

## **BERLIN 7 OPEN ACCESS CONFERENCE, DEC 2-4, 2009, PARIS**

Session „Practical challenges in moving to Open Access: a focus on research funders and universities“, Dec 3, 2009, 11:00-13:00

Chair: Fred Friend (JISC)

Notes taken by Anja Lengenfelder, Max Planck Digital Library, with additional text supplied by Fred Friend, JISC.

### **Introduction**

Fred Friend provided some background information on Knowledge Exchange as a co-operation between JISC, SURF, DFG and DEFF. Knowledge Exchange recognises that while Open Access can bring benefits to all stakeholders, there are challenges in implementing open access and we want to describe how the challenges can be met. The session was divided into three sections

- a) benefits to institutions
- b) funding for gold open access models
- c) how to bring about open access mandates.

### **Section 1: Benefits to Institutions**

#### **John Houghton**

**“What do recent studies tell funders and institutions about the costs and benefits for them?”**

Many studies on open access exist, but they mainly focus on journals, not on system-wide costs. The RIN report carried out by CEPA focused on publication, distribution and access, but did not look at research costs. Studies on subscription and journal publishing costs show a potential for cost reduction.

John has done his own study on “Economic implications of alternative scholarly publishing models: Exploring the costs and benefits” for JISC; scenarios considered are moving to e-only, moving to author pays, paying for peer review, increase in research funding. The first result from the research is that alternative publishing models including author pays-models can make a difference to costs and benefits and lead to increased use of research. By looking at the whole system costs, one can move away from rather simplistic views such as that open access will be more expensive for research intensive universities.

What are the implications for institutions? That depends on the kind of institution and on their activities, e.g. if the activities include being a university publisher or running a repository. Returns to R&D can be very different. The implications for funders are greater accessibility and increasing efficiency. In response to the statement that author-pay-fees are greater than current subscription costs, Houghton responded that the statement is not true, e.g. because library costs – including staff costs - need also to be considered when making a calculation.

The Houghton model is a study activity model, demonstrating how the process can be reengineered. Many universities have universities presses, IRs or even SRs, and the actual return by a complete shift to Open Access in R&D will be very different according to the situation, for example on medical studies up to 400% against an average of 20% across the

board. Implications for institutions are therefore very different; you have to study the activity of a given institution to answer the question “what benefits does open access bring to the institution”. Therefore the online model was set up so that institutions can test out the situation for themselves.

## **Alma Swan** **“Modelling Open Access for Institutions”**

Alma Swan presented an analysis of activities within an institution and shows how to attach costs (related) to all of these activities. That is essential for the cost and benefit analysis for an institution. The basis for the cost models is provided by the following economic studies: CEPA 2008; the “Houghton studies”; information system perspective (Björk 2007); the LIFE Project with its focus on preservation.

The “Houghton Model” differentiates between three models - toll access, gold OA and green OA – and the green OA model contains two options, either in parallel to subscription journals (i.e. authors self-archive “copies” of the officially published article), or instead of subscription journals repositories collect the content and provide overlay services on top of that content. The second Green OA option is already working, e.g. arXiv in physics where publishers collect articles from arXiv and include it in the publishing process.

For the analysis of modelling the transition to open access, the following data (not costs, but data) are required: research related, library-related, and repository-related. So, for example in the library-related area, not only costs but also the time to check in a journal will be included within the calculation.

For a JISC project Alma Swan has been collecting data from four UK universities, each different in their annual research budgets. In respect of cash modelling, graphs show the potential savings for a university with various gold and green open access scenarios. One scenario is if there were to be a complete transition to Gold OA but at different fee levels. The conclusion from the data is that in cash terms gold open access may not work out for some universities if the OA publication fee rises above a certain level. Other scenarios can also be presented covering both forms of green open access. In making the calculations, it has to be recognised that money comes in from funders, such as Wellcome Trust, not only from the university.

The non-cash benefits of open access also have to be recognised. The number of citations is likely to rise over time. It has been suggested that the advantage from OA will disappear when everybody practices OA, but the early OA advantage will remain. A recent study from CERN suggests that citation starts before publication. Within the knowledge triangle (Research – Knowledge – Innovation) universities contribute especially to research & knowledge. However, some studies have criticized universities for not contributing to innovation properly: SMEs don't get enough knowledge out from the research institutions and higher research institutes.

Alma Swan also considered the issue of increased research funding due to OA. Queensland University of Technology introduced an open access mandate in 2004 and articles were put in the repository. This led to a steep increase in research funding; compared to the general increase of research income (general 68%) this for QUT has risen significantly more (132%). This increase is not only due to public money, but also due to money from the industry. Open Access and thus greater visibility seems to be one reason for this.

## Section 2: Funding agencies on Gold OA

**Wolfram Horstmann**

### “Researchers’ institutional support for OA publication costs”

Questions that had to be answered at Bielefeld University were about the local effects of large scale initiatives, such as BMC membership for the University of Bielefeld and Springer Open Choice as an option for their scholars.

The background to these decisions was an OA resolution in July 2005, leading to massive repository activities and participation in the PEER project and in the DRIVER project. There were a variety of OA activities, including publishing in subject repositories and publishing OA journals. BMC prepay membership library usage has consistently risen from 2003 (2 articles) to 2008 (50 articles). Wolfram made a suggestion that institutions should create OA publication funds which would be balanced across the disciplines. These funds would lower the barriers for researchers to actually practice OA.

The principles for distributing publication fund money at Bielefeld are that authors’ decisions where to publish are untouched, adopting “Help the poor” as a motto to support OA where it is most needed, allocating funds on a “first come, first served” basis due to the limitation on available funds, and using a lightweight administration. No large scale announcements about the availability of the OA funds were made and there have been 30 claims so far of which 50% were approved. More direct contacts with researches are required to identify their needs. The funds for 2010 have been approved.

The claim process only involves one phone call and two-e-mails by the researcher and when the author receives the invoice s/he sends it direct to the library. Experience so far is that mainly pure OA journals were chosen by authors, only a few hybrids. Also with the institutional support the conversion to OA of a journal was achieved. One problem area is that rich projects asked for support but had to pay themselves in the end as funds are limited.

Does the existence of the funds change the publishing behaviour? Yes, change is an intended effect. The existence of the funds has enriched the support for researchers and helped in structuring the negotiation with publishers and administration.

**Johannes Fournier, Anita Eppelin**

### “Gold OA Charges at the national and institutional level in Germany”

There is collaboration on the topic of gold OA charges at the national level in Germany through the Alliance of German Research Organizations. All German policies support both the green and the golden road to OA. Not all gold OA costs money, e.g. it can be achieved through institutions employing editorial staff and through not asking for fees from the authors.

Johannes described three support models.

*Example 1: Model (MPS) central contract with a publishing house*

e.g. PLoS: PLoS send invoice to MPDL, PLoS gets from MPDL list of all MPIs, MPDL verifies authors and covers publication charges.

*Example 2: Fraunhofer Publication funds*

Authors apply directly for OA funds. Central unit checks if authors are entitled and only 4 questions to be checked: is the journal truly OA, does it have quality control, has the journal existed for three years or more, and does the journal publish on a regular basis? Tis model is flexible in that it supports the publication of books as well as journals.

### *Example 3: DFG's funding instrument (OA Publishing)*

A university is given money but needs to set up structures so that authors within the university can apply for OA publication. This option is only for true OA journals, and 25% of the cost needs to be provided by the university. The aim is to create fixed budgets for OA publications at universities.

Some problems being experienced are that funding models are not implemented broadly, that researchers are unaware of funding opportunities, and a general lack of experience in using the funding models. What is needed is an overview of the existing funding models, to give others better support and to move towards a comprehensive picture of Gold OA monetary flows.

To improve the current situation there are plans for a large survey on Gold OA by the Alliance, to be completed by more than 100 universities in Germany and non-university institutions (MPS, Fraunhofer, Helmholtz, etc.). The aims are to identify potentials and to collect political arguments for a shifting of subsidies. Designated responsibilities are needed within the organisations and a better exchange of best practices. The monitoring of cash flows is necessary to avoid double payment etc. An aim is to offer a support service for authors. In general there needs to be better and more coordinated planning for Germany to take advantage of gold OA opportunities.

### **Kurt de Belder (UKB)**

#### **“A national deal with Springer: an institutional view of national transition arrangements for Gold OA”**

The background is that publishers such as Springer receive low number of hybrid OA article submissions. Talks with Springer started in 2006, and a letter of intent was agreed on 27 June 2007. The objectives are:

- authors gain experience in OA publishing but with already existing journals
- more large scale implementation of OA
- experience of consequences for all stakeholders involved.

Big deal with Springer: payments for subscriptions to be translated into open access fees; in addition free Open Choice articles for all authors affiliated to Dutch institutions were already included. The experiment ran for one year under the following conditions: 2006 numbers were taken as a basis, i.e. 1162 Dutch articles with Springer. The bandwidth for automatic Open Choice was set at up to 1250 articles (has been handled very flexible by the partners). Author will have option to choose Open Choice or not.

The success criteria were to be for Springer that more articles were published, that authors might choose different journals in which to publish, and a growth in citations. The success criterion for UKB was that authors and university administrations gained more awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of the OA model. No complete report on the results is available yet, but in 2007 1443 OA articles were published, in 2008 1494 articles, and in 2009 up to the beginning of December 1417 articles. An author is not aware before submitting that there might be an Open Access option for him/her as the announcement is dependent upon acceptance of the paper. University libraries have not promoted this scheme on a large scale and further analysis of the results needs to be carried out.

Many funders have established OA funds (e.g. NSF) but the Netherlands do not pay any extra money with this deal. In the negotiation this year for the big deal with Springer the idea is to turn the scheme around and say “Pay for Open Choice and get the rest of the content for free.” UKB also wants to experiment with other publishers.

## Section 3: Implementing mandates

**Robert Kiley**

### **“Improving compliance with the OA mandate: a work-in-progress report from the Wellcome Trust”**

Funders, researchers and publishers are the three actors within this mandate. Wellcome Trust has concentrated on the Golden Road since this road is preferred by authors and often the only road to open access. OA mandate conditions for WT grantees are that all output must be in UKPMC within 6 months either by publishing in a full OA or hybrid journal, or by self-archiving into UKPMC. Otherwise the author needs to find a different publisher. The current result of that policy is that 43 % of Wellcome publications are available in UKPMC after 6 months.

Funders have to be explicit how they will address OA funding; they need to develop guidelines and/or dedicated budgets. It is also necessary to check compliance and enforce sanctions (e.g. hold back further funding until all previous papers are in UK PMC). A Letter from Wellcome Trust to Vice Chancellors has led to a significant increase of authors' depositions into UKPMC; the message in the letter was that deposit is not a “nice to have” but a strict requirement. In parallel with an increase in content, new services such as text mining are being developed by UKPMC.

Experience shows that for the roles of researchers and institutions, good communication is absolutely necessary. The benefits of open access have to be demonstrated. Also there is a need to establish mechanisms to split up OA fees proportionately between funders when there is joint funding of research. For the role of publishers, researchers need them to clarify and standardize their OA policies. There are many different nuances in publishers' policies and researchers are not interested in the nuances because they find the process too difficult. There is a need to simplify the process for Gold OA options, e.g. with Elsevier authors can tick box and get easy instructions and as a result submissions have risen. It is a key requirement to make the relationship between subscription and open access fees explicit. It has to be absolutely clear that there is no double dipping. Only transparency in the monetary flows can clear this up. There is also a need to provide tools for institutions to track status of submitted articles to OA journal (e.g. has it been deposited in an IR already?).

**William Nixon**

### **“A research institution's view of their role in OA mandates and policies: using the institutional repository”**

Universities can help funders implement mandates by asking authors to deposit in the IR (or in *The Depot* for authors without IR), by minimizing the effort for self-archiving, by reporting funders' outputs for better monitoring, by having a local publication policy (mandate), by advocacy to raise awareness. The clarity of the mandate and associated policies are most crucial and local OA funds need to be provided. One observation from Glasgow is that researchers nowadays don't ask why open access or why deposit, they just want to know how to do it.

There are infrastructure implications, as all parts of the university become engaged in an OA mandate (faculty, library, IT staff). Library staff need to remind authors of their OA obligation. The outputs from projects need to be linked to authors and funders. The university should be proactive so that compliance with funders policies is assured

Concerns expressed by authors are about copyright, and about how the data and full-text will be seen and accessed. Funders need to set up clear policies and guidance on OA and also add their policies to the SHERPA Juliet web-site. Universities need to be able to integrate mandate requirements into workflows. Rewarding research and the fostering of OA are shared goals within a university. The main message is for funders, institutions and publishers to be clear on all details of their OA policies and practices.

**Bernard Rentier**

**Mandating open access at the Université de Liège (presentation by video link)**

The Open Access mandate at Liege from November 26, 2008 led to 25000 deposits in IR in a single year, 7500 of which have a full text. The only official list of publications used for the evaluation of academic staff is generated out of the IR. It takes 15-20 minutes to deposit per paper, which is still too long. Authors soon realized that the reading of their work and citations grew quickly. Every university has to be equipped with an IR as every researcher belongs to one scholarly entity (not to funders). The model should be deposit locally, then harvest to collect for subject repositories. The EOS (Enabling Open Scholarship) group has a website designed to convince higher authorities in universities to join the IR network.