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OPEN SCIENCE: WHAT ABOUT QUALITATIVE RESEARCH?

Substantial restrictions:
- Privacy (GDPR)
- Ethics (informed consent)
- Confidentiality (NDAs)

Current solution:
- De-identification (pseudonymization)

Does not work for qualitative case studies:
- No resolution for confidentiality
- Loss of meaning: case details are needed for coherent interpretation
- Decoupled from experience of original researchers
LIMITED REUSE OF QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY DATA

- **Waste of resources**
  - Individual researchers work with **few cases**
    - little attention for replication and boundary conditions
- Organizations get **overloaded with similar requests**
- Challenged by **funders’ data requirements**
AN ALTERNATIVE: **DECENTRALIZED REUSE**

- Decentralized re-analysis by original researchers who maintain sovereignty over data, according to shared **analytical protocol**, leveraging the power of **cross-case analysis**
PILOT: GOVERNANCE OF MISSION-ORIENTED INNOVATION ECOSYSTEMS

- Formulation of **Analytical Protocol**
  - Case selection criteria
  - Concepts & coding rules
  - Presentation of case interpretation

- Document with **Rules of engagement**
  - roles and responsibilities
  - authorship
  - possible confidentiality

- **Invitation** based upon network
  - own cases
  - overlapping cases
  - unfamiliar cases

---

Please fill in the following table based on definitions and key indicators provided below. Include examples or quotes or other data excerpts where possible. Note that the case may fit into various categories. If so, please include this in the explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant-led</th>
<th>Lead Organization</th>
<th>Network Administrative Organization (NAO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unbrokered; no separate or unique governance entity, dependent on the commitment of all or a significant subset of actors. Decentralized, symmetrical power structures.</td>
<td>Centralized, highly brokered, asymmetrical power structures. Decision making and resource acquisition/utilization and conflict management is coordinated through a single party. Can be a mandated or emergent role.</td>
<td>Centralized, brokered, asymmetrical power structures. Separate external unique governance entity with an exclusive governance role. NAO plays a coordinating role in sustaining the network. NAO is not a member providing its own services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GOVERNANCE**

- To what degree do you consider the participant-led governance label applicable? High, medium, or low.
  - Explain why you indicated ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’

- To what degree do you consider the lead organization governance label applicable? High, medium, or low.
  - Explain why you indicated ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’

- To what degree do you consider the network administrative organization governance label applicable? High, medium, or low.
  - Explain why you indicated ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’
LEARNINGS SO FAR

- Lot of explaining to do
- Enthusiasm!
- Tradeoffs w.r.t. recency of cases
- Defining analytical protocol
  - balancing degree of pre-structuring
  - required details and data excerpts
- Refining our rules of engagement
- More robust findings?
OPEN QUESTIONS & NEXT STEPS

- Cross-case analysis & writing manuscript
- Methodological paper
- Session with DSIG in February
- Boundary conditions / applicability domain?
  - domains and topics
  - methods of data collection
  - methods of analysis (theory development / elaboration / testing)
- Scalability
- Openness of case interpretations according to analytical protocol?
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