

University of Cambridge
Open Access Project Board

Minutes – 5 June 2014

Meeting held at 9.00-10.00 on Thursday 5th June 2014
in the PVC Meeting Room, The Old Schools

Present: Professor Steve Young (Acting Chair), Professor Richard Prager, Professor Martin Daunton, Professor Paul Luzio, Professor Andy Parker, Dr Peter Hedges, Mrs Anne Jarvis, Mr John Norman and Dr Gill Rands (Secretary).

Apologies: Professor Lynn Gladden (Chair).

Declaration of Interest: No new declarations were made.

1. Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising – OAPB-26

1.1 The draft minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2014 were approved (OAPB-26).

1.2 Members reported on the progress of actions:

- Action 2.2: John Norman had looked into the cost-effectiveness of automating the filter that was needed after Raven log-in to ensure that access to the publication fund was available only to University and College employees. He had concluded that this was not a priority, given that the existing manual process was effective. However, the matter would be kept under review.
- Action 4.7: John Norman and Gill Rands had investigated Earth Sciences as a first case study of departmental research data and data management practices. This department benefitted from being small with a proactive administrative team, and it represented a discipline in which data openness and data repositories were well established. The situation in most other departments would be quite different and further case studies would be needed as part of the open data project (see below).
- Action 3.3: Peter Hedges had passed paper OAPB-23 (the potential role of Symplectic in plans for open access) to the University's Symplectic working group. The group was expected to make its report to the Research Policy Committee by the summer.
- Discussions with the Russell Group about Symplectic and about open data (actions 3.5 and 4.5) were ongoing.

2. Open access to research publications – OAPB-27

2.1 John Norman introduced the project report (OAPB-27), which included an overview of both the first year of the RCUK publications policy and the pilot implementation of the recently announced HEFCE policy.

2.2 Although HEFCE's use of acceptance date as the reference point for collection of accepted author manuscripts (AAMs) was still controversial, the overriding issue was the requirement for institutions to collect AAMs at all. A significant development was that publishers in both the UK and US were being strongly lobbied to consider informing institutions when a paper was accepted. If implemented, this would enable the institution to pre-populate the metadata record and contact the author in a timely manner.

2.3 As further examples of external developments that were changing the open access landscape, John Norman reported that it was now expected that the forthcoming open

access policies of US research funding agencies would require AAM deposit with an embargo period of no more than 12 months; and that CrossRef were investigating the possibility of linking AAMs to the final publisher's version within the DOI.

2.4 Responding to the question raised in OAPB-27, the Project Board agreed that the issuing of ORCID's (persistent digital identifiers) to Cambridge researchers was an issue that should be addressed with some urgency at an institutional level (linked to the allocation of CRSIDs), in order to meet the University's needs with respect to both open access and the HESA return.

2.4 **Action:** John Norman and Peter Hedges to meet with representatives from PRAO, HR and UIS to identify the options in relation to issuing and recording ORCID's for all Cambridge researchers.

3. Open access to research data – OAPB-28

3.1 Peter Hedges and John Norman introduced a discussion paper (OAPB-28) which proposed a framework for open research data management. This would involve an open research data register and promotion of best practice to meet research funder (and specifically EPSRC) expectations.

3.2 The Board identified some key principles:

- If the terms of a project grant required the management and curation of data, this was the responsibility of the Principal Investigator and should be funded via the project grant.
- It was, however, necessary to create and maintain an institutional open data register and this would need to be funded centrally.
- Assessment of the prevailing disciplinary culture and needs of researchers at the departmental level was essential in order to determine how best to provide Principal Investigators with appropriate local support and propagate best practice.

3.3 The Project Board agreed that an open data implementation project should be established to ensure compliance with the RCUK open data requirements. The project would be jointly managed by the Head of the University Research Office and the Head of Scholarly Communications (University Library). A project manager would be funded for 12-18 months from resources available through the RCUK Open Access Award and based initially within the Research Office. It was recognised that further resources would be needed in both the short and medium term but more evidence was needed to underpin such a request.

3.4 **Action:** Peter Hedges and John Norman to bring to the next meeting a more detailed proposal for the scope of the project, the remit of the project manager and the anticipated resourcing needs.

4. AOB

4.1 A date for the next meeting would be sought in the second half of July.