focus from traditional knowledge-transfer indicators to relational and trust-building dimensions. On the other hand, scaling co-evaluation proved resource-intensive, with tensions between the ambition of inclusivity and the capacities of small evaluation teams. These trade-offs underline the need for realistic planning, investment in capacity building, and recognition of evaluation as a co-created research output in its own right.

The paper situates these findings within broader debates on responsible and socially responsive open research. Co-evaluation is argued to be not merely an accountability

mechanism but a methodological innovation that supports democratic governance of knowledge production. By treating evaluation as a shared inquiry, researchers, citizens, and policymakers can collectively interrogate the values, assumptions, and impacts of open research practices. The Think-Ins experience also offers lessons for training and infrastructure: evaluation tools must be flexible, accessible, and designed for co-use by diverse actors; facilitators require skills in empathy, dialogue management, and inclusivity; and institutional frameworks must provide incentives and resources for collaborative assessment.

In conclusion, the paper proposes that co-evaluation should be recognised as a critical dimension of open research, alongside open access, open data, and citizen science. Embedding co-evaluation in research practices enhances legitimacy, equity, and responsiveness, ensuring that open research does not only open outputs but also democratises the processes through which research is designed, conducted, and assessed.

Narrative CV

Michael Creek is head of training and facilitation at Stickydot, a Brussels-based SME specialised in participatory dialogue, co-creation, and evaluation in research and innovation. He co-authored the evaluation of ADAPT's #DiscussAI Think-Ins (2022–2023), leading the integration of co-evaluation techniques that embedded inclusivity and accessibility in assessment design. His expertise lies in combining quantitative and qualitative approaches with participatory tools, ensuring evaluation serves as both accountability and shared learning. Michael has extensive experience in EU-funded projects and policy-support actions on responsible research and innovation, open science, and citizen engagement. He has coordinated evaluation work packages, designed monitoring frameworks for participatory governance, and contributed to mutual learning initiatives for the European Commission. In addition, he develops and delivers training on facilitation, co-creation, and participatory evaluation, mentoring researchers and practitioners in embedding openness and inclusivity into their work. His practice demonstrates how evaluation can be a co-created output that strengthens socially responsive open research. Marzia Mazzonetto is co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Stickydot, a Brussels-based SME dedicated to dialogue, co-creation, and evaluation in research and innovation. With over 20 years of experience in science communication and public engagement, she has designed and facilitated participatory processes across Europe, focusing on responsible research and innovation, citizen science, and open research policy support. Marzia co-authored the evaluation of ADAPT's #DiscussAI Think-Ins (2022–2023), contributing to the development of co-evaluation approaches that prioritised inclusivity, accessibility, and stakeholder ownership. She has served as expert and rapporteur for the European Commission in Mutual Learning Exercises on citizen science and public engagement, producing evidence-based policy recommendations for the European Research Area. Beyond evaluation, she regularly moderates high-level policy dialogues and delivers training on co-creation, science communication, and facilitation. Her work demonstrates how participatory methodologies can enhance openness, equity, and impact in research and innovation. Stickydot was founded in 2018 to advance innovative approaches to multi-stakeholder engagement. The team has extensive experience in EU-funded projects and policy support actions, with expertise spanning methodology design, facilitation, and

evaluation. Stickydot works at the intersection of research, policy, civil society, and citizens, developing participatory tools such as focus groups, deliberative democracy formats, citizen conventions, and co-creation labs. Its portfolio includes support for EU missions, cluster initiatives, and Horizon Europe projects, where it contributes to impact assessment, capacity-building, and dissemination.

Enabling a Commons - the challenges EOSC will encounter for equitable access.

Hugh Shanahan
Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, United Kingdom

Abstract

EOSC has been an ongoing concept since it its planned implementation was announced by the EU Commission in 2015. It has a undergone a series of sometimes painful revisions of what its goals are but at present its planned operation is summarised in EOSC Federation Handbook- "*The EOSC Federation aims to provide Europe's researchers with the necessary digital resources to conduct research within and across disciplines and borders according to the principles of FAIR data and open science, in a trustworthy and secure environment driven by the scientific communities.*" The handbook also notes that "*The target end-users of the resources of the EOSC Federation are primarily researchers working at research performing organisations and research infrastructures across Europe and beyond. Potential users of the EOSC Federation also include citizen scientists and researchers in industry.*"
Hence Open Science lies at the heart of EOSC and looks to provide broad access. Hence EOSC is subject to the UNESCO recommendation on Open Science which has an emphasis on inclusiveness. Indeed as in many respects EOSC is seen as the engine for Open Science there is a even greater need to ensure the UNESCO recommendation is implemented in EOSC.
EOSC is necessarily complex. There are a variety of challenges it faces on an organisational, technical, financial and cultural basis. It is a federation with central federation bodies developing key elements of that federation including technical standards and requirements and base required services. Services (such as data and compute) will be provided by EOSC nodes. While the EOSC Nodes will need to comply with decisions, rules and policies that are agreed to be applied across the EOSC Federation each Node is fully autonomous and can apply their own rules, including those of access. For example the EOSC EU node has a clear access policy which provides tiered access to their resources.
EOSC need to be financially sustainable. Research databases integrated as a scientific resource in the EOSC federation need to have a sustainability plan of ten or more years. Nodes need to confirm continued operations compliant to the EOSC Federation's requirements for ideally 5 years or more.
Providing universial access for datasets or other resources that are meant to be entirely open may add a considerable cost and affect sustainability plans. This raises questions about how to enable access to these resources to researchers from low- and middle-income countries and citizen scientists in Europe. Even on a more

restrained situation, it is not clear how resources on a national node that a research group wishes to share with another research from another country could be enabled. In this talk we will provide more detail on this problem, comparing the EOSC Federation handbook's description of how EOSC should work with the requirements from the UNESCO recommendation on Open Science. We will also propose possible frameworks for how to address this issue noting that there is a need for guidance from central part of the federation to the nodes which reflects the reality of maintaining a node.

Narrative CV

Hugh Shanahan's area of research is Open Science, specifically initiatives to ensure interoperability and accessibility. He has a background in Computational Biology, having worked in Structural Biology and Transcriptomics combined with a deep background in Computational and Theoretical Physics. He completed his PhD in 1994 in Lattice QCD and completed postdocs in Glasgow, Cambridge and Tsukuba before moving into Bioinformatics in 1999. In 2005 he joined the department of Computer Science at Royal Holloway, University of London where he is now Professor of Open Science. Since 2015 he been a co-chair of the CODATA-RDA schools in Research Data Science that has delivered training in Data Science methods for researchers to students from approximately 40 countries. He was a member of the FAIRsFAIR consortium which was focussed on the development of an overall knowledge infrastructure on academic quality data management, procedures, standards, metrics and related matters, based on the FAIR principles. He is an active member of the Research Data Alliance. He is a a vice-chair of the World Data System Scientific Committee. In this area he has investigated equitable access to Open Science infrastructure from Low and Middle Income countries. He has also increasingly focussed on the fragility of research infrastructures from a sustainable to a disaster-prone perspective. Through FAIRsFAIR and other related projects he is also familiar with EOSC.

Evidence for Equitable Open Research with the EOSC Open Science Observatory

Tereza Szybisty
OpenAIRE AMKE, Athens, Greece

Abstract

Over the past decade, the European Research Area (ERA) has placed Open Science at the heart of its policy vision. The ERA Policy Agendas 2022–2024 and 2025–2027 both identify Open Science as a structural priority, with a clear call to support sharing and reuse of research outputs through the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC). Recent initiatives, including the Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information and the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA), further stress the need for transparent, equitable, and responsible approaches to research assessment that are grounded in open, trusted data. These policy commitments raise a central challenge: how to monitor progress effectively, assess the uptake of Open Science practices, and evaluate their impact on research systems and society.

The EOSC Open Science Observatory [https://www.eoscobservatory.eu/] responds directly to this challenge. Enhanced under the EOSC Track project [https://www.openaire.eu/eosc-track-project], it is a unique policy intelligence platform that translates policy ambitions into measurable practices. The Observatory provides data-driven evidence on how Open Science policies, whether on Open Access, FAIR data, infrastructures, or skills, are implemented in practice, and how these practices evolve across Member States and Associated Countries. By enabling comparative insights, it supports policymakers, research organisations, and funders in designing and refining Open Science strategies based on robust, evidence-based analysis.

What makes the EOSC Open Science Observatory distinctive is its integration of heterogeneous, openly available data sources. At its core, it builds on the monitoring framework of the EOSC Steering Board for National Contributions to EOSC and Open Science, ensuring policy relevance and comparability across countries. Complementing this, the Observatory harnesses the OpenAIRE Graph, one of the largest scholarly knowledge graphs worldwide, which interlinks metadata on over 300 million research outputs, 320,000 organisations, 3.6 million grants, and billions of connections from more than 150,000 data sources.

The Observatory's methodology also reflects broader international debates on equitable Open Research, grounded in co-creation principles and guided by the OSMI principles, ensuring inclusivity, transparency, and shared ownership of the monitoring process. By grounding its monitoring framework in open, reusable datasets, it contributes to a more inclusive and transparent evidence base that can be interrogated and reused by all stakeholders. It aims to avoid reinforcing asymmetries of information and power that arise when proprietary or opaque data sources

dominate research policy and evaluation. In doing so, it aligns with the principles of the Munich Manifesto for Equitable Open Research that this conference seeks to advance.

In this presentation, we will introduce the EOSC Open Science Observatory and demonstrate how it enables evidence-based policy making at European and national levels. We will highlight examples of how policies in areas such as Open Access and FAIR data are translated into practice and show how indicators can capture their wider impacts. Finally, we will discuss future directions for the Observatory as part of the EOSC, including how it can serve as a common reference point for monitoring, policy learning, and global collaboration on equitable Open Research.

Narrative CV

Dr. Tereza Szybisty is a dedicated Open Science advocate with experience in Open Science policy-making across various levels of scientific organizations. She holds a PhD in Management and has worked as an Open Science Specialist, Policy Officer, and trainer of early-career researchers. Tereza is the founder of the Stop Predatory Practices initiative, which raises awareness of unethical academic publishing. At OpenAIRE, she serves as the Research Project Manager for the EOSC Track project, building the second phase of the EOSC Open Science Observatory.

In Trust We Build: Engaging Disciplinary Communities in Service Development - Early Experiences from Base4NFDI

Sandra Zänkert
ZB MED - Information Center for Life Sciences, Cologne, Germany

Abstract

Research data management (RDM) is a key enabler of Open Science, providing the foundation for transparent, collaborative, and reusable research practices. In Germany, the National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI) coordinates efforts across disciplines to develop sustainable, interoperable data Developing sustainable, discipline-sensitive services in this area requires more than technical excellence: it calls for a framework that connects technical rigour and quality with active user engagement and domain expertise.

The Base4NFDI initiative addresses this challenge through a bottom-up approach, driven by infrastructure experts who are closely connected to disciplinary research communities. This ensures that emerging services are both technically robust and directly aligned with diverse research needs.

Service development follows a three-phase model. In the Initialisation phase, a one-year program of requirement analysis, persona-based modeling, and prototyping is carried out, complemented by early engagement with stakeholders to identify reusable patterns and integration opportunities. In the Integration phase, candidate services are embedded into real disciplinary workflows through incubator projects with NFDI consortia, which enable co-development, integration within disciplinary communities, and policy alignment. Training and user studies further support adoption, while early success stories demonstrate impact and encourage take-up. In the ramp-up phase, services prepare for long-term operation by establishing governance structures and sustainable models, and where applicable, aligning with the German EOSC node to ensure interoperability and compliance at the European level.

A concrete example is IAM4NFDI, which makes it possible for institutes to share their infrastructures beyond local boundaries. For researchers, this means that resources previously tied to a single institution become accessible to a wider community, enabling collaboration and opening new opportunities for data-intensive work. For institutes and service providers, it creates a sustainable way to make their infrastructures available to broader audiences without duplicating effort. In this way, IAM4NFDI supports both sides of the Open Science ecosystem: researchers gain easier access, and providers ensure that their services are used more widely and effectively across disciplines.

Building on this principle of shared, accessible infrastructure, Jupyter4NFDI provides a central JupyterHub that supports teaching, reproducible analysis, and collaborative

research. Like IAM4NFDI, it empowers researchers with an easy entry point to Open Science workflows while enabling institutes to contribute their backend resources in a sustainable way without managing access individually. Together, these services illustrate how Base4NFDI creates community-driven, interoperable tools that benefit both researchers and service providers.

By combining phased development with close collaboration between infrastructure experts of the discipline-specific NFDI consortia, Base4NFDI delivers services that are open, interoperable, and responsive to real research needs. This bottom-up approach builds trust by re-using and opening institutional infrastructures under transparent governance, allowing researchers to help shape solutions they can rely on. In doing so, it ensures sustainability while strengthening the foundations of Open Science both on a national level and beyond.

Narrative CV

Sandra Zänkert is a psychologist by training who conducted her PhD during the early years of the reproducibility crisis, which shaped her perspective on the importance of transparency and openness in research. Motivated by these experiences, she worked as a data steward for the natural and health sciences, supporting researchers in managing, sharing, and reusing their data as part of everyday scientific practice. She currently works as part of Base4NFDI, a German national initiative developing and coordinating cross-disciplinary services for the National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI), and is employed at ZB MED – Information Centre for Life Sciences, an institution dedicated to Open Science that provides a professional environment to advance these practices. In Base4NFDI, she serves as a liaison officer, supporting cross-disciplinary working groups of infrastructure experts and facilitating communication and collaboration across and beyond these groups. Sandra combines a multi-disciplinary perspective with an interest in change management and socio-technical processes, where effective adoption, trust, and sustainability of research services depend on considering both human and technological factors.

RIECS-Concept: Shaping Tomorrow's European Research Infrastructure for Excellent Citizen Science

Franziska Stressmann, Carolina Doran, Kai-Ti Wu
European Citizen Science Association (ECSA), Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Citizen science is expanding rapidly across disciplines and countries, but fragmentation, inconsistent data management, and limited reuse of solutions continue to restrict its impact. To address these barriers, the RIECS-Concept project (2025–2027) is laying the foundations for a Pan-European Research Infrastructure for Excellent Citizen Science (RIECS). Its goal is to increase the capacity of European citizens to participate in research and advance open, inclusive, and impactful science. By embedding citizen science into Europe's research infrastructure landscape, RIECS-Concept aims to transform isolated and short-term initiatives into coherent, sustainable ecosystems that foster local innovation and open science practices.

With 14 partners from eight European countries, the project addresses the structural, technical, and societal requirements of establishing a robust and sustainable infrastructure, with the vision to shape a Europe where citizen science is not peripheral but central to excellent research and innovation.

Its highly participatory methodology involves more than 100 thematic and regional workshops across Europe, engaging citizen science communities, policymakers, researchers, infrastructures, and civil society, aiming to co-design the research infrastructure with its community of anticipated users and stakeholders. Conducted in two phases, these dialogues first define and validate the core services and resources needed, and then refine the technical, governance, and sustainability dimensions. Together, they culminate in a conceptual design and five-year implementation plan to be delivered by 2027, with the ambition to join the ESFRI Roadmap.

RIECS-Concept builds on the fact that citizen science already contributes significantly to tackling challenges in environment, health, and climate, while driving resource-efficient and user-focused innovation. With stronger support and integration into European research infrastructures, its potential can be expanded even further, accelerating discovery, democratising knowledge production, and enhancing the societal relevance of science.

By creating interoperable data systems, designing services and functionalities that connect multiple user communities, and positioning citizen science as a core part of the European Research Area, the project advances both scientific excellence and societal impact. Central to this goal is inclusivity and trust. The RIECS-Concept engagement model emphasises transparency, co-design, and broad representation,

ensuring that communities, researchers, and policymakers co-shape the infrastructure around real societal challenges.
We will present the results of the first 50 co-creation workshops carried out in the first project phase, summarising the challenges, solutions, functionalities, and services envisioned for RIECS by diverse stakeholders, including citizen scientists and practitioners, researchers, citizen science networks and platforms, NGOs, technology providers, companies, educational institutions, policymakers, and other European research infrastructures. The session will highlight the distinct contributions of each stakeholder group and showcase the current prototype concept of RIECS. Participants will be invited to provide feedback to further refine both the vision and the prototype.

Narrative CV

Franziska Stressmann is a microbial ecologist by training, whose doctoral and postdoctoral research across Europe explored the balance between health and disease in diverse microbial systems. She always believed science should be as open as possible and in constant exchange with society, and contributed to numerous science communication initiatives such as Soapbox Science Berlin, Kitchen Science, and Pint of Science, making complex research accessible to broad audiences. Driven by her passion for democratising science, she joined the European Citizen Science Association (ECSA) in 2023 as a Project Officer, where she works to promote open, inclusive, and participatory approaches to research. She is the scientific coordinator of RIECS-Concept, contributing strategic and research expertise to ensure that the future European Research Infrastructure for Citizen Science is not only scientifically robust but also inclusive, resilient, and reflective of citizen values. Carolina Doran did her PhD in behavioural ecology and continued with a postdoc studying patterns of animal collective behaviour. When individuals work together amazing patterns emerge. This remains a key tenet in her work as a project officer at the European Citizen Science Association (ECSA). With over 10 years of experience in traditional research and with leading science communication initiatives like Soapbox Science Berlin she now advocates for wider participation in research projects with different methodologies and strategies within citizen science projects. Kai-Ti Wu is a PhD candidate in geography whose research applies computational methods and big data analysis to understand how natural infrastructures influence regional economic development and subjective well-being. By integrating spatial thinking with digital methods, she generates fresh insights into the links between environment, economy, and society. Within the RIECS-Concept project, she contributes her expertise on place-based research and data infrastructures. Beyond academia, she engages in emerging technology projects and co-creates tools for transparent, collaborative research. Kai-Ti is also committed to empowering women in science and technology, fostering more inclusive communities.

PLENARY ABSTRACTS

Research Software is the Hidden Hero of Open Science

Daniel S. Katz[1], Michelle Barker[2], Carole Goble[3], Neil Chue Hong[4,5]
[1]University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign & Research Software Alliance (ReSA), Urbana, IL, United States. [2]Research Software Alliance, Cairns, Australia. [3]University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom. [4]University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom. [5]Software Sustainability Institute, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Abstract

Open research is essential for research to have an impact on society; it must be seen as trustworthy by members of society, and efforts must be made to connect it to policy makers. It is often formally communicated via peer-reviewed papers, monographs, technical reports and preprints, and informally via blogs, videos, and the media. To be most effective, they should be backed up by other open evidence and tools.

The research community has now generally accepted that research data is an important part of this but has not yet accepted research software to the same extent. We know that research software is essential to today's research. Across fields, software enables researchers to generate & process data, run experiments, and gain knowledge. New areas like AI are implemented in software, and quantum computing is moving from hardware experiments to more general purpose systems driven by software. OECD's 2018 International Survey of Scientific Authors (https://doi.org/10.1787/18d3bf19-en) found that 33% of scientific research across disciplines results in new code, including 45% of research in mathematics, physics, astronomy, Earth and planetary sciences, and 65% in computer science. Maxfield Brown & Weber (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10530616) found that 47% of all 13,784 Australian Research Council (ARC) grants between 2010 and 2019 produced software. Surveys of UK academics and US postdocs found that about 50% develop software as part of their research.
(https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1183562, https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5328442.v3)

We also know that research software is different from research data. Software is a creative output; while data are facts, leading to different treatments in ownership and copyright. Software is executable and dynamic, requiring specific environments and dependencies to function, while data is more often static. Software needs human effort when the environment and/or dependencies are updated. Software depends on external libraries, packages and runtime environments and evolves through versioning and updates, demanding robust documentation and reproducibility standards. In addition to being reused – as data is – software also is frequently modified, with more frequent changes in authorship, leading to different licensing needs and requiring proper attribution for developers. Software's unique characteristics mean that ensuring that it can be reliably run, cited, and maintained across diverse research contexts requires unique guidance, such as the software citation

(https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.86) and FAIR for research software (FAIR4RS) principles (https://doi.org/10.15497/RDA00068).

As we move forward and continue to promote open research, research software must be an explicit element of policy, including the Munich Manifesto for Equitable Open Research and the Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information. It must be included in all parts: policy, education & training, reward & recognition, reproducibility, publishing, archiving, etc. Many groups of stakeholders need to be involved, ideally in a coordinated way: policy makers, educators, research performing institutions, professional societies, research infrastructure providers, publishers, librarians, and of course, researchers themselves.

Narrative CV

The authors are global leaders in promoting the idea that research software and those who develop and maintain it are recognised and valued as fundamental and vital to research worldwide. They have (co)created and (co)led organizations and efforts such as the Research Software Alliance (ReSA, https://www.researchsoft.org/), the Software Sustainability Institute (SSI, https://www.software.ac.uk/), the US Research Software Engineer Association (US-RSE, https://us-rse.org/), the Amsterdam Declaration on Funding Research Software Sustainability (https://adore.software/declaration/), the European Virtual Institute for Research Software Excellence (EVERSE, https://everse.software/), and the software citation and FAIR4RS principles. They are the core team working with the OECD on a 2025-26 project to understand the achievements and policy gaps concerning access to research software, which recently ran a first workshop (https://www.oecd.org/en/events/2025/09/access-to-research-software-opportunities-and-challenges.html). Daniel S. Katz is Chief Scientist at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications and Research Professor in the Siebel School of Computing and Data Science and the School of Information Sciences (iSchool) at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. NCSA hosts the US's largest academic team of research software engineers, with about 50 RSEs. Dan is also co-founder and current Associate Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Open Source Software (JOSS, https://joss.theoj.org/), co-founder of US-RSE, co-founder and steering committee chair of ReSA, and member of IEEE Computer Society's Board of Governors. Dr Michelle Barker is Director of ReSA, which aims to advance the research software ecosystem by collaborating with decision makers and key influencers. As a sociologist, Michelle is passionate about building collaborative partnerships to achieve system change. As a consultant in the field of open science her roles have included chairing the OECD expert group on digital skills for the research sector (https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/science-and-technology/building-digital-workforce-capacity-and-skills-for-data-intensive-science_e08aa3bb-en) and co-editing the European Open Science Cloud report, Digital Skills for FAIR and Open Science (https://www.eoscsecretariat.eu/news-opinion/digital-skills-fair-open-science-report-eosc-skills-training-working-group). Carole Goble founded and co-leads the eScience Lab (https://esciencelab.org.uk/) at the University of Manchester. She is a leader in open Digital Research Infrastructures, translating technical innovations in distributed computing, semantic and metadata technologies, data and software sharing and computational workflows into FAIR and Open information solutions for Life Sciences, Health and Biodiversity. She is Joint Head of Node of ELIXIR-UK (https://elixiruknode.org/), the national node of European Research Infrastructure for Life Science Data; joint director of the Federated Analytics for Health Data Research UK; and a founder of the SSI and EVERSE. She is co-author of the FAIR data principles and FAIR principles

applied to computational workflows and serves on the G7 Open Science Working Group as the UK expert. Neil Chue Hong is Professor of Research Software Policy and Practice at EPCC, University of Edinburgh and Director of the Software Sustainability Institute, an organisation founded in 2010 to improve software in research. His work focuses on how software developed from and for research can be improved through the application of software engineering practices and development of communities, policies and incentives, He is co-author of Best Practices for Scientific Computing and the FAIR4RS Principles and founded the Journal of Open Research Software.

From Policy to Practice: Implementing Open Science and Responsible Research Assessment at Helmholtz

Lea Maria Ferguson[1], Steffi Genderjahn[1], Heinz Pampel[1,2], Antonia C. Schrader[1], Mathijs Vleugel[1]

[1]Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany. [2]Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

Evaluating researchers and institutions requires a fundamental rethinking to advance as well as strengthen the quality and impact of research. In 2022, the Helmholtz Association, Germany's largest research-performing organization, adopted its Open Science Policy, committing to reforming research assessment by recognizing and incentivizing open and responsible practices, thereby strengthening its role as a pioneer of open science in Germany and beyond.

Driven by this policy, the Helmholtz Open Science Office — the central body responsible for promoting the cultural shift towards Open Science within the Helmholtz Association and representing its stance on open science nationally and internationally — is increasingly dedicating its efforts to supporting the Association in translating these principles into practice. This presentation will detail several key Helmholtz initiatives that demonstrate this commitment. Furthermore, our contribution situates these activities within broader initiatives in Germany, such as the focus area "Digitality in Science" of the Alliance of German Science Organizations, and describes how they interact with international initiatives like CoARA and the Barcelona Declaration on Open Research Information.

In its efforts to reform research assessment, the Helmholtz Association is a signatory of the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA) and coordinates the respective German National Chapter. A new Helmholtz Task Group Research Assessment has been established in March 2025 to provide a platform for the exchange and development of modern, quality-oriented assessment practices. We will present key findings from a recent survey of Helmholtz-affiliated researchers, which received 1,145 responses, providing valuable data on researchers' perceptions of current research evaluation practices and their expectations for future developments. Furthermore, the development of a "Quality Indicator for Data and Software Products" will be presented, an initiative designed to both capture the quality of research outputs beyond traditional text publications and to enhance their visibility. Reinforcing these efforts, the Helmholtz Software Award will be highlighted. This award recognizes the crucial role of software developers in modern data science and promotes the creation of professional, high-quality research software.

Narrative CV

Lea Maria Ferguson joined the Helmholtz Open Science Office of the Helmholtz Association in 2020. Her work focuses on promoting Open Science practices, supporting the development towards Open Research Software, and coordinating the Helmholtz Task Groups on Research Software and Research Assessment. She is active in the DFG-project Transform2Open and a member of the Steering Group of the German Reproducibility Network. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7060-3670 Steffi Genderjahn has worked since 2023 in the Helmholtz Open Science Office and is active in the “PID Network Deutschland” project, contributing to the project PID4NFDI. She focuses on the various facets of Open Science and Research Data Management and coordinates the Task Group Helmholtz Quality Indicators for Research Data and Software Products. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8912-184X Heinz Pampel works as a professor of Information Management at the Berlin School of Library and Information Science at Humboldt-Universität Berlin and is a scientific consultant for the Helmholtz Open Science Office. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3334-2771 Antonia Schrader has been an Open Science Officer at the Helmholtz Open Science Office since 2020. She is active in the NFDI-driven project 'Persistent Identifier Services for the German National Research Data Infrastructure (NFDI)' and contributes to the DFG-funded project 'PID Network Deutschland'. She also coordinates the Helmholtz Task Group on Quality Indicators for Research Data and Software Products and chaired the German Reproducibility Network steering group from 2022 to 2023. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7080-634X Mathijs Vleugel serves as the head of Helmholtz Open Science Office since September 2024. He supports the Helmholtz Association, its research centers, and the broader scientific community in shaping the cultural shift toward Open Science. Mathijs is a steering group member of the focus area "Digitality in Science" of the Alliance of German Science Organizations and currently serves as the coordinator of the CoARA National Chapter Germany. ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2988-2628

Cochrane Early Career Professionals Network: Building Equity Through Open Research

Ema Avdic[1], Ariel Y. Ong[2], João Vitor Ziroldo Lopes[3], Vaibhav Sahni[4], Elpida Vounzoulaki[5], Reem Fakak[6], Ana Beatriz Pizarro[7], Hammam Omar[8], Soumya Shivananda[9], Magaly Aceves-Martins[10], Bahaaeldin Baraka[11], Emre Bilgin[12]

[1]Faculty of Medicine, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. [2]Institute of Ophthalmology, University College London, London, United Kingdom. [3]Hospital das Clínicas, University of São Paulo Medical School, São Paulo, Brazil. [4]All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India. [5]Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom. [6]University of Nicosia Medical School, Nicosia, Cyprus. [7]Evidence Production & Methods Directorate, Cochrane Central Executive Team, London, United Kingdom. [8]Ministry of Health and Population, Cairo, Egypt. [9]Berlin Institute of Health at Charite, Berlin, Germany. [10]The Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, United Kingdom. [11]Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, United Kingdom. [12]Sakarya University Faculty of Medicine, Sakarya, Turkey

Abstract

Early career professionals (ECPs) are defined as individuals at an early stage in their careers. Regardless of varied backgrounds and interests, they all generally face the same set of issues such as delayed career progression, invisibility and limited mentorship. These are more prevalent in the case of underrepresented groups and low- and middle-income country settings. Open science and research practices offer a compelling pathway to mitigate some of these inequities.

To overcome these challenges, based on principles of inclusion and open research, Cochrane has launched its own community of early career professionals back in 2019 - Cochrane Early Career Professionals Network (ECPN). Its fundamental goal was to enable international networking for early career professionals and create an environment that helps them embrace their full potential. The network has grown to encompass members across five continents, with representation from a wide range of disciplines and professional background.

The reflective case study draws on the experience of existing and past members and provides insights into the success and future direction of ECPN. The aim of this reflective case study is to illustrate how ECPN has influenced members' professional development and engagement with open research. For the majority of members, participation in network's activities was a breakthrough moment in their careers and first contact with open research opportunities. Certain challenges remain and they are primarily related to circumstances of early career professionals in low - and middle - income countries. Achieving genuine equity requires sustained mentorship, accessible funding and supportive institutional policies.

ECPN is looking forward to establishing collaboration with other similar networks and create a base for mentorship opportunities of its members. It is committed to increasing student involvement and positioning itself as leading network for early career professionals in evidence-based healthcare.

Looking ahead, ECPN plans to focus on equity, innovation and professional development to ensure equal representation and empowering voices of those routinely left behind. While fostering open dialogue and inclusion, ECPN remains committed to its mission of providing equal opportunities for learning and recognition, regardless of background and life circumstances.

Narrative CV

Authors are current members of The Cochrane Early Career Professionals (ECP) Steering group. Ema Avdić is a medical doctor working as a research and teaching assistant in epidemiology, biostatistics and medical informatics at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. Ariel Y. Ong is an ophthalmology resident and at the Institute of Ophthalmology, University College London. She is an NIHR Doctoral Fellow studying clinical validation, safety and bias in artificial intelligence health technologies. João Vitor Ziroldo Lopes is a resident doctor at the Department of Internal Medicine at Hospital das Clínicas, University of São Paulo - Medical School, Brazil. Vaibhav Sahni holds dual specialization in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery and Periodontics and works at the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India. Elpida Vounzoulaki is a postdoctoral epidemiologist at the Leicester Real World Evidence Unit, Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, United Kingdom. Her primary interests include the prevention and management of diabetes and other cardiometabolic complications, real-world epidemiology and medical statistics. Reem Fakak is a final-year medical student at the Department of Basic and Clinical Sciences, University of Nicosia Medical School, Cyprus, with research experience in neurosurgery, neurology, and oncology, focusing on evidence-based medicine and peer review. Ana Beatriz Pizarro is a nurse scientist specializing in health equity and evidence synthesis. She supports Cochrane's Thematic Groups and Evidence Synthesis Units and leads initiatives to strengthen capacity and global collaboration. She currently works at the Evidence Production & Methods Directorate, Cochrane Central Executive Team, London, UK. Hammam Omar is a pharmacist and health economics researcher who works as a Health Economics and Outcomes Research Consultant at the Ministry of Health and Population in Egypt. His research focuses on HTA, real-world evidence and health policy. Soumya Shivananda is a medical doctor and epidemiologist working as a research fellow in the Health Data Privacy Group at Berlin Institute of Health at Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Germany. Magaly Aceves-Martins is a public health nutrition expert, currently researching healthy and sustainable eating. She works at the Rowett Institute of Nutrition and Health, University of Aberdeen, UK. Emre Bilgin is a medical doctor specialized in rheumatology, currently working as an associate professor at the Department of Rheumatology, Sakarya University Faculty of Medicine, Türkiye. Bahaaeldin Baraka is a medical doctor and Consultant in Medical Oncology at Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK. His primary area of focus is conducting systematic reviews and evaluating the quality of evidence in the context of cancer guidelines, as well as enhancing patient care.

POSTER PRESENTATIONS

Open Science Communication and Evaluation: Co-creative Paths Between Research and Society

Monica Déchène, Julia Serong
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München / Munich Science Communication Lab, Munich, Germany

Abstract

Open Science (OS) is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of reliable, responsible, and socially engaged research. However, discussions often focus on open data, publications, and digital infrastructures, while the communication of research processes, findings, and implications remains underexplored (Zarghani et al., 2023). Without deliberate and inclusive science communication, the promise of OS risks remaining accessible only to well-resourced actors, reinforcing existing inequities in the production, use, and evaluation of knowledge (Ross-Hellauer et al, 2022; Fox et al., 2021).

This contribution argues that Open Science Communication (OSC) is an essential dimension of Open Research, bridging research practices with diverse publics, contextualizing research, and fostering socially accountable knowledge production that makes an impact. By OSC, we refer to all forms of (strategic) science communication that make scientific knowledge and research processes accessible, transparent, and engaging for diverse audiences, both within and beyond institutionalized science, including their production, content, use, and societal effects (Zerfass et al., 2018; Schäfer et al., 2015). Drawing on formats such as participatory workshops, museum exhibitions, social media interactions, and 'meet-the-researcher' events, the contribution shows how science communication can open research to new audiences and amplify underrepresented voices. These initiatives demonstrate how research can be co-created with audiences, making OS relevant beyond academia (Elliot, 2022; Kondo et al., 2019).

OS relies on dialogue and communication with diverse audiences, but these interactions must be considered from the start and carefully designed to be measurable. Evaluation is therefore essential: beyond simple metrics of reach or visibility, it helps capture engagement, identify context-specific barriers, and account for diverse definitions of public interest (Ziegler et al., 2021). Iterative, mixed-method approaches provide insight into both short-term outcomes and long-term societal impact, enabling the design of more equitable and effective science communication strategies (Volk & Schäfer, 2024; Fischhoff, 2018). Meanwhile, structural challenges in OSC and evaluation persist (Valzano, 2020). The absence of widely adopted benchmarks and openly published evaluation practices limits shared learning across projects (Ziegler et al., 2021; Volk & Schäfer, 2024). Moreover, the frequent use of evaluation as a performance indicator can create a publication bias, favoring positive

outcomes and silencing valuable insights from failures or partial successes, raising ethical concerns about transparency, accountability, and the responsible reporting of science communication practices (Jensen, 2022; Medvecky & Leach, 2017). Addressing these limitations is critical to developing responsible and equitable Open Research practices.

Drawing on participatory projects and reflections on systemic barriers, this contribution illustrates how evaluation can serve as a lever to enhance OSC and advance OS. It provides evidence-based guidance on how to design, implement, and assess inclusive, participatory formats that respond to diverse societies. Ultimately, this approach positions OSC not as a downstream dissemination task, but as a co-creative, evaluative, and socially embedded practice that is central to the future of equitable, responsible, and reliable research (Grand et al., 2010).

Through this lens, this contribution demonstrates how OS can be operationalized in ways that are responsive, accountable, and just, aligning with the conference's aim to explore equitable and socially engaged Open Research.

Narrative CV

Monica Déchène studied Health and Nursing Science with a minor in Political Science and Sociology and completed her consecutive Master's degree at the Technical University of Munich (TUM), including a study abroad semester at City University of Hong Kong. During her studies she worked as a student assistant in the field of science communication and educational research (PISA study). After graduating, she was a research associate at the Centre for International Student Assessment (ZIB). Since the end of 2023, she has been a research associate and evaluation coordinator at the Munich Science Communication Lab (MSCL) at LMU Munich and a doctoral researcher at the Professorship of Formal and Informal Learning at TUM. Her research focuses on evaluation of participatory science communication and informal learning formats. She has developed, implemented, and assessed interactive projects that link research with diverse audiences, including participatory workshops on heat protection, museum exhibitions on climate futures, educational escape games, and film-based science dialogues. Across these initiatives, she applies iterative, mixed-method evaluation strategies that capture both immediate learning effects and longer-term outcomes such as shifts in attitudes, behavioral intentions, and inclusiveness. Her work demonstrates how evidence-based evaluation can contribute to equitable, transparent, and socially relevant science communication and strengthen Open Science practices. Dr. Julia Serong is a research associate at the Department of Media and Communication at LMU Munich and serves as Research Director and member of the Executive Board of the Munich Science Communication Lab (MSCL). She previously coordinated the ad-hoc working group "Faktizität der Welt" at the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities (2019–2021) and worked in journalism and communication research at TU Dortmund (2013–2020) and Freie Universität Berlin (2009–2014). She received her PhD from FU Berlin in 2014 with a dissertation on "Media Quality and Audiences." Her research focuses on strategic and open science communication, knowledge governance, and public engagement, with a particular emphasis on Planetary Health as an interdisciplinary challenge at the intersection of science, politics, and society. At the MSCL, she investigates how environmental and health topics are communicated to the public, analyzing media coverage, framing of Planetary Health, and further forms of science communication such as harmful, constructive, and impactful communication. Her work

bridges fundamental and applied research, combining theoretical insights from communication science with interdisciplinary collaboration across social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences. She highlights how inclusive, transparent, and socially accountable communication can enhance accessibility, societal understanding, and trust, supporting equitable and responsible Open Science practices. Together, Déchène and Serong combine complementary expertise in evaluation, science communication, and public engagement. Their collaboration bridges practical insights from participatory projects with conceptual and institutional perspectives on Open Science, demonstrating how science communication and evaluation can work hand in hand to make research more inclusive, transparent, and socially impactful.

Analysing Law's impact on European scientific data governance through the experience of the European Open Science Cloud.

Miguel García
European University Institute, Florence, Italy

Abstract

The EU is currently undergoing an infrastructural moment. Its regulatory efforts are increasingly turning towards the development of technological capabilities necessary to adapt to the new informational landscape. The establishment of the common European data spaces in strategic sectors, such as healthcare, energy and agriculture, presented by the European Strategy for Data, reflects this trend. One of the most significant projects is the European Science Cloud (EOSC), a repository of federated datasets and tools that has been created to support scientific research in the region. EOSC lies at the interface between the EU's strategy for data and its wider policy on research: the European Research Area (ERA) Policy Agenda.

These developments do not exist in isolation; they are part of a wider reform program that is altering the foundations of data governance in the region (Among others, the Open Data Directive, the Data Governance Act, the Data Act, etc.). Most of these laws are skewed towards the promotion of a single, borderless market for innovation and technology across the EU. As such, they embody certain assumptions about data's nature, availability, economic value and representational capabilities that have been criticised by different strands of literature for being in tension with the design and implementation of successful Open Science Policies.

Through the analysis of the different laws that regulate EOSC in its capacity as a data infrastructure, I intend to explore the dialogical relationship between these two distinct policy fields. To do so, I will engage with the different legal instruments regulating the structure, governance and funding of the EOSC. Additionally, I will analyse the legal system in which it is integrated, and the impact that copyright law and data law are having in shaping the definition of openness embraced by the European legislator.

Although my research aims are mostly descriptive, they could provide the basis for a normative examination of the EU's policy program for scientific data governance. By exploring the norms that define what data is shared and used, by whom and under what conditions in the context of EOSC I attempt to shed some light on the notion of openness enacted by the law, to the detriment of other (potentially fairer) alternatives based on different epistemologies of science and a more nuanced understanding of the credit structures involved in scientific research

Narrative CV

I am a doctoral researcher at the Law Department of the European University Institute, under the supervision of Prof. Thomas Streinz. The proposed abstract is part of my PHD research, focusing on: “The role of Law in the definition of scientific data governance practices in the EU”. My aim is to explore the different ways in which the law and other regulatory tools, such as funding schemes, public procurement practices, or inter-institutional legal arrangements, are shaping the governance of scientific data in the region. To do so, I will focus on several salient cases involving the use of data for research. Although I have been trained as a lawyer and my research is fundamentally legal in both its scope and ambitions, I would like to enrich my perspective by actively engaging with the literature from those disciplines in which data is employed for scientific research. I consider this kind of interdisciplinary exercise necessary to understand some of the central issues for the design of an adequate research policy, such as what processes are involved in the production of scientific knowledge, how data are mobilised across disciplines, or what the social and organisational conditions are for the creation of scientific knowledge. My work draws inspiration from several theoretical camps and disciplines, including the Science and Technologies Studies, Philosophy of Science, Data Feminism and Infrastructure Studies. One of the main sources of inspiration for my work has been the work of Sabina Leonelli, regarding the conceptualisation of openness and scientific data, as well as her discussion on the alternative epistemologies of science. From the legal literature, I have also been heavily influenced by the work on the construction of Cultural Commons developed by Michael J. Madison, Brett M. Frischmann and Katherine J. Strandburg (drawing inspiration from the work of Elinor Ostrom). These sources provide an invitation to envision alternative structures for governing scientific data. Before joining the PhD program at the EUI, I used to combine the practice of administrative law at a Spanish law firm, Uría Menéndez, with work as a researcher at the Administrative Law Department and as a guest lecturer in the Master in Telecommunications, Data protection, and Information Society Law at the University Carlos III de Madrid.

From stage to society: An arts-based approach to open research and responsible AI

Franziska Poszler[1,2], Anastasia Aritzi[3]
[1]University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. [2]TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Munich, Germany. [3]MoralPLai - TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Munich, Germany

Abstract

Generative AI, especially chatbots powered by large language models, enables individuals to increasingly rely on automation to support their decisions by answering questions, offering information or even providing concrete moral advice and emotional support in high-stakes decision contexts (Aharoni et al., 2024; Meng & Dai, 2021). For example, ChatGPT shows promise in improving triage accuracy in emergency departments (Kaboudi et al., 2024) and can serve as a personal therapist by delivering mental health support to individuals in real-time (Alanezi, 2024). Although AI chatbots may help address shortages in medical care and alleviate feelings of loneliness (Syed, 2024), their use also entails substantial risks, as demonstrated in court cases that connect chatbot interactions to suicide incidents (e.g., Yousif, 2025). Considering the profound societal impact of AI chatbots, it is important to inform the public and involve them in relevant ongoing scientific research, an imperative underscored by open science agendas (Ramachandran et al., 2021) and recognized by regulatory initiatives (e.g., Pact for Research and Innovation IV (2021–2030), EU AI Act). However, traditional science communication practices face various challenges, such as the often difficult-to-understand technical language in academic publications, which can reduce the public's interest in scientific work (Dietrich et al., 2024). To make scientific debates accessible beyond the academic community, innovative methods and mediums are needed through which civil society can stay informed about up-to-date research and engage with scientists (Weber et al., 2021). In this endeavor, arts – an important reference for social knowledge and inclusion – can become a key enabler to ensure human-centric, participatory discussions around the design of pertinent technological innovations (Guryanova et al., 2019). More specifically, arts-based methodologies such as research-based theatre, ethnodrama or the playwright-approach "combine research and theater to create novel opportunities for inquiry and knowledge translation" (Nichols et al., 2023; p.1). Adapting this alternative format to open research, the MoralPLai project uses a creative, arts-based approach to explore and communicate AI Ethics research. At its core is *The Third Voice*, a research-based theatre play that examines the ethical and emotional challenges of relying on AI chatbots for decision-making. Based on expert interviews, the play portrays a doctor and her daughter who both turn to a chatbot for guidance in a morally complex situation, highlighting the potential benefits and risks of AI chatbots as moral dialogue partners. By engaging the audience in accessible ways, the performance aims to promote AI literacy and gather public insights that can guide the design of human-centered AI. This presentation will provide an overview of the MoralPLai project, detailing its underlying research, production process, and the plot of *The Third Voice*, and will summarize audience feedback, key learnings, and takeaways. Overall, the MoralPLai project aims to lay the groundwork for transforming scientific communication and inquiry in AI Ethics,

drawing on humanities and cultural sciences as vital methodologies for bridging academia and society and fostering AI literacy.

Narrative CV

Dr. Franziska Poszler is a postdoctoral researcher at the Chair for Philosophy of Media and Technology at the University of Vienna. Her research focuses on AI Ethics, value-sensitive design, moral psychology, and creative science communication, with an emphasis on the interplay between AI, decision-making, and morality. Specifically, she investigates how ethical principles can be embedded in AI systems (e.g., self-driving cars and medical AI) and explores the potential of LLM-based chatbots as moral dialogue partners. Previously, she worked as a doctoral candidate and postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence at the Technical University of Munich, where she led the MoralPLai project. Her doctoral dissertation, Integrating ethical principles into AI systems: Practical implementation and societal implications, received the Roman Herzog Research Prize for the Social Market Economy. She holds a B.A. in Philosophy and a B.Sc. in Business Administration with a minor in Psychology from Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, and an M.Sc. in Organisational Behaviour from the London School of Economics and Political Science. Anastasia Aritzi is a Senior Political and Communications Consultant with more than two decades of experience in EU institutions, multinational organizations, and leading policy think tanks. She holds a B.A. in Political Science and Public Administration and an M.A. in EU and Southeast European Studies from the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, as well as an M.A. in Communication Studies from the University of Westminster. Her work focuses on political analysis, strategic communication, and technology governance, with a particular emphasis on the ethical use of artificial intelligence and emerging technologies. She has designed and led large-scale campaigns and contributed to major policy debates through direct engagement with policymakers, regulators, industry leaders, NGOs, and the media. Together with her team, she received the European Union’s Interreg 25 Years Project Slam award. She has also served as Communication Consultant at the TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence (2020–2024) and continues in this role with the MoralPLai project (2024–present).

From local to systemic implementation: Embedding open research in institutional practices

Malika Ihle[1], Sarah von Grebmer zu Wolfsthurn[1], Sara Lil Middleton[1], Flavio Azevedo[2], Felix Schönbrodt[1]
[1]LMU Munich, Munich, Germany. [2]Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

Abstract

Open Research Practices (ORPs) improve reliability and reproducibility, yet adoption remains limited. While policies and infrastructure for ORPs are advancing, researchers still face two major barriers: insufficient training in daily workflows and lack of supportive communities to normalize open practices.
To address this gap, the LMU Open Science Center is running two complementary programmes that link local interventions with systemic institutional change. The "switch-to-open" program supports research groups in transitioning from closed to open workflows. Through tailored resources and collaborative workflow design, each group produces an internal ORPs guide, later shared within departments to spread awareness and encourage broader uptake.
The train-the-trainer program builds capacity by empowering researchers to become instructors and ambassadors in open science. Covering eight modules, from pre-analysis planning, to computational reproducibility and FAIR data management, the program develops participants' technical expertise alongside their teaching skills through two tailored learning pathways (one to train students and one to train researchers). These tracks prepare future instructors to effectively integrate open science into their teaching and research environments, combining didactic training with leadership development to promote the adoption of the highest standards in research methodology.
Over three years, the project aims to produce a large amount of open sourced self-learning online materials, engage around twelve research groups, and train fifty instructors, who will in turn reach at least 250 further participants. We will share lessons learned from the first year of development and delivery, with the aim of refining our programmes, enhancing their impact, and inspiring other institutions to embed Open Research Practices as a cornerstone of their research culture.

Narrative CV

The LMU Open Science Center (OSC) is a university-wide hub dedicated to fostering transparency, reliability, and reproducibility in research. Founded to address the challenges of replicability in science, the OSC provides training, resources, and community support to help researchers across disciplines adopt Open Research Practices (ORPs). The Center, while a grassroot initiative, operates as both a service unit and a research lab. On the service side, it offers workshops and consultations to enable practices such as pre-registration, FAIR data

sharing, reproducible coding, and open access publishing. On the research side, the OSC investigates the effectiveness of different interventions for improving research quality, generating evidence to guide future reforms. Community building is at the heart of the OSC's mission. It brings together scholars from diverse faculties, creating networks of support and exchange that make openness the norm rather than the exception. Flagship programmes, such as switch-to-open and train-the-trainer, translate principles into action by helping research groups reconfigure workflows and by empowering instructors to act as ambassadors of open science. By combining bottom-up engagement with institutional support, the OSC seeks to efficiently embed open research into academic institutional culture. The LMU Open Science Center is supported by LMU Munich and the Volkswagen Foundation. The Train-the-Trainer program is developed in collaboration with FORRT - the Framework for Open and Reproducible Research Training.

Training for Open and Equitable Research - The Digital Research Academy

Ankita Dolai, Heidi Seibold, Joyce Kao
Digital Research Academy, Munich, Germany

Abstract

Practising open research has been taxing specifically for researchers working in under-resourced and inequitable conditions across locations and disciplines. Many researchers lack aid and consistent training on how to publish openly, preregister research and write code that is sharable and reachable to a wider audience. Such discrepancy in skills illustrates skewed dissemination of knowledge. Teaching open research skills across various disciplines becomes a crucial element when progressing from a closed research system to an open one.

In this context, we established the Digital Research Academy (DRA), a training provider that functions by building and maintaining an international trainer network. The DRA is geared towards inculcating and circulating open research skills among researchers across various contexts, regions and fields. DRA works through an interconnected trainer community where trainers plan and execute courses and workshops and peers review each other's teaching material, which are published openly.

One crucial aspect of the DRA is its fostering of a culture of openness, transparency, integrity and equity by keeping in mind the challenges researchers face in terms of field oriented disparities, lack of presentation of othered voices as well as financial and institutional hindrances.

Sustaining such a trainer network has its own challenges. Supporting trainers' work, building quality and open training materials and enabling continuity of open research support requires funding, contributions and extensive collaboration.

This poster presents DRA as a constructive exemplar for building quality and accessible research capacity and resources. DRA demonstrates its guiding principles and emphasises that trainer networks can promote and support equitable research methodology and provide space for underrepresented groups and research fields.

We discuss the workings of how a trainer community functions, challenges faced across different research contexts and how workshops and training always aim towards reducing barriers across the research world.

In the end we believe that worthwhile change in open research takes place through collaborative labour that acknowledges disparity across various research domains, recognizes diverse research objectives, portrays the constraints and struggles when building an open framework and accepts multiple interpretations of the public interest, rather than presupposing a single pathway toward openness.

Narrative CV

The Digital Research Academy focuses on teaching skills relevant to improving the quality of research (see https://digital-research.academy). Our core topics are open research, data literacy and research software engineering. Our trainers are experts in their fields and go through a Train-the-Trainer program, which emphasises pedagogy, didactics, and community knowledge sharing. The inclusive trainer community consists of researchers, research support staff, and other professionals, who care about good and open research. We work closely with academic research institutions and initiatives to tailor interactive training experiences that meet their specific needs. Projects include an introduction to open science for high performance computing specialists, a flipped classroom course on reproducible research we created for and with BERD@NFDI, and a series on outreach for open research initiatives (OSPARK bootcamps). Next to our training services for organizations, we regularly run free online workshops for the broader community. The poster will be presented by Ankita Dolai and Heidi Seibold from the DRA core team.

Creating a data management plan for infrastructures to increase FAIRness of data output

Ida Taberman[1], Hanna Lindroos[2]
[1]SLU University Library, Umeå, Sweden. [2]SLU University Library, Uppsala, Sweden

Abstract

We are currently planning and will during fall and winter implement two workshops aimed at generating data management plans (DMPs) for large-scale data-generating infrastructures that are vital for research at the university. To help the infrastructures structure their research data management the university support team will work with them to generate DMPs adapted for their use. In addition to better data management, this will make the output data from the infrastructures easier to reuse for researchers. At the FOR 2026 conference, we would like to present our experiences from planning, implementation and evaluation of the two workshops. We suggest that the workshops are in line with the suggested themes of 'Training and capacity building for responsive and responsible open research' and/or 'Infrastructures and tools supporting responsive and responsible open research

The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU, is a university within the life sciences sector and has a long tradition of research-supporting infrastructures that are prerequisites for research within this domain. The infrastructures themselves are large-scale investments and are established to run continuously, e.g. farms, greenhouses, forest, lake and sea research stations, a research vessel as well as databases, and many are installed as long-term experiments. Because of their diverse natures their current data management practices vary. However, the data generated by the infrastructures is a gold mine for researchers.

The SLU Data Management Support team, DMS, consists of representatives from the library, legal affairs, archive, IT, grants office, information security and data protection unit and work in an established university-wide network to provide better service for researchers on data management related issues. In 2022 SLU adopted a data management policy encouraging the practices of open science. It also requires that all research projects establish a DMP. In two upcoming workshops facilitated by the support team, several of the infrastructures at the university will generate DMPs containing information about the infrastructure and data generated within that the researchers using data from one of these infrastructures in turn can use for their project DMP. The initiative to the workshops comes from the university management and the infrastructures themselves and will be a first-time experience for the support team, in which we have a chance to bring together all our different competences and discuss data management issues at this scale.

The workshops will centre around the Science Europe data management plan template and during the two workshops the infrastructures will be provided

information on the expected content of the DMP and time to start work on one. Additional goals of the workshops are to learn from each other, advance the knowledge of open research within the infrastructures so the services and the data they provide will become FAIRer and in line with good research data management practices. Another outcome that we hope for is increased collaboration and exchange between the support staff and infrastructures within the university to advance open science.

Narrative CV

Hanna Lindroos, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8455-8452. I have been working in research data management since 2017 and I am currently the head of the Data Management Support team at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU). I have a PhD in cell and molecular biology and a background in project management which has led me to be involved in several EU projects, IT projects and event coordination. In my current role as head of data management support, I participated in the EOSC task force on Data stewardship, curricula and career paths 2022-2023. I am now a member of the EOSC OA5: Skills, Training, Rewards, Recognition & Upscaling. I currently work part time for the Swedish research council with data as a strategic resource and as a member of the Swedish National Data Service steering board.
Ida Taberman, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4358-2341. I started off in 2009 as a database manager for a small-scale research infrastructure project collecting stream water chemistry. In 2013 I co-authored an infrastructure paper describing the small-scale catchment and its openly available data https://doi.org/10.1002/wrcr.20520. During this time, I represented the small-scale infrastructure in a university collaboration with the aim of creating combined repository and e-archive. The task gave me insights too new aspects of data management and its complexities that I still have use of. In one stage I suggested that when this system is in place the is a need for a function at the university to support its users regarding the diverse and complex matters of the data management's lifecycle. For some years I was part of the management for the newly established Swedish infrastructure of Ecosystem Research, SITES, a consortium of nine existing Swedish research infrastructures and was responsible for data management issues among others. During the startup phase my role included facilitation and creating arenas to meet, much focus was set on finding good data management examples and learning from each other. From my own experiences of a small-scale infrastructure, it was very inspiring to see participants meet and exchange ideas and knowledge. Nowadays I´m part of the university's support function on data management. I collaborate with colleagues locally, nationally and internationally, there are workflows and systems in place, and I can support a wide variety of users.

ROBOPSY: Contributions from the Arts to Open Research on Ethical AI

Boris Abramovic [1,2], Margarete Jahrmann[2]

[1] The Institute for Philosophy at the University of Vienna, Wien, Austria. [2] University of Applied Arts Vienna, Wien, Austria.

Abstract

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly large language models (LLMs), into our everyday experiences presents both opportunities and risks. Some of these risks, as identified by scholars in the field of technology ethics, relate to the trustworthiness of AI and its acceptance in various aspects of life. For example, issues surrounding the opacity and explainability of AI systems (Müller, 2020) and the conditions necessary for trusting AI (Coeckelbergh, 2020) are critical considerations. However, more research is needed to assess issues surrounding trust in these technologies, especially in contexts where LLMs interpret political and historical narratives and the impact these interpretations have on our collective memory.

To address these uncertainties, we draw on insights from technology ethics and examine their intersection with the arts in the context of open research. We build upon existing art-science collaborations and artistic practices involving AI and robotics to propose ways in which the arts can contribute to the civic re-envisioning of AI, helping us uncover both its potential benefits and the vulnerabilities faced by users—especially when we rely on algorithms to interpret politically or socially charged events.

In our presentation, we will use the experiences from the ROBOPSY project, currently ongoing at the University of Applied Arts Vienna in collaboration with partners, as a case study to explore this intersection. Here, participants engage in experiments grounded in game art, acting as "ludic citizen researchers" based on the ludic method developed by Margarete Jahrmann (2021). During a series of role-playing sessions conducted within the project, participants interact with ChatGPT as it embodies historical figures and navigates politically charged events. This process raises important questions about how algorithmic systems shape new forms of remembrance (Makhortykh, 2021).

Thus, the methodological approaches implemented in ROBOPSY allow us to rethink how open science principles can be expanded and how artistic methods can enhance them. This framework fosters critical inquiry about technology, enabling users to engage more directly with issues such as blind trust in technology and the challenges surrounding accuracy, hallucinations, and the biases inherent in the datasets that inform AI narratives.

Accordingly, this presentation aims to highlight the potential of artistic approaches in open research, particularly in reimagining ethical AI in the context of trust and acceptance of LLMs. In doing so, we seek to enrich the ongoing discussion about the tension surrounding LLMs' impact on the integrity of collective memory and historical narratives while fostering civic engagement through alternative formats of open research.

Coeckelbergh, Mark. *AI ethics*. MIT press, 2020.
Jahrmann, Margarete. "Ludics: The art of play and societal impact." *Not at your service. Manifestos for design* (2021): 319-329.
Makhortykh, Mykola. "Memoriae ex machina: how algorithms make us remember and forget." *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 22, no. 2 (2021): 180-185.
Müller, Vincent C. "Ethics of artificial intelligence and robotics." (2020).

Narrative CV

Robopsychologists: An Artistic Exploration of Collective Memory through Role-Playing with AI Language Models.This artistic research project aims at designing and implementing a playful experimental system to creatively examine AI's relationship with collective memory and trauma. By adopting the roles of "robopsychologists," participants interact with AI large language models (LLMs), especially ChatGPT, which will embody historical figures. We will design three scenarios (the experience of adolescents in Belgrade during the Yugoslav Wars, the murder of the Austrian philosopher Moritz Schlick in 1936 that resulted in the disintegration of the Vienna Circle, the terror attack in Vienna in 2020), within which ChatGPT will be prompted to take on the roles of historical personae. Funded by Vienna Science and Technology Fund WWTF-ICT23020.

Valuing Data in, around, and through Biodata Infrastructures

Roman Hansen, Sarah R Davies
Universität Wien, Wien, Austria

Abstract

Biological data and knowledge bases (collectively called resources) are central to life sciences research, supporting both lab-based researchers and bioinformaticians. These resources do more than make data findable and accessible: through curation, they actively structure scientific knowledge. Research papers and underlying datasets are selected, annotated, and aligned with ontologies through the labor of curators. In this process, the value of data is determined, captured, and represented, but these valuation practices are not solely realised by curators. Curation is prestructured by rules, infrastructures, and design choices that shape how data are perceived and enacted as valuable. Building on scholarship in data work and digital maintenance, this project examines how value is enacted and stabilized in biological research infrastructures. Based on interviews with maintainers and user-curators of biodata resources, we trace how valuation practices are embedded in research data infrastructures and how they are made durable.

The findings show that the ways in which data are valued are largely structured by maintainers of data infrastructures. As designers of curation manuals and user interfaces, they define what counts as valuable and how value is to be captured and represented. Their work involves identifying, combining, and negotiating multiple ways of valuing data, producing the rules and tools that guide curators. By making these processes visible, this project highlights how data work is structured across different roles and professional activities, showing the layered, infrastructurally mediated nature of valuation in scientific practice. In doing so, it connects to broader discussions in open science about how infrastructures, standards, and expertise shape who benefits from digital resources and how knowledge is produced, used, and made valuable.

Narrative CV

Roman Hansen is an interdisciplinary social scientist with a master's degree in science and technology studies from the University of Vienna. His research explores the social and technical aspects of digital infrastructures, emphasizing their development, maintenance, and practical use. He examines data work and the ways in which rules, tools, and expertise shape how data are curated, valued, and mobilized. This project was developed as part of his work with the Technoscience, Materiality, and Digital Cultures research group at the STS Department in Vienna, connecting empirical studies of everyday practices with broader questions about open science and knowledge governance. Sarah R Davies is Professor of Technosciences, Materiality, and Digital Cultures at the Department of Science and Technology Studies, University of Vienna. Her recent work includes the books Science

Societies (2024) and Revisiting Reflexivity (2025), as well as articles on data work in the biosciences.

Policy Pathways to Inclusive Open Science in Indonesia: Practice-Based Insights

Ria Ariani
Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Abstract

It is crucial that openness spectrums are accessible to everybody in the middle of the global expansion of open science implementations. It is not just about "how to open," but also about "who are included" in the ecosystem of Open Science (OS). The purpose of this study is to establish a connection between the sociocultural context in which OS is used and the groups who are part of this ecosystem. Indonesia, which is geographically divided by islands and has a heterogeneous population in terms of ethnicity and language, serves as the case study for OS. This study explores national policymakers' perspectives of OS's inclusiveness components. Using a qualitative methodology, this study examines how institutional capacity and policies affect the fair application of open science by interviewing 12 policymakers (governments) in-depth. A policy matrix was then created to depict the OS policy situation in Indonesia after the data was analysed using thematic analysis with codification using the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science (2021) framework. This policy matrix identifies drivers, obstacles, and practical recommendations by mapping interview themes to policy stages (formulation, implementation and evaluation). According to the findings, open scientific practices in Indonesia are still primarily in the awareness-raising stage, with programs and policies primarily concentrating on building institutional trust, establishing concepts, and managing data. Egocentrism, however, remains a source of tension that hinders the acceptance of OS uniformity and data sharing. It is suggested to make Indonesia's open scientific ecosystem more inclusive, more researchers are required to fully understand the concept and benefits of open science and local communities should be encouraged to participate in the practice.

Narrative CV

Ria Ariani is a PhD candidate at the research group Knowledge Dynamics and Sustainable Technology, Berlin Ethics Lab, Technische Universität Berlin. She is doing her PhD under funding of the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP), Ministry of Finance - Indonesia and investigates ethical considerations in open science policy in Indonesia case study. After completing her Bachelor's degree in Library Science (2010), she studied Digital Curation and then completed her Master's degree in Digital Curation from Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin and King's College London (2018). After completing her Master's degree, she worked at National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN) - Indonesia (2021).

Towards a Constitutional AI: Testing Language Model Accountability Through Open Legal Norms

Cindy Delage
JustAI, Evreux, France

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have become central to research, practical applications, and public debate. Their ability to generate biased, harmful, or inappropriate responses has led to internal regulation strategies such as red teaming and algorithmic moderation. Yet, these mechanisms often rely on opaque rules, set by private actors according to criteria that are difficult to verify and sometimes arbitrary. This lack of transparency raises fundamental concerns about accountability, ethics, and fairness.

This contribution proposes a critical experiment inspired by the concept of "constitutional AI," developed notably by Anthropic. It explores the idea that a language model can revise problematic outputs when guided by open legal norms. For instance, extracts from criminal codes or other legal texts used as reference corpora. Instead of relying on proprietary rules, this approach seeks to establish a red-teaming framework grounded in public, explicit, and legally contextualized principles.

Practically, the experiment consists of submitting a series of sensitive prompts to an AI model, whose responses are then assessed and, when needed, revised by the model itself in light of legal norms. The process aims to test whether self-regulation can emerge through interpretive alignment with open norms, rather than through implicit instructions embedded in proprietary systems.

This approach is part of a broader reflection on social responsibility and transparency in open AI research. It raises key questions for this conference: How can the behavioral norms of AI systems be made accessible, transparent, and open to critique? What limits and opportunities arise from using law as a public instrument of algorithmic regulation? How can this approach be articulated with principles of cognitive justice, contextual fairness, and normative sovereignty in multilingual and multicultural environments?

By mobilizing legal texts as foundations for computational ethics, this contribution explores a critical alternative to closed models of AI governance. It envisions AI systems capable of revising their outputs against public legal corpora (not as a universal technical solution, but as a transdisciplinary framework for rethinking openness and accountability in language technologies).

Ultimately, this work invites a re-examination of what it means to conduct AI research that is truly open, responsible, and socially engaged. It suggests that public legal norms can be integrated into the design of AI not as external constraints, but as

resources for reflection and action, supporting the development of a critical, situated, and democratic AI.

Narrative CV

Cindy Delage is an AI engineer and researcher with expertise in designing and implementing end-to-end artificial intelligence projects. Her work spans from scoping and building AI solutions to their operational deployment, combining technical depth with strategic oversight. Alongside project delivery, she conducts research and development on emerging topics in AI, with a current focus on “Constitutional AI” and the use of open legal norms to guide model behavior. She holds a PhD in Artificial Intelligence from INSA Lyon, where her research applied advanced machine learning methods to satellite data for atmospheric studies, in collaboration with international partners. Beyond her academic and professional projects, she has contributed to volunteer initiatives addressing social challenges through AI — from analyzing gender representation in cinema with LLMs to developing predictive tools for wildfire prevention. With a dual background in applied mathematics and management, Cindy brings both scientific rigor and a systemic perspective to her work. Her interests lie at the intersection of trustworthy AI, legal and ethical frameworks, and the design of socially responsible technologies.

From the Umbrella to the Forest. Exploring Open Science through Images

Francesca Di Donato
CNR, Pisa, Italy

Abstract

This contribution analyses the visual metaphors used to describe Open Science (OS) and shows how these reveal the values, priorities and cultural assumptions of the movement.

The journey begins with the metaphor of the ‘umbrella’ (Fecher, Friesike, 2013). The umbrella brings together and shelters related concepts under a single term: it is a tool created by humans for a specific purpose. However, what lies beneath the umbrella varies significantly, reflecting the different priorities of the respective community.

The 'mushroom' metaphor, introduced by Méndez (2017), marks a significant transition from an artefact to a natural organism, and represents a conceptual shift. In addition, the mushroom is not merely a vessel for observable practices. The idea of a hidden and foundational system represented by the roots is here introduced (Rafols et al., 2024).

The next step in this evolution is the ‘wheel’ (Kramer, 2017), representing OS as a circular infinite research workflow. The image illustrates the various stages of the research process (from discovery and analysis to publication, dissemination and evaluation) as a continuous cycle, and evokes the hermeneutic circle. Through the wheel - among the most significant examples of human invention - OS is elevated from a collection of practices to a fundamental process for knowledge production, dissemination and assessment.

The concept of a process is further elaborated on using the 'taxonomy' (Pontika and Knoth, 2015) and the 'tree' metaphors (YERUN, 2018; Méndez, 2022). By organising the components of OS into a hierarchical structure, the taxonomy/tree provides detail about the ecosystem.

The final metaphor is the 'graph', used by UNESCO (2020). The image immediately evokes the topologies of the Internet and the World Wide Web. The graph describes OS as a dynamic, decentralised and distributed network of relationships.

This vision of a complex, living network serves as a bridge to my proposed synthesis to represent OS as a 'forest'. The forest is a natural organism like the mushroom, it includes the symbolism of the tree, and its vast system of interconnected roots functions as a living graph.

I this contribution I will discuss how the metaphor embodies a number of OS principles and values (collaboration, inclusiveness and biodiversity, collective intelligence) but also its ability to represent the real tensions and inequalities that persist in our

knowledge ecosystems (in terms of unequal distribution of resources, lack of equal opportunities, exclusion and competition, and efficiency without equity).
A value of the forest metaphor, then, is that it makes these tensions visible, challenging the status quo and forcing us to confront the gap between our principles and our practices (Sepehri, 2025). But it also helps us to radically change the way we evaluate research quality and value, encouraging us to go beyond conventional parameters of efficiency and excellence and ask new and deeper questions about our work, such as: 'Is it sustainable? Is it inclusive? Is it creative? Is it alive?' (Mounier, 2022)

Narrative CV

I graduated in Political Science from the University of Pisa (1999) and in 2003 I obtained a PhD in the History of Political Philosophy from the Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies of Pisa. The methodology I developed during my PhD is based on the study of original texts, on the analysis of concepts and their historical and political context, and on the comparison between "modern" and "contemporary". From 2004 to 2015 I held research positions at the University of Pisa and the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa. From 2015 to 2020, I worked at Net7srl as head of the Digital Humanities and Open Science department. Since 2020, I have been a researcher at the Institute of Computational Linguistics at the National Research Council of Italy (CNR), where I work as a Researcher. The common thread running through my scientific career has been the study of open models and systems of science creation, management and communication (Open Science). In particular, over time I have developed a theoretical interest focused on the conditions of the republic of science (its practices and means), and on the comparison between the traditional system of science communication, and the paradigms of online digital science communication and their concrete applications. The monograph "La scienza e la rete. L'uso pubblico della ragione nell'età del web" (FUP, Florence, 2009) brings together a first reflection on these theme. Since 2004, I developed the idea of a possible convergence between Open Access and the Semantic Web. This interest led to the design of "HyperJournal", an open source application for the publication of OA academic journals. HyperJournal, which experimented with alternative metrics based on semantic web technologies and Social Network Analysis, was used by the journal 'Bollettino telematico di filosofia politica' (2005-2011). Furthermore, my research is focused on the link between the system of knowledge production and communication and the research evaluation system. In 2022 I was a member of the Core Group who drafted the "Agreement on reforming research assessment". Since 2023 I've been involved in the GraspOS eu funded project, which aims at developing, assessing and operating an open and trusted federated infrastructure for next generation research metrics and indicators. Currently, I'm co.chairing the Italian National Chapter of CoARA. In addition to the research activities, I have been involved in intensive teaching activities, including university teaching assignments, master's programmes, doctoral schools, public institutions and research bodies. Interacting with students has allowed me to deepen and revisit my reflections on the main topics I have dealt with over time. In recent months, I have been finishing writing a monograph on OS for CNR Edizioni, which brings together twenty years of research. The work presented here is part of this monograph. My publications (all open access) are available on my ORCID profile: https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0000-0003-0144-8934

Liberata - Open Access Academic Publishing with Incentivized Quality Controls

Han Zhang
Duke University, Durham, United States

Abstract

Academic publishing continues to rely on incentive structures that misalign the interests of authors, reviewers, institutions, and the public. Three systemic failures dominate: difficulty in attributing contributions within multi-author work, absence of dependable quality-control mechanisms for open access publishing, and the near total lack of incentives for replication. These problems distort academic labor markets, weaken research reliability, and impose substantial costs on universities, governments, and industry. Liberata introduces an integrated solution: an open access publishing platform that embeds incentive-aligned quality control and graph-theoretic scientometrics directly into the publication and evaluation workflow.

The core of the system is a **contribution-share credit model** that replaces traditional authorship order. Contributors assign themselves quantifiable shares reflecting their actual input to the work. These shares serve both as a transparent attribution record and a transferable asset used within Liberata's **academic marketplaces**. Peer reviewers and replicators are compensated in contribution shares, connecting their incentives to the long-term reliability of the work they evaluate. This mechanism addresses a longstanding structural weakness: peer review labor is traditionally uncompensated and unaccountable, leading to uneven rigor and limited transparency. Under Liberata, all reviews, replications, annotations, and updates are permanently recorded and associated with specific agents in the system.

Liberata then applies **graph-based scientometrics** to the full publication and evaluation network. This produces measures of contribution, replication outcomes, collaboration structure, field permeability, reliability of research groups, and shifts in subdisciplinary activity. These metrics differ from citation-based indicators by incorporating validation behavior, credit flow, and structural properties of research communities. Institutions can use these data products for hiring, promotion, and funding decisions, replacing prestige-based proxies with empirically grounded indicators. Government agencies can evaluate research outputs funded by public money without relying on private publishers' filtering mechanisms. Industry researchers and AI developers can access curated, quality-controlled literature and datasets that support reproducibility, model training, and R&D decision-making.

All published work on Liberata is open access without copyright transfer, eliminating the long-standing practice in which private publishers acquire distribution rights to publicly funded research. The platform is built to interoperate with existing preprint repositories and can serve as a downstream validation and metrics layer for open

scholarship ecosystems. In parallel, Liberata's metrics platform provides a sustainable revenue model that supports continuous maintenance, infrastructure growth, and collaboration with institutional partners.

This presentation presents the conceptual foundation, system architecture, and scientometric framework underlying Liberata. It describes the contribution-share system, the design of the incentive marketplaces, and the graph-theoretic methods used to characterize research behavior. It also outlines expected impacts on researchers, universities, funding agencies, and industry, including reductions in wasted effort from irreproducible research, improved allocation of academic credit, and expanded access to high-quality research outputs. Liberata offers a unified incentive-compatible infrastructure for producing, validating, and evaluating scientific knowledge—addressing fundamental structural limitations of contemporary academic publishing.

Narrative CV

Han Zhang is a doctoral researcher in Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science at Duke University, working on AI simulation and design of metamaterials. His research focuses on using physics-informed machine learning techniques for surrogate modelling of wave-matter interactions, as well as on robust learning methods to transfer learned physics concepts to similar domain problems. Han is the recipient of multiple competitive fellowships, including the NSERC PGS-D Fellowship, the Rhodes Fellowship, and the NSF NRT Fellowship in AI for Materials, reflecting both technical excellence and interdisciplinary training. In parallel with his research, he contributes to academic governance and research culture through leadership roles at Duke University, including founding and leading Liberata, an interdisciplinary project for open scholarship, and serving on institutional boards related to doctoral training and entrepreneurship. Han's early training includes a BASc in Engineering Physics from the University of British Columbia, with strong foundations in physics, mathematics, and mechatronics. It was during this time that Han accumulated many international research experiences in nanotechnology, metamaterials, and experimental physics at Canada's National Institute for Nanotechnology, Germany's Max Planck Institute for the Structure and Dynamics of Matter, and Singapore's Nanyang Technological University. These formative experiences would later inspire Han not only to pursue advanced studies in metamaterials but also to attempt an internationally compatible overhaul of the academic publishing system, given his familiarity with the similarities and differences of various academic cultures. Prior to doctoral study, Han accumulated substantial experience in microfabrication as well as electrical, mechanical, and software engineering in industry. At Neuralink, Han designed and fabricated micron-scale electrode devices. At Celldom, he designed and prototyped microfluidics, microscopy, and lithography instruments. At Atomic Machines, he designed complex mechatronic systems that used fluid chemistry to etch and machine micron features on metal wafers. These roles required tight integration and broad knowledge of physics, hardware, and software under manufacturing and capital constraints, and inspired his transition to doctoral studies in AI for nanotechnology with emphasis on robustness and transferability in learning. Han's ability to communicate and teach non-technical people about technical topics during this time also resulted in him being featured in ZDF's Utopia documentary, as well as several podcast features. Midway through his PhD and following his first publication, Han founded Liberata, an academic publishing platform using game theory to correct maligned incentives in academic publishing, and graph theory to construct more

accurate and insightful academic metrics. By leveraging his startup experiences and expertise, Han has expanded the project to over 50 people and secured multi-year funding from Duke University, powering the buildout of the project to a beta testing state in just under 18 months.

Challenges to Solutions: Addressing Math Education Needs and Usability Insights in Low-Resource Primary Schools in Bangladesh.

Chandra Shekhar Roy[1], Sarker T. Ahmed Rumee[2], Shiplu Chandra Kar[3], Nanno Hossain[4]
[1]Data and Design Lab, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh. [2]CSE Dept, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh. [3]RK Software (Bangladesh) Ltd, Dhaka, Bangladesh. [4]Labcom Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract

Empowering education systems with AI-driven platforms and conversational agents holds immense potential, especially in low-resource environments in Bangladesh where traditional approaches face critical limitations. While AI-based learning tools such as Khanmigo, AI Math, and Mathful have shown success in providing personalized learning support in Western contexts, their adoption in the Global South remains limited due to barriers such as language incompatibility, resource constraints, and high student teacher ratios. In Bangladesh, for instance, primary schools operate with an average ratio of 30.05:1, exceeding UNESCO's recommended 25:1, resulting in overcrowded classrooms and minimal individualized instruction. These challenges directly impact student motivation, conceptual understanding, and retention, underscoring the urgent need for innovative, context-sensitive solutions.

This work presents the design and evaluation of an **AI-based math learning platform** tailored for primary students in Bangladesh. The platform centers on a **Bangla-language conversational agent**, supplemented with gamification, anonymous group competition, and progress tracking features. To guide the design, a comprehensive **need-finding study** was conducted with **191 students and 11 teachers across five schools**, employing classroom observations, surveys, and semi-structured interviews. Findings revealed systemic issues: insufficient practice opportunities, limited teacher capacity for personalized feedback, and a lack of peer-collaboration mechanisms. These insights informed the development of three key design principles:

(1) Repeated practice helps students to learn better.
(2) Analogy-based explanation helps students to understand better.
(3) Solving problems in groups helps students to improve their problem-solving skills.

Building on these principles, a prototype platform was developed and subjected to a **usability study with 72 students and 5 teachers from two schools**. Mixed-method evaluations included task completion metrics, time-on-task analysis, and satisfaction surveys. Results were encouraging: **75% of students reported higher engagement**, **80% found the conversational agent helpful in understanding math concepts**, and teachers noted a **25% reduction in time spent addressing individual queries**. Overall, satisfaction rates were **78% among students** and **80% among teachers**, demonstrating both feasibility and acceptability in real-world classroom contexts. This study contributes in three ways: (i) it identifies the unique challenges of math

education in low-resource Bangladeshi primary schools, (ii) it presents a localized AI-driven platform designed around a conversational agent to support students' learning needs, and (iii) it validates the platform's effectiveness through a mixed-method usability evaluation.

Findings not only provide evidence for the role of AI in enhancing foundational education in the Global South but also highlight engagement-focused design strategies such as gamification and anonymity that can inform future educational technologies in resource-constrained settings.

Narrative CV

1. Chandra Shekhar Roy works on various areas of public policy, including National Statistics. Before joining the Data & Design Lab as a Senior Policy Fellow, he worked for 25 years as Senior Maintenance Engineer at Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), Ministry of Planning. After a long career in Data support service specialist in the Data-center of the National Statistical Office, he contributed as Project Director of Historical Data Conversion and Archiving project based at BBS. He studied MCSE, PGDCSE, EEE and also hold a Bachelor's degree from the University of Dhaka. Mr. Roy is involved with Paris21's IDR project, iData Studio project, IPUMS international, ANCSDAAP, APPI, ITU, DDI(metadata standard), World Data Forum . Also his contribution in International Data science community like: IDW, RDA, IASSIST, WDS, ICPSR, ESRA, EDDI, PV2023, PiDfest, DCMI, IDCC and Bangladesh Computer Society (BCS). 2. Dr. Sarker Tanveer Ahmed Rumee is an Associate Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. He completed his Ph.D. in 2017 from University of Texas at Arlington ,USA. At UTA He worked in the Software Engineering Research (SERC) Lab. His work area was on software security: especially on securing mobile operating system (Android) to identify and prevent sensitive personal data disclosure. His current research interests include Program Analysis/Synthesis, Data Analytics and Adversarial Machine Learning. Dr. Rumee used techno-economic analytic methods to understand issues related to spectrum management, competition due to technology and regulation in the marketplace. He is well published in peer-reviewed journal papers and have showcased his research in the number of acclaimed Engineering policy conferences. 3. Shiplu Chandra Kar, a graduate in statistics, has honed his skills as a Statistical Survey Coordinator. His responsibilities in this project include: Design and program survey tools on CAPI platforms . Conduct pre-tests and ensure functionality of digital questionnaires. Recruit, train, and supervise enumerators and supervisors on CAPI devices and ethical interviewing. Manage day-to-day survey fieldwork, including deployment, logistics, and adherence to protocols. Monitor real-time data submissions, conduct spot checks/back-checks, and provide corrective feedback. Troubleshoot technical issues with devices, applications, and connectivity. Coordinate with the data management team for validation, cleaning, and storage of datasets. Prepare daily field progress updates and final survey completion reports. Liaise with community leaders and stakeholders to support smooth field operations. 4. Nanno Hossain is currently pursuing his Bachelor's Degree in Software Engineering Serving as a Lab Manager. He possesses a profound passion for Python and is deeply engrossed in exploring the realms of machine learning. His enthusiasm extends to dedicating significant time to learning and extracting insights from AI/ML-related projects. Presently, he is immersed in a busy schedule, delving into experiments with various language model models such as BERT. His technical acumen goes beyond the realm of data analytics, as he revels in the challenge of dismantling repetitive and complex tasks using Linux. Sharing his real-life experiences, he has actively contributed to educating others on GitHub, Linux, and Python.

Fostering cultures of responsible data work: The Ethical Data Initiative

Paul Trauttmansdorff[1,2], Kim Hajek[3,4], Lena Sindel[2], Nathanael Sheehan[5]
[1]Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany. [2]Ethical Data Initiative, Munich, Germany. [3]Technical University of Munich/Ethical Data Initiative, Munich, Germany. [4]Ethical, Munich, Germany. [5]Ethical Data Initiative, Exeter, United Kingdom

Abstract

The Ethical Data Initiative (EDI) is a non-partisan platform that fosters open discussions and practical interventions around data ethics, including the role of open data and open research practices in enabling responsible and equitable data work. Informed by philosophical, historical, and social studies of science, the EDI's long-term goal is to promote active ethical reflection at every stage of data work. Making data ethics material practical and accessible to learners in lower-resourced environments, alongside data scientists and practitioners in academia, public services, civic associations, and small/medium enterprises is key to this. The EDI is coordinated jointly by the TUM Think Tank (Munich) and the University of Exeter. This poster presents two of our key educational activities:

(1) the 'data clinic', an interactive problem-solving and teaching format designed to bridge theory and practice in the realm of data governance and ethics. Clinics bring together small groups of TUM students from across a range of disciplines to collaborate with partner organisations on real-world ethical challenges and decision-making processes, including those related to risks and benefits of openness. In recent clinics, for instance, students have explored what is involved in making energy data openly available and accessible in a public facing online 'dashboard', an evaluated tensions between public value considerations and the sharing of secondary health data.

(2) Data stories, a short video and vignette format that examine a concrete case-study and its implications for data ethics, based on academic research in critical data studies. They ask, for example, how file formats might play an exclusionary role in open science infrastructures.

We invite visitors of our poster to exchange ideas and experiences of teaching data ethics in practice and participate in further developing these formats. Our ultimate aim is to consider collaboratively how we can empower learners and partners with actionable insights to handle complex issues such as data privacy, discrimination, transparency, and accountability in open research, and thus foster responsible cultures of data work.

Narrative CV

Paul, Kim, Lena and Nathanael are currently all team members with different funcions and tasks at the Ethical Data Initiative, a non-partisan fostering open discussions on data ethics, and hosted by the TUM Think Tank and Exeter University. Paul Trauttmansdorff is a postdoctoral researcher in the social studies of science and technology. He is based at the Chair for Philosophy and History of Science and Technology, located at the School of Social Sciences and Technology, Technical University of Munich. His research focuses on imaginaries and infrastructures of datafication. He is particularly interested in how bodily data is produced, valued, circulated, and stored, and in how these practices shape forms of knowledge and governance in areas such as security, surveillance, and medicine. His latest project examines the use of face recognition for purposes of diagnostic medicine and healthcare. Kim M. Hajek joined the Ethical Data Initiative (EDI) in 2024 as a postdoctoral fellow based at the Technical University of Munich (TUM), where she is part of Sabina Leonelli's Chair group for Philosophy and History of Science and Technology. Together with Paul Trauttmansdorff, Kim primarily works on the EDI's educational pillar, notably running 'data clinics' that bring together TUM students with partners and practitioners to collaborate on real-world ethical challenges and decision-making processes. Kim's interdisciplinary research draws on concepts and methods from narrative theory, history of science, and intellectual history to scrutinise scientific knowledge-making and its cultural products. Her current project examines textual 'datafication' in psychotherapy research between ca. 1880 and 1960. It asks how textual practices intersect with and contribute to the epistemic function of different forms of case-writing. Lena Sindel is a student assistant at the Chair for Philosophy and History of Science and Technology at the Technical University of Munich (TUM). She primarily supports the teaching team for the data clinic "Data Ethics in Practice". Lena is currently pursuing a master's degree in Responsibility in Science, Engineering and Technology (RESET) with a focus on Data and AI Ethics and Governance at TUM. Prior to this, she completed her bachelor's degree in Informatics at TUM. Nathanael Sheehan is a computer scientist and philosopher of science whose work focuses on issues of data sharing in public health. Central to his work is the aim to shift the perception of Open Science from an object-oriented perspective, which perceives it as a capitalist paradigm built on perpetual growth and speculative profit, to an ethical understanding that positions openness as the cultivation of judicious collaborations amongst researchers.

The impact of data-intensive methods on plant science research

Emma Cavazzoni
Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Abstract

In this poster, I present the main themes addressed in my PhD thesis, which examines the impact of data-intensive methods on plant science research. My analysis is based on six months of ethnographic fieldwork and close collaboration with the Haly.Id project, carried out between 2020 and 2024 in Northern Italy. The project aims to develop innovative technologies and large datasets for the targeted monitoring of the brown marmorated stink bug, *Halyomorpha halys* (*H. halys*), a highly invasive pest that feeds on fruit and causes severe damage to agricultural production in southern Europe, the United States, and East Asia.

I begin by focusing on specific aspects of scientific data generation, arguing that the growing drive to produce and use data—often at large scale—has led to substantial research efforts centered on data practices themselves, frequently without critically articulating the epistemic expectations underlying data generation or the kinds of knowledge such data are meant to produce. This perspective leads me to examine more closely the forms of knowledge produced within plant science research, identifying sample models as a type of material model designed to operate across both field and laboratory settings.

Beyond material models, I also examine data models. While the foundational role of statistics in data modeling is well established (Suppes 2003), this work instead focuses on the non-statistical forms of reasoning involved in selecting biological parameters and mathematical variables, as well as the considerations and dynamics that shape data model and algorithm construction. Finally, I explore data and technologies as the elements that bring together members of data- and technology-intensive, multidisciplinary research projects, enabling collaboration and the production of meaningful scientific outcomes.

Narrative CV

Emma Cavazzoni is a PhD candidate at the Technical University of Munich. Her work focuses on philosophy of plant science and technologies. Specifically, she looked at topics of modelling, collaboration, and data-intensive research.

A Typology of Open & Proprietary Software in Science

Nathanael Sheehan
Technical University Munich, Munich, United Kingdom

Abstract

Since the early days of the internet, software has been composed not only by code, but by names. Developers, users, lawyers, and hobbyists have collectively invented a small lexicon of labels—*open source*, *free software*, *shareware*, *adware*, *careware*—intended to summarise—typically in a single word—a tangle of technical, legal, and social arrangements. Acronyms such as *open* or CC-BY are now comfortably spoken in grant proposals and data management plans. Others, particularly those associated with proprietary or semi-proprietary practices, linger at the margins of academic discourse, poorly defined, under-examined, and often treated as unscientific curiosities rather than objects of study.

This poster takes these names seriously, not as internet slogans or legal shorthand, but as conceptual tools that describe research practices and ways of scientific sharing more broadly. Methodologically, the work is based on a structured literature and document review of contemporary software distribution models, drawing on a heterogeneous corpus that includes software distribution licences, software terms and conditions, governance and contribution guidelines, and relevant academic literature, with particular attention to materials drawn from re3data, GitHub, and Hugging Face.

The resulting analysis is mapped as a form of conceptual cartography, tracing how different software models cluster, overlap, and diverge across legal, technical, and institutional contexts, rather than treating “open” and “closed” as fixed or exhaustive categories. The poster has two modest ambitions: first, to improve software literacy among researchers by offering a map of software models that reflects how software is actually distributed and governed in contemporary science; and second, to refine and, where necessary, introduce software names for emerging models, not in order to police practice, but to render it more visible and intelligible. In doing so, the poster argues that clearer conceptual maps of software distribution are a prerequisite for clearer thinking about openness, responsibility, and infrastructure in open science.

Narrative CV

Nathanael Sheehan is a researcher working at the intersection of philosophy of science, data science, and environmental intelligence. He is part of the Philosophy of Open Science for Diverse Research Environments project, where his work examines how open data, software, and research infrastructures shape inclusion, accountability, and justice in contemporary science, with a particular focus on global health and environmental research.

Opening Agricultural Research: Boundary Organizations, Institutional Mediation, and the Science–Policy Nexus in Ghana.

Joyce Koranteng-Acquah
Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Abstract

This study investigates how agricultural research in Ghana is organised and circulated across scientific, policy, and practice domains. Framed within Science and Technology Studies (STS) and scholarship on the science–policy nexus, it examines how institutional structures shape research governance in Ghana's postcolonial national research system. Conceptually, it approaches boundary organisations as infrastructures through which research coordination occurs, exploring how these arrangements configure relations between knowledge production and use. The research focuses on Ghana's Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) as a boundary organisation operating across government priorities, scientific communities, donor agendas, and agricultural stakeholders. Within this architecture, the Crops Research Institute (CRI) functions as a nested boundary site where national policy directives encounter research programmes, experimental practices, data systems, and extension activities. The study asks how these institutional arrangements mediate what counts as research, whose priorities are accommodated, and which forms of knowledge gain traction across different organisational boundaries.

Methodologically, the research combines historical analysis with ethnographic fieldwork in Ghana's agricultural research sector, including participant observation, interviews with scientists and administrators, and analysis of policy and institutional documents. This approach reconstructs institutional development from the colonial through the postcolonial periods while examining how translation and openness unfold in contemporary practice—through organisational hierarchies that structure authority, resource flows that enable or constrain activities, data infrastructures that render phenomena legible, and accountability mechanisms that determine credibility. The research also interrogates how institutional routines and organisational frameworks enable or constrain research translation in resource-limited contexts. It asks what forms of mediation are required to move knowledge across boundaries between laboratories and fields, between policy documents and farming practices, between international research standards and local agricultural realities. By examining these processes, the study contributes to ongoing inquiries into how research systems in the Global South negotiate tensions among scientific autonomy and state coordination, donor requirements and national priorities, and standardisation and contextual responsiveness.

Narrative CV

Joyce Koranteng-Acquah is a PhD candidate in Sociology at the Technical University of Munich, working in the Department of Science, Technology and Society (STS). Her research explores the science–policy interface in agricultural research and policymaking, focusing on how scientific knowledge is generated, interpreted, and utilised within institutional and policy contexts in Ghana. She has an interdisciplinary background in chemistry, nuclear science, the history of science, and science policy, which informs her sociological approach to research governance and knowledge co-production.Joyce earned an MPhil in the History of Science, Technology and Medicine from the University of Manchester, specialising in science policy and diplomacy, as well as an MPhil and a BSc in Chemistry from the University of Ghana. Before her doctoral studies, she spent more than 10 years at the Ghana Atomic Energy Commission, holding roles in research, project management, and leadership. Notably, she was Deputy Project Manager for the Ghana Radio Astronomy Project, helping convert Ghana's 32m satellite dish into a functioning radio telescope, and later managed science outreach and communication at the Ghana Space Science and Technology Institute.Her experience also includes international policy work, including an internship with the Policy and Global Affairs unit at TAE Technology in the UK, where she supported science-policy strategies related to climate action and net-zero transitions in the UK and EU. She has coordinated multinational training programmes, managed large interdisciplinary research projects, and engaged extensively with policymakers, scientists, and civil society.Through her research and professional work, she aims to promote co-production, research-informed policymaking, and equitable knowledge practices across diverse research settings.

Making Science Public – Emerging Approaches from the TUM Public Science Lab

Desirée Hetzel, Elis Jones
TUM, Munich, Germany

Abstract

In this poster we outline the distinctive approach to public science taken in the recently launched Technical University of Munich Public Science Lab (PSL). The Lab puts public matters of concern at the heart of science, technology, and innovation. It experiments with methods, infrastructures and institutional collaborations. Times of ecological crisis ask for new approaches which bridge diverse ways of knowing. Through different projects at the PSL, we focus on how to expand concepts of expertise through reciprocal approaches of knowledge making in science-society, bringing together scientists and stakeholders outside traditional scientific contexts and academic institutions. How can we understand current challenges from the everyday to scientific fields, including both qualitative and quantitative approaches to evidence-gathering? How can we think with technology in areas of complex social-environmental relations? How can we come into a reflexive mode of doing science together in all phases of research? Using examples of our own work at the PSL, we explore which approaches, formats and methods allow for the inclusion of a broad range of perspectives and the potential emergence of surprises.

Narrative CV

Desirée Hetzel and Elis Jones are Science and Technology scholars interested in bringing public perspectives together with scientific fields to collaboratively address pressing environmental issues. They are postdoctoral researchers at the Department of Science and Technology, School of Social Sciences and Technology. Since 2025, they have shaped the work of the TUM Public Science Lab, focusing on water and diversifying water expertise in areas such as marine science and hydrology. Desirée works at the Chair Anthropology of Science and Technology, Elis at the Chair Philosophy and History of Science and Technology.

Researchers' views on an e-infrastructure landscape: a survey of Swedish researchers' current needs and future dreams for data management

Madeleine Dutoit
Swedish National Data Service, Gothenburg, Sweden

Abstract

The Swedish e-infrastructure landscape is fragmented. E-infrastructure refers to all resources needed for storing, transferring, analysing, calculating, and making digital data available, but also includes the competencies and organisations necessary for research to appropriate the resources and existing data. Despite recommendations from decision-makers, fragmentation is increasing. All entities responsible for research are responsible for documenting the research, including the research data. In parallel, at a national level, actors have assignments and mandates related to research data. Research data services and support to researchers are provided by local, national, and even international actors. Due to the currently unclear national mandates and assignments, expectations on the different actors become difficult to live up to. Swedish researchers are part of a global research community, and therefore take part in a variety of international infrastructures, tools, and contexts. Swedish e-infrastructure needs to be interoperable with available international services that are used by Swedish researchers, not least the services offered through EOSC.
The needs of Swedish researchers, and who is responsible for responding to these, is not clear. The support that researchers need to manage research data, with well-functioning interfaces between local, national, and international actors' infrastructure solutions, varies in quality and implementation between different instances. In 2025, the Swedish National Data Service therefore decided to investigate the researchers' perspectives on the current e-infrastructure for research. Researchers' voices need a prominent role when developing infrastructure supporting current and future open research practices. The project asked how the Swedish e-infrastructure landscape would need to be shaped to better meet researchers' needs in the future. About 40 researchers from different research areas, seniority levels, and higher education institutions were interviewed about their data management practices. What works for them in their daily work with data, and what does not? Could they dream – what would they wish for? The results of the qualitative analysis will be presented. These results contribute to a deeper insight into researchers' data practices and related needs, providing policymakers and responsible actors with important knowledge in future decision-making processes.

Narrative CV

Madeleine Dutoit works as a training coordinator at the Swedish National Data Service. She is currently coordinating researcher interviews in a survey conducted by the Swedish National Data Service. The project asks how the e-infrastructure landscape would have to be developed to better meet researchers' needs in the future. Madeleine has an MS in Information Science from the University of Borås in Sweden, and a Ph.D. in Library and Information Science from Oslo Metropolitan University in Norway. Her main interest is the researchers' perspectives on the open science movement, particularly their conceptualisations of research data and data sharing. In her dissertation, "We exchange data all the time", she interviewed researchers in an interdisciplinary Horizon 2020 project, one of the first European projects to encounter external requirements on how to manage their data. Since researchers increasingly encounter and must respond to data policies in their profession, it is key that we develop deep knowledge of how researchers' data sharing is shaped within the context of open data initiatives.

Responsible Openness? Qualitative researchers' experiences with Open Science and alternative practices of openness

Agata Bochynska, Anette Bringedal Houge, Åshild Lappegard Hauge, Luca Tateo, Sigrun Marie Moss, Guro Brokke Omland
University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

Abstract

One of the many aims of Open Science (OS) is to democratize knowledge through increased openness (UNESCO, 2021). However, even though knowledge is produced in a variety of ways, using a plurality of methods, approaches and epistemologies, OS practices are surprisingly uniform, overlooking the diversity of research. These uniform OS practices predominantly built on one notion of openness, tailored to specific types of knowledge production that stem from quantitative approaches and hypothesis-driven research. For example, 'hard' disciplines (such as physics) are often seen as the reference standard and other ways of knowing are neglected. Additionally, when new OS practices are proposed for different methodologies, these solutions are often still created on the basis of quantitative approaches and may not be (as) meaningful for, for example, qualitative research.

To address this issue, together with qualitative researchers in psychology, criminology, education and meta-research, we have started ReDemOS: The Unintended Undemocratic Consequences of Open Science practices: Rethinking the Democratisation of Knowledge Production. ReDemOS is an interdisciplinary project at the University of Oslo investigating the assumptions and consequences of Open Science movement with a special focus on qualitative methodologies. The project aims to answer three main research questions: (1) How do qualitative researchers in different disciplines understand and respond to the demands for Open Science, and how do they democratise their research? (2) What understandings of democratisation are reflected in recommended practices of Open Science and what unintended consequences may this entail for different methodological traditions, e.g., qualitative and participatory approaches? and (3) What new concepts and models to democratise research practices within or beyond Open Science are needed to encompass a broader body of research?

In this presentation we will introduce the ReDemOS project and present the results from a study on qualitative researchers' understandings of Open Science practices and openness in research more broadly, as well as their perceptions of openness as one of the practices for democratizing research.

The study data have been gathered through an online survey, building on previous approaches (see e.g. Prosser et al., 2024; 2023), where qualitative researchers from various academic disciplines are asked about 1) Definitions, understandings and direct experiences with openness, for example access to and availability of research,

2) Opinions on ethical dilemmas that concern openness in qualitative research, for example when making decisions about data sharing; 3) Input on the existing OS practices and other transparency practices already present in qualitative research. The survey design includes a combination of single- and multiple-choice questions as well as open questions and questions that follow short stories that serve as examples of different practices of openness in research.
The analysis is aimed to better understand the perceptions of openness in qualitative research. We want to highlight the variation in the issues, values, and positions of qualitative researchers related to Open Science. This is particularly valuable for the further debate on what practices should be recommended or required for increased transparency, accessibility, and democracy of research in qualitative approaches.

Narrative CV

Dr Agata Bochynska is a researcher and a research librarian currently working with investigating and implementing open research and reproducibility practices across disciplines at the University of Oslo in Norway. Her academic background is in experimental psychology, cognitive science and linguistics with a special focus on the relationship between language and cognitive abilities in children and adults, including both neurotypical and neurodiverse populations. She completed her PhD in language and linguistics at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Norway in 2015 and a postdoctoral fellowship in psychology at New York University in the USA in 2021. Starting in 2021, she has been working at the Section for Open Research at University of Oslo Library where she has been teaching a variety of courses on open and reproducible research, research data management and sharing, research ethics, and digital research skills. She has been also coordinating various open research events and initiatives at the university, including a ReproducibiliTea Journal Club for early career researchers and national Open Science Lunch webinars. In 2022, together with several other researchers in Norway, she took initiative to start a Norwegian Reproducibility Network (NORRN) and she has been serving on NORRN Steering Board since. In years 2022-2024 she has been coordinating a university-wide project QualiFAIR: Making qualitative and context-sensitive data more FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable). In the project, ran locally at the University of Oslo, she worked with a large team of researchers and research support staff from several different academic disciplines on developing new solutions for qualitative data reuse as well as raising awareness on the challenges and possibilities for more reusable qualitative research. Building on that, and together with researchers in psychology, criminology and education, in 2025 she started in a new project exploring tensions between Open Science and qualitative research methodologies: ReDemOS: The Unintended Undemocratic Consequences of Open Science practices: Rethinking the Democratisation of Knowledge Production. In ReDemOS, the project team is investigating the perceptions, assumptions and possible unintended consequences of the current Open Science movement. Her most recent research interests focus on meta-scientific assessments of research transparency, reusability and reproducibility as well as on investigating assumptions, implementations and consequences of more open and reproducible research.

Open Science, Blockchain, and Network State: An Empirical Study of Decentralized Science (DeSci)

Lidia Yatluk
University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

Abstract

Decentralized science (DeSci) is one of the most recent attempts to build new infrastructures for open science. DeSci initiatives use blockchain technologies, such as distributed databases, tokenomics, and zero-knowledge proofs. Their ambition is to make research more transparent, to simplify reproducibility, to reduce bureaucratic barriers to funding, and to increase inclusivity through wide opportunities for online participation. Current projects include data repositories, longevity research accelerators, experimental peer review systems, and the integration of blockchain technology with laboratory equipment to verify that data was not generated by artificial intelligence.

However, by 2025, many DeSci organizations returned from the cloud and began developing physical locations. They opened offices, created startups, and participated in experimental environments, such as popup cities and network states. This creates a key sociological tension: while DeSci projects are driven by the ambition to create decentralized and radically innovative research infrastructures, the demands of local regulations, institutional expectations, and the need to gain legitimacy with local partners often push them to adopt more traditional organizational formats. This contrast between global digital ideals and localized practical realities raises critical questions about how openness, decentralization, and innovation are negotiated, adapted, or constrained in practice and what survived from the original ambitions.

The goal of this research is to map existing DeSci projects, their aims, practices, and conditions of sustainability. The research combines three studies: analysis of imaginaries presented in whitepapers and other official documents, a comparative case study of four DeSci organizations, and a multisited ethnography of new physical locations of decentralized science.

The research uses the framework of strategic action fields by Fligstein and McAdam, Lefebvre's understanding of space, and the concepts of imaginaries and living labs. The findings are relevant for researchers in biotechnology, practitioners of open science, and activists of academic freedom in authoritarian regimes. The study shows how tools and practices developed within DeSci evolved and what could be borrowed by other organizations and scientific domains.

Narrative CV

Lidia Yatluk holds a BA and MA in Philosophy from Ural Federal University (2007–2013) and an MA in Sociology from the European University at St. Petersburg (2013–2015). She has studied the application of technologies in research and education at Venice International University (2014), during an internship at Institute for Computational Linguistics “A. Zampolli”, CNR-ILC (2015), and at the School of Technology Leaders in Vladivostok (2019). From 2015 to 2023, Lidia led an independent reading club “Lampovo” to popularize philosophy and social sciences in Saint Petersburg, Moscow, and Tbilisi. Between 2018 and 2022, she conducted applied research on the use of virtual and augmented reality in education and training in startup Modum Lab and School of management St. Petersburg State University. In 2019–2020, she worked on the academic entrepreneurship research supported by the Oxford Russia Fellowship. In 2021–2022, she studied authoritarian modernization and higher education reforms at the SEDeC, School of Management Skolkovo. In 2022–2023, she conducted independent research on hidden resistance tactics in Russian wartime academia. Since 2023, Lidia has been pursuing a PhD on decentralized science at the University of Groningen, as part of the SCOOP project on sustainable cooperation. She is involved in the university’s open science community, OSCGroningen, and serves as a junior editor for the YoDA journal on data autonomy. In parallel, she collaborates on projects related to academic freedom with the Center for Independent Studies (CISRus) at George Washington University. This work includes editing a special issue of Laboratorium on academic freedom, studying research and educational organizations in exile, and organizing a conference on academic freedom scheduled for October 2025 in Tashkent. Lidia’s research bridges organizational studies and science and technology studies (STS), focusing on the intersections of open science, academic freedom, and emerging technologies for research and education. Drawing on her combined academic and applied experience, she aims to critically assess current challenges and develop innovative technological approaches to support academic freedom and sustainable research practices.

Building capacity for open research: insights from Stickydot's training programme

Alexandre Torres Ferreira, Michael Creek, Marzia Mazzonetto
Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium

Abstract

Open research requires not only infrastructures and policies but also the development of skills, reflexes, and shared cultures that allow researchers, practitioners, and citizens to engage meaningfully in collaborative knowledge production. This paper examines evidence from participant feedback collected across Stickydot's training workshops on co-creation, science communication, and facilitation skills, delivered across Europe between 2018 and 2025. These workshops were designed to build capacity for responsible and responsive open research, supporting participants from research, policy, civil society, and cultural sectors to develop practical competences in multi-stakeholder dialogue, co-design, and effective communication.

The analysis draws on qualitative and quantitative data gathered through post-training surveys, structured reflection exercises, and follow-up interviews. Across more than 40 workshops involving several hundred participants from diverse backgrounds, three themes emerge. First, participants consistently reported **gains in confidence and skills**: facilitation and dialogue training helped researchers lead discussions more inclusively, while co-creation methods ensured community voices were recognised in research projects. Second, participants stressed the **value of peer learning**: workshops created spaces for individuals from different sectors to exchange perspectives and reflect critically on assumptions. Third, participants expressed a **desire for longer-term support**, highlighting the need to embed training within institutional cultures rather than treating it as a one-off intervention.

Findings show that targeted training can act as a catalyst for embedding open research practices at multiple levels. Co-creation workshops equipped individuals with tools such as participatory mapping and agenda-setting to integrate citizen perspectives into research design and evaluation. Science communication workshops encouraged participants to reframe communication as dialogue and trust rather than one-way dissemination. Facilitation skills training proved particularly impactful, enabling participants to create safe spaces for deliberation and navigate power dynamics across multi-actor groups. Together, these trainings strengthened capacities to make open research more inclusive, reflexive, and socially responsive.

At the same time, feedback data point to **structural challenges**. While individual skills development is necessary, participants underlined that institutional barriers and limited resources for participatory processes continue to hinder widespread adoption of open practices. This reflects broader debates on research culture and underscores

the need for policy frameworks that reward and resource engagement skills alongside scientific excellence.

By situating these insights within current discussions on training and capacity building for open research, the paper argues that workshops of this kind should be seen not only as professional development opportunities but as **micro-laboratories of open research practice**. They provide experiential spaces where openness, inclusivity, and reflexivity are enacted, tested, and refined. The paper concludes with recommendations for integrating capacity-building into open research infrastructures, including sustained mentoring, peer-learning networks, and recognition mechanisms for engagement competences.

This contribution speaks to debates on training, infrastructures, and policy-making for equitable open research. It shows how participatory training formats can bridge gaps between researchers, policymakers, and citizens, while participant feedback provides an essential evidence base for improving the responsiveness and responsibility of open research across Europe.

Narrative CV

Alexandre Torres Ferreira is a Project Manager at Stickydot, where he develops and implements training and facilitation programmes that strengthen open and participatory research. His expertise lies in designing inclusive workshops that bridge the worlds of research, policy, and civil society, with a focus on practical tools for dialogue, co-creation, and evaluation. Alexandre is a biologist with a background in science-society engagement, science communication and science journalism. Since joining Stickydot, he has coordinated and delivered training modules on co-creation and facilitation skills across European projects and beyond, supporting researchers and practitioners in integrating citizen engagement into their work. Michael Creek Michael Creek is head of training and facilitation at Stickydot. His professional focus is on building methods that enable researchers, policymakers, and citizens to collaborate in shaping research agendas and assessing their outcomes. Michael has extensive experience in designing and facilitating training programmes for open research skills. He has led the development and implementation of Stickydot's workshops on facilitation skills and co-creation, helping participants acquire practical methods for creating safe spaces for dialogue, managing group dynamics, and embedding inclusivity in open research practice. His expertise lies in connecting methodological innovation with societal impact, ensuring that engagement contributes to both knowledge production and democratic accountability. Marzia Mazzonetto is founder and CEO of Stickydot, a Brussels-based SME specialising in dialogue and co-creation in research and innovation. With over two decades of experience in science communication and public engagement, she has designed and facilitated numerous co-creation processes across Europe. Her expertise spans responsible research and innovation (RRI), citizen science, and open research policy support. She has served as expert and rapporteur for European Commission Mutual Learning Exercises on citizen science and public engagement, producing evidence-based recommendations for policymakers across the European Research Area. Stickydot is a Brussels-based SME founded in 2018, dedicated to dialogue and co-creation in research and innovation. The company specialises in participatory methodologies that bring together researchers, policymakers, civil society actors, and citizens to shape more open and inclusive research practices. Its training portfolio, developed between 2018 and 2025, covers co-creation,

science communication, and facilitation skills. Stickydot's workshops are designed as experiential learning environments where participants gain practical competences in multi-stakeholder dialogue, collaborative design, and inclusive communication. The company has contributed to numerous Horizon Europe projects, European Commission policy-support actions, and international initiatives, across topics including responsible research and innovation, citizen science, and knowledge valorisation. By combining methodological rigour with creativity, Stickydot fosters safe and inclusive spaces for learning and experimentation. Its trainings act as micro-laboratories of open research practice, helping embed reflexivity, equity, and accountability into research systems.

The possibilities for graphic art to support open research on health data justice

Amelia Fiske, Paula Hepp, Jonas Fischer
Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine, Department of Preclinical Medicine, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

Abstract

Across the globe, structurally marginalized communities have faced historical disadvantage and continue to experience many challenges accessing safe, high-quality health and social care. Recent advances in technologies that need large amounts of health-related data to be built, such as health-focused artificial intelligence, make it more urgent and important to ensure that health-related data are governed and used in the best interests of marginalized communities. These concerns speak to similar debates in the future of open research, specifically in relation to the availability and (re)usability of health-related data. In this talk, we present research on advancing "health data justice," a concept that aims to integrate social justice in health-data systems by explicitly centering the needs of marginalized communities. As part of this, we explore the question of "open science" through methods from the arts and humanities that intentionally pluralize the kinds of knowledge that are engaged in qualitative research, as well as the ways that such knowledges are shared with publics. Situated at the intersection of critical social science, feminist empirical bioethics, and graphic art, we explore the possibilities for integrating graphic art – as method, as communication tool, and as a form of reflection – in order to open research modalities on issues of health, justice, and policy. We are interested in how engagements in collaborative, arts-based approaches can help to multiply the knowledges and experiences that inform health data justice research and practice.

Narrative CV

Dr Amelia Fiske is Senior Researcher at the Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine at the Technical University of Munich, Germany. Her work is situated at the intersection of cultural anthropology, science and technology studies, graphic art, social medicine and bioethics, and environmental humanities. She has over a decade of experience conducting interdisciplinary qualitative and ethnographic research in two key areas: 1) Anthropological and critical social science approaches to bioethics, artificial intelligence, and digital and sociotechnical shifts in knowledge production; 2) Ethnographic attention to issues of social-ecological justice, experiences of toxicity in the context of extraction, participatory research methods, and graphic arts. Paula Hepp is a research associate at the Institute of History and Ethics of Medicine at the Technical University of Munich (TUM). As part of the ADJUST-project, she is investigating health data governance and data practices in the health sector through the lens of critical social science. She previously worked as a scientific officer at the German Federal Ministry of Health and a medical resident in obstetrics and gynecology. She holds a Master's

degree (MSc) in Global Health from Maastricht University and a medical degree (M.D.) from the Ludwig Maximilians University of Munich. Jonas Fischer is an illustrator and graphic designer at the Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine at the Technical University of Munich (TUM) and works as a freelance illustrator, graphic designer, and artist for various regional science and cultural institutions, including the State Department for Archaeology Schleswig-Holstein, the Muthesius University of Fine Arts and Design, and the Municipal Gallery Kiel. As part of the ADJUST-project, he illustrates communication around the concept of health data justice. He also keeps busy with personal projects: creating zines, artist books, exhibitions, and hosting local cultural events. Jonas holds an M.A. in Communication Design from Muthesius University of Fine Arts and Design in Kiel, Germany, where he studied illustration, typography, and book design as well as language and form.

Transparency in Open Science: An Actionable Principle?

Roberto Cruz Romero
Leipzig Universität, Leipzig, Germany

Abstract

The concept of transparency is considered a cornerstone for the open science paradigm and the open access movement despite various discussions on the concept's validity and applicability. To this regard, this contribution reviews a host of official positions from supra-national bodies regarding open science and transparent research ontologies. Following, a contrast is offered regarding these positions with convergent elements in scholarly works that assess distinct aspects of openness and transparency in research systems. As seen in the literature, transparency defines most policy and declarative approaches for greater access and academic accountability, yet the concept is rarely defined or operatively characterised. Hence, the text discusses a framing of transparency to accompany and better understand its guiding role in the open science and open innovation systems and presents the example of open peer-review as a paradigmatic case. Final remarks are presented in order to indicate potential avenues of research, as well as areas of scholarly incidence to expand and deepen the reach of transparency-oriented academic and scientific practices.

Narrative CV

Roberto Cruz Romero is currently a PhD Candidate at the Graduate School Global and Area Studies (GSGAS) at the Philosophy and Social Sciences Faculty at Leipzig University. He is also a researcher at the German Centre for Higher Education and Science Research (DZHW) in Berlin where he works on the intersection of bibliometrics, science studies and policy. His current project, Innovation through Open Access (INNOA), explores the constituting effects of open access publishing in innovation processes, namely, those directly impacting research and development outputs. Through this lens, the project explores the intersection of bibliometrics and patent analysis, offering insights not only into the open science movement, but also on the existing policy frameworks supporting innovation-led research. Roberto has a background in political science, as well as in public policy and good governance, having extensive experience in policy consulting and evaluation from his work with different national and international institutions in Costa Rica. His research interests cut across the social sciences, focusing in institutional development, democratic governance, and comparative analyses. Methodologically, Roberto is interested in developing mixed-method approaches, integrating statistical and other quantitative techniques with in-depth critical analyses of the case studies.

From Platforms to Practices: training and infrastructures for responsive Open and Responsible Research in Europe

Angela Simone[1], Marzia Mazzonetto[2], Benjamin Valcke[2]
[1]Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy. [2]Stickydot srl, Brussels, Belgium

Abstract

Although the principles of Open and Responsible Research & Innovation (ORRI) have been widely endorsed across Europe, initiatives that bring together the community at scale and provide systematic forms of support remain rare. Most efforts to date have been fragmented, discipline-specific, or confined to well-resourced institutions. This leaves unresolved questions about what kinds of infrastructures and capacity-building mechanisms are needed to embed ORRI as a sustainable practice across diverse institutional and territorial settings.

The Horizon Europe project REINFORCING represents the first attempt to establish a genuinely pan-European hub for ORRI. As an EU-funded initiative, it convenes a wide community of researchers, public institutions, and civil society organisations, and provides multiple forms of support including financial instruments, training activities, digital infrastructures, and networking opportunities. Its integrated design offers a valuable opportunity to examine how ORRI principles can be translated into practice at scale.

This paper draws on evidence generated in the project's first three years, with a particular focus on infrastructures and training. At the centre of REINFORCING is the One-Stop Source platform, which integrates cascading grants, training modules, and a growing community of practice. 7 open calls have provided financial support to a broad spectrum of organizations, to start implementing the ORRI approach and to strengthen their ORRI journey. Around 10 training sessions have been delivered, with feedback collected from participants. This combination of activities makes it possible to analyse how different actors engage with ORRI practices, and what forms of support are most effective in enabling their uptake.

The paper addresses three sets of findings:

- Infrastructures: A single EU-level entry point can reduce fragmentation by consolidating dispersed expertise, while at the same time connecting local experimentation with European policy debates.
- Training and capacity building: Feedback from training participants demonstrates that co-designed content is more directly applicable to day-to-day research practices. Insights suggest that responsive training formats enhance both uptake and long-term institutionalisation of ORRI practices.
- Support mechanisms: Cascading grants and targeted calls are effective in addressing bottom-up needs and in enabling cross-regional collaboration. They

provide access to resources for actors who might otherwise be excluded, while also stimulating exchange between territories and disciplines.

By situating these findings within broader debates on the future of open research, the paper contributes empirical evidence on how infrastructures and training mechanisms can be organised at EU scale to promote responsible and socially responsive knowledge ecosystems. In doing so, it advances understanding of how open research can move from principles to practice, and how European-level initiatives can support this transition.

Narrative CV

Angela Simone, PhD, is an expert in Citizen Engagement in Research and Innovation, Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI), and Open Science, with nearly 20 years of experience as both a scholar and practitioner. Since 2011, she has been the Scientific Coordinator of International Initiatives at the Bassetti Foundation, a Milan-based CSO promoting Responsible Innovation for over 30 years. In this role, she designs and leads projects to engage citizens and stakeholders in R&I processes and policies, supporting policymakers, institutions, and other actors in the responsible governance of research and innovation. On behalf of the Foundation, Angela coordinates the Horizon Europe-funded project REINFORCING, which develops a central EU hub of expertise and resources on Open and Responsible Research and Innovation (ORRI). With long-standing involvement in EU-funded projects since FP6, she has designed and led numerous initiatives in science engagement and responsible innovation. She also serves as an independent expert for the European Commission and its agencies (REA, ERCEA). In 2022, she was appointed Jury Expert (Involve–Citizen Science section) for the ERC Public Engagement with Research Award. In 2023, she joined the Core Group drafting the Code of Practice on Citizen Engagement for Knowledge Valorisation, and in 2025, she was among four selected experts supporting the Mutual Learning Exercise on Public Engagement in R&I. Angela also contributes to higher education, having co-designed the Executive Master in Management of Research, Innovation, and Technology at Politecnico di Milano, where she teaches modules on citizen engagement and RRI as an Adjunct Professor. Trained as a biotechnologist, she holds an Advanced Master's in Science Communication and a PhD in Law and New Technologies – Bioethics. During her doctorate, she was a Visiting Fellow in the Science, Technology, and Society Program at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

Transparency in Open Science: An Actionable Principle?

roberto cruz romero
Leipzig Universität, Leipzig, Germany

Abstract

The concept of transparency is considered a cornerstone for the open science paradigm and the open access movement despite various discussions on the concept's validity and applicability. To this regard, this contribution reviews a host of official positions from supra-national bodies regarding open science and transparent research ontologies. Following, a contrast is offered regarding these positions with convergent elements in scholarly works that assess distinct aspects of openness and transparency in research systems. As seen in the literature, transparency defines most policy and declarative approaches for greater access and academic accountability, yet the concept is rarely defined or operatively characterised. Hence, the text discusses a framing of transparency to accompany and better understand its guiding role in the open science and open innovation systems and presents the example of open peer-review as a paradigmatic case. Final remarks are presented in order to indicate potential avenues of research, as well as areas of scholarly incidence to expand and deepen the reach of transparency-oriented academic and scientific practices.

Narrative CV

Roberto Cruz Romero is currently a PhD Candidate at the Graduate School Global and Area Studies (GSGAS) at the Philosophy and Social Sciences Faculty at Leipzig University. He is also a researcher at the German Centre for Higher Education and Science Research (DZHW) in Berlin where he works on the intersection of bibliometrics, science studies and policy. His current project, Innovation through Open Access (INNOA), explores the constituting effects of open access publishing in innovation processes, namely, those directly impacting research and development outputs. Through this lens, the project explores the intersection of bibliometrics and patent analysis, offering insights not only into the open science movement, but also on the existing policy frameworks supporting innovation-led research. Roberto has a background in political science, as well as in public policy and good governance, having extensive experience in policy consulting and evaluation from his work with different national and international institutions in Costa Rica. His research interests cut across the social sciences, focusing in institutional development, democratic governance, and comparative analyses. Methodologically, Roberto is interested in developing mixed-method approaches, integrating statistical and other quantitative techniques with in-depth critical analyses of the case studies.

Who conceals the provenance? Descriptions beyond data.

Alina Mierlus
Autonomous University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

The open research practices are currently supported by solid frameworks, tools, and workflows. With a robust philosophy dedicated to open science, European projects such as Elixir have been providing handbooks for an easier implementation of Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable standards, particularly in life sciences. These standards are adaptable to other *domains,* including social sciences and humanities. However, when it comes to extracting data from archives - public or private -, analyse specific situations that might imply specific ideological biases, and describing determined phenomena in which data is not necessarily available, then tools, workflows, and current standards might not be enough. In scientific experiments, researchers might almost always conceal the provenance since it is part of the scientific discovery process.

In this talk, we propose to analyze cases in which data are drawn from diverse sources: not only recent statistical records but also archival materials documenting school performance in that particular region during the 17th century. Modern computational methods such as time series or semantic similarity might be of great help to extract some meaningful correlations and observations. Fine-tuning a specific language model with the extracted archival data might also give some interesting results. However, our question is more structural: data extracted from the archive shall be considered as mere historical fact or a fiction? I show that this structural difference and the afferent semantic description make the difference to achieve a long-standing, informed policy.

I present this paper to address these limitations that we often find in practice by tackling the problem of provenance from a philosophical perspective. I aim to bridge two different audiences: scholars in philosophy and policymakers on one hand and data stewards on the other hand. The core idea and fundamental aspect of a positive use of provenance is to acknowledge that there are different situations where data is not retrievable, identifiable, or traceable. Whether the records are missing or there is an inability for an essential part of a population to generate new data, accounting for and describing these situations is crucial. In this scenario, capturing this kind of information is of structural importance to derive policies or make data-driven decisions. However, this divide, depending on the epoch, can also be considered the problem of adequacy between theory and practice, natural and synthetic, etc., which might alter our ability to judge and take action. To specify, let us think about isolated populations (such as indigenous ones) that cannot access technology easily, or some immigration fluxes, which barely leave traces when they disappear in the migration process. Perhaps, we should think as well that different populations, depending on age, geography, or social situations, generate data in various ways and do not always

capture “the reality.” The question is, how, from a data steward perspective, can we make rational deliberations in the face of these inconsistencies?

Narrative CV

Alina Mierlus is currently a PhD candidate in the Cognitive Science and Languages program at Autonomous University of Barcelona, where her work focuses on Philosophy of Language, Epistemology and the Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence. Her thesis draws on the post-structuralist tradition and its debates with analytic philosophy, proposing a conceptualization of AI Data. Before starting her academic pathway in philosophy, she studied computer science, helped build software, dedicated hours to teaching and digital literacy, and spent many years contributing to open source. In parallel with her PhD, she obtained a Professional Certificate in Large Language Models and is pursuing an online master program in Data Science.

Equality Impact Assessments in Open Research: A Tool for Change?

Ruth Davies[1], Alice Howarth[2]
[1]King's College London, London, United Kingdom. [2]University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Abstract

The UK Reproducibility Network's Open Research Programme (ORP) (2021-2027), is engaging twenty-four UK universities in accelerating the uptake of high-quality open research practices. The ORP is seeking to build institutional capacities; support reform of reward and recognition mechanisms; promote collaboration and sharing of policies, practices and case studies; and develop a sustainable longer-term model for change - through five projects.
Whilst the teams within the ORP are working towards these outputs and impacts, given the scale of change, we recognised that considering Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) within every ORP project would be essential

Putting EDI values into practice can often be overly bureaucratic, intangible and - for those not familiar with EDI - it can feel like there are insurmountable barriers to action. To address these challenges, the main EDI work of the ORP centred on using Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) as a tool for change. To support the use of EIAs, we recruited, managed and supported EDI Champions for each ORP project, to have locally-embedded expertise within each area.
EIAs are often used as an assessment at a specific point in time, such as before a policy is implemented. We used EIAs to systematically assess, understand and implement actions and mitigations to ensure the ORP is delivering change that is equitable throughout the entire lifetime of the programme.
Taking this approach was not without its challenges, through working with EDI Champions, Project Leads and their teams, it took time to truly embed EDI considerations within the ways of working of each of the projects and their outputs. However, the structure of the EIAs gave us essential framing for discussions and clear requirements for taking actions. It also allowed for us to consider changes over time and be more specific as project outputs were refined.
Ultimately, we have delivered the EDI commitments made by the ORP and gone much further to embed sustainable EDI actions throughout the programme. Using EIAs in this way allowed us to go beyond simple assessments to rooting EDI values throughout the ORP and the change it has showcased.

Narrative CV

By training, Alice is a cancer cell biologist with experience in clinical and molecular pharmacology and in her academic career worked on a number of multi-stakeholder consortium projects with academic and industry partners. Alice turned to open research advocacy through the UKRN's Open Research Programme (ORP) and has developed expertise in evaluation design where she co-developed and deployed the ORP's 2025 survey and position statement (yet to be published) on surveying researchers within the research ecosystem and co-led theory of change work for each of the projects in the programme. Alice has also co-led the EDI project within the programme co-developing Equality Impact Assessments for each of the projects, managing a team of EDI champions and coordinating expertise in the field. In her previous institution she also chaired the Disabled Staff Network, was co-convenor of Libraries, Museums and Galleries EDI Advisory Forum and has led on implementation of institutional strategy in open research including the institution's position statement on open research. She also led the institution's participation in Open Research Week - a successful and well-regarded collaboration, which sees hundreds of attendees globally each year. Outside of her day-job, Alice is also a science communicator, podcast host, magazine deputy editor, event manager and community leader where, in addition to the running of the various associated groups, she serves as the scientific and EDI lead. She has a special interest in mis- and dis-information and has recently concluded a project funded by Royal Society Edinburgh to convene expertise and develop national policy guidance in this field. She has a decade of experience in investigating the impact of alternative medicine and the wellness industry on women and disabled people and how structural bias can leave marginalised people vulnerable to exploitation. Ruth is a policy-maker turned open research advocate. She started her career in the UK Civil Service (CS), before being drawn back into higher education through the opportunity to work on the UKRN’s Open Research Programme (ORP). Within the UKRN ORP, she has co-led the EDI work over the last three years, where amongst other work with the projects, Equality Impact Assessments (EIA) have been used as both tools for engagement and outputs. Throughout the development of the EIAs workshops have been coordinated with EDI experts, connections cultivated with other EDI bodies in the OR/higher education space, and Ruth has ensured (alongside her EDI co-led) that the ORP meets and goes beyond the EDI commitments outlined in its initial Business Case. In addition, she’s been active in Evaluation Design Project within the ORP – initially working on Theories of Change workshops and more recently on the ORP Survey 2025 that sought to understand awareness, use, attitudes and facilitators with regards to open research practices for a stratified sample of colleagues at UK higher education institutions. In addition, she’s also more recently joined the UKRN EDI Advisory Committee, after having been part of institutional EDI committees within the Civil Service and more recently at King’s.

Open Research – Why You Need Academic Libraries to Support You

Alexander Berg-Weiß, Laura Meier, Martin Spenger, Pauline Aldenhövel, Stefan Gebhardt
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany

Abstract

The promise of open research to produce reliable, responsible, and equitable knowledge cannot be realised without effective local support structures that help researchers navigate the complex landscape of data, tools, and methods. Academic libraries are uniquely positioned to provide such support, e.g. by acting as both coordinators and facilitators of tailored research data management (RDM) services. Without this local expertise, researchers face high barriers to FAIR data management, reproducibility, and long-term data availability. The University Library of LMU Munich demonstrates how strategically designed library services can empower researchers to engage actively with open research.

The poster will focus on how academic libraries add value with their tailored research support and RDM services. One example are discipline-specific Software and Data Management Plan templates in the DMP tool RDMO that are designed around the needs of research. Such tools also lower the barrier to adopting open research practices, providing practical guidance for responsible data management and reproducible research. Complementary support formats, such as customised workshops and consultation, ensure that researchers receive training and advice suited to their specific needs, disciplinary conventions, and project requirements.

Equally important is the role of academic libraries in fostering community engagement. Initiatives like rdmuc, dhmuc or RSE Munich chapter bring together researchers, infrastructure experts and institutions to share expertise, experiences, and best practices. These initiatives demonstrate how academic libraries can act as connectors between institutional actors, research groups, and disciplinary communities, creating a culture of open, responsible, and equitable research practice.

All above mentioned services are bundled in Research Data LMU, an institution-wide platform that provides an integrated overview of RDM services, tools and infrastructures across the university. Hosted by the University Library of LMU Munich but collaboratively edited, the platform invites all LMU members to contribute information about their services. This design allows researchers to access tailored, locally relevant information while fostering transparency, collaboration, and equitable access to resources.

The efforts of the University Library of LMU Munich exemplify how academic libraries can operationalise the principles of open research in ways that are reliable, responsible, and equitable. They show that fostering open research is not only about making tools and data accessible, but also about providing the guidance, infrastructure, and collaborative frameworks that allow researchers to use them

effectively. In this way, libraries are not merely service providers – they are essential enablers of open research.

Narrative CV

The authors work at the University Library of LMU Munich in the Digital Services Department. Within the team of RDM Information, they work closely together to offer important infrastructure for researchers and to make research results open. Services in the field of research data management range from training, workshops, consultations as well as support with data management plans and data publications.

Taming the Open Science Transformation of Humanities and Social Sciences

Mateusz Franczak, Gabriela Manista, Maciej Maryl, Marta Świetlik, Cezary Rosiński, Tomasz Umerle, Magdalena Wnuk, Piotr Wciślik
Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Abstract

The **SCIROS** project (*Strategic Collaboration for Interdisciplinary Research on Open Science in the Social Sciences and Humanities)* brings together CHC IBL PAN and six international partners to inquire into how the development of Open Science (OS) is transforming the research landscape in the SSH and how to make sure that SSH have a voice in its future evolution.

Three central themes structure the collaboration in the SCIROS project:

Theory - explores philosophical and ethical underpinnings of OS and how consolidation of OS as a research paradigm reflects the intellectual concerns specific for the SSH.

Infrastructure - investigates how infrastructure reorganizes research in SSH, building on the insight that infrastructure is the central organizational form of OS, but for SSH it constitutes a "boundary object" - an exogenous *modus operandi* adopted to scale up research collaboration.

Practice - focuses on implementation of OS in scholarly practice in SSH across various scales, from the local through the national to the global. It aims to identify case studies of successful strategies uptake of the mandated OS practices and inquire whether these strategies are replicable. It also explores aspects of OS practice specific to SSH, such as multilingualism and its implications for equitable knowledge sharing, or reform of research assessment that would better reflect the diversity of forms and genres of scholarly communication.

SCIROS represents not only a research agenda, but also a **model of international and interdisciplinary collaboration** designed to mutual learning and knowledge co-creation. This model combines a series of **study visits** each culminating in a workshop on one of the project themes, and the **Open Research Notebook**, a communication platform on hypotheses.org, which produces a live record of the ongoing collaboration in the spirit of transparency, accessibility, and community building. Endorsing the diversity of scholarly communication, the platform features to date **20 blog posts and 12 episodes of the Big Open Science Podcast**, synthesising methods, workflows and findings into actionable knowledge and documenting study visits as collaborative sites of knowledge co-creation. It is the space where SCIROS partners work to contribute to a more reliable, responsible, and equitable future of OS.

Narrative CV

The SCIROS project (Strategic Collaboration for Interdisciplinary Research on Open Science in the Social Sciences and Humanities) aims to incubate and consolidate a scholarly network for conducting systemic open science research in the area of Humanities and Social Sciences, though sustaining cooperation between six international partner institutions based on the scholarly mobility, knowledge co-creation and international and local events. The project is a response to the needs of the OS community in the field of SSH, expressed in surveys and interviews conducted by the OPERAS community as part of the following projects: OPERAS-P, DIAMAS, Dariah.lab, PALOMERA and OPERAS-PL. They identified a significant gap in the discourse on open science, i.e. a deficit of empirical reference points for a comprehensive argument demonstrating its usefulness. SCIROS fills this gap by systematizing diverse and fragmented open science research from fields such as economics, bibliometrics, philosophy of science and infrastructure studies to undertake an interdisciplinary reflection on open science and its impact on the scientific community. SCIROS collaboration is structured into three framework areas: theory, practice and infrastructure, and takes advantage of the diverse experiences and competences of project partners. The project fosters mutual learning through study visits and workshops, as well as knowledge co-creation, whose live record in its various forms is presented on the platform sciros.hypotheses.org.

Author Index

Author name	Affiliation name
Berg-Weiß, Alexander	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
Beth, Suzanne	**Érudit, Montréal, Canada**
Bezuidenhout, Louise	**Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Bilgin, Emre	**Sakarya University Faculty of Medicine, Sakarya, Turkey**
Blümel, Clemens	**German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Berlin, Germany**
Bocchi, Federica	**University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark**
Bochynska, Agata	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway. University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Bordignon, Frédérique	**École nationale des ponts et chaussées, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Marne-la-Vallée, France. LISIS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel, CNRS, Marne-la-Vallée, France**
Bossu, Carina	**The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom**
Brück, Janise	**LMU, Munich, Germany**
Byers, Kaylee	**University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada**
Böschen, Stefan	**RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany**
Carrier, Marcus	**TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany**
Carvalho, Ana Sofia	**ICBAS, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal**
Cavazzoni, Emma	**Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Christiansen, Torgeir	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Chue Hong, Neil	**University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom. Software Sustainability Institute, Edinburgh, United Kingdom**
Creek, Michael	**Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium. Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium**
Cruz Romero, Roberto	**Leipzig Universität, Leipzig, Germany**

Author name	Affiliation name
Céspedes, Lucía	**Érudit, Montréal, Canada. École de bibliométrie et sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada**
Davies, Ruth	**King's College London, London, United Kingdom**
Davies, Sarah	**University of Vienna, Austria, Austria**
Davies, Sarah R	**Universität Wien, Wien, Austria**
Delage, Cindy	**JustAI, Evreux, France**
Di Donato, Francesca	**CNR, Pisa, Italy**
Dolai, Ankita	**Digital Research Academy, Munich, Germany**
Doran, Carolina	**European Citizen Science Association (ECSA), Berlin, Germany**
Duine, Maaike	**Open Research Office Berlin, Berlin, Germany**
Dutoit, Madeleine	**Swedish National Data Service, Gothenburg, Sweden**
Déchène, Monica	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München / Munich Science Communication Lab, Munich, Germany**
Egelhofer, Jana	**LMU, Munich, Germany**
Fakak, Reem	**University of Nicosia Medical School, Nicosia, Cyprus**
Farrow, Robert	**The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom**
Ferguson, Lea Maria	**Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany**
Field, Sarahanne	**University of Grongingen, Groningen, Netherlands**
Finger, Vanessa	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
Fischer, Jonas	**Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine, Department of Preclinical Medicine, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Fiske, Amelia	**Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine, Department of Preclinical Medicine, TUM School of Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Fleerackers, Alice	**University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands**

Author name	Affiliation name
Franczak, Mateusz	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Frech, Andreas	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
García, Miguel	**European University Institute, Florence, Italy**
Gebhardt, Stefan	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
Genderjahn, Steffi	**Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany**
Giglia, Elena	**University of Turin, Turin, Italy**
Goble, Carole	**University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom**
Gregory, Kathleen	**Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands. Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Grens, Nikki	**Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, Netherlands**
Grimpe, Barbara	**RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany**
Guenther, Lars	**LMU, Munich, Germany**
Hadad, Shlomit	**Ashkelon Academic College, Ashkelon, Israel**
Hajek, Kim	**Technical University of Munich/Ethical Data Initiative, Munich, Germany. Ethical, Munich, Germany**
Hansen, Roman	**Universität Wien, Wien, Austria**
Hartgerink, Chris	**Liberate Science GmbH, Berlin, Germany**
Hauge, Åshild Lappegard	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Heger, Tina	**Leibniz Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), Berlin, Germany. Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany**
Hepp, Paula	**Institute of History and Ethics in Medicine, Department of Preclinical Medicine, TUM School of**

Author name	Affiliation name
	Medicine and Health, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany
Hetzel, Desirée	**TUM, Munich, Germany**
Hocquet, Alexandre	**Archives Poincaré, Nancy, France**
Hoffman, Andrew	**Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Hossain, Nanno	**Labcom Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh**
Hostler, Thomas	**Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom**
Houge, Anette Bringedal	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Howarth, Alice	**University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom**
Hsing, Pen-Yuan	**University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom**
Hysa, Desantila	**TUM, Munich, Germany**
Ihle, Malika	**LMU Munich, Munich, Germany**
Illari, Phyllis	**University College London, London, United Kingdom**
Jahrmann, Margarete	**University of Applied Arts, Vienna, Austria**
Jamieson, Kayli	**Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada**
Jones, Elis	**TUM, Munich, Germany**
Juckeland, Guido	**Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Dresden, Germany**
Judith, Hartstein	**German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Berlin, Germany**
Kafle, Anushka	**University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom**
Kao, Joyce	**Digital Research Academy, Munich, Germany**
Kar, Shiplu Chandra	**RK Software (Bangladesh) Ltd, Dhaka, Bangladesh**
Katsamakis, Melios Michail	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece**
Katz, Daniel S.	**University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign & Research Software Alliance (ReSA), Urbana, IL, United States**
Kindling, Maxi	**Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany**
Klette, Kirsti	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**

Author name	Affiliation name
Koesten, Laura	**Mohamed Bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria**
Koranteng-Acquah, Joyce	**Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Kulkarni, Gargi	**Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, Netherlands**
Leone, Paolo Vincenzo	**NOVA SBE, Lisbon, Portugal**
Leshoska, Vaska	**Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia**
Lindroos, Hanna	**SLU University Library, Uppsala, Sweden**
Linxweiler, Jan	**Technical University of Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany. de-RSE e.V. – Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany**
Lysova, Tatiana	**University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy**
Löffler, Frank	**Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Jena, Germany. de-RSE e.V. - Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany**
Malaguarnera, Giulia	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece**
Manista, Gabriela	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Mannseicher, Florian	**de-RSE e.V. - Society for Research Software, Berlin, Germany**
Manola, Natalia	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece**
Martinez Lavanchy, Paula	**Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, Netherlands**
Maryl, Maciej	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Mayer, Katja	**University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria**

Author name	Affiliation name
Mazzonetto, Marzia	**Stickydot srl, Brussels, Belgium. Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium. Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium. Stickydot srl, Brussels, Belgium**
Meier, Laura	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
Middleton, Sara Lil	**LMU Munich, Munich, Germany**
Mierlus, Alina	**Autonomous University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain**
Moore, Samuel	**University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom**
Morselli, Francesca	**Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands**
Moss, Sigrun Marie	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Munafò, Marcus	**University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom**
Müller-Karabil, Anika	**Bremen University, Bremen, Germany**
Naumova, Katerina	**Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia**
Nedelkova, Daniela	**Institute of Psychology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, North Macedonia**
Neufend, Maike	**Open Research Office Berlin, Berlin, Germany**
Nijssen, Ties	**Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands**
Noël, Marianne	**LISIS (CNRS, INRAE, Université Gustave Eiffel), Marne-la-Vallée, France**
Omar, Hammam	**Ministry of Health and Population, Cairo, Egypt**
Omland, Guro Brokke	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Ong, Ariel Y.	**Institute of Ophthalmology, University College London, London, United Kingdom**
Pampel, Heinz	**Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany**
Paschetta, Mauro	**Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy**
Penagos, Jaime	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**

Author name	Affiliation name
Pinfield, Stephen	**University of Sheffield, Information School, Sheffield, United Kingdom. Research on Research Institute, London, United Kingdom**
Pitt, Beck	**The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom**
Pizarro, Ana Beatriz	**Evidence Production & Methods Directorate, Cochrane Central Executive Team, London, United Kingdom**
Poszler, Franziska	**University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria. TUM Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Munich, Germany**
Priess-Buchheit, Julia	**Kiel University, Kiel, Germany**
Raban, Daphne	**University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel**
Rafols, Ismael	**INGENIO (CSIC-UPV), Valencia, Spain. CWTS, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Ratcliff, Chelsea	**University of Georgia, Athens, United States**
Reyes Elizondo, Andrea	**Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Rosiński, Cezary	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Roy, Chandra Shekhar	**Data and Design Lab, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh**
Rumee, Sarker T. Ahmed	**CSE Dept, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh**
Rzayeva, Narmin	**Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Delft, Netherlands**
Sahni, Vaibhav	**All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India**
Schneider, Jesper	**Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark**
Schniedermann, Alexander	**German Centre for Higher Education Research and Science Studies, Berlin, Germany**
Schrader, Antonia C.	**Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany**

Author name	Affiliation name
Schönbrodt, Felix	**LMU Munich, Munich, Germany**
Seibold, Heidi	**Digital Research Academy, Munich, Germany**
Serong, Julia	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München / Munich Science Communication Lab, Munich, Germany**
Shah, Safieh	**IGDORE, Karachi, Pakistan**
Shanahan, Hugh	**Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, United Kingdom**
Sheehan, Nathanael	**Ethical Data Initiative, Exeter, United Kingdom. Technical University Munich, Munich, United Kingdom**
Shivananda, Soumya	**Berlin Institute of Health at Charite, Berlin, Germany**
Simone, Angela	**Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy. Giannino Bassetti Foundation, Milan, Italy**
Sindel, Lena	**Ethical Data Initiative, Munich, Germany**
Sipos, Regina	**Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Speck, Robert	**Jülich Research Centre, Jülich, Germany**
Spenger, Martin	**Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany**
Stressmann, Franziska	**European Citizen Science Association (ECSA), Berlin, Germany**
Strubbia, Carla	**Health-RI, Utrecht, Netherlands**
Szybisty, Tereza	**OpenAIRE AMKE, Athens, Greece**
Taberman, Ida	**SLU University Library, Umeå, Sweden**
Tateo, Luca	**University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway**
Teira, David	**UNED, Madrid, Spain**
Tesfaye, Rackeb	**Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada**
Thompson, Jackie	**University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom**
Torres Ferreira, Alexandre	**Stickydot, Brussels, Belgium**
Tran, Quoc Tan	**University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany**

Author name	Affiliation name
Trauttmansdorff, Paul	**Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany. Ethical Data Initiative, Munich, Germany**
Tsiavos, Prodromos	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece**
Tuertscher, Philipp	**VU Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands**
Tzouganatou, Angeliki	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece. OpenAIRE, Attiki, Greece**
Ulpts, Sven	**Centre for Studies in Research and Research Policy, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark**
Umerle, Tomasz	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Valcke, Benjamin	**Stickydot srl, Brussels, Belgium**
van der Weijden, Inge	**Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands**
Vleugel, Mathijs	**Helmholtz Association, Potsdam, Germany**
von Grebmer zu Wolfsthurn, Sarah	**LMU Munich, Munich, Germany**
Von Schomberg, Rene	**RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany**
Vounzoulaki, Elpida	**Diabetes Research Centre, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom**
Waltman, Ludo	**Leiden University, CWTS, Leiden, Netherlands. Research on Research Institute, London, United Kingdom**
Wciślik, Piotr	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Wieber, Frédéric	**Archives Poincaré, Nancy, France**
Williams, Richard	**Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany**
Witteveen, Joeri	**University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark**

Author name	Affiliation name
Wnuk, Magdalena	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**
Wu, Kai-Ti	**European Citizen Science Association (ECSA), Berlin, Germany**
Xenou, Zenia	**OpenAIRE, Athens, Greece**
Yatluk, Lidia	**University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands**
Zhang, Han	**Duke University, Durham, United States**
Ziroldo Lopes, João Vitor	**Hospital das Clínicas, University of São Paulo Medical School, São Paulo, Brazil**
Zänkert, Sandra	**ZB MED - Information Center for Life Sciences, Cologne, Germany**
Świetlik, Marta	**Digital Humanities Centre at the Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland**

This conference and book of abstracts are part of the Phil_OS project hosted at the Technical University of Munich (TUM) and have received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation program [Grant Agreement 101001145]. The event was hosted by the Technical University of Munich (TUM), Chair of Philosophy and History of Science and Technology/ Department of Science, Technology and Society on 4-6 May 2026 in Garching/Munich.

Disclaimer: Views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council. Neither the EU nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Munich, May 2026