The NHMRC mandate and you – a guide

Overview
- The NHMRC mandate – what it is, what it isn’t
- How the ANU is approaching the management of this mandate
- Other existing and proposed mandates
- Publisher’s responses to mandates
- International context

NHMRC
- New policy as of 1 July 2012
   - Any publications* resulting from NHMRC grants must be available in an institutional repository within 12 months of publication.
   - Researchers can request funds for gold OA publication

Any publications?
- No actually, only journal articles at this stage
- NHMRC webpage vs information sent to Librarians is different (they will update their site)

Any grant?
- Yes – this policy relates to publications, not grants.
  - Any publication arising from a grant (regardless of how old that is) should fall under the policy
- No - scholarship holders
  - "are covered in principle as grant recipients but deposit by them will not be mandatory at this stage because of the (often long) lead times involved."

What this does NOT mean
- You do not have to change where you publish your work
- You do not have to start paying to have your work published
- You do not have to negotiate anything with your publishers
What is unusual about this mandate

- The requirement for material to be available in an institutional repository
- Other mandates around the world:
  - Require publication in an OA journal (eg: Wellcome Trust), or
  - Require deposit in a subject based repository (eg: NIH into PubMed Central)

But let’s take a step back

- Open access
  - Making publicly funded research publicly available
- ‘Roads’ to open access
  - Publishing in an open access journal (through payment of an article processing fee) - Gold
  - Depositing a copy of the work into a repository, subject based or institutional - Green

More work is available green OA than gold OA

- Study* of the proportion of research published in 2008 that was available OA in 2009:
- One in 5 papers - split between OA journals & repositories.
  - OA journals - 8.5% of all published papers (one in four of these in a hybrid journal)
  - Repositories 11.9% of all published papers

MANAGING THE MANDATE AT ANU

“What do I have to do?”

Example of an author page

http://research.anu.edu.au/access
How ANU is approaching the mandate

- Working with Research Services
  - Identify articles which have been published as the result of a grant
  - Work on introducing a GrantID – external specifications
  - Determine who is PI and Corresponding Author
- Determine OA status of that work
  - Source OA version if needed
  - Link to OA version elsewhere
- Develop flowcharts to assist researchers
- Investigate harvesting other OA sources

Can we use RGMS?

- NHMRC Research Grant Management System (RGMS)
  - Requires researchers to list publications in their Final Report – separate file
  - New field to ask for Grant info against a paper
- Possible method of cross checking at the end of the process
- Issue is papers that arise five years later

Different kinds of mandates

- Funder mandates
  - NIH – deposit in PMC. Requested from 2004, required since 2008
  - Wellcome Trust – publish in OA journals preferred. Since Oct 2005
  - NHMRC – in institutional repository. Since July 2012
- Institutional mandates
  - QUT (recognised 1st in world) since Jan 2004
  - Now six universities in Australia which have an open access mandate (if you include ANU)
Australian Research Council

• Discovery Grants funding rules 2012:
  – Researchers may spend up to 2% of grant on gold OA publication
  – Final report must say why work is not publicly available

ARC – things are changing

• Future position:
  – Have sent a letter to VCs to ask about possible impact of matching the NHMRC policy
  – If it happens, will be effective 1 January 2013

• Academic concerns:
  – Some disciplines in HASS only publish books
  – Worried this may kill the book industry

• ARC considerations:
  – As administrators of ERA the ARC has control over what is ‘counted’ as academic output

Publishers are not created equal

• Springer
  – allows deposit of Accepted Version in a repository

• Taylor & Francis
  – allows deposit of Accepted Version after an embargo

• Elsevier
  – allows deposit of Accepted Version as long as you are not mandated (!)

• Wiley Blackwell
  – do not allow deposit of Accepted Version under any circumstances

It comes down to the version

For green OA the accepted version is ‘gold’!
In theory…

We can make about 70% of NHMRC funded publications available this way:

- List of all NHMRC funded publications in one year
- Analysis of the first 400 journals (representing 52.4% of the total)
- Blue, Green, light Green & Elsevier = 36.4% of the total outputs
- 36.4/52.4 = 69.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colours</th>
<th>No of journals by colour</th>
<th>% of total outputs</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>Can archive post print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>Archiving not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>Can archive pre print only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Green</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>Can archive post print after embargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>Can archive pre and post print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>Can archive post print once ‘agreement’ reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanalysed</td>
<td>9353</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 98.18%

What do the publishers actually say?

- Elsevier ‘authors rights’ page
  [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights)
  - Authors have: "The right to post a revised personal version of the text of the final journal article (to reflect changes made in the peer review process) on your personal or institutional website or server for scholarly purposes, incorporating the complete citation and with a link to the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of the article (but not in subject-oriented or centralized repositories or institutional repositories with mandates for systematic postings unless there is a specific agreement with the publisher)"
- Wiley Blackwell - Copyright Transfer Agreement
  - No to placing an Accepted Version into a repository UNLESS they are funded with a funding organisation that has a specific agreement with Wiley Blackwell

Separate Agreements

**Elsevier – 14 funders**

- Arthritis Research Campaign (UK)
- Austrian Science Fund (FWF)
- BBSRC
- British Heart Foundation (UK)
- Cancer Research (UK)
- Chief Scientist Office
- Department of Health (UK)
- Duhal Medical Trust
- ESRC
- Howard Hughes Medical Institute (US)
- Medical Research Council (UK)
- National Institutes of Health (US)
- Telethon (Italy)
- Wellcome Trust (UK)
- [NHMRC to come](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements)

**Wiley – 5 funders**

- Austrian Science Fund (FWF)

Wiley Blackwell agreements (5 funders)

- Howard Hughes Medical Institute — In PMC within 6 months
  - Wiley deposits Accepted Version
- NIH — In PMC within 12 months
  - Wiley deposits & authors can place in IR
- Telethon — Must be in PMC
  - Authors comply by paying for gold. Telethon is directly invoiced by publisher
- Welcome Trust — Publish in gold (copy to PMC)
  - Authors comply by paying for gold. Welcome reimburses author
- Austrian Science Fund — Publish in gold
  - Funder pays gold

What does gold pay for?

- Elsevier
  - "If authors want to submit a version of the work in an open access repository they must seek permission from the Global Rights Department before articles are posted within an open access repository [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights)"
- Wiley
  - In addition to publication online via Wiley Online Library, authors of OnlineOpen articles are permitted to post the final, published PDF of their article on a website, institutional repository, or other free public server, immediately on publication.

2012 has been a big year for OA

**OPEN ACCESS INTERNATIONALLY**
Recent proposed US law that would affect scholarly publishing

- **Research Works Act (RWA)**
  - US House Bill 3699 introduced 16 December 2012
  - It would be illegal for government funding body to make OA publication a condition of funding
  - Put forward by two congress people
    - Found to both have accepted large donations from Elsevier in previous financial year

What happened?

- Major blogging campaign
- Elsevier boycott – petition started by Tim Gowers
- Elsevier withdrew support for Bill
- Bill pulled 28 February 2012
- **Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA)**
  - Senate Bill 2096 and House Bill 4004 introduced 9 February 2012. (Reworking of the 2006 and 2009-10 FRPAA)

UK - Finch Report

- 2012 UK Working Group on Expanding Access to Published Research Findings, chaired by Dame Janet Finch stated in their report*
  - Recommends increasing open access to UK research
  - States that gold OA is the preferred method
  - Estimates the cost will be an extra £38 million – to pay for APC (based on average of £1500) in both OA journals and hybrid journals
  - UK Govt has endorsed the report and its findings. They have announced £10m in funding - not new money but will be taken from the science budget.
    - *http://www.researchinfonet.org/publish/finch/

Compliance is varied

- **Wellcome Trust**
  - Despite having one of the first funding mandates, in Feb 2012 a presentation showed they only had 50% compliance
- **European Research Council**
  - Reported in 2012 that ‘62% of journal articles from ERC funded projects are available in open access’
  - The share of article OA varies across domains:
    - 70% Life Sciences
    - 65% Physical Sciences & Engineering
    - 50% in SSH

Funding bodies clamping down

- Now, where Wellcome Trust-funded researchers have not complied with the open access policy, three sanctions will apply:
  - If non-compliant papers are identified in an End of Grant Report, the Trust will withhold the final 10% per cent of the ‘total transferable funds’ budget on the grant until all papers comply. See 10 per cent retention policy.
  - Applicants will be required to ensure that Trust-funded papers resulting from current or previous grants are compliant before formal notification of any funding renewals or new grants can be activated.
  - Researchers will not be permitted to include any non-compliant Wellcome-funded publications in any application submitted to the Trust, and such papers will be discounted from consideration of a researcher’s track record.

Open Access is becoming tied to the reward system

- Two Belgian universities have clamped down on OA - University of Leige & Louvain Catholic University:
  - In its meeting of 2 July the Academic Council of UCK adopted a policy of mandatory deposit in its DIAL repository of all bibliographic metadata as well as full-texts as of 1 January 2013. As of that date, the Academic Council will only consider duly deposited publications in its internal research performance evaluations and that deposit will also be one of the criteria in the allocation of institutional research funds.
Thank you and questions
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