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Where I am these days

University of Strathclyde

• Established 1796 as “the place for useful learning”
• 21,470 FTE Students and 3,200 staff
• Research: research grants and contracts income of £59,921m in 2016
• Among the 20 top research-intensive universities in the UK
Where I was in 2015/16

The EC FP7 Post-Grant Open Access Pilot provides funding to cover the OA publishing fees for publications arising from completed FP7 projects.

- 4 million euros have been made available by the EC to fund the OA “post-grant” publications of over 8,000 completed FP7 projects.
- The Pilot will last for a maximum of two years (i.e. until Apr 30th, 2017) or until its budget is exhausted.

In October 2016, Research Consulting, within the scope of the OpenAIRE Work Package dealing with the FP7 Post Grant Open Access Pilot (WP5) – lead by LIBER – was commissioned by OpenAIRE on behalf of the European Commission to undertake an economic analysis study of the Open Access publishing market: “Towards a Competitive and Sustainable OA Market in Europe – A Study of the Open Access Market and Policy Environment”.

The report (pdf) is accompanied by an Annex (pdf) which contains the mid-term evaluation of the FP7 Post-Grant Open Access Pilot, organised by OpenAIRE. This annex will be discussed in detail in the reporting phase of the pilot, which ends on April 30th, 2017.

https://blogs.openaire.eu/?p=1841
• The FP7 project should have finished by the time the funding is requested, but no longer than two years ago;

• A maximum of three publications will be funded per eligible FP7 project as a means to ensure a fair distribution of the funding across projects;

• Funding requests must be submitted once the publication has been accepted;

• Publications submitted to hybrid journals will not be funded, but only those accepted at fully Open Access journals;

• The following funding caps apply to this funding: EUR 2,000 for research articles and EUR 6,000 for monographs;

• The final version of the funded output must be deposited in an OpenAIRE-compliant Open Access repository.
Back at the institutional Open Access coalface

- Direct contact with researchers
- First-hand experience of upgraded institutional workflows
- Exploring ways to better align institutional and research funders' approaches to OA

We're ranked No.1 in the UK

The Department of Physics at the University of Strathclyde, in the centre of Glasgow, has been rated number one in the UK for research in the REF 2014.
Open Access: Why?

- More exposure for your work
- Researchers in developing countries can see your work
- Practitioners can apply your findings
- Taxpayers get value for money
- Higher citation rates
- Compliant with grant rules
- The public can access your findings
- Your research can influence policy
Open Access implementation landscape

In dramatic statement, European leaders call for ‘immediate’ open access to all scientific papers by 2020

By Martin Enserink  |  May. 27, 2016, 2:30 PM


Concerning open access to scientific peer-reviewed publications, most EU Member States reported a national preference for one of the two types of open access, either the Green (self-archiving) or the Gold (open access publishing) model. Preference for the Green model is found in Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia and Spain. Those expressing a preference for the Gold model are Hungary, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Other Member States support both models equally, such as Germany, France, Croatia, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland and Finland. However, the expressed preferences for one of the two models are not pure models in which only one route is followed. Instead, there is generally a system of predominance of one model with the possibility of using the other model, so a mixture of both routes results.
Funders’ policies as drivers: UK

- Charities Open Access Fund (COAF)
- Green!
- Gold!
- Green!
- Green!
- Green!
- Gold!

Logos of various organizations are shown with green and gold ribbons indicating their level of commitment to open access policies.
Need for quick progress plus ongoing pressure on library budgets: are offsetting agreements the solution?

The impact of article processing charges for libraries and what we’re doing to help

Principles for Offset Agreements

As open-access (OA) publishing funded by article-processing charges (APCs) becomes more widely accepted, UK academic institutions face an increase in the ‘total cost of publication’, comprising subscription costs plus APCs and additional administration costs. Most APC payments are made to large ‘traditional’ commercial publishers who also received considerable subscription income. Jisc Collections is asking publishers to introduce offset systems that will reduce this extra cost to UK higher education.

https://www.jisc.ac.uk/blog/the-impact-of-article-processing-charges-for-libraries-and-what-were-doing-to-help-27-jun-2016
Offsetting agreements: pros & cons

• Sheer scale allows quick progress towards OA goals
• Brings publishers into APC reporting
• Temporary stage towards full Open Access

• Disproportionately benefits legacy publishers
• Additional layers of complexity in implementation and dissemination
• Very expensive intermediate stage: not every country can or will afford it

https://oa2020.org/
So how can disruption happen?

http://blog.thecostofknowledge.com/

Funded APCs by Publisher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded APCs by publisher</th>
<th>Aug-Dec'16</th>
<th>Jan-May'17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Publishing Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A maximum of €2,000 funding will be provided for covering the Open Access publication fees for research articles, book chapters and conference proceedings. A maximum of €6,000 will be allocated for publishing Open Access monographs. Where VAT is charged, the funding caps will apply to the total invoiced amount.

2. The €2,000 maximum funding above only applies to fully Open Access journal titles. Publications in hybrid journals (i.e. subscription-based journals offering the option of making individual articles Open Access upon payment of Article Processing Charges) will not be supported by this Pilot.
Disruption *is* happening – legally or otherwise

Court Awards Science Publisher $15M in Suit Over Copied Articles Online

Doug Isenberg · June 23, 2017

**SCI-HUB**

...to remove all barriers in the way of science

enter URL, PMID / DOI or search string
Disruption *is* happening – legally or otherwise

It’s a Sci-Hub world

Server log data for the website Sci-Hub from September 2015 through February paint a revealing portrait of its users and their diverse interests. Sci-Hub had 28 million download requests, from all regions of the world and covering most scientific disciplines.

Ways to make it happen *legally*:
Licensing negotiations

https://www.projekt-deal.de/about-deal/

Projects DEAL
Bundesweite Lizenzierung von Angeboten großer Wissenschaftsverlage

https://openaccess.nl/en/what-does-academia-want

Publisher deals

"Let's all join forces and go for gold together."
Dutch State Secretary Sander Dekker

http://openaccess.nl/en/what-does-academia-want
The funders' tools: policies and beyond

Wellcome Open Research
A new way for Wellcome-funded researchers to rapidly publish any results they think are worth sharing.

https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/

- the success of the platform depends on the quality of the scientific publication service provided.
- Although it has an office for publications, the Commission itself is not a scientific publisher (e.g. no experience with peer review, no reputation in the community).
- a service on par with the highest quality standards of scientific publishing can only be provided by outsourcing the implementation of the platform through a fully transparent public procurement process.
A few conclusions

• Open Access is unstoppable now, but still needs to generate sustainable and competitive implementation mechanisms
• It is getting more and more complex and difficult to disseminate to researchers: serious risk
• Open Access will happen via a combination of strategies and routes: internal fights are not useful
• 'Temporary stage towards full Open Access' needs to benefit Library budgets sooner rather than later
• The power is with researchers, which OA advocates aren't always able to get involved
• Is informing authors on where it would make economic sense to publish really beyond the remit of institutional libraries?
Two valuable bits of bibliography

EARLY CAREER RESEARCHERS: THE HARBingers OF CHANGE?

Final report from CIBER
August 2016

Year one (2016)

http://ciber-research.eu/harbingers.html

My top 9 reasons for embracing OA

1. People will find your work
2. People can read your work
3. It’s a nice thing to do
4. It’s a good thing to do
5. It’s the right thing to do
6. It’ll look bad if you don’t
7. People will share back
8. You will find it helpful
9. Others will find it helpful

But be careful: people might read it
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