

## LERU Chief Information Officers Community Meeting

10 November 2014 • Imperial College London

**Welcome by Chris Banks, Director of Library Services at Imperial College and Dr. Paul Ayris, Chair of the LERU Chief Information Officers Community.**

**LERU members' progress on OA to publications and data, presentation of the results of the updated ERA MoU questionnaire by Alea López de San Román, LERU Policy Officer.**

- ➔ Power point presentation available.
- ➔ A1\_Report on the updated ERA MoU Q on OA.

-(Chris) It would be interesting to have case studies on cross-disciplinary use of Open Data. Important to make the case for the sceptics.

-If the metadata records in CRIS would had been included in the Q, the percentage would have been much higher.

-The HEFCE policy hurts academics where it hurts. Being referenceable is very important for them.

-Publishers are holding the rights because academics have given the rights to them.

-(Ignasi) The university just needs a non-commercial use and to give the commercial use to the publishers.

-H2020: now academics are concerned about OA, that is good news. For the first time we do not chase the academics but the academics come after us. There is an increase of awareness and concerns.

-(Chris): a combination of external requirements (i.e. REF) and internal promotion would help. The two together could indeed be very powerful change engines.

In the UK we still have awarding mechanisms based on journal impact (being a proxy for quality). We could consider the San Francisco Declaration that seeks to redress that re how you advertise this and how you consider promotion within your institution.

-(Paul): the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment ([DORA](#)) makes aspirational statements. UCL has just signed it. No use of journal impact factors to evaluate research or use them as the basis for promotion.

Kurt: it leads back to the quality of the article instead on focusing on the article being published in a certain journal.

-(Paul): if promotion boards did not use the journal impact factor what could they use? What system would you use?

(Sb) I fear that, unless we as a community put something else in place, people will stick to the journal impact factor because it's the least worst option.

(Kurt): the VRR-C will examine peer review in December. It can be linked to DORA.

-(Kimmo on Q29, double-dipping): what should we do with this issue to get better results?

-(Kurt): KU Leuven has now introduced from 1st January the obligation to deposit the full-text in the repository (without an external incentive).

-(Paul): What could LERU do? The EG on Research Data could have a look at this list. We will review the membership

### **Copyright reform and Text and Data Mining, presentation by Dr. Paul Ayris.**

- ➔ Power point presentation available.
- ➔ A2\_LERU's actions on copyright and TDM.

-(Paul): We ask for an exception for TDM in both the InfoSoc Dve and the Database Dve since the right to read is the right to mine. TDM a very important part of doing research in the Science 2.0 world.

UK Hargreaves Review has introduced Fair Dealing Exception in UK for TDM. But if there is a project with e.g.: UK and Amsterdam's Barcelona's researchers, UK researchers can apply the exception but not the rest of them.

US, Japan, Israel, Taiwan and South Korea already benefit from legal limitations and exceptions.

-(Kurt): the EU legislation was leaving some discretion for the use of exceptions, so the UK has been making good use of them.

-(Paul): The question does not seem to be whether there will be an exception (it seems there will be) but the extension of the exception. There might be an exception for non-commercial research but we also need an exception for commercial research (universities are engaged in public-private partnerships).

Next steps: lobbying of the EC, MEPs and Council is vital in the next 12 months to try to get the best exception we can get.

(Kurt): next 6 months, since this is a very top priority for Juncker.

### **LERU paper on Science 2.0, presentation by Prof. David Price, UCL Vice-Provost Research.**

- ➔ Power point presentation available.
- ➔ A3\_LERU response to the Science 2.0 consultation
- ➔ A4\_LERU Paper accompanying the response to the Science 2.0 questionnaire
- ➔ A5\_Science 2.0 Factsheet

-(David's conclusions and next steps): LERU universities should work with the EC in a number of areas to progress the debate. LERU universities should:

- ✓ Establish a series of pan-European Workshops to investigate the various elements that make up Science 2.0.
- ✓ Seek funding from the EC to set up pan-European advocacy/research programmes on the potential benefits and challenges of Science 2.0 approaches.
- ✓ Open data is a fundamental building block of Science 2.0. Universities should bid for a collaborative project under the Horizon 2020 Research Data pilot to construct the necessary European infrastructure and to advocate Open Science approaches to research data management in research universities across Europe.
- ✓ The other elements of the "Science 2.0 portfolio" are less mature or well defined. These need to be monitored, but it is probably too early to develop detailed advice on them at this stage.

-(Alea) Website to support the validation process of the Science 2.0 consultation:

<http://scienceintransition.eu/>

-(David): re double dipping, Taylor & Francis is changing how publishers address the issue of the Total Cost of Ownership.

(Paul) UCL press release: "UCL welcomes the news that two major academic publishers are tackling the issue of subscription costs and the level of article-processing charges (APCs)."

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/news-articles/1014/291014-publishers-open-access>

-(Kurt): if gold open access fees are part of eligible costs and there is not a decrease in the funding, then there is no problem with gold open access.

**Private provision of data storage, presentation by Dr. Max Wilkinson, Head of Research Data Services, UCL Information Services Division.**

→ Power point presentation available.

-(Max)What we´re doing here is not a revolution but an evolution.

-Licensing in research data: that´s what keeps me awake at night.

-Main challenges: authentication, networking, multiple access mechanisms and licensing.

**EU bid for the international implementation of the LERU Roadmap for Research Data, by Dr. Paul Ayrís.**

→ Power point presentation available.

-(Maria): if the project does not get funded, it would also be interesting to organise workshops to promote use of the Roadmap.

-(Ignasi): it would be good to organise workshops with the participation of researchers.

**OA and publishers: state of affairs in The Netherlands, presentation by Maria Heijne, Director of Libraries, University of Amsterdam, and the United Kingdom, presentation by Chris Banks.**

**State of affairs of the negotiations in The Netherlands**

-(Maria): At the end of 2013, our Minister declared that universities should have by 2019 60% of the articles in OA, gold OA. We were taken by surprise by that but the Association of Dutch universities took up the challenge.

We started in July with the negotiations: we are not going to pay more for OA and OA for 2014. That was the mandate for the Association of Dutch universities. Numbers: subscriptions and operational costs and profits.

We left the table at the beginning of September. We tried again in October and now we are still waiting for a new better offer. After a few days we got a message from Elsevier saying that they regretted that we had broken up the negotiations unilaterally.

During the first half of 2016 The Netherlands will be presiding over the Council of the EU and the Secretary of State would like to have Science 2.0 and OA on top on the agenda. He has set up a task force with important people and Elsevier is now talking to these people but Elsevier is getting the same answer from everyone.

The main problem with our position (according to Elsevier) is that if they give us OA for the same amount of money we will be giving their business away. That is why the approach of Taylor & Francis (we give you OA for a little bit more) is so interesting.

-(Kurt): fantastic progress to see everybody on the same side in The Netherlands (academics, medical centres, Rectors, ...).

-(Sb): it is important to inform the researchers and to support them in making this step (that they have support from their institutions and that they will not get any sanctions, e.g. re promotion for this).

-(Maria): within LERU we could inform colleagues about what we're doing. Exchange with each other and see what is happening in each country. Because Elsevier knows about what is happening in each country and they use that against us.

-(Ignasi): the Spanish Law of Science asks for green OA and recently some recommendations were issued to put that in practice.

-(Adeline): there is not a national approach (green or gold) in France for this.

### **State of affairs of the negotiations in the UK**

➔ Power point presentation by Chris Banks available.

-(Chris' presentation): Challenges

- ✓ Scalability of processing , especially for gold.
- ✓ Creating a touchpoint with the repository for FAV/AAM to meet the new HEFCE requirements.
- ✓ Working with publishers to achieve "offsetting" deals.
- ✓ Enduring hybrid gold –affordability question.
- ✓ Academic reward systems not contributing to behaviour change.

## The Institution as Publisher, presentation by Dr. Paul Ayris.

➔ Power point presentation available.

-(Paul): The institution as Publisher is in line with Science 2.0.

-The library is not just a store house/cataloguer of knowledge but also a producer of knowledge by publishing.

## Conclusions and way forward

**Main points for the Rectors Assembly** (14&15 November, Milan):

-Can LERU sign the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment?

-Can LERU recommend Harvard/MIT-style licence where academic retains copyright, but institution has non-exclusive licence over final output, instead of copyright being assigned to publishers

-Can LERU issue a statement encouraging all commercial publishers to act on 'double dipping'?

-CIO Community will look for ways for LERU Universities to collaborate in Research Data Management activities

-Licensing for research data is an issue that the CIO Community will address

**Way forward for the CIO-C/actions:**

1. CIO Community to support Vice-Rectors (Research) in their consideration of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)
2. CIO Research Data Expert Group. Reform Membership and then meet/skype to consider the points raised by Alea from the ERA MoU. UCL willing to lead/write Horizon 2020 bid with individual universities as partners, if this is an outcome of the discussions
3. If the LEARN project is funded, universities to be invited to host the European Workshops
4. Licensing models for publications and for data.

In future CIO-C meetings, the participants will present the state of affairs re the negotiations with the publishers.

Background documents:

- A1\_Report on the updated ERA MoU Q on OA
- A2\_LERU's actions on copyright and TDM
- A3\_LERU response to the Science 2.0 consultation
- A4\_LERU Paper accompanying the response to the Science 2.0 questionnaire
- A5\_Science 2.0 Factsheet
- A6\_LIBER report on Research Data Management

Additional documents sent with the report:

- Conclusions of the Report on the updated ERA MoU Q on OA
- San Francisco Declaration