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Government to open up publicly funded research
16 Jul 2012

Universities, businesses and the public to have better access to British scientific research and academic papers by 2014.

RCUK announces new Open Access policy
16 July 2012

Research Councils UK (RCUK) has today, 16th July 2012, unveiled its new Open Access policy. Informed by the work of the National Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings, chaired by Professor Dame Janet Finch, the policy at once harmonises and makes significant changes to existing Research Councils’ Open Access policies.

Professor Douglas Kell, RCUK Champion for Research and Information Management commented: "Widening access to the outputs of research currently published in journals has the potential to contribute substantially to furthering the progress of scientific and other research, ensuring that the UK continues to be a world leader in these fields. I am delighted that, together, the Research Councils have been able both to harmonise and to make significant changes to their policies, ensuring that more people have access to cutting edge research that can contribute to both economic growth in our knowledge economy and the wider wellbeing of the UK."

It is clear that more UK papers will be made open access though the payment to publishers of APCs
Managing APCs presents challenges to all stakeholders
2.1 From interviews with the principle stakeholders and from feedback at the workshop, it is clear that lack of awareness of funding for OA article-processing charges and difficulties in accessing the funding are the main barriers in the UK to authors taking up this option.

2.2 Funders, other than those already actively engaged with this process, need to become involved by making funds readily available and by creating clear, consistent, implementable and unambiguous mandates.

2.3 The process of paying OA article-processing charges as part of indirect costs is not perceived to be efficient, effective or useful. Funders need to consider alternative approaches – such as those used by The Wellcome Trust or the British Heart Foundation, where clearly defined pots of money are made available – if they are to successfully fund, track and audit how and where their investment is being spent. A “one size fits all” model is not what is being proposed here; more that administrative rigour, clear process and transparency are necessary regardless of the size and profile of the funder.
Institutions

ISSUES RELATING TO HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

2.8 Libraries continue to be frustrated by the convoluted processes involved in managing OA article payment charges, with the level of work disproportionate to the amount of activity.

2.9 According to librarians, there is still huge investment needed in educating academics in the nuances and procedures around OA publishing.

2.10 Lack of transparency from publishers is a major complaint from librarians. This relates in particular to the issue of locating OA articles easily on publisher websites and in the area levels of fees applied.

2.11 There is specific frustration concerning the time delay between payment of an invoice and the relevant article being made available.

2.12 Records relating to Wellcome-funded grants are generally well maintained, but there is very little knowledge or record-keeping relating to article-processing charges funded by other bodies and very little understanding of the level of this activity. This may be because the level of activity is still very small, but is more likely to be because the processes and resources are not in place to capture this activity.

2.13 OA policies from smaller publishers are still not as clear as they could be, which causes confusion and additional work.

2.14 In terms of the situation in HEIs, in most areas, little has changed since the first phase of this work in 2009.

- Institutions need funds to pay APCs
- APC funds need to be managed – not simple e.g. multiple authors, multiple invoices, multiple accounts
- Expect to see >APCs = <subscription fees
Publishers want to publish open access articles but in many cases lack the back-end systems to process APCs.

In the case of hybrid journals, this in effect means running two systems – one for subscription income and another for income from APCs.

They wish to be transparent – but need to be able to capture the data to provide such transparency.
Availability and use of OA funds by funding type

- Yes, and I applied for such funding
- Yes, but I did not apply for such funding
- No, I was not aware of any opportunity to apply for such funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding type</th>
<th>Yes, and I applied for such funding</th>
<th>Yes, but I did not apply for such funding</th>
<th>No, I was not aware of any opportunity to apply for such funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research council grant</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from another funder</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core university funds</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-funded</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 It is not just financial transparency that is being sought by librarians. End users often find it difficult to locate articles available under OA. This difficulty is compounded by the hybrid model, which means that the same users may become confused when they discover that other articles within the same journal are subject to access-control methods linked to the subscription model.

Which licensing terms is this article made available under?

How is this different to the subscription article?
Some practical solutions

6.5 Working together and sharing

As more content becomes available without barriers across the web and services become web scale, the next question is how individual libraries fit into this picture. Some librarians at the roundtable are already speaking with others in neighbouring institutions about how to, for example, share subject librarians or share repositories. Licensing content across consortia is another longstanding example of working at scale. Such moves can reduce overhead costs and help librarians focus their energies on providing advice to users.

‘The concept of the individual library is going to go away. We are going to have to work together,’ suggested one speaker.

This collaboration can go beyond the library sector too. As one participant put it: ‘We collaborate and do strategic partnerships where it makes economic sense.’

#movingtowardsanopenaccessfuture

Library consortia can provide a role in addressing some of these issues and in providing a shared service to avoid replicated effort across their membership
Consortia Agreements for APCs

- negotiate and manage consortia agreements on behalf of their members e.g. BioMed
- negotiate discounts on APCs where membership in place
- reviewing the associated legal agreements
- work with publishers to ensure licensing is clear
- work with stakeholders to develop standards to identify OA articles
An offer for UK higher education institutions negotiated by JISC Collections

Option 1: Wiley Open Access Account

Prepay account – discounts on APCs based on deposit – combined consortia discount

Option 2: Wiley Open Access Partners Fee

Annual flat fee based on band – discount on APCs
Yesterday announced agreement to our members for OAK:

- discount off subscription fee
- OAK terms and conditions of use reviewed

New service, feed into development or it working centrally to help libraries and users explore new ways to manage APCs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Potential service providers in this area should be identified and discussions held as to their interest and preparedness for providing a service to funders, institutions and publisher. As a minimum, the two leading subscription agents in the UK, EBSCO and Swets, should be contacted along with a genuine new player, such as Open Access Key. JISC Collections itself could also be considered as a potential candidate, given its existing role as a helpdesk and subscription service provider for UK HE.
• Institutions may not want to trust open access funds with a new entity

• Library consortia such as JISC Collections may have a role to play here, as trusted independent parties, used to managing institutional fund for journal subscriptions

• They could too, manage or help manage funds and (data capture) for institutions
Library Consortia need data too

demonstrate transparency

show subscription fees reduction as APCs income increased

Need data on APCs, membership fees, number of articles, sum total for consortia members....

centralised infrastructure
Thank you!