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1. Introduction

This guideline addresses data storage, data access/sharing, and publication procedures during the life of PRIME and beyond. It is intended to promote open and enhanced access to PRIME data and outputs in accordance with the DFID policy, and a fair and transparent process for publishing outputs from PRIME to ensure the timely production of high quality research outputs and to build capacity of junior researchers. It is based on the assumption that everyone in the PRIME collaboration will gain by a fair system of sharing these research assets within the collaboration during the life of PRIME. Furthermore, given the wealth of PRIME data and the potential impact of these data, future access privileges given to parties outside the PRIME collaboration will aid in realising the full impact of the collaboration’s efforts. These opportunities for non-PRIME parties will mainly be available once PRIME has been completed, although access to certain datasets may be possible before this time. See section 3.2. Thus, this policy aims to maximise PRIME outputs and impact, through collaboration amongst PRIME partners, particularly encouraging early career individuals, and through collaboration between PRIME partners and external parties.

Under each heading, guidelines will be detailed for two time periods, namely: (1) during the life of PRIME and (2) 0-7 years after the PRIME project has been concluded.) Within these two time periods, two issues will be addressed: (1) data storage and access to data and (2) the procedure to be followed in producing actual PRIME outputs, such as peer-reviewed publications, conference reports, book chapters, policy briefs, media reports, etc. Data analysis can include primary and secondary analysis for such outputs. Guidelines for student involvement are also provided in section 4.

This guideline does not apply to indirect PRIME outputs, i.e. outputs not utilising PRIME data. These are any outputs by collaborators which do not use PRIME data but may be related to the overall aims of PRIME. Examples include editorials written by one or more PRIME partners on a subject related to PRIME’s objectives of scaling up mental health care in low resource settings, or outputs published by PRIME partners that report on data from another project which has similar objectives, and clear synergies with PRIME.

2. Data storage

2.1 PRIME data storage during the life of PRIME

PRIME data are owned jointly by all PRIME partners, in accordance with the legal agreement reached between the partners; thus all partners may access PRIME data. In certain instances, this access will be facilitated by the data management team. Data will be collected by the country teams and maintained in secure storage, e.g. locked cabinets, password protected PCs. It is the responsibility of the country teams to ensure that electronic databases are regularly backed up with a back-up stored in a separate geographical location. Once data is captured electronically a copy should be uploaded on a common server housed at UCT. This will be accessible by the Data Manager and other members of the data management team. Country-specific data will be available to that country’s Principal Investigator and
Project Co-ordinator, with access to other countries' data being provided with permission from the country team. Where data is collected by handheld devices such as the Mobenzi system, the Mobenzi data will also be downloaded onto the UCT intranet daily during data collection, and backed up on the data management team members’ password-protected computers. A local copy should be kept by each country and a back up copy will be kept on the UCT intranet once the data is cleaned. Data should be stored for 7 years after the completion of the project as per our contractual arrangements with DFID.

**2.2 PRIME Data anonymization**

It is a core responsibility of PRIME to ensure appropriate confidentiality while collecting the information provided by the participants in its various research studies. All participants of PRIME studies have been assigned participant ID, which uses a plain no. in combination with the code of the place or mental health condition of the cohort group. PRIME has collected some direct and indirect identifiers such as interviewees’ full name, age, sex, education level, residence, designation (of service providers), telephone/mobile numbers, details of significant others (of people receiving PRIME interventions) however it has been ensured that these direct identifiers has not been recorded with the study data. All physical copies of identifiable information are kept separate from the data in locked cabinet and the soft copies in password protected folders in a secure computer, including audio-recordings of all interviews. This identifiable information is accessible only to core research team members of PRIME who are directly involved in data management. Where follow up is required, field data collectors are provided a list of participants with their names, ID numbers and contact details by the data management team.

Apart from above mentioned we will ensure following additional steps to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of the data shared with other researchers

**Quantitative data**

All quantitative data collected with handheld devices will use participant IDs rather than names to identify participants. On receipt of data, UCT data manager will check the datasets for anonymity prior to data cleaning, archiving and data sharing. Additionally, the UCT will remove village identifiers and add noise to any GPS data so that it is impossible to identify the individuals from their GPS data. In addition, GPS data will only be available for data sharing when there is a clear rationale as to why the authors need to analyse this data.

**Qualitative data**

All interview, transcription and translation files will saved with the Patient Identification number of the participant, diagnosis and treatment category and not using patient’s name by the country teams. During transcription and translation of interviews, patient’s and care giver’s name and address will be removed from all interviews and replaced with a placeholder such as [Participant 1] or [XXXXX]. Qualitative data management team will check each transcript to ensure that any direct or indirect identifiers are not included in the same. Only the anonymised data will uploaded onto the UCT server
for archiving and data sharing. The UCT data manager will check the interview transcripts for anonymity prior to archiving and subsequent data sharing.

2.3 PRIME data storage after PRIME completion
Once PRIME has been completed, the data will be hosted by UCT on ZivaHub, UCT’s open data repository. After data is cleaned, the data will be prepared for archiving by the data management team at UCT and LSHTM, namely Emily Baron and Sujit Rathod, after which the final versions will be uploaded onto the intranet. This will be managed by the data management team at UCT, currently Emily Baron and overseen by the PRIME CEO and Research Directors, together with the data management oversight from Dr Sujit Rathod at the LSHTM. For data sharing procedures for non-PRIME parties, see section 3.2. These data will include all audiovisual (final versions), quantitative and qualitative data collected during PRIME. The data will be stored for 7 years after the completion of PRIME and a decision will be taken regarding ongoing data storage towards the end of that period.

2.4 Metadata
The metadata, namely details of protocols, summaries of datasets, questionnaires, as well as direct, indirect and planned PRIME outputs will be stored or recorded as described below. (See Table 1 below.) The datasets will be stored by study design, and by country. All questionnaires related to the datasets will be made available, as well as the corresponding codebooks.

A searchable list of direct completed and planned outputs, by category, will be made available on the PRIME website. The data management team will update the published output list monthly, and the planned output list as data request or intention to publish forms are approved.

The metadata will also be deposited on the R4D website, utilising their online submission process. Peer-reviewed publications’ metadata with hyperlinks should be submitted as soon as possible, and the pdf files of these outputs within 6 months of publication (see section 4.1.4). The metadata of non-peer reviewed PRIME outputs should be updated on the R4D website at least once every 6 months.

Table 1 Metadata: during PRIME and after

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metadata/output logs</th>
<th>During PRIME</th>
<th>After PRIME (0-7 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Datasets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Study protocols</td>
<td>• As they are cleaned, final datasets become available (as far as possible by 18 months after data is cleaned (provisionally August 2019) for that complete dataset, ie endline data for that study included)</td>
<td>• Available for at least 5 years after PRIME work concluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Codebooks</td>
<td></td>
<td>• On archived PRIME website and R4D website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Direct PRIME outputs

- Collected as part of usual reporting *
- Reported in annual PRIME reports
- Listed with hyperlinks on PRIME and R4D websites
- Posted on the PRIME website if possible

- Logged with UCT data management team as part of data access agreement
- Listed with hyperlinks on PRIME and R4D websites

3. Planned PRIME outputs

- Title, abstract and co-authors listed in publication list collated and circulated quarterly
- ‘Planned submission date’. If the paper is not submitted within 6 months of the planned submission date, the output may be taken over by other authors

- Title and abstract on PRIME website
- ‘Planned submission date’. If the paper is not submitted within 6 months of the planned submission date, the output may be taken over by other authors

3 Access to data

This section will deal with data access and sharing procedures. For these issues, there are 3 time periods to be kept in mind, the first 2 being those mentioned in section 1, namely during the life of PRIME and 0-7 years after the project completion. A further time period comes into play regarding data access for non-PRIME partners. According to the DFID Research Open and Enhanced Access Policy v1.1, data should be made available on request from 18 months after data collection completion. Since this policy came into effect in 2013 for projects that began after November 2012, PRIME is not bound by this policy. PRIME will endeavour to make complete, final datasets (ie, with endline data included) available within 18 months of final data cleaning and this will apply to each study design separately. This will occur within 18 months of final data collection for a study design. For example, 18 months after final data cleaning for the cohort study (in all countries) data will be available on request subject to approval by the PRIME team.

As datasets become available, their availability and access procedures will be advertised on the PRIME website, the Mental Health Innovation Network website, across our networks, student groups (see section 4) and on social media (Twitter and facebook). PRIME collaborators will follow the procedure described in the 2014 version of this policy, using the intention to publish form.
3.1 PRIME collaborators
During the life of PRIME, the data management team will have access to all datasets. All country teams will have access to their own data, as well as those collaborating on country-specific papers. Access to the relevant aspects of cross-country data will be given to those collaborating on these papers, according to the PRIME approved publication list.

Once PRIME has been completed, PRIME country teams will retain their cleaned datasets, with duplicate datasets being stored at UCT as described. Further access to data will be facilitated by the data management team in accordance with the publication procedure outlined in section 4.1.2.

3.2 Non-PRIME parties
The procedure described below will apply after PRIME completion, and, where possible, for PRIME research 18 months after data cleaning has been completed. In some circumstances, data access will be granted prior to 18 months after data cleaning. Parties interested in accessing PRIME data for publications, conference proceedings, reports or policy briefs will be directed to the website to compare their planned output with the published outputs on the PRIME website. Once they have ascertained that their planned output has not already been planned or published, they will fill in a data request form (see appendix B) on the PRIME website. On receipt of the form, the UCT data management team or administrator will compare the request and planned output with the completed and planned PRIME outputs. Should the team find that the output has been published, they will inform the applicant that their request is denied, citing the appropriate publication. However, if the applicants aim to replicate methodology and verify findings, then this request should be considered by the PRIME team.

If the proposed output has not been published or the applicants plan to replicate a methodology or verify findings, the team will compare the request to the planned outputs list. If the planned topic is similar to an already-claimed topic, the team will email the original authors (PRIME/non-PRIME) of the topic, asking them to indicate whether they are still interested in the topic and requesting a timeline. Topics may only be reserved for 6 months, after which the topic will become available again unless significant progress or proof of submission can be shown. In cases where interested authors apply and the topic has been reserved, they will be asked to check the list again once the 6 month period has elapsed at which time they may send a further enquiry. Should the topic requested by the authors be available, the data request form will be sent to the PRIME team for comment (2 week window for comments).

Comments from the team will then be sent to the applicants who will be given 2 weeks to respond. They can submit an amended abstract and request form, or a reply motivating their original plan should there be any requests from the PRIME team for changes. Once these have been resolved and access has been approved, the applicants will be asked to sign an appropriate data use agreement (see appendix C). This data use agreement will include: (1) agreed timelines; (2) open and enhanced access recommendations (to be adhered to as far as possible); (3) confidentiality and agreement to not further disseminate the data and (4) the inclusion of at least one PRIME author, to be decided by the PRIME team depending on which data is requested according to (a) country: cross-country data (key cross-country partners and others as appropriate) or country-specific data (country teams) and (b) specific study design (partners
who played an integral role in a specific aspect of PRIME). Once the appropriate data use agreement has been signed by all authors of the planned output, the UCT data management team will send the authors the required data or, after PRIME completion, a link to the data on ZivaHub. Authors should allow at least 2 weeks for the data access to be granted.

Should disagreements arise among the authors and the PRIME team, once the appropriate data use agreement has been signed, every effort will be made to resolve the issue. If this fails, the matter will be referred to the PRIME leadership (Profs Lund, Hanlon and Patel), who will attempt to resolve the matter. Should this not be possible, the matter will come under arbitration according to the UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules (http://www.uncitral.org/uncitral/en/uncitral_texts/arbitration/2010Arbitration_rules.html). The following steps will be adhered to: (1) one of the parties will begin the process by sending the other party/parties a notice of arbitration; (2) the party/parties receiving the notice will respond; (3) the parties involved may appoint a representative to assist them; (4) an appointing authority will be chosen at this stage, unless this has already been agreed in the appropriate data use agreement; (5) ‘impartial and independent’ arbitrator(s) will be appointed – either one arbitrator or 3 arbitrators according to the parties’ preferences at the time or prior agreement; (6) the appointment(s) may be challenged by any of the parties involved; (7) the proceedings will include a statement of claim by the party/parties initiating the process, and a statement of response by the other party/parties involved and (8) the matter may be settled or terminated before the final decision if the parties have come to an agreement, or the outcome will be decided by the arbitrator(s). For further details on the arbitration process, see the UNCITRAL website hyperlink above.
Figure 1 Process for data access – non-PRIME parties
4 PRIME outputs

Procedures related to a number of different outputs are presented below. The DFID policy encourages the production of outputs which are easy to access even in areas with low bandwidth internet access and limited connectivity. All digital outputs, including the website, images and pdf files should be designed to facilitate download of the outputs in such areas. See page 2 of the implementation guide in appendix G for further information.

In the spirit of capacity building, student authorship will be encouraged. This may be facilitated through either a PRIME collaborator or a non-PRIME party. The data access procedures described above should be followed. Extra effort will be made to advertise the PRIME datasets to students. Certain programmes will be targeted, namely: the PhD programme offered by the Department of Psychiatry at Addis Ababa University, the MSc in Global Mental Health at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, PhD and postdoctoral fellows in the African Mental Health Research Initiative (AMARI) programme and the MPhil in Public Mental Health offered by the Alan J Flisher Centre for Public Mental Health at the University of Cape Town.

4.1 Journal publications

4.1.1 Authorship – PRIME

The authors of a paper and the sequence of authorship should reflect the relative contribution of each individual to the writing of the paper as well as the design, analysis and conduct of the study. In keeping with the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship (Appendix D), authorship credit should be based on:

1) Substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; and

2) Drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and

3) Final approval of the version to be published.

Authors should meet all three of the above conditions. All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.

The first author should be the individual who is responsible for the first draft of the paper, in addition to taking overall responsibility for the other aspects of the process including research design or data analysis. For cross-country papers, at least 2 country team authors should be invited to contribute to the paper. For country-specific papers, at least 1 cross-country author should be invited to contribute.

External authors may contribute to PRIME publications, including taking the part of the lead author, providing they are identified in the Intention to Publish form and this guideline is followed. We
encourage long term collaborators to complete the Expression of Interest form on the PRIME website which can be circulated to the consortium to inform them of new collaborators.

Principles of capacity building should be inherent in the choice of authors. Junior members of PRIME should be encouraged to take the lead on outputs and thus qualify for first authorship. However, it is important to ensure that the authorship group has the necessary technical skills to complete the paper. Where these are not available within the PRIME group, external authors should be brought in, and identified in the Intention to Publish form outlined in the process below.

4.1.2 Procedure for writing and submitting a publication – PRIME

A potential publication list will be drafted by the PMG with inputs from the consortium with possible outputs of PRIME, both inter- and intra-country. This should be seen as a fluid document which will provide a guideline for collaborators but should not limit the scope of possible publications from PRIME. The potential publication list will be circulated quarterly and available on request from the Erica Breuer.

Country partners will have preferential access to their own country data, and should be encouraged to take the lead on their country-specific papers. This does not exclude cross-country partners working with data from a single country or country partners working with cross-country data. Cross-country partners wishing to write an article based on country data should discuss this with the relevant PRIME country teams where the data was collected and any other collaborators they wish to include.

The process for writing and submitting a publication is set out in Figure 1. Once an outline of the paper and a list of authors has been established, the lead author should submit an Intention to Publish form (Appendix A) to the PRIME Administrator, Gillian Hanslo (Gillian.hanslo@uct.ac.za). Once it has been received, the PMT will check the intended paper against the Intention to Publish Database to determine if there is any potential duplication with an existing intended publication, and how it aligns with other papers on the potential publication list. This information will be relayed to the author. The intention of this step is to coordinate the various PRIME outputs and in most instances it is expected that there will be minimal or no changes to the Intention to Publish form that has been submitted.

Following this, the Intention to Publish form will be sent out to the PMG who are invited to comment on the Intention to Publish, within two weeks of the receipt. If the author does not agree with the PMG feedback, the author will be asked to submit a motivation to the PMG who may decide on how to take the matter forward.

Any dispute around authorship or the process will be handled by the Prime Management Group, in accordance with general PRIME policies for managing disputes between partners as specified in the subcontracts. In situations where a publication is not submitted according to the timetable or if more than one author wants to take the lead on a specific publication and they are not able to come to an agreement, the PMG have the authority to adjudicate and their decision may include the appointment of a new or lead author. It should be noted that the timetable for writing papers will be generous, open to negotiation and will include an important component of capacity development.
Designated co-authors who do not provide the requisite intellectual input, according to the above authorship criteria within a one month period of requesting that input at each stage of the process (e.g. paper outline, data analysis, first draft, final draft) will be asked to withdraw as co-authors. This shall initially be done informally by the first author but may require adjudication by the PMG as above. The updated PRIME paper list will be circulated on a quarterly basis to all partners. Once the Intention to publish form has been submitted, the process towards publication will be monitored using the outputs section of the quarterly reports.

**4.1.3 Procedure for writing and submitting a publication – non-PRIME**

Non-PRIME authors will access data as described above in section 3.2. Once accepted by the PRIME management team, their proposed title and abstract will be added to the planned output list posted on the PRIME website. The authors will be asked to submit the completed output or hyperlink for the output to the UCT data management team. (See section 2.3 above.) As with all other PRIME outputs,
both PRIME and DFID should be acknowledged in the standard manner on all publications produced by non-PRIME partners (see section 5).

4.1.4 Choice of journal and publishing strategies – PRIME and non-PRIME

PRIME is committed to open access publication as per DFID’s policy and implementation guide (see appendices F and G). Although PRIME collaborators are not contractually obliged to adhere to this policy, as it only applies to research grants awarded from November 2012, we will aim to adhere to this policy as far as possible. Wherever feasible, authors should publish in open access format, whereby an article is freely available on a journal website (gold open access). To enable this it may be necessary to apply for an open access fee waiver or for reduced fees from the journal which supports open access publication. Alternatively, where possible, authors should consider applying for additional funding from their institutions to support this. All recipients of PRIME data will be encouraged to publish in open access format. Furthermore, DFID encourages PRIME authors to choose journals which allow the researchers, or their institutions, to retain copyright of the output.

Another open access option is so-called green open access. This option may be selected if gold open access is not possible. With this option, authors should self-archive the output, i.e. publish it on the PRIME website and the R4D website within 6 months of initial publication. Authors should ensure that they have the necessary permissions to do so. The output versions should be final drafts after completion of the peer review process. To check a journal’s policy on self-archiving, search the SHERPA/RoMEO database, or contact the journal editorial team. When considering the green open access option, authors are encouraged to identify journals or publishers which give preferential access low- and middle-income country users. The World Health Organization’s HINARI Access to Research in Health Programme provides free or low cost access to certain journals and resources to institutions in selected low- and middle-income countries. See the HINARI website for a list of participating publishers.

4.2 Presentations
4.2.1 PRIME collaborators

Any collaborators wishing to present any form of research findings based on the PRIME findings at an academic conference should submit an Intention to Publish form prior to submission of abstracts using the same process as for peer reviewed journal articles described above. Authors need to take responsibility to ensure that conference presentations do not prejudice successful publication according to conference and journal policies. In addition, if any PRIME partner wishes to present PRIME data at a conference before it has been published, they should seek the consent of the other authors involved in publishing that data.

A standard PRIME slide will be provided for conference presentation purposes with the appropriate logos, acknowledgements and disclaimers.
4.2.2 Non-PRIME parties

Non-PRIME parties should follow the data access procedures for conference presentations. Should they wish to publish a peer-reviewed article as well as present the findings at a conference, both should be mentioned in the expression of interest/data access form. As with all other PRIME outputs, both PRIME and DFID should be acknowledged in the standard manner on all conference presentations by non-PRIME partners (see section 5).

4.3 Policy briefs

Access to data for policy briefs is as per guidelines for PRIME or non-PRIME parties as appropriate. These should be sent to the PRIME team for them to deposit on the R4D and PRIME websites. Authors are encouraged to make these available in the languages of their area/country.

4.4 Books or book chapters

Prior to publication, authors should request full or partial open access for the book or chapter. Should this not be possible, DFID recommends that the authors arrange with the publisher to buy back copies to distribute. Whether open access or not, a 500 word synopsis and table of contents should be deposited on the R4D and PRIME websites once the book is published.

4.5 PRIME-produced resources

Such resources should be licensed through Creative Commons using the ‘Attribution’ licence CC-BY, as appropriate. For more information, refer to the DFID Research Open and Enhanced Access Policy v1.1: Implementation Guide and the Creative Commons website.

4.6 Audiovisual material

All final versions of the audiovisual material produced by the PRIME team should be made freely available online. The PRIME documentary clips and films are available on YouTube, with links from the PRIME website. These links and metadata will also appear on the R4D website.

4.7 PRIME website

The PRIME website will be managed by the PRIME team for the duration of the project. It will continue to be hosted by UCT for five years after PRIME. Should there be no resources for the site to continue, the website and all its contents will be archived with a landing page directing people to the archived data. Should the PRIME website address change at any time, the team will notify the R4D website staff.

5 Acknowledgments, disclaimers and additional considerations

All direct outputs of PRIME work by PRIME or non-PRIME authors should contain the following statement in the Acknowledgements (or appropriate) section, in keeping with our contractual arrangement with DFID:

“This study is an output of the PRogramme for Improving Mental health care (PRIME). This work was supported by the UK Department for International Development [201446]. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government’s official policies.”
For papers on which WHO staff members are listed as authors, the following disclaimer should be included:

"X and Y are staff members of the World Health Organization. The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this publication and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the World Health Organization."

Additional acknowledgements for individuals who have substantially contributed to the study such as site staff, study co-ordinating staff and user groups will be decided by the authors. It should be noted that journals may require written approval from all named persons who are listed in the Acknowledgements for their names to be mentioned.

Staff members of WHO are required to obtain internal clearance on any information products where staff members of WHO are listed specifically as authors. This may take a few weeks to obtain and should be factored into the timetable for final submission.

6 Duration and review of policy
The principles of this guideline will apply to the publishing of all PRIME data until 7 years after the formal completion of the project. The PMG will review the guideline at the annual meetings in 2012, 2014 and 2016. The 2016 draft of the guideline will formalise the publication process to be followed after the formal completion of the project. This guideline should then be reviewed in 2018 and at two-yearly intervals, or sooner should any circumstances change.

____________________________

We would like to thank Prof Graham Thornicroft and the ASPEN and INDIGO-Depression Projects for the use of their Publication Protocol for ASPEN and INDIGO-Depression (January 2011) as a guideline for developing this protocol.
## Appendix A: Intention to Publish form – PRIME authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other authors:</th>
<th>(Anticipated) Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of data

- **Site:**
  - [ ] Ethiopia
  - [ ] India
  - [ ] Nepal
  - [ ] South Africa
  - [ ] Uganda
  - [ ] Cross country
  - [ ] n/a

- **Type of analysis:**
  - [ ] Primary
  - [ ] Secondary

- **Phase:**
  - [ ] Inception
  - [ ] Implementation
  - [ ] Scaling up

### Brief description of paper (including aims and methods):

**Stage of paper:**
- [ ] Planning
- [ ] Draft preparation

**Proposed completion date**

[Blank space for date]
Proposed dissemination

Conference

National [ ] International [ ] [ ] Funding secured

Name of conference:

Date of conference:

Place of conference:

Publication

Target date for submission:

Target journal:

Date log form updated:

Additional Comments:
Appendix B: Expression of interest/data request form

Expression of interest/data request form

1. Name and Surname *

2. Country of Origin *

3. Occupation *

4. Email Address *

5. How did you find out about PRIME? *
   a) Website
   b) Colleague
   c) Journal Articles
   d) Conference Presentations
   e) Media (Newspapers, TV, Radio etc)
   f) Other:

6. Current Affiliation

7. I am interested in:
   a) Accessing PRIME data (CONTINUE to question 8)
   b) Implementing the PRIME strategy in my area/country (SKIP to 13)
   c) Working with the PRIME team (SKIP TO no. 17 – usual EOI form)
   d) Using the PRIME images (SKIP TO no. 24)
   e) Using the PRIME film (SKIP to no. 25)
   f) Other ________________________________

8. I would like to use PRIME data for: (more than one option may be selected)
   a) Peer-reviewed journal publication
   b) Conference presentation
   c) Policy brief
   d) Student dissertation
   e) Media article
   f) Other ________________________________
9. **Which data would you like to access?** (Allow this section to be completed multiple times)

   Please go to XXXXXX for details on the datasets currently available, formats and codebooks.

   Data Set: ____________________________________________

   Requested Sections: ________________________________

10. **Please provide a brief abstract or description of your proposed end product.**

   Before you submit your abstract, please access the planned and published outputs list on the PRIME website [INSERT HYPERLINK TO OUTPUTS LIST HERE] to make sure that this topic has not already been covered.

11. Where do you plan to present or publish this product?

   a) Peer-reviewed journal (please provide the journal title)
   b) Conference (please provide the conference details)
   c) Website
   d) University for student dissertation
   e) Other publication ____________________

12. **Estimated completion date (END for data request)_______________**

13. I would like to implement the PRIME strategy in (area/country/region)________________

14. I believe that the PRIME strategy is appropriate for my context because ________

15. Please describe the aspects of the PRIME strategy that you would like to implement.

16. I would need the following expertise from the PRIME team ________ (END for PRIME strategy)

17. **Which PRIME team are you interested in working with?** *

   a) Ethiopia
   b) India
   c) Nepal
   d) South Africa
   e) Uganda
   f) Not sure yet
   g) Other:

18. Please summarise briefly your prior discussions or collaboration with any PRIME partners.

19. How do you see yourself becoming involved in PRIME? Specifically, how can you contribute to the
goals, outputs or impact of PRIME? *

20. Do you have funding that could cover your collaboration with PRIME? * If Yes, please specify 
source of funding under Other

   a) Yes
   b) No [Skip to 22]
   c) Other:

21. Please indicate what this funding will cover

   a) Salary
   b) Travel
   c) Research Costs
   d) None
   e) Other:
   [Skip to 23]

22. If you do not have funding, please specify how you will fund the time and costs associated with 
your work on PRIME?  (END working with PRIME team)

23. PRIME Images:
See (INSERT HYPERLINK HERE) for list of PRIME Images

   a) Which images are you interested in using?
   b) To what target audience/demographic will the image be disseminated?

   3. How many readers do you expect? (END interest in PRIME images)

24. PRIME Films:
See (INSERT HYPERLINK HERE) for list of PRIME films

   a) Which film/video are you interested in using?
   b) Where will the video/film be screened/disseminated?
   c) To what target audience/demographic will the video/film be disseminated?
   d) How many viewers do you expect? (END interest in PRIME film)
Appendix C: Data use agreement

DATA USE AGREEMENT

ENTERED INTO BETWEEN

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN (UCT)

Data Provider

AND

Data Recipient

Contact information for data recipient
Name: 
Mailing address: 
Telephone/Fax: 
Email: 

Authorised official for data recipient

Name: 
Mailing address: 
Telephone/fax: 
Email: 

Name of Program: Programme for Improving Mental Healthcare.

Description of research project: [SHORT OUTLINE OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT INCLUDING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS/AIMS AND OBJECTIVES]

Description of data: [INSERT NAME OF DATASET AND COUNTRIES HERE]. Details of the sections and variables are outlined in Annex 1.

Effective Date: [INSERT DATE HERE]

In consideration of receipt of the above-referenced date, the undersigned data recipient agrees to the following:

1. **Ownership.** Except as expressly set forth in this agreement, nothing herein shall be construed as granting data recipient any rights in the data. Data provider shall retain all ownership rights in the data.
2. **Limited use.** The data will be used only for scientific research related to the Program or Project indicated above.
3. **Data access.** Access to the data will be restricted to data recipient’s researchers who are required to have access for the purpose of carrying out the Program or Project.
4. **Non-commercial use.** The data are for non-profit, non-commercial use only. No profit or other commercial gain may be obtained through the use of any of the data.
5. **De-identification and/or contact with individuals.** Data recipient will not attempt to identify any persons related to the data nor contact the individuals who are the subject of the data.

6. **Data security.** Data recipient will ensure that all data are stored and analysed in a secure environment and adequately protected from access by unauthorised or third parties.

7. **No redistribution.** Data recipient will not publish the data (online or in any other format) or distribute the data in whole or part (with or without charge) to any other individual or organisation, providing that the data may be referenced in a peer-reviewed scholarly publication if the data are properly cited as stated in clause 9 below.

8. **Reporting of unauthorised use or disclosure.** Data recipient will report in writing to data provider any unauthorised use or disclosure of the data within five (5) working days of becoming aware of the unauthorised use or disclosure.

9. **Data citation.** Data recipient will acknowledge data provider and funder in any publications resulting from the use of the data using “This study is an output of the PRogramme for Improving Mental health carE (PRIME). This work was supported by the UK Department for International Development [201446]. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government’s official policies.”

10. **Open access.** The data should preferentially be published in an open access journal in line with DFID’s Research Open and Enhanced Access Guidelines.

11. **Co-authorship.** At least one member of the PRIME research programme consortium should be included as an author in peer reviewed publications. These author(s) will be determined by the PRIME research programme consortium.

12. **Copies of publication.** Data recipient will inform data provider about publications using the data and if feasible send an electronic copy of the publication to [INSERT RELEVANT EMAIL ADDRESSE(S) HERE]

13. **Term and termination.** This agreement is effective as of the effective date above and will continue for 6 months after this date unless significant progress or proof of submission can be shown. Either party may terminate this agreement immediately upon written notification to the other party and without liability for such termination. Upon the termination of this agreement for any reason, data recipient agrees that it will either return or destroy the data as instructed by data provider.

14. **Severability.** If any provision of this agreement is found to be wholly or partially invalid or unenforceable, the remainder of this agreement shall be unaffected.

15. **Waiver.** No term or provision of this agreement shall be deemed waived and no breach excused unless waiver or excuse of breach is in writing and signed by the party against whom such waiver or excuse is claimed.

16. **Indemnification.** The parties agree to defend, indemnify and hold each other harmless from and against any loss, claim or damage arising from the negligent acts or omissions of their own officers, employees, students or agents in the performance of their duties under this agreement.

- **Governing Law.** Should any disputes arise between the parties in connection with this Agreement or any items not covered by this Agreement, the parties shall use their best efforts to resolve the dispute through the negotiation between the parties. Any such dispute not satisfactorily settled by the parties shall be settled in accordance with the rules of International Chamber of Commerce in the place of the respondent, namely, in [INSERT LOCATION OF DATA RECIPIENT] if the respondent is [INSERT NAME OF DATA RECIPIENT], or in Cape Town South Africa if the respondent is University of...
Cape Town. Nothing herein shall preclude either party from seeking interim equitable relief from a court of competent jurisdiction. A request by a party to a court for interim relief shall not affect either party’s obligation hereunder to arbitrate. The award of such arbitration shall be final and binding on the parties and shall not be subject to appeal to any court, and may be entered in the court of competent jurisdiction for execution forthwith. This Agreement and any arbitration to follow shall be construed and interpreted in accordance with the laws of South Africa.

### Data Provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed at</th>
<th>This</th>
<th>Day of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Data Provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Data Recipient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed at</th>
<th>This</th>
<th>Day of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Data Recipient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Authorised official for data recipient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed at</th>
<th>This</th>
<th>Day of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For Data Recipient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Annex 1: PRIME data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIME Dataset</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sections/Variables included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Phase 1: Inception

**Formative interviews**
- Ethiopia
- India
- Nepal
- SA
- Uganda

### Phase 2: Implementation

**Community survey**
- Baseline
  - Ethiopia
  - India
  - Nepal
  - Uganda
- Endline
  - Ethiopia
  - India
  - Nepal
  - Uganda

**Facility detection survey**
- Baseline
  - Ethiopia
  - India
  - Nepal
  - SA
  - Uganda
- Interim
  - Nepal
  - Uganda
  - Ethiopia
- Endline
  - Ethiopia
  - India
  - Nepal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohorts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epilepsy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal depression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and district profiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation logs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service users</td>
<td>Service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Biomedical Journals: Ethical Considerations in the Conduct and Reporting of Research: Authorship and Contributorship

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors


Byline Authors

An “author” is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study, and biomedical authorship continues to have important academic, social, and financial implications (1). An author must take responsibility for at least one component of the work, should be able to identify who is responsible for each other component, and should ideally be confident in their co-authors’ ability and integrity. In the past, readers were rarely provided with information about contributions to studies from persons listed as authors and in Acknowledgments (2). Some journals now request and publish information about the contributions of each person named as having participated in a submitted study, at least for original research. Editors are strongly encouraged to develop and implement a contributorship policy, as well as a policy on identifying who is responsible for the integrity of the work as a whole.

While contributorship and guarantorship policies obviously remove much of the ambiguity surrounding contributions, they leave unresolved the question of the quantity and quality of contribution that qualify for authorship. The ICJME has recommended the following criteria for authorship; these criteria are still appropriate for journals that distinguish authors from other contributors.

Authorship credit should be based on 1) substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and 3) final approval of the version to be published. Authors should meet conditions 1, 2, and 3.

When a large, multicenter group has conducted the work, the group should identify the individuals who accept direct responsibility for the manuscript (3). These individuals should fully meet the criteria for authorship/contributorship defined above, and editors will ask these individuals to complete journal-specific author and conflict-of-interest disclosure forms. When submitting a manuscript authored by a group, the corresponding author should clearly indicate the preferred citation and identify all individual authors as well as the group name. Journals generally list other members of the group in the Acknowledgments. The NLM indexes the group name and the names of
individuals the group has identified as being directly responsible for the manuscript; it also lists the names of collaborators if they are listed in Acknowledgments.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group alone does not constitute authorship.

All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify should be listed.

Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content.

Some journals now also request that one or more authors, referred to as “guarantors,” be identified as the persons who take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, from inception to published article, and publish that information.

Increasingly, authorship of multicenter trials is attributed to a group. All members of the group who are named as authors should fully meet the above criteria for authorship/contributorship.

The group should jointly make decisions about contributors/authors before submitting the manuscript for publication. The corresponding author/guarantor should be prepared to explain the presence and order of these individuals. It is not the role of editors to make authorship/contributorship decisions or to arbitrate conflicts related to authorship.

Contributors Listed in Acknowledgments

All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an acknowledgments section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, writing assistance, or a department chairperson who provided only general support. Editors should ask corresponding authors to declare whether they had assistance with study design, data collection, data analysis, or manuscript preparation. If such assistance was available, the authors should disclose the identity of the individuals who provided this assistance and the entity that supported it in the published article. Financial and material support should also be acknowledged.

Groups of persons who have contributed materially to the paper but whose contributions do not justify authorship may be listed under such headings as “clinical investigators” or “participating investigators,” and their function or contribution should be described—for example, “served as scientific advisors,” “critically reviewed the study proposal,” “collected data,” or “provided and cared for study patients.” Because readers may infer their endorsement of the data and conclusions, these persons must give written permission to be acknowledged.
Appendix E: Checklist for publishers/journal access policies and data availability requirements

When selecting a journal for publication, please take note of the following:

1. Open access policy:
   a. Is the journal an open access journal, or does the journal offer an open access option?
   b. If so, how much does the journal charge in article processing fees?
   c. Does the journal offer better rates to authors from LMICs?
   d. Does your academic institution have an agreement with the publisher regarding fees?
   e. If you are a PRIME author, check with your team if there are open access fees available.

2. Green open access:
   a. Does the journal allow authors to self-archive or post the paper online?
   b. If so, in what version may the authors post it – pre-production or post-print?
   c. If so, when may the author post it – after 6 months or 12 months? (DfID prefers 6 months.)

3. Copyright:
   a. Do authors retain copyright?
   b. Or does the journal ask authors to transfer copyright to the journal or publisher? Is this negotiable? (DfID prefers authors to retain copyright.)

4. Data availability
   a. Does the journal have requirements regarding data availability?
      If so,
      i. when should the data be made available – on publication, on completion of the study?
      ii. for how long should the data be available – five years, ten years after publication?
      iii. where should the data be made available – online in a repository, as supplemental files, on request?
      iv. In what format should the data be?
      v. Does this apply to quantitative and qualitative data?
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1. Policy scope

1. This document describes the Department for International Development’s (DFID) open and enhanced access policy for the research that DFID funds.

2. Open access refers here to irrevocable and free online access by any user worldwide to full-text/full version scientific and scholarly material (‘outputs’). Unrestricted use of manual and automated text and data mining tools, and unrestricted re-use of content with proper attribution should be allowed. By enhanced access we mean steps taken to help users find, view and download materials. By research we mean a wide range of activities broadly designed to generate primary and secondary empirical data both to inform our own work and as a global public good (‘projects’). This includes most of the work commissioned through DFID’s central research funds as well as research commissioned by other units within DFID.

3. The aim of this policy is to increase the uptake and use of findings from research funded by DFID. The primary objectives are to:
   - increase the number of research outputs that are open access
   - increase information to help locate research outputs
   - increase the accessibility of outputs.

4. We recognise that our research partners already do a great deal to open up access to outputs and to enhance their visibility. This policy formalises our expectations.

5. DFID standard contracts give DFID an irrevocable worldwide licence to use all material produced through research, while allowing researchers to retain all intellectual property rights over that material. This policy is designed to extend and supplement any contractual obligation.

6. The policy contains actions to be carried out by individuals and institutions undertaking research funded in whole by DFID, including research commissioned through a third party using DFID funds. In many cases, it will also apply when DFID funds research in collaboration with other donors. This will be decided between the funding parties on a case-by-case basis and communicated during the commissioning process. In exceptional circumstances, access to DFID research outputs may be restricted. The policy does not apply to research funded by our partners where DFID has made no financial contribution.

7. The policy is effective from 1st November 2012 and applies to new research projects and programmes with grants or contracts awarded from this date.

8. While not required, researchers holding grants or contracts awarded prior to 1st November 2012 are encouraged to adopt the policy.

9. The policy applies to data and material generated during the funding period, even when those data and materials are released beyond the period of the grant or contract (for example, a journal article published after the end of the grant or contract, but which draws on data generated during the contracted period).

10. DFID recognises that this policy, and the license granted to DFID to use material produced through the research we fund, affects only material produced during the lifetime of the contract. It does not extend to any enhancements or improvements made which come about later and which are not a result of DFID funding.

---

1 The policy does not concern removing limited connectivity and other technical barriers experienced by those wanting to access research outputs (although it does make recommendations on designing outputs so they require minimal data download to see and use). Tackling these barriers is an essential side of opening and enhancing access and DFID funds initiatives to enable access to research outputs in poor countries.
11. The rest of this policy document contains:

- a summary table of the main policy requirements and recommendations (section 2)
- an outline of why open access to research outputs is an important goal for DFID (section 3)
- general principles, recommendations and requirements that apply across DFID funded research (section 4)
- recommendations and requirements that apply to specific types of output (section 4).

12. The policy is supported by and should be read in conjunction with:

- [DFID Open Access Policy Implementation Guide](#)
- [The DFID Ethics Principles for Research and Evaluation](#), especially principle 8: publication and communication
- [Research for Development (R4D) Editorial Policy](#).

13. General contact point: openaccess@dfid.gov.uk.

---

# 2. Summary of requirements and recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General principles</th>
<th>Open and enhanced access</th>
<th>Required*</th>
<th>Encouraged*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access and Data Management Plan included in project design</td>
<td>Maximise opportunities to make research outputs available for free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit outputs in subject-based or institutional repositories as well as R4D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translate key outputs into pertinent languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design outputs so they require minimal data download to see and use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Open access activity reported during project monitoring cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>DFID funding acknowledged in all written outputs</td>
<td>DFID funding acknowledged in non-written outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata</td>
<td>Metadata for all outputs deposited in R4D</td>
<td>Use journals that allow researchers (or their institutions) to retain ownership of copyright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership/copyright</td>
<td>Ensure necessary permissions are in place to add material to R4D, repositories or websites</td>
<td>Use open licenses such as Creative Commons, favouring CC-BY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Associated costs to be budgeted for when research is commissioned and included in DFID’s award</td>
<td>Researchers administer direct payment of any open access fees incurred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Required: actions that researchers are expected to do unless exempted by DFID; Encouraged: alternative or additional actions that will help increase access to outputs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific types of output</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Encouraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer reviewed journal articles</strong></td>
<td>Choose open access publishing whenever available (in open access or hybrid journals), and in preference to self-archiving</td>
<td>Use journals/publishers that enable free or reduced cost access to developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When self-archiving, post-print digital version deposited in R4D within six months of first publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports and other written material (excluding books published by third parties)</strong></td>
<td>Deposit digital version in R4D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books and book chapters published by third parties</strong></td>
<td>Request made to publisher for the right to make book/book chapter open access in part or whole</td>
<td>Negotiate the right to make book material open access in part or whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit table of contents and 500 word synopsis in R4D</td>
<td>Negotiate buy-back to purchase copies at reduced price for free distribution on request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Datasets</strong></td>
<td>Deposit raw or derived datasets in a suitable open access discipline or institutional repository within 12 months of collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retain and provide free on request raw datasets for a minimum of five years after project completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video, audio and images</strong></td>
<td>Complete digital versions of significant outputs openly available in the public domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Websites</strong></td>
<td>Inform R4D when project website established and if website address changes</td>
<td>Project websites permanently archived and accessible on closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer software</strong></td>
<td>Use free and open source software licenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit in a suitable open software repository</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Open and enhanced access to research outputs: A goal for DFID

14. DFID is committed to providing greater transparency to its activities and spending, and is working to make data more accessible to the public. The government is also committed to expanding access to publicly-funded research, and the recent government-commissioned ‘Finch Group’ report ‘Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications’, and government’s response to the report, set out a programme of action to open up access to research publications. In line with these initiatives, DFID is opening up and enhancing access to the outputs of the research that it funds.

15. DFID’s approach to research is to use public funds to generate and make available new knowledge as a pro-poor public good, as well as promote the use of research findings to inform the decision making of DFID and others. DFID recognises the benefits that scientific and social science knowledge can have in addressing poverty, and expects the research it funds to benefit researchers, policy makers and others globally.

16. To maximise the impact of research, researchers, practitioners, governments and civil society, especially in developing countries, need better access to research outputs to enable them to build upon and use this knowledge. Through increasing visibility and removing price barriers to research outputs, DFID expects open access to increase the uptake and use of DFID research.

17. There is evidence to support this. For example, research suggests that:
   - open access research articles are downloaded more frequently than subscription-controlled articles.
   - when a journal volume becomes free to access, the mean country per-capita gross national income (GNI) of an author citing it drops by $800.

   These findings suggest that open access publishing widens the circle of those who can access research articles.

18. Open access is also likely to increase the visibility of developing world research. Developed world outputs are often privileged by current publishing and indexing models. Open access may help address this balance.

19. Survey research points to high levels of support for opening access to research publications amongst researchers in developing, emerging and developed countries. The SOAP project (Study of Open Access Publishing) ran a global survey of the attitudes of researchers to, and their experiences with, open access publishing. Of 38,000 survey respondents, 89% thought that journals which publish open access articles were beneficial for their field, principally because they were seen to benefit

---

5 www.dfid.gov.uk/Global-Issues/What-transparency-means-for-DFID/
8 www.bis.gov.uk/news/topstories/2012/Jul/government-to-open-up-publicly-funded-research
9 Davis PM. Open access, readership, citations: a randomized controlled trial of scientific journal publishing. The FASEB Journal, 2011; 25:2129-2134.
12 http://project-soap.eu/
the scientific community, overcome financial restrictions, and benefit those outside the scientific community. An analysis of SOAP data for a sub-set of eleven developing and transition countries showed very similar results to the overall picture. An analysis of SOAP data for a sub-set of eleven developing and transition countries showed very similar results to the overall picture.20

20. Open access principles can also be applied to research outputs other than journal articles. Opening access to data enables secondary analysis of data and the contextualising of results to different circumstances. It may also avoid duplication of work and enable reproducibility. Although limited to the UK context, a survey of researchers on the benefits of national data repositories showed that most considered the data to be important to their research, and that data centres increased the quality of their own work and the quality of the data deposited. They also thought that data repositories improve efficiencies, for example by saving time, money and effort.14,15

21. Case studies undertaken as part of the same project suggest that research made possible by data repositories has had an impact on wider society and the economy, through the development of new tools and methodologies, new policies and regulatory controls, and new products or services.16

22. Research does however identify potential downsides and concerns with a move toward opening access. For example, amongst key informants from seven southern African universities who were aware of open access, 77% supported it. Yet concerns were also raised including: perceptions of poorer quality associated with open access published material; fear of breaching intellectual property rights; and the fear of research being plagiarised. The SOAP study also pointed to barriers to the adoption of open access publishing, including the availability of funding to pay open access charges and low numbers of journals of a (perceived) suitable quality.

23. The Finch Group report also highlights some systemic barriers and concerns, including ad hoc and unsystematic arrangements for meeting article processing charges leading to poor uptake, and the views of some publishers that in certain forms, open access might undermine their ability to meet the costs of publication and associated activities.18

24. Current limitations to opening access to research materials also include patchy availability of suitable data repositories, uncertainties over the economic implications of moving to full open publishing, and limited ability to access material that is nonetheless available. For example, open access publishing has a lesser impact on the citation behaviour of researchers in the very poorest countries, probably because of poor internet access.20

25. DFID’s policy attempts to mitigate some of these concerns and limitations. For example, DFID will provide funds so that researchers can make their research outputs openly available, including meeting any charges imposed by publishers, and we provide guidance on locating local, regional and international class open access journals, protecting intellectual property and not breaching the rights of others, and designing outputs so they require minimal data download to see and use.

26. Some issues remain outside our immediate reach (for example concern over plagiarism and the limitations of internet connectivity) and there are many aspects of the move toward opening access that remain to be fully researched and understood. Few research studies have explored perspectives, impacts and implications of opening access to the full

19 For a discussion, see e.g. Research Information Network. Heading for the open Road: costs and benefits of transitions in scholarly communications. RIN: London; 2011.
range of research outputs across different users, sectors, regions, countries, output types and so on.

27. Overall, on balance the evidence that is available suggests that open access increases the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of research, and therefore DFID supports a direction of travel toward opening access to research outputs.
4. Requirements and recommendations

General principles, requirements and recommendations that apply across DFID funded research

28. Researchers and their institutions are expected to maximise opportunities to make their research outputs available for free; this policy sets out minimum requirements and recommendations.

29. This policy covers the following types of output: peer reviewed journal articles; reports and other written materials; books and book chapters; datasets; video, audio and images; websites; and computer software.

30. The value and utility of these outputs depend on their quality and researchers need to exercise some judgement when making them openly available. Whilst DFID research is generally of high quality, access to incomplete or draft outputs may be of little value, and poor quality data and other outputs may be of no benefit to others. See ‘General guidance on what constitutes an output’ in the policy implementation guidance.

31. All research partners for whom this policy applies will be required to complete an Access and Data Management Plan. The Plan outlines the strategy for maximising opportunities to make research outputs open access, both during the life of the project and for permanent digital access on project closure. It will also estimate any costs. When funds are awarded through a competitive tendering process, the Plan will be part of the tender terms of reference and will be assessed as part of the award process. Usually, a Plan will also be required when competitive tendering is not used, and will form part of the business case for the project. A template is at the Annex.

32. As part of its monitoring and evaluation framework, DFID Research and Evidence Division (RED) collects data on the extent to which researchers fulfil the requirements and recommendations of this policy. RED researchers are required to report open access activity, usually during the annual review.

33. R4D, the DFID research portal, provides a central, stable, permanent and free-to-access repository for the outputs of DFID-funded research. R4D enables users of DFID research to find information about research outputs, and for this information to be located by other sites and search engines. R4D is therefore the central repository for DFID funded research outputs and associated metadata.

34. Metadata for all research outputs must be deposited in R4D on publication or before, and must include a link to an online digital version of the output or to a site from where a digital or hard copy version may be obtained. We further require that final digital versions of certain classes of output be deposited in R4D (details below). Depositing research outputs or metadata in R4D does not prevent researchers and institutions from also depositing a copy in a further subject-based or institutional repository, or personal or institutional website. Indeed, this is encouraged. The overarching principle is that research outputs must be stored where people can find them and where they will be preserved for future use. R4D serves this function.

35. The following acknowledgement will be used in or associated with all written outputs and associated metadata:

‘This work was supported by the UK Department for International Development [insert project title and Aries number].’

A statement on how to access original datasets must also be added.

We also encourage the use of this acknowledgement in non-written outputs where feasible. The acknowledgement ensures DFID-funded research can be tracked.
back to DFID and readily located on R4D, for example to find further details and outputs from the project. When research has been funded by more than one donor, then those donors will also be acknowledged according to their requirements.

36. Researchers and institutions are encouraged to use open licenses such as Creative Commons that recognise authorship of an output and encourage its use and adaptation. The Creative Commons license ‘CC-BY’ is recommended. This licence lets others modify, build upon and/or distribute the licensed work (including for commercial purposes) as long as the original author is credited.

37. For peer review research publications, researchers are encouraged to use journals that allow them (or their institutions) to retain ownership of copyright. Researchers are reminded that DFID standard contracts allow researchers to retain all intellectual property rights over the outputs of their research whilst at the same time giving DFID licence to freely use those outputs. Therefore researchers should not pursue publishing options that then prevent DFID using those outputs or versions of them.

38. Researchers are responsible for ensuring they have the necessary permissions to make material available through R4D or other open access repositories and channels. Third party copyright, licensing and embargo policies must be respected.

39. Researchers are encouraged to translate key documents and other media into pertinent languages. All versions should be deposited in R4D.

40. To assist those with limited internet connectivity, researchers and institutions are encouraged to design research outputs (e.g. websites, PDFs) or make available alternative versions that require minimal data download to see and use.

41. DFID considers that costs associated with enabling open access to outputs are a legitimate research expense and will include these in the overall research budget as long as:
   - the costs are proportionate, reasonable and represent value for money
   - existing arrangements and resources at the host institution are used first when available and appropriate; this is to avoid paying twice for services.

42. Researchers will be responsible for directly administering, from their research budget, the payment of any open access fees and costs incurred.

43. Where DFID funds research in collaboration with other donors, these costs are likely to be split between the funders.

Requirements that apply to specific types of output

Peer reviewed journal articles

44. Researchers are required to make peer reviewed journal articles open access. Two routes are available: open access publishing ('gold' open access) or self-archiving ('green' open access). DFID’s preference is for the former.

Gold open access: open access publishing

45. Researchers are encouraged to pursue open access publishing, and have two options:
   - open access journals which make all content freely accessible immediately at the time of on-line publication; this is the preferred option
   - ‘hybrid’ journals in which individual articles are made open access immediately at the time of on-line publication, following payment of a one-off charge.

Both options typically involve the payment of an ‘article processing fee’ (APC). Because DFID will include the cost of APCs in the overall project budget then we expect that authors will follow the ‘gold’ route whenever it is available. At the same time, we do recognise authors are free to choose the journal most appropriate to their needs. Some journals do not offer an open access option. In these circumstances, authors will need to follow the green route.

Green open access: self-archiving

46. Where a publisher or journal does not offer a ‘pay-to-publish’ open access option, then authors are required to make available in R4D a digital version of the research paper within six months of first publication. Exceptionally, a case may be made for a longer delay, most
likely for papers in the arts, humanities and social sciences. This is because we recognise that currently there are fewer opportunities for open access publishing in these areas. However, an embargo longer than six months will have to be agreed by DFID as an exception.

47. The version that is self-archived must have been modified following the journal’s peer review process (sometimes called the ‘post-print’ version), but not necessarily the copy edited and type set journal print version. A version prior to peer review is not sufficient. When self-archiving, researchers must respect the copyright and licensing policies of the journal/publisher.

48. Whichever route is taken (gold or green), if data enters the public domain ahead of publication (e.g. as a conference paper or working paper) then that data is to be available for DFID use.

Faster availability in developing countries

49. When publishing in closed access journals (and so self-archiving within six months), researchers are encouraged to use publishers and journals that enable free or reduced cost access to developing countries (the Policy Implementation Guide gives guidance on locating these). This will make articles available immediately to developing country researchers and others in registered institutions.

Reports and other written material produced by research partners or their institution

50. Researchers and institutions are required to deposit in R4D written outputs not intended for peer review journals as soon as it is feasible to do so. This includes, but is not limited to: reports, conference papers, policy briefs and working papers. Some other written materials produced by research partners, for example event flyers and press releases do not need to be deposited in R4D, but it may in some cases be appropriate to do so where that information cannot be found elsewhere.

51. We expect that a full digital version of books published by the institution will also be deposited in R4D. However, exceptions may be made by DFID where institutions generate important revenue from book sales.

Books and book chapters published by third parties

52. Where a book or book chapter is a primary output of a project (rather than a consolidation of outputs available elsewhere), researchers and institutions are required to make a request to the publisher for the right to make this material open access, even if according to certain restrictions (e.g. following a period of six month publisher exclusivity or within regional limits).

53. Researchers and institutions are therefore not required to make books or book chapters open access, but they are required to show that this avenue had been explored.

54. In any event, when the book is published researchers and institutions are required to deposit in R4D a table of contents and 500 word synopsis of the book/book chapter’s main arguments.

Datasets

56. Datasets (derived or raw) are to be placed in an open access repository, unless a case is made against this in the Access and Data Management Plan and agreed by DFID on grounds of, for example, legal, ethical or commercial constraint.

57. DFID recognises that researchers have a right to a period of exclusive use of the data they generate. However, unless a case is made against this, researchers are required to make datasets available within 12 months of data collection or on publication of outputs underpinned by that data, whichever is sooner. All published results must include information on how to access original, raw datasets (unless exempted by DFID).

58. Where possible, datasets should be deposited in an established discipline or institutional repository. Where no such repository exists, then simple datasets may be deposited in R4D.
59. Researchers or their institutions are required to retain raw datasets for a minimum of five years after the end of the project, and make them available on request, for free, any time after 12 months from data collection (unless exempted by DFID). This applies to all data, whether published or not.

**Video, audio and images**

60. Complete final digital versions of significant video and audio outputs, and image collections, must be open access and available in the public domain. Metadata for all video and audio outputs and image collections must be deposited in R4D.

**Websites**

61. Researchers are required to inform R4D as soon as project websites are established and to inform R4D if the website address changes.

62. For websites that do not fall within the dfid.gov.uk address, research partners/institutions are encouraged to permanently archive project websites and ensure they are openly accessible when the project closes (this is done automatically for websites under dfid.gov.uk and so no further action is required).

**Computer software**

63. The associated source code for software developed from scratch, whether as a major, minor or incidental component of a project, must be deposited in a free/open software archive on project completion. A suitable free/open license must be used that allows anyone to use, copy, modify and distribute the software.

**Implementing the policy**

64. An [implementation guide](https://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/DFIDResearch-Open-and-Enhanced-Access-Implementation-Guide.pdf) is published alongside this policy document. The guide will help researchers meet the policy requirements and recommendations. For further help, DFID research partners may contact their DFID research manager. The general contact point is: openaccess@dfid.gov.uk.

---

Annex: Access and Data Management Plan template

1. The Access and Data Management Plan outlines the researchers’ strategy for maximising opportunities to make research outputs openly accessible, both during the life of the project and for permanent digital access on project closure.

2. When funds are awarded through a competitive tendering process, the Plan will be part of the tender terms of reference and will be assessed as part of the award process. A Plan will usually also be required when competitive tendering is not used, and will form part of the business case for the project.

3. To help complete the template, please refer to the DFID Research Open and Enhanced Access Policy, including the Implementation Guide.

4. Please note that not all sections of the plan will be relevant to all bids/projects. Fill in only those sections that you feel will apply to the research that will be undertaken.

5. The Plan template may be further developed during the inception phase and will be agreed by the relevant DFID research manager. It may be revisited and revised during the course of the project or at annual review as required.

6. If you believe there are good reasons not to make some research outputs openly accessible (on grounds of, for example, security, legal, ethical or commercial constraint), then these must be explained in the Plan. DFID will consider these requests and may grant an exemption.

7. A Word version of the template is available from your DFID research manager.
Access and Data Management Plan

| Project title: | |
| Project lead: | |
| DFID Research Manager: | |
| Person/s with overall responsibility for maximising open access opportunities: | |
| Person/s responsible for depositing metadata and materials in R4D and/or other open access repositories: | |

Describe your host institution’s existing approach to open access (if any) and any arrangements already in place that will help you meet the criteria and objectives of DFID’s policy:

**Journal articles**
Note the likely journals to be used for peer review publications (or the major journals in your field) and the open access policy for these (in brief):

**Datasets**
Note likely data repository/ies for your datasets, as well as any anticipated limits or exclusions to data sharing:

**Video, audio and images**
Explain how video, audio and/or image outputs will be made openly available:

**Websites**
Explain your strategy for permanently archiving project webpages:

**Computer software**
Note repositories that will be used to deposit software:

**Books and book chapters, including those published by third parties**
Explain your strategy for seeking permission to make book/s or book chapters available open access:

**Resources and budget**
Describe resources provided by your host institution for open access activities:

Note the total estimated cost requested from DFID for open access activities detailed in this plan:

Detail how the requested budget for open access activities has been calculated:

What other resources or support will you require to deliver your plan?

**Timeline**
Describe the key milestones during the project when materials will be made open access, with indicative dates:

Describe any other strategies for maximising the accessibility of your outputs not covered above:
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This guide provides information to help researchers and project managers fulfil the requirements and meet the objectives of the DFID Research Open and Enhanced Access Policy. Where queries remain, in the first instance please contact the relevant research manager in DFID.

The guidance maps on to the structure of the policy, with additional material included on deciding on what constitutes an ‘output’ for the purposes of the policy, and on locating open access repositories.

The guidance will evolve as DFID and project partners gain experience with its use. Please contact openaccess@dfid.gov.uk with any suggestions to help improve it.

Guidance on what constitutes an ‘output’

DFID’s open and enhanced access policy covers the whole range of outputs produced by the research we fund. However, projects may well produce more outputs than will be of value to others, for example because those outputs are draft, poor quality, incomplete or better considered rough cuts or ‘inputs’ to a final ‘output’ (for example the complete video recordings that are later cut to produce a short video). Similarly, the project may produce materials that are not research outputs as such, for example brochures, flyers for events or promotional material for books.

Some judgement therefore needs to be made over the materials that will be made permanently and openly available and fall within the policy. The guiding principle is that the outputs made available will be of value and use to others, erring on the side of inclusion over exclusion where difficult judgements are made.

Also see the R4D Editorial Policy.

Guidance on locating repositories

R4D is DFID’s own research repository. At several points within the policy, researchers and institutions are requested or encouraged to deposit material in a suitable subject or institutional repository as well as, or as an alternative to, R4D (guidance on depositing outputs and metadata in R4D is in the section R4D as the central repository below). The number of institutional repositories is growing. When a repository is not available at the host institution, then the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) may help in locating a suitable repository.¹ The directory aims to provide a searchable, global, comprehensive list of manually checked, quality-controlled repositories for academic material of all types.

Further resources to help locate repositories are listed by INASP here.²

¹ www.opendoar.org/
² www.inasp.info/file/befc376be7b821ba0667ba35483234c2/list-of-institutional-repositories.html
Guidance for general open access principles, requirements and recommendations that apply across DFID funded research

Maximise opportunities to make research outputs available for free
The policy takes a broad ‘open knowledge’ perspective. It seeks to promote open access to all results and outputs of the research that RED supports, and puts emphasis on broadening open access beyond open access publishing and depositing data and papers in repositories. Multiple opportunities should be sought to make outputs of all types openly accessible as well as increase the visibility of outputs so that they are more likely to be found.

Design outputs requiring minimal data download to see and use
Minimising the size of digital outputs will increase their accessibility to users with poor internet connectivity and low bandwidth. An overview of low bandwidth-friendly practices is here. A more detailed set of design guidelines, covering website design as well as a variety of digital media that might be made available on websites (such as PDFs, images, audio and video clips) is here.

Value and quality of outputs
See ‘guidance on what constitutes an output’ above.

Access and Data Management Plan
See the Annex in the policy document.

Monitoring cycle
For projects funded by Research and Evidence Division (RED), data on open access activities will be collected during the normal RED project annual review process. Further guidance will be provided at the time of review. Other units within DFID will have their own arrangements for monitoring open access activities.

R4D as the central repository
R4D is DFID’s research repository; a free to access online database containing information about research programmes and projects supported by DFID as well as outputs from those programmes. It currently contains details of current and past research in its repository of over 35,000 project and output records.

Since 2010, R4D has been fully integrated with the DFID website: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/R4D/. Users access its content through browsing or searching the site, via search engines or via subscriptions to various alerts through, for example, the DFID Research Newsletter, RSS, email, Twitter and Facebook.

Researchers should normally notify us of material to add to R4D by use of the online document submission admin system. The general online route to deposit is here.

Using this system for collection of metadata is most likely to result in material being added promptly to R4D. Publications lists may also be emailed to research@cabi.org stating for each list either the ARIES code for the project or the existing R4D Project ID if known.

3 www.inasp.info/file/e02bfffde7fe5319fe06ff05dabd0f152/bmo-guidelines-for-low-bandwidth-websites.html
4 www.aptivate.org/webguidelines/Home.html
5 www.dfid.gov.uk/R4D/AdminLogin.aspx
Peer-Reviewed material metadata should be submitted as soon as possible after publication (plus links to the material) and pdfs should be submitted within six months of publication. R4D displays the archive policy of peer-reviewed journals listed in SHERPA/RoMEO, and the open access status of all articles from open access journals. Relevant non-peer reviewed publications should normally be submitted at least biannually.

Those submitting material on behalf of the programme should check that the material has not already been added to the repository before submission to avoid duplication of effort (exceptionally material may have been added prior to formal submission if DFID has been made aware of an output through other means).

Metadata
Metadata refers to data about digital (and non-digital) materials that can be used to support operations including describing materials, finding materials, managing information, and digital curation of materials. Metadata needs to include information to enable it to be understood and used effectively by others, as well as details on the origin and previous manipulation of data to prevent misuse, misinterpretation or confusion.

The curators of the R4D Repository will enter metadata for each output based on the details provided, at a minimum this must include: details of project to which the output applies (R4D Project ID or ARIES Code), document type, country or countries of relevance, plus citation details.

Creative Commons and ownership of copyright
We suggest that researchers/institutions apply a Creative Commons license to project material that they self-publish (and have copyright control over) or otherwise make available. Information on Creative Commons is available here.⁶ Descriptions of the range of Creative Commons licenses are here.⁷ Of these, we encourage use of the ‘Attribution’ license ‘CC-BY’. This is the most open licence, letting others modify, build upon and/or distribute the licensed work (including for commercial purposes) as long as the original author is credited.

We discourage the use of the ‘Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs’ (CC BY-NC-ND) license, because this prevents users from altering or using the work to make other works.

A tool to assist choosing an appropriate Creative Commons license is here.⁸ A Creative Commons FAQ is here.⁹

Permissions
Authors should have secured permission for anything they pass on for inclusion on R4D. R4D does not curate copyright information in its metadata for materials held. Please note that R4D operates a take-down policy when notified that it doesn’t have permission to republish material.

---

⁶ [http://creativecommons.org/](http://creativecommons.org/)
⁷ [http://creativecommons.org/licenses/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/)
⁸ [http://creativecommons.org/choose/](http://creativecommons.org/choose/)
⁹ [http://wiki.creativecommons.org/FAQ#What_are_the_terms_of_a_Creative_Commons_license](http://wiki.creativecommons.org/FAQ#What_are_the_terms_of_a_Creative_Commons_license)
Open access costs
The main direct cost to projects of this policy is connected to open access publishing (gold open access). Open access journals, or those operating an ‘author pays’ or ‘hybrid’ model, commonly require a fee, usually called the article processing fee (or APC). Fees range from around £800 to £2000 and, in the case of ‘author pays’, may be on top of any standard article processing fees charged by the journal. The section peer reviewed journal articles below discusses this further, including how to locate open access and hybrid journals.

The Access and Data Management Plan asks for an estimate of the resources required to support open access activities. Any resources requested for open access activities should be reasonable and fully justified and will be subject to value for money considerations in the assessment of applications in the same way as other directly incurred costs. Recognising that these are just estimates, revisions may be discussed as the project develops.

Guidance on requirements that apply to specific types of output

Peer reviewed journal articles
Gold open access refers to the immediate availability of a publication free of charge on the publisher’s or journal’s website. Gold routes to open access include publishing in an open access journal (which is likely to charge an article processing fee) or through an ‘author pays’ (or ‘hybrid’) model which enables authors to publish articles in traditional subscription journals on an immediate open access basis following payment of a fee.

The policy favours the former model - use of open access journals. This is because using open access journals is likely to encourage this publishing model, which is less restrictive than the hybrid model. A list of open access journals is maintained here. However, this database does not include hybrid journals, and an increasing number of journals offer an author pays option which authors may wish to explore.

If researcher’s don’t pursue gold open access, then they must pursue green open access; that is, self-archive a ‘post-print’ copy of an article within six months of first publication. Post-print here means a final draft, revised after peer review, but not necessarily the publisher’s version. This means the content is the same as the final published version, even if the appearance is different. We request that the paper is deposited with R4D; researchers may make their post-print copy available on their own website or a suitable institutional or subject based repository as well. Researchers must however check any limitations imposed by the publisher: some publishers have rules on where post-print papers may be published.

The searchable RoMEO database holds publishers’ copyright conditions as they relate to authors archiving their work on-line. Use RoMEO to search for a publisher, or a particular journal, to see rights which are assigned to publishers and rights which are retained by the author. RoMEO uses a colour coding system to highlight publisher’s archiving policies. To comply with green open access as defined above, then the publisher must be green or blue in RoMEO. The RoMEO colour coding system used to indicate the archiving policy for a particular journal is also used on R4D.

---

10 www.doaj.org/
11 www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/
The RoMEO database also shows when an author pays open access option is available. This information is also organised by publisher [here](#) and includes an indication of how much it might cost.\(^\text{12}\)

Note that it is unlikely that the RoMEO database contains every journal or publisher that researchers may wish to use. Where this is the case, then it will be down to authors to check the policies of that journal/publisher.

DFID welcomes the retrospective submission of post-print copies of journal articles, where currently only the metadata exists on R4D and there is no full text access (subject to usual permissions having been obtained).

When publishing in a closed access journal (and so choosing to pursue green open access), researchers are encouraged to use publishers that enable free or reduced cost access to journal content for developing countries. There are several schemes that negotiate with publishers to provide this access, with lists of participating publishers and journals are on their websites, including:

- **AGORA** for food, agriculture, environmental science and related social sciences\(^\text{13}\)
- **HINARI** for biomedical and health literature\(^\text{14}\)
- **OARE** for environment research\(^\text{15}\)

In a similar vein, INASP works with publishers to enable their online resources to be made available to researchers in developing and emerging countries, freely or with deeply discounted access. The full list of publishers is available [here](#).\(^\text{16}\) The INASP project [Journals Online](#) supports national and regional platforms (JOLs) for online publication of journals.\(^\text{17}\) Over 80% of participating journals are freely available full-text.

Note however that publishers may vary content by country and over time. Using a publisher participating in one of these schemes is no guarantee that content will always be available, and available to all low and middle income countries. This is another reason that open access publishing is the preferred option.

**Reports and other written material produced by the project or institution (‘grey literature’)**

This is material over which the author or their host institution retains copyright because they are the owners and publishers of the material. As outlined above, we encourage the use of creative commons licenses to remove doubt and enable open access to, and the right to reuse or redistribute that material.

**Books and book chapters published by third parties**

This section refers to books and chapters published by third parties and which are a primary research output, rather than a consolidation of materials (e.g. journal papers, case studies) published previously and elsewhere and so already covered by other aspects of the policy.

Some countries operate legal deposit libraries that receive a copy of every book published in that country. Where this is done, that item is then in principle openly

---

\(^{12}\) [www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PaidOA.html](#)

\(^{13}\) [www.aginternetwork.org/en/index.jsp](#)

\(^{14}\) [www.who.int/hinari/en/](#)

\(^{15}\) [www.oaresciences.org/en/](#)

\(^{16}\) [www.inasp.info/file/0bf4173e84e076b39ba98c46a0636972/publishers-in-perii.html](#)

\(^{17}\) [www.inasp.info/file/4fd988568504d4bcfa2f4cd855a07d45/jols.html](#)
available to others in that country. In practice however there is likely to be a cost of obtaining books on loan from legal deposit libraries. Therefore whilst these libraries serve as book archives, they are not usually openly accessible as we have defined them (i.e. without price barriers).

We require that researchers/institutions negotiate with publishers to retain copyright and to make the book/book chapter in part or whole open access, even if according to certain restrictions such as following a period of publisher exclusivity or within regional limits, or on payment of a fee (see Open access costs above).

When a book is published by a third party with no open access arrangements, we recommend that authors negotiate a buy-back option to purchase copies at reduced price to distribute to individuals and institutions at the authors’ discretion.

Datasets
Researchers and institutions are requested to deposit datasets in a suitable subject or institutional repository. The Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) may help in locating a suitable repository. The Directory provides a global, comprehensive list of manually checked, quality-controlled repositories for academic material. Users can search by a range of variables including country, subject and content type. Suitable repositories may also be available through the members of the ICSU World Data System.

Further resources for help locating repositories are listed by INASP here.

The advantage of using established repositories is that they are likely to have in place the infrastructure required to curate complex as well as simple datasets, and have standards and conditions for depositing material. This helps ensure that datasets are readily discovered, accessed and used. Metadata for all datasets should be included in R4D.

Where no suitable repository is available, simple datasets may be deposited with R4D here. Alternatively, this may be an opportunity to establish an archive at the host institution. For those in developing countries, INASP (International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications) offers training in creating open access institutional repositories; see here.

A discussion on the distinction between raw and derived data, as well as options available to share datasets and good practice in the curation of datasets is in the report To Share or not to Share: Publication and Quality Assurance of Research Data Outputs (RIN 2008).

Video, audio and images
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The host institution may have suitable tools in place for making video, audio and image outputs freely available. Where this is not the case, we suggest using appropriate third party tools such as YouTube, Audioboo and Flickr.

Metadata for all video and audio outputs and online image collections must be deposited in R4D.

Websites
Where the website domain is on www.dfid.gov.uk, The National Archives will snapshot and archive every page of the site several times a year. This is an automatic process and no additional work is required.

Where the website domain is outside dfid.gov.uk, then we encourage pursuit of permanent, open access archiving. For example:
- Host institutions may already have a web archiving process in place
- UK based websites may be nominated for permanent archive to the UK Web Archive
- Websites may have been archived automatically through the Internet Archive. It is possible to view archived web pages using the Wayback Machine, currently on the Internet Archive home page. The Internet Archive also offers a subscription service for institutions to archive websites and other digital material. These are then made accessible to the general public with full-text search. (However, the perpetual future stability of the Internet Archive cannot be guaranteed.)

Computer software
The PLoS (Public Library of Science) software policy lists software archives that meet their standards here. These may be suitable for software produced by RED projects. Otherwise, Wikipedia lists and compares many free software hosting facilities.

No single license is appropriate for all research projects. Licenses from the Open Source Initiative or the GNU Project, although they differ in approach, are suitable.
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