# Jisc work in scholarly communication / Open Access

Update for RIM Group meeting 13 Jan 2015

## Introduction

This paper provides a brief update on Jisc’s activities in the area of OA that are relevant to research information management. Jisc’s overall activity in the area of OA is broader than this.

## Background

OA, especially in the UK, but also worldwide, has been dominated recently by policies being developed, changed, reviewed or considered by national agencies and governments. Examples in the UK are the introduction of the REF OA policy, and the independent review of the RCUK OA policy (ongoing). With respect to the former, HEFCE announced in November 2014 a set of information audit requirements, while RCUK requested a set of compliance data from universities by September 2014. Jisc has been working for some time on the assumption that universities are becoming key actors in the supply chain for scholarly material, as well as (instead of?) being purchasers of it. This change in the supply chain is significant, and also affects other players, such as publishers and funders. A first step by universities in this change of role is the installation of repositories and research information management systems, and associated workflows. Research funders are also becoming much more active in specifying data and developing systems to support their new roles.

## Jisc contributions

Jisc is developing a coherent suite of services to support its customers, higher education institutions, in the change outlined above, and especially at the moment in fulfilling their obligations to research funders. With respect to journal articles and conference proceedings (the main focus of OA policies to date), Jisc work – with progress reports – is outlined in the table below.

The table is organised according to the point in an article’s lifecycle a project or service is most relevant.

| **Point in lifecycle** | **Service / project** | **Progress 2014 Q4** | **Plans 2015 Q1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| On submission of the article to a journal | Sherpa RoMEO, Juliet, FACT | Issue – trust in data  Action – Designed a test of FACT’s accuracy, in partnership with HEIs, funders and publishers.  Action – commitment advertised by Sherpa that feedback will receive a response within 3 days  Issue – communications with users  Action – interface improved  Issue – scope of service  Action – Sherpa and HEFCE have agreed a project to develop an information service, like FACT, for the REF.  Issue – complexity in journal OA policies  Action – Work with publishers to express their journal OA policies in a clearer way. | Will implement this test, using a sample of 150 of the most recent lookups done on FACT; how many of these gave results that HEIs, funders, and publishers agree gave the right result?  Sherpa will work with a small group of users to improve the way FACT presents information, especially where no clear answer on compliance is possible.  Project to be implemented, including extensive consultation with potential users. The project includes a break point, so that if a viable and acceptable service does not seem possible, further work will not take place.  Direct dialogue with the Publishers Association within the SherpaFACT Advisory Group, and thereby with publishers. |
|  | PASTEUR  4OA | Issue – authors navigating interactions between various OA policies to which they are subject  Action – development of a schema for OA policies to improve consistency with which they are expressed. | Discussion of proposed schema with international research library community, research funders and wider community. Further revision of schema, if necessary, take-up. |
| On acceptance of the article | Jisc Publications Router | Issue – provision of notification / AAM that will satisfy REF OA requirement  Action – outline discussions complete with 10 publishers, all but one agreed in principle to explore practical / technical next steps.  Issue – take-up by HEIs  Action – survey of HEIs to assess nature of demand.  Issue – challenge of deduplication / updating of records between acceptance and publication.  Action – Decision that Router will not address this directly, but will try to make it easier for HEIs | Project will have discussions with publishers with a view to receiving either notification or AAM at acceptance, and will investigate alternative multi-publisher options, eg PubMed and CrossRef.  Project will set up a community advisory / early adopter group of HEIs and engage with them regularly.  Jisc will support workshops with HEIs and repository/CRIS suppliers to define better solutions.  Longer term solutions might need discussions with third parties and more fundamental changes in workflow, eg with CrossRef on DOIs. |
|  | Jisc Monitor | Issue – it is difficult with certainty to relate particular authors, research grants, and outputs  Action – prototype service development | This service will enable authors and HEIs to share key ID data as early as possible, to reuse their bundle of IDs and to make them available to actors that need them downstream.  Review meeting in late Dec 14 to prioritise focus of final five months. |
| On payment of the APC | Jisc Collections negotiations | Issue – For HEIs, total cost of publication risks nearly doubling with APCs and subscriptions.  Action – Offset proposals in place with some publishers. Progress with others.  Issue – Opportunities for publishers to support OA workflows  Action – working with the sector to articulate these opportunities. | Ongoing negotiation, and extensive consultation with HEIs.  Continued work. |
|  | APC data collection and sharing | Issue – Risk that insufficient information on APCs paid prevents effective benchmarking, negotiation, etc.  Action – Jisc developed a standard spreadsheet for data collection, and collected and, where possible, shared data. | Inclusion of standard spreadsheet fields into Jisc Monitor prototype specification, and agreed CASRAI data definition for OA research reporting. |
|  | Jisc Monitor | Issue – HEIs need to monitor expenditure on APCs  Action – Prototype service developed to aggregate and provide reports over APC and related data.  Issue – administration of offset arrangements is complex  Action – Data being collected from HEIs involved in IOPP Option 3 arrangement, to get a clearer picture of the issues. | Further development depends on outcomes of Monitor review meeting.  It is rather early to anticipate clear requirements on this, but a close watching brief will be maintained. |
|  | Knowledge Exchange (internatnl partnership) | Issue – No-one really knows the full picture of APC payment in HEIs – which budgets are they paid from?  Action – The Knowledge Exchange has defined a small project to document common practice across five European countries. | If agreed by KE, then this work will be done during 2015. |
| On publication of the article | CORE | Issue – OA material is not as available as it should be, eg for text mining, leading to lower re-use and impact.  Action – Support for CORE applications.  Issue – sustainability  Action – Jisc and OU developing a service model / partnership to support CORE. | Ongoing maintenance.  Reviews of legal position, development if possible of agreed business model, agreement on branding, technical hosting, etc, and implementation of these agreements by Jisc and OU. |
|  | Jisc Monitor | Issue – HEIs need to monitor publication outputs, for internal management and external reporting.  Action – Exchange standards, focusing on: Publication events; Compliance terms; Price schedules; Purchase transactions; IDs. | Development of a data model for APC transactions:  <http://jiscmonitor.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2014/11/11/apc-aggregation-data-model-and-analytical-usage-by-richard-jones/>  Review meeting will prioritise focus of final five months. |
| On monitoring / reporting compliance | Jisc Monitor | Issue – HEIs need to plan, manage, test, and report on compliance with funder OA policies.  Action – Develop prototype compliance reports, input into CASRAI group 9see below) | Prototype system to aggregate and report on cost information from across institutions. Also, specification for a system which could help institutions manage aspects of Open Access publishing at a local level.  <http://jiscmonitor.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2014/10/24/managing-open-access-publication/>  Review meeting will prioritise focus of final five months. |
|  | Standards work | Issue – Need for basic metadata profile meeting most funder requirements: RIOXX  Action – RIOXX finalised, draft 2.0 released.  Issue – Need for wider metadata profile meeting all funder and HEI requirements  Action – re-establishment of CASRAI OA research reporting working group. | Technical support, patches, plugins etc now available for common repository platforms.  Development of an agreed CASRAI data definition for OA research reporting. Implementation via Jisc Monitor, and perhaps main suppliers (EPrints, PURE, etc), driven by their user groups. |
|  | Knowledge Exchange (internatnl partnership) | Issue – developments to monitor OA in different countries are uncoordinated  Action – Knowledge Exchange has drawn up a plan to host an international fact-sharing workshop for those developing OA monitoring services. | If agreed by KE, then this workshop will take place around May 2015. |
| On someone downloading the article | IRUS-UK | Issue – measurement of usage of content held across multiple repositories.  Action – delivery of standardised usage statistics.  Progress ongoing – now more than half eligible UK repositories are participating. | Continue to expand user base.  Continue to explore potential for publisher engagement. |

Further work includes:

1. Support for universities (organisational)
   * Issue: Professionals in universities are charged with implementing OA policies. Many benefits follow from their being able to develop and share good practice across departmental, professional and institutional boundaries.
   * Action: The OA Good Practice community provides a range of activities that enables this. So far it has delivered workshops, webinars, briefings on a range of topics, various outputs from pathfinder projects, the first synthesis of lessons from pathfinder projects.

1. Support for universities (technical)
   * Issue: The information systems used by universities will need to collect, manage and share information about research in new ways, requiring them to interoperate with other systems within the university and beyond.
   * Action: Jisc will provide / coordinate support from common repository platforms and services, and supports related user groups in articulating their requirements to the suppliers of those platforms and services.