To address the topic of public access to federally funded research following the memorandum of “Increasing Access to the Results of Federally-Funded Scientific Research” issued by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) on February 22, 2013, the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) and bepress Digital Commons co-presented a Symposium at 2014 ALA Midwinter meeting on January 24, 2014 in Philadelphia Convention Center. Thirty three attendees were present at the symposium. Laura Palumbo and Yingting Zhang from Rutgers University attended the symposium. They will give a short presentation to the RU Research Team members at one of its meetings.

The symposium started with the welcome address presented by ALCTS president, Genevieve Owens who introduced the background and rationale for the happening of this symposium. The morning session was comprised of an Overview of the Open Access Landscape and a panel on PubMed Central, SHARE, and CHORUS. In the afternoon, there was another panel on Local Responses followed by a Q & A session for all the speakers. The Symposium concluded with a closing address presented by Olivia Madison, Dean of the Iowa State University Library. Below are the highlights of the symposium:

I. Overview of the Open Access Landscape – Open Access to Federally Funded Research: Current Status and Future Directions, presented by Richard Huffine, Senior Director, U.S. Federal Market at ProQuest. Major issues covered in this session were:

- OA definition which he used the one given by Peter Suber who co-founded the Open Access Directory (OAD) with Robin Peek: “literature [and data that] (added by the speaker) is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions.” In the speaker’s words: “Open access is free of charge to the users but not free.”

- Three types of Open Access: Gold OA is “content where the cost barrier is removed by journals, regardless of their business model, with permission of the copyright holder.” Green OA refers to “content where the cost barrier is removed by serving the content through institutional repositories or by self-archiving by the author or copyright holder.” And Clear (libre) OA is “content where both the cost and permissions barriers have been removed.

- Audience of OA has been much broader as “publishing and scholarship matured” and the internet makes it possible for the general public to access some research.

- More and more mandates and policies are being made at local and federal levels by institutions, funders and federal agencies to require researchers to make their research outputs publicly available.
Open access is not the same as public access in that in OA “research is available without a fee and that there are some rights provided for re-use, redistribution, etc.” while PA rather lets the authors and their publishers take care of the rights issues. In regard to public domain, copyright is not associated with its material.

The U.S. Government has tried to legislate OA without success: e.g. FRPAA, FASTR. Other legislation has also been proposed to restrict OA including Fair copyright in Research Works Act (2009), Research Works Act (2011), FIRST (2013). NIH Public Access Policy that was applied to all research funded by NIH was instituted in 2005 and codified in appropriations legislation in 2008. The OSTP Memo (February 22, 2013) directed Federal agencies with more than $100M in R&D expenditures to develop plans to make the published results of federally funded research freely available to the public within one year of publication and requiring researchers to better account for and manage the digital data resulting from federally funded scientific research.

The OSTP Memo also directs Federal agencies to maximize access to scientific data created with Federal funds and requires that agencies must also address data management. NSF started DMP requirements in 2011 of all their extramural grantees.

The role of providers was addressed in the overview. In responding to the OSTP Memo, several means of addressing this mandate, including SHARE (offered by the ARL, AAU, and APLU) and CHORUS (offered by the AAP), have been proposed. NIH’s PMC is presumed to meet the requirements of the OSTP Memo for NIH. Researchers will have the choice of publishing in OA journals, working with commercial publishers to comply with the policy, or self archiving their research in order to be in compliance with the policy.

As new business models are being continuously developed, the ways how the publications and data are accessed will also continuously evolve. Some notable efforts in improving discovery and access are: DOIs, ORCID, VIAF/ISNI, FUNDREF, and DATA CITE. The U.S. Federal Government takes advantages of these efforts and strategies for publications and dissemination.

II. Panel on PubMed Central, SHARES, and CHORUS presented by P. Scott Lapinski, Tyler Walters, and Howard Ratner.

PubMed Central (PMC) – this section was presented by P. Scott Lapinski, Digital Resources Librarian of the Countway Library of Medicine at Harvard Medical School. He addressed PMC in terms of reflections and anticipations:

- PMC, a part of the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), is the primary repository for publications arising from NIH funded research. It is vital for compliance with NIH Public Access Policy.
Do not confuse PMC with PubMed. (PMC is free full text repository of peer-reviewed biomedical and life sciences journal articles. PubMed is a free resource developed and maintained by NCBI. It is comprised of over 22 million citations for biomedical literature from MEDLINE, life science journals, and online books.)

Understanding the submission tools (NIHMS, MyNCBI My Bibliography), methods (A, B, C, & D) & workflows that lead to successful deposit in PMC.

Supporting facilitated deposit for researchers to local and funder mandatory IR, e.g. HMscholar (PMC, Europe PMC, and DASH).

Collaborating with sponsored research administration and understanding key OER systems and procedures. To learn about the important system that ties the federal mandate back to the institution and Principal investigator, i.e. the eRA Commons system, and the workflows of the people who are delegated various tasks for the PI within that system. More and more things were integrated and came together: eRA Commons and My NCBI Bibliography, RPPR (Research Performance Progress Report).

The Principal Investigators (PIs) are required to link their eRA Commons account with a My NCBI account for accurately monitoring the NIH Public Access Policy compliance status.

As of July 1, 2013, NIH implements strict monitoring of its Public Access Policy. Awards of grants with associated publications that are not in compliance with the policy will be held until all relevant publications become compliant.

Essential tools for monitoring and tracking compliance for institutions – Public Access Compliance Monitor (PACM) (a web-based tool that institutions can use to track compliance of publications that fall under the NIH Public Access Policy.)

Expanded PMC Anticipations – workflows, people, and “responsible parties” will remain the same, unless the publishers are willing to assume the legal responsibility when Public Access manuscripts have “mistakenly” been omitted from ChorUS or NIHMS.

Do not want to lose the data rich XML rendition of manuscript.

• Overview of SHARE presented by Tyler Walters, Dean of University Libraries, Virginia Tech.

SHARE stands for SHared Research Access Ecosystem. It is a partnership of higher education associations: ARL, AAU (the Association of American
Universities), and APLU (the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities) as a long-term solution for higher education to manage its digital assets. It also serves as a response to the recent White House directive on public access to federally funded research and data. SHARE is envisioned as a network of digital repositories at universities, libraries, and other research institutions across the US that will provide long-term public access to federally funded research articles and data. (from http://www.arl.org/focus-areas/public-access-policies/shared-access-research-ecosystem-share)

- Current status: Planning of developing a notification system project is underway.


- SHARE Notification System Project: the goal is to addresses the system-wide problem of knowing that an article has been published, a pre-print shared, or a data set made available; to enable Repository Managers to identify manuscripts for deposit, University and funding agency grants administrators to determine compliance with public access policies. It focuses on development and deployment of a common notification system that notifies any interested stakeholder of the release of research results; distributes notifications to relevant parties, i.e. funding agencies, sponsored research offices, institutional and disciplinary repositories; provides a record of notifications that could be queried by interested stakeholders, including researchers themselves, in preparing faculty tenure review materials, creating progress reports, or doing compliance checks.

- SHARE benefits to researchers, funding agencies, universities/institutions, and the general public.

- The SHARE development is led by ARL, AAU, and APLU, guided by a steering committee, carried out by the SHARE Working Groups.

- SHARE future components include registry layer, discovery layer, and aggregation layer.

- CHORUS presented by Howard Ratner, Executive Director of CHOR Inc.

- CHORUS stands for Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States, offered by the American Association of Publishers (AAP), a broad coalition of scholarly journal publishers formed to develop, implement and steward a partnership with the federal research funders for providing public
access to the peer review publications that report on federally-funded research.

- It was evolved from an ad-hoc group of publishers who initiated partnership discussions with several agencies in Spring 2011; incorporated as a not-for-profit entity – CHOR, Inc. - on October 1, 2013; applying for US IRS 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status

- CHORUS provides a solution for agencies to comply with the OSTP memo on public access to peer-reviewed scientific publications reporting on federally-funded research.

- It builds on publishers’ existing infrastructure to enhance public access to research literature, avoiding duplication of effort.

- It is a way to expand access to peer-reviewed articles reporting on federally-funded research. Reflecting the OSTP memo, CHORUS will present and preserve these as digital form, final peer-reviewed manuscripts or final published documents

- It supports funding agencies in fulfilling the OSTP directive to provide public access, use public-private partnerships

- It utilizes current and developing tools, resources and protocols for identification, discovery, access, preservation and compliance (such as CrossRef, FundRef and ORCID).


- To be inclusive and interoperate with scholarly repositories and other systems providing access to scholarly articles, in July 2013, CHORUS and SHARE met to discuss initiatives and explore areas of possible collaboration and agreed to work jointly on persistent identifiers and metrics and to follow up in next few months

- CHORUS infrastructure can link to data repositories when available and will use standard identifier schemes.


III. Panel on Local Responses presented by Harrison Inefuku, Rebecca Kennison, and Maureen P. Walsh.
“Preparing for the OSTP OA Mandates” presented by Harrison Inefuku, Digital Repository Coordinator, Iowa State University.

- Iowa State University is a member of AAU.
- April 2012, the university launched its Institutional Repository (IR) using the Digital Commons platform hosted by bepress. It includes articles, conference presentations, multimedia, university publications, books, etc.
- Advantages of using a hosted platform: the server is handled by bepress; updates are performed not by the local staff allowing them to focus on education and outreach, etc.
- Finding campus partners: Office of VP of Research, College Research Offices, Assistant Dean of Research, Directors of Research Centers and Institutions, etc.
- Understanding Sponsored Research on Campus: Federal funders like Dept of Energy, NSF, Dept of Agriculture, Dept of Education, DHHS, etc.
- Communicating with colleges and depts on OA mandates on federally funded research to ensure they are in compliance with the mandates.
- Digital Commons Network – aggregate network of OA full text publications from all digital commons.
- Digital Commons and SHARE
  - OA Mandates increase awareness of OA on campus, self-archiving, and allowing libraries to be part of the research process.

“On Academic Commons based on Fedora” presented by Rebecca Kennison, Director of Center for Digital Research and Scholarship, Columbia University.

- Academic Commons is Columbia University's campus-wide digital research repository where faculty, students, and staff of Columbia and its affiliate institutions can deposit the results of their scholarly work and research. Content in Academic Commons is freely available to the public. It is based on Fedora repository software.
- Fedora Platform and Columbia’s Library and Information Services include:
  - Columbia Digital Library – e.g. digitized collections, born-digital collections, online exhibitions
  - Columbia Academic Commons – e.g. Columbia-produced content, rich collaboration spaces
- Internal Workflow Management System – e.g. cataloging ingest tools, digitization workflow, preservation workflow, online exhibition workflow
- Internal Data Management System – e.g. backup, data migration

- Opportunity #1 – Campus Communication
  - Communications group from Libraries, Sponsored Projects, Research Compliance & Training to discuss resources, training, and messaging for our community
  - Research Without Borders speaker series event devoted to discussion of OSTP memo

- Opportunity #2 – Repository Enhancements
  - Have added RIOXX metadata fields to Academic Commons to track publications and data by grant number, funder
  - Integrating SWORD protocol into Fedora repository for interoperability with other repositories – NB: SWORD is big part of the SHARE proposal
  - working fast and furious on implementing MODS/RDF for LOD interoperability, incl. spearheading discussions with larger community

- Opportunity #3 – Scalable Data Services
  - Raised per-file size for Academic Commons from 2 GB to 10 GB (no cost) to accommodate large data sets and are allowing up to 100 GB files to be submitted (cost above 10 GB at $5/GB one-time)
  - Set up campus-wide EZID DOI service (http://www.cdlib.org/services/uc3/ezid/) for researchers to be able to obtain DOIs for their work and thus be able to contribute to data registries

- Opportunity #4 – Partnership
  - Proposal to National Endowment for the Humanities (along with Modern Language Association) to set up and run repository for NEH-funded researchers, already have sandbox clone of Academic Commons as proof-of-concept
• Discussions with other repositories about investigating/testing interoperability

• Active participation in SHARE (e.g. visiting program officer, representatives from the libraries, compliance officer and faculty on SHARE Working Groups.

• “On Knowledge Bank based on DSpace” presented by Maureen P. Walsh, Associate Director, Institutional Repository Services Librarian, The Ohio State University Libraries Digital Content Services.
  o Knowledge Bank is Ohio State University’s institutional repository. Its mission is to collect, preserve, and distribute the digitally formatted intellectual output of the University.
  o KB has 80 partners, 54,716 items, and 120,927 content files, but no etds in the repository. It does not have a lot of data; small datasets are small (not large scale)
  o Mediated or automatic deposit – 26% individual submission and 74% batch loaded.
  o Individual Item Submission – customized input forms for partners
  o Improved self-deposit
  o DSpace and SHARE
    ▪ DSpace supports SWORD, OAI-ORE, OpenURL, SEO, Embargo
    ▪ SHARE – usage stats, copyright / licensing, preserving rights, metadata enhancements, compliance reporting
  o Advisory Task Force on Federal Public Access formed six months ago with the following charge
    Scan the environment broadly, scan the environment on campus and within the Libraries, communicate to key stakeholders within the Libraries, make recommendations to the Libraries’ Executive Committee for strategic action or investments, and develop action agendas for the Libraries – eventually/sequentially.
  o ATF SWOT ANALYSIS: Strengths
    Strong IR (infrastructure, staff, content), existing services – copyright, engaged librarians, faculty relations; research services, knowledgeable staff – Metadata and OA Policies; practice with Library Faculty OA Resolution; everyone dealing with the new requirements; existing
relationships – Consortia, NIH, publisher (purchasing), campus Office of Research – Deans, OCIO, KB partners, Responsible Research Office.

- ATF SWOT ANALYSIS: Weaknesses

Readiness gaps: gaps in OA/PA outreach, not having history supporting author fees, staff, need to build campus administrative support, need to identify local champions; scale – local scale and scale of funding landscape: don’t know who to reach – who are the researchers?
Architectures may need development to allow compliance.

- ATF SWOT ANALYSIS: Opportunities

Create new resources to support deposit/develop IR; new chance to promote existing services: repository, copyright, research services; connect with those who are embracing OA/PA; new Vice Provost title in-house – chance to leverage and/or define; build relationships with faculty; build relationships with other units: IRB/sponsored programs, OCIO, Office of Research, Colleges and Departments, OSUL-HSL; new/enhanced consortia relationships.

- ATF SWOT ANALYSIS: Threats

Lost funding through non-compliance; resource shortages; institutional fragmentation/decentralization; policies/requirements could get very complex – too many policies/repositories; others assume the role wanted: publishers, individual departments, other U’s, subject repositories, Agencies, scholarly societies; getting too far ahead of the “known”.

Following the Local Responses Panel was a Q & A session for all the speakers moderated by Mary Case, University Librarian, University of Illinois-Chicago. The symposium was concluded with a closing address by Olivia Madison who is Professor and Dean of the Library, Iowa State University.

The symposium was very well organized and very informative.

-- The End --

Respectfully submitted by Yingting Zhang