

Meeting minutes of the National Associations (NAs) Meeting on Open Access, Open Data, and Research Data Management
30 January 2020 - 11:00-16:30 (CEST)
Zurich, Switzerland

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions / Objectives of the Meeting (10 min)
2. "From publications to data: how to set up a comprehensive scientific information policy", Laurent Romary - Inria, France (20 + 10 min discussion)
3. Open Access, Open Data, and Research Data Management: Initiatives and Practices in Different European Countries (10 + 10 min discussion for each represented country)
 - a) France - Pierre Paradinas, CNAM and SIF (10 + 10 min discussion)
 - b) Germany - Kai Rannenber, Goethe University and GI (10 + 10 min discussion)
 - c) Netherlands - Dick Bulterman, CWI, VU Amsterdam and IPN-ICT (10 + 10 min discussion)
4. Lunch Break (45 min)
5. Open Access, Open Data, and Research Data Management: Initiatives and Practices in Different European Countries (continued)
 - d) Switzerland - Martin Glinz, University of Zurich, SIRA (10 + 10 min discussion)
 - e) UK - Edmund Robinson, Queen Mary University and CPHC (10 + 10 min discussion)
6. "FAIR data and the European Open Science Cloud", Per Öster - CSC, Finland (20 + 10 min discussion)
7. Coffee Break (15 min)
8. Conclusions and the Way Ahead (30 min)
9. Discussing Joint Activities and Future Plans/Meetings (40 min)
 - a) Initiative on Research Evaluation from previous NA meeting
 - b) Next joint activities

11:00 - 11:15 Welcome and Introductions / Objectives of the Meeting

Enrico Nardelli, President of Informatics Europe (IE), welcomed the participants and opened the meeting. The meeting aimed to discuss aspects of the current developments in Open Data and Open Science (OS) that are of direct relevance to Informatics, such as:

- What are data policies, data repositories, FAIR data and the European Open Science Cloud, and should we care about them?
- What are the Informatics research and technology challenges in current Open Data initiatives?
- Who is going to educate all those data science and data management specialists?
- What is and what should be the level of involvement of the Informatics community in these developments?

Pekka Orponen, member of the Board of IE and responsible for the relations with academic associations, presented the agenda which revolved around two main items: an overview of OS and Research Data Management (RDM) initiatives and best practices in the European Informatics community, and a discussion of possible joint initiatives, coordination, exchange of information. Pekka also introduced some research questions to be addressed:

- *What are the concerns and opportunities related to OS and RDM from an Informatics point of view?*
- *Where does the Informatics community position itself with respect to the big movement towards "OPEN"?*
- *Is there something that the Informatics community specifically could or should contribute in this area? (Especially since as computer scientists we have a comparative technical advantage and technical expertise).*
- *How could IE and the NAs collaborate and contribute to this?*

The agenda was adopted with no further changes.

Participants to the meeting made their presentations available and these are now accessible on the IE website at: <https://www.informatics-europe.org/community/national-associations.html>.

11:15 - 11:45 "From publications to data: how to set up a comprehensive scientific information policy", Laurent Romary - Inria, France

The presentation illustrated the different components and the main associated issues of a scientific information policy. A scientific information policy should not be reduced to an OS policy but aspects of sustainability, assessment, impact, transfer, plagiarism, etc. should all be taken into account. While implementing a vision, a scientific information policy also needs to deal with a number of pressing issues such as the journal crisis, the heterogeneity of data in Computer Science (CS) and aspects of digital

sovereignty, as well as specificities of the CS field (i.e. Computer savvy people, multidisciplinary, subscription costs and Article processing charges (APC) issues).

Laurent then presented the scientific information policy of Inria, the French national research institute for the digital sciences. Inria has implemented a deposit mandate on all scientific publications, mandating its researchers to deposit their publications in the French national repository (HAL). The baseline policy also defines reuse conditions, quality control, digital properties, dissemination and exploitation of results, and measures to enforce the deposit mandate. With regards to APCs, Inria scientific information policy relies on a central budget for APCs (management of a national dashboard of costs and journals) and forbids hybrid open access fees. The corresponding expense information is uploaded in OpenAPC, and the presenter encouraged every institution to follow the same approach.

The presentation concluded recalling some of the challenges when thinking about scientific information policies in the long-term: develop a scientific information culture among researchers, provide a clear vision when developing a scientific information policy, invest in public and independent infrastructures, and never neglect staffing to accompany the infrastructures. The final comment was a warning to not give away data to commercial companies.

The discussion that followed touched on different aspects of the presentation. Questions were raised on the possible additional burdens that the Inria policy could place on its researchers in terms of bureaucracy and additional administrative duties. Laurent was able to report that they try to minimize any administrative costs; also feedback from researchers are positive, and most seem to be happy with the current repositories.

Participants also quickly discussed scientific social networks such as ResearchGate and identified several negative characteristics, including its unsustainability, and the mere business and commercial purposes of the network.

The discussion then focused on [Plan S](#), the European initiative for open-access science publishing. Laurent reported some of the general criticisms to Plan S. It was too quickly conceived, and it is inadequate to some disciplines, e.g. social sciences. Moreover, Plan S was very ambiguous and too ambitious for the timeframe; as a consequence not so many institutions rushed to take part in Plan S. A participant reported how some other disciplines resisted and expressed clear concerns to Plan S, while the Informatics community seems not to have taken a clear position. The opportunity for IE and the Informatics community to take a stance on Plan S was therefore briefly mentioned, but this was postponed to later discussion.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/From_publications_to_data_LRomy.pdf

11:45 - 12:45 Open Access, Open Data, and Research Data Management: Initiatives and Practices in Different European Countries

This part was devoted to concise presentations on the situation of “OPEN” in different European countries. Each presentation was followed by a brief question and answer session, and discussion.

France - Pierre Paradinas, CNAM and SIF

The presentation reported on some initiatives and practices in France related to open access (OA), open data, and RDM. Three specific initiatives were reported.

The Jussieu Call for Open Science and bibliodiversity was drafted by a French group of researchers and scientific publishing professionals working together in the Open Access and Public Scientific Publishing task forces of BSN (Digital Scientific Library). The Call is aimed at scientific communities, professional associations, and research institutions to promote a scientific publishing OA model fostering bibliodiversity and innovation without involving the exclusive transfer of journal subscription monies to APC payments.

A National Plan for Open Science was issued in 2018. The plan is centered around three key commitments: generalise OA to publications, structure research data and make it available through OA, and be part of a sustainable European and international OS dynamic. To deploy the national plan a permanent [Committee for Open Science \(CoSO\)](#), a Steering committee for Open Science ([Copil SO](#)), and a series of colleges and groups specialized on specific topics which bring together experts in the field have been created.

The [Open Science Monitor](#) aims to measure progress in open access to scientific resources: publications, data and code. Its first edition issued in 2019 by the Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Innovation focuses on scientific publications. The observatory tracks really what is happening in the field.

Overall, these ongoing structured initiatives are showing that there is a defined political vision as well as a real growth of open data in the academic world in France. The presentation concluded with the illustration of some data and figures on OA publications in France. For computer and information sciences about 50% of the publications are open.

In the brief discussion that followed the presentation, participants asked for few more details on the work and role of the CoSO Committee, and on some legal aspects of copyrights and publications. The discussion moved then on the differences between Informatics and the other disciplines in terms of OPEN, as other science fields (such as Mathematics and Medicine) are more advanced and provide open access to a much larger number of publications; one reason for this is the existence of established publications repositories in these fields. Discussion also touched on the possible differences within the CS subdomain. While there

was agreement on the likely existence of such differences, there are unfortunately no figures available on that in France.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/OPEN_France_PParadinas.pdf

Germany - Kai Rannenber, Goethe University and GI

The presentation focused on the emergence of the [national research data infrastructures \(NFDI\)](#) whose aim is to systematically manage scientific and research data, provide long-term data storage, backup and accessibility, and network the data both nationally and internationally. GI, in collaboration with other German Universities, recently launched the NFDI 4 CS & CS 4 NFDI. It is an initiative to identify, define and deploy services to store complex domain specific data objects from the specific variety of domains from CS and its applications, and to realize the FAIR principles across the board. The initiative will provide a variety of data types, standards for metadata and data exchange, protocols for interoperability (rights and roles), processes for outreach and inclusion, agreement on standards, assessment and evolution, and dissemination. The related findings and results in terms of methods, processes and way of communication and service will be offered to other domains beyond CS as well.

The presentation highlighted some of the cross-cutting concerns of the initiative, including security and privacy, usability, distribution, liaison and connectivity, persistent storage, and evolution. There are no solutions designed to satisfactorily address all these issues. Solutions and alternatives shall be investigated at European level, with other institutions sharing the same issues. In this direction, GI is seeking international collaboration, cooperation and forum for discussion. RDM is more than a national issue. International partners are needed for cooperation and liaison, as well as service providers are needed. Connections to the EOSC are also under investigation.

The discussion revolved around the case and opportunity for national and international/European research data infrastructure and platforms. Currently, there is no single national platform in Germany yet, as opposed to what exists for France, and the German government is financing the creation of several national platforms, one for each science area/discipline. Participants questioned if this is the right approach, or if multinational/ international platforms and repositories would represent a more efficient solution. Such platforms should then be financed instead. The necessity of physical proximity of domain was mentioned as the main reason for national level repository. Nevertheless, the participants agreed on the need to coordinate the national initiatives and developing cooperation. There was also a clear agreement that computer scientists need to be more involved on the technical level when platform and repositories for other disciplines are being developed. *It was mentioned that IE could be the promoter of a public statement in this direction, calling for closer cooperation on the design on national and international repositories, and a stronger involvement of computer science expertise in defining the needed infrastructure.*

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/OPEN_Germany_MGoedicke_KRannenberg.pdf

Netherlands - Dick Bulterman, CWI, VU Amsterdam and IPN-ICT

The talk presented the view of the NWO, the Dutch National Science Foundation. It started comparing the perspective and definition on Open Science of the European Union (EU) and the one of NWO, and highlighted how the latter is more pragmatic and ambitious. For both the NWO and the EU the idea behind OS is “As open as possible, as closed as necessary”. Due consideration is given to aspects such as privacy, public security, ethical limitations, property rights and commercial interests. To make data open for the use by other researchers’ research it should become *findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable* (FAIR).

The presentation also explored the different forms of OA publication, and compared the number of publications with a hybrid, pure gold, green only model, and not OA, both in the Netherlands and in the EU. The Dutch government has set the objective that by 2020 100% of scientific publications funded with public money must be published in OA form.

The presentation continued sharing the experience of the Journal of Data Science, an interdisciplinary journal that addresses the development that data has become a crucial factor for a large number and variety of scientific fields. Among its main characteristics, the journal is OA, authors receive first decision within weeks rather than months, reviews are open and attributed, all submitted papers are made available as pre-prints before the reviewing starts, data sets used/referenced are openly available and freely reusable. The presentation reported the journal as a positive experience because of the full OA policy and faster responses for the authors, but the lack of an impact factor is still a limit.

The presentation moved to introducing the [cOAlition S](#) and the [Plan S](#). Plan S is an initiative for OA publishing that was launched in September 2018. The plan is supported by cOAlition S, an international consortium of research funders, including NWO. Plan S requires that, from 2021, scientific publications that result from research funded by public grants must be published in compliant OA journals or platforms. Plan S should be applicable to all NWO calls that are published from 1 January 2021 onwards, but it is unclear if this can be arranged by that date.

The discussion started with a remark on the NWO definition of OS. The definition is very broad. It also states that research methodologies should be made available for use and reuse across disciplines, which may be controversial to accept and implement. Some participants also expressed criticism of Plan S and in particular on the possibility that it could be really implemented over the very tight deadline announced.

The rest of the discussion dealt with the OA journal model. Participants recognized that OA is of high importance for the thriving of interactive communities, but OA journals still present critical issues that

need to be addressed. In particular, participants agreed that the low quality of the submissions is currently a fundamental flaw of OA journals and it is a key issue to address. Requiring researchers to publish in OA journals may be tricky at this point. The overall perception that OA is less prestigious should be reverted, a first possible solution would be to ask researchers to put a copy in an open repository hosted by the institute. Lastly, it was recalled that OA entails also to take a decision on how to deal with copyright issues, and this should not be neglected.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/OPEN_Netherlands_DBulterman.pdf

12:45 - 13:30 Lunch Break

13:30 - 14:15 Open Access, Open Data, and Research Data Management: Initiatives and Practices in Different European Countries (continued)

Switzerland - Martin Glinz, University of Zurich and SIRA

The presentation explored OA and OS in Switzerland, both from the perspective of the national strategy and the one of the universities. The main players dealing with OA in Switzerland are the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), the State secretariat for education, research & innovation (SERI), and the Swiss universities (Rectors' conference Swiss Unis & ETHs).

A National OA strategy was published in January 2017 and its vision is pretty clear: by 2024, all scholarly publication activity in Switzerland should be OA – all scholarly publications funded by public money must be freely accessible on the Internet. Similarly, researchers who receive funding from the SNSF are obliged to make the resulting publications available to third parties free of charge. An action plan was also launched in February 2018. It defines OA policies, coordinates and bundles resources, explores alternate forms of publishing, communicates and raises awareness about OA, seeks regulatory support, and establishes national monitoring. Contract negotiations with the main publishers (Elsevier, Springer Nature, Wiley) are currently in progress.

A national strategy for OS is currently under development. It is elaborated by Swiss universities and based on the FAIR principle: make all information *findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable*. The OS strategy is published but not yet approved, and the Action plan shall be launched later in 2020.

Swiss universities operate OA repositories. At the University of Zurich (UZH), the UZH open access repository went online in 2006 and in 2007 the UZH launched an electronic journal library with full text access to many journals. Since 2008 all publications at UZH must be entered into the open access repository (with some restrictions).

The discussion touched on different aspects of the presentations. First, a question was asked on potential difficulties that universities may encounter in complying with the national plan. The universities are on board with the plan and there should not be any major obstacles. Convincing publishers will be the most difficult step, but the plan itself may offer universities some additional leverage to negotiate. Participants from Germany mentioned that the German rectors' conference is also negotiating with publishers, and with some publishers it is encountering some resistance and difficulties. Other questions were asked on the OS initiative. This is just getting started and the discussions are led by a working group of rectors of Swiss universities, triggered by the federal government; the universities will then elaborate upon it. Lastly, it was asked how the Swiss initiatives relate to the European ones, and the presenter reported that the Swiss don't seem to refer to European initiatives and there does not seem to be any coordination at the moment.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/OPEN_Switzerland_MGlinz.pdf

UK - Edmund Robinson, Queen Mary University and CPHC

The talk started by remarking that the UK is currently in a state of flux and it is not easy to predict the developments of the near future. Nevertheless, there is a fair amount of information about priorities and direction of travel. The presentation brought more of a governmental perspective on the issues of OS and OA. It reported that the current Minister of State for Universities, Science, Research and Innovation is very supportive of OA to research. As a matter of fact, as of January 2019, over half of the publications arising from publicly funded research can now be read online and without payment, one year after publication.

With regards to OA, relevant policies for researchers in the UK are the OA policy of the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), the Research Councils UK (RCUK) Policy on Open Access, and the open access requirements for research outputs submitted to the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Researchers funded by the RCUK/UKRI should adhere to the following OA policy: either the journal provides, via its own website, immediate and unrestricted access to the final published version of the paper and allows immediate deposit of the final published version in other repositories without restriction on re-use, or the journal consents to deposit of the final accepted manuscript in any repository, without restriction on non-commercial re-use and within a defined period. Moreover, any journal or conference paper to be submitted to REF must be OA (exception for papers published early in the cycle).

Then the presentation dealt with open data. In 2016 a Concordat on Open Data was published promoting the need to move to open research data. An Open Research Data Task Force was also created. It published a report (July 2018-Jan 2019) highlighting their support to Open Data as well as the needs for a lot of people to get their act together. This goes now to the civil servants at DfE and BEIS, and a team will be charged with the implementation. While there appears to be a clear agreement around the need for

Open Data and Open Data policies, both BEIS and UKRI are currently busy, so one possibility is that the UK government would decide to outsource its solution.

The presentation concluded with a brief introduction of the [Open Data Institute](#), an independent non-profit company that works with companies and governments to build an open, trustworthy data ecosystem, where people can make better decisions using data and manage any harmful impacts.

The discussion briefly refers again to Plan S. Although UKRI has joined cOAlition S, Plan S did not feature heavily in the report of the Open Research Data Task Force as well in the general discussion in the UK. Overall, there seems to be no clarity on Plan S implementation at the moment in the UK. The discussion then moved on the need for cooperation on legislation initiatives across Europe and how to best design policy measures on OPEN. Participants agreed that the involvement of the community is fundamental.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/OPEN_UK_ERobinson.pdf

14:15 - 14:45 "FAIR data and the European Open Science Cloud", Per Öster - CSC, Finland

The presentation started with introducing the CSC – IT Center for Science. It is a Finnish center of expertise in information technology owned by the Finnish state and higher education institutions. It provides internationally high-quality ICT expert services for higher education institutions, research institutes, culture, public administration and enterprises to help them thrive and benefit society at large.

The talk presented in more detail the [European Open Science Cloud \(EOSC\)](#). This is a EU programme to provide a virtual environment with open and seamless services for storage, management, analysis and re-use of research data, across borders and scientific disciplines by federating existing scientific data infrastructures. CSC is a partner in the EOSC-Hub project (2018-2020) that creates the integration and management system of the future EOSC. The hub will deliver a catalogue of services, software and data from the EGI Federation, EUDAT CDI, INDIGO-DataCloud and major research e-infrastructures. This integration and management system (the hub) builds on mature processes, policies and tools from the leading European federated e-Infrastructures to cover the whole life-cycle of services, from planning to delivery.

The presentation retraced national and European projects that have been going on, such as PRACE, EGI, EUDAT, OpenAIRE, etc., which were mainly consolidations of national projects, organization coming together. These initiatives formed the base for the actual EOSC. The EOSC is governed by three constituent bodies, the Executive Board, a body tasked to ensure implementation and accountability, the Governance Board, gathering representatives from the EU Member States (MS) and the Commission to ensure effective supervision of the implementation, and the Stakeholder Forum, organised by the EOSC Secretariat, formed by a group of representatives from a wider range of actors, tasked to provide input and recommendations through events and online consultation mechanisms.

The presentation then focused on one of the working groups of the EOSC, EOSC FAIR. The 'FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship' were published in 2016 to provide guidelines to improve the *findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reuse* of digital assets. The 2019 EOSC FAIR working group work plan envisaged an investigation and an ongoing report on FAIR practice, a Persistent Identifier (PID) policy for EOSC, FAIR metrics assessing datasets and other digital objects, a repository certification guidelines for supporting FAIR research outputs, and an EOSC interoperability framework.

The last part of the presentation dealt with Research data management (RDM). It referred to issues linked to the research data life cycle, data generation, data archiving, field measurements, data domains, and unique / persistent identifiers (DOI, PID). It also presented the [EUDAT Collaborative Data Infrastructure \(CDI\)](#), a European e-infrastructure of integrated data services and resources to support research. The CDI consists of a network of nodes that provide a range of services for upload and retrieval, identification and description, movement, replication and data integrity, plus some additional services that are needed to operate the infrastructure. The establishment of the EUDAT CDI was timed with the one of the EOSC.

In the discussion, participants asked some questions on the structure and activities of the EOSC. In particular, a question was raised with regards to the EOSC timeline, and it was clarified that there is no deadline for EOSC operations, as the infrastructure, as well as the working groups, will keep evolving as science evolves. Also, a key step would be the creation of a legal entity for the EOSC, which can keep leading the work, provided that EU MS are convinced. It was asked whether there is any plan for certification mechanism of measurement data; this is partly handled by the EOSC Portal that could give some kind of assurance of what can be expected of certain services, also in terms of costs and reliability, but the EOSC Portal is only just starting.

Continuing from previous discussion, the issue of national and international infrastructure was tackled again. Participants discussed how the EU initiative(s) relates to what MS already do, how can the MS be convinced to replace what they have already done with this European initiative, and the possibility of a federation approach at policy level. A European infrastructure may be the right way ahead, but this will heavily depend on the effective contribution of the MS and their acceptance. Some conflicts between MS and EU exist.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/FAIR_Data_EOSC_POster.pdf

14:45 - 15:00 Coffee Break

15:00 - 15:45 Conclusions and the Way Ahead

Participants reflected on the common themes and matters that emerged from the different presentations and the discussion.

A long part of the discussion revolved again around [Plan S](#), participants shared their views and opinions. There was a certain consensus that the concept of Plan is reasonable and shareable but its implementation is not convincing and it leaves room to a lot of criticism and worries. It was recalled how Plan S is clearly the result of a compromise: some of the guidelines are extremely technical and detailed, while other parts are particularly vague. Some participants highlighted that it is difficult to apply Plan S as practical guidance since many aspects are too abstract and still vague. Moreover, participants agreed the current timeline is at the moment the most critical issue, as it is unrealistic. Some participants mentioned that the entire Informatics community should be more vigilant regarding Plan S, especially because it would impact national research funding.

In a second section of the discussion, participants reflected on the different national initiatives that are taking place in the field of “OPEN”. The presentations showed that there are many initiatives going on at the moment but it seems that these are not informing each other and risk being inconsistent on a larger (pan-)European level. Participants from some countries noted that in their national Informatics community little attention and little work was drawn to OPEN. As it seems that there are some examples of good practices in some countries, these could be promoted more largely, and some common models could be identified. Participants agreed that all this would need a much deeper discussion. Nevertheless, the common concern emerged that if there is no consolidated European view on the importance of OPEN, national independent and uncoordinated initiatives will continue to proliferate.

In the continuing discussion, participants focused on some issues specifically related to OA. They agreed that the issue is particularly complex because of the large number of actors and stakeholders involved, which have different expectations and objectives. In many countries national funding institutions and funding agencies are pressuring towards OA. On the other hand, publishers are expressing some resistance and the negotiations are taking time. The discussion expressed then the difficulties of striking a balance between the roles and influences of the funding institutions, publishers, and the more general OA movement. Participants also discussed again the different route to OA and the OA models; there was an agreement that the hybrid model should not represent a benchmark.

Looking at the way ahead, it was acknowledged that while we are facing similar issues, different solutions are often applied. It was also clear that rather than focusing on implementation, which would be more local, the Informatics community needs to focus its efforts more on the policy level. The question is a combination of technical and political issues, and it is necessary to clearly distinguish and separate OA, open data and open data infrastructure, and open science. *Following from this, the participants decided to prepare two brief statements:*

1. Enrico Nardelli, Dick Bulterman, Laurent Romary, and Pekka Orponen will prepare a short statement on Open Access

2. Pekka Orponen, Gregor Engels, Ernesto Pimentel, Michael Goedicke (to be contacted by Kai Rannenber) and an additional French representative (Laurent Romary may have some suggestions) will prepare a short statement on Open Science.

15:45 - 16:30 Discussing Joint Activities and Future Plans/Meetings

IE Initiatives and Ongoing Activities, and Next Joint Activities

Enrico Nardelli reported on some IE projects and activities which are also of particular interest for the National Informatics Associations.

IE has recently made available [The Informatics Higher Education Data Portal](#), a project created with the goal of providing the Informatics academic community and other stakeholders a complete and reliable picture of the state of Informatics higher education in Europe. The portal presents a wealth of fundamental data including statistics of students enrolled, gender distribution, statistics of degrees awarded, a list of subjects identifying Informatics programs, and a list of universities and academic units offering Informatics higher education in different European countries. IE has also published the report: [Informatics Education in Europe: Institutions, Degrees, Students, Positions, Salaries - Key Data 2013-2018](#).

IE is participating in the Erasmus+ Project [Ethics4EU – Ethical Computer Science Education for Europe](#). The goal of the project is to create open source, widely used concrete resources for the teaching of Ethics in CS higher education programmes across Europe. In particular, IE has launched an Online Survey for the Report on Existing Competencies in the Teaching of Ethics in CS Faculties and will organize an event on the 7 May 2020 in Zurich.

IE is part of the [Informatics for All Coalition](#), funded together with ACM Europe Council and CEPIS. The Coalition has organized a [Workshop](#) on 17 March in Brussels with DG Education to discuss strategy and possible actions and the renewal of Digital Education Action Plan. The Coalition has also recently published the [Rome declaration](#) on the importance of Informatics Education and is currently collecting signatures.

Slides of the presentation are available for download at: https://www.informatics-europe.org/images/national-associations/IE_Activities_ENardelli.pdf

Initiative on Research Evaluation from previous NA meeting

Gerald Steinhardt, Norbert Ritter, and Gregor Engels, presented the first draft of a Joint Statement on Research Evaluation in Informatics. Participants made some comments and minor amendments to the text. The Joint Statement will be circulated among the NAs for signatures in the coming weeks.

List of National Associations participating to the meeting:

- Informatik Austria (Austria)
- SIF (France)
- GI - Gesellschaft für Informatik (Germany)
- Fakultätentag Informatik (Germany)
- GRIN (Italy)
- IPN (Netherlands)
- CODDII (Spain)
- SCIE (Spain)
- SIRA (Switzerland)
- UKRC (UK)
- CPHC (UK)

List of participants:

1. Maria Francesca Costabile - University of Bari, GRIN - Gruppo di Informatica
2. Antonio Bahamonde - University of Oviedo, SCIE - Sociedad Científica Informática de España
3. Ernesto Pimentel - University of Malaga, CODDII - Conferencia de Directores y Decanos de Ingeniería Informática
4. Pierre Paradinas - Conservatoire national des arts et métiers (CNAM), SIF - Société informatique de France
5. Dick Bulterman - CWI and VU Amsterdam, IPN-ICT - Research Platform Netherlands
6. Martin Glinz - University of Zurich, SIRA - Swiss Informatics Research Association
7. Jie Xu - University of Leeds, UKCRC - UK Computing Research Committee
8. Edmund Robinson - Queen Mary University of London, CPHC - Council of Professors and Heads of Computing
9. Gerald Steinhardt - Vienna University of Technology, Informatik Austria
10. Norbert Ritter - University of Hamburg, Fakultätentag Informatik
11. Kai Rannenberg - Goethe University Frankfurt, GI - Gesellschaft für Informatik
12. Laurent Romary - Inria - National Institute for Research in Digital Science and Technology
13. Per Öster - CSC - IT Center for Science
14. Pekka Orponen - Aalto University School of Science, Informatics Europe
15. Kim Mens - Université catholique de Louvain, Informatics Europe
16. Viorel Negru, West University of Timisoara
17. Ismael García Varea - University of Castilla-La Mancha, CODDII - Conferencia de Directores y Decanos de Ingeniería Informática
18. Enrico Nardelli - University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Informatics Europe
19. Gregor Engels - University of Paderborn, Informatics Europe

20. Cristina Pereira - Informatics Europe
21. Matteo Barberi - Informatics Europe
22. Svetlana Tikhonenko - Informatics Europe