

Open Science Talk No. 59 (2025): The Lorraine Model: a computer-generated transcript ¹

00:00:08 Per Pippin Aspaas

You are listening to Open Science Talk, the podcast about open science. My name is Per Pippin Aspaas. Today I am joined by Nicolas Fressengeas and Jean-François Lutz, both from the University of Lorraine in France. So welcome to the podcast, Nicolas! First of all, what is the Université de Lorraine?

00:00:36 Nicolas Fressengeas

Université de Lorraine is a university that has 12 years of existence and it's issued from a merge of four universities in the Lorraine region, and it encompasses two big cities: one is Nancy, where Jean-François works, and the other one is Metz, where I work. And well, what's interesting also is to know the size. We have 60,000 students, roughly, and 7000 people working in the university, among which – half of them are researchers.

00:01:17 PPA

Right. And you are a Professor of Physics and also, you have the position as Vice-President for Open Science at the University of Lorraine. What does that imply?

00:01:31 NF

Well, what does that imply? In fact, I am the Vice-President for Open Science, but also for the Digital Policy, and also for Data. So this is, you know, this is a position which is quite unique in France because I have the opportunity to have the whole sets of, you know, going from the digital policy to publishing. And this – well, I must say this is quite large – but that allows to make all this kind of work interact together because, in order to do open science we need data and we need, you know, digital work. So that's quite interesting to do that. So what does it imply? It implies driving the university policy towards open science. So well, I wouldn't say 'managing', but working with Jean-François and other managing people – and Jean-François is managing people. The idea is to work with a large team. So I'm working mainly with Jean-François – with the people from the libraries. But that's not the only people we need to make open science work. I also have to work with people from the IT Department – I work with them for the digital policy, but I also work with them for open science, and we also work with the Research Department, the Law Department – and that's quite broad and comprising many people.

00:03:14 PPA

Yes, many pillars, it seems, in making this work. And one of those pillars is you, Jean-François. You work as Head of Research Support at the University Library. What is research support? How many are you, and what do you generally do in your department?

¹ This is a computer-generated transcript of the podcast episode Open Science Talk No. 59 (2025): <https://doi.org/10.7557/19.8074>. The automated transcript has been proofread by Kristin Vieweger and Per Pippin Aspaas. It is included here for the sake of Universal Design and improved discoverability by full-text search engines.

00:03:36 Jean-François Lutz

Yes, this department in the University Library has now 13 people, but we started much lower. Ten years ago, we were only five. So, this shows the growth of our activities, which is really linked to the development of open science in France and in the university. And we are working on all open science topics, but historically the first core work was around theses and dissertations, which is the type of documents that libraries in universities have always dealt with, but then it expanded progressively to the open repository of the university, research data management, bibliometrics, persistent identifiers, and scientific publishing. So now we have a whole range of services that we are running and yes, it requires some workforce and also a very good relationship with the political level: the governance of the university. And this is working quite smoothly at the moment. And as Nicolas stressed, the library is maybe the most active department on open science, but we are really working hand in hand with other departments.

We have a unit that specialises in Humanities and Social Sciences support, so we are – they are working with HSS laboratories and researchers. IT is, of course, quite paramount when we are talking about code and software, for instance. The Research Department – quality control department for bibliometrics, for instance. So there is a whole team that needs coordination, and this is also one of my roles at the moment.

00:05:32 PPA

Right, and this requires a little bit of resources, I guess – to make all this happen. And traditionally – university libraries, they buy books, they buy journals, and nowadays, of course, electronic books and electronic journals is important. And that costs a lot – that's part of the debate in science today, that these costs are a problem. But now you have done something a little bit special. You have cancelled a few of the deals, a couple of the 'big deals'. Could you tell a little bit about that?

00:06:11 JFL

Yes, I can talk a bit about the first cancellation that we did in 2017 – it was the 'Springer deal'. And then Nicolas can talk more about the Wiley cancellation, which is more recent. In 2017, the context – and the two cancellations were quite different in terms of process, decision making process, and context – in 2017, we had quite an important budget cut. And it was the end of the year, a decision had to be made quite rapidly, and it was made between the library director and the president of the university, the director of the university. We had no time to make a broad consultation with the community, we had no tools to make an impact study, to know what would be the impact. So it was a bit of a cancellation 'in the blind', I would say.

But what is interesting is that the level of the budget cut was not as high as the subscription for the Springer deal. The Springer deal was like €160,000 per year and we had something like €25,000 left. And at that moment, we proposed to the university governance to use that money in order to support open science initiatives. And this was very well welcomed, this proposition. And then it was the first time that we decided to use savings to support open science. So at that time we supported, for instance, Open Edition, Érudit in Quebec, Open Library of Humanities, SciPost, and maybe a couple of more initiatives. So this was the first cancellation.

We did a survey two years after that, in 2020, for the whole researchers' population to give us feedback on this cancellation: what was the impact for them? It was very interesting to see that we had 400 answers to that survey, and for 70% of the respondents, there was absolutely no impact. So they were users of these Springer journals and they said to us that: 'you cancelled it, but we managed

to do our research otherwise'. So this was the first lesson for us. And the second one was that they – many of them – said to us: 'OK, you did that. It was a bit rapid, a bit rough, we would like you to have a more broad consultation if this situation happens again'. So we learned this lesson, and then maybe Nicolas can talk about how we proceeded with the Wiley subscription deal.

00:09:05 NF

Yeah, the Wiley subscription was of course done very differently, but it began with something very rapid. The idea – at the beginning, there was the French negotiating team, Consortium Couperin, who negotiated a Read-and-Publish Agreement with Wiley. And we had, also, one week to decide: 'do we go for this Read-and-Publish Agreement?' So we met in – it was in 2020, something like that, we met in a virtual room, because it was in 2020 – with the Vice-Rector for Research at that time and with Jean-François and said: 'OK, what are we going to do?'

So since we didn't have the time to consult anybody, and we were – previously to that, we were in a Read Agreement, we were in a subscription agreement. So we said: 'OK, we're not very much in favour of Read-and-Publish Agreements. So what we're going to do is not ask anybody, not tell anybody because we don't have time, but we will not go for this Read-and-Publish Agreement, but keep the Read Agreement.' And this was not a matter of budget because the Read Agreement was, well, a little bit less expensive than the Read-and-Publish one, but not that much – that was not our reason for doing this.

So that was the first year. The second year, same kind of thing – because we were in the process of electing a president and it was really not a good time to have this discussion. So we kept this Read-Only Agreement and, basically, at that time it changed nothing to our researchers.

And we used the next year – it took roughly a year – we used the next year to start and conduct discussions. So, the idea was just to start with our Open Science Committee in Lorraine and say: 'OK, what are we going to do?'

So, of course, the Open Science Committee, as expected, said: 'OK, we should consult and we should get, you know, get rid of that – we shouldn't go for that Read-and-Publish Agreement, and probably get rid of that Read-Only agreement because they had made – as you said, Jean-François, previously we didn't have any tools to track the consequences of that, but by that time we had the tools and we used Unsub – if I remember correctly – to track and see the consequences of that. So you came up with a file, saying: 'OK, if we do unsubscribe, this is what's going to happen'. But the next step was going to the political team of the university. That was done, and the political team said: 'OK, you have good agreements' – sorry – 'you have good arguments. We should proceed, but you should have talks with the community'. So next time, the next step was having talks with the Labs – so we have 60, we have 60 labs, which are in ten scientific Pôles. So we cannot talk with all the 60 Labs at the time but we talked with the 10 Pôles. And the Pôles said: 'OK, this is interesting, but we also need time to discuss with the labs'. So it went down to the Labs, the discussion went there.

And all this process was about four to five months. And we had another meeting with the Pôles, and from the ten Pôles there were nine of them saying: 'yeah, do it!' And one final argument that finished to convince everybody was the fact that we have this Click-and-Read extension on the browsers, which looks a little bit like the Unpaywall extension, but that's adapted to France because you can access what is Open Access with one click, but you you can also access what is paywalled, for which you have paid, with one click only, also. So that gave the final blow to the subscription, including the fact that many of our Labs are depending on us, but also on a national research organisation. Some of them still have the subscription to Wiley – but this still is important because they're also considering

removing the subscription. So all in that saying – the community was: ‘OK, let's do it’. And the interesting thing is they also asked: ‘And what about the remaining subscriptions? We still have some. Do you plan to get rid of them? And do you have a plan – can you give us a multi-year plan on what we're going to do, how we're going to get rid of it?’ We didn't do that yet, that's in the To-Do-List. So, that was the global process that led us to have a final unsubscription of this Wiley thing.

00:14:19 PPA

Thank you for this detailed account and – just to to make sure that listeners that are not familiar with the research system in France: you have Labs – *Laboratoires* – and those are research groups, and then, clusters of research groups, maybe in the same discipline, they are organised as *Pôles* – is that the right thing?

00:14:40 NF

That's not, that's not in France. That's in our university.

00:14:43 PPA

In your university, that's the system. So these *Pôles*, there were 10 different *Pôles* representing different disciplines and perhaps some disciplines were harder hit, you could say, by not having the ability to read Wiley journals?

00:14:57 NF

Yeah. The one, the one that was not for unsubscribing was more, you know, in chemistry and theoretical physics. That's the one who was not in line with the others. But we had two other *Pôles* within, you know, in computer science, and also in chemistry and physics. And these ones were OK, so that why they felt a little lonely and said, ‘OK, let's let's do it’.

00:15:25 PPA

Right. You mentioned a figure, Jean-François. You ended up after budget cuts, but also the big cut of of Springer Nature deal you ended up with 250,000 € – was that it?

00:15:41 JFL

So after the the Springer cancellation, we we had €25,000 left, so it was quite a modest amount. And what is also interesting with the Wiley cancellation is that the university rector – governance, Scientific Council, decided to repurpose the whole amount towards open science, and this was €210,000. So it's a much larger amount, and it helped us to really develop open science, and to move forward in a very major way.

00:16:23 PPA

So what then happened was that you saved money on – first Springer, and then much more money on Wiley. And then you dedicated that fund, if I understand correctly, to open science activities. Could you tell a little bit about what you have been spending the money on?

00:16:44 NF

I will just start with saying – I leave Jean-François with the spending part, but in fact we went a little further than that. We used this money that we saved as an argument to say: ‘give us more money’. And, well, they did it. They gave us more, and the result – that's with the state, with the nation, with France. And another one is – when they saw, the surroundings organisms, national organisms of

research which are in our region – so it's a national one, but, you know, they have representatives in the region – and they have discussed together between the University of Lorraine and the surrounding national research performing organisations. And they chose to dedicate all the overheads they have on the National Research Agency projects – all the overheads they had in the first year, they dedicated to open science. So with all this, we had a big project, which is roughly €400,000 or €500,000. So this – Jean-François will give you the precise details – this is this whole project for *Science ouverte à l'Université de Lorraine*.

00:18:13 JFL

Yes, absolutely. And yes, then we – thanks to these two additional revenue streams, we ended up with a budget, an annual budget of €500,000 per year. So this is the budget we have now in 2025, for instance, and it's a tremendous change of scale from what we did previously. And this has been a real help in developing open science activities and services.

So you were asking about how we spend it? So I'm not going to go much more into details, but just the broad 'families of spending': most of this money is used to recruit colleagues working on open science. So we have seven contracts – we have recruited seven persons. Four of them are working on scientific publishing, two at the library and two at the university press's.

We also have three people working on research data management, two at the library and one at the IT service – IT department. This is roughly €300,000. So the major part of the budget is dedicated to the salaries of these colleagues. Then we have set up an open science fund of €100,000 that is aimed at funding open science infrastructures, open science platforms at the international level, and also at the national level. So, for instance, we are funding Software Heritage, we are funding the infrastructures that have been selected by the SCOSS initiative at the international level. And we have also set up, last year, a fund of €50,000 dedicated to Diamond Journals, specifically to fund Diamond Journals that are published by the university or which are linked to the University of Lorraine. So this is something that we are also very proud of, because we believe that Diamond Journals are one of the best ways to reconcile scientific quality, business model, community, and governance for scientific journals.

00:20:39 PPA

Yeah, let's stay with the Diamond model for a few more minutes. It's a model where there is no payment per article to the publisher, right? So it's, like, usually charity money or public money paid upfront to have the infrastructure run. And then sometimes also there is some – you could call it 'pocket money' for the editors, so that they can gather and have an annual meeting with all the editors of a journal, for instance. You said you channel this into Diamond. How do you do that? Do you pay per journal or do you pay, like, a big platform to have all the journals hosted there? How does it work?

00:21:28 JFL

We do both, actually. There is this Open Science Fund of €100,000 I mentioned. And through this fund we are, for instance, funding the Open Edition Platform in France, we are funding the Érudit Platform, Open Library of Humanities, which all gather Diamond Journals mainly. And this is one way of funding Diamond Journals, and we want to keep that support in the coming years. But we also identified another need for local journals. 'Local' in the way that they are managed locally at the university level or that they are linked, closely linked, with the university – for instance, their chief editor is a researcher at the University of Lorraine. And these journals, we wanted to have a

dedicated fund to them in order to strengthen the Diamond model, because some journals can struggle with the – when they, specifically when they decide to move away from the subscription model towards the Diamond model. So we want to help them, we want to support them with a revenue stream, an additional revenue stream.

So this is basically the two ways that the library is supporting – that the university is supporting Diamond Journals. The first one is through large platforms at the national or international level, and then through this 'Diamond Journal Fund'.

00:23:05 PPA

Right. And this 'Diamond Journal Fund', do you have any feedback so far from the journals that have received money? I mean, with editors-in-chief that are affiliated to Lorraine, and similar journals?

00:23:21 JFL

Yes, we have some feedback, but it's quite recent one because we set it up last year. It's very positive. From the editors of the journals – they really like the idea of being able to meet some of their needs for, like you said – for meetings, for organising workshops, for outsourcing copy editing, for instance. So these are all expenses that can be covered by the fund, and we do that on an annual basis, for the moment. With a Call for Proposals, we are asking journals to fill in a very short form to explain what is their need and then it's up to the Open Science Steering Committee of the University of Lorraine to make the final decision. We are attributing a lump sum of €2000, but journals can also ask for more if they have special needs. This year, some journals tell us that they don't need that much, so they ask for lower amounts. Some ask for higher amounts, but overall we have – yeah, it works quite well, the feedbacks are very interesting, also for us as a research support team.

And one of the very interesting outcomes of this Open Science – Diamond Fund was that we had a much better understanding of the landscape. Because some journals we didn't, we weren't aware of, all of a sudden said: 'Ohh, here we are! We we are interested in the fund!' So we discovered journals that we didn't identify before, and it was a way of getting to know them better and also to include them in the network that we are also managing and supporting.

00:25:20 PPA

A question for you, Nicolas, it has been mentioned, like, an 'Open Science Committee', or a group at the university making decisions. Could you tell us how that works? How is it? Who are the members of this group and and how does it work?

00:25:35 NF

Yeah. That's an important part of the set-up of open science governance in the university, and that's indeed the main part. So the idea for this is to be as inclusive as possible, to have many people from – I mean, all the skills needed around the table at all levels, but also not only the Université de Lorraine. The idea is to have all the Lorraine region.

So, who's in there? Of course, we have Vice-Presidents, Vice-Rectors. So Vice-Rectors – there's me, of course, but also Vice-Rectors for Research. We also have the Vice-Rector for Human Resources. And we have, also, many people from the departments. So, the heads of the departments. We have – for the library, actually, we don't have the head of the department, we have Jean-François, but Dominique, the head, is also invited. We have the head of the IT Department, we have people from the Law Department, we have people from the Research Department. So you have all the departments which I mentioned before, which are needed to have open science work correctly, you

have the Vice-Rectors – and I insist on the fact that we have the human-resources Vice-Rector over here because, you know, research evaluation, research assessment – it's not directly open science, but it's in the field, it's in the field and we need a change in research assessment if you want open science to work correctly. So we're not going into detail right now, but it's in there and then we also have people from the surroundings national research organisations.

We happen to have in Lorraine, *l'Institut de l'Information Scientifique et Technique*, National Scientific and Technical Information Institute from the CNRS, which is next to our university, so it's included in the committee. We have the University of Strasbourg, which is not so far, and we have the school called *CentraleSupélec*, which is in Metz. We have also – and it's very important – we have researchers, we have researchers in the committee. And the big task was: how do we get researchers to be correctly represented? We could not get – you know, we have ten scientific Pôles, we could not get ten researchers. So we chose to have one from the STEM side and one from the HSS side. And this works good. We also have the *Maison des Sciences de l'Homme*, Home for Human Sciences. And I was saying that we also have – when we had these partners, local partners, that told us they would give us some money and said: 'OK, we do not have a regional open science policy. How could we do that?' And the idea was to say: 'OK, well, let's transform our committee for Université de Lorraine into a Lorraine-region Open Science Committee by just inviting them'.

So this makes a big committee, we have meetings once a month online and we try to have, one or two times a year, a physical meeting. They all last two – two hours usually. And the idea there is, when you get advice from this committee – we're only giving advice, by the way, there's no decision made here. We're only giving advice to the President, to the political team, and so on. But usually these advices are heard because we have this, you know, multidisciplinary, multi-skills, multi-establishment, multi-institutions committee, which I think – this is the one of the strengths of the governance which is in place.

So if we make a decision, say: 'OK, we are going to offer this kind of training, or we're going to propose money, or we have this money, this is how we're going to spend it'. Usually, that's enough. We make these decisions in the committee. But if we have stronger things – stronger things, like, I don't know, removing Wiley, for instance. That's a strong move. Or other strong moves like, say, 'we would advise our researchers not to pay APC at all'. This is also a strong move. Or we have a position on Read-and-Publish Agreements, which is public – also a strong move. So we have to decide in the committee: 'do we do it there? Or do we ask for more higher-level political validation?' And that's why we have, you know, the Vice-Presidents, which are also members of the political team, and say: 'OK, now you could do that!' or 'No, we prefer to have a higher-level validation'. And that's the tricky thing because if we do things without asking, we don't want the higher political people saying: 'ohh, this was wrong!' So we try to do good things and if we're not sure, we ask higher political political validation.

00:31:32 PPA

Very interesting reflections there on, you could say, the freedom to make decisions in academia in general. I mean, you are in a region and you have decided – strategically, it seems – to include as many research institutions, research performing agencies in that region – in the region of Lorraine and around it – to take part in these discussions on how to spend the money in the best way.

But what, then, about the relation with the national level? How does that work in France? You also have strong national policies on open science and so on?

00:32:11 NF

First of all, to be precise on the region, we have been able to do that because there is a long-standing policy – a regional policy – where the university is talking monthly to the representatives of the other research organisations, so we have this long-standing cooperation which exists, which allowed us to do this. It was easy because it was already there. So the question was about what's the relationship with the nation, the state. So yeah. So I personally have a mission in the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, so I know what's going on in there, but I, of course, try not to mix, you know, the hats between Lorraine and the ministry. So what is the overall agency of all that? First of all, if we look at what we're doing in Lorraine, we had at the beginning when we started – I, when I started my mission on open science, it was 2019 – what we were trying to do was trying to convince: 'you should do open science! It's very good for you. It's very good for the community. It's very good for research'. And we tried to convince people and we realised, quite rapidly, that it was a really, really hard task and it took lots and lots of time, and it didn't work that much.

So well, we decided at the time and said: 'OK, let's stop that. Let's stop convincing people and let's offer everything we can to help people who want to do things, who want to go to open science.' And our policy, our policy over here in Lorraine says: 'If you want to do things – come to us. Come to us, ask for help with what you want'.

And just an example of how it works. When we started – it was quite long ago, 2020, I think – when we started training on research data, research data management, we had a – it was not easy to find people to come to the training. And when the National Research Agency said that if you want money from this main funder of research in France, then you do some research data management – you should publish a data data management plan.

When they said that, we had a hard time to keep up with the people coming into our training. So the idea is: 'Get ready! Let's get ready for when people will come in'. And, in fact – things are getting, you know, the incentives are not coming from us. The incentives are coming from the National Research Agency, the incentives are coming from Europe, the incentives – so these are these are strong incentives because they said: 'if you want to have the money, then do open science'.

These are strong incentives, and then there are soft incentives. Soft incentives come from the nation, from France, so the ministry cannot and should not do strong incentives. But the ministry – with the French national plans, the two French national plans for open science say: 'OK, you should do that', and they explain what to do, and so on. And they have a big, you know, Open Science Committee at the national level, which publishes many guides and say: 'OK, you should do that and should that'. These are soft incentives and, well, they work too.

But what we've been doing in France – well, no, sorry – what we've been doing in Lorraine, sort of shed the light a little bit and we were contacted by the French Ministry for Higher Education and Research, and we have a few projects going on at the national level and at international level. The national one is the French barometer of open science, 'French Open Science Monitor', which is the – the chief of this project is actually in our university, in Lorraine, and it's a national project. And there's there's also this OSMI – World Open Science Monitoring Initiative – which is led by the French ministry with UNESCO, and with – also, the chief of the project being the same person in Lorraine too. And here we have 150 countries in this initiative, trying to have open science monitoring principles endorsed by UNESCO. So by the way, it's going to be endorsed by UNESCO, if everything goes well, which it should, in the beginning of July in Paris.

00:37:07 PPA

Right. Jean-François, this balancing for a library, then – between national guidelines, national soft initiatives, soft – sorry – incentives and this more hard, ‘money talks’ thinking: how have you felt that this has influenced you from the library side?

00:37:40 JFL

Yes, good question. When we look back, so we started working on open science – we were not early adopters actually because we only started working on that in the library in 2014 – some other research performing organisation were doing open science previous – started much earlier, but then the pace of the work really increased rapidly and one of the major drivers for this increasing pace was the National Open Science Plan in 2018. So this was really something that – even if it was a soft incentive, it really changed the landscape at the national level and it also raised political awareness about open science. And I think it is not by chance that Nicolas started his mission as political leader for open science at the university one year after that. So this is really what was a big game changer, I would say, but it's only a soft incentive. So we also had to take responsibility at the local level. And within the library, we really took advantage of the fact that we had after 2019, a really close and smooth and effective relationship between the library and the open science people who are working on the field and the political – so, Nicolas, and also the university rector. This relationship is really of paramount importance because we can really, yes, exchange and decide and investigate important discussions.

We were talking about APC's, we were talking about transformative agreements, and we made some bold decisions – some public ones where we decided ‘OK, we have a strategy regarding open science. We see for instance regarding transformative agreements that a lot of countries, a lot of consortiums are moving towards this type of deals. But we are not comfortable with this approach’. And as a library, you cannot have this type of discussion on your own. It's not only a library discussion, it should also be discussed with the political level at the university. So we had this opportunity and this helped us in really having a value-based strategy within the library and so I would say that the political incentives were really something that helped us move forward, but at the same time, we also needed this institutional-level strategy to be shaped and this – our strategy is not completely shaped by the national incentives, this is also something we had to create on our own, I would say. And my main, maybe, advice would be that in order to have a strong open science policy and services and development – these two pillars, the people on the field and the political people in charge need to have a close, smooth relationship.

00:41:24 PPA

Yes, it's very interesting to hear how this has worked in France, and in Lorraine in particular, in the last few years. From Norway, I could say that the breaking news is that this year, the Read-and-Publish Deal with Elsevier, the largest publisher, was cut in costs by 25% from one year to the next, and the ‘Wiley deal’ has been cancelled all over Norway now. So we need to figure out what to do with that money. And you mentioned that in France you have Couperin that are negotiating Read-and-Publish Deals, and similar deals, for the entire nation. The same is in Norway known as SIKT. So the SIKT deal is now gone with Wiley. And as I said, 25% cost cuts with Elsevier.

So for just this university library here at UiT, we have approximately €500,000 per year saved. So we need to make a good use of that money, and I think this has been a truly inspirational talk. So thank you so much both of you. Any other thoughts at the very end that you would like to add?

00:42:45 NF

Yeah. One about the change needed in research assessments. It's not open science directly related, but doing open science – from the researcher's side, it's taking time, it's time consuming. You need to get – you need to make efforts to get trained. You need to get efforts to write your papers in the correct way so that you can put it in open archives. You can you have to go to your data and sort them and treat your data correctly, and so on. It takes lots of time. So doing doing open science is, I think, doing better science, but also taking time.

And you have to be recognised for that. So if you don't go into reforming research assessment, if you don't go to the CoARA, the European – international, now – initiatives, the CoAlition for Reforming Research Assessment – it will be hard to do to open science. So my message here is: 'go with CoARA, join us all in this coalition, to have an international thing to – an agreement to reform research assessment in a more qualitative way'. And the other message is: 'this is not a purely open science thing'. And this is very important, because if it comes only for the open-science-side people, we won't, we will not understand because there are other things to value that take time – you know, economic valorisation, citizen science, public relations, and so on.

And this is why we have also started this, but the people leading this are not – well, I'm helping them, of course – but it's they are the Vice-Rectors for Research and for Human Resources. Conjunctive reform for personal research assessment, but also the research assessment for research communities communities like labs, for instance. And this is part of the landscape, it must be a part of the landscape.

00:45:03 PPA

Anything from you, Jean-François?

00:45:05 JFL

Yes, maybe from a more librarian perspective, a final word. The approach that we have put forward for with two cancellations that we discussed, Springer and Wiley, some would be quite critical, saying that in a way if we go until the end, we would cancel all our subscription packages and then we would be hurting ourselves as librarians, because the purpose of libraries is to bring scientific literature to the academic community. So what is the purpose of a library that doesn't have any subscription left?

And I can understand the point and the critic, but our experience is that since we embarked in this strategy of having a quite bold political approach and value-based strategy, our – the position of the library has been really much more recognised within the academic community and we have a lot of positive feedbacks, because we are more focused on accompanying and supporting the research units. And I think we are still librarians, we are still using the skills and competencies of libraries and librarians, but we we do it, maybe, in a slightly different approach, and I think we are still working within our mission as a library, but it's quite a shift – that has to be a cultural shift, a cultural change that is happening and starting with the small research unit that I am – library unit – that I am heading, but it's spreading more and more. So I'm quite confident in the future.

00:46:56 PPA

Jean-François and Nicolas, thank you very much for coming to the podcast.

00:47:02 NF

You're very welcome.

00:47:03 JFL

You're welcome. Thank you very much for the invitation.

00:47:07 PPA

Open Science Talk is produced by the University Library of UiT The Arctic University of Norway.

Thanks for listening.