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Executive Summary
Summary of the discussion at the last meeting.

Action
For approval
In attendance
Adam Tickell (Chair), Steven Hall, Alicia Wise (delegate), Neil Jacobs, Mark Patterson, David Carr (delegate), Valerie McCutcheon (delegate, telecon), Andrew Wright (delegate), Max Hastings (secretariat), David Prosser, Graham Stone (delegate), Helen Snaith, Kitty Inglis, Torsten Reimer, Steven Hill, Laura Bellingham.

Observers
Michael Jubb, Anne Horn

Apologies
• Robert Kiley, Wellcome Trust – delegate: David Carr, Policy Adviser, WT
• Alexandra Vincent, RCUK – delegate: Andrew Wright, RCUK
• Gemma Hersh, Publishers Association – delegate: Alicia Wise, Elsevier
• Liam Earney, Jisc – delegate: Graham Stone, Jisc
• Professor Yvonne Barnett, Chair, UUK OA service standards working group
• Professor Shearer West, Chair, UUK OA monographs working group
• Dr Simon Kerridge, ARMA – delegate: via telecon Valerie McCutcheon, ARMA
• Emma Wilson, Royal Society of Chemistry

Item 1- welcome and apologies
1.1 The Chair welcomed attendees to the eighth meeting of the group and gave apologies for those not present. The chair welcomed delegates to the group.

Item 2- note of the last meeting (paper 1)
2.1 The note was approved by the group, subject to one correction: Mark Patterson was not in attendance.

2.2 Actions from the last meeting:
• At 3.15: Action: RCUK to share slides on the block grant. [update: see item 4]
• At 3.16: Action: UUK to assist with coordination between secretariats of the working groups and RCUK OA Practitioners’ group. [update: ongoing]
• At 4.13: Action: group members are invited to send further comments to Max by the end of the year. It was agreed that Max would launch an ITT in the new year. [update: the ITT was launched as planned and has been awarded - item 8]
• At 5.1: Action: Members are invited to send responses to the industrial strategy consultation once launched to Max, for consideration for the UUK response. [update: no comments were received]
• At 6.4: **Action:** UUK to canvas availability *update: completed*

**Item 3- Open Access Groups – updates** (Papers 5,2,3,4)

3.1 The chair invited group members to suggest any pressing updates in lieu of the normal round-table updates item. None were raised.

3.2 The Chair invited the chairs of the working groups to provide updates on recent activity.

3.3 **OA Repositories working group (Anne Horn, Chair) (Paper 5):** Anne updated the group that the first meeting of the OA repositories working group has taken place and was productive. The following themes are being explored as a priority, in four sub-groups: interoperability between repositories; a national approach to long-term preservation; improving discoverability; and reporting and compliance.

3.4 A short discussion took place on the costs associated with institutional open access repositories. It was noted that there is work in train by RCUK, Wellcome Trust, HEFCE and Jisc to assess the costs associated with compliance with funder mandates (see item 4). The link between the costs of repositories and the work of the OA efficiencies working group was also noted – both want to look into the financial aspects.

**Action:** Efficiencies working group – in close collaboration with the repositories working group – to take the lead on investigating the costs associated with OA repositories.

3.5 A discussion followed on how many FTE posts are involved in running repositories, noting ambiguity in roles such as with University Press, IT staffers etc. It was noted that Research Consulting has done some work in this area.

**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.

3.6 A short discussion followed on whether models such as Europe PubMed Central might prove to me more efficient than institutional repositories.

3.7 **OA Efficiencies Forum (Steve Hall, Chair) (Paper 2):** Steve Hall updated the group that the OA efficiencies forum has now had two meetings, both of which have largely focussed on Gold OA, but are now starting to consider Green too.

3.8 Of the sub-groups, one investigating *identifiers* has not yet met, although initial discussions around the possibility of mandating ORCID, for example, suggested that...
the mandate would need to be applied early in the research process if it were to be effective. It is also not yet clear who could issue such a mandate.

3.9 Steven Hall reported that data on RCUK had now been received, and was being analysed.

3.10 The communications sub-group has met twice, and is looking at the terminology used and how it might be standardised/simplified. There is a desire to organise a workshop to explore this issue better and identify ‘pain points’. Funding from the Coordination group to support activities was briefly discussed, however remaining budgets are currently allocated to supporting central outputs. This may be revisited at the next meeting if necessary.

**Action:** Steven Hall to coordinate a meeting of the Chairs and Secretariats, including Max Hastings.

3.11 A discussion followed about whether Offsetting could be included as a topic for consideration within the efficiencies working group, as it is currently being avoided due to concerns around competitive issues. It was suggested that discussions of this nature could focus on processes of how offsetting might be delivered, rather than the specifics of proposals.

3.10 A question was put to Steven Hill on whether ORCID could be mandated. Some issues have been raised regarding data protection, and consultation responses are currently being analysed.

3.12 **OA Monographs Working Group, Shearer West (Paper 3):** the first meeting went well, and focus is on avoiding duplication of previous efforts, and on developing the agenda further. Discussion centred on the barriers and drivers of OA monographs, and efforts will focus on the workability of business models (and how they can be supported), and also on myth-busting and educating on the nature and benefits of OA monographs.

3.13 There was a brief discussion about the pros and cons of a ‘concordat-style’ output for promoting OA monographs. The Chair acknowledged that this issues at hand for OA monographs are very complex, not least due to the cultural challenges involved. There was a brief discussion on the costs associated with OA monographs, and it was noted that more pertinent information might be available with the launch of the final reports of the Academic Book of the Future, which are due in May. Possible business models such as that of ‘knowledge unlatched’ were briefly discussed, alongside Author Royalties.

3.14 **OA Service Standards working group, Michael Jubb (Paper 4):** Michael explained that the group had been established and the first meeting is being arranged. The
group is focused on a limited output, and it is keen to have links to the efficiencies group, in particular, along with the other working groups.

**Item 4: RCUK update**

4.1 Andrew Wright explained that the block grant data for years 2 and 3 is looking good and is expected to be made available by the end of April – noting they have now gained dedicated analytical support.

4.2 The RCUK Open Access Practitioners Group is assisting in the launch of a refreshed reporting template, which aims to be low-burden for institutions. The group is also looking at how Researchfish data is used. The group will also be looking towards the future, and what the post-March 2018 policy framing might be for UKRI.

**Item 5: HEFCE update**

5.1 Steven Hill updated the group on the joint HEFCE-RCUK-Wellcome-Jisc project to gain information on compliance with funder mandates. It was suggested that findings from this project be linked to the monitoring project. This project, and the proposed sharing of information with the monitoring project was welcomed by the Chair. RLUK and SCONUL offered to help with the project if needed.

**Item 6: BEIS update**

6.1 Neil Jacobs informed the group on the proposed BEIS Open Science Coordination Group, which is to focus on Open Access, Open Research Data and research metrics. BEIS is looking to assist in coordinating outputs from various groups in the sector, and also to improve the evidence base on the benefits of Open Science.

6.2 A short discussion followed on the balance between prioritising commercialisation and openness in the UK, and on the value of OS to UK PLC.

6.3 Neil introduced the logic models which attempt to describe OA relationship to improving impact quality and efficiency of UK research. Neil is interested in defining both benefits and disbenefits of Open Science, and to reflect on the design of the models.

**Action:** All group members to give feedback on the logic models via email to Max or to Neil.

**Item 7: Jisc-Elsevier Open Science Group update**

7.1 Alicia Wise introduced the Jisc-Elsevier OS group, with the following text provided by Liam Earney, Jisc:
As part of our renewal negotiations in 2016, Elsevier and Jisc agreed a 5-year partnership on Open Science. This reflected a widespread belief that an agreement limited to subscriptions only was a wasted opportunity. This is not a Jisc and/or Elsevier attempt to define OS for the sector. Clearly there is the BEIS group and OS is hotly discussed around the world. It’s very early days in our OS partnership and there is much to be agreed. We are in the process of appointing a steering group for the initiative, we have a chair, but until the group is formed and has terms of reference there isn’t much more to say. I am happy to provide updates at future meetings.

7.2 A short discussion took place on the time frames for the groups operation. The relatively slow initiation period has been a symptom of trying to find mutually agreeable calendar times for meetings. The group intends to report on an annual basis.

**Item 8: Monitoring the Transition to OA - project update**

8.1 Michael Jubb introduced the project he has been commissioned to deliver. The project builds on the previous 2015 report, and expands a little in some areas as new data/sources of evidence have become available. Michael reflected that complexity in the OA system has increased in the last two years.

8.2 Michael is keen to have a focus group in May to inform the work, and also to have a feedback event in Autumn before the final output is produced.

**Item 9: AOB**

9.1 David Prosser asked the group if it had any views regarding the recent move of UK publisher to change the definition of the ‘date of acceptance’ without consultation. A short discussion followed regarding the ‘communications element’ of OA – and that it was suggested that the academic community had only recently gained a wider understanding of what this term previously meant.

**Action**: David Prosser to forward details of the definition change to HEFCE.
The group has now met in person three times, on 3 November 2016, 30 January 2017 and 13 June 2017. Its next meeting is scheduled for 30 October 2017, by which time it hopes to have some outputs, beyond meeting minutes and draft documents, to share with the wider OACG.

The group has so far focused on reviewing the activities, reports and recommendations of many groups working on open access processes, in the UK in particular. In its first meeting it formed two sub-groups to address issues which it believes are central to improving processes around open access (and scholarly communications more generally): much more effective and consistent communications to researchers by their institutions, funders and publishers on policies, licences and processes to support open access; and on the use of consistent identifiers through the research and publication process, for example ORCIDs, which would support more effective automation of processes.

It has also produced three draft documents on pain points in the workflows to support gold open access (for example, in the payment of APCs) and green open access (for example, on deposit in repositories) and in the form and management of offsetting agreements.

Its aim is to agree recommendations for best practice and improvements to processes from its two sub-groups and on the three workflows at its October meeting and to be able to share these with the OACG shortly after that.

It is somewhat hampered in its assessment of the efficiency of gold open access processes by the lack of data from RCUK on its block grants. While data are now available on the number and cost of articles published on a gold open access basis under RCUK’s policy in the years 2013/14 to 2015/16, there are no data yet available on articles complying with requirements on green open access and no overall data on the totality of outputs from RCUK-funded research; nor granular data on the costs of administration. It must also be noted that the adoption of the proposed Scholarly Communications Licence by UK universities would have a very significant impact on the work of the group and any recommendations that it might make, given the degree of disagreement between stakeholders on the licence and the lack of full consultation on it to date.

The chair of the Efficiencies Group has convened a meeting of the chairs and secretaries of the four sub-groups – Efficiencies, Repositories, Standards and OA Monographs – to take place on 1 August, to share information and to discuss overlaps in the work of the four groups and to ensure their work is coordinated and not duplicated.
**UUK OA Monograph subgroup**

**Update report**

**Overview**

The OA monograph subgroup has met twice since its inception in February 2017. Discussions have centred around three key themes:

- Funding OA monographs
- OA monograph business models
- Fostering a dialogue to bring about a positive cultural change towards OA in HE.

**Outputs**

A Budget Transition Report (Eve et al.) has been produced for the purposes of identifying potential streams of funding in a transition to OA monographs. This report will be used as a means of exploring potential avenues of investigation as the group progresses.

We have identified three outputs that will be developed over the next few months. These are:

1. **Synthesis report**
   - A 5-6 page literature review that summarises the work that has been carried out on OA monographs. The synthesis report will:
     - Summarise key findings of reports focusing on OA monographs
     - Highlight benefits of OA monographs to a range of stakeholders
     - Be used to disseminate to external stakeholders that the group wishes to engage with in the transition to OA monographs.

2. **Outreach**
   - An outreach programme will engage with key stakeholders within the sector. These include (but are not limited to): University VCs, PVCs (Research), ECRs, publishers (traditional and new), librarians, research managers, policy-makers, research councils and funders. The aims of the outreach programme are to initiate a dialogue with the sector around the anxieties and issues perceived with publishing monographs open access. Events will also serve as a means in which to share the benefits of OA across a range of stakeholders.

   The outreach programme will take a dual approach:

   a. **Workshops series**
      - We will host a series of invitation-only workshops/symposiums targeted at key stakeholders. The objectives of the workshops is to foster a dialogue with the sector in order to understand, and (as far as possible) alleviate some of the anxieties around OA. These events will also provide a space in which to share positive stories about OA and demonstrate examples of good practice by those already involved in the process. A formal output (e.g. a short publication or report) will be produced at the end of the series.

   b. **Representation at external meetings and events.**
      - In order to take a proactive approach to understanding discipline-specific issues pertaining to OA monographs we will attend relevant external events and meetings to engage with the sector. Groups to target may include (but are not limited to): DASHH, subject associations, learned societies, PVCs (research).
3. **Pilot study**
   
   A pilot study will build upon work carried out for the Budget Transition Report and the synthesis report identified at point (1). The pilot aims to explore potential business models and funding streams that may be used in a transition to OA for monographs.

   Development of a pilot is still in its tentative stages, and the group is currently considering the form that this project will take. The following issues could be addressed through a pilot:

   - How to encourage a greater portion of books to be published by low cost publishers.
   - How to encourage innovative ways of accessing OA books (e.g. through subscription models such as Knowledge Unlatched).
   - How to support a mixed ecology of publishers in the transition to OA.

   A business case will be developed for the pilot project and will be discussed with the members of the UUK coordination group in due course.
UUK OA Repositories Working Group

Report of Progress and Emerging Findings

Meetings with Working Group members in attendance:
10 February 2017 at Wellcome Trust, London
9 April 2017 at the British Library, London

Sub-groups
- Shared vs Distributed Services Group
- Discovery, Access and Communication Group
- Reporting and Compliance Group

Members have been meeting and engaging with their respective communities between meetings. The emerging recommendations reflect these more topic-based discussions, engagement with stakeholders and any agreed and developing actions.

Engagement

- A survey of members of UkCoRR (United Kingdom Council for Research Repositories) sought feedback from the HEI repository community around priority concerns and proposed stakeholder responses that would assist. The question of whether in an ‘ideal world’ a central repository solution would address some of the issues raised was explored.
- The Reporting and Compliance Group have consulted with seven research intensive universities around their reporting experiences in more depth. This has assisted in forming some early recommendations.
- Publisher and academic representatives and research administrators have focussed on communication and metadata, specifically for journal articles deposited in institutional repositories.
- A workshop is scheduled for 28 July 2017, hosted by the UUK OA Repositories Group and the British Library to explore the interest in a national solution for preservation, including underpinning repository infrastructure. RLUK, SCONUL and JISC representatives and other experts have been invited.
- Links have been established with the Steering Group for the OA Assessment Survey being conducted on behalf of HEFCE, RCUK, Jisc and Wellcome.

The landscape and emerging recommendations

- We have a strong institutional repository landscape in the UK complemented by established international subject repositories including arXiv, with more subject repositories emerging in other disciplines.
- There is an active repository community sharing knowledge and expertise.

Improvements in systems and workflows are in the interests of all stakeholders, including HEIs and publishers, and of benefit to the sector as a whole.

1. Enabling fulfilment of funder and institutional mandates. (TOR1)
The need to release staff from the day-to-day operational burden of populating repository records was identified. A variety of data sources and 3rd party tools are currently used, including CrossREF and Europe PMC. Significant manual effort is also required, specifically in managing embargoes.

**Recommendation:** A full implementation of the JISC Publications Router, supported by publisher agreements to supply manuscripts and metadata, will significantly improve institutional and publisher workflows.
2. Easing deposit of the relevant version of research outputs; creating and updating high quality metadata; and ensuring clear expression of embargo and licence information. (TOR 2, 3 and 10)

2.1 Communicating article acceptance/publication. Currently the onus is on authors, who are notified by publishers of article acceptance or publication, to advise their institution of the status of their research output. The author or librarian then is required to upload the accepted or published manuscript to the institutional repository.

Given different publisher archiving and embargo policies the following parameters need to be known:
   a. That an article has been accepted/published, with consistently reported date fields
   b. Which version of an article is available for upload; accepted manuscript or final published paper
   c. When the article can be uploaded and made publicly available via the repository; that is, knowing and being able to act on the publisher’s embargo/archiving policy
   d. What the license arrangements are; for example, CC-BY.

**Recommendation:** The capability of the Jisc Publications Router to record and communicate these parameters is considered mandatory to ensure essential information is communicated to institutions.

2.2 Communicating the version of the article. There is a need for a reader to be able to clearly identify the version of an article or research output being downloaded from an institutional repository. As a minimum, it should be clear i) which version a researcher is consulting, and ii) what the route is to the latest or corrected version.

**Recommendation:** Systems and tools that have the potential to provide a metadata-based solution to address article versioning are explored, including CrossREF and Crossmark.

3. Interoperability and ensuring repositories evolve to exploit web and other technologies. Long-term preservation of repository content. (TOR 8 and 9)

3.1 The repository community has raised many concerns regarding technical support, including the ability to upgrade software, maintain custom functionality, and integrate with the university CRIS and other systems. The sustainability of the institution's chosen repository solution is a concern for some.

3.2 Most institutional repositories do not have a preservation layer.

**Recommendation:** The interests of key stakeholders in supporting a centralised repository solution that has underpinning repository functions and a commitment to preservation should be explored. The British Library, JISC and representatives of HE institutions have expressed interest.

[It is noted that a central solution will not be an attractive proposition for all HEIs, where multiple business needs are being met through the repository infrastructure; for example, publishing digitised original materials and University press functions].

4. Reporting and auditing structures for funders and institutions (TOR 7)

4.1 Repositories play a critical but not exclusive role in supporting compliance and financial monitoring. Repositories and CRIS systems should be looked at together in this context.

**Recommendation:** National solutions, including JISC Monitor and OA Dashboard are expected to be of value when fully developed.
4.2 For benchmarking OA compliance, including financial reporting, the sector is not working with agreed descriptors nor share a common understanding of the criteria being used.

Recommendation: A clear guide to benchmark criteria and definitions is required to assist the sector and ongoing review and evaluation of progress towards OA. (HEFCE’s Open Access Assessment survey should expose some of the issues).

5. Integration of repositories into the wider scholarly communication landscape, improving discoverability and text and data mining. (TOR 4, 5 and 6)
Institutional repositories are commonly structured to use Open Archives Initiatives Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH), a Dublin Core vocabulary, the RIOXX Metadata Application Profiler for RCUK policy compliance, and some may also incorporate the OPenAIRE Syntax for Europe supporting Horizon 2020. NISO best practice recommendations inform schemas and formats, as well as the XML markup language used by most publishers.

New services are emerging, including Jisc’s CORE and the British Library’s Magellan.

Recommendation: Improving discoverability of research outputs requires adoption and implementation of agreed standards and protocols by trusted repositories, publishers and other organisations with responsibilities for communicating through open access channels.

Recommendation: Full implementation of ORCID to allow integration into stakeholder systems and workflows.

6. Explore costs associated with long-term storage or preservation of an article. (TOR 11)
JISC is likely to have data to assist with this specific question, which the group has yet to review.

Anne Horn (Chair) & Dave Ross (Secretary)
30 June 2017
UUK Open Access Co-ordination Group

OA Service Standards Working Group

1. Terms of reference: the group’s remit

The terms of reference require the group to produce by the end of 2017 Voluntary Good Practice Guidelines relating to Gold OA

- based on the expectations of the key stakeholder groups, and
- setting out agreed and achievable service standards

2. Relationships with other groups and initiatives

The group’s work clearly implies a close relationship with the work of the Efficiencies Group (where we have cross-membership. The work of the Repositories and Monographs groups is of less relevance.

We are also aware of relevant work that has been, or is currently being, undertaken by external groups including UKSG, Jisc, CASRAI, and the Wellcome Trust/COAF

3. Progress

The group started its work later than the other three groups. Work was initiated with a conference call in April, and we have had two meetings in May and June. Progress may be summarised under the following heads.

3.1 Identifying key issues that need to be addressed

In summary, these issues include

- information flows and the actions that flow from them
- language and terminology
- financial issues and processes
- licensing
- author awareness and education
- monitoring and reporting

3.2 Stakeholder and process mapping

As important background material, we have produced maps of stakeholders and the relationships between them, and of key elements in workflows. In doing so, we have drawn on work by others including Jisc, UKSG, and the Efficiencies Group.

3.3 Stakeholder expectations

Again drawing on the work of others, we have tabulated varying sets of service expectations from universities, funders and publishers; and work is in hand to consolidate those three sets of expectations. More detailed discussions will require to take place where there are
mis-matches in expectations. We also need to take into account the work being undertaken by the other sub-groups to ensure any Voluntary Guidelines support the recommendations being agreed.

3.4 Examples of good practice guides

We have reviewed examples of good practice guides from a range of sectors.

4. Target output

Our aim is to produce a short document based on key principles with explanatory text around expectations and the practicalities of implementation. We envisage a document that would be endorsed by representative bodies for universities, funders, relevant intermediaries and publishers. We aim to present a draft to the OA Co-ordination Group at its meeting on 3 October, which may require subsequent amendment to ensure the Voluntary Guidelines are in line with the work of other sub-groups.

5. Next steps

- offline work over the summer to identify key principles based on consolidated sets of expectations
- liaison with Efficiencies Group
- draft document to be considered at next meeting on 18 September.

6. Input from the Co-ordination Group

We would welcome input from members on our work to date, and on the kind of output we envisage, as we begin to put together our thoughts on key principles. We envisage a more detailed discussion at the meeting of working group chairs and secretaries to be held on 1 August.
Monitoring the Transition to Open Access Project: Note on progress

Work is at somewhat different stages on the five strands of the project. It has been informed by discussions with a number of publishers, librarians and funders.

1. Availability of OA options

Data gathering is now almost complete, with data on the profiles of journals and their policies from 35 of the publishers most popular with UK authors, and more detailed analysis of the policies of the 30 most popular journals in each of the four subject areas covered by the main REF panels. Analysis of trends since 2012 is now under way.

2. Take-up of OA

The census of fully-OA journals and the numbers of articles they have published is now virtually complete. Work is now beginning on the search for copies of randomised samples of articles published over the past two years.

3. Usage

Data is still being gathered from a number of publishers, from IRUS, from JUSP, from PMC, and from Mendeley. As in 2015, we have not succeeded in getting any data from Research Gate or from Academia.edu. But we have conducted further analysis of the usage data released last year by Sci Hub.

4. Funders and universities

Analysis is now under way of datasets from a sample of universities, from RCUK, and from COAF on payments of APCs.

5. Learned societies

An initial analysis of financial data in Charity Commission returns from the sample of 30 societies has been completed and discussed with Laura Bellingan. Refinement of the analysis is under way and will be discussed with a range of societies in September.

Next steps

Data analysis will be the focus of our work over the summer. We are proposing to hold a workshop to present initial thoughts and findings to representatives of the key stakeholder groups, including members of the OA Co-ordination Group, on the morning of 3 October at Woburn House.