GAP ANALYSIS RCUK OUTPUT SPECIFICATION

General Points

This is an initial high level analysis based on information available March 2011. There is a lot more detail and this needs checked against final specification.

We expect RC outcome collection to commence late 2011/early 2012.
http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/ResearchOutcomes/Pages/home.aspx

We expect that not all data to be mandated initially and that publications will be expected as per Terms & Conditions.

All RC's are taking part with the exception of MRC and STFC who currently have their own systems but may join the generic exercise in future years.

User acceptance testing took place August 2011 and issues were fed back to RCUK.

A pilot is planned taking publications from some HEI's (including University of Glasgow) into the RC system before the go-live date.

The criteria will probably be outputs for grants ended in the last 5 years (dates to be confirmed).

There will be resource requirements to implement data extract from GU Systems or support non-implementation (i.e. assisting researchers with checking, finding and providing information) Provision of data from GU systems is preferable as GU will not have the data if it is provided direct to RC's by academics. Even if RC's give this back to HEI's there will be work involved in knitting that into core systems and issues with synchronisation and duplication of effort. Therefore the most cost effective and robust option is to develop data extracts from core systems to supply to the RC system. We know this as even managing the small amount of data returned via MRC and STFC is labour intensive.

We should initially extract all data and publicity flags. GU to filter any data that does not seem appropriate to go to RCUK e.g. due to confidentiality. We understand RCUK are working on the basis of receiving anything that is suitable for the public domain only.

As well the established checks done by the library staff for new outputs on the repository any items that we decided to store and submit will need checked for confidentiality. This may require business development/scientific/IP expertise in one of the central offices or at colleges to review data and make decisions.

For the entities currently in the core Research System and listed below we may use the narrative fields to match any fields we store and wish to report where these are not specified as separate fields for RCUK.

We may need to set defaults of 'none' for some entities if we have nothing to report (if blank cannot be accepted).

Under each entity the narrative field asks for any notable **impact** arising from the further funding. To be discussed with library as some of this may be in repository given we already capture impact information there.

In the odd event of significant changes we may not reflect this in core systems therefore there may be an extra requirement for the core system. May require further clarification as to what sort of changes RC mean.

Can we supply organisation name or do we need to use standard list. If so investigate mapping to ours – this may be a large job.

Can we supply our own organisation type or de we need to use/map to Je-S list of organisation types?

Country code – we can supply the partner country and the 'non-gu' staff country. There is a suggestion to use the ONS list. This would be a lot of work to map to.

There is also sector required for some outcomes….

Overlap from further funding/collaboration/exploitation sub-types confusing and a method needs to be established to deal with this. We prefer to provide only once e.g. under further funding.

Entities Currently In Research System

Further Funding

Further funding that has been received to take the project to the next stage. This could be a result of a competitive application or payment for carrying out a consultancy project.

Criteria = any further award subsequent to Research Council award (date criteria tbc by RC's) Could possibly include all other awards regardless of whether financial or not.

Include award type with 'funding type' as the field header.

If funding type = 'other' narrative becomes mandatory as RO is requested to give further details. Suggest we force award type details into the narrative where the type does not equal the types provided – i.e. not = research grant, consultancy or travel grant (note we have no way of identifying 'travel grants' at present so just force these into the other for now?)

Funder – map to 'funding organisation'

Funding scheme

Description of funding (unclear what is required here leave blank?)

Value of award map to 'funding value'

Actual start date map to 'start date'

Actual end date map to 'end date'

Narrative – see above.

Collaboration

Collaboration is where an organisation or person provides resource or intellectual contribution to a research project.

Collaboration can span all output types (e.g. in journal articles RCUK ask is there a co-author) however this is more about joint activities & working.

The collaborations listed should not be a repeat of what was captured on the grant. However, if a change has occurred e.g. the estimated contribution or details of the collaboration, details can be entered here.

Map to any awards that do not fit under 'further funding' but that do have either external partners or 'non-gu' staff? I think the bulk will come out under further funding therefore we can just leave collaboration blank if it is resource hungry to do this for first pass.

Not sure about use of 'non-gu' staff on projects where relevant sit - this may not give much information at present for the amount of effort it might take to set up.

Data required:

Organisation name (note there may be a list supplied by RCUK)

Collaboration title – just use project title and/or award type?

Collaboration type:

Financial
Equipment/materials
Secondment/Training of personnel
Academic input
Access to Facilities and/or other resources
Staff time/expertise
Other

Estimated contribution – Proposed value or actual value (if received) of resource commitment by collaborator. Total contribution over the lifetime of the collaboration. Allow a category of 'Don't Know' to be captured (equivalent to our blank extracts?) Use value or estimated value field.

Start date - actual start date or proposed start date is in the past

Narrative – details

Some sub-types may be defined later by RC's.

Exploitation of Research

Sub-divided into intellectual property, spin-out company and other exploitation.

International involvement – specify if international involvement helped to enable the exploitation/innovation of research. I think we can ignore this as this will be obvious from further funding/collaboration country code or provided from this information.

Other involvement – If there was other involvement in the expoitation of the output/outcome indicate which type:

Government/public sector
Private sector
Charity/non-profit sector
Academic
None

Think we can supply funder group as part of further funding/collaboration to satisfy this request. May require mapping.

Intellectual Property

Asks for stage and method of disclosure/protection. Think this is irrelevant i.e. we will provide information that is public domain e.g granted patents but not inventions that were not yet protected.

Could possibly omit from first round if data not linked to projects.

However if we look at IP granted from the date criteria set by RC there might not be many to match up with core systems and then add any new as time progresses.

Intellectual property granted <u>as a result </u>of a research council grant.

Type: Copyright, Trademark, Patent, Other (if other force type/some info into narrative field as this becomes a mandatory field)

IP Title – Name/Title of the discovery

IP Reference Number e.g. licence reference number, patent number

Description – suggest some info required in a narrative on core system

Date awarded = date granted

Location filed = Country - suggest we can use country codes but need to report as UK (GB or GBS), EU, USA, or other or could just supply as is.

Licenced indicator

Exploited indicator

Income – suggest mark default as 'not disclosed' for now else pull from Finance System avoiding overlap with further funding if licences have been included there.

FY that income was received (mandatory if income entered)

Narrative

Spin Out Company

Currently not held on core system. There are very few of these and could be supplied manually if any relationship to RC awards. A member of staff has on their list to add the current spin outs to the system.

Formally registered companies only not partnerships or sole traders.

Company name

Registration number as per Companies House.

Description of Company

FY that income year was received and number of employees reported

Joint venture Y/N

Joint Venture Partners

Number of employees (on a financial year basis)

Income – any income generated as a result of the Spin Out for the FY. Allows us to register 'not disclosed'.

Narrative

Other Types

Sale of physical goods/items
Consultancy projects
Facilities/equipment
Contract research
Specialist training

The above will all come out in further funding and have clear labels but could potentially be mapped to RCUK types (at a resource cost).

We need further clarity on what is required for production facility and translation to clinical practice. These may be covered by further funding/agreements with third parties.

Entities Currently in Repository

Publication

Impact – but RCUK needs more detail than currently supplied. Library considering implications.

A range of output types may need additional details or sub-types. In principal this should be fine library are considering.

Entities Not Currently in Core Systems

Award/recognition details are not currently available. Could possible be sub-type in respository. Library staff considering this and mapping to REF types.

Staff Development – Most of the data is already collected in the HRS. 17/08/11 HR Representative said the additional data required could be added. There are some concerns over data protection as staff could make any comment at all in the narrative field and it would be difficult and time consuming to check this. Could possibly either just accept this, or force a nil return for this field to avoid issues.

End of Award Report – not sure if in a system (possibly finance sytem and no details available from

Dissemination/Communication

A key area for decision is the storage of information from the 'other research output' category. This includes:

- Bio/Medical e.g. cell lines, antibodies
- Electronic e.g. data set, algorithm
- Physical e.g. new molecule, prototype

As well as the issues noted regarding confidentiality we are considering where these might best fit in the core GU systems and what the requirements are.

See issue log.xls for more details.

Valerie McCutcheon
University of Glasgow
25/03/11