**RCUK Open Access Practitioners Group**

**23 April 2018 Meeting**

**Key Messages**

**Jisc dashboard to compare funders’ open access policies**

OAPG had sent comments on the dashboard. While the dashboard would be a useful visualisation tool for providing an overview of funders’ open access policies, it was not clear what types of users would find it useful and the value that they would gain. It was agreed that it would be sensible to discuss this with other funders and stakeholders. Jisc gave permission for this.

**UKRI update**

OAPG received an update on the creation of UK Research and Innovation, including the organisational structure and the role of Policy Branch within the central Strategy Team.

The UKRI Review of Open Access is in the early planning stages. It will be an internal review which will engage widely with stakeholders.

**Relationship between block grants and MRC Units**

The MRC Units are strategic investments, set up to meet specific needs, for example, to provide scientific leadership in key research fields, or to tackle important research questions where the need cannot easily be addressed through grant funding. The MRC Units have their own funding for open access, separate from the block grants. This had caused administrative difficulties for Cambridge University. It was agreed that a discussion between universities that had MRC units could help to share best practice in how to administer the open access funding.

There was a separate issue to do with institutes that were not included in the block grant algorithm as they did not have staff costs on their grants. UKRI would look at changing this for the next block grants.

**Non-compliant licences**

OAPG discussed the issue of non-compliant licences for green open access, commenting that most publishers do not have licences for green open access, and if they do they might not be compliant with the RCUK policy (CC BY NC ND is not compliant with the RCUK Policy on Open Access for green open access). Many universities did not have the resources to check every single article for compliance with the requirements for green open access, as this would involve checking the funding acknowledgement, embargo period and licence for each. In appreciation of these difficulties, UKRI provided three options for compliance reporting against the RCUK policy: actual publications data, estimates of publication numbers, and statements on how the implementation of the policy is progressing. It was suggested that increasing adoption of identifiers, such as ORCID and organisational identifiers, could help in the future. The UKRI Review of Open Access would consider the issues of licences and compliance requirements.

**Compliance targets**

UKRI confirmed that the compliance targets for year five were an expectation that 100% of papers would be published open access, whether by gold or green routes, and for 75% of these to be
published via gold open access. These had been the targets in the RCUK Policy on Open Access since it was originally written, but it had been intended that the policy would be reviewed regularly and for various reasons only the 2014/15 review had taken place. OAPG discussed how realistic the targets are in terms of their experiences in trying to achieve them within the limits of the funding provided through the block grants. OAPG requested clearer messages to the community on UKRI’s expectations with respect to the compliance targets and consequences if they are not met (there are no sanctions if the compliance targets are not met).

RCUK Policy on Open Access FAQs

The FAQs that accompany the RCUK Policy on Open Access would be updated shortly to correct wording in a couple of the FAQs that was not in line with the policy document itself (for example, on the compliance targets) and to delete some that had out-of-date information.