University of Cambridge
Open Access Project Board

Minutes – 27 July 2016

Meeting held at 14.00-15.30 on Wednesday 27 July 2016
in the General Board Meeting Room, The Old Schools

Present:
Professor Chris Abell, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Research, Chair
Professor Graham Virgo, Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education
Professor Abby Fowden, School of Biological Sciences
Professor Peter Mandler, School of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Professor Alan Blackwell, School of Technology (User Needs Committee representative)
Dr Nicholas White, School of Arts and Humanities
Dr Martin Bellamy, University Information Services
Dr Matthew Day, Cambridge University Press *(from item 4b only)*
Mrs Anne Jarvis, University Library
Dr Peter Hedges, University Research Office
Dr Danny Kingsley, Office of Scholarly Communications, University Library
Dr Ralph Ecclestone, Research Strategy Office (REF Manager)
Helen Jones, Research Strategy Office (Research Strategy Analyst), Secretary
Dr Marta Teperek, Research Office/University Library (Research Data Facility Manager), Secretary

Apologies:
Professor Duncan Maskell, Senior Pro-Vice-Chancellor
Professor Lindsay Greer, School of Physical Sciences
Professor John Danesh, School of Clinical Medicine
Professor Richard Prager, School of Technology

Declarations of Interest: No new declarations were made.

The Chair welcomed Helen Jones, Research Strategy Analyst, Research Strategy Office, as the new co-Secretary of the Project Board.

1. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising – OAPB-58
1.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 1 March 2016 were approved (OAPB-51). Actions from that meeting were complete or to be discussed during the meeting. Action 5.3 was to be discussed at the Project Board meeting on 31 October 2016.

2. Revised governance structure of the Open Access and Open Data – OAPB-59
2.1 Danny Kingsley presented a diagram explaining the governance structure of Scholarly Communication Working Groups (OAPB-59), which all report to the Open Access Project Board. The diagram reflected a broader focus of issues considered by the Project Board than the initial focus on Open Access and Open Data.

2.2 It was discussed that the presented governance structure was unclear on remit.

2.3 The Group agreed that once remits had been defined, the paper was otherwise accepted and once finalised should be referred to the Research Policy Committee.

2.4 **Action**: Secretary to revise the governance structure and forward it to the Research Policy Committee for information after Chair's approval of the revisions.

3. Change of name and modification of terms of reference of the Open Access Project Board

3.1 The Project Board considered whether it would be appropriate to change its name to "Open Research Project Board" to reflect the broader range of activities that the Project Board supports, exceeding the traditional definition of Open Access to publications. It was recognised that the Project Board now deals with matters beyond open access and open data and it was noted that changing the name to "Open Research Project Board" might demonstrate the University's endorsement for research sharing beyond publications. However, concerns were raised whether "Open Research" is a meaningful name. The Project Board asked for more arguments on why a name change would be beneficial.

3.2 **Action**: Danny Kingsley to present a document explaining what Open Research is and why it would be beneficial to change the Project Board's name for the OAPB meeting on 31 October 2016.

4. Updated Open Access Policy Framework – OAPB-60

4.1 Danny Kingsley proposed a revision to the Open Access Policy Framework (OAPB-60). The Policy Framework was revised in accordance with open access policy schema recommended by Jisc and approved by the University Draftsman and the Development and Alumni Relations Office. The revised policy consisted of three main parts: Introduction, Responsibilities of the University, Responsibilities of Researchers.

4.2 The Project Board discussed the Policy Framework and recommended that the 'Introduction' should clearly state that the University does not support payments for publications in hybrid journals. Additionally, it was suggested that in 'Responsibilities of the University' it should be stated that the University will take responsibility for ensuring compliance if the paper is submitted through the OA system.

4.3 **Action**: Secretary to revise the Policy Framework and circulate the revised document with changes indicated to Project Board members for comment.

5. Open Access Project – OAPB-61, OAPB-62 and OAPB-63

5.1 Danny Kingsley presented an updated version of OAPB-61 with the financial situation of the Open Access Project (see Annex I). The paper noted that the payment of the RCUK Block Grant would be further delayed until ~October 2016 (original estimated payment of the Grant was April 2016). In agreement with the Project Board's decision from 23 July 2015[1], the Open Access services had stopped paying article processing charges for publications in hybrid journals. However, given the delays in the payment of the RCUK Block Grant, the Project Board was asked whether payment of all article processing charges should be stopped. The Board decided that since re-assurance from the RCUK was given that the fund will be made available, Open Access charges should continue to be paid for all journals, based on the assumption that any deficit will be recovered from the Block Grant in October 2016.

5.3 **Action**:
Danny Kingsley to prepare a short paper for the Research Policy Committee meeting on 6 October 2016 about the financial situation and the Project Board's decision to continue paying Open Access charges for all journals.

5.4 The Project Board welcomed the significantly increased compliance rates with the HEFCE policy (growth from 30% to 50%) presented in OAPB-61.

---

[1] http://osc.cam.ac.uk/files/minutes_of_oa_project_board_23_july_2015.pdf

5.5 Danny Kingsley introduced a UK Scholarly Communications Licence proposal (OAPB-62). Many UK universities, including some Russell Group members, are considering adopting the licence. Not being a signatory of the Licence might present a potential licensing difficulty to Cambridge researchers involved in collaborations with researchers from institutions who signed the licence. The Project Board discussed whether signing the licence would be beneficial to the University of Cambridge. The fact that the University of Cambridge does not own the IP over research outputs was indicated as a roadblock to Cambridge signing the licence.

5.6 **Actions**:
Danny Kingsley to discuss the issues around the UK Scholarly Communications Licence proposal at a meeting with Imperial College London on 28 July 2016 and circulate a report of that meeting to OAPB members.
Danny Kingsley to prepare a paper discussing the Scholarly Communications Licence proposal for the next Open Access Project Board meeting on 31 October 2016.

5.7 The Project Board was informed that the Getting It Together Advisory Group addressing communication issues across various University departments had been established and had its first meeting.

5.8 Peter Hedges reported on the proposal to use the mechanisms of academic promotion to increase researchers' REF compliance rates, paper OAPB-63. Research Policy Committee had agreed as a first step, all appraisals and promotions should require researchers to declare the open access status of each of their publications, with the expectation that these would be spot-checked.

5.9 Anne Jarvis reported that the University's negotiations with Elsevier were effectively at a standstill. Negotiations would continue until the end of 2016.

6. Open Data Project – OAPB-64 and OAPB-65
6.1 Peter Hedges presented the updated OAPB-64 (see Annex II) outlining the deficit in funding for the Research Data Management Facility. The Open Access Project Board was asked to endorse the plans to extend the suspense account to cover the RDM Facility expenses for 24 months to December 2018 and to support the RDM Facility with a non-recurrent grant to cover the debt in the suspense account. The Project Board endorsed these plans.

6.2 The Open Data Project Report (OAPB-65) with key achievements of the Open Data project was attached for information. Peter Hedges informed the Board that the Open Data Project Working Group changed its name to the Research Data Management Project Group to reflect the broader range of activities within its remit than just Open Data. The Group also changed its membership and remit and new Terms of Reference of the Group will be presented at the Project Board meeting on 31 October 2016.

The Project Board was also asked whether Cambridge should sign the Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles. The Project Board noted that the Declaration encouraged proper acknowledgement and citation of research data and therefore agreed to sign the Declaration as the Open Access Project Board of the University of Cambridge.

6.3 **Actions:**
Secretary to forward the Research Data Management Project Group Terms of Reference to the Project Board meeting on 31 October 2016.

Secretary to sign the Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles on behalf of the Open Access Project Board and forward the Declaration to RPC for information.

7. Items to be referred to the Research Policy Committee

7.1 The Chairman would forward the following papers to the Research Policy Committee (RPC) meeting on 6 October 2016:

- Revised governance structure of Open Access and Open Data
- An update about the financial situation and the Project Board's decision to continue paying Open Access charges for all journals
- Information that the Project Board signed the Joint Declaration of Data Citation Principles, together with the Declaration.

8. AOB

8.1 The next Project Board meeting is scheduled for Monday 31 October, 13:30 – 15:00 in the Syndicate Room, starting 30 minutes earlier than originally scheduled.

8.2 The Chair informed the Project Board that Anne Jarvis will be leaving the University and the Project Board and thanked her for her contribution to the Group.

Open Access Project Board
Wednesday 27 July 2016

1. RCUK Block Grant fund

On 27 July 2016 the University was notified by the RCUK that new funds for the RCUK Block Grant will come through in October. Correspondence to Peter Hedges noted:

"Grants will be formally issued to the research office and will be issued with terms and conditions which are specific for the Open Access Grants and will not replicate those included on all other research grants. These are still being finalised, so a draft award letter is not currently available."

The situation as reported in the Open Access Project Report referred to commitments from the RCUK fund of APCs only. When actual expenditure and commitments for other costs to run the Open Access Service is taken into consideration the financial situation is very different. [Note we have already released as many committed older APCs as we can].

1.1 Actual status of the RCUK fund

As of 14 July 2016 there was **£440,110** of actual money left in the RCUK account.

Committed
Article Processing Charges[2]   £298,737
Costs for prepayment publisher accounts, staffing, and IT development   £95,725
Commitments add up to   **£394,462**

This leaves £45, 648 in the RCUK account (approximately 20-25 APCs)

1.2 Ring-fenced funds

We also have £21,665 from IOP last year and £26,029.05 +VAT for IOP for this year = £52,864 ring-fenced for fully open access journals.

TOTAL available currently to pay for fully open access journals = £98,512 (approximately 55-60 APCs).

1.3 Decision required

Can the OAPB please decide if we should:
1. Inform the research community there are no RCUK funds available until October and we will move to a green only OA compliance model (as had Glasgow University)
2. Decide that given the RCUK will be forthcoming with future funds, continue to accept invoices for APCs for Open Access only journals on the understanding these will come out of the new fund.

Dr Danny Kingsley
Head, Office of Scholarly Communication
27 July 2016

---

[2] [2] This figure comes from two places:
1. Committed amount in the OSC spreadsheet - £717,190 but this could include some invoices that have been paid but not yet updated on our spreadsheet.
2. The amount listed in ZenDesk as an amount committed to and an invoice has been processed (many of these will have been paid - so included in the final bank amount) £418,453

If we are optimistic and assume ALL the 'invoice been processed' items have been paid we can take that figure from the committed figure and we get £717,190 - £418,453 = £298,737

Open Access Project Board
Wednesday 27 July 2016

Research Data Management Facility – Update on Funding Model

Introduction

Currently the Research Data Facility Manager is on a second one year contract until December 2016. The Library has recruited a Research Data Advisor and Outreach and Engagement Coordinator on three year contracts.
The Facility is currently financed through a suspense account which runs to December 2016.

Paper OAPB-64 notes that the RDM Facility will be established as a TRAC Facility based on the agreed annual direct operating cost of ~£165K.
The income from this source will begin to flow through from February 2017.

Staffing and other costs for the Research Data Facility will also be included in the next Planning Round (2016/2017) as a confirmation of the TRAC process for funding.
If this is successful the finance for the Facility will begin to flow from this source from 1 August 2017

Charging model

The extension of the suspense account until December 2017 will allow for the extension of the Research Data Facility Manager contract for a further year and will provide security for the period between January 2017 and August 2017 while the result from the Planning Round is determined.

A non-recurrent grant will be required to cover the costs allocated to the suspense account from January 2016 until approximately 1 August 2017. This has the benefit of the RDM Facility working within the operating cost of ~165K from February to August 2017 to determine actual expenditure when in full operation.

Action

The OAPB is asked to endorse the plan to:
- Extend the suspense account for 12 months to December 2017
- Support the RDM Facility with a non-recurrent grant

Dr Peter Hedges
Head of the University Research Office
27 July 2016