

## 23rd Plenary Meeting Collaborative Notes

**Group(s) name(s) organising the session:** [Policies in Research Organisations for Research Software \(PRO4RS\) WG](#)

**Session link:** [Update from Policies in Research Organisations for Research Software \(PRO4RS\) WG](#)

**Session scheduled date/time/breakout session:** Wednesday, 13 November, Breakout 3, 08:00 – 09:30 CST

**Venue:** Edificio de Ingeniería, Auditorium 2

### Session summary (for Group co-chairs)

We will use the content in the table below to highlight your work to the RDA community as a report organised by the Technical Advisory Board and to a wider audience through English & Spanish social media mentions.

Please complete ALL fields below by **Friday, 29th November, close of business** to be included in the report & social media activities.

<b>Summarise the session in three sentences:</b>
<i>A review of the present findings of PRO4RS. An interaction with the audience about how to annotate software policy review documents. A broader discussion on what to do with respect to curation.</i>
<b>Key outcomes/actions/takeaways</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>WG reported on completed work: database on RS policies &amp; resources for policy change; attendees provided information on additional RS policies</i></li> <li><i>Suggestion of storing all policies, but not really considering those policies that only briefly mention RS but that focus on something else</i></li> <li><i>Discussion about policy analysis and the role/value of AI in doing so, which so far is not promising but has been interesting and meaningful to try</i></li> </ol>
<b>Synergies and/or possible collaborations identified with RDA groups and other groups:</b>
<i>Some overlap with FAIRsharing Registry (which focuses on data, but has a larger collection of policies than we do, some of which include software)</i>
<b>Highlight text that will be used in social media mentions (please make sure the text is clear and appropriate for public consumption &amp; comprehension)</b>
<i>Useful discussion about which research software policies to analyze, and how to analyze them, setting up the group for the next phase of work</i>
<b>Direct link to Group home page</b>
<a href="https://www.rd-alliance.org/groups/rda-resa-policies-research-organisations-research-software-pro4rs/activity/">https://www.rd-alliance.org/groups/rda-resa-policies-research-organisations-research-software-pro4rs/activity/</a>

Get involved in [RDA Community](#)  
Check out [P23 programme sessions](#)

This meeting will take place according to the [RDA Code of Conduct](#)

## Attendee Check-in

Please complete this table to indicate your attendance (add rows as needed):

Full Name	Affiliation	Location	Email
Amy Nurnberger	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	USA	nurnberg@mit.edu
Francoise Genova	Observatoire Astronomique de Strasbourg	France	francoise.genova@astro.unistra.fr
Morane Gruenpeter	Software Heritage, INRIA	France	
Liise Lehtsalu	RDA Europe	Italy	liise.lehtsalu@rda-foundation.org
M-Christine Jacquemot	CNRS	France	marie-christine.jacquemot@inist.fr
CJ Woodford	Digital Research Alliance of Canada	Canada	<a href="mailto:c.joseph.woodford@gmail.com">c.joseph.woodford@gmail.com</a>
Pedro Hernández Serrano	Maastricht University	Netherlands	
Aline Grand	Université de Strasbourg	France	alinegrand@unistra.fr
Daniel S. Katz	University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign	USA	d.katz@ieee.org
Allyson Lister	University of Oxford	UK	<a href="mailto:allyson.lister@oerc.ox.ac.uk">allyson.lister@oerc.ox.ac.uk</a>
Laurence El Khouri	CNRS (FR)	France	<a href="mailto:laurence.elkhouri@cnrs-dir.fr">laurence.elkhouri@cnrs-dir.fr</a>
Sverker Holmgren	Chalmers University of Technology	Sweden	svehol@chalmers.se

Maud Medves	Inria	France	<a href="mailto:maud.medves@inria.fr">maud.medves@inria.fr</a>

- **Collaborative Session Notes** (*To be used by participants and chairs during the session*)in We would like our two projects to fully share data around sharing research software via our connection points with Hugh and Timothee.

## Policies to be reviewed:

- 1) Model Policy on Sustainable Software at the Helmholtz Centers
  - a) Link to policy (PDF):  [Helmholtz OS Office - Policy on Sustainable Software at the ...](#)
  - b) Section to review:  
“Continuing Professional Development, Career Prospects, and Networking” (**Page 6**)
- 2) Open-Source Science Guidance. NASA Science Mission Directorate (SMD)
  - a) Link to policy (PDF):  [NASA - Open-Source Science Guidance.pdf](#)
  - b) Section to review:  
“Where to Share Software” (**Page 16**)

## Polling:

Please go to [vevox.app](https://vevox.app) and enter

**111-200-769**

## Shared notes:

Link to slides:

[https://docs.google.com/file/d/1YUygjKro7E0a-eyxWMy277XXt5Hro7se/edit?usp=docslist\\_api&filetype=mspresentation](https://docs.google.com/file/d/1YUygjKro7E0a-eyxWMy277XXt5Hro7se/edit?usp=docslist_api&filetype=mspresentation)

## Recap on PRO4RS working group

PRO4RS objectives and deliverables:

- Identify existing policies
- Collate resources on supporting policy change
- Categorization, annotation curatino or RS polciies identifying policy gap
- Case studies on RS policy work

The WG has been working in sub-groups. This session focuses on outputs from some of the sub-groups.

- WG1: database of RS policies
- WG2: reporting on resources for policy change
- WG3: methodology to curate policies
- WG4: reporting and use cases implementation

Co-group b/t ReSA & RDA. Diverse geographical & experience representation (see slides)

## Findings sub WG1 & sub-WG2

Sub WG1 : database of existing public policies

Work:

- Built a db of policies (38 of them) <- WG1
- Finding overlaps & gaps b/t distribution of policies
  - There's a report! It's on zenodo. (see slides for links?)
- Case studies on taking knowledge form policies database/gap review, and if changes can be made, things can be learned from them

Sub WG2: focus on resources to support policy change, focus on cultural change

Allyson Lister: FAIRsharing currently has [209 policies](#) that either mandate or suggest software sharing, and that PRO4RS is working with FAIRsharing via their WG co-chairs and our Community Champions (Hugh Shanahan, Timothee Aubourg) to ensure that we are sharing our information regarding these policies. It may also be that FAIRsharing can store appropriate metadata around research software policies; this can be determined through the lifetime of the WG. With regards to non-English policies, in FAIRsharing we encourage all policies to be in their own local language, and then we use our language requirements to find ways in which these non-English policies can still be integrated into our policy registry.

Power outage, conversation on Zoom continued, focused on:

- FAIRsharing plans annotation of policies

## Showcase sub WG3-4: Interactive session!

Overview of annotation & categorization methodology

- Identify gaps
- ask 3 questions on policy characteristics
  - Who is this for, etc
  - Who is responsible
  - And a third mystery question
- 15 questions on what categories policy covered (Does policy cover, e.g., IP, open source software, etc)

- OSS
- IP
- Copyright and software licensing
- Open science (open software as a pillar)
- FAIR research outputs
- Research skills and training
- Research assessment reform (e.g. DORA)
- Research infrastructure
- Research ethics and integrity
- Research outcomes/outputs
- Research data (includes analysis, methods, tools)
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion in research
- Privacy and protecting human subjects
- Research software impacting education
- Used genAI (ChatGPT, model??) and then validated w 2 humans for each policy
- Noticings
  - Very different tones/style: formal to very informal

Use cases:

- [Helmholtz](#)
  - Tone: formal. Very seriously written
  -
- [NASA](#)
  - Tone: authoritative
  -

Comparing how phrasing and context impacts what ChatGPT picked up in each of these policy examples. Reflecting on how prompts may have influenced what was autodetected. E.g. Software archiving was not detected as part of open source software.

### Questions:

Should we ignore all RDM-only policies even if they mention software in passing? [An RDM-only policy is one that explicitly titles itself as Research Data Management and makes no reference to software in its description.]

- Amy: What is the goal here? Have an overview of software policies out there? Or policies titled software management policy? If it is to provide guidance on how to write a software policy, then focus on focused policies
- Allyson: FAIRsharing already stored RDM-related policies and a plethora of FAIR-enabling attributes. We suggest that we ensure our content is available to you (e.g. via saved searches you can regularly run and pull the info out that you need), and your metadata is incorporated (with attribution and cross references) within FAIRsharing. Policy [registry](#), Policy [factsheet](#), Policy [metadata](#). We also encourage you to create a FAIRsharing [collection](#) that showcases the policies that you are using within your WG.
- Francoise: It is a question about inclusion/exclusion criteria
- Sverker: A good Open Science policy would include a software management policy; first data policies were included in OA policies
- CJ: perhaps not analyse, but at least collect the RDM policies that mention software

- Hugh: need to think about the goals of this group – give advice to RPOs about what should go into a software policy; also a workload and capacity question; since we want to provide advice, we should focus on the software-only policies
- Pedro: we want to understand the gaps and offer advice, e.g. ethics and integrity a gap in current policy landscape

A goal of PRO4RS is to provide generic guidance on what a research software policy should cover. ...

- We skipped this question

Can we come up with a rule about when something can be ignored if it is mentioned rather than elaborated upon or do we have to trust the judgement of the reader?

- Françoise (added in the notes): I would ignore the policies which just mention software. The alternative is to just keep track of them in a specific category with only one annotation: mentions software in passing, and no more effort on these cases as suggested by Sverker. But for me it would be much better to concentrate the effort on the good examples.
- Allyson: DCC has a FAIR-enabling data policy checklist (<https://zenodo.org/records/6225775#.Y243wcvP2Uk>), 'if a policy that software sharing is required...it uses value judgements, e.g., green if quite clear. Yellow if casually referenced or not adequately described. Red if not mentioned.'
  - Allyson in chat: If the policy clearly states that sharing research software is required and provides clarity on any legitimate exceptions, select Required. If the policy encourages but does not require, the sharing of research software, select Suggested. If the policy does not address this topic or lacks clarity over what is expected of researchers, select Not Covered. Other is provided if none of the available options are suitable. An optional free-text note field is also available to provide further detail if necessary.
  - AL: Sometimes also important to state positively that the information is not present (rather than it just being e.g. a curation oversight)
- Amy: If you want to offer guidance, then you want solid examples of what was done.
- Morane: policy without resources will be difficult to implement, defining policy should come hand in hand with actionable plans that can be supported by infrastructures, research institutions and research laboratories.
  - Asking more with less would be not effective
- CJ: Will you also do content-level analysis? In terms of looking at what the policies actually say and whether it is good practice?
- Hugh: That would be part of the final stage of work?

What other overall curation issues should we be thinking about?

- Françoise: Are you comfortable providing a quality stamp?
- Françoise: Did you consider adjusting the categories from what you found in using them?

## Rounding up the session and WG5 goals

- Please liaise with the Evaluation of Research group to discuss reward & credit for research software (Amy & Françoise)

