3.3. CONCLUSION

The argument of this paper is that, no matter what sort of relationship the UK develops with the European Union post Brexit, Brexit itself poses not only challenges but also presents opportunities. The Mayor of London has written about a new agenda. The UK has already achieved much in the field of Open Access policy and infrastructure, much without direct dependence on European parallels. Indeed, new models of scholarly publishing, developing quickly in the UK, have the power to redefine how the outputs of research are shared and made available.

Nonetheless, there remain challenges. Loss of funding from bodies such as the European Research Council and programmes like Horizon 2020 would have a detrimental effect on the amount of research which the UK can undertake. And while Brexit may give the UK freedom from European jurisdiction, that must not lead to isolation. The European Union has taken a major leadership role in propounding Open Science approaches. It would be a disaster for the UK, were leadership in this important global agenda to be lost in a country that has cut itself off from wider partnerships and collaborations.

Full Open Access by 2020 is a very ambitious vision. As a member of the EU, the UK is committed to support this objective. After Brexit, depending on the nature of the future relationship between the EU and the UK, the United Kingdom probably will not be mandatorily subject to this requirement going forward. In the UK itself, there is no current equivalent mandate for 100% OA compliance by 2020. The nearest directive is probably the HIFCE requirement for the Research Excellence Framework, also 2020. However, not all research produced in the UK is submitted to the REF. The EU ambition for OA, therefore, is more expansive than the public position in the UK. It has to be said, however, that the UK position on 2020 may be more realistic in terms of the ability to attain the stated objective.

One of the major early deliverables from the Open Science agenda is a bold vision for a European Open Science Cloud (EOSC) of research objects. The Commission has appointed a High Level Expert Group (HLEG) to advise on progress in the Cloud, which is a metaphor for an Internet of data, and the HLEG has recently released its Report.26 I was honoured to be a member of the Group that compiled this document. One of the major observations it contains is that the majority of challenges to reach a functional EOSC are "social rather than technical." UK27 Another major finding is that there is an "alarming shortage of data experts both globally and in the European Union". The Report also determines that the technical components needed to create a first generation EOSC are largely in existence already, but that they are "lost in fragmentation globally and in the European Union". There is a real challenge facing the UK, and indeed Europe, if the UK is not a member of the EOSC going forward. Research is global; it does not stop at national boundaries. The UK will suffer if its research data is not visible as part of this European collaboration. Europe, and indeed research communities across the globe, will also be the poorer if they cannot seamlessly access UK research outputs alongside other European findings.

4.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of this Case Study is to explore and anchor the concept of RDM in the landscape of research integrity. Once positioned in this space, it is then possible to develop ideas around RDM to support emerging agendas. One of the most important agenda items facing 21st century researchers is Open Science. This Case Study then looks at how RDM can contribute to the Open Science debate and to the benefits to Society that Open Science is said to bring.

4.2. RESEARCH INTEGRITY

All well-managed research performing organisations should have codes of conduct for research integrity, which are developed at institutional level and/or at national level.1 These codes provide frameworks for best practice in research practice and conduct, establishing principles, guidelines or norms for the ethical, effective and legal conduct of research enquiry. By way of example, this Case Study looks at the framework for research integrity in place in UCL (University College London).2

UCL has a Statement on Research Integrity3 and an accompanying Code of Conduct for Research.4 The Statement on Research Integrity makes clear: "It is the view of UCL that everyone involved with research has a joint responsibility for ensuring high standards of integrity throughout the research process, from the creation of methodology and data collection through to publication and authorship."

The UCL Statement is itself grounded in UCL 2034, the UCL institutional strategy. Principal Theme 1 of this strategy is 'Academic leadership grounded in intellectual excellence’. In 2012, Universities UK published the Concordat to support research integrity and the five commitments set out the UK’s determination to maintain high standards of rigour and integrity in its research.6

This concordat7 seeks to provide a comprehensive national framework for good research conduct and its governance. As signatories to and supporters of the concordat to support research integrity, we are committed to:

2 Key documents and statements are laid out at UCL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/research/integrity; last accessed 8/1/17.
3 UCL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/research/integrity/pdfs/UCL-Statement-On-Research-integrity.pdf; last accessed 8/1/17.
4 UCL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/uni/governance-and-committees/igsov; last accessed 8/1/17.
5 UCL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/2034/; last accessed 8/1/17.
6 Universities UK (UK): http://www.universitiesuk.co.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/research-concordat.aspx; last accessed 8/1/17.

4.3. RESEARCH DATA MANAGEMENT AS A FEATURE OF OPEN SCIENCE

In February 2015, the European Commission published a Report entitled Validation of the results of the public consultation on Science 2.0: Science in Transition.10 Inter alia, the Report looked at the barriers that researchers encounter in moving to Open Science approaches. The top two concerns,11 which acted as barriers, were identified as:

- Concerns about quality assurance – 53% fully agreed that this was a barrier; 35% partially agreed
- Lack of credit-giving for Science 2.0 [Open Science] – 50% fully agreed, 38% partially agreed

The Report then looked at how these barriers could be removed, and the types of intervention that would be needed to do this. The answers to the questions of interest to this Case Study are given in Figure 4.1 below.12 Comparison of the figures is interesting. There was not much interest amongst researchers in intervention in the metrics space. Concerns about the lack of Open Access to research publications and research data scored highly – in fact, this was the most significant total in the validation exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Issue</th>
<th>Need to Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Open Science – raise awareness</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Metrics do not capture Open Science</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop research infrastructures</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK to publications and data</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: Agreement for Policy Actions [abbreviated] from 2015 EC Report on Science 2.0

The EC’s validation exercise points to the realisation amongst researchers that there is a need to raise awareness of these issues, particularly around the issues of Open Access to publications and Open Research Data. How far has the research community travelled in attaining these goals? Again, the UK and UCL’s work can act as a helpful example.

The UK has a well-established framework for mandating Open Access to publications. UCL Policy states that all publications should be deposited by the author in UCL Discovery upon being accepted for publication, copyright permissions allowing. All papers intended for inclusion in REF 2020, the UK’s national Research Evaluation Framework,13 must be deposited within 3 months of acceptance. This is supplemented by funder mandates such as those from Research Councils UK14 and the Wellcome Trust.15 For Research Data Management, the picture is much less clear. In July 2016, a group of research stakeholders issued a Concordat on Open Research Data – HEFCE, RCUK, Wellcome Trust and UUK. The purpose of this document is “to ensure that the research data gathered and generated by members of the UK research community is made openly available for use by others wherever possible in a manner consistent with relevant legal, ethical, disciplinary and regulatory frameworks and norms, and with due regard to the costs involved.”16 The Concordat sets out ten principles for Open Research Data, and these are highlighted below. The Concordat is important because it amplifies UCL’s commitment in its Research Integrity framework to openness in collecting, analysing and reporting research data.
4.4. UCL ACTIVITY TO DELIVER THE OPEN DATA AGENDA

UCL has a well-established pattern of activity in supporting Open Access to publications. It has established UCL Press as the UK’s first fully Open Access University Press. One of its objectives is “To embed and explore Open Access approaches as the principal means of dissemination for academic work in a digital world.” The challenge for research-intensive universities like UCL is to expand this activity into all relevant fields of Open Science, including Research Data Management. UCL has a Research Data Management policy, which stresses:

“The purpose of this Policy is to provide a framework to define the responsibilities of all UCL members and to guide researchers and students in how to manage the data, enabling research data to be maintained and preserved as a first class research object and made available to the widest possible audience for the highest possible impact.”

The position taken by the UCL policy on Open Data is that research data should be as open as possible, as closed as necessary.

Supported by this policy, UCL is taking practical steps to deliver pan-university RDM systems and services. Top-level activities are illustrated in Figure 4.3 below.

---

**Figure 4.2: The 10 Principles of the UK’s Concordat on Open Research Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open access to research data is an enabler of high quality research, a facilitator of innovation and safeguards good research practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are sound reasons why the openness of research data may need to be restricted but any restrictions must be justified and justifiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open access to research data carries a significant cost, which should be respected by all parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The right of the creators of research data to reasonable first use is recognised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of others’ data should always conform to legal, ethical and regulatory frameworks including appropriate acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Good data management is fundamental to all stages of the research process and should be established at the outset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Data curation is vital to make data useful for others and for long-term preservation of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Data supporting publications should be accessible by the publication date and should be in a citable form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Support for the development of appropriate data skills is recognised as a responsibility for all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regular reviews of progress towards open research data should be undertaken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 4.3: Outline of current RDM activity to embrace Open Science approaches in UCL**

Figure 4.3 outlines ten activities which UCL has prioritised to embed RDM in sound practice for research integrity, leading to Open Science and Open Data, where that is possible. It is important to note that this pan-UCL activity represents a collaborative approach across UCL Divisions. The LERU Roadmap for Research Data emphasised in 2013 that work in pursuing RDM institutionally was a collaborative effort. Recommendation 23 captures the spirit of this when it says, “Involve a broad range of stakeholders in training and raising awareness about RDM and Open Data.”

4.5. CONCLUSION

Research performing organisations should all have sound research integrity frameworks which support the research-intensive nature of their work. Sound RDM activity is key to this framework as research data becomes increasingly recognised as a component of Open Science. The UK’s Concordat on Open Research Data is a Best Practice example of what is required in order to move on the agenda for Open Research Data at an institutional level. Figure 4.3 in this Case Study shows how roles and responsibilities for this are allocated to a number of stakeholders and different parts of the university, RDM is a key part of the research agenda in the 21st century, and research performing organisations have to be proactive and flexible to embrace the challenges that agenda poses.

---

20 UCL: http://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data/policies; last accessed 8/1/17.
21 UCL Library Services has identified funder requirements for RDM and actively advocates these.