

Outputs from JISC/RCUK event 'New RCUK awards service interoperability workshop'

11th May 2016

Equipment

Opportunities for interoperability:

- RO systems such as asset systems, CRIS systems, local, bespoke e.g. access, oracle. Lab informatics – quartz/cabtorve. Local stuff contributes to national equipment portal data aggregation. Captures equipment title and name and ID, URI (sp?)
- Data captured/format – Name/Title, Unique ID, Description, Contact, Location (Typically compatible with unquip data publishing spec) Format .csv .JSON. RDF TTL
- API on equipment.data.ac.uk – newsletters, more info, diagrams
- API/SPARQL Enabling download/query of grants (eg using facilities/equipment) using equipment field

Equipment

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Equipment.data generates URIS for equipment/facility. It is automatically refreshed daily• It's curated by institutions (this can also be a weakness)	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not all equipment at present• Need robustness in use of [should that be "by"] PIs• Naming equipment – quality of descriptions
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leverages requirement for publishing equipment (Cross Council Policy)• Improved analytics for equipment utilisation• Linking to other datasets such as gateway to research• Link to outputs via CRIS ingest	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Delay to grant application if the item is not listed• Item selected before conversation with owner

Offer Letter

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Award letter received with payment schedule:
- Electronic pdf files via Je-S/email
- Need to reprofile costings (in excel/RO system) to match schedule
- Work out a budget profile (finance systems/RO systems)
- Potential resource management data such as % FTE
- Risk! Payments made to third parties requiring full payment versus final retention sum
- Manual transfer Je-s to costing tool to finance systems – back to Je-S to input start date
- No live update between RCUK systems and HEIs re: actual payment profile or schedule (both ways)
- Recommend that it's ID of the important data to convey and that it's conveyed consistently across RCUK not about trying to plug in technology into every system
- So many variable systems across institutions plugging directly into each impossible. Ability to export data in a simple way impossible

Offer Letter

Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce effort and duplicate• Improve accuracy of data and information• Reduce manual input	Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Security and confidentiality• Variability of local systems acts against interoperability
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More efficient budget management• Transparency – flexible payment schedule in real time• Tailored view dependent on role tracking of funded investigator FTE across awards• Improved communication of a) data b) distribution• Reviewer feedback	Threats <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academics see too much but don't understand finances• Increase in workload due to more capability of system

Reporting on actual spend

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Our costing system captures expenditure and income for each grant/project. We get reports breaking down expenditure into different categories so it would be helpful to be able to transfer the data for FES statements.
- PIs get a budget – how much they can spend on directly incurred costs such as consumables and t&s. What are the RO processes to check this spend?
- Collaboration – one proposals multiple payments – this would part solve problems with collaboration agreement pain. Fix status reporting

Reporting on actual spend

Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Easier to complete the FES statements – reduce burden	Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accuracy of data e.g. when wrong transactions put through budget
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data can be manipulated to fit into timescales of project opportunities• Data can be manipulated to fit into timescales of project	

Studentship Information

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Spreadsheets £
- Finance system £
- By individual, cohort and total programme
- Supervisors produce scientific documents – collated at RO level SITS. Supervisor information in CRIS. Pick up data from RCUKL system. Improve flexibility. Live data feed, standard schema

Studentship Information

Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Easy to do stuff• ORCID• Long term link with HESA• Recording what we need progression• Value add in linking and tracking student	Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Non-standard mechanisms and schemes• External supervision• Link with HESA• CERIF coding for students
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lots of SITS users• Look at REF system• External supervisions to join up• Self service for students	Threats <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Priority• Might take longer to process• What happens when things change• Lack of support for research students

Non RO systems

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Researchfish
- HESA
- REF/HEFCE
- CRIS Systems
- Other RO systems (eg impact, data etc)
- Third party services – peer review, classification
- Identifiers e.g. ORCID, ISNI etc.
- Prioritise those that are mandated
- Don't reinvent the wheel
- All data in autoharvester from authoritative sourced

Non RO systems

Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can reduce admin burden• Can analyse results in aggregate• Can use new metrics• Best systems looked after by the best people	Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CERIF barrier high to implementation• TIME and EFFORT to implement standards
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mandating same standards• Plugging in existing systems to cut down DEV TIME• Further implementation and getting academic buy in• Common data model and metadata	Threats <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tie into 3rd party systems• Closed systems• Market failures/dependencies

Research Outcomes

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Closing loop – Researchfish interoperable with the grants service. Input data from grants service straight to Researchfish – need to update can't be static.
- How capture other output types that can't be easily written down? – put a DOI or URL that points to where it is stored [this exists in ResearchFish]
- Non submission passed back to new service automatically
- Use unique digital identifiers wherever they exist - what are they??
- Where there is a resolvable identifier we want to be able to use
- Data about department that holds the award in grant service and research fish
- More automation from publishers – two processes into one
- Remote access/people overseas without access to internet – tools that can do this and grants service more generally
- Two way exchange with uni CRIS systems
- ORCID interoperability has been good for publications could be expanded to broader set of output types and link grant input data associated with outputs – some CRIS systems already make this link so could be done direct
- Re-capture and re-use open data through the system

Research Outcomes

Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Closed circle/life cycle of project• Flow of RI	Weakness <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Costs (increased with complexity)• Time and implementation
Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All parties agreed to one standard• CERIF in Action lessons learned	Threats <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multiple systems• Disjointed systems• Technical Implementation• CERIF in Action lessons learned

People data/ORCID

Opportunities for interoperability:

- PIs/Co-Is/Students/RAs/Reviewers/Panel members
- Grant ref, PI id and Org id – these three give us the interoperability that we need
- People linked to publications and other outputs
- ORCIDS linked to CRIS systems
- HR systems – linked to grants process
- Multiple ORCID iD'S – need to dedupe
- Embed use of ORCID in RO processes/policies

People data/ORCID

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Save time and duplication• Benefits to clients with minimal overhead	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unwillingness to mandate ORCID
<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduction of data collected• Flexibility of interface content• Increased desirability of suppliers tools• Increased transparency of partner costs	<p>Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multiple systems in ROs• Incomplete uptake of ORCID

Costings

Opportunities for interoperability:

- Actually the full proposal would be better where possible
- Different HEIs have different start points
- Different data fields recorded by each
- Number of APIs – create record, - costings, - justification, - equipment facilities – data management plan. A supplier API might hit one or more of these
- Partners are a possible issue – though there is an MI benefit – separate splits within overall
- Approvals and timings will need focus
- Multiple transfers needed
- Is all salary metadata needed
- Suppliers of HEI systems are very keen
- FEC values for submission rather than RCUK inflated – finance policy issue
- 2-way e.g. RCUK reference number
- ORCID rather than PID (though personally a mandate would help)
- Not mandatory to transfer – combination of manual and transfer helpful
- Totally separate – reviewer feedback from previous table.