Universities UK Open Access Coordination Group

Contact/s	**Paper number**
Max Hastings	1
02074195642	
Max.Hastings@UniversitiesUK.ac.uk	

Note of meeting held on 7 July 2017

Executive Summary

Summary of the discussion at the last meeting.

Action

For approval

In attendance

- Adam Tickell, Vice-Chancellor, University of Sussex (Chair),
- Max Hastings, Policy Researcher, Universities UK (secretariat),
- Steven Hall, Managing Director, Institute of Physics Publishing
- Simon Kerridge, Director of Research Services, University of Kent, Representing the Association of Heads of University Administration (AHUA)
- Emma Wilson, Publishing Director, Journals, Books and Databases, Royal Society of Chemistry, Representing the Society of College, National & University Libraries (SCONUL)
- David Prosser, Executive Director Research Libraries UK (RLUK)
- Helen Snaith, HE Policy Adviser, Research Education and Knowledge Exchange, HEFCE
- Gemma Hersh, Policy Director, Elsevier, representing the Publishers Association
- Alex Vincent, Associate Director, Policy and Analysis, Research Councils UK
- Torsten Reimer, Head of Research Services, British Library, Representing the British Library
- Rob Kiley, Head of Digital Services, Wellcome Trust
- Mark Patterson, Managing Editor, eLife
- Steven Hill, Head of Research Policy, HEFCE, Representing the national funding councils
- Liam Earney, Director, Jisc Collections, Representing Jisc

Observers

- Shearer West, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield, Chair of Open Access Monographs working group
- Jess Cole, Head of Policy (Research and Europe), the Russell Group
- Anne Horn, University Librarian, University of Sheffield, Chair of Open Access Repositories working group (via teleconference),
- Yvonne Barnett, Pro Vice-Chancellor and Head of College, Science, Nottingham Trent University, Chair of Open Access Service Standards working group (via teleconference)
- Neil Jacobs, Programme DirectorDepartment for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS)

Apologies

- Kitty Inglis, Chair, SCONUL Academic Content and Communications, Representing Society of College, National & University Libraries (SCONUL)
- Michael Jubb, Consultant, Jubb Consulting

Item 1- welcome and apologies

1.1   The Chair welcomed attendees to the ninth meeting of the group and gave apologies for those not present. The chair noted that the CEO of Universities UK, Nicola Dandridge, has been appointed the prospective CEO of the Office for Students, and offered congratulations. The chair also congratulated Shearer West on her appointment as VC-elect of the University of Nottingham. The chair also informed the group that Kitty Inglis will be retiring, and the group extended thanks for her valued expertise and engagement with the OACG over the last few years.

Item 2- note of the last meeting (paper 1)

2.1   The note was accepted as correct; however, a small number of typos were identified, including Steven Hill being erroneously recorded in place of Steven Hall at 3.9.

2.2   Actions from the last meeting:

- At 3.4 **Action**: Efficiencies working group – in close collaboration with the repositories working group – to take the lead on investigating the costs associated with OA repositories. *[update: unfortunately, this has proved too difficult]*
- At 3.5: **Action**: Steve Hall and Kitty Inglis to work together to survey SCONUL members to ask about FTE staffers employed to support OA at institutions, and on costs more generally associated with making an article openly available in a repository. Both are to keep Anne Horn and the Repositories Group briefed.

    [Update - from Kitty Inglis (apologies):
    SCONUL is actively encouraging all members to complete the OA Assessment Survey questionnaire (distributed by Research Consulting on behalf of HEFCE, RCUK, Jisc and Wellcome). Members who have completed the questionnaire have advised me that the survey captures staff costs (including levels of staff and time spent) as well as costs for making an article open access through a) the gold route and b) the green route.]

- At 3.8: **Action:** Steven Hall to coordinate a meeting of the Chairs and Secretariats, including Max Hastings**.** *[Update: this has been arranged for 1st August]*
- At 6.3: **Action:** All group members to give feedback on the logic models via email to Max or to Neil. *[Completed]*
- At 9.1: **Action:** David Prosser to forward details of the definition change to HEFCE. *[Completed]*

Item 3- the proposed model Scholarly Communications Licence

3.1   The chair departed from the circulated agenda order to prioritise discussions on a model scholarly communications licence. David Prosser was invited to introduce the SCL and the background to its development.

3.2   David summarised the ambitions of the SCL - to facilitate open access by fulfilling a variety of OA mandates in one step, and also to clarify where IP rights lie. The SCL steering group believe the SCL had been well trialled to date, and beyond the discussion at this meeting, there is a series of engagement meetings lined up, between the SCL steering group and the Russell Group, ARMA, PA members and others, with a view to refining the model licence. Employees of approximately 70 institutions have shown some interest, and the steering committee expect 8-10 universities to be in the first cohort of adopters later this year.

3.3   Steve Hall responded, and explained the view and rationale behind his strong objections, which were three-fold and briefly summarised below.

        1) The way in which the SCL has been developed: it was felt that the SCL had not received proper and transparent consultation with appropriate stakeholders, particularly publishers, and that the way it has been handled to date effectively undermines the role and spirit of the UUK OACG.

        2) The licence is wrong in principle: it was felt that the SCL seeks to appropriate peer review process and ignores the significant investment that publishers make in supporting peer review.

        3) The licence is wrong in practice: it was felt that the SCL steering group makes broad assumptions about how publishers and others will respond to the licence, and there is inadequate evidence on the impact of waivers requests from publishers – and that the Harvard licence does not provide a reasonable example of how the SCL could work in practice. Steve explained that, with the SCL in its current form, IOP publishing will likely require a waver on every article before acceptance, and that he believed there would be a very large administrative burden associated with gaining wavers, for both institutions and for publishers.

3.4   Steve proposed how the licence could be developed, in order to address the perceived problems with it from the IoP perspective. IoP would like to see an automatic embargo period of one or two years, depending on discipline, and remove the need to for each author to apply for it. Secondly, IoP would like the licence to be attached to the Accepted Manuscript and be CC BY NC ND. Steve raised concerns about whether meaningful and productive discussions with the steering committee is possible, due to a perceived lack of willingness to engage with publishers and other key stakeholders to date.

3.5   Gemma Hersh commented that the Publishers Association fully agrees with Steve Hall and the IoP, particularly that the Harvard licence is not a fair comparison and that there has been nothing which could be considered appropriate consultation to date.

3.6   It was offered that the SCL had been raised at the coordination group during a meeting in June 2016. The Chair read the pertinent part of the record of the meeting, as follows:

> Paragraph 3.16: oral update from David Prosser, RLUK:
> *4) There is some angst around HEFCE policy compliance from the library community, which has prompted further consideration of a Harvard-style licence. A discussion followed regarding potential opportunities for learning from the experience in the US.*

3.7   The chair summarised that the group did not recognise the significance of this statement.

3.8   Emma Wilson of ALPSP updated the group that there were very significant concerns being raised about the SCL from some ALPSP members, especially around the embargo period (currently zero), which would lead members to seek waivers from the licence.

3.9   Mark Patterson of eLife updated the group that the SCL is not a problem for OA publishers, and that eLife considers the SCL as a positive development.

3.10   Simon Kerridge, ARMA, commented that a CC-BY-NC licence is HEFCE and RCUK compatible. A discussion followed on whether RCUK policy has changed, which Alex Vincent confirmed it had not – although the accompanying FAQ had been updated following consultation.

3.11   A discussion followed on the extent of consultation with publishers and other groups/organisations to date. Torsten Reimer informed the group that some discussions did take place at early stages with employees of some publishers, and it was stressed that the motivation of the SCL steering committee is to help OA.

3.12   Discussions continued on points already raised. The chair shared his view as chair of the OACG, which is summarised below:

- If there has been consultation on the SCL with key stakeholders, there has clearly been a lack of awareness of the significance of the proposed SCL and its implications.
- The members of the UUK OACG have a ministerial backing to collaborate in order to advance OA objectives in the UK, hence the composition of the membership of the group.

- The SCL represents the biggest challenge to the post-Finch consensus in the years that the group (and others) has been working on it. The group and those represented via the group's membership have made progress on open access, but slower than some in the sector would like.
- Ultimately, whether to change an institutional policy (such as adopting the model SCL) or not is a matter for autonomous universities, and the OACG has no mandate to take a position one way or another, should some individual institutions wish to adopt.
- The UUK OACG monitoring report will show the progress the sector is making in the transition to OA, and is due in December 2017, and our working groups are on a similar timeframe for outputs. The research councils are committed to conducting a five-year review of OA policies next year.
- Of course, institutions are free to act as they decide, however there is a risk of frustrating the OA journey with the model SCL, and institutional decision-making would be better supported by a proper review of an appropriate evidence base.
- The Chair thanked everyone for the spirit of the discussion at the meeting and the commitment on the part of everyone present to meet in future and to do so understanding that people's intentions were honourable and in the spirit of compromise and progress.

Action: The Chair, via UUK, will write to VCs to make them aware of the SCL and with a summary of some of the associated claims being made for and against. *[update: this has been completed]*

Action: all members to circulate views and evidence on the SCL to UUK. *[Update: views received from the PA, available **here**, and from the SCL steering committee, available **here**.]*

Item 4 – updates from the working groups (papers 2, 3, 4, 5)

4.1   The Chair invited the chairs of the working groups to summarise the update papers already provided by each working group, and invited group members to discuss direction of travel and explore synergies.

4.2   OA Efficiencies Forum (Steve Hall, Chair): Steve updated the group that the working group is focussing on the following areas: improved communications to stakeholders of policies, licences and processes to support open access; the use of consistent identifiers through the research and publication process; workflows to support gold and green open access; and the form and management of offsetting agreements. Steve also confirmed that a meeting of all working group chairs and secretariats will take place on 1st August at Woburn House.

4.3   Anne Horn reflected that a new mandate requiring the use of unique identifiers is being implemented in New Zealand could provide a good resource of information on how a similar mandate could work in the UK. Steven Hill commented that the REF may not be an appropriate platform for such a mandate. There was broad agreement that it would be helpful for members to encourage the use of ORCID, and that perhaps the upcoming Open Access Week could provide such an opportunity.

4.4   OA Monographs Working Group (Shearer West, Chair): Shearer updated the group that the working group is focussing on three broad areas: funding OA monographs, supporting cultural change, and developing supportive business models.

4.5   Simon Kerridge commented that a CASRAI working group is active in this area and doing work on definitions.

>   **Action**: Simon Kerridge to share details of CASRAI working group with Shearer West.

4.6   The Chair noted that the UK government has indicated a considerable increase in funding for research over the next few years, and that it might be timely to develop a business case to have some allocated to OA monograph developments / pilots.

4.7   A discussion followed on 3rd party rights for image use in OA monographs, and associated challenges. These issues are too large for the working group to address; however, it was noted that such issues should not prevent progress being made.

4.8   David Prosser suggested that the Chair might helpfully include a recommendation in his next independent advice to government, that all publicly funded bodies are encouraged to adopt a policy that would allow the reproduction of images cost-free for academic monographs, such as that currently in place for the V&A (https://www.vam.ac.uk/articles/terms-of-use). There was broad agreement.

4.9   OA Repositories working group (Anne Horn, Chair): Anne Horn updated the group on the good progress being made by the working group. The group is in the process of refining potential recommendations. A short discussion took place on an enhanced role for ORCID and also on a wider take up of Jisc Publications Router, both of which were met with broad agreement.

4.10   OA Service Standards working group (Yvonne Barnett, Co-Chair): Yvonne updated the group on the current areas of focus. The working group is predominantly focussing on Gold OA, and is currently mapping the various stakeholder needs and requirements. Collaboration and engagement events are being planned, and the group is currently looking to consolidate headline recommendations or features of the working group's output.

4.11   There was a short discussion on the relationship between the proposed output and the COAF and Wellcome agreements, and it was suggested that it would be helpful to find alignment.

4.12   The chair, on behalf of the whole group, thanked all chairs, secretariats and members for their hard work and assistance with the working groups – noting that all is being delivered out of good will and in people's own time, with no additional funding or resources – and congratulated them on the good progress to date.

4.13   The Chair also suggested that the groups could use the upcoming Open Access Week in October as an opportunity to promote the excellent work and progress being made. There was a short discussion regarding using social media and other online for a o achieve this. There was agreement in principle, however this will need to be kept under review, as there may be announcements anticipated regarding the SCL.

Action: Max Hastings to draft a communications plan for OA week.

Item 5: Update on the OA monitoring project (tabled paper)

5.1   Michael Jubb provided a short update paper on progress to the group, having it become necessary to send late apologies. Max Hastings spoke to his paper, and reported that work continues on track, and the team is not yet in a position to make provisional findings available. However, members of the OACG and other experts are invited to attend a meeting ahead of the next OACG meeting in September, to discuss, challenge and inform provisional findings.

Action: Max to circulate details and collate attendance.

Item 6: BEIS update

6.1   Neil Jacobs updated the group on the first meeting of the BEIS Open Science Coordination Group meeting. The next meetings will be in Autumn 2017 and early 2018, and will consider OA infrastructure, skills, incentives and organisational change and leadership. A short discussion followed, and it was noted that open access continues to be discussed in G7 fora, which the Minister will be attending later this year.

Item 7: HEFCE update

7.1   Steven Hill updated the group on the joint HEFCE-RCUK-Wellcome-Jisc project to gain information on compliance with funder mandates. The second phase of the project has been awarded to Research Consulting, who are now engaging with 18 institutions to inform the design of the questionnaire. Findings are due in Autumn, and will be fed into the OA monitoring project.

7.2   Gemma Hersh raised a question as to whether the research is focussed on compliance rates, however the research is a temperature check of the mandates and which technology is being used to by institutions.

Item 8: RCUK update

8.1   Alex Vincent provided an update from RCUK. Recent announcements on policy and compliance data had been frustrated by the election, but will be released soon. Work continues regarding the OA block grant, with announcements to follow.

[update: RCUK have since announced that Open Access block grants will be continued at current levels for a further 2 years: http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/media/news/180717/*]*

8.2   The research councils are committed to a five-year review of their OA policies, which will be taken forward into UKRI. Details are being worked up, with an announcement anticipated for Autumn 2017.

Action: Alex to share details when available with Max for circulation.

Item 9: AoB and next meeting

9.1   Simon Kerridge offered to provide the group with further details of CASRAI activities in this space.

Action: Simon for forward to Max for circulation.

9.2   Mark Patterson informed the grop that the Open Citations project is progressing well, now recording 45% ofg citation data. Further information can be found at https://i4oc.org/

9.3   The next meeting will take place on Tuesday 3 October, 14:00 – 16:00, at Woburn House.

9.4   The Chair noted the scale of current activity and expressed thanks group members for their constructive contributions to the meeting, and for the continued collaboration.

MH 03/08/2017