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Open access publishing has become an increasingly significant part of the scholarly communications landscape over the past few years. Both new and well-established publishers are finding new ways of publishing fully-peer-reviewed articles and making them available free of charge to all readers immediately upon publication. Such immediate and widespread access can bring obvious benefits in ensuring that the results of research are freely available to all who have an interest in them.

But in order to retain a revenue stream to support their activities, many open access publishers charge, in place of a subscription fee for readers, a publication fee for authors. This turns the traditional publishing business model on its head, and thus poses challenges for publishers but also for researchers and the institutions that employ them. They have to find new ways to meet the costs of publication fees, alongside the well-established budgets for the majority of journals that still operate the traditional subscription model.

The Research Information Network (RIN) published some brief guidance for institutions on these issues in December 2006. It is clear, however, that the response in the UK to the development of open access journals remains haphazard. Research funders’ requirements that the outputs of research should rapidly be made freely available to all readers have not been matched by consistent and readily-understandable arrangements across the HE sector to enable researchers to meet the costs of publication fees. Hence over the past few months we have worked together with Universities UK (UUK) and a group of representatives from the publishing, library and research administration communities to produce detailed and practical guidance for funders, publishers and authors as well as higher education institutions (HEIs).

I am very grateful to my colleagues on the working group for their input to this document. Our central message is the need for a coordinated and strategic response in the UK – at both institutional and national levels – to the opportunities as well as the challenges posed by open access publishing, and for good communication between all the parties involved. The test of our work will be the extent to which it helps in achieving those ends.

A summary of our recommendations is at Annex A on page 19.

Michael Jubb
Chair of the Working Group
Director, Research Information Network
1. Introduction

This document provides advice and guidance on the arrangements for paying open access publication fees: that is, fees levied by some journals for the publication of scholarly articles so that they can be made available free of charge to readers, immediately upon publication. The guidance is directed to UK HEIs and other research institutions, to research funders, to publishers, and to authors. It is the practical outcome from a working group established by UUK and the RIN. It presents the advice from representatives of the library, publishing and research administrator communities on the practical issues to be addressed in establishing coordinated and strategic approaches to the payment of publication fees.

This guidance is of course voluntary, though implementing it will bring benefits to all parties involved in producing and publishing research outputs. We recognise too that it will be up to individual institutions, funders, and authors as to how they adapt their practices to meet their own particular circumstances.

This report reflects an understanding of the position as it stands at the end of 2008. Since the scholarly communications landscape is changing rapidly, UUK and RIN are committed to review this guidance periodically and update it as necessary. Feedback from institutions on good practice and further issues that might need to be addressed, to help inform this process, would be extremely useful. This can be sent to chris.hale@universitiesuk.ac.uk and michael.jubb@rin.ac.uk
2. Background

Research funders’ policies on publication

Many research funders now require grant recipients to make the journal articles arising from work that they fund available free of charge to any readers. Among major research funders in the UK, six of the seven research councils, along with the Wellcome Trust, have established such a policy, and in the US the National Institutes of Health have introduced a similar mandate.

Funders have introduced these requirements because they see communication of the results of research as an integral part of the research process and because they wish to maximise the dissemination of the research that they fund.

Wide and rapid dissemination of publications and other research outputs brings benefits both to the research community and to society at large. As the European Commission has recently noted, broad dissemination of, and access to, research publications and raw data can accelerate scientific progress. This in turn is essential for Europe’s ability to innovate, to enhance its economic performance, and improve its capacity to compete on a global scale (see the European Commission’s policies on open access as set out in the documents referenced in Annex E).
How to comply with funders’ requirements

Broadly, there are two ways to comply with funders’ requirements of this kind. The first is for researchers to publish their articles in journals that offer ‘open access’ publishing, by making articles available free of charge to readers immediately on publication, usually in return for the payment of a fee – sometimes called an ‘author-pays’ fee. The second way is for researchers to deposit, in an institutional or subject-based repository, copies of the articles they publish, whether in an open access journal or a traditional journal that requires a subscription from readers or their libraries. The repository will then make those copies available to anyone who wants to read them, either immediately upon publication or after an embargo period designed to cushion the impact on the journal’s subscription revenues.

Developments and services adopting each of these approaches are becoming increasingly significant in the scholarly communications landscape. Both approaches offer the long-term prospect of savings in subscription costs met by libraries, as well as increases in the efficiency of scholarly communications. But both also imply significant transitional costs in setting up and sustaining new arrangements. More information on open access can be found in briefing papers and reports produced by the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) and by the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) (see Annex E).

This document does not debate the merits of open access in general, nor of the two approaches outlined above. Rather, it starts from the position that open access publishing, accompanied by the need to pay publication fees, is a significant and growing development. It focuses solely on the implications of that development for all who are involved in the scholarly communications system, by providing information and guidance on the practical arrangements required for the payment of publication fees.

Open access and ‘hybrid’ journals

A number of relatively new publishers, including BioMedCentral, Public Library of Science (PLOS) and Hindawi, have now established portfolios of journals that operate in this way. Other longer-established publishers and learned societies are experimenting with some of their journals now operating at least in part on an open-access basis. Many have introduced so-called hybrid models, under which the authors have a choice. They can make a payment if they wish so that their articles become available free of charge to all readers immediately upon publication, if they make no payment their article will be immediately available only to readers, or through libraries, who have paid a subscription in the traditional way.
Journals where publication may require payment of a fee have thus become a small but growing part of the scholarly publishing landscape over the past few years. They have the potential to play an increasingly significant role in achieving funders’ goals of wide and rapid dissemination of research results, avoiding the embargo periods often associated with access through a repository. But they also present challenges both to funders and to research institutions in establishing systematic arrangements for the payment of such fees. Without a sustainable basis on which to move forward there is the risk that further development and innovation in this area could be stifled.

**Current arrangements**

Mechanisms for the payment of publication fees have grown up haphazardly, even though they are not an entirely new phenomenon: some academic journals have for many years levied page fees or charges for illustrations. Fees are sometimes met from unallocated funds available to researchers from research grants or from a variety of other sources including researchers’ own pockets. As fees for open access journals have become more prominent, there have been a number of attempts in the UK at more systematic arrangements:

- the Wellcome Trust has since 2005 provided funds to meet the costs of fees for research papers arising from Trust-funded research: block grants are provided to 30 institutions, and researchers outside those institutions can reclaim the costs from the Trust (see the policies on their website)
the Research Councils UK Position Statement on Access to Research Outputs issued in June 2006 stated that “…it is for authors’ institutions to decide whether to use funds for any page charges or other publishing fees. Such funds could be part of an institution’s indirect costs under the full economic costing regime”.

the RIN published the Payment of publication fees briefing note (December 2006) with initial guidance on how universities might make provision for payment of publication fees either as direct costs or as indirect costs under the full economic costing regime.

There have been similar developments overseas, where such bodies as the Max Planck Society in Germany, and the University of California Berkeley have established arrangements through which researchers can apply for funds to meet the costs of publication fees. At a European level, the European Commission is now using FP7 grant agreements to encourage grantees to seek reimbursement for the full cost of open access publishing, and has introduced a pilot to require open access in seven subject areas.

The response at institutional level in the UK has been patchy. The University of Nottingham established in 2007 a central fund for the payment of publication fees (see Annex B). This response appears to have been exceptional - however a recent JISC survey of UK HEIs (see Annex C) showed that only a very small number had any clearly-established arrangements in place.

This document seeks to build on experience to date, to advise HEIs and others on how to establish a strategic and coordinated approach to the payment of publication fees, and to provide practical guidance on the implementation of such an approach.
3. Guidance for HEIs & research institutions

To ensure that publication fees can be supported in a sustainable way, there are four key areas institutions need to consider: coordination of policy, management of funding, communication and interface with the researcher.

Coordination of approach

HEIs are diverse organisations, and there is no standard model of institutional management and organisation. Within any institution a number of different groups may have an interest in managing the payment of publication fees. These include library and information staff, the research support office, administrative staff at a school or departmental level, as well as researchers themselves. This may make the processing and management of publication fees complicated and inconsistent.

In moving forward, institutions need to develop arrangements that suit their particular situation. However, we recommend that HEIs should designate a single person at senior level (for example, a pro or deputy vice chancellor) to coordinate their activities. That person should take the lead in assessing how effectively arrangements are operating, ensuring that they develop appropriately in the light of changing circumstances. HEIs should thus not treat publication fees solely as a matter for libraries, but as a strategic issue for the institution in terms of how it effectively manages the outputs and impact of its research effort.

Funding arrangements

The current arrangements for meeting the costs of publication fees arising from work supported by major funders including the Wellcome Trust and the research councils are shown in the box overleaf.

As noted overleaf, in most cases it will not be possible to treat publication fees as a directly-incurred cost, but only as an indirect cost. Moreover, for those researchers whose work is not supported by external funders, there is no source other than their institution to help in meeting the costs of publication fees. Therefore in order to achieve a coordinated approach across the institution, we recommend that HEIs establish dedicated budgets to which researchers can apply for funds to meet the costs of publication fees. Institutions can then, include the costs met from such budgets within the indirect cost rates for grant applications to the research councils and other bodies. Such budgets should also include, on the income side, any funds provided by the Wellcome Trust or other bodies specifically for these purposes.

Such a budget will provide an identifiable and sustainable resource from which to pay fees for publications produced after a grant has expired, a mechanism for administering the dedicated grants provided by funders such as the Wellcome.
Trust and, once established, a mechanism to manage the payment of all such fees.

It may take the form of a dedicated pot of funding that is held and managed centrally, or funding that is devolved to departments, or a dedicated budget heading. In some cases the library may take responsibility for these arrangements, but should not be treated simply as an additional call on the library budget.

The key points are that HEIs should establish the principle that a separate and identifiable resource is established for these purposes and that, **even if management of the budget is devolved, a consistent and coordinated approach to managing the payment of publication fees is taken across the institution.**

**In establishing such an approach, HEIs should establish clear criteria as to the circumstances in which researchers can apply for funds**, including:

- eligibility for support when articles include authors from other institutions
- eligibility for multiple grants in any one year
- the priority to be given to researchers whose work is not supported by an external grant
- the criteria for judging between competing claims for grants if funds are limited, and
- any requirement to have the institution properly identified, e.g. within the context of the Research Excellence Framework (REF).

Institutions may also need to consider appeal procedures in cases where applications for funding are refused.

We recognise that there are risks that institutions need to take into account when setting up arrangements of this kind. Indirect cost rates are calculated annually, based on information from the previous year. Institutions which establish dedicated budgets in Year One will have to wait until Year Two before they can recover a proportion of the costs through the project grants that they win in that year.

HEIs are also unlikely to recover all of the costs. For research council grants, although there is a long-term commitment to meet 100% of full economic costs, the recovery rate currently will not exceed 80%. Moreover, in order to secure a significant return, institutions must maintain in Year Two and
Publication fees charged as directly-incurred costs

The Wellcome Trust has awarded additional funds to thirty HEIs to cover the cost of publication fees, and has set up arrangements under which other HEIs may reclaim the cost of publication fees charged to Trust award-holders. The research councils allow publication fees to be included as a directly-incurred cost under the ‘other’ costs heading on the standard grant application form. There is one key restriction, provision for publication fees may be included only if they will be incurred during the period of the grant. Fees that will be incurred after the project and the grant have come to an end – as will usually be the case with publications may not be included. And as with all elements of directly-incurred costs, funds unspent at the end of the grant period will be recovered by the relevant research council.

Publication fees charged as indirect costs

Publication fees may be charged as an indirect cost if HEIs establish budgets and administrative arrangements at institutional or sub-institutional level to enable their researchers to pay such fees. There is no bar under the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC)/full economic costs (FEC) guidance against establishing such budgets, the disbursements from which will then form part of the cost base used for calculating institutions’ standard rates for the indirect costs of research. Just as a proportion of the costs of the library, including acquisition and subscription costs for journals, are included in calculating the standard rate, so the costs of meeting publication fees can be included in that calculation.

See Payment of publication fees briefing note (RIN, 2006)
subsequent years their success rates in securing project grants from the research councils and other sources.

Notwithstanding these risks, the wider benefits to HEIs in promoting the rapid and widespread dissemination and impact of articles produced by their staff mean that it would be in their interests to meet from their own resources any shortfall in the funds they secure through project and other grants.

**Communication**

The recent JISC survey of authors in the biomedical field (see Annex B) indicated that only 28% of those employed by HEIs believed that they had received any guidance from their employer on the payment of publication fees. *Whatever arrangements institutions adopt to meet publication fees, it is vital that they are communicated effectively to all relevant academic and administrative staff.* Effective communication, through such mechanisms as short pamphlets and staff seminars, will also help in managing expectations and making clear what institutions can or cannot support. Coverage of these issues should form part of the induction processes for new research and relevant administrative staff.
Practical considerations

One of the main problems identified to date has been the difficulties in securing speedy and ready access to funds once an article has been accepted for publication. The JISC survey at Annex C found that only 25% of HEI-employed authors in the biomedical field believed that their institution provided easy access to the grants supplied by the Wellcome Trust. The arrangements recommended in this report should alleviate such difficulties, but it is essential that the procedures for making decisions on individual publications, and for raising purchase orders, should be as transparent and speedy as possible.
4. Guidance for funders

The policies established by funders have played an important role in promoting open access initiatives and the Wellcome Trust in particular has played a critical role in promoting the development of open access publishing models. But not all funders have developed such clear and detailed policies, and researchers are often uncertain about how they can secure funds to meet funders’ requirements. We recommend that all funders should clarify how they will provide financial support for researchers in meeting their open access policies in general, and the payment of publication fees in particular.

As the moves towards open access gather pace, and open access publishing becomes a more significant part of the landscape, there is also a need for coordination between funders – including the funding councils – to ensure that their policies are consistent with each other, and with institutional processes. We recommend that the RIN should continue to work with funders and UUK to monitor and assess developments in policy and practice, and in the funding environment; to advocate through dialogue coherent approaches to the development of policy; and to promote innovation in scholarly communication that is both cost-effective and in the best interests of research and the research community.
5. Guidance for publishers

Who pays?

Normally, responsibility for ensuring that the publication fee is paid rests with the corresponding author who submits the article for publication. We recommend that the submission process should include:

- for fully open access journals, a requirement for corresponding authors to confirm that they will pay the fee, or arrange for payment, if the paper is accepted for publication, and

- for hybrid journals, a requirement for corresponding authors to indicate whether or not they wish to pay a publication fee, and if so to confirm that they will pay it, or arrange for it to be paid, if the paper is accepted for publication.

In both cases, good practice is to require the corresponding author also to indicate how the payment will be made (by cheque, credit/debit card, in response to invoice or purchase order, etc) and by whom (including where an institution will be making the payment, the contact to whom the invoice or purchase order should be addressed). Such information can then be entered into publishers’ internal management and financial systems.

Where publishers have in place systems to require authors to identify the bodies that have funded their research (see the guidance in the RIN’s Acknowledgement of funders in scholarly journal articles), they should also where possible alert authors to the relevant funders’ policies on the use of grant income to pay publication fees.

Discounts and fee waivers

Most publishers provide discounts or fee waivers for authors who for one reason or another may find it difficult to pay the full publication fee, or who fall into specified categories (for example, those who have recently reviewed papers for the journal). It is important that authors should be alerted to relevant fee waivers and discounts during the submission process.

Institutional subscription and membership schemes

Some publishers have subscription and membership schemes under which institutions pay in advance to meet the fees for publication of articles by their staff, or so that they benefit from a discount on the standard fee. The models vary, but it is important in all cases that:
• corresponding authors should be alerted during the submission process if they or any of their co-authors are from a member or subscribing institution, and of any implications for the payment of the publication fee, and

• member institutions should be informed when a paper from one of their researchers is accepted for publication.

Fee payments by universities and other research institutions

In most cases, actual payment will be made by the corresponding author’s employing institution. Publishers should ask the corresponding author for a named contact in his/her institution, and seek confirmation of whether the payment will be made in response to an invoice or by purchase order or by other means.

Timing

The interval between acceptance of an article and the deadline for payment is usually short, many publishers seek payment (or sometimes a purchase order will suffice) within 30 days, usually in order to adjust the workflows to achieve immediate open access publication. It is clearly important that corresponding authors and institutions are alerted to deadlines as early as possible, so that there is no risk of delay once an article has been accepted for publication.

Transparency in setting fee levels

Publication fees represent significant sums of money in what may be seen as a new burden of costs for authors, research funders and institutions. Hence it is important that publishers should be as open as possible about their business models and how they set their fee levels. Transparency is particularly important where publishers are operating a mix of open access and traditional subscription models for their journals. Authors, funders and institutions need reassurance that publication fees are not simply serving as an additional source of revenue for publishers. We recommend that publishers should be as open as possible about their business models, about the income they are receiving in subscription and publication fees respectively, and about how they set their fee levels and that publishers of hybrid journals in particular should adjust their subscription rates to reflect increases in income from open access fees.
6. Guidance for authors

Open access and ‘hybrid’ journals are, as noted above, becoming an increasingly significant part of the scholarly communications landscape. They constitute an important mechanism for enabling authors to comply with funders’ requirements that journal articles should be made available free of charge to readers as rapidly as possible; and more broadly, for ensuring rapid and wide dissemination of research results. We recommend that authors should make use of services such as the Directory of Open Access Journals, or the Authors’ guide to UK funders’ policies on open access by the Biosciences Federation, and consider the options for publishing their results in such journals.

Authors should familiarise themselves with their funders’ policies and requirements; with the options and the arrangements available to them in their institutions for meeting the costs of open access publishing and with the administrative arrangements to apply for such funds. Guidance should be available on intranets and from other sources in the institution, and also on open access publishers’ websites.

Before they submit articles for open access publication, corresponding authors should ensure that they have access to the funds necessary to meet the publication fee. They should confirm this to the publisher upon submission, indicate how the payment will be made, and set in motion the procedures to ensure that the payment is made as rapidly as possible if the article is accepted for publication.
ANNEX A: Summary of recommendations

Higher education institutions

We recommend that:

- HEIs should designate a single person a senior level (for example, a pro or deputy vice chancellor) to coordinate their activities. That person should take the lead in assessing how effectively arrangements are operating, ensuring that they develop appropriately in the light of changing circumstances.

- HEIs should establish dedicated budgets to which researchers can apply for funds to meet the costs of publication fees.

- Even if management of the budget is devolved, a consistent and coordinated approach to managing the payment of publication fees is taken across the institution.

- HEIs should establish clear criteria as to the circumstances in which researchers can apply for funds, including: eligibility for support when articles include authors from other institutions; eligibility for multiple grants in any one year; the priority to be given to researchers whose work is not supported by any external grant; the criteria for judging between competing claims for grants if funds are limited and any requirement to have the institution properly identified, e.g. within the context of the REF.

- Whatever arrangements institutions adopt to meet publication fees, it is vital that they are communicated effectively to all relevant academic and administrative staff.

Funders

We recommend that:

- Funders should clarify how they will provide support for researchers in meeting their open access policies in general, and the payment of publication fees in particular.

- RIN should continue to work with funders and UUK to monitor and assess developments in policy and practice, and in the funding environment; to advocate through dialogue coherent approaches to the development of policy; and to promote innovation in scholarly communication that is both cost-effective and in the best interests of research and the research community.
Publishers

We recommend that the submission process should include:

- for fully open access journals, a requirement for corresponding authors to confirm that they will pay the fee, or arrange for payment, if the paper is accepted for publication, and

- for hybrid journals, a requirement for corresponding authors to indicate whether or not they wish to pay a publication fee, and if so to confirm that they will pay it, or arrange for it to be paid, if the paper is accepted for publication.

Where publishers have in place systems to require authors to identify the bodies that have funded their research, they should also where possible alert authors to the relevant funders’ policies on the use of grant income to pay publication fees.

Authors should be alerted to relevant fee waivers and discounts during the submission process.

Where publishers operate membership or subscription schemes:

- corresponding authors should be alerted during the submission process if they or any of their co-authors are from a member or subscribing institution, and of any implications for the payment of the publication fee, and

- member institutions should be informed when a paper from one of their researchers is accepted for publication.

Publishers should be as open as possible about their business models, about the income they are receiving in subscription and publication fees respectively, and about how they set their fee levels, and publishers of hybrid journals in particular should adjust their subscription rates to reflect increases in income from open access fees.
Authors

We recommend that:

- Authors should make use of services such as the Directory of Open Access Journals, and consider the options for publishing their results in such journals.

- Authors should familiarise themselves with their funders’ policies and requirements, with the options and the arrangements available to them in their institutions for meeting the costs of publication in open access and hybrid journals and with the administrative arrangements to apply for such funds.

- Before they submit articles for open access publication, corresponding authors should ensure that they have access to the funds necessary to meet the publication fee.
Annex B: Establishing the University of Nottingham’s central open access fund

This case study looks at the steps taken by the University of Nottingham to establish a central, institutional fund for the payment of article processing charges (APC) for open access publication and to initiate a systematic process to support investigators at the University in disseminating their research to a global community.

The driver for central funds: open access mandates

The central fund was established in direct response to the open access mandates from research funders. The Wellcome Trust, The Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), six of the seven member councils of the Research Councils UK (RCUK) and other funders now require that any publications arising from the research they fund be made available through two main open access routes. These funders want the work they fund to be made available either through depositing in an open access repository or publishing in an open access journal and have different arrangements for how this is paid for.

The University recognised that a clear, institutional approach would be required to deal effectively with funder policies and establish the central fund: “…major research councils have these policies in place. It was obvious that we needed an institutional approach to dealing with these policies.”

The University also believed that the central fund should provide a level playing field for all authors within the institution, no matter how their research was funded, to enable all authors to apply for funds to publish in open access journals: “Researchers should be able to claim against this fund, no matter who funds their research. If their funder doesn’t have a mandate, they should still be able to apply.”

Setting up the central fund

Information Services (IS), a combined library and IT service, was the initial drivers of the open access initiative at the University, but it was essential to work in partnership with other stakeholders in the institution. IS first pitched the idea of having a central open access fund to other departments, and asked the following questions: how are we, as an institution, going to respond to those requirements and how are we going to meet the demands of funding agencies that work be published in open access? A partnership was then formed between IS and the Research Innovation Services (RIS) department, the central support office responsible for supporting the University’s research and innovation activities and managing the bidding for research funds.
Following initial discussions with RIS, IS put forward a proposal to the University Research Committee, and getting its support was essential. The Research Committee recognised the importance of the issue, particularly in the light of the funder mandates outlined above. The proposal put to the Committee was that authors should be encouraged to deposit their work in the institutional repository; that the University identify a central budget for open access publishing to which all researchers could apply; and that internal communications should be designed to inform staff about the fund.

Following the presentation of the initial proposal, IS prepared a second paper, detailing step-by-step policy guidelines from each funding agency about the different modes of open access policy compliance, which was then approved by the Research Committee and then publicised within the University. IS had already set up an open access repository in which papers could be deposited.

**Financing a central, open access fund**

The University of Nottingham publishes about 4000 articles a year. At an average APC of between £750 and £1500, this implies that several million pounds would be needed to fund open access publishing at the University in the future. The question was asked whether money for the central fund should in the short term come out of the periodicals budget, but this was not considered a good idea.

Most publishers now run a hybrid model for open access publishing, where authors may choose an open access option in otherwise subscription-based journals, but are not (yet) reducing their subscription charges. It was acknowledged that during a medium-term transition period, the University might end up paying more money to support subscriptions, as well as open access publishing. In the long term, however, funds from the periodicals budget could conceivably be transferred to support a central fund, but it cannot be a simple and immediate solution.

Some of the funders with open access policies, including The Wellcome Trust, provide money for open access publishing whilst authors supported by other funders can use direct or indirect costs for publishing. Since the payment of open access publication charges is directly linked to the University’s research income, the cost scales with the research income. The direct costs of a project include the payment of researchers’ salaries associated with the research project, travel expenses, equipment and other similar costs. Many funders allow publication charges to be funded as a direct cost of the project but only during the lifetime of the research grant. The majority of publications, however, occur after the lifetime of the grant. The University hopes that the central fund will prove useful when this happens, particularly for researchers who have insufficient funds.
Most funders regard the funding of publication charges as a legitimate indirect cost along with other institutional costs, such as accommodation, library, IT and other infrastructural expenses. Indirect costs are usually calculated as a percentage of direct costs, with funders adding a given percentage to their grants for indirect costs. Institutions have to ensure they alter their internal formulae for allocating indirect costs to the different areas of the institution to take these new costs of publication into account. Once again, it is important that a variety of stakeholders in an institution are involved in ensuring this is achieved. At the University, it was acknowledged that the open access publishing cost would have to be recalculated on a year-by-year basis, as it is likely to increase.

**Administering the central fund**

The University of Nottingham is now monitoring the take-up of funds, something that is made easier by the funds being administered centrally. A named contact in the RIS department is responsible for looking after applications to the fund and for monitoring and tracking monies. To date, only a small number of researchers have applied and have received open access funds for their work, but demand is expected to grow significantly over the next few years when those affected by the funders’ current policies finish their research. Owned and administered by the RIS, the Central Fund provides a level playing field for everyone within the institution, which means funded researchers without a mandate are also able to apply. No matter where the research money comes from, researchers are able to claim against the central fund: “Having a central fund makes it easier to manage and monitor for the institution, at least for the time being”.

**Planning for the future**

Most funders’ policy requirements apply to grants awarded after August 2006 and therefore most won’t publish their projects until 2009. Significant demand for this funding is not likely to start until then. For now Chief Information Officer Stephen Pinfield and his colleagues are taking a step-by-step approach to get the fund set up and then to monitor its use.

With provisions in place to see repository and funding developments through to the next decade, the University is now ready to enable authors to comply with funders’ open access mandates. The University can monitor open access costs along with other research costs. The creation of the central fund for open access has helped the University implement policies that satisfy the funders’ new requirements. With a central fund placed at the heart of the institution’s research activities, the University is in a good position to provide appropriate support for open access publishing in the future.
Annex C: JISC survey

The JISC’s Scholarly Communications Consultant, in collaboration with the RIN/UUK working group on the payment of open access publication fees, conducted two surveys investigating how journal publishers were charging to publish open access articles (published October 2008).

The surveys were done during May and June 2008, one was sent to 160 UK HEIs and the other to 4055 biomedical authors. The surveys were conducted via web-based forms, but respondents to the HEI survey were also given the option to complete the questionnaire in hard copy format.

Representatives from the Society for Endocrinology, the publisher BioMed Central and the Wellcome Trust (who are members of the RIN/UUK Group) assisted by sending the survey form request to their authors and grantees. The surveys were conducted by Framework Ltd and managed by Charles Hutchings, JISC Market Research Manager. The main findings of the surveys are below, to read the full report visit www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/committees/workinggroups/scholarlycomms

Author key findings

- Completed responses were received from 713 authors (an 18% response rate), 80% who were employed by a HEI, 15% by a research institute and 12% by a hospital.

- 72% of the responding authors have published in a fully-OA journal in the last five years, 64% in a hybrid OA journal during the same time-period.

- Of all authors who have published an article in a journal in the last five years 43% have on at least one occasion paid an OA publication charge, and 47% have had to pay colour charges or other charges to a publisher of a subscription journal.

- Of those responding authors employed by an HEI, 43% stated that their HEI has an OA policy, 20% that it does not, and 36% do not know, while 31% feel that their HEI has a policy that encourages OA publication by its staff.

- Asked whether their employer has an OA fund, 16% replied “yes at a central level”, 4% “yes at a faculty level”, 4% “yes at a departmental level”, while 40% replied “no OA fund” and 36% “do not know”.

12% of responding authors acknowledged a restriction upon the use of grant funding for OA – of which the most common restriction mentioned was use during the lifetime of the research grant – but 39% felt that there are no restrictions and 48% “do not know”.

Asked about the time taken to obtain a purchase order for an OA publication charge, 32% of responding authors who perceive their employer to have a fund for OA publications thought that this could be done “within a few days”, with the percentage rising to 44% in “up to one month”.

25% of responding authors feel that their employing institution assists in accessing a research funder’s OA grant, 38% feel that the assistance is not there, and 37% “do not know”.

UK HEI key findings

61 responses were received from UK HEIs, of which 10 came from Russell Group institutions, 28 from “post-92” institutions, 18 from “pre-92” institutions, and 5 from colleges of higher education.

The responses received were completed by a variety of post-holders, and no clear pattern of responsibility emerged from the responses.

23 institutions stated that they have an OA policy, 34 do not and 4 were unsure.

5 institutions mandate OA, 13 encourage it, 10 allow it, and 1 discourages it.

6 institutions have a central OA fund, 4 have a School or Faculty or Departmental OA fund.

All 10 Russell Group institutions responding claim to be dealing with the payment of OA publishing fees.

Of the 55 institutions which responded that they do not have an OA fund, 11 responded that they are likely to set up an OA fund in the future, 21 responded “not very likely”, and 4 “not at all likely”.

44 responding HEIs allow researchers to make an application for OA publication charge funding up to the point of publication, 9 after publication, but 15 allow no application for funding and 21 “do not know”.
• 15 of the 46 institutions allowing applications will authorise a purchase order “within a few days”.

• Asked about any restriction upon use of a research grant for OA publication charges, 5 institutions acknowledged restrictions (of which for 2 the reason given is “limited by the availability of funding”), 47 responded that there are no restrictions, and 9 “do not know”.

• Asked about including OA publication charges in FEC calculations, 8 institutions replied that they do this, 21 replied “no”, and 13 replied “planning to do so in the future”.

• 17 of the 61 responding institutions believe that no member of their research staff has used a research grant for the payment of OA publication charges over the past 12 months but 16 institutions estimate up to 99 instances and 4 institutions estimate over 500.
Annex D: Glossary of terms

**Full economic costs (FEC)** A methodology for calculating the costs of each research project on a reliable, sustainable and comprehensive basis. This is then used to set the price for grants made by the research councils and Government departments, and informs the price on projects for other sponsors. The full economic cost of a project is made up of directly incurred costs, directly allocated costs, and indirect costs. The latter two types of cost use the rates produced from the annual TRAC process (see below).

**Hybrid journals** Scholarly journals where only some of the articles are open access (i.e. available to the reader without financial or other barrier), normally after the payment of a publication fee by the author(s).

**Open access journals** Scholarly journals that are available to the reader without financial or other barrier other than access to the internet itself. This guidance relates to fee-based open access journals, which rely for the bulk of their revenue on the fees paid by authors for the publication of their articles. It should be noted that some open access journals operate without any fee to either reader or author, relying instead on subsidies from universities, research institutions, learned societies, foundations, or Government agencies; on revenue from advertising, auxiliary services, membership dues, endowments, reprints, or a print or premium edition or other sources; or on the efforts of volunteers.

**RCUK** is the strategic partnership of the seven UK research councils. Its mission is to optimise the ways that Research Councils work together to deliver their goals, to enhance the overall performance and impact of UK research, training and knowledge transfer and to be recognised by academia, business and government for excellence in research sponsorship.

**TRAC** is the **Transparent Approach to Costing**. Since 2000, TRAC has been the standard methodology used by the 165 HEIs in the UK for costing their main activities (teaching, research, and other core activity), and it is increasingly informing the public funding of higher education. For further guidance see the TRAC **Guidance Manual** at [www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance](http://www.jcpsg.ac.uk/guidance)
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Useful links

Although by no means extensive, some websites that can provide further information and advice:

BioMed Central www.biomedcentral.com

Directory of open access journals www.doaj.org

Hindawi www.hindawi.com

Policy statement on open access. Biosciences Federation (September 2007) www.bsf.ac.uk/journals/BSF_position_statement1_open_accesss.pdf

Position statement in support of open and unrestricted access to published research. Wellcome Trust (February 2008) www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Policy-and-position-statements/WTD002766.htm

Public Library of Science www.plos.org

Publishers with paid options for open access (SHERPA RoMEO) www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PaidOA.html

Research Councils UK www.rcuk.ac.uk

Update of position statement on access to research outputs. RCUK (2008) www.rcuk.ac.uk/aboutrcuk/publications/policy/20060628openaccess.htm
Research Information Network

The Research Information Network was set up in 2005 by the four UK Higher Education Funding Bodies, the Research Councils and the British Library. Its role is to enhance and broaden understanding of the information resources and services available to researchers, and how they use them; and to promote innovation and the development of effective policies and strategies for the benefit of the UK research community. [www.rin.ac.uk](http://www.rin.ac.uk)

Universities UK

Universities UK is the major representative body and membership organisation for the higher education sector. It represents the UK’s universities and some higher education colleges. Its 133 members [www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/members/](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/members/) are the executive heads of these institutions. Universities UK works closely with policy makers and key education stakeholders to advance the interests of universities and to spread good practice throughout the higher education sector. Founded in 1918 and formerly known as the Committee for Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP), Universities UK celebrated its 90th anniversary in 2008. [www.universitiesuk.ac.uk](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk)
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