



WDS response to the Proposed POSI 2.0 Revisions

Deadline: March 5, 2025

Website details: <https://openscholarlyinfrastructure.org/public-comment-v2/>

Overview

We're excited to announce that we are gathering feedback on the proposed revisions to the [Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure \(POSI\)](#), drafted by the existing ~20 adopters and based on real-world experience of following them.

The [original blog post about POSI](#) (considered the 1.0 release) was in 2015 and, since 2020, 22 organizations and initiatives have adopted the principles and done self assessments. In November 2023, the POSI Adopters released [version 1.1 of the principles](#). The revisions were clarifications based on the experience of the adopters at that time.

[The POSI adopters](#) are now undertaking a public consultation on proposed revisions for a version 2.0 release of the principles. This is a crucial step in ensuring that POSI evolves to meet the needs of the community. Whether you are part of an organization that has adopted POSI, is considering adoption, or operates outside its scope but interacts with POSI-aligned organizations, your perspective is crucial.

Some additional context about POSI:

- POSI is not an organization; POSI adopters are an informal group of those that have conducted self-assessments.
- The POSI principles are not rules or a checklist; organizations or groups can adopt or interpret them to fit many different circumstances.



- Our goal is for POSI self-assessments to be made publicly available and for interested communities to assess and monitor updates and progress.

How to Participate:

1. Review the [proposed changes](#)
2. Complete the 10–15-minute [survey](#)

Questions

* denotes required

Section 1: General Feedback

What is your organization's relationship to POSI?*

- We have adopted POSI.
- ✓ We are considering adopting POSI.
- We have not adopted POSI but are familiar with it.
- Other: _____

Do you think the proposed revisions address key concerns for POSI adopters and the broader community?*

- ✓ Yes
- No
- Other: _____

If you answered “No” please give the reasons why.

Section 2: Specific Principles



1. Are the principles appropriately scoped and applicable to different types of organizations (e.g. government agencies, a department that is part of a larger organization) and initiatives?*

The first principles on “Coverage across the scholarly enterprise” makes sense in general, but may be limited in practice by the scope or mandate of the organization. For example, the organization may have a disciplinary focus or target user group. That should be acceptable, as long as that is clearly stated and ethical.

“Stakeholder governed” makes sense, but this may not always take the form of a board. Other forms of stakeholder inputs can be utilized such as committees, surveys and events. As long as the organization demonstrates accountability to these input processes, that is acceptable.

“Transparent governance” is important, and thus the governing bodies should be listed or shared on public facing websites and/or publications.

2. Should a a distinct principle on Transparent Operations separate from Transparent Governance be added?*

Partially agreed. Not all aspects of operations need be transparent, but certain ones like workflows to produce open scholarly outputs should definitely be transparent. Thus, we’d suggest to expand the existing principle to include that point instead of a separate item.

3. Should the "Living Will" principle be clarified and strengthened so that it applies not only when an organization is wound down but to any transfer of assets, data, and services to another organization?*

Agreed, since transfer of major assets could occur while the organization is still functional. These instances should be planned for at least the most likely cases of migration factors. Factors may include natural disasters (e.g., flooding, earthquakes, wildfires) or anthropogenic causes (e.g., war, political disruption, cyber-attacks).



Also consider adding in communication and notification of stakeholders as a best practice to inform the community of any transfers.

4. Should the "Formal Incentives to Fulfill Mission and Wind Down" principle be revised to focus on organizations and initiatives regularly reviewing their value to the community to assess if they are still necessary and that the reference to organizations having "direct incentives to deliver on the mission and wind down" should be removed?*

Agreed that it would be advisable to emphasize a value-added review process, rather than "winding down" when a mission is achieved. That review process can lead to a revised mission that evolves with community needs, and allows the organization to stay relevant.

5. Should there be a principle recognizing volunteer and other in-kind contributions in sustainability planning?*

Agreed. For organizations that rely on volunteer resources, developing incentives to acknowledge and reward volunteer inputs is an important factor. Service-oriented donations or in-kind resources may also be obtained. In fact, some funding sources require them.

6. Should the principle "Time-Limited Funds are Used Only for Time-Limited Activities" be revised to account for the length of time that it can take to reach sustainability and that time-limited funds can be used to build capacity or implement a sustainability model?*

Agreed, but this should be worded in such a way that milestones, demonstrated progress reports and setback reviews would be used to establish sustainable operational funds. That said, this goal can be very difficult for grants-based organizations to achieve, depending on the political and funding context.

7. Should the principle "Goal to Create Financial Reserves" call for a policy on the level of financial reserves with the actual level of reserves determined by the organisation's or initiative's governing body?*



Agreed that a policy would be an important first step to actualizing a financial reserve, compelling the leadership team to collectively consider what would be deemed appropriate.

8. Should there be a separate principle addressing interoperability and open standards (both de facto and formal) within the "Insurance" section?*

Agreed that would make sense, especially because open is not sufficient for effective sharing and re-use. That would also increase alignment with the FAIR Principles.

9. Should the principle "Open data (within constraints of privacy laws)" be revised to include security as well as privacy laws?*

Agreed that makes sense.

10. Should the "Available Data" principle be revised to call for data to be archived with a 3rd party?*

Only partially agreed. The data should be deposited at an appropriate trusted data repository (based on the TRUST Principles). However, it's not essential that this be a third-party data repository, as trusted repositories are meant to have sustainability plans, including succession plans, in place. In fact, this would make it almost impossible for open data repositories that are involved in data production to adhere to this principle. Thus, the emphasis should be to deposit data in trusted repositories, rather than having a third-party constraint. Also, I would remove the language of "via periodic open data dumps" replacing it with "in a timely manner," as the data release can take multiple forms (dynamic near-real time data, period releases, one-off production subject to peer-review processes, etc).

Section 3: Implementation, Practicality & Additional Feedback



Do the proposed changes seem practical and implementable for organizations like yours? If your organization is not in scope for adopting POSI, do the changes adequately support your needs and interactions with POSI-aligned infrastructures?*

- Yes
- No
- ✓ Other: _Mostly_____

If you answered "No" please give the reasons why

Most of these principles are achievable, and those that are not yet achieved would be desirable. These principles provide a good basis to motivate pathways to their fulfilment.

Do you have any concerns about how the proposed revisions might be interpreted or implemented?*

- ✓ Yes
- No
- Other: _____

If you answered "Yes" please give the reasons why.

The choice of the word "Insurance" seems a bit misleading. These principles do not seem to reflect that notion directly (maybe indirectly, but that isn't clearly implied).

Do you have any suggestions for further changes or improvements to the POSI principles or FAQs?

Sustainability should also consider technology, and its maintenance or migration. Policies and plans should be in place to routinely evaluate and revise technology used or developed by the organization, such that it meets evolving functionality and security needs. Technology includes hardware, software, and other digital assets.



For the “Open Source” principle, it is not always practical or feasible for all software to be open. Perhaps consider this principle in light of complex IT systems, as well as limitations on adequate technical skills in low resource environments.

Would you like to stay informed about updates to the POSI revisions process?*

- ✓ Yes
- No