



## **Quality Assurance Group**

### **WP4 REVIEW OF DELIVERABLE:**

***C4 - Evaluation methodology for monitoring the usage of open science platforms and the performance and impact of research at Serbian universities***

## DELIVERABLE DETAILS

Title of the deliverable:	Open Science Monitor at University of Belgrade
Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:	Biljana Kosanović and Milica Ševkušić
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>To monitor the implementation of Open Science principles, the University of Belgrade has developed a preliminary list of indicators to track the outputs of the BE-OPEN project. The indicators are limited to main focuses of the project: policy development and the repository infrastructure. The document lists four indicators that are already used by the University of Belgrade and draws attention to a number of indicators that need further elaboration but could be used in the local context in near future.</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"> <li>• External sources used</li> <li>• Bibliography</li> <li>• List of contacts</li> <li>• Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)</li> </ul>	Deliverable Adequacy of complementary information complies with minimum information required	N/A	N/A
External sources and Bibliography used:				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>				
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.*