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Open access to publications

- Funders worried about the rise in poor quality and predatory journals - in the future, our guidelines will stipulate that researchers must check the *bone fide* of a journal in DOAJ before submitting
- Funders are worried about the cost of open access with exorbitant APCs eating into project costs - Capping APCs will be vital
- We will need to develop sanctions for researchers who use unacceptable journals or publish in closed journals

- OA publication already mandatory for many funders BUT encompasses green to gold routes and compliance rates only about 50%

- Plan S about to change how we evaluate funding applications Move to open publishing platforms (such as HRB Open Research, Wellcome Open Research) and open peer review/post-publication peer review
- Other than Plan S how can we incentivize researchers to be open access especially in the HSS?
Open access to data

Open Data has the potential to speed up the research process while simultaneously improving our confidence in the results.

BUT the access, use and curation of this huge and growing body of data presents many challenges ahead in terms of the ability of researchers and institutions to curate complex datasets and make such that they align with the FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable) principles:

- The cost of training and employing data stewards with appropriate skill-sets and ensuring that there are opportunities for career progression within the data field
- Requiring data management plans all very well, but do the researchers understand what is needed and have they access to adequate infrastructure to implement their DMP
- Ensuring that open access data is not misused - move towards a governed access model (e.g. Scottish Public Benefit Panel)
- Rewarding people for good data management practice – credit in applications, other rewards?
- Getting public buy-in on decisions about data to drive policy and regulatory change
- **Ensuring the quality of the data – circles back to training, infrastructure etc.**
Open access to the research process

We’ve moved from believing that engagement with the public or patients is ‘to,’ ‘about’ or ‘for’ them, to advocating for public and patient involvement in research (‘with’ or ‘by’ them) – this is not just crowd funding or citizen science!

PPI and KEDS Initiatives
• Public reviewers of research applications – soon to be part of scoring criteria
• PPI training for researchers to help them understand on to do this
• Expectation of PPI in relevant awards, across research design, conduct, dissemination and implementation
• Knowledge exchange initiatives to add end-user value to research outputs

The future for PPI
• Make PPI mandatory in both grant applications and reported outcomes but include this as a legitimate cost in awards
• Continue to support researchers and institutions to implement PPI in their research (but only for a while – institutions need to pick up this baton)
• Collect evidence for the benefits of PPI in improving implementation and utilization
• **Funder engagement with the public to prioritize investment (e.g. James Lind Alliance)** – deliberate democracy!
The biggest challenges for funders

Understanding what initiatives will effect cultural change in the research community around ownership of research and outputs, and the benefits of data sharing and transparency.