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Outline of presentation

• Main policy messages from EUA
  • EUA Statement on Open Science to EU Institutions and National Governments (October 2017)
  • Towards OA to research publications (June 2017)
  • Towards OA to research data – RDM and TDM (October 2017)

• Outcomes of the EUA OA institutional survey 2016/2017 (report to be published in February 2018)

• Preview of outcomes of EUA Big Deals Survey (report to be published in Spring 2018)
EUA Statement on Open Science to EU Institutions and National Governments
Achieving Open Access to Research Publications and Research Data Must be a Priority for Europe

Key messages for EU institutions

• Embed Open Science in all parts of the next Framework Programme (FP9)

• Support the creation of new European infrastructures (e.g. EOSC) and a possible European-wide publishing platform, ensuring that it is accessible and open for all relevant stakeholders

• Support the ongoing development of existing infrastructures supporting Open Science (e.g. OpenAIRE)

• Support the development and implementation of new research assessment approaches

• Craft a coherent EU legislation package that ensures lawful access, use and re-use of both research publications and research data, including text and data mining (TDM).
Key messages for national governments

• Embed Open Science in all nationally funded research projects
• Ensure the compatibility of national policies and regulations with EU policies
• Support both the gold and green OA routes, or other convenient routes
• Incentivise researchers to adopt open practices
• Include open science practices as part of the pre- and post-evaluation of research projects
• Contribute to additional costs incurred by institutions and researchers related to open access to publications
• Provide political support for open access to research publications and data
• Take a proactive role in adopting national legislation that facilitates OA to research outputs (publications and data)
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Towards Open Access to Research Publications

Recommendations for university leaders and NRCs – Research Publications

- The transition towards full and immediate OA must be as short as possible
  - Both ‘gold’ and ‘green’ OA routes have their advantages and should be pursued
  - Cost transparency in the scientific publishing market is a non-negotiable requirement
- Institutional leaders play a crucial role in leading the transition of the current publishing system into a full OA publishing system
- Achieving full OA requires the mobilisation of all researchers, including robust incentive and rewards systems
- The development of policies favourable to open access to research results requires new competences at both university and country levels
- Research assessment systems need to evolve to recognise a variety of approaches and activities in open science
- The negotiation of ‘big deal’ contracts should include provisions for protecting institutions’ current and future interests, in terms of overall costs and possibility to use and re-use information.
Recommendations for university leaders and NRCs

Engage in dialogue with other relevant national bodies to support the development of policies and guidelines that facilitate RDM and TDM.

Establish policies and guidelines for RDM and TDM, including:

- Raising awareness at institutional and researcher levels of the importance of RDM and TDM for the advancement of science and knowledge
- Ensuring that ownership of research data remains with researchers and their institutions
- Investing in and supporting human resource skills training
- Adopting, recognising and rewarding standards and good practices in RDM and data analysis
- Supporting and investing in the development and sustainability of infrastructures and support services for RDM and TDM at institutional, national and EU-levels
Focused on the degree of implementation of institutional policies on:
• Open Access to research publications
• Research Data Management
• Open Access to research data

Deadline for responses: 31 March 2017

Respondents:
• 338 universities from 39 countries (2015/16: 169 institutions; 2014: 106 institutions; 100% increase compared to 2015/16)
Questionnaire on Open Access 2016/17

Participants: 338 universities from 39 countries
Institutional policies on Open Access

Share of institutions which have a policy of Open Access (OA) to research publications

- Yes
- My institution is in the process of developing an Open Access policy (and expects to have one in place within 12 months)
- My institution is planning to develop an Open Access policy (but does not expect to have a policy in place within 12 months)
- My institution is not planning to develop an Open Access policy

Number of respondents: 338/338
Key elements of institutional OA policies for research publications

- Encouragement policy, recommending researchers to deposit publications in an institutional/shared repository (60.2%)
- Awareness raising, including training for early-stage researchers on open access to research publications (54.1%)
- Financial support for researchers to publish their papers in open access (31.3%)
- Mandate: researchers deposit publications in a repository and make full text open-access within a specified time period (28.9%)
- Mandate: researchers deposit publications in a repository, this requirement being linked to internal performance evaluation (12.6%)
- Mandate: researchers deposit publications in a repository, this requirement being linked to an external, national review procedure (12.2%)
- Mandate requiring publication in open access (gold route/gold open access) (5.4%)

Number of respondents: 294/312.
Question only applicable to institutions who replied “Yes”, “In the process of developing and OA policy” or “Planning to develop an OA policy” to Q1 (see slide 4). Multiple-choice question.
Available funding sources for supporting Open Access to research publications

- **European funding (e.g. Horizon 2020)**: 66.6%
- **National funding (e.g. from research funders)**: 62.2%
- **General institution budget**: 59.8%
- **Project-based funding**: 47.7%
- **Cooperative funding across institutions**: 11.5%

Number of respondents: 323/338. Multiple-choice question.
Institutional repositories

- Yes, my institution has an institutional repository: 73.8%
- Yes, my institution participates in a shared repository: 9.5%
- No: 13.7%
- Don’t know: 3%

Number of respondents: 336/338
Increase in deposit rate of research publications in the repository since OA policy adoption

- Yes: 31.5%
- No: 57.9%
- Don't know: 10.7%

Number of respondents: 178/180. Question only applicable to institutions who replied “Yes” to Q1 (see slide 4).
Existence of institutional guidelines on research data management

- Yes, institutional guidelines: 18.8%
- Yes, informal guidelines (guidelines not institutionally formalised, but apparent in the institutional practices): 19.6%
- No: 58%
- Don’t know: 3.6%

Number of respondents: 336/338
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### Key elements of guidelines on research data management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended guidelines</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for data storage</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aspects</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions on research ethics</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions on research integrity</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory guidelines</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for specific disciplinary areas</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of respondents: 127/129. Question only applicable to institutions who replied "Yes" to Q14 (see slide 9). Multiple-choice question.*
Existence of institutional guidelines on OA to research data

- Yes, institutional guidelines: 16.1%
- Yes, informal guidelines (guidelines not formalised, but apparent in the institutional practices): 11.6%
- No: 69.6%
- Don’t know: 2.7%

Number of respondents: 336/338
**Key elements of guidelines on OA to research data**

Number of respondents: 91/93. Question only applicable to institutions who replied “Yes” to Q15 (see slide 11). Multiple-choice question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended guidelines</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for data storage</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aspects</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions on research ethics</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions on research integrity</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory guidelines</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific guidelines for sensitive data</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions for specific disciplinary areas</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of universities
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EUA questionnaire on Open Access
Results survey 2016/17

Existence of an institutional permanent Open Research Data working group or committee

- Yes: 73.1%
- No: 4.2%
- Don’t know: 22.7%

Composition of institutional governance structure dealing with research data management/OA to research data

- Library: 74.7%
- High leadership or management: 49.1%
- Research administration bodies: 47.3%
- ICT department: 42.2%
- Representatives of faculties: 32.1%
- Legal department: 20.9%
- Data protection office: 13.4%

Number of respondents: 331/338
Number of respondents: 277/338

Reasons accounting for the absence of institutional guidelines on RDM and/or OA to research data

- Absence of national-level guidelines on the topic: 64.8%
- Novelty of the topic and general unawareness of its importance: 62.2%
- Technical complexity: 48.7%
- Absence of funding to develop infrastructure or expertise: 46.5%
- Lack of knowledge and expertise in this area: 45.2%
- Lack of adequate infrastructures: 44.8%
- Absence of mandate or recommendations from research funders on the topic: 44.3%
- Institutional priority focus on open access to research publications: 36.5%
- Unclear or fragmented legal framework: 29.6%
- Distrust or negative stereotypes on the benefits of open access: 25.2%

Number of respondents: 230/244.
Question only applicable to institutions who indicated not having guidelines on RDM and/or OA to research data. Multiple-choice question.
Support provided by the institution to researchers interested in OA to research data (I)

- Some institutions currently do not provide support to researchers interested in OA to research data, but they are planning to do so in the near future (26%)

- Some institutions provide training to researchers and support staff (e.g. workshops on RDM, training on H2020) on a regular basis or ad-hoc, depending on demand (22.6%)

- Training for graduate students, including doctoral candidates: some institutions provide courses, workshops or specialised training on open science, research data management, as well as legal and ethical matters. A few institutions provide doctoral candidates with individual support in creating Data Management Plans. (22.6%)

- Support services provided by the library staff or other specialised staff, typically on a one-on-one basis. This type of support typically focuses on legal issues, technical help (e.g. archiving, managing data, open access to data, advice on data repositories, information on policies relevant to RDM and/or OA to data) and information on relevant policies. (20.8%)
Support provided by the institution to researchers interested in OA to research data (II)

- **Institutional website** with information on RDM and OA to research data, blogs, newsletters (13%)
- Some institutions have a **dedicated office or service** available for supporting researchers. Examples include an Open Access office, helpdesk, RDM support desk, university data centre. Support typically focuses on the technical area, legal matters and information on relevant policies. (9.9%)
- **Information events** focusing on RDM and/or OA to research data (6.7%)
- **Financial support to researchers**, including doctoral candidates, to attend events on OA to research data and/or to publish articles in OA (1.8%)
Main barriers at institutional level in promoting RDM and/or OA to research data

- Different “scientific cultures” within the university: 68.6%
- Absence of policies or guidelines at national level: 60.6%
- Limited awareness of the benefits of research data management and/or open access to research data: 57.5%
- Concerns over the legal framework: 56.8%
- Technical complexity: 55.2%
- Absence of incentives to promote research data management and/or open access to research data: 54.9%
- Concerns over increased costs: 47.3%
- Lack of expertise on the topic: 42.2%
- Lack of support structures for researchers: 41.6%
- Lack of coordination among the relevant actors within the university: 41%
- Lack of awareness raising, including training opportunities, for early stage researchers: 37.8%

Number of respondents: 315/337. Multiple-choice question.
### Importance of actions in the transition to RDM and/or OA to research data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>EU + national level</th>
<th>EU level</th>
<th>National level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing policies and clear guidelines, with an emphasis on legal aspects</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the definition of technical standards, procedures and definitions</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guidelines on quality assurance in the area of research data</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the exchange of best practices</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness on the benefits of RDM and/or OA to data for different stakeholders</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, extend and support infrastructure for data storage, access and sharing</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting rewards/incentives for sharing or opening data in researchers’ assessment evaluation</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer awareness raising, including training, to early-stage researchers on OA to research data</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents: 319-324/338. Multiple-choice question.
EUA Big Deals survey

Survey Key characteristics

• National experts nominated by their respective NRCs
• Data collection: summer 2016-june 2017
• Respondents:
  • 28 NRCs from across Europe, representing 27 countries
Consortia negotiating big deals

EUA Big Deals survey

Composition of the consortium

- University: 80% of NRCs
- Libraries: 60% of NRCs
- Government representative: 40% of NRCs
- Scientific organisations: 20% of NRCs

Number of NRCs: 27/28
Multiple-choice question
Consortia negotiating big deals

EUA Big Deals survey

Are there university representatives (leadership) involved in the negotiation committee?

- Yes: 29.6%
- No: 63%
- Not available: 7.4%

Number of NRCs: 27/28
Consortia negotiating big deals

EUA Big Deals survey

Origin of funds for big deals

- Universities: 48.1%
- Government/ministry: 25.9%
- Government and universities: 26%

Number of NRCs: 27/28
Consortia negotiating big deals

EUA Big Deals survey

Inclusion of APCs in current contracts
- Yes: 85.2%
- Offsetting provisions: 11.1%
- No: 3.7%

Inclusion of APCs in future big deal contracts
- Yes: 63%
- No: 11.1%
- Still under analysis: 25.9%

Number of NRCs: 27/28
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