Questions by moderator:

1. Challenges for you as a public research funder regarding open data? Is there a difference in perspective being a public research funder at the national or European level?

2. The services you provide at DANS (DataverseNL, EASY and NARCIS) and how this fits into the EOSC declaration?
Questions (continued):

3. Science Europe working group on Research Data:
   - Is agreement possible on how to deal with open research data with such a big group of research funding organisations?
   - What are some of the main pressing obstacles you have encountered in your working group?

4. We have just started 2018: where do you stand as public research funder in 2025?
Question 1

Challenges for you as a public research funder regarding open data?

Is there a difference in perspective being a public research funder at the national or European level?

Answers:

- NWO started promoting Open Access Publishing a few years ago
- More recently: Open Science Policy, promoted during Dutch EU Presidency, also cornerstone of new Government
- Principle: Open if possible, protected if needed
- RDM costs can be budgeted in proposals
Answers to Q1

- NWO started pilot requesting data management paragraph and plan in 2016; now policy is implemented for all funding instruments and all domains
- National/international perspective: NWO active Science Europe member, pledged to work on international common core set of RDM requirements
- Challenges:
  - Harmonizing RDM requirements, nationally and internationally
  - How to evaluate DMPs? They do not (yet?) play a role in decisions about grants
Question 2

The services you provide at DANS (DataverseNL, EASY and NARCIS) and how this fits into the EOSC declaration?
DANS is about keeping data FAIR

Mission: promote and provide permanent access to digital research resources

Institute of Dutch Academy and Research Funding Organisation (KNAW & NWO) since 2005

First predecessor dates back to 1964 (Steinmetz Foundation), Historical Data Archive 1989
DANS core data services

EASY: long-term Electronic Archiving System for self-deposit

DataverseNL for short/intermediate term storage (including RDM during research)
Three additional services

http://www.datasealofapproval.org/

http://www.persid.org/

Persistent Identifier
URN:NBN resolver

Cradle of the
Data Seal of Approval

Training & Consultancy

http://datasupport.researchdata.nl/
Three new collaborative services

- Mendeley Data Beta
  - https://data.mendeley.com/

- Dryad
  - Software Heritage Archive
  - https://www.softwareheritage.org/

- Background Archive
- Research Data Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences
  - http://www.brill.com/rdj
Research Data Services: the EASY long-term Electronic Archiving System

over 40,000 data sets published
DANS is partner in:

- EOSC pilot
- EUDAT
- OpenAIRE
- EOSC-hub
- cessda eric

and many other EOSC building blocks
Question 3

Science Europe Working Group on Research Data:

- Is agreement possible on how to deal with open research data with such a big group of research funding organisations?
- What are some of the main pressing obstacles you have encountered in your working group?
Answers to Q3

Working group aims at Common Core Requirements & Domain Protocols for RDM
What is Science Europe?

- Association of 43 European Research Funding Organisations (RFO) and Research Performing Organisations (RPO) in 27 European countries, based in Brussels. Combined budget: €18 billion
- Founding General Assembly in Berlin in October 2011
- Mission:
  - promote collective interests of members
  - support members to foster European research
  - strengthen the European Research Area (ERA)
Until 2016, the SEWGRD worked on basic aspects of research data, such as:

- Funding of data management and infrastructures: [https://goo.gl/eokd1j](https://goo.gl/eokd1j)
- Legal aspects related to copyright and Text and Data Mining (TDM)
- Common data terminology: [http://sedataglossary.shoutwiki.com/wiki/Main_Page](http://sedataglossary.shoutwiki.com/wiki/Main_Page)

Since summer 2016 the Working Group has focused on Domain Protocols for Research Data Management.
Growing demands for Data Management Plans

- A growing number of SE Member Organisations have formulated policies, requirements, templates, etc. for Research Data Management (RDM) and Data Management Plans (DMP)
- The practices and cultures of data stewardship and data sharing vary among and within domains and communities, often depending on methodologies and nature of data collected/processed
Research Data Management: Lots of variation

Who requires RDM?
- funders: national and international, public and private
- research infrastructures: national and international (e.g. ESFRI)
- universities, RPOs
- journals (DAP)

What do they require?
- which/how many criteria?
- FAIR principles?
- retention period?
- during/after research?
- data sharing?
- eligible for funding?
- including software?
- recommended repository/datacentre/archive?

How do they require it?
- via project proposal
- during evaluations
- via code of conduct
- via DMP tool

How detailed?
- data management plan
- data paragraph
- once or periodic updates
- template: narrative/

How strict?
- obligatory
- (strong) recommendation
- advice
Summary of the RDM situation:

- Agreement on the overall policy aims of data management

However….

- Many details differ at the level of implementation

Does this make sense?
What we try to avoid:
One size of data management doesn’t fit all: a domain-oriented approach

Specialized data management practices are in use by different disciplines and communities.

A “bottom-up” approach complementing the “top-down” requirements, involving research communities, is needed:
- Will be more suitable to community needs
- Will get better acceptance/adoption by communities

However:
- Terms of reference and guidelines are needed, to ensure legal compliance, comparability, procedures and basic quality standards
- This implies that research funders and performing institutions are to align their core RDM requirements
Actively involve communities in formulating RDM good practices

Science Europe M.O.’s to align RDM requirements and endorse Data Protocols Framework (Terms of Reference for Domain Protocols)

Domain Data Protocols to be openly published

Common core and domain specific requirements for DMP’s

Data Management Plans for individual research projects

Institutional variations?

Domain specific requirements

Common Core RDM requirements:
- Data description and collection / reuse of existing data
- Documentation and data quality
- Storage and backup
- Ethics and legal compliance, codes of conduct
- Data sharing and long term preservation
- Timeframe of data sharing
Summary: the advantages of this approach

- Counter different RDM requirements from funder to funder, from university to university, from institute to institute
- Active involvement of scientific domains and scholarly communities increases acceptance and usefulness of RDM
- Less work for researchers proposing projects by accepting domain protocol as part of DMP
- Provision to researchers of a learning vehicle on RDM practices in their field, thus raising the general quality level of data management
- Reduced DMP processing costs and burdens for funders and researchers, and more focus on and better assessment of deviating RDM solutions
Question 4

We have just started 2018: where do you stand as public research funder in 2025?
Answer to Q4

Some of my expectations for 2025:

- Culture change is a slow process, but data sharing will be the norm; data management will be as normal as footnotes or bibliographic references; funders will have common DMP criteria worldwide and endorse domain protocols
- Data repositories will be like journals: there will be certified, high-quality ones… and obscure ones
- Data citation is as normal as citation of research papers
- We will have an international software sustainability infrastructure
- We will have a couple of implementations of the FAIR data principles
- The EOSC will be a moderate success: as a technical backbone for data sharing it works fine, the governance and responsibilities will be more distributed in FP10
One final personal expectation for 2025:

Reserved for retired director of DANS