

**Comments and Recommendations on  
the first draft of the Recommendation on  
Open Science**

Nowadays, the global development of open science is an imperative as we aim at building an engaged global community with equal opportunities and shared responsibilities. In this regard, the Preliminary Report is an incentive to brainstorm the ideas and come up with clear vision of appropriate actions in line with the concept of “Open Science.”

The following comments and recommendations might have further contribution into both discussions and implementation of the draft Recommendations on Open Science:

1. The Preliminary Report draws a clear vision where we want to be, as well as clarifies the main components of that vision. However, what is missing and what might be added is to strategize the Program and develop a roadmap to achieve the goals and objectives.
2. We highlight the importance to establish a Global Advisory board, which will involve the representatives of all member states. At the same time, the establishment of regional boards might also be helpful to bring the national discussions and implementation processes to the international agenda.
3. Additionally, UNESCO might bring closer academia, expert community, and decision-making bodies on state, regional, and global levels. Nowadays, we witness the Ivory tower issue in academic communities not only in the developing, but also the developed world. In this regard, if Open Science is tied to decision making process, it will become an additional impetus for Open Science development. The establishment of a database of specialists in respective fields will make the task more effective. This will lead to the necessity to work closely with the national governments to make it possible to maximize the engagement and participation of all peoples and cultures in science-related process. However, the opportunity for the general public to get involved into the processes should establish clear mechanisms of professionalism and

quality control. On the other hand, clear mechanisms should be developed to make science attractive for public to be involved in. The Preliminary Report also makes it clear the need to foster investments into science. In this regard, the issue that arises is how to make science attractive and reasonable for the business and how to make the governments to invest in, avoiding the Ivory Tower issue. The task is especially complex when Social Sciences are concerned.

4. Finally, the rising global complexity and non-linear developments in the world make it necessary to foster Open Science collaboration on national, regional, and global levels to share the best experience and practices. It is obvious that during the meetings on Open Science lots of scientists and educators are engaged in the process. However, we have to mention that all the scientists and educators represent different fields and branches of study. Thus, in order to organize more effective discussions, we would like to advise to organize the process by sharing discussions into the groups by the fields and areas of the study. For example, scientists and educators of legal studies might be involved in discussions devoted to the legal aspect of the document, engineers and scientists in AI technologies must have their discussion concerning their part and so on. In this way it is possible to have more productive and engaging discussions and in the end to have a summed up paper fully covering all the possible questions and possible problems, which might occur in the future. Thus, we recommend that provisions concerning the organization of the work be included in the paper.
5. The draft refers also to the issue of intellectual property rights. It might be appropriate to include a separate section dedicated to that issue. Questions concerning the intellectual property rights are highly recommended. The reason is that scientists from all over the world gather in one group and have discussions during which they share their thoughts, ideas and researches regarding the raised questions. The ideas, researches and thoughts might be already published in some scientific journals, and also cannot be published yet, which can bring to the further plagiarism situation. Besides, the person, who shares his views with the audience, must be convinced that he will be mentioned as an author of the idea in the further discussions and in the other papers. In such situations the person has to be informed firmly about his rights and

obligations concerning his/her own and others' intellectual property rights. These questions are essential and have to be placed in the paper as a separate section.

6. It would be appropriate to pay special attention to the specific tools and operational mechanisms which will not only help answer what should be done at the meta-level and what priorities are set, but also how to act in practice. A large portion of the paper is devoted to theory, to science, but less is written about the practical issues. During any legal document preparation, practice is as important as science is. It is obvious that scientists, besides theoretical researches, study the practical part of the question too, but researches made in a scientific field cannot be as useful from practical part of view, as in case of practitioner. Thus, for us it is highly important to have another discussion with practitioners, who can tell about the possible problems concerning the practical application of the paper, written, discussed and changed by the scientists. Besides, during discussions with practitioners, we can identify problems that may face any country while applying this or that legal paper. Accordingly, only in conjunction of science and practice we can have a really useful and practically approachable document.
7. Not only involvement of practitioners, but also holding extensive debates must be placed among the principles of the document. Discussion groups are very large, the time was really short, so we had time to express only the thoughts of several specialists, but we didn't really have time to have extensive debates, which could have been more effective.