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1. **Sponsors**
	1. Research Councils UK (RCUK)
		1. Seven United Kingdom Research Councils fund the majority of UK university research
		2. Annual budget over £2.8 billion
	2. Wellcome Trust
		1. The largest independent medical research charity in the UK
		2. Annual grants of over £600 million
		3. Pioneer and trendsetter of open access to the research
2. **New Open Access Mandates**
	1. A new common policy due to come into force on the 1st April 2013
	2. Authors are required either to publish with open access (gold) or to self-archive (green)
	3. Open access publications must be under a Creative Commons Attribution licence.
		1. Wellcome Trust additionally requires the publishers to deposit articles in Europe PMC at the time of publication
	4. Self-archiving:
		1. Accepted version or better
		2. Must be available for non-commercial re-use (i.e. CC-BY-NC or equivalent or better)
		3. Embargoes of 6 or 12 months tolerated, depending on the Research Council.
3. **Bewildering complexity of publishers’ open access policies**
	1. Gold open access
		1. Is the journal an open access journal?, or
		2. Is there a paid OA option?
		3. What are the fees (if any)?
		4. What CC licence is it published under?
	2. Green
		1. Does the author retain copyright?
		2. What version(s) can be archived? – Accepted and/or Publisher’s version/PDF
		3. Is there an embargo?
			1. Does it comply with the funder’s policy?
		4. Are there special arrangements
			1. For the specific funder?
			2. For funders generally?
		5. Is the journal a full member of Europe PMC/Pubmed Central?
	3. Are all the publisher’s policies clearly defined?
	4. Are the publisher’s policies known at all?
4. **SHERPA/RoMEO**
	1. Most publishers’ copyright and open access policies are in SHERPA/RoMEO
	2. These are standardised to a degree, but still require interpretation by authors
	3. There are hundreds of combinations and permutations of funders’ mandate requirements *versus* publishers’ policies.
	4. Information professionals can struggle, so how can the poor academic cope?
5. **CRC Commissioned to create a Funders & Authors Compliance Tool - FACT**
	1. Must be simple to use
	2. Authors:
		1. Select their funder
		2. Specify their journal
		3. Optionally say where they are in the publication cycle
	3. FACT tells them:
		1. If the journal complies with their funder’ s mandate
		2. Which compliant methods are available – gold and/or green
		3. Which method to choose, if the funder has a preference
		4. How the journal is compliant or non-compliant for each of these methods
		5. What to do next, depending on the stage in the publication cycle
			1. FACT should normally be used before submitting for publication
	4. Therefore FACT interprets RoMEO data, rather than just displaying it.
	5. Development entailed gathering/handling new data not already in RoMEO – e.g. Gold CC licences and fees, PMC membership
	6. Short development timescale
6. **The FACT “App”**
	1. <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/fact/>
		1. Currently a test version. This may or may not be the final URL
		2. Reviewers: Please do not disseminate this URL until FACT has been officially released, no later than the 2nd April 2013.
	2. An API will be available
7. **Progress**
	1. Testing at the time of submission of this conference paper proposal
	2. FACT **will** be released by the 2nd April 2013 at the latest
	3. This paper will discuss:
		1. Issues encountered during development of FACT – data and technical
		2. Issues involving the funders
		3. The response of publishers
		4. The legislative debate
		5. Take-up by academics, research managers and repository administrators
		6. Lessons learned
8. **The Future**
	1. How FACT can be improved in the light of experience
	2. Implications for the SHERPA/RoMEO and SHERPA/JULIET databases
	3. FACT opportunities for other funders