UUK Open Access Group

Some Key Developments since May 2014

Introduction

1. This short paper outlines some key developments since the Group last met at the end of May. It does not aim to be comprehensive (there may be more developments in Open Access Week, after this paper has been finalised); and while it covers some significant developments overseas, its primary focus is on the UK.

Policy developments in the UK

2. The major policy development has been the announcement in September by Arthritis Research UK, Breast Cancer Campaign, the British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Leukaemia & Lymphoma Research and the Wellcome Trust of the Charity Open Access Fund (COAF)[1]. The fund has been established for an initial two-year period, and will operate in a similar way to the Wellcome Trust's established scheme of block grants to institutions to meet the costs of APCs for articles arising from projects funded by one of the consortium partners.

3. The UK Government has made no policy recent announcements relating to open access (OA). The resignation of David Willetts and the untimely death of Ron Egginton (the two of whom led the development of policy at Government level), along with the lead-up to the General Election, probably makes it unlikely that any more significant announcements will be made on the issue. Gavin Copeland has taken over Ron Egginton's responsibilities at BIS for matters relating to OA and open data.

4. The major development for universities, publishers, and other agencies has surrounded preparations for implementing the policies for OA in the next REF, which are seen as surpassing in reach and importance any other policies. At the same time, they have been submitting evidence to the independent review of the implementation of RCUK's OA policies (see below).

Publishers and intermediaries

5. Major publishers have continued to launch new fully-OA journals. Elsevier has launched 110 over the past two years, while SpringerOpen now has over 160 fully-OA

---

[1] http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Charity-open-access-fund/index.htm

journals, and a further 265 at BioMedCentral. Recent launches include *Geo: Geography and Environment* (Wiley and the Royal Geographical Society); *Research in Mathematical Sciences* (Springer); and *Pleura* (SAGE with the International Society of Pleural Diseases); while Taylor and Francis's Cogent OA imprint has grown to 15 titles covering areas from medicine and engineering to the arts and humanities. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) currently shows just over 10,000 titles, some 300 more than in May.

6. Other notable developments include the Royal Society of Chemistry's decision to shift its flagship journal, *Chemical Science*, to OA from January 2015, while waiving all APCs for a period of two years; NPG's decision to move *Nature Communications*, the online-only hybrid journal it launched in 2010, to fully-OA status from 20 October; and the formal launch of the Royal Society's new journal *Open Science* in September.

7. A new version of the guide '*How Open Is It'* has been published by SPARC, PLOS and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA). A new aggregator of OA articles both from fully-OA and hybrid journals, called Paperity, launched in October. It currently provides access to 160k articles from 2k journals, and aims to cover all OA articles in the next two years. It claims to be the first aggregator to cover all disciplines in this way (PubMed Central covering only the life sciences and medicine).

8. Several publishers have reported increases in the numbers of articles published under Gold OA terms including the payment of an APC. Taylor and Francis, for instance, reports an increase of 77% in payments of APCs for articles in hybrid journals in the period August 2013 to July 2014, as compared to the equivalent period in 2012-13. Increases were significantly higher for corresponding authors from the US (121%) and Europe (90%) than from the UK (36%). Wiley similarly reports sharp growth in take-up of hybrid OA options in the US and Germany as well as in the UK.

9. We shall not know with certainty about trends in the take-up of Gold OA – or indeed any other form of OA – until the kind of study discussed at the last meeting is undertaken. There are signs, however, of significant differences across journals, sectors and disciplines, with solid growth in some areas accompanied by fluctuations in others, including the biggest journal of all, PLOS ONE.

10. Nearly all publishers are struggling with how best to adapt their systems and workflows for OA and hybrid journals so that they deal more effectively with what some have characterised as a shift from a business to business (ie library) model to a business to consumer (ie author) model. Developing and implementing new systems to handle what is still for most publishers a relatively small part of their business is still work in progress in most cases. Among the solutions adopted have been the Copyright Clearance Center's RightsLink for Open Access platform which integrates payment of APCs with editorial and production workflows (adopted by the American Chemical Society, De Gruyter and Many Publishing among others), and Wiley's Open

[Access Account Dashboard](#) which enables institutions and funders to control APC funds online. Publishers are also engaged with many of the infrastructure and service initiatives mentioned below.

Directory services

11. On a much broader scale, the ISSN International Centre has launched with the support of UNESCO, a beta version of a Directory of Open Access Scholarly Resources ([ROAD](#)). This provides free access to a subset of the ISSN Register , comprising bibliographic records for scholarly OA resources which have been assigned an ISSN by the ISSN Network : journals, conference proceedings and academic repositories. ROAD records are also downloadable as a MARC XML dump and will be available as RDF triples. The bibliographic records are enriched, when appropriate, by metadata about the coverage of the resources by indexing, abstracting, citation databases, registries and journal indicators.

12. The proclaimed purpose is fourfold:

   ❑ to provide a single access point to different types of online scholarly resources published worldwide and freely available.

   ❑ to provide information about the quality and prominence of OA resources, or at least the criteria they meet, by indicating by what services or journal indicators they are covered

   ❑ to give an overview of OA scholarly production worldwide

   ❑ to demonstrate new ways of using the ISSN for compiling information from various sources.

13. The functionality is impressive, but it must be emphasised that the data is at title, not article level.

RCUK Review

14. The independent review of the implementation of RCUK's OA policies was launched in June, and the Review Panel chaired by Professor Sir Robert Burgess met for the first time on 27 June[2]. A call for evidence was issued in July, with a deadline of 12 September, by which time 92 submissions were received. The submissions will eventually be made public, and many organisations – learned societies, publishers and universities - have already made theirs available on their websites. The panel is

---

[2] For information about the review, including membership of the panel and its terms of reference, along with a note of its first meeting, see http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/openaccess/2014-independent-review-of-implementation/

holding a series of oral evidence sessions in October and November, and the Panel aims to produce its report by the early spring of 2015.

15. Key issues that have been raised in the submissions that are available in the public domain have included:

- ❑ *Administrative complexity* associated with decision-making relating to different policies (on the part of funders, universities and publishers) and OA options; to universities' tracking of publication activity by their researchers; to handling of APC payments and deposit in repositories, especially but not solely with regard to multi-author publications; and to monitoring compliance. Related to these concerns is a need recognised by all parties for better and interoperable systems via which data can be efficiently exchanged between them.

- ❑ *Costs and funding*, where universities and learned/professional societies seek greater transparency from publishers, particularly in relation to offsets between APC and subscription costs; where there are concerns from some universities about the difference between APC prices for fully-OA and hybrid journals; where there remain concerns about potential funding shortfalls; and where less-research-intensive institutions raise concerns about funding inequities.

- ❑ *Non-alignment between policies*, sometimes referred to as 'mandate messiness'. Some responses urge RCUK to change its policy so that it aligns with the Funding Councils'.

- ❑ *Embargoes*, where there are conflicts of view as to the reasonableness and/or viability of short, especially 6 month, embargoes

- ❑ *Subject and institutional repositories,* where several responses point to the Funding Councils' requirement that publications should be deposited in institutional repositories, and the difference between that requirement and RCUK's; where there are concerns about different versions of publications; where there is common recognition of the need for better systems of deposit; and where there are strong views in the life sciences in particular about the value of subject-based repositories (essentially Europe PubMedCentral) as distinct from institutional repositories.

- ❑ *Awareness and communications*, where there is widespread recognition that many researchers have only a hazy understanding at best of OA, and that more needs to be done in the way of effective communications from all parties. There are particular concerns about different levels of awareness and understanding in different disciplines

- ❑ *Pace of transition*, where there is a common view that it is still too early to get reliable data on key issues.

Infrastructure, standards and services

16.   An updated version of the Open Access Button was issued in October. The Button searches the web for a version of any paper a user wishes to access, and if one is not available, emails the author and looks for more information about the paper.

17.   Europe PubMed Central has introduced this month Evidence Finder as a new way of searching, which involves the surfacing of 'facts' based on biological concepts.

18.   A number of bodies are working at national and international levels on standards and related issues.

      a.   The National Information Standards Organisation (NISO)'s *Accessibility and Licensing Indicators Working Group* has been considering over the summer the responses to a draft issued earlier in the year on recommended practice for metadata relating to access status and licence terms for journal articles. A final document is expected soon. This work has had implications for Jisc's work on Vocabularies for OA (V4OA) and also for the release of version 2.0 of its RIOXX application profile, which focuses on consistency in the metadata fields used to record research funder and project/grant identifiers, and thus provides a mechanism for institutional repositories to use in tracking publications. RIOXX will now subsume the V4OA work, which is recommending adoption of the NISO identifiers. Hence the release of RIOXX 2.0 is being delayed until the NISO recommendations are finalised. Jisc has been discussing with the CORE project, which aggregates OA content from repositories and journals, how to translate harvested RIOXX records into metadata that will be passed to the European OpenAire project which facilitates access to OA content across Europe.

      b.   Also on metadata and standards, Jisc has established working groups with the *Consortia Advancing Standards in Research Administration Information (CASRAI)* to reach agreement on vocabularies and metadata for reporting on OA more widely. In the meantime, the final report of the *UK Research Information Shared Service* was issued in August, with proposals for a comprehensive model for research reporting in the UK.

19.   Jisc has moved forward with a number of projects to develop services to help universities implement OA[3].

---

[3] Useful summaries of Jisc activities can be found in tabular form at http://scholarlycommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2014/08/Jisc-Scholarly-Communications-Roadmap-20140804.pdf ; and in more detail in a recent presentation at http://openaccess.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2014/10/Jisc-REF-OA-workflows-workshop1.pptx

a. Jisc Monitor was initiated in May as a one-year project to explore through interactions with a wide range of interested groups the development of services in four areas:

    i.   tracking publication activity across an institution

    ii. monitoring compliance with funder policies

    iii. expenditure on APCs (where it will make use of the outputs from the Jisc-APC project)

    iv. interoperability to facilitate efficient exchange of data.

    The aim is to scope and build by May 2015 'proof of concept' prototypes to respond to specific use cases. The project has held initial workshops and built up a corpus of user stories as well as a logical data model.

b. The Jisc Publications Router, formerly called Repository Junction Broker, automates delivery of publications from multiple sources to multiple repositories. Jisc is discussing with publishers and universities how this will work in a pilot of automatic notification and deposit of accepted manuscripts into repositories.

c. Jisc published in June the report of its study into the feasibility of establishing an aggregation of OA content from repositories in the UK, termed an Open Mirror. It identifies significant barriers in the way of creating such an aggregation, and suggests some actions that might begin to make it easier.

d. Sherpa FACT, where steps continue to enhance the accuracy of the data, in the light of continuing concerns among some publishers and also universities about inaccuracies, and therefore the reliance that can be placed on the service. It is planned that the service should cover the OA requirements for the REF; and a new API is due to be issued in December.

e. The Jisc-ARMA ORCID pilot project was launched in May, with the aim of streamlining the implementation ORCID across the HE sector, with an assessment of different systems and workflows, as well as of costs and benefits, , including the possibility of national ORCID membership. The project is due to be completed in January 2015.

f. Nine pathfinder projects have been launched, with the involvement of 30 universities to develop and share models of good practice in implementing funders' OA requirements. The projects will run until June 2016.

g. Jisc Collections has also been gathering information from over 20 universities on their expenditure on APCs, subscriptions, and OA-related administration to provide input into modelling for its *Total Cost of Ownership* project. A report on the challenges of data collection and processing has been published.

And some of the data has been used for a forthcoming paper by Stephen Pinfield et al (see below).

Recent Reports

Taylor and Francis surveys of authors and of learned societies

20.   Taylor and Francis issued in June the [results](#)[4] of a second survey of *authors' attitudes towards OA*, following an initial survey in 2013. The responses show some rise in the numbers of those who think that OA provides wider circulation and higher visibility, and a corresponding decline in those who think that OA offers no benefits. Nearly half (47%), however, were unsure whether they would make their next publication Gold OA, and while 46% said they would make their next publication Green OA, 41% were unsure. Uncertainty about publishers' policies is still a major barrier, and licensing remains contentious: CCBY was the least favoured option, with respondents showing a strong preference for more restrictive licences.

21.   In a [subset](#) of the survey, UK authors were asked about the RCUK policy. The results were mixed: 62% said they were aware of it, but 38% were not; and only 43% of those who were aware of the policy indicated that they understood it, and only 22% thought it was easy to comply. Just over half (53%) of respondents had published work under the policy.

22.   In collaboration with the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, Taylor and Francis also published in August the results of a [survey of learned societies](#). In relation to OA, it found that 68% of respondents believe that the research they publish should be free to read for all; but only 18% said they were willing to earn less money in an OA world, while 46% said they were not. Hence 41% saw OA as a threat as compared with 30% who saw it as an opportunity, though the negative majority is much lower than in previous surveys.[5]

Nature Communications

23.   In July, NPG published the [results](#)[6] of an analysis of articles published in the hybrid journal *Nature Communications*, which was launched in 2010, and which has a high proportion of OA articles. The analysis, undertaken by the RIN, showed that OA articles were viewed up to three times more often than subscription articles, and that there was a smaller positive effect on the number of citations. The data did not allow

---

[4] The underlying data are available in figshare at http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1181745

[5] These findings are somewhat more positive than those in a smaller survey undertaken by TBI Communications for EDP Sciences: http://www.edp-open.org/images/stories/doc/EDP_Society_Survey_May_2014_FINAL.pdf

[6] The dataset can be downloaded from figshare at http://figshare.com/authors/Nature_Communications/598818

for investigation of the reasons for the differences, nor was it possible to control for all the factors that might affect views and citations, such as whether articles had been posted in one or more repositories, or the numbers and locations of authors. But the analysis clearly showed positive effects for OA. (Whether it had any impact on the decision to shift the journal to fully OA status is not clear.)

NPG Palgrave Macmillan author survey

24. As part of Open Access Week, NPG and Palgrave have made data from their [Author Insights survey](#) publicly available for the first time. Key findings from the survey include*:*

   ❑ 1 in 5 (20%) science authors and 1 in 10 (12%) HSS authors do not know if their main funder requires them to publish OA

   ❑ a significant number of authors, including 17% of Wellcome Trust and 25% of NIH-funded authors, are unaware of the requirements of even the those funders with long-established OA mandates.

   ❑ 40% of science authors and 54% of HSS authors who have not published OA say that 'I am concerned about perceptions of the quality of OA publications'

Google study of the growing impact of non-elite journals

25. Researchers at Google have produced an [analysis](#) of the citations to articles published between 1995 and 2013, computing the 10 most cited journals and the 1000 most cited articles in different subject categories each year. It shows that the concentration of citations in the top 10 journals each year has fallen from 47% in 1995 to 27% in 2013; and that the proportion of the top 1000 articles published in journals other than the top ten rose from c15% to c25%. There are variations between subject areas, but in six out of nine broad areas, the proportion of top-cited articles published outside the top journals rose by 45% or more. These results are not perhaps surprising in the light of developments such as the shift since 1995 to online provision, the increase in the numbers of journals accessible to researchers in most universities and research institutions, and the development of search services that cover virtually all journals.

Bergstom et al: evaluating big deal bundles and the cost-effectiveness of OA publications

26. In late May Theodore Bergstrom et al published a [study](#)[7] of bundle prices charged by commercial and non-commercial publishers to different categories of US universities. The paper indicates that when analysed, for instance, by price per citation, commercial publishers' prices charged to large PhD-granting universities are 3-10 times those charged by non-commercial publishers; but the differences in price are much lower for small PhD-granting (Carnegie research2) universities; and for Master's institutions the price differences in some cases disappear.

---

[7] The article is published by PNAS, but the PDF is available on the University of California Santa Barbara Department of Economics website, to which the hyperlink above directs.

27. In October, Jevin West, Bergstrom et al published a [paper](#)[8] outlining the development of a tool to enable researchers to judge – when deciding in which journal to publish – the cost-effectiveness of different OA journals. The tool essentially puts price (the level of APC) against a measure of citations weighted by influence. The assumption is that, other things being equal, authors would prefer to publish in journals with higher 'Article Influence' scores and lower APCs. The paper includes some results from use of the tool.

Bernstein Research update on Reed Elsevier

28. A September report from the Wall Street research and brokerage company Bernstein Research has been [posted](#) on the blogger Richard Poynder's site. It signals a shift in opinion since earlier reports, when Bernstein argued that political moves to force a shift to OA would have negative consequences for Elsevier. The September report suggests that the rise of OA is inflicting little or no damage on leading subscription publishers; that 'the threat posed by OA seems to recede'; and that OA funding may be adding to the profits of STM publishers.

Simba Information report

29. A report - *Open Access Journal Publishing 2014-2017* - published by the market intelligence company Simba Information in August is said to indicate ([according to the journal Research Information](#)) that the revenue generated by APCs for STM publishers grew 32.8% in 2013. Despite this rapid growth, OA revenue still only represents 2.3% of global 2013 STM journal sales. While other journal revenue in this area is expected to increase at a compound annual rate of 1-2% between 2011 and 2017, OA revenue is expected to more than triple in that period.

Pinfield study of 'total cost of publication'

30. In a forthcoming paper[9] to be published in the *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, Stephen Pinfield and colleagues at Sheffield have analysed data provided by 23 UK universities as part of the Jisc Total Cost of Ownership project. The analysis shows that in the calendar year 2013 the universities spent a total of £29m on subscriptions and £3.3m on APCs from central funds. The proportion of total spend accounted for by APCs varied significantly, from 1% to 39% across the 23 institutions. The analysis also shows that the number of APCs paid has been rising strongly in the past two years, from 570 in 2012 to 2445 in 2013, and a projection of c5k in 2014, with expenditure rising similarly, from £977k in 2012 to a projected c £8m in 2014. The

---

[8] The paper was published in the Wiley journal *Economic Inquiry* in October; the link above is to one of the many versions that are available from other sources.

[9] Stephen Pinfield et al, The 'total cost of publication' in a hybrid open access environment: institutional approaches to funding journal article processing charges in combination with subsccriptions.

average APC paid in 2013 was c£1.6k; and as Bjork and Solomon showed in their study (reported in the previous update paper) there are notable differences between levels of APC for fully-OA and hybrid journals (though Pinfield et al show higher levels for both fully-OA publishers and for hybrid journals than in the Bjork study).

Some overseas developments

USA

31. Legislation is stalled in Congress, with rival Bills – the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act and the Frontiers in Innovation, Research, Science and Technology Act – both failing to make progress. But in California, the Taxpayer Access to Publicly-Funded Research Act was signed into law at the end of September. It will provide via an online database access after a maximum 12 month embargo to publications arising from work funded by the California Department of Public Health.

32. The key development following last year's OSTP Memorandum has been the launch by the Department of Energy of its Public Access Gateway for Energy and Science – PAGES – a web-based portal that will provide free public access to accepted peer-reviewed manuscripts or published scientific journal articles within 12 months of publication. The Department also announced that for publisher-hosted content, it is collaborating with the publisher consortium CHORUS (see below).

33. CHORUS -- the Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States - went into production in July. It makes use of CrossRef's FundRef metadata and provides a discovery and access service, linking to articles on the publisher platform; along with dashboards for use by funders, universities, researchers and others to monitor and track public access compliance and a range of other value-added services. At the same time, the Association of Research Libraries is working, with a $1 million grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to develop the Shared Access Research Ecosystem (SHARE) which will be built around a notification system and also include
    - a distributed registry layer covering both publications and research data
    - a discovery layer to help find research outputs across repositories
    - a content aggregation layer to facilitate data and text mining and other value-added services

UN High Commission for Human Rights

34. Farida Shaheed, the Special Rapporteur for the UN's Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, has decided to devote her next thematic report to the Human Rights Council in March 2015 to the impact of IP regimes on the enjoyment of the right

to science and culture, as enshrined in particular in article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights[10].

35.   The report will address the impact of IP regimes on 'the right of people to enjoy and access cultural heritage; access by everyone without discrimination to the benefits of science and its applications, including scientific knowledge, technology, and opportunities to contribute to the scientific enterprise; the freedom indispensable for scientific research, including access of researchers to scientific information and advances, as well as collaborative work; artistic freedoms and the right of people to access, contribute to and enjoy the arts; and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities.' A request for contributions closed on 15 September.

ICSU

36.   The General Assembly of the International Council for Science (ICSU) approved in September a [statement](#) setting out 5 key goals for open access, and 12 recommendations on how to attain them.

Other issues

Monographs

37.   Jisc launched at the beginning of October its [National Monographs Strategy](#), with a roadmap built around a monographs bibliographic and library holdings knowledgebase; a service to help researchers and others to enhance the impact of their monographs; a shared publishing platform; piloting new business models; a national digitisation strategy; national licensing for digital monographs; and a monographs thinktank.

38.   HEFCE's [Expert Reference Group](#) – chaired by Professor Geoffrey Crossick - set up to advise 'on the diverse body of evidence needed to understand open-access publishing for monographs' is due to report in December.

39.   A two-year project on academic books of the future, funded by the AHRC with the support of the British Library, is starting this month. It is led by UCL, with support from KCL and the RIN, with active involvement from a wide range of organisations.

Data

40.   The UK Open Research Data Forum, which brings together representatives from a wide range of practitioner and stakeholder organisations involved in research data held its second meeting on 9-10 October. A sub-group is working on a research data concordat, similar to the concordat on research integrity. A copy of the update paper prepared for the Forum's meeting is available on request.

---

[10] See the announcement at
  http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/CulturalRights/Pages/impactofintellectualproperty.aspx

October 2014