



UUK Open Access Group

Some Key Developments since October 2013

Introduction

1. This short paper outlines some key developments since the Finch Group published its report on progress in the implementation of its original recommendations¹ in October 2013. It does not aim to be comprehensive, and while it covers some significant developments overseas, its primary focus is on the UK. It does not cover the proposals on the monitoring of progress on OA in the UK and globally which are the subject of a separate paper and agenda item.

Policy developments in the UK

2. The Government's response to the Group's review of progress was in the form of a letter from David Willetts to Dame Janet Finch² which was published in January 2014. The letter welcomed UUK's willingness to take up the challenge of establishing the current group; outlined some of the Government's discussions with international partners; and stated that the Government would engage in discussions with key stakeholders about what more might be done to develop licence extensions to benefit SMEs. The response also announced that the Government had, in response to recommendations from Select Committees of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords, commissioned a study to examine the feasibility of undertaking a full cost-benefit analysis of the impact of the UK's OA policies.
3. But perhaps the most significant section of the letter covered issues relating to costs and sustainability. It outlined a set of three principles to facilitate 'a commercially-sustainable transition to a higher proportion of Gold OA':
 - i. a meaningful proportion of an institution's total APC costs with a publisher to be offset against total subscription payments with that publisher (or vice versa, a proportion of subscription payments offset against total APC costs);
 - ii. a sliding scale to be applied to this proportion to incentivise use of Gold OA; and

¹ Available at <http://www.researchinfonet.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Final-version.pdf>

² Available at <http://www.researchinfonet.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/BIS-Transparency-Letter-to-Janet-Finch-One-Year-On-Response-January-2014.pdf>

iii. a limit applied to the total value of offset for an institution, taking into consideration administrative costs incurred by both the institution and the publisher.

4. Issues under each of the heads covered in the Government response will be considered further below.

Funders' policies

5. RCUK's review of the implementation and impact of its OA policies will take place in the second half of this year. The review will be chaired by Professor Sir Robert Burgess, the retiring Vice Chancellor of the University of Leicester, and will report in early 2015. The draft terms of reference for the review were published on 9 May³.
6. In the meantime, the major development among funders has been the publication in March this year of HEFCE's and the three other UK Funding Bodies' policy on OA in the post-2014 REF⁴. The key features of the policy are that, in order to be eligible for submission to the post-2014 REF, the authors' final peer-reviewed manuscripts of any journal articles or conference proceedings (with an ISSN number) accepted for publication after 1 April 2016 must have been deposited in an institutional or subject repository on acceptance for publication. Deposited material should be discoverable, and free to read and download, for anyone with an internet connection.
7. The policy makes allowance for embargo periods, by allowing for closed deposits, which must nevertheless be discoverable before the full text becomes accessible once the embargo period has elapsed. Allowable embargo periods are in line with RCUK's policy. The policy makes provision for a number of exceptions, including articles published in journals that are judged to be the most appropriate for the article in question, but which have policies that are not in line with the Funding Body requirements.
8. The policy, which follows two rounds of consultation, has been broadly welcomed. Many institutions, however, have characterised it as a 'game-changer', since it covers not only the articles that acknowledge support from RCUK, the Wellcome Trust or other specific funders, but in effect all the articles published by University staff (since it will be hard to determine in advance which might be submitted to the REF).

Publishers and intermediaries

9. Major publishers, as well as some smaller ones, have continued to launch new OA journals, and to publish the first sets of articles: for example, Elsevier (*Schizophrenia Research: Cognition*); Wiley (*Clinical Case Reports*); Springer (*EJNMMI Physics*); Oxford University Press (*Journal of Law and the Biosciences*), the Royal Society (*Royal Society*

³ <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/RCUK-prod/assets/documents/documents/TermsOfReferenceOpenAccessReviewDRAFTMay2014.pdf>

⁴ HEFCE 2014/07, available at

http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/pubs/2014/201407/HEFCE2014_07.pdf

Open Science); and so on. Despite having to introduce new procedures before accepting journals for indexing (see below), the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) is currently showing over 9,700 journals, about 500 more than in October 2013; and that number does not include those launched most recently.

DOAJ and the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)

10. A crisis arose for gold OA publishers in October 2013 when *Science* published a news article "Who's Afraid of Peer Review?" by John Bohannon⁵. It describes his investigation of peer review among gold OA journals, in the form of his submitting to 304 of them between January and August 2013 a fake paper with obvious scientific flaws that should have led to its being rapidly rejected. But 60% of the journals accepted it, including 45% of those listed in the DOAJ, which as a result has tightened the rules for inclusion. Bohannon's 'sting' was subject to much criticism, but also received strong statements of support. An investigation commissioned by OASPA led to its removing two publishers from its list of members, and suspending another (which has since been reinstated).

Intermediaries

11. Subscription agents and other intermediaries have for some time been considering the services that they might offer in relation to OA, including support for authors, libraries and publishers; workflow tools for processing, invoicing and collection of fees; and real-time reporting. Jisc APC is a pilot service addressing some of these issues, in partnership with Open Access Key. The Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) has also developed services which integrate its RightsLink service with Aries Systems' Editorial Manager manuscript submission and peer review tracking system; and a number of publishers including the BMJ Group have adopted the service.

Elsevier and take-down notices

12. Elsevier's issuing of large numbers of take-down notices under the terms of the US Digital Millennium Copyright Act, relating to versions of articles posted on public sites such as Academia.edu and Research Gate gave rise to considerable comment in the blogosphere, and also in some mainline media. Most recently, Tim Gowers has revived his activity around the Cost of Knowledge campaign, as part of which he has secured under the UK Freedom of Information Act 2000 information from most of the Russell Group universities about the amounts they pay in subscriptions to Elsevier. His lengthy blogs on the issue⁶ have again given rise to much comment.

⁵ Available at <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/342/6154/60.full>

⁶ <http://gowers.wordpress.com/2014/04/24/elsevier-journals-some-facts/>

Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP³)

13. The SCOAP³ initiative⁷ has been long in gestation, and finally came into effect on 1 January 2014. It involves a partnership of libraries, funding agencies and research centres, working with leading publishers to convert to OA key journals in high-energy physics. After a tendering process organised by CERN, SCOAP³ identified ten journals by 11 publishers which cover the vast majority of the high-quality peer-reviewed literature in the field. SCOAP³ now pays centrally for the costs of these journals, funded from contributions from participating countries, each of which pays an amount commensurate to its scientific output in the field.

Public libraries and access to research

14. Following a successful technical trial in the autumn of 2013, the Access to Research⁸ initiative to provide walk-in access to scholarly journals in public libraries was launched in January. The two-year pilot is a joint enterprise organised by the Publishers Licensing Society on behalf of publishers, and the Society of Chief Librarians. The pilot currently covers some 8,400 journals from all the leading publishers.

University libraries, subscription costs and 'double-dipping'

15. Costs and the issues relating to possible offsets between subscriptions and APC payments have continued to be the subject of much discussion (not least following the statement in David Willetts' letter to Janet Finch). Research Libraries UK (RLUK) issued in late February two 'framework papers' setting out their expectations for future negotiations with publishers⁹: the first set out an expectation that price increases for big deals should be limited to no more than 1% in cash terms; and the second an expectation that offsets between subscriptions and APCs should operate at the level of individual institutions. The documents form in effect part of the mandate that RLUK members have given to Jisc Collections to negotiate collectively on their behalf. Jisc Collections has undertaken some modelling of possible options to underpin its negotiations.

Jisc initiatives and services

16. In addition to the services already mentioned, Jisc has been active in a number of other areas. In response to the Finch recommendations on extensions to licensing, it has recently launched two short-term pilots. The first extends to NHS staff licensed access

⁷ <http://scoap3.org/>

⁸ <http://www.accesstoresearch.org.uk/about>

⁹ <http://www.rluk.ac.uk/news/rluk-issues-guidance-nature-future-big-deals-double-dipping/>

to a range of journal content¹⁰; the second provides licensed access to SMEs on the Daresbury and BioCity campuses.

17. Jisc is also planning to commission a series of institutional pathfinder projects to examine what works best in implementing OA in a variety of institutions across the sector, to share this knowledge openly, and to support a community of practice. It is also developing and enhancing a number of its services, including
 - ❑ Jisc Monitor, which is testing the feasibility and value of services to help universities demonstrate compliance with funders' policies, and to monitor APC payments
 - ❑ A study on the feasibility of an "Open Mirror", which would aggregate and provide access to the open access research outputs from UK researchers
 - ❑ Sherpa FACT, where steps are in hand to enhance the accuracy of the advice provided on journals' compliance (or not) with the requirements of funders' policies (www.sherpa.ac.uk/fact/)
 - ❑ Continuing development of services such as IRUS-UK, which collects raw download data from UK repositories and processes it into authoritative COUNTER-compliant usage statistics (<http://www.irus.mimas.ac.uk/>); Repository Junction Broker, which automates delivery of research publications from multiple sources to multiple repositories (<http://broker.edina.ac.uk/>); and CORE, which aggregates OA content from repositories and journals and provides a number of value-added services (<http://core.kmi.open.ac.uk/search>).
18. Jisc has also continued to work on a range of standards issues through a cross-sectoral Gold OA infrastructure group (www.golddoa.org.uk/); RIOXX, a metadata profile which allows repositories to share information about OA papers and their compliance with funder policies (<http://rioxx.net/>); V4OA, a set of vocabularies to describe features of OA papers, including version, licence, readability, APC status and embargo (<http://v4oa.net/>); and a joint working group CASRAI, seeking agreement between funders, HEIs and others, on metadata for research reporting (http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/di_researchmanagement/researchinformation/casraipilot.aspx).

Recent reports

19. In December, as part of its report on the *International Comparative Performance of the UK Research Base*¹¹ commissioned by BIS, Elsevier published figures on the take-up of various routes to OA, including breakdowns for articles in OA journals that do or do

¹⁰ <https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/nesli2/Extending-Access--2014-NHS-Pilot/NHS-Pilot-Title-information/>

¹¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/263729/bis-13-1297-international-comparative-performance-of-the-UK-research-base-2013.pdf

not charge APCs, hybrid journals, delayed free access journals, and articles in repositories that focus on pre-prints submitted to journals (eg ArXiv) on the one hand, and on authors' accepted manuscripts on the other. The figures show some interesting differences between average levels of take-up in the UK and in the rest of the world, as shown in Annex A.

20. In March a consortium of funders led by the Wellcome Trust published a report by Bo-Christer Björk and David Solomon: *Developing an Effective Market for Open Access Article Processing Charges*¹². It showed that the average APC in a hybrid journal was almost twice that for fully OA journals (\$2,727 compared to \$1,418) and suggested that this demonstrated that the market for OA via hybrid journals was not working effectively. It went on to suggest a number of policy options for funders including
 - ❑ providing funding to meet APCs for fully-OA journals, but only for those hybrids that offset APC revenues by reducing subscription charges at a local (institutional) level;
 - ❑ setting multi-tier price caps on the amounts they will contribute towards APCs for particular journals, based on the quality of services they provide;
 - ❑ providing only a fixed percentage of APCs once they exceed a threshold – with authors (or institutions) covering the shortfall.
21. The data on which the analysis is built has been posted in figshare¹³ (where the Wellcome Trust and Cambridge University have also posted data relating to their expenditure on APCs¹⁴).
22. Also in March, the British Academy published a report on *Open access journals in Humanities and Social Science*. Among the key conclusions were that
 - ❑ Gold OA is unlikely to play much of a role in HSS disciplines, but Green OA is more feasible
 - ❑ A significant number of HSS articles are published in journals based outside the UK, and although most large multi-national publishers generally comply with RCUK policies, compliance among smaller specialist publishers is low; hence the current RCUK rules 'make non-UK journal publishing in the humanities very difficult, and in literature/art/music-based disciplines almost impossible'.
 - ❑ Usage half-lives in most HSS disciplines range from 40-50 months. But given the importance attached to the version of record, so long as embargoes remain at 24

¹² www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Guides/WTP054773.htm

¹³ http://figshare.com/articles/Developing_an_effective_market_for_Open_A_APC/951966

¹⁴ <http://blog.wellcome.ac.uk/2014/03/28/the-cost-of-open-access-publishing-a-progress-report/>; and http://figshare.com/articles/Cambridge_APC_payments_for_RCUK_2013_14/987118

months for HSS journals, Green OA will probably have little effect on libraries' decisions on subscriptions and cancellations of journals.

- The pressures arising from the cost of journal subscriptions are independent of any OA policies

Some overseas developments

Europe

23. The Berlin 11 conference to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Berlin Declaration on OA was held in Berlin on 19-20 November 2013, and included presentations by Neelie Kroes, the Vice-President of the European Commission responsible for the Digital Agenda, as well as David Willetts¹⁵. The Commission remains committed to support for both Green and Gold OA, though there are as yet no clear mechanisms for meeting the costs of APCs beyond the life of a research grant. In December, however, the Commission issued a call for proposals under the e-infrastructures programme in Horizon 2020, which included a requirement to pilot a mechanism to meet that gap, for up to three publications that occur within the two years following the related EU grant.
24. In the meantime, Sander Dekker, State Secretary for Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands, issued a statement on measures to be taken in to support Gold OA as the preferred route in the Netherlands¹⁶.

USA

25. In the US, the deadline for federal agencies to respond to the OSTP memorandum requiring them to submit plans for implementing a requirement for deposit and access to published papers (with a guideline maximum embargo of 12 months) expired on 29 August 2013. A similar requirement was included in the 2014 Appropriations Act passed by Congress. But so far none of the plans submitted to the OSTP has been published, and there is some frustration at this.
26. In the meantime, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the Association of American Universities (AAU), and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) are developing, with support from the Sloan Foundation and others, a SHared Access Research Ecosystem (SHARE) for the preservation of, access to, and reuse of research outputs, including data as well as publications. And a separate scheme, CHORUS -- Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States -- is being developed by the publishers as a not-for-profit public-private

¹⁵ Presentations are accessible at <http://openaccess.mpg.de/Berlin11>

¹⁶ See <http://www.government.nl/documents-and-publications/parliamentary-documents/2014/01/21/open-access-to-publications.html>

partnership to increase public access to peer-reviewed publications that report on federally- funded research.

China

27. On 15 May the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Natural Science Foundation of China issued statements in advance of the meeting of the Global Research Council (to be held on 26-27 May) announcing that researchers they support should deposit their papers into online repositories and make them publicly accessible within 12 months of publication¹⁷. They also noted that OA will continue to evolve and that they expect further cooperation with the international scientific community to promote the cause.

RCUK International Meeting

28. As a follow-up to the G8 Science Ministers' meeting held in London in June 2013, RCUK organised an international meeting on open access on 20 March 2014. The purpose of the meeting was to share thoughts and good practice, and to identify practical actions that could be taken to help advance the shared aim of OA. One concrete proposal emerging from the meeting is to investigate the feasibility of establishing an observatory to gather and share authoritative information about key developments, to promote co-ordination, and to identify common principles and guidelines. Such an observatory might well complement at an international level some of the kinds of activity to be undertaken by the UUK group in the UK. A note of the meeting is expected to be posted on the RCUK website soon.

Other issues: research data

29. Research data falls outside the terms of reference for the current group; but the group may nevertheless wish to note some significant developments. The broad communities of those in the UK with an interest in research data management are heavily involved in the Research Data Alliance (RDA)¹⁸, which is supported by funding agencies in the US and the EU, as well as the UK. The RDA held its third plenary meeting in Dublin at the end of April, with the fourth planned for September in Amsterdam.
30. Within the UK, as a key part of the follow-up to the Royal Society's report *Science as an Open Enterprise*, an initial meeting of a Research Data Forum, bringing together some 30 representatives of key practitioner and stakeholder groups, was held in January. Following that meeting, it has been agreed to establish the Forum as an entity for at least the short-to-medium term. Its next meeting is planned for late September or early October.

May 2014

¹⁷ <http://english.cas.cn/Ne/CASE/201405/P020140516548023313654.pdf>

¹⁸ <https://rd-alliance.org/about.html>

Annex A



Global take-up 2012

□ fully-OA journals with APCs	5.5%
□ fully-OA journals no APCs	4.2%
□ hybrid journals	0.5%
□ delayed free access journals	1.0%
□ pre-print repositories	6.4%
□ accepted ms repositories	5.0%

Elsevier, International Comparative Performance of the UK Research Base, 2013: a Report for BIS



UK take-up 2012

□ fully-OA journals with APCs	5.9%
□ fully-OA journals no APCs	1.9%
□ hybrid journals	2.7%
□ delayed free access journals	4.2%
□ pre-print repositories	7.4%
□ accepted ms repositories	11.6%