



Quality Assurance Group

WP2 REVIEW OF DELIVERABLE:

***A3 - Recommendations to the national Action Plan
for improving the impact and accountability of
publicly-funded research through the
implementation of open science principles
(incorporated into National Strategy for Scientific
and Technological Development)***

DELIVERABLE DETAILS

Title of the deliverable:	Open science in the newly adopted Law on Science and Research in Serbia / Amendments on the public arguments on the new Law on Science and research
Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:	Biljana Kosanović
WP leader:	University of Belgrade
QAG reviewer(s):	Snezana Smederevac, Petros Stefaneas, Marina Lenisa, Caspar Addyman, Thed van Leeuwen
Short description of the deliverable:	
<p>Public arguments on the new Law on Science and research started at the December, 2018, and finished on the January 3rd, 2019. University of Belgrade sent few amendments about open science in order to improve understanding the role (and requirements) of OS in the new Law. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development (MESTD) has unambiguously shown determination in the previous period to follow the principles of open science. This is, above all, reflected in the Open Science Platform (adopted in July 2018), and in several articles in the recently adopted new Law on Science and Research.</p>	

QUALITY ASSURANCE DETAILS

Assurance point:	Issues to be addressed:	Assessment:	Comments:	Recommendations:
1. Compliance with the objectives of BE-OPEN	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	Deliverable complies with objective of the project	N/A	N/A
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the work package	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Deliverable complies with WP objective specified in the WP description	N/A	N/A
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	Deliverable corresponds with the activity description as specified in the Application Form	N/A	N/A
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Deliverable is presented using the Project's deliverable format	N/A	N/A
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External sources used • Bibliography • List of contacts • Methodology used (i.e. for surveys) 	Deliverable Adequacy of complementary information complies with minimum information required	N/A	N/A
External sources and Bibliography used:				

6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	C2	N/A	N/A
Quality assurance:				
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement		Overall assessment is that deliverable is completely in line with adequate quality expectations for the Report on the existing open science legislative and incentives		
Date of Quality Assurance performed by QAG reviewers:		01.04.2020.		
Deadline for submission of amended version of the Deliverable:		N/A		

BE-OPEN TEAM

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.