

PALOMERA Interview

Date: 30.08.2023

General information

Stakeholder type (multiple choice, delete irrelevant):

- research performing organisations

Country the interview is focused on: Sweden

Language of the interview conducted: Swedish

Interviewer

I would like to ask a general question first. Could you tell us a bit about your background, how you in your professional role have come into contact with open access and open science in general? What is your perspective on these things?

Interviewee

Of course. My name is [anonymous], as I said, and I'm employed by [anonymous] and have been since 2012 when I started as head of media acquisition. For a few years, I was responsible for the purchase of media resources together with my colleagues. There was a lot of focus on the shift to acquiring e-books instead of previously mainly print books. Given that it was the transition from printed materials to electronic materials, it was a kind of journey we made there and we developed a new media policy focusing on a more user-driven acquisition and the transition to electronic material both for books and also journals, that we had already been working on for several years. When it comes to e-books the idea of switching to e-books was a big issue in many libraries and also among users. Many protested in the beginning. It was still within a paywall and we had to pay expensive money to publishers to provide access. There were also quite a lot of complicated contractual restrictions on use, and we couldn't continue with interlibrary loans between libraries because the material was locked up.

Since 2016, I have been involved in the strategic work of developing larger services for research data at [anonymized]. Research data had been around for many years, but it was not something that was talked about so much or handled as correctly as it should be according to new needs and requirements. So I got the assignment to start looking at this. It was quite new in Sweden

then. There wasn't much talk about research data management and open access to research data. I almost think it was more topical in Finland because I found that when I went to Helsinki in 2016 and heard about the Finnish Open Science work. It was quite new then to bring back the discussion to Sweden. I was around Europe in various contexts. Tried to bring things home to [anonymous] but also to Sweden nationally. So since 2017, I think I have been active within the Swedish Association of Higher Education Institutions (SUHF) in a national working group focusing on research data. But we work more broadly than that. Because we try to pave the way for what we see is needed. But the focus has been mainly on research data for our working group. No one was really working on these issues at the time, so we wanted to try to take a lead on it and support the HEIs in their work. This was before the Swedish Research Council received its formal government assignment. And KB hadn't received its government commission either then, for publications or journals. So I've been involved and have seen the development in Sweden for several years, both at [anonymous] but also a little bit at the national level. In the national working group for research data, we've had a survey every year that we have sent out to the higher education institutions, where we've asked the institutions questions like: How is it going? Do you have a data management plan? How do you handle research data? Do you have a research data policy? At the time, it was research data that was the main focus. But then this year, we focused the survey on our national roadmap for open science that we wrote in 2021, and also a guide with proposals for the implementation of this roadmap that we wrote in 2022. It's still very general and focus mainly on publications and research data. We try to cover a broader spectrum of open science without going into the missions of the specific agencies, but thinking more from the overall perspective of the institution.

Interviewer

An important thing that we try to document but also compare and understand is how different countries and institutions differ in how they work on the first versions of these policy documents, but also the permanent processes or working groups that may also exist to update them at regular intervals. It was interesting to hear what you have done regarding research data, with an annual survey that goes out to get a feel for the situation.

Interviewee

When we started the research data group within SUHF, we also started a group within SUHF called the Open Science coordination group. It actually consists of the chairs of the relevant working groups that may be affected by what is going on in open science in that area, and the research data group is a subgroup of that group. Now there is also a working group for open learning resources and a group for the merit system. Small working groups are formed within SUHF based on needs and where it is seen that something is needed. We saw quite early on that



there was little coordination between HEIs in research data issues. It was in some aspects difficult for HEIs to know what to do and get started. The work with open access to publications had been going on for some time and worked quite well over the years. There were resources for that. There was a structure for it. It was not so controversial anymore.

But we saw with research data that there were really no processes for it. There was very little knowledge and it was perhaps only when the Swedish National Data Service started its, how shall we say, its education campaign and visited all the Swedish HEI that the knowledge and interest for research data management was raised. It was almost like a popular movement when I think about it now. They started to educate the universities through the libraries and archives. They made us think about the management of research data and perhaps talk more about open access to research data in a way that happened perhaps a little earlier before the government proposals and the whole process started in a wider sense.

So somewhere along the line, higher education institutions were educated at the library level but we also needed to increase the knowledge and importance of it at a university management level. That is why we wrote the roadmap for open science. At the time, the level of maturity at the universities was quite low and it was really only possible to focus on open access to publications and research data, which was not mature at all at the time. To start talking about books or open educational resources or other free resources was not really on the agenda. So that's why we focused quite a lot on research data. We made recommendations through SUHF where we encouraged higher education institutions to start working with it. We wrote a recommendation around 2018, now I don't remember the years exactly, that you should write a data management plan, for example. And then came a recommendation where we encouraged higher education institutions to draw up a research data policy. Now a research data policy feels a bit passé. Now it feels like an open science policy is what we want higher education institutions to develop. Most HEIs had an open access policy for journals, but nothing for research data or other resources. There we also see quite high immaturity among higher education institutions nationally.

Interviewer

To clarify, what is the distribution of work in the coordination of open science between SUHF and KB? Is it the case that there are working groups within both, is there cooperation, or how does this distribution look like?



Interviewee

Yes, it is a bit complicated. There are working groups within SUHF and it is based on SUHF's work. KB has its internal working groups and now that they are writing national guidelines for open science on behalf of the government, there is a reference group that has been created where actors from different areas have been brought in as reference persons. But I see this as a temporary working group, and the same is true of the Swedish Research Council, which has an assignment to coordinate open access to research data. They also have some national working groups where they have invited actors, someone from SUHF, someone from KB, perhaps someone from the Swedish National Data Service etc.. I was in Helsinki around 2016 when a report on open science was published in connection with a major conference at that time. I remember that I was the only one from Sweden together with another person, so there was no representative from a government agency at that time. And we looked at the presentations from Finland and we saw how it started to build up with DMP Tuuli for data management plans. We had some contact with some people who also worked with research data. In any case, many of us felt that there was a very good structure in Finland. There was good thinking and that it was centralized and that it was very good that someone pointed with their whole hand and said now we will do this and we will do this and develop it. That was the feeling we got and that's not the case in Sweden. Perhaps we thought when we wrote our recommendations within SUHF that we would be able to inspire greater cooperation, better coordination, but it feels like Sweden has no ... I was a bit naïve perhaps, but I thought it would be easier for everyone if you coordinate and can cooperate and use the same guidelines or similar policy documents. It will be better for the researchers when they recognize themselves regardless of the university. But it has also been very difficult to coordinate. KB has a mission. VR has a mission. SUHF has a mission to support the universities as an organization. But you have to be very diplomatic because SUHF represents all the higher education institutions and it can be sensitive at times. How much you should step out and say sharply that this is how it should be or this is how it is. It's a difficult balancing act, and then there are also the research infrastructures that sometimes work individually, in isolation, because they may have been forced to do so before, and worked on their own infrastructures, their own administrative structures. They sometimes have very well-functioning contexts in the small world. But the problem now is when we try to look at the entire landscape and put together all the publications in the entire research process and make it sort of correct from start to finish, so to speak. So it has been a challenge with the working groups. It is difficult because we are such a small country and there are quite a few people who still work with these issues at an overall level. But it is difficult to achieve coordination and it is easy to think that KB is responsible for the books, the Swedish Research Council is responsible for research data, and in between there are the higher education institutions that have to wait for someone else to do something. And yes, that's where SUHF comes in, so we wrote the "Roadmap for Open Science" where we thought that we might be able to help higher education institutions a little more and encourage them both to educate the university management that these are important issues, you have to start looking at the issues, because we saw that it was really library issues in many cases when it was the libraries that were involved and perhaps the researchers who



encountered this in their own work, but the university management? This was a non-issue for many of the universities for a long time. So somewhere along the line we thought that if we create the roadmap, and as an aid create the guide with proposals for measures and also time them, we might be able to put some pressure on them in a good way, but also help the HEIs with self-help. And then we changed our questionnaire so that from this year onwards, we ask the questions based on these proposals that we have specified in the guidance and asked about how well they have fulfilled them or whether they have not started, partially started, fulfilled or don't know. It is a very simple survey, it certainly has many shortcomings from a survey perspective, but we just wanted to get something out quickly to take the temperature at the higher education institutions to see how they are doing. But regarding books ... It was the same thing there, that we could not really. We couldn't really approach that area, it was immature. Even more immature perhaps than research data actually.

Interviewer

Yes, research data may not be as much of a direct cost issue as books. Of course, there are a lot of indirect costs involved in working with research data, but with books it's very much about investing quite large sums of money if you want to invest more in it. It's a rather different issue when it comes to books.

Interviewee

Yes, exactly. [anonymized] still has a university publishing house that has grown anyway. But making it attractive to researchers is another matter.

Interviewer

I would now like to ask a very fundamental question. We have tried to formulate a definition of what we mean by an academic book. We have now formulated it as follows: scientific peer-reviewed books that include monographs, book chapters, edited collections, critical editions, and other long scientific works. Now, we've tried to cover what we mean by academic books and where we emphasize peer review as the main thing that distinguishes an academic book from everything else. But how do you think this fits in with your own perception when dealing with e-books and such, how it fits in with the picture you have of what an academic book is?

Interviewee



Yes, spontaneously I think it makes sense. An ordinary book is reviewed in some way, maybe reviewed by an editor at a publishing house and passes through some sort of needles eye. But maybe not based on that kind of criteria. Somewhere I think that an academic book has to have a different weight in itself based on the content and what the facts are based on. I think that peer review is important, that it is included, and that it is actually perhaps also clear and visible who the reviewer is.

Interviewer

In Finland we have developed a system where there is a national stamp that can be applied for if a work meets certain criteria for review. But it's not like there is an international standard for peer-review.

Interviewee

It sounds very exciting to be able to have such a quality label.

Interviewee

I got an association when we talked. We will have an event now through SUHF in September where we will go through the survey a little bit. We have had a series of lectures on the theme of open science linked to SUHF's work. So in the spring we had a webinar on emeritus evaluation. We have had a webinar on the old survey that we had for five years and did some digging into it and also talked a bit about the roadmap. And then there was a webinar on CoARA and this fall there will be an event focused on EOSC. So we have a few different themes and so on, and then we noticed that when we invited people to this, we wanted to invite people at the university's strategic level, but at several of the seminars, there was an overwhelming majority of librarians. And nothing bad about librarians, but it was kind of the wrong target group, they were not the ones we wanted to reach. We wanted to reach more people in university management positions or research representatives in some way. This was very difficult. For this event now in September, we discovered that something has happened because suddenly there were vice-rectors and rectors from different universities, professors. It was a completely different type of roles and titles who signed up, and we felt that wow, now something is starting to happen, this



is the type of people we wanted to reach. So we wanted to ask some of them if they would be willing to sit on a panel and talk about the roadmap and the survey. How this could be relevant to the university. Or maybe it is not relevant. Because there were some HEIs that didn't want to fill in the survey and we can't force them, but we also know why and the internal processes. Because this is like lifting a big stone and there is a black hole underneath as I understand it. But then it turns out that no one wanted to accept and I felt like, isn't it part of your job to be able to answer these things? And then I realized that no one wants to talk about this. It seems that open science is difficult, and it seems that few people want to stick their necks out and say anything at all. And I don't really understand why it's sensitive or why it's difficult or what the reason for that is. I think that this is the trend we are heading towards. And there's nothing controversial about the fact that we're going to do it, we know we're going to do it, then it's more about how it's going to be done.

Interviewer

I would say that in Finland we have the same challenge: we have a centralized national coordination that has working groups that are completely open for anyone to join. It is free for anyone to come to these various meetings and then from there it may break out into some smaller groups if there is some specialized thing that needs to be sorted out. But the majority are probably also librarians and information specialists. But it's completely open to participate and influence and be involved, so that also makes it a bit difficult to make decisions that have sufficient weight behind them. If there aren't enough people who can push things forward other than at lower levels, it's difficult to escalate from there to the actual decisions when it comes to funding and so on.

Interviewer

I think there is a problem here, there are a lot of competent people who can, who want to, but they don't always have the mandates and that is the difficulty now. I think in general in Sweden, it is still the case that higher education institutions have taken care of themselves quite a lot. They are individual authorities, they have never liked being told to do something by someone else. There may have been a certain amount of competition between the authorities. I think if they had been profit-making companies, they would have had to rethink how they use resources. It would perhaps be good if you could privatize the universities and force them into a different organizational approach. Because I think that as far as the financing issue is concerned, many university or college administrations could be made more efficient. Most are built on structures that have existed for 40, 50 or 60 years, and there is a difference between the very large universities and the very small ones, of course. They have different organizational structures, they have different ease and difficulty. But the issue of funding to drive open access, whether it's about books or publishing datasets or whatever. I still think it would be possible to

make fairly large resource changes within the university administration to free up resources for other things. But it also seems that it is difficult to find someone who really works in this way. I would like to have a lecture from a university that has made such a journey where they have changed their organization, adjusted to adapt the entire organization for these purposes to be able to meet new needs around everything that is linked to open science and funding models. But I haven't found anyone and I don't know if anyone would be ready. It feels like nobody is ready to take it...I think that's almost one of the biggest challenges in this whole process of the transition to open science. That there are still very old-fashioned organizational structures, perhaps also partly old-fashioned working methods. Because as well as making demands on the researcher, the researcher needs to adapt his or her way of working now for new needs linked to open science, new ways of working, new other types of system support services to be able to publish. Nevertheless, the university or higher education institution's organization must adapt with its administrative support. We are not quite there yet. I think that this discussion is missing somewhere. Because it's easy to point the finger at the publishers. They have to do this and that and the publishers are stupid. And we have to protect our rights as universities. We have to stand up for things. That's great. But in these years, 4-6 years, I haven't seen any major changes internally, and that's why many services and support within the universities can't be fully used for the researchers because they have different departments. You run your own business. It is difficult to collaborate. The library has often been responsible for being the central hub for publication support or journal purchases or paying APCs and such things. There are lots of different models and so on, and it has worked quite well, but maybe it can work with books too. But for research data it definitely doesn't work. And I think maybe even within journals and books... And also when this spills over into other areas as well. You have to have more competencies in place. Legal expertise is required, as is IT expertise. You may need a librarian, an archivist, and above all the researchers who will work on projects or create. There are so many different skills needed in this context.

Interviewer

Then you have to be early, that's what makes it different from many other things, to have things sorted out before you start.

Interviewee

It's so big...I remember maybe 20 years ago when we sat at conferences. There was a lot about journals and the transition to electronic journals. It was really big. So you can play with the idea and say that in 15 years, we will be able to look back then at ... what do we see then in terms of research data, open access? Will we have solved everything by then? Or will we still be spinning around...? Because we tend to run into the same problems. In Sweden at least, I am absolutely convinced that it is the inability to coordinate that is one of the biggest challenges. And to take

responsibility. Because it is very easy to think that yes, but it is the authority that is responsible for that and then nothing happens. Or it goes slowly.

Interviewer

KB has a national open access strategy, a policy document, whatever we call it, which has a certain year when everything should be open in terms of journal articles and so on. How does this policy affect your work? Has it been important in shaping your own policies?

Interviewee

No. We've had an open access policy since 2015 I think... I'm not sure of the year here, but we were quite early with an OA policy for publications. Then it sort of was just there. But it wasn't really an active policy, we were working on it. Then when SUHF came up with this recommendation on research data policy, it was easy for me because I'm part of the research data group and my manager is part of the open science group, so it was kind of easy for us, and our vice-chancellor was also connected to SUHF. So it was quite easy for us then, we were the first higher education institution in Sweden to write a research data policy in 2018, and then there were a few higher education institutions that followed suit, and then we felt quite early on. Or I thought we should have an open science policy, but the time was not really right. Then came the pandemic and so on. But when we published the roadmap with these eight recommendations. Then it somehow became very logical that now when I wrote our open science policy and adapt it to SUHF's eight recommendations. Because then we thought that, on the one hand, we have the SUHF's recommendations, which still carry quite a lot of weight, even if they are not mandatory or compulsory, they are still a recommendation that carries some weight. It was linked to the government assignments for both VR, KB and SUHF. There was a connection to the research bill. Then to break this down to [anonymized] and then we made it quite simple for us. We adapted the eight recommendations to six objectives for [anonymized], so in principle they are roughly the same as the eight recommendations, but we merged two of them so there were six objectives. So if you read them, you will recognize that the text is very similar. It was quite easy to develop, because we or I were asked to write a draft. That draft went around to various working groups within the library, those connected to open science. So it was the research data group, the OA group and some other functions, and then the administration in the research data team took it to them to look at it. Others were also sent out to some researchers that we had had as a researcher reference group when we worked with For a few years, we worked in project form to introduce support for research data at [anonymized], so they reused the researchers, and then it went on to the university management, to the pro-rector and to the management office. It came back, slightly adjusted but not much, so the policy was fairly straightforward, and for the policy I wrote a plan with a division of responsibilities where we tried to indicate at a strategic level a little more of this university's



responsibility and the researcher's responsibility. We tried to keep it at a very general level. There were requests from the functions that work operationally. They wanted detailed checklists and templates for everything. No, that won't work, but we have to maintain a strategic overall level. Then you have to add checklists. So this became a division of responsibilities that was also quite good. And it is also somewhat based on the guidance from SUHF where we have these proposed measures. So we have tried to set a good example there as a higher education institution. To show the other higher education institutions in Sweden that the roadmap and guidance can be used. They save work, that there is something already formulated. You can reuse quite a lot of it, make small adjustments for your own organization and then get it to grow and develop. It was completely uncomplicated to get the policy and plan through. What is more difficult is what we have now. We have formed a research reference group for open science at [anonymized] where we have representatives from the areas where we try to meet twice a semester. There we try to raise these points that are in the policy and in the plan in order to have the opportunity to create dialogues with the core activities. We don't know how much they represent the core business or how much stays with them. But it's our formal way of reaching out and having a formal structure for the work. So work is now underway to ensure that this is implemented, that the university actually does what we have said we will do and that we also provide the support and services needed for the purpose. And there is a little bit in place and a lot more to do. But it feels like our policy has been almost the easiest. I know that many other universities find it much more difficult to even get a policy in place, but it becomes quite natural then. The criticism in Sweden is that SUHF wrote the roadmap, a limited roadmap, but still a roadmap for open science. Then came the government assignment to KB to write a national policy and then you can feel that it is a bit late. This should have been done a few years ago now. Now you are very late on the ball. But the advantage of this policy, which should be ready in January, I think, or at least at the turn of the year, has been postponed. The advantage of it is that it can address perhaps books, open learning resources, citizen science, the bits that we don't really mention at all. The SUHF document, because it was not the time to mention those things, it was quite sufficient with what we had. The risk is that there will be a lot of policy documents that are not connected, that it will be the Swedish Research Council and KB and then SUHF, the higher education institutions and research funders. It can also be a lot of things. But we have talked about this and hopefully there are wise people who one day look at the landscape. What is already in place? What can we refer to? What does not exist? What is not mentioned? What needs to be highlighted? So I think that it can be very good on the policy document side if you bring together what has already been done. But what needs to be done now and is perhaps missing. But that won't help. The coordination issue really, because the coordination issue is something else. But I think that a major benefit is that when we at [anonymized] we mention publications that cover what has been produced at the university. But it is clear that on the book front we do not have the same insight there as we have on the journal side and perhaps it is rather slow on the research data side as well. But at least it has more developed support there.



Interviewer

How do you feel that you at [anonymized] are able to influence? Regarding these national policies and guidelines. Do you feel that it is easy to have your voice heard there or is it more of a closed process?

Interviewee

It really depends...

Interviewer

With books and such, there have been some investigations and such, but so far there has been no concrete policy ...

Interviewee

My manager and our principal are members of this reference group for the KB's work on the national policy. From what I hear, a lot is going on. I know that the Swedish Research Council has a rather closed working culture. They try to provide information, but they are often criticized for the fact that there is very little insight, very little opportunity to influence, and it is very slow. They have a lot of internal processes so, a heavy structure. KB is a bit lighter in that context, but I think they also work on quite a lot from their own authority and I don't know about Finland, but in Sweden there is a great love of reports and investigations.

Interviewer

Yes, there is a lot of writing here too.

Interviewee

At [anonymized], perhaps also thanks to our principal and my manager, we have had a kind of working policy of not doing a lot of investigations, not investigating everything for too long, too much, but actually identifying and then trying to take a few steps forward. And it might not be perfect, but it will be some steps forward and that's what's difficult with this national policy. This is my personal opinion, but I think that in a way it should not be very difficult to make a national

policy. It could be done quite quickly if you look at what you have in place, what is missing and so on. The risk now when you are working for such a long time and are very careful and you want to include and you want to be sure that you don't miss anything is the risk that you get tangled up in your reasoning rather than in concrete measures to change the way forward. There is a risk that it will be a paper product that then can't be worked on properly because everyone already agrees in some way. And it just becomes another policy document. So I think we would need concrete examples of practical activities where, as I thought, this somewhat unexplored field of open access to books. To start talking more about it, to show examples. Identify activities that actually work with these issues and may not have perfect structures, but something is going on. I think that's what is needed now. I don't think we need more policy documents now. There is a lot of good stuff written. You can just pick and copy and reuse, I think.

Interviewer

This is what this project is also trying to promote, that there should be more cooperation. Get inspiration from different institutions to update or create their policies from ready-made bricks.

Interviewee

I am part of a Task Force group linked to EOSC, upskilling countries to EOSC. Our ambition there was to look at policies to see how we could coordinate the countries and so on. Then that task was moved to EOSC centrally, so it's probably others who have worked on it since then. But I started to think in general, even though EOSC is research data, when I was looking at different contexts, because I was at a meeting with the EUA that had written down the open science policy and open science plan, and that's what I looked at when we wrote the roadmap for SUHF. I had some idea that the EUA has already written something and it felt relevant and correct. Nothing to question. Why should we do something completely different within SUHF, which is still part of the EUA? If we were to try to reuse it, and adapt it to Swedish conditions. And it felt important to be able to point out that this is already out there in the world, it is not something we invented ourselves. We are part of the chain here. And then I tried to suggest it in some context when looking at the higher education institutions in Europe, so how could we coordinate? Because it's the same thing there, that we have lots of different policies in different contexts. Many say more or less the same thing. Would it not be possible to coordinate much more? And perhaps also in connection with UNESCO coming out with its open science policy or recommendation? It should be possible to incorporate much more into what already exists and just improve it in some way. But it's somewhere ... I haven't understood what it is that makes ... There are people in each function in the working group and it depends very much on the person sitting in the context whether it will succeed. I've experienced that it's me or no. It's not the idea, the thought or the resources, but sometimes it's actually as simple as dependent on the person sitting in a position.



Interviewer

Something that I think is quite unique for Sweden is the Kriterium portal. It's not a publisher, but a place where different publishers can publish books open access even if they don't otherwise do so. Do you have any insight into how it works administratively?

Interviewee

No, not so much actually. Something that came to my mind is that Open Access Week has been around for many years, and I've wondered why it retains very much the same focus, and I feel that it must now become Open Science Week in some way so that these other aspects can be highlighted. We have pretty narrow perspectives and thinking on these issues. So somewhere. You could help the process forward. The risk is that a researcher works with his or her, now I'm just generalizing. But I can imagine that many employed researchers at the university. They are completely uninterested in whether we have a policy or whether SUHF has a policy, I think it is very important. But they don't really care. I buy that, I understand that. But that there should be a link between the policy and what can actually be used and which can be of interest to the researcher and which can be important to the researcher. in the researcher's everyday life, I understand the researchers' work environment. It will be somewhere there. And then it doesn't matter. They don't have to be involved in anything related to open science or even understand all the parts. They just need to know how to do the right thing to be able to conduct their research in a correct way according to the norms and practices that apply today. It should not be a political position that you publish this or that, but it should really be a natural part of the process. So simple that if I can publish myself openly, I do, and if I can't do that, I have to limit myself in some way and then I do this. But it doesn't matter, I've known that since 2016, because we had no services and support at all for research data management. And now there is a research data team if there are people who can curate research data. There is a tool to write a data management plan. There is a certain storage area for research data that is also paid for by the library as subsidized. There are some repositories. There is still support and services in place, but if they are not used, they are not relevant anyway.

Interviewer

That's a bit tricky. It's not about transforming something that's closed or behind a paywall, it's about a completely different process. It's about actually being involved from the beginning. And actually, it requires quite a commitment from the researcher to actually want to do it. Either by force, or by inner motivation.



Interviewee

That's just the way it is. It's what you said before, doing the right thing from the start. I'm thinking of the new generation of researchers who may then have the opportunity to structure their work in a different way or work with their research in a different way. It will be much easier for that person to choose publication routes. But it is still the merit system that can put a spanner in the works.

Interviewer

Now it seems that there are also some real new winds, via CoARA and so on. But now, for another half generation, it will probably be top publications in exclusive journals that are more important than open data. One more question regarding your university's policy with these six goals. It is at quite a high level if we compare with how other organizations have formulated their documents. There is no mention of publication types and there is not, for example, too much about specific licenses or funding or like they have more ... what shall we say, such things that are at a much lower level of detail that this is more of a strategic document. How do you see that? There may be a risk if you have several documents floating around that if you have different library pages or whatever there are more detailed instructions: What should you do if you have a journal article? Or what should you do if you have research data and so on? How do you think we should try to prevent or manage this balance between taking a policy document and then doing things that are in line with what is at a lower level? Do you have any insight into that? It's something I've thought about for a long time, but how much should be included in these policy documents really?

Interviewee

We had a project. It was an idea I had a few years ago that I tried to pursue and I got a hearing and started it. But then it took a different form. We had an idea that 'the researcher's path' through the research process and that we could create some kind of orientation map on the web so that it would be easier to follow the researcher's path in the research process and be able to offer the right support services at the right time. That project had to be renamed because the university management felt that there is not just one researcher's path. You can't mark the researcher's path. Because there are very many paths, and we understood that. The idea was that they wanted to include all services and support regardless of departmental affiliation to make it easy for researchers. And such a project was started where we tried to create an information entrance, a funnel, where researchers could go and find these different types of



services and support linked to where they are in the process and it was ethics, application or review or whether there was a need for storage space or writing data management panels and such things. Somewhere along the line, now that you've said it, I think that you might actually present the support service with some kind of link to the policy and plan. That it actually ... now I have a new idea.

Interviewer

It's tricky, you want them to be coherent, but you don't want to include everything in a policy that the principal has to sign. If you have to change some OA models or some other detail, you don't always want to go with a new update and ask for it to be signed because of a small detail. So that's something I think I need to look at a little more closely because there are a few different ways it's been resolved.

Interviewee

That is the difficulty, and we have encountered it. One of our difficulties has been the organizational structure, that different departments are responsible for different parts of the information. Because what the library is responsible for is easy to adjust. But then there is information from other departments. It could be legal functions, it could be the research support departments, or it could be IT. Then we have this traditional divided structure that each department for itself, each area for itself. But for researchers who want to find the service, it doesn't matter whether it's the IT department, the library or you just want to know. They just want an answer to their question.

Interviewer

That's actually true. Something that I think there is room for improvement. For my own institution, I have been thinking about how to instruct on making data management plans, applications for research ethics review and also GDPR aspects. It has previously been on 3-4 different pages, but it is perhaps better to have one process, one place that would take care of it instead of researchers jumping around in four different places for pretty much the same thing.

Interviewee



We talked a lot about this when we had this Researcher's Path, which is not called the Researcher's Path, but there was also a risk that administrative staff from the administration wanted to tell so much about something and perhaps tell too much. Because it was also the case that what is the essence of the information? Not everything is as relevant for researchers to know as for a librarian curating metadata. Researchers don't need to have all those details. Maybe even if the librarian wants to give that information away because they want to educate or they want to teach. And it's getting more and more difficult because the information touches so many different competencies and it has to be narrowed down and it has to be adapted in some way to many different needs, so it's a challenge. Our website is definitely in need of improvement. Open science creates enormous challenges, not only for the individual researcher, I think, but also for the organizational structure.

