Deliverable

Grant Agreement number: 288945

Project acronym: MEDOANET

Project title: Mediterranean Open Access Network

Funding Scheme: Coordination Support Action

Project co-ordinator
Organisation: EKT/NHRF

Project website address: www.medoanet.eu

Deliverable No.	3.1
Deliverable Name	Report on the European Workshop
Lead Beneficiary	UMINHO
Dissemination Level	PU
Due Date	M17

Report on the European Workshop

Document Change Control

The following is the document control for revisions to this document.

Version Number	Date of Issue	Author(s)	Brief Description of Change
V1	22 February 2013	Clara Boavida	Initial Draft
V2	18 April 2013	Clara Boavida	Draft reviewed (Vasso Kalaitzi, Eloy Rodrigues, Clara Boavida)
V3	24 April	Clara Boavida	Additional revisions (Eloy Rodrigues, Clara Boavida)
V4	30 April	Clara Boavida	Final Version

Acronyms

EC – European Commission
ENCES – European Network for Copyright in support of Education and Science
EOS – Enabling Open Scholarship
EUA – European University Association
FP7 – Seventh Framework Programme
H2020 – Horizon 2020
ID - Identification
IRs – Institutional Repositories
LERU – League of European Research Universities
LIBER – Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche
OA – Open Access
RPOs – Research Performing Organizations
UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Table of contents

Background

The European Workshop aimed to bring together decision-makers and Task force representatives of relevant European and international organizations and initiatives, to discuss and provide Conclusions/Recommendations on how to implement coordinated policies in line with the European Commission's initiatives (OpenAccessPilot[1] on FP7 and OpenAIRE[2]). The current document, is the project deliverable (D3.1) reporting on the Workshop.

The European Workshop was organized by the University of Minho and took place in Braga – Portugal, on the 6th and 7th February 2013. This initiative was included in a larger event, the UMinho Open Access Seminar, which brought together the MedOANet European Workshop and the OpenAIREplus Interoperability Workshop. Both workshops were bridged on the 7th of February with an open Seminar, that concluded the MedOANet Workshop (in the morning), and launched the OpenAIREplus Workshop (in the afternoon). The three-day event (6-8 Feb 2013) managed to gather more than 120 participants, including many international experts and representatives from relevant worldwide projects and initiatives (e.g. COAR[3] – the Confederation of Open Access Repositories, euroCRIS[4]), fostering an exchange of experience and knowledge that was very fruitful for both projects. It was not only an opportunity to network and liaise but also to promote the development and enhancement of repositories on the region, based on shared good practices and established standards and guidelines.

Additionally, the wider European Open Access community had the opportunity of being informed on MedOANet's accomplishments so far as well as on the future tasks and activities. Regarding MedOANet accomplishments, the project partners presented the state of Open Access in each country, including the results of the surveys that were carried out in the WP2 mapping task (2.1) and highlighting best practices and success cases existing in most of the countries.

Extending and building upon the work carried out in the National Workshops organized in each country, the European Workshop was the occasion to bring together representatives from the Task Forces from all six countries. According to the Report on Six National Workshops and the National Task Forces (2.3), the most important outcome of national Open Access workshops was to bring the main stakeholders together for the first time in most of the cases, increasing the awareness of Open Access and also energizing the stakeholders to design and implement Open Access policies and regulations in the near future in their respective countries. In the European Workshop, all this was taken into a higher level. In fact, the possibility to gather, representatives of Task Forces from different countries was advantageous to strengthen the network, to improve awareness and knowledge of Open Access developments, not only at national, but also regional, European and global levels, and to promote more effective future developments of the Open Access policies and strategies.

---

[1] http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/open-access-pilot_en.pdf
[2] https://www.openaire.eu/
[3] http://www.coar-repositories.org/
[4] http://www.eurocris.org/Index.php?page=homepage&t=1

Delegates

The European Workshop brought together decision-makers and task force representatives from the six Mediterranean countries of the MedOANet project: France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain and Turkey. The event gathered 42 participants (on the first day, organized as an invitation-only meeting), comprising experts, project partners and Task force members. Project partners from the six Mediterranean countries attended the workshop, as well as two partners from Northern Europe: ENCES and LIBER. Alma Swan and Norbert Lossau, members of the Advisory Board, have also participated. Finally, ten members from the Portuguese Task Force attended the workshop, which was also considered to be the second meeting of the Portuguese working group.

Task Force representatives from France:

Odile Hologne
Jean-Marc Quilbé

Task Force representatives from Greece:

Dimitris Kouis
Panagiotis Chatzinikolaou
Ioannis Klapsopoulos

Task Force representatives from Italy:

Roberto Delle Donne
Maria Cassella

Task Force representatives from Spain:

Ramón Rodríguez
Juan Miguel Gonzalez Aranda
Javier Pérez Iglesias
Reme Melero
Luis Castrillo Aguilera

Task Force representatives from Portugal:

Clarisse Pais
Maria Potes Barbas
Maria João Amante
Manuela Berjano
Delfim Leão
Dina Rocha
Jérôme Borme
Ana Neves
José Carlos Kullberg
Arsénio Reis

Task Force representatives from Turkey:

Ramazan Acun
Orcun Madran
Umut Al

Programme

The European Workshop kicked off with an opening session with a welcoming message from the Vice-Rector of the UMinho, Rui Vieira de Castro, followed by a presentation by Jean-François Dechamp, policy officer of the European Commission, on the European Policy on Open Access and finally Victoria Tsoukala, project coordinator of the MedOANet project, who briefly introduced the workshop, stressing the participation of task force members from all six Mediterranean countries and gave an overview of the project.

Following the opening session, each project partner presented a brief overview of the current state of Open Access and best practices in the six Mediterranean countries. These presentations covered Open Access policies from the aspect of research funders, research performing organisations and academic and research publishers. They also made reference to the state of scientific journals, Open Access repositories and Open Access projects in each of the six countries.

Recent achievements on Open Access in all six countries were highlighted:

- the statement on Open Access presented by the French Ministry of Research in January 2013, at the occasion of an international OA conference in Paris;

- the great opportunity for green Open Access, despite the low rate of Open Access policies among Greek research funders;

- the establishment of a temporary Open Access Committee under the aegis of the Ministry of University and Research with the main stakeholders (universities/research centre administrators, researchers, publishers and national evaluation agency) and the CRUI[5] (Italian Rectors Council) OA-working (a subgroup lead by legal experts) that is drafting a policy model;

- the good level of success of repositories, the high rate of and Open Access policies from Portuguese research performing organizations and the announcement that the Portuguese public funder will launch a national OA policy very soon;

- two regional Spanish funders that have Open Access mandates and the Open Access provision in the Spanish Law on Science, Technology and Innovation;

- the issuance of the declaration of Open Access to scientific literature and institutional repositories as a by-product of the national OA workshop and the availability of more than 200 OA journals published in Turkey through DOAJ[6].

The morning work was completed with a session about perspectives on policy. Bernard Rentier, Rector of the Université de Liège, presented the institutional perspective of a research performing organization on Open Access policies, explaining why institutions need top down policies first (mandates) and describing the successful implementation of the OA policy of the Université de

---

[5] http://www.crui.it/english/
[6] http://www.doaj.org/

Liège[7]. Lucie Guibault[8], a copyright scholar from the University of Amsterdam, presented the legal perspectives of Open Access, addressing the legal context and challenges for Green and Gold Open Access and also Open Access to research data.

The afternoon work planning was organized in parallel sessions. Participants were split into two groups, one intended to discuss policy issues in the perspective of Research Funders and the other one in the perspective of Research Performing Organizations. On both sessions the points of discussion focused on policy definition, policy implementation and sustainability and policy enforcing and monitoring.

Parallel Sessions organization

A document which was used by the session moderators was designed, in order to guide and structure the discussion on both sessions. The defined method to manage both sessions included:

a) Initial presentation of the objectives, method of the session and reminder of the European Commission policy initiatives (10 minutes)

b) Breakout of the groups

c) Discussion in the groups about the three identified areas (90 minutes)

d) Drafting summary and conclusions of each group (20 minutes)

Research Performing Organizations Session

During the session three main topics were addressed in the perspective of the Research Performing Organizations:

1. Policy definition and content

2. Policy implementation and sustainability

3. Policy enforcing and monitoring

Regarding policy definition and content, the obstacles and drivers for defining OA policies at institutional level, as well as the different approaches of the deposit mandate and types of documents covered by the policy, should be considered as discussion topics. Regarding policy implementation and sustainability, not only the infrastructures and technical requirements should be covered, but also the resources (human resources, funding…), preservation and advocacy. Finally, on policy enforcing and monitoring the ways on how to enforce and monitor OA policies, including evaluation and reporting processes, incentives and sanctions, should be taken into account.

---

[7] http://www.ulg.ac.be/cms/c_5000/en/home#
[8] http://www.ivir.nl/staff/guibault.html

Research Funders Session

The same three topics were addressed in the perspective of Research Funders:

1. Policy definition and content
2. Policy implementation and sustainability
3. Policy enforcing and monitoring

During this session the topics of discussion were very similar with the approach above, however some specific issues related to the research funders were included. In addition to the obstacles and drivers for defining OA policies for funders, on policy definition and content, the option of paying for Gold OA should be addressed. Regarding the policy implementation and sustainability the standardized ways for funders' identification, interoperability and funding of OA publishing should be debated. On the subject of policy enforcing and monitoring, beyond evaluation and reporting processes, an opinion on different types of funders' sanctions should be requested; for example hold part of current funding and refuse further funding.

Results of the Research Performing Organizations' Session

Most of the people that attended this session work at universities and research centres and are mainly people involved in repositories. There were also three top management representatives from CRUI Italy, UGöttingen[9] and ULiège. Most of them were from the Mediterranean countries, where an OA policy did not exist, except for Portugal, where the majority of representatives' institutions already have a mandatory OA policy and an institutional repository.

Policy definition/content

Considering that most institutions did not have policies, but have repositories, the question that emerged was: what are the **obstacles** that hinder policy development in those institutions?

The following obstacles were identified:

- Lack of awareness on both top level administration and researcher/faculty side;
- A top-down approach in policy development, which has effectively worked in e.g. ULiège, is hindered by the politics of high RPO administration. This was observed at least in the cases of Greece and Italy.

The following were also identified as **opportunities** in developing Open Access policies in institutions:

- Fortunate timing with respect to the recent EC recommendations and Horizon 2020 requirements, that can be used as arguments to increase coordinated policies and policy uptake in institutions;

---

[9] http://www.uni-goettingen.de/en/1.html

- Collective top institution management is a good starting point for entering into engagement with top institutional policymakers and obtaining multiplier effects in e.g. the CRUI in Italy.

Policy implementation and sustainability

While policy content was briefly discussed and all participants agreed that the UNESCO[10] and LERU[11] guidelines should be followed, more time was spend on **policy implementation strategies,** where the following points were highlighted:

- Linking policies to research performance evaluation works as a way to secure compliance to the policy;

- A very aggressive mandatory policy may elicit reactions and become an obstacle; caution is necessary in the wording. Nonetheless, if the policy links deposit and access to research through repositories to evaluation, this works in favour of the success of the policy, e.g. ULiège and Instituto Politécnico de Bragança[12];

- Implementing an institutional open access policy places the focus on the research performing organization and serves its best interests as it renders it capable of being in complete control of safeguarding, disseminating and promoting its research output. Considering that most institutions in the discussion have Open Access repository infrastructures, emphasis should be placed on green Open Access policies;

- Open Access champions within organizations are absolutely necessary and must be capitalized in making the case for Open Access policies to other researchers/faculty and top management.

Policy enforcing and monitoring

In **enforcing and maintaining an Open Access policy**, the following points emerged as the most significant:

- A strong advocacy activity is necessary within institutions for the birth and implementation of Open Access policies, strategies and activities (before, during and after). Bi-directional policies, towards the top and the base;

- Appropriate structures need to be in place for the successful uptake of an Open Access policy, i.e. repositories and people that will facilitate researchers in complying;

- Incentives and not sanctions need to be provided, in order to showcase the benefits of Open Access to the researchers' professional development (e.g. link publications to their profile, provide citation counts, view counts, etc.), as well as that of individual departments and institutions. This will help the gradual uptake of the policy and the change of culture among management and researchers. Economic

---

[10] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002158/215863e.pdf
[11] http://www.leru.org/files/publications/LERU_AP8_Open_Access.pdf
[12] http://portal.ipb.pt/portal/page?_pageid=735,592336&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

incentives can also be provided in the form of grants for Open Access publishing within institutions;

- Financial planning needs to take place. Implementing an Open Access policy does not necessarily mean that the institution will save money from subscriptions etc.; nonetheless the investments for maintaining a steady mechanism for the smooth implementation of Open Access are not substantial for an institution, per the example of ULiège.

Results of the Research Funders' Session

The attendees of this session were funders from Portugal, Greece and Turkey, and a European Commission's representative. Moreover, Alma Swan, from the MedOANet advisory board, project partners, people working at universities and research centres, scientific publishers have also participated in this session.

Policy definition/content

After a brief presentation on Open Access policies already published or in a process of definition, e.g. Spain and Portugal, the drivers for defining Open Access policies for funders were identified:

- To find an Open Access champion
- Educating colleagues, so that all people in the policymaking institution understand
- Arguments that Open Access can support change and the irresponsibility of not adopting change
- To get the infrastructure in place
- Economic/innovation arguments
- Arguments that Open Access can support small publishers
- Make researchers aware of costs of dissemination
- The Council conclusions helped influence progress in some countries
- Commission to act on commitments from LERU and EUA[13] to work with EC to further Open Access
- Preservation discussed as a driver

Regarding the obstacles for defining Open Access policies the following were identified:

- Loopholes in policy
- Publisher conditions on policies
- Lack of coordination (at all levels)
- Lack of context for policy

The questions of using research funding to support OA publishing (Gold OA), and what type of Open Access (Green or Gold) should be supported or required by funder's policies were also discussed. There was a general understanding that deposition/availability in Open Access repositories should be required while Open Access publishing should be supported by funders policies. Participants concluded that the Open Access policy framework from the European Commission, as defined in the already approved documents, could

---

[13] http://www.eua.be/Home.aspx

be used as the basis for the definition and convergence of Open Access policies from public and private funders in the Mediterranean countries.

Policy implementation and sustainability

Some examples of Open Access policy implementation were described, as well as the main problems associated with this process. The following topics are a summary of the discussion:

- Infrastructure in place is needed (and available in some of the MedOANet participating countries)
- Record-keeping and evaluation linked to Open Access policy
- Arguments that Open Access helps keep work secure
- A good infrastructure can help drive things (even accompanied by a "bad" policy)
- Advocacy needed continuously and throughout

Policy enforcing and monitoring

In enforcing and monitoring Open Access policies, it was referred that elements of metadata related to funders, should be included and standardized, in order to promote interoperability between funders. However, it was mentioned as an enforcement problem, the fact that funders do not care about publications, because the impact of a funder is not measured through the publications. Sanctions should be encouraged to support Open Access policy compliance, because, as far as the examples discussed confirm, Open Access policy compliance seems to be more effective when sanctions are imposed.

Reflective points that were raised are summarized as follows:

- Difficult area
- Defining metrics to use
- Acknowledging funders in a standardised way (this allows the distributed model to work)
- Use the ULiège tactic
- Practical needs from MedOANet
  - Good practice guidelines
  - Author LTP (Licence to Publish) (at European level)

Concluding the working day, a brief summary of the Discussion on both parallel sessions was presented to all participants.

The Workshop comes to its conclusion on the morning of the second day as part of the Open Access Seminar that bridged between both MedOANet and OpenAIREplus Workshops. The Seminar was attend by more than 100 persons, some of whom work on both projects, and merged sessions on open access policies, MedOANet, open science and interoperability.

The first half of the seminar concluded the MedOANet workshop. The Rector of the University of Minho opened the working day. The first session discussed themes regarding Open Access policies in Europe. Lucia Monaco, representative of the Fondazione Telethon[14], a private research funder from Italy, described the implementation experience of the Telethon Open Access policy and the way it is being executed and managed. Bernard Rentier, rector of the University of Liège, described the Liège experience in implementing the Open Access policy of the university. Alma Swan, from EOS[15], gave an overview of the Open Access policies in Europe and around the world.

The second session was on MedOAnet and Open Access in Mediterranean Countries. Victoria Tsoukala gave an overview of the project followed by Paola Gargiulo who presented the Open Access Tracker, an online tool developed in the scope of the MedOANet Project which gathers information about different types of open access resources and policies of the Mediterranean countries. Eloy Rodrigues closed the session summarizing the conclusions from the MedOANet Workshop.

The second half of the Open Access Seminar was focus on open science, open data and repositories with Geoffrey Boulton[16] (University of Edinburgh/Royal Society), Jenny Molloy (Open Knowledge Foundation[17]) and Alicia Lopes Medina (Confederation of Open Access Repositories). The working day finished with the OpenAIRE developments on services of the OpenAIRE infrastructure, guidelines and linking data to publications.

---

[14] http://www.telethon.it/en
[15] http://www.openscholarship.org/jcms/c_5012/en/home
[16] http://royalsociety.org/
[17] http://okfn.org/

Conclusions and recommendations on how to implement coordinated policies

Resulting from the presentations, and especially the discussions on the parallel sessions on funders and research performing organizations, some conclusions and recommendations were drawn together and are presented here.

Firstly, on policy definition and content, both for funders and research performing organizations, during the Workshop several drivers and motivations, needs and opportunities, as well as obstacles, were identified.

Drivers and Motivations:

- Monitoring/assessment of research output (Funders and RPOs)
- Empowering institutions - management and preservation of institutional output (RPOs)
- Promotion of Innovation and maximizing economic and social benefits (Funders)
- Increasing visibility and impact (Funders and RPOs)
- Supporting/promoting change in science and research dissemination (Funders and RPOs)

Needs and Opportunities:

- Having/Capitalizing (local) champion(s) making researchers aware of the costs of dissemination
- Having the infrastructure (repositories, ...) in place
- Using the new EC Open Access policies for H2020 to promote policy definition and coordination (at institutional, funder, national and European levels)
- Using the work already done by EUA, LERU, etc.

Obstacles:

- Lack of awareness on both top level leadership and researchers (RPOs and Funders)
- Lack of context for policy (Funders)
- Lack of coordination (Funders and RPOs)
- Fear of change - and focus on publishing instead of research (Funders and RPOs)

A general recommendation on policy definition was to use existing models and guidelines (UNESCO, LERU, etc.) to develop funder and institutional policy, making sure they are aligned with the contents and objectives of EC policies[18].

---

[18] Commission Recommendation on access to and preservation of scientific information available at: http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/recommendation-access-and-preservation-scientific-information_en.pdf

On policy implementation and sustainability, as well as enforcing and monitoring, several recommendations have emerged:

Recommendations on policy implementation and sustainability:

- Linking Open Access policies to research evaluation and monitoring
- Developing continuous advocacy
- Building incentives/tools to "reward" compliance (metrics – download and citation counts; report/list generation, etc.)
- Creating, maintaining and making sustainable the needed infrastructures (financial, human resources, etc.)
- Identifying/acknowledging funders in a "standardized way" (quality of metadata)

Recommendations on policy enforcing and monitoring:

- Linking OA policies to research evaluation and monitoring
- Requiring ID/link of OA version (from IRs or aggregators) on all official lists and reports
- Use of sanctions by funders (retaining part of funding)

From all the above, and on summary, some general conclusions and recommendations have been identified:

- To engage with top level management/leadership of research performing organizations, funders and policy makers
- To engage with relevant organizations (national Rectors Councils, EUA, LERU, Science Europe, etc.)
- To intensify the coordination of "centres of expertise" and relevant initiatives and projects (OpenAIRE, RCAAP[19], Recolecta[20], ...) to promote policy and infrastructure alignment
- To explore the creation of a "License to Publish" - compatible at European level
- To build MedOANet Guidelines with the guidance of existing documents (UNESCO, LERU, etc.), lessons learnt from the project, and translated into the six national languages

---

[19] http://www.rcaap.pt/
[20] http://www.recolecta.net/buscador/

Conclusion

Important reflective points resulted from the European Workshop, concerning open access policy definition and content, implementation and sustainability and also enforcing and monitoring, which served as the basis for the production of recommendations on how to implement coordinated policies in line with the European Commission's initiatives.

In general, what can be stressed, is the regional diversity (levels of awareness and involvement of stakeholders across the countries), the limited coordination at different levels (national, regional and within the European context) on the Mediterranean countries and the need to strengthen the advocacy and awareness efforts and make them permanent. In order to improve the convergence, alignment and coordination of policies at regional level, a strong recommendation has been issued, using the European Commission's policies and documents (especially the Communication and the Recommendation to member states from July 2012), as the general framework and model for this purpose.

As predicted in the Partner Workshop Synthesis Report (2.2) the European Workshop was an excellent opportunity for enhancing coordination among the different countries and exchange viewpoints provided by the discussion of the results of the mapping and best practices.

Annexes

List of participants

Name	Institution	Country
Alma Swan	EOS / SPARC Europe	UK
Ana Neves	FCT	Portugal
Arsénio Reis	UTAD	Portugal
Bernard Rentier	Université de Liège	Belgium
Clara Parente Boavida	UMinho - SDUM	Portugal
Clarisse Pais	Instituto Politécnico de Bragança	Portugal
Cristina González Copeiro	FECYT	Spain
Delfim Leão	Universidade de Coimbra	Portugal
Dimitris Kouis	Heal-Link	Greece
Eloy Rodrigues	Universidade do Minho	Portugal
Herbert Gruttemeier	INIST-CNRS	France
Ilaria Fava	CINECA	Italy
Ioannis Klapsopoulos	University of Thessaly	Greece
Javier Pérez-Iglesias	Universidad Complutense de Madrid	Spain
Jean-François Dechamp	EC	Belgium
Jean-Marc Quilbé	EDP Sciences	France
Jerôme Borme	Associação dos Bolseiros de Investigação Científica	Portugal
José Carlos Kullberg	Sociedade Geológica de Portugal	Portugal
Juan Miguel Gonzalez Aranda	Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness	Spain
Karin Ludewig	ENCES	Germany
Lucie Guibault	University of Amsterdam	Netherlands
Luis Castrillo Aguilera	Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas	Spain
Manuela Berjano	Instituto Ncional de Investigação Agrária e Veterinária, I.P.	Portugal
Maria Cassella	University of Turin	Italy
Maria João Amante	ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa	Portugal
Maria Potes Barbas	Instituto Politécnico de Santarém	Portugal
Marieke Willems	LIBER	Netherlands
Norbert Lossau	Goettingen State and University Library	Germany
Odile Hologne	Inra	France
Orcun Madran	Atilim University	Turkey
Panagiotis Chatzinikolaou	GSRT	Greece
Paola Gargiulo	CINECA	Italy
Pilar Rico Castro	FECYT	Spain
Rainer Kuhlen	ENCES	Germany
Ramazan Acun	ULAKBIM	Turkey

Ramón Rodriguez	CSIC Press	Spain
Reme Melero	CSIC	Spain
Roberto Delle Donne	CRUI	Italy
Umut Al	Hacettepe University	Turkey
Vasso Kalaitzi	National Documentation Centre (EKT/NHRF)	Greece
Victoria Tsoukala	National Documentation Centre (EKT/NHRF)	Greece
Yasar Tonta	Hacettepe University	Turkey

Programme

Feb. 6th	PROGRAMME	
09.00 – 10.00	**Opening Session** University of Minho Vice-Rector, *Rui Vieira de Castro* European Commission, Directorate-General for Research & Innovation (DG RTD), *Jean-François Dechamp* Project Coordinator, *Victoria Tsoukala*	
10.00 – 11.00	**Open Access in the Mediterranean Countries** Open Access in France Open Access in Greece Open Access in Italy Open Access in Portugal Open Access in Spain Open Access in Turkey	
11.00 – 11.30	Coffee Break	
11.30 – 13.00	**Perspectives on policy** Institutional perspective – *Bernard Rentier, University of Liège* The Legal perspective – *Lucie Guibault, University of Amsterdam*	
13.00 – 14.00	Buffet Lunch	
14.00 – 16.00	**Parallel Sessions**	
	Research Funders	**Research Performing Organizations**
16.00 – 16.30	Coffee Break	
16.30 – 18.00	**Closing Session** Reporting from parallel sessions Conclusions and Wrap-up	
20.00	MedOANET Workshop dinner	

Resources

- The presentations can be found at the UMinho Open Access Seminar website [http://openaccess.sdum.uminho.pt/?page_id=1791]
- The MedOANet European Workshop Press Release is available at [http://openaccess.sdum.uminho.pt/?p=1855] and [http://www.medoanet.eu/news/medoanet-european-workshop]
- The pictures of the event are available at [http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.297534600372270.68507.193570257435372&type=3]