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Presentations

- Open Science - Funder perspective - Wim van der Doel (NWO)
- Talk to Open Science conference - Rosanne Hertzberger (independent)
- Using open resources in education - René Bakker (HAN)
- A workflow perspective on Open Science - Jeroen Bosman and Bianca Kramer (UU)
- Open Science - what’s next? - Egon Willighagen (UM)

Breakout sessions - statements and session reports

Short form - statements

1. **Open access**: We should re-invest in green open access, including better services
2. **Research data**: Researchers should focus on the research; data stewards on the data; but it should be a joint effort with close collaboration. Plus - researchers need incentives!
3. **Rewards and incentives**: Open Science needs competitions as well as collaborations. It is a false dilemma.
4. **Support**: Support for open science should be fully integrated into the research cycle. The funding required for this support should thus be an integral part of science funding. Since we cannot have experts on all topics (e.g. data, legal, analytics) at all institutions, we need a national level support network, that will work in synergy with support at the local level. Local level support is crucial. Researcher do not need (just) services, they need help!
5. **Metascience**: A broad societal debate including various stakeholders is needed to discuss the relation between privately and publicly funded science in a context in which the first moves to an Open Science model.

6. **If it can’t be open**: If not all of science (data, software, workflows) can be open, more explicit technical, legal, policy and ethical operationalization is needed by additional experts that help out researchers to still put open science into practice. If you can’t share, don’t stop there, make it FAIR and increase scientists' awareness & funders’ care.

7. **Commercial use**: an open science ecosystem needs commercial entities and more exchange of knowledge about various business models is needed

8. **Competition vs. collaboration**: (open) science needs competition as well as collaboration; it is a false dilemma.

---

*Long form - session reports*

**Report Breakout Sessions 1: Open Access (moderator: Just de Leeuwe/Sarah Coombs)**

The breakout sessions on Open Access were quite diverse. The first group was approximately 30 people of various backgrounds. Researchers, support staff, and people from the publishing world were present. The second group was a much smaller group of 7, where from one person was a new researcher who had come to learn more about what Open Access is. The others were support staff with a solid understanding of what OA is and should become.

Several statements came out of these groups.

1. We need to invest in Green Open Access and repositories need to create services that make the green route desirable.

This was not the meaning of all however. The other group felt that:

2. Open Access publishing must become transparent and the quality improved in order for OA to become a recognized and accepted means of publishing. Issues such as: the quality control of preprints, the presence of old and un-updated information in repositories, and an inability to search repositories at a federated level need to be addressed.

A third statement also suggested:

3. Investments need to be made in Open Access publishers such as Frontier and PloS. Instead of exclusively financing multi-disciplinary likes as Elsevier and Wiley, moneys available to publishers must be differently divided in order to facilitate this.

Given the make-up of these groups and the potential influence of the participants, it will be interesting to see how the future of OA publishing will be affected by the discussions that took place during the first NPOS day.
Report Breakout Session 2: Research Data (moderator: Alistair Dunning)

The following issues were raised

- Lack of standards - types and formats of data so different; format (disciplinary level)
- DOI as the universal standard for data (already part of FAIR principles)
- Software versioning - tracking versions of software; finding the right tools to address this
- Need for data stewards during and after projects managers (institutional / faculty / project) Grant money needed for this; different stream. Needs to be enforced beyond project level or else researchers will just use the money for something else.
- "Researchers should focus on the research; data stewards on the data; but it should be a joint effort with close collaboration. Plus - researchers need incentives!"
- Incentives or data sharing / career progression are essential
- Institutional / national cooperation to ensure there are enough data stewards.
- Encourage researchers to deposit uncleaned data / - let a third party do the data cleaning (but make sure that's documented)
- Working together is important - goal is global, but institutions are a starting place to make change happen.
- Embedding data management from the start reduces the burden at the end
- Introductory courses for PhDs about Data Management at a national level? Maybe discipline specific?
- Govt needs to supply more funding - channeling funding to support Open Science
- “As Open as Possible; As closed as necessary” - not everything needs to be shared.

Report Breakout Session 3: Rewards and Incentives (moderator: Gareth O’Neill)

How can we encourage and reward researchers to practise Open Science? This was the theme of the two workshops on Rewards and Incentives which attracted a variety of researchers and policy makers on a hot summer's day at the NPOS day for researchers in Delft on 29 May 2017.

The participants first shared the words that they associated with Open Science and grouped them thematically. The degree of overlap in the terms was noticeable, with the most frequent being 'sharing', 'collaboration', 'transparency', and 'society'. Open Science for researchers is clearly related to the sharing of research data and results. Researchers also see benefits in collaborating on research, not only with academics from their own disciplines, but across disciplines and even across sectors. This research, however, should be responsible, transparent, verifiable, and accountable. Research should also have societal impact, and be expressed in popular and appealing terms for the general public through Science Communication, as well as actually involving citizens via Citizen Science initiatives.

The participants then focused on how to reward researchers for practising Open Science and in so doing how to encourage more researchers to start doing Open Science.
A first distinction was made between the different stakeholders involved, such as government, funding agencies, research institutions, researchers themselves, and the general public. All participants agreed that the training and support for researchers in Open Science needs to be in place at research institutions for Open Science to properly take hold. Adequate funding incentives also need to be devised so that researchers are encouraged to start doing Open Access and Open Data. Also of importance is tackling issues with major publishers so that the academic community is more in control of publishing and APCs are greatly reduced. The most important issues, however, were addressing the evaluation of both research output and research careers. All participants were strongly committed to moving away from impact factors and the current publish-or-perish environment towards FAIR principles of research output. All participants were lastly adamant that good practices in Open Science should be related to the career evaluation of researchers.

To sum up, the workshop participants proposed two main recommendations towards the government, funding agencies, and research institutions to help researchers with Open Science:
(1) Reformulate incentive structures for researchers away from impact factors towards FAIR and collaborative principles of research
(2) Reformulate the research and career evaluation of researchers by including good practices in Open Science in evaluation criteria.

Report breakout session 4: Support (moderator: Alenka Princic)

The sessions had a somewhat small attendance; mostly support staff and two or three research staff. This small setting however, rendered good discussions about support solutions on a local, i.e. institutional level, national level and international. Attendees confirmed there is ever-growing need for support. Attention should thus be given not only to kind of support needed but also to funding of the support. Support (funding) should make part of project proposals, so in return support (beyond lab technician) can be an integral part of the project. Ideally support FTEs should not be direct competition with research FTEs in proposals. Support efforts are undertaken in a common, coherent approach throughout the research cycle predominantly with regard to research data. Similar national-level efforts should be taken also for publishing-support solutions and for research evaluation support (as part of the research lifecycle) in particular. Research evaluation support for researchers and faculties requires adoption of powerful analytics tools and expertise in advanced in-depth analytics (bibliometric and altmetric).

As universities can not have experts in all different fields of support developments are suggested that can enable ‘shared’ expertise, such as shared data scientist, shared analyst, shared legal expert, etc. However, locally available support is vital, as people need someone to talk to and build a relationship with. “We do not need services, we need help!”

What may be missing in the NPOS is the ‘universal infrastructures’ that support Open Science (as examples DOAJ, ORCiD, DOI, Sherpa/Romeo were mentioned). The funding of these global/universal infrastructures and organisations needs to be addressed.
Quotes from the discussion grouped per topic

Support as part of the research cycle
- We need support for experimental design as well.
- Support should be part of the research project lifecycle (not only in the output phase).
- Support FTEs should not come at the cost of Research FTEs.
- Support should be a fixed percentage of all projects.
- We need to fund the basic support infrastructure as well (DOI, ORCID, etc)

A national support network of local support.
- We need a national network of support (people), since not all expertise is available everywhere.
- Local support is however vital, people need someone to talk to and build a relationship with.

Support as in People, not as in Services.
- Support does not match researchers needs.
- Services are implemented the wrong way around (from the infrastructure perspective, not from the scientist perspective).
- Let scientist participate in the (support) community to make sure it matches their needs.
- **We do not need services, we need help!** (Jean-Sébastien Caux, University of Amsterdam)

Fragmentation of services
- Why all the different data repositories (4TU, DANS, etc), there are gaps in between.
- It doesn't help if we can local/regional solutions, we need a global solution, universal agreement.
- I need all my datasets to be findable and accessible globally "when someone googles it", not when they happen to visit the repository where I deposited my data. It is ok if the data is stored locally, but indexing of data repositories should be better.

Other
- We also need advice on legal issues.
- We need better methods and support for evaluating all science (output), not just papers. E.g. data, software, tutorials, outreach, etc.

**Report breakout session 5: Meta-science perspective (moderator: Raf de Bont)**
The meta-science breakout sessions were attended by 5 participants in the first round and 10 in the second.

The major topics of discussion were what it is we ultimately hope to achieve with Open Science in society, and which hidden expectations and assumptions (of an ethical, societal or epistemic kind) there are in our conceptualization of Open Science today.
One topic of discussion was the extent to which Open Science is sometimes conflated with a particular scientific model (associated with experiment, reproducibility, quantification). Attendants disagreed about the extent to which such a conflation was actually there, but agreed on the fact that criteria for Open Science should be defined as inclusive as possible, in order to accommodate all possible scientific disciplines and approaches. According to some this might involve revising the FAIR criteria at some points, in order to acknowledge the broad spectrum of ‘data’ used in various disciplines.

A second point of discussion was the extent to which Open Science would affect science’s place in society. It was discussed how Open Science might reshape not only the relation between publicly funded science and commercial publishers, but also between publicly funded science and privately funded science (e.g. in the pharmaceutical or chemical sector). It is this last issue that led to our statement:

‘A broad societal debate including various stakeholders is needed to discuss the relation between privately and publicly funded science in a context in which the first moves to an Open Science model.’

Report Breakout Sessions 6: If it can’t be open (moderator: Tom Bakker)
In both groups there was general agreement, both among researchers and support staff, that research outputs should be shared. There was no discussion as to the commitment towards Open Science. However, in pretty much all cases, researchers are dealing with situations in which sharing their method, source code, data or publications is not feasible or easy enough: too much work, too complex, too technical, too much legal issues involved etc. So, even if the data do not relate to personal data or other sensitive information that cannot be shared, there are various practical (technical, time, knowledge) limiting factors. For example, knowledge about the possibilities that ‘linked open data’ may provide researchers to actually share (parts of their) data in a safe manner, is limited. A strong call for more awareness among research funders (universities, funds, NWO, companies) to provide the right support (training, experts that help researchers!), was made.

Report breakout session 7: Commercial use (moderator: Egon Willighagen)
The Commercial Use session has as topic how Open Science may be combined in commercial settings. The two session repeats had five and nine participants respectively. The discussions followed the various different backgrounds, including large industry, academia, and open source proponents. Various topics were discussed, including how open science and commercial use are linked together. Various examples of successful combinations were discussed, with some clear examples from information technology sciences, such as the Fortune 500 Red Hat company and the Dutch life sciences companies The Hyve and Euretos. Discussions continued with the goals of commercial use: "in it for the money" versus commercial use to implement the need for sustainability.
This led to the notion of various possible business models, such as based on IP (licensing, patents, copyright), based on selling services around open science solutions, and based on added value (e.g. by cleverly combining data sets). The role of funders was also discussed, which can use reward and restriction mechanisms to steer how their funding is used.

Another aspect that should not be ignored, according to the session, is the distinction between using Open Science and producing Open Science, both options to actively engage with the Open Science community; it was generally agreed that the former is a non-issue regarding commercial use.

**Report breakout session 8: Competition versus Collaboration (moderator: Rebecca Steketee)**

During the first round no participants were present (although there should have been 7 based on number of labels taken from the registration desk). This may indicate people think this is not an important or relevant aspect of open science. Based on the second session (~20 participants) however, it seems that people are relatively unsure about the topic and its relation to open science. Hence, when people were split into smaller groups (4-6 participants), discussions took very different directions, as people raised various issues with respect to collaboration and competition in the context of open science.

Overall, in all groups the constant tension between collaboration and competition - or the delicate balance between the two - was addressed. More specifically, people concluded that although collaboration is theoretically preferred, a collaborative system should only be preferred over the current competitive system once quality is/will be regarded as more important than quantity. Especially for early career researchers, in the current system collaboration would mean shooting yourself in the foot because you need the output for yourself to establish your scientific track record. Another group added that in a collaborative context, the party spending the resources should be the one getting the credits, and not (just) the people publishing on the data.

This means the current evaluation system would have to change before collaboration yields more benefits than competition. Moreover, funding criteria need to change, as these seem to encourage collaboration but at the same time implicitly reinforce competition (by judging applicants on publication record etc).

The main conclusion based on the issues raised above was that in the current form, science needs both collaboration and competition to function, and researchers are not sure how open science will change this status quo (or vice versa).
Participant remarks handed in on paper

On the organization of the day
- Break out sessions were too short
- Good keynotes and moderators
- Nice break out sessions
- Very interesting day. Good to hear all these different perspectives. Contributions from researchers in break out sessions fruitful
- More time for the break out sessions could be better next time
- It is a pity that so many people already left with the wrap up and discussion
- I expected more in depth discussions…….
- Many thanks, well done
- Very interesting and inspiring day
- This deserves more attendants
- Next time invite the pharmaceutical industry
- I was hoping to see more scientists; how to recruit more scientists
- Were all stakeholders invited?
- In a next meeting consider to invite a speaker from the Foss community
- I missed the publishers providers perspective in the program

On the outcomes of the meeting
- What will happen with today’s outcome
- How are the discussions outcomes handled? How to check up what ends up in the recommendations
- What is the next step
- How often will this meeting be held? Annually would be nice
- What kind of updates will we receive (e-mail, website, news article)
- How will the statements/advises from the sessions be communicated to policy makers?
- Make an open forum for continuation of these discussions

On next steps for researchers
- A next step may be more specific for various fields of research. As each field has its own challenges in terms of open science
- I would like more practical or thorough speakers on implementation, statistics on open science, solutions to challenges, international icons on open science
- Please find a good way for sharing good practices
- We need more ambassadors (advocates) to show the best practices
- National training for PhD on research data is needed
On funding and evaluation

- Do evaluate PhD’s on competencies, not only on thesis
- Take Open Access activities along as criterium in personal grants
- Is the pressure enough on funding agencies to react?
- If more money is necessary to facilitate research data sharing (and it is), would researchers opt for x % deducted from their research budget or no support?

On implementation of NPOS ambitions (at the level of policies)

- I’d love to see more pilots (Miedema, UMCU, Science in Transition)
- How will Dutch initiatives for open science be embedded internationally?
- Why are the health funds (SUF) not with the co signers of NPOS. Please ask them, because this topic is on their list
- Open Source versus data privacy: what are the implications, what is possible in working together with others outside NL, how do we cope with foreign legislation?
- Missing is the need for infrastructure financing / sustainable funding for DOAJ, Crossref, ORCID, Open Data Archives. In the NPOS it is assumed that they are all there (but they are all sponsor financed)

On connections with other communities

- There is a lot of relation between open science and free open source software (FOSS), open science can learn a lot from the FOSS community (Wikipedia, Open Street Map) also see the GPL license that ensures freedom for the user (e.g.researcher);
- Connect with the opencon conference organization, do not reinvent all wheels. There is much done internationally

On sharing research outcomes

- Establish a list with classification according to field, sub field, subjects etc. of DOI’s produced while using NWO funding. Not repositories of Data, but pointers to sets, papers etc. with title. Enforce updating this list at end of project.
- Correct deposition of datasets can be handled by depositors such as 4TU, Dans etc.
- Would an open access button for datasets help?
Selection of remarks and questions from the audience in the plenary sessions.

Welcome (R. van Wegberg)
- no remarks from the audience

Opening (K. Luyben)
- no remarks from the audience

Speech S. Dekker
- We do need to consider as a scientific community how to evaluate individual careers of researchers: practicing open science takes time and is currently not being recognized/rewarded.
SD: agrees that evaluation schemes have to revised with respect to how academic quality is defined, current ‘quantitative’ evaluation is too limited to assess what you are doing as a scientist and has developed in such a way that it has perverse effects. First, we need to push academic publishers to open up their business models to become open access publishers. Second, we need to come to a wider interpretation/definition of what academic quality is. Publications will always be important but other aspects such as (broad) impact are important too and should be recognized. This is not only government-driven, but should also be driven by universities and researchers themselves (as envisioned/agreed to in the National Plan) and on a global scale.
- Conference chair: as a former researcher, what would SD’s view as a researcher be on OS?
SD: used to work as a public administration scientist, which is a field that by itself is not only limited to publications and such, but in which impact and outreach (to policy makers, politicians, civil servants) are just as important to be able to improve policies. There was already a tendency then to focus on ‘hardcore science’ e.g. publishing in journals, and SD’s perspective is that this got worse over the last 15 years. The focus has moved away from where science can make real impact, on real lives on a daily basis.

Funder perspective (W. van den Doel, NWO)
- Open access and open data are just two aspects of OS, what will NWO do for open source and open standards to support OS?
WvdD: NWO is still in the process of developing its strategy, so this is still open for discussion, but NWO will not take the lead in this.
- What about citizen science? Is there in the funding mechanisms from NWO a way to reward researchers for valorization, blog posts, online tutorials, articles in popular journals/media, MOOCs, etc?
WvdD: this is an issue in NWO’s discussions now, they have to come up with a new strategy. His position is that citizen science is important, not only in the way that researchers reach out to the community (which has to be taken into account when you evaluate research and when you award research funding), but also the other way around: it is important that the general public is
involved/can participate in our research, e.g. through means as the National Research Agenda. Conversation with the general public needs to be continued, but it is not yet clear how. But citizen science is important, so researchers that communicate with the general public should be rewarded and we have to be responsive to what general public tells us.

**Researcher perspective: R. Hertzberg**
- Did RH ask for a salary that she can live from for her project?
  RH: No. Her personal default situation was doing science for a living and writing on the side, at the moment she is reversing this: getting paid for the freedom to write whatever she wants and doing science as a hobby. Her ultimate dream is to start her own lab outside academia, independently, because she is not sure whether she wants to get funded at this point as the current funding system demands researchers to spend a lot of time and energy on other things than science (such as CV issues, publishing in the right). Her personal preference at the moment is to explore another way [of doing science] for herself. Experiments are being paid for, so she gets hospitality, and sees this situation as flex working in a lab.
  - doing open science in the way RH proposes is great, but will take a lot of time and effort on top of her research: what is her advice to juggle all these things? How is it a possible to do such a privileged thing when there is all the basic needs (career, money) in life to think about?
  RH: acknowledges to be privileged by not having to make money from science. She hasn’t started her project yet, so she is not sure how long she will last. It will take a lot of time to open up, but at the same time it will save a lot of time too: a lot of the protocols have to written out and she is keeping a lab journal anyway. And once you’re ready to write up the bigger paper, you have most work written out already. Additionally, she believes it is your duty: we are all privileged as scientists, maybe even more if you are a funded scientist, if you are funded by public money it is your duty to share your knowledge. And at the moment we are only sharing the good stories. Sharing the bad stories may save other people time (by preventing them from doing the same). RH hopes that we collectively want to move to more collaboration, although she realizes that at the same time, competing for funding makes it difficult to collaborate. But ultimately we can save time by sharing more.

**Researcher perspective: J.A. Pascoe**
- Sentiments recognized as part of tenure track, but what evidence do we actually have that OS interferes with tenure or causing scooping?
  JP: does not know actual examples, perhaps it’s all in our head. But if you create a very competitive environment it makes people more cautious: “what benefit does it have to talk about an idea that I have now, what is the risk of talking about it now?”
  - what is the difference between replication and scooping? Regardless of which independent lab publishes a finding first, it makes the results stronger if they find the same result. This should therefore be considered the gold standard, so journals should also publish this same finding again, to emphasize the value of replication.
  JP: agrees, we overvalue being first. Difference between being scooped and replication is only the order of who publishes first.
**Researcher perspective: R. Bakker**
- the right to have the ability to reuse data is very important. Why do Dutch researchers not cooperate much despite all the options we have within the Netherlands?

RB: research results are not only used by researchers, but also by professional practice and educators, and we should open up and facilitate all use of the materials. The University of Applied Sciences has a different kind to evaluate the results of researchers and teachers; evaluation is based on impact on professional practice and education. Publishing is required but not that important.

RH: the fact that we are together today is hopeful with respect to collaboration. Also consortia are increasingly established and funded (Zwaartekracht subsidies), which stimulates collaboration. But the fact that we are not collaborating more (yet) has to do with our cultural mindset.

- The question of 'why only now' is overdue: aspects of open science were already present 40-50 years ago. It is interesting that a Dutch researcher has to go to US to find the means for his research, it is puzzling that this is not available in the Netherlands.

- best tip to be/become an 'open scientist'?

RH: learn by doing: instead of keep talking about it, the first step is to just do it – there are many platforms that will allow you to share in a way you’re comfortable with.

JP: just do it.

RB: just do it and do not be afraid to get scooped, you’ll get more out of science when you’re open about it (example, proprietary methods/data limit fruitful collaboration).

**A workflow perspective (J. Bosman, B. Kramer)**
- no remarks from audience

**Discussion breakout session 8: Competition versus collaboration (R.Steketee)**
-a solution to incorporate both competition and collaboration in (open) science would be organizing challenges, as is increasingly being done in ICT. This involves posing a research question (online) to which everybody in the world can provide a solution. Those solutions are all evaluated using an established method and a fixed threshold, and the first group achieving a score based on the evaluation method that surpasses the threshold wins. After the winner is announced all participants can collaborate in refining/implementing the winning solution. It is unknown though whether this approach would be easy to apply in other disciplines than ICT.

-From a researcher's perspective, the ideal situation is to have as much collaboration and as little competition as possible, but it is unsure (too early) to conclude whether open science will contribute to that balance - follow up is necessary.

**Discussion breakout session 1: Open access (J. de Leeuwe)**
- What we need it to improve the quality of the process of OA itself, to make it as attractive as possible for researchers; and we should start seeing OA as a means rather than an end to better quality of research (more effective, more transparent etc.) Therefore the quality of the OA process will benefit the quality of research.
Discussion breakout session 2: Research data (A. Dunning)
- Infrastructure can be an incentive to share but is in itself also very important: it should be easy for people to share their data, the infrastructure and training how to use it has to be available.
- It is all about (the burden of) sharing research data but not about the reuse of data and all its advantages (we don’t have to collect the data again, recruit subjects again, etc).

Discussion breakout session 4: Support (A. Princic)
- Shouldn’t NWO explicitly require researchers to allocate budget in their proposals for support for OS?

Discussion breakout session 6: If it can’t be open (T. Bakker)
- Junior researchers are not in the position to decide whether data can be open, hierarchy can prevent/hamper OS. We need to convince the PIs (top down). Gareth: it should start here with the researcher, we should reach out to stakeholders.
- Young people are aware that if they don’t start doing OS, it will not happen, because their seniors/supervisors are not doing it. They know they can realize the transition. What is missing are structural incentives and rewards for OS, especially coming from funders and university policy, these need to change to remove barriers also for senior researchers.
- Even the professors only have so much room to make their own decisions. Audits/review still require impact factors despite not being formally recommended. What can be done to ensure reviews from another perspective?

Concluding presentation: Open Science, what’s next? (E. Willighagen)
- No remarks from audience
Selection of tweets

(original tweets only and excluding tweets just quoting speakers), by participants as well as others mentioning either NPOS17 or NPOS2017

(in reverse chronological order)

- Tessa Pronk: Sharing does not take long: John Allen Pascoe at #npos2017 'spent on average one day per deposited research data set' at @4TUResearchData (link to tweet)
- Ann Viera #npos2017 open science means access to evidence nonprofits and policy makers http://www.policiesforaction.org/blog/turning-research-into-action-a-dialogue-decision-makers-part-one ... (link to tweet)
- Dirk van Gorp: Support for open science should be fully integrated into the research lifecycle, and should be properly funded #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Graham Steel: DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA DORA - SIGN IT FOLKS !!!!!!!!!! @DORAssessment #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Egon Willighagen: There seems consensus here that they impact factor must be replaced #NPOS2017 (link to tweet)
- Sanli Faez: Summing up the #npos2017 meeting on open science : "incentives, incentives, incentives" (link to tweet)
- Jan Willem Veening: Just dumping data in the open is not useful. I like how @EMBOPress is thinking about this with http://sourcedata.embo.org/#npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Jeroen Sondervan: Quite a few early career researchers and research staff present here #npos2017. Wonder if there is anyone here from the 'industry'? (link to tweet)
- Bianca Kramer: Incidentally, Rubicon one of the few grants for which @NWONieuws still explicitly asks for impact factors https://im2punt0.wordpress.com/2017/01/09/nwo-the-impact-factor-paradox/ ... #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Egon Willighagen: Is there hard evidence that #OpenScience actually conflicts with getting tenure? #NPOS2017 (link to tweet)
- Alistair Dunning: Great ideas @ryhertzberger! Start Open Research Pilots at @tudelft? Similar to Cambridge? http://osc.cam.ac.uk/open-research/open-research-pilot-project ... by @martateperek #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Casper Hulshof: I think everyone agrees (except for those whose career depended on publishing!) - measuring broad impact is the real challenge. #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Ingrid Wijk: Suggestion @egonwillighagen @maasuniversity to add open standards to the NWO agenda posed at @npos2017. (link to tweet)
- Sanli Faez: here is an idea @NWONieuws : reduce the (hyper)competition to give people chance of sharing without being punished! #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Alistair Dunning: Very sceptical of dataset citation counts, at least for certain disciplines. Quantity of use not equal to data quality #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- 4TUResearchData: Long-term Data Storage is not necessarily expensive. Documentation and cleaning before archiving can be costly #npos2017 (link to tweet).
- Caralo Hageman: Aan #nwo zal het niet liggen: fair policy t.a.v open Science #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Sanli Faez: speakers emphasize #openscience is more than #openacces, still put the monkey on the shoulder of publishers instead of evaluations #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Willem van Valkenburg: I fully agree with @SanderDekker on changing the way we review researchers. It is not only about high impact journals #npos2017 (link to tweet)
- Carola Hageman: #npos2017 Waarom is deze nationale opening in het Engels? Is dat nodig? (link to tweet)
- Egon Willighagen: Luyben: FAIR != Free != Open, but forgets to note the key point of Open: permission to redistribute and modify #NPOS2017 (link to tweet)

Wordcloud of NPOS2017 tweet texts (image by Egon Willighagen)
Appendix 1. Speech State Secretary – Sander Dekker

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Firstly, if I may, I’d like to express my appreciation to Karel [Luyben] for his hospitality and his support for the cause of open science.

It takes a lot of courage to throw open the doors and lay bare your own work, your personal achievements.
Because there is no way of knowing what will come in and what will fly out.
The easy option would be to open them just an inch, allowing selected visitors to enter and keeping your cherished stuff away from a wider audience.

When searching for a metaphor to make my point about open science, I thought of Het Loo Palace in Apeldoorn.
The palace, which opened to the public in 1984, is one of the Netherlands’ national museums.

Before then, it was one of the homes used by our royal family.
It was queen Wilhelmina, the great-grandmother of our present king, Willem-Alexander, who decided that her beautiful palace should pass into the hands of the state after her death.
The next question faced by the Dutch government at that time was ‘where do we go from here’?
The safety measures and logistics alone presented a major challenge.
Opening a palace like that, stuffed full of valuable paintings, furnishings and other treasures, is no simple matter.
Contemporary specialists may well have recommended that the focus should be on preserving the property, keeping it safe and restricting access to a distinguished and carefully selected audience.

It would have seemed so much easier than throwing the doors wide open.
But what a shame that would have been, denying access to half a million visitors from all over the world every year.
People who, in this way, become acquainted with our history, our art and our culture in the former home of our royal family.
Now science, of course, is not exactly a palace. But please bear with me and, just for now, try to picture it as a building. A building in which we have now opened a few doors. Because, as you may know, we have already made good progress towards the realization of open access in the Netherlands.

Now we want to take it a step further and push ahead with the realization of open science. After all, open access is good, but striving for open science is even better. So what’s the difference between these goals? Open access alone would be as if we had opened the door of Het Loo palace but had not provided any guides. The public would be able to walk through the rooms, but they would soon get lost. Moreover, it would be hard for them to understand what they were looking at. So opening up to the world without any direction or explanation doesn’t get the job done. Open science, on the other hand, is more comparable to what Palace Het Loo is today, a truly open space.

I don’t think I have to convince anyone here of the importance of open science in general. Yet, some of you may still have doubts regarding specific cases. After all, as I mentioned, open science is not an easy road to follow.

And that is exactly why we invited you here. To listen to your ideas and your concerns. We are here to consider where we stand today and where we need to go from here, eliminating obstacles and finding new ways ahead. We need every scientist and every researcher to help us in this endeavour.

The National Open Science Plan was launched last February. Most of the academic organizations behind it are represented here today. The purpose of this national plan is to elevate open science from the status of an abstract concept to a more tangible level.
Open science involves a way of doing research that is open and truly accessible, not only to researchers but to everyone, whether they are entrepreneurs, patients, or just interested members of the public.

One of our main challenges definitely involves the current business models used by scientific publishers. Only this month, VSNU – the Association of Universities in the Netherlands – decided to terminate its negotiations with Oxford University Press. This is a predictable stumbling block in the quest for freely accessible research results.

If the publishers are reluctant to make concessions, there cannot be a deal. In Germany, something similar happened during talks with Elsevier. Elsevier, however, reopened negotiations once the disadvantages of their position began to have an impact. So let’s push ahead and see what happens here. There has also been some positive news. Just one week ago, VSNU concluded a good open access deal with Cambridge University Press!

At European level, we are part of a grand coalition working to achieve open science. Last year, our council drew up its conclusions on open science, and I have an ongoing dialogue with my European colleagues about their progress on this subject.

In fact, Germany and the Netherlands will be presenting a joint position paper to the council tomorrow. This sets out substantial steps towards the realization of a European Open Science Cloud, which will allow research data to be opened up in accordance with the FAIR principles.

So we are working towards open science on several levels, both national and international. Clearly, this is going to take a great deal of time and is by no means a simple matter. But then again, we are engaged in a massive undertaking.
For researchers like yourselves, fully open science will change the nature of what you do and how you do it.

We are all part of a movement that, I believe, is unstoppable. I am convinced that, if research results, conclusions and data become easily accessible, this will not only help to move society forward but also science itself.

Together, we still have to go a long way to go, and many obstacles to overcome. As researchers, you are very valuable travelling companions indeed. After all, our work to achieve open science is intended to benefit you, the researchers. To support you in your work and to improve the way that research is done.

Your opinions and ideas are invaluable, because you know better than anyone else what you have to deal with on a daily basis.

I realize, of course, that it is not always easy for you to follow the path of openness. We are only halfway there, and many practical problems remain to be tackled. But I would like to ask you to join the club, to help us achieve the goal of open science, to extend your hand to the outside world and to guide everyone with an interest in this field through the wonderful building of science.

I very much hope this day will be a fruitful one, both for you and for open science. I look forward to hearing about the ideas that were put forward today, and about the discussions that took place. Also, I fully endorse the value of maintaining an open dialogue.
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