OPEN RESEARCH STEERING COMMITTEE

Minutes for Monday 27 June 2022, 15:00–16:30
MS Teams

Present: Steve Russell (Chair), Holger Babinsky, Marta Costa, Stephen Eglen, Alastair Flett, Jess Gardner, David Owen, Liz Simmonds, Siddharth Soni, Niamh Tumelty, Debbie Hansen (Secretary).
In attendance: Matthew Day, Agustina Martínez García.
Apologies: Emma Gilby, Peter Hedges, Sara Hennessy, Mandy Hill, Ian Leslie, Amy Orben.

1 Declaration of interests
Matthew Day, as a representative of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, declared an interest relating to the University’s discussions and agreements with other publishers and in issues relating to rights retention.

2 Minutes of previous meeting (29 March 2022) — ORSC-82
The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3 Matters arising: Report on actions from previous meetings — ORSC-83
Matters arising that were not complete or discussed during the remainder of the meeting:
1. DORA Guidance and Metrics (item 4 of 13 December 2021 meeting). Complete.
   A brief update on DORA. In May Steve Russell sent a request to all schools and non-school institutions involved in research assessment to develop their school or institution DORA compliant policies and to send to their policies to this committee for subsequent approval. He will be asking the Schools of Clinical Medicine and Biological Science for feedback as they have already developed their guidance.
2. Funding for open research. Jess Gardner informed the group of three pots of funding for open research which have been allocated as follows: i. to provide an institutional fund for payment of open access fees where there are no other funds available, for example to pay for gold open access in fully open access journals; ii. for the development of an Open Research Community at Cambridge; iii. to progress onto the next stage of investigations related to electronic research notebooks. This led to a discussion about resourcing other areas related to open research such as funds for staff to support the reproducibility network and the University data service; considerations around these are in progress. David Owen had a question about research reproducibility and how the University supports reports of misconduct in this space; he was advised that Rhys Morgan Head of Policy, Integrity and Governance would be the best person to contact about this.

4 Open Research Infrastructure
Agustina Martínez García, Head of Open Research Systems at the University Library, gave a presentation on the University’s open research infrastructure roadmap. She explained that the open research information technology development is part of the University’s research information technology portfolio and current work builds on prior gap analysis along with a consideration of wider changes happening in the open research landscape. She presented the
vision for open research infrastructure, which is to ‘Meet researchers’ needs across the full research life cycle, supply streamlined and better integrated services’ before explaining in more detail the key development areas and the roadmap for the University’s open research systems.

Steve Russell thanked Agustina for the very comprehensive update and expressed how fantastic it was to see this impressive progress on so many fronts.

Alastair Flett left the meeting.

David Owen asked about electronic research notebooks and whether there would be a move for their use to be strongly encouraged or made compulsory. Agustina explained that at the moment the focus is to find out how researchers are using these notebooks and why some are not using them. A driver for this is consideration of potential future funders’ requirements and planning for support for our researchers to be in place.

There was also discussion over the cost of data storage, particularly for very high volumes of raw data. It was noted that the cost of data storage at Cambridge is level with other UK institutions. Stephen Eglen commented that funders such as Wellcome Trust understand that not all the raw data for a project needs to be shared; instead, relevant processed data can be shared.

The question of why cloud storage was being planned was raised. Agustina explained that cloud storage will not be solely used; rather, the purpose is to spread risk.

There was a discussion over why there are individual institutional repositories and not a UK-wide repository, for example, along with potential portability issues for early career researchers who may move between different institutions. Agustina mentioned that Apollo is integrated in the wider CORE network.

**Action:** Debbie Hansen to distribute the slides to committee members.

### 5 Rights retention

Niamh Tumelty provided an update on the rights retention pilot currently in progress. Over 280 researchers have now signed up to the pilot and a briefing paper has been distributed to all departments and libraries. She illustrated numbers signing up from each of the schools and noted that there had been no target on numbers but rather the aim was to achieve a spread over all disciplines. So far the Rights Retention Working Group have encountered main issues with two publishers, both society publishers: the American Society of Hematology (dialogue is in progress) and the Seismological Society of America (a paper with the rights retention statement was desk rejected). A few other publishers are giving mixed messages which are causing confusion. It was stressed that the rights retention route is about widening an open access publishing route to our researchers where funds for gold open access are not available.

Matthew Day asked what other UK institutions are doing regarding rights retention. Niamh mentioned a number of institutions moving in this direction; for example, Sheffield Hallam have recently announced a new open access policy with rights retention.

Marta Costa asked whether departments would be targeted for sign-up to the pilot in response to knowledge about publishers expected to be problematic in this space. Niamh confirmed that no analysis along these lines has been done yet but is intended later in the year.

### 6 Future of Scholarly Communications Workshops

Niamh gave some background on the series of three Future of Scholarly Communications Workshops — ORSC-84
Workshops that have now taken place, the latest on 10th May. Attendees included researchers spanning the disciplines and representatives from Cambridge University Press and from the library community. Five main themes were covered by the workshops, with two of these selected for further consideration during the final workshop: Cambridge Convenes and Open Research Infrastructure.

The discussion included whether Cambridge Convenes would be able to be developed with or without extra resources. The importance of collaboration, dialogue and joined-up thinking (for example between academic and library communities) was stressed, as well as working together with the research culture group. Niamh suggested that she bring a proposal back to the group at a later meeting.

**Action:** Niamh to develop a proposal.

**7 Open Research Event**  

Niamh outlined the current plan for this annual event which, this year, will follow the same theme as the workshops described in Item 6. She asked whether the committee have any comments or suggestions. Committee suggestions for a keynote speaker included Alex Freeman (Octopus) or Ottoline Leyser (UKRI), although it was noted that for the keynote it would be important to avoid a leaning towards either of the science, technology, engineering, mathematics or humanities, arts, social science subject groupings.

**Action:** Feedback any comments on the plan or suggestions for a keynote speaker to Niamh (All).

**8 *Open Research Operational Group**  

This was a starred item not discussed in the meeting.

**9 Items to be referred to the Research Policy Committee**

The following papers will be forwarded to the RPC:

1. The approved minutes from the previous meeting (29 March 2022).
2. In future, a package of the two papers from the Open Research in the Humanities and the Open Qualitative Research Working Group (once the latter paper has been finalised).

**10 Any Other Business**

David Owen asked, on behalf of a colleague, whether the University has a stance on Researchfish and whether this tool is used by the University. Agustina recommended that David contact Owen Roberson in the Research Information Office.

**Next Meeting:** Thursday, 29 September 2022, 14:00–15:30  
MS Teams