UNL-NFU-UKB-NWO-Elsevier Open Science pilot program
Comments captured during the 23rd May 2024 evaluation session.

Per pilot 2-3 pilot participants provided comments on usefulness maturity and process. The comments were captured and summarized by members of the steering group.

Evaluation	AmsterdamUMC research portal	DataMonitor	GrantsMonitor	RareDiseasesMonitor
Did the pilot meets its objectives and evolve to become a trusted service. If applicable, how was the data that resulted from the pilot used.	Yes, managed to combine data from 2 institutions, generating a unified view to public. Did show the need to align both organisations in terms of business rules. Hence complex if done for NL.	Yes, for some partially, depends on the uni. Data is being integrated with CRIS or used in an institutional Research Graph linking multiple sources. Further improvements needed in data quality/coverage and integration with systems	Partially, API developed and works but still open issues with data (pub matching, missing links to projects, funding schemes etc) and as such not completely evolved yet, but data is being used in organisation	Yes, with comment that precision of underlying algorithm can be further improved. Additional linking to publications made a difference. Data was used to scout for experts, the application process and finding collaborations
Did the pilot contribute to your institutional initiatives to promote OS, did it lead to better (open) research information, did it help you to experiment, raise awareness etc.	Indirectly, and helped significantly in optimising effective use of data and making the institutional context clear. Also helped to identify areas of improvement. No proof for increased usage but expect increased awareness with new datatypes added.	It did help to service issues/problems around what "data" is (definition) and stimulated interactions and alignment within institutions. Helped to discuss the topic with Researchers. Did not result into expanded profiles but data is being used by administration (reporting)	Different use cases applied: "marketing" projects, educating/ interacting with researchers/faculties to change mind set (importance of linked data and public exposure of their outputs)	As an example of what OS can accomplish but not beyond that. Pilot did contribute to better showcasing data that was already there to both researchers and the public. Raised awareness of research and stimulated collaboration. Did improve profiles of researchers (objectively)
How was the pilot executed. Was it time consuming. Was the right expertise available and was there sufficient interaction among the participants. Did it help to keep the admin burden to a minimum	Frequent team meetings. Fairly time consuming for some. Right expertise available although large reliance on single person at E. E. could have documented solution better.	Setup and comms. around pilot went well. Fairly time consuming also because of internal governance in unis. Sufficient expertise and support. Comms with Pure team sometimes a bit slow.	Pilot was not too time consuming. Progress a bit slow also because of delays at NWO. Caught interest from the financial staff in one uni. In other uni, thanks to data of pilot, will help to get attention from faculty to get consistency in grants representation	Weekly meetings between partner and Elsevier. Pilot required 0.5 day per week (partially repurposed for PhD research). Expertise was available (some issue with access to experts to check the precision of the classification) . Tool helped researchers create publication lists and coordinators to find researchers
In case the pilot continues as service, how relevant and valuable it is for you and what improvement/developments are required	Will continue as website for merged organisation. Areas of improvement are: ease of customisation, ranking results, add a section auxiliary/conflict of interest.	Service is not yet crucial enough for these participants (although interest is growing) and not mature enough to justify spend. In terms of relevance and value it scores 20-30 on a scale of 100 (Scopus/WoS)	Considered by one potentially to be quite useful/valuable (60 out of 100) and by other to be somewhat useful (30-35). Improvements: benchmarks, non-awarded grants, link to Pubs, PIDs, correction loop	case is valid and very important to relatively small group of people. Value therefore somewhat limited (for NL data 25 out of 100. Improvement areas: internationalisation, regular updates, exports, link to CRIS, other datatypes (CTs), dashboard functionality
Structural imbedding: has the availability of data from the pilots led to specific follow up and do you have plans to keep the data up to date	Yes, will keep the service and merger continues at individual Pure instances as well.	Beyond having internal discussion about the definition of research data and how the data could be used, not much. Participants prefer to focus on quality vs quantity and will be looking at alternatives to be able to compare	One participant still looking at most logical dataflow and data entries as the information is important for unis. Might use NWO API with manual input. Other participant thinks it will be very hard to get this right without a service like GM.	Yes, data was used in scouting expertise and demonstrating research prowess. Want to continue the service.

Evaluation	EquipmentMonitor	PreprintMonitor	Author disambiguation	Team Science (CRediT)
Did the pilot meets its objectives and evolve to become a trusted service. If applicable, how was the data that resulted from the pilot used.	exceeded initial SoW (2nd and 3rd phase) Requires further thinking about definition of a research infrastructure, inclusion external parties, persistent IDs, etc. Use case is valid. Solution will go in production in 1 Uni.	Since there was no API developed participants (which the participants preferred) felt that the pilot did not evolve enough. Participants felt that clarity lacked about the final deliverables. Data was assessed but not ingested.	Partly, for the pilot there is a limit on the profiles that could be disambiguated, and partners wished they could run an entire institutional dataset. Service is good in terms of accuracy,	Yes, data analyses completed, and white paper is being written. Partners are discussing possible next phase (extended dataset). Need for data currently at (bi) yearly basis. Longer term as part of regular metadata feeds
Did the pilot contribute to your institutional initiatives to promote OS, did it lead to better (open) research information, did it help you to experiment, raise awareness etc.	Indirectly.. Will potentially help in reproducibility /integrity. Raises awareness in and outside the organisation and may lead to more collaboration. Equipment and use will now be visible on portal.	service could potentially lead to more efficiency for those entering the data into a CRIS however, currently there is no strong policy push to do so. The availability of the data can be used to inform policy making. Longer term data could also be used to enrich profiles.	Use cases for better data is important for unis: both cleaning up in CRIS and clean up data outside CRIS. (depends on vision university has on their CRIS and how to use it). One example of showcasing collaborations.	Early days for that to assess: R&R requirements still not clear. Use cases in CV building, team composition/career planning seem promising but still somewhat academic. Expect that in time admin burden to process/ingest data will go down.
How was the pilot executed. Was it time consuming. Was the right expertise available and was there sufficient interaction among the participants. . Did it help to keep the admin burden to a minimum	Initially more time consuming than expected, but good focus and interactions. Because of one-one interaction with Elsevier, more focus from institution required, but also better outcome.	The definition of deliverables could have been better. It should have been clearer if this was to be a true pilot ((exploring options for a possible joined project). A mid-point evaluation would have been useful to agree on final deliverables	Pilot was executed well. service worked (with the limitations as described above). Pilot raises questions about dependency on Elsevier and to what extend it should be DIY @ institution	Pilot was executed well. Still work in progress where it relates to the whitepaper that will go with the data analyses. Doable in term of time required
In case the pilot continues as service, how relevant and valuable it is for you and what improvement/developments are required	Mixed response: quite high for one uni (70); Potential in future for other unis. Improvement: Interface is lacking to simplify operating the service	Currently there is no convincing business case for the unis. R&R may become a forcing mechanism in time. The data can be used to evaluate policies around preprints.	Service considered a good product as it disambiguates people with good accuracy. Improvements are related to API limitations (dataset size) and link to other IDs (beyond Scopus and ORCID)	In time, data probably should get into the university systems (CRIS, etc.) and include all publishers data.
Structural imbedding: has the availability of data from the pilots led to specific follow up and do you have plans to keep the data up to date	Service will go life soon in one of the participating institutions and they want to continue to use it. Other acknowledged importance of use case and future application but may not ready yet to move into production.	There are no plans as yet to maintain the data in a CRIS as there is no mandate to do so.	Opportunity to ensure that narratives from researchers are supported by data proof points (currently very often not the case). Disambiguation important element in providing accurate proof points.	Led to internal discussions and alignment in RI team and will help to clarify and action differences between disciplines.