Open Access compliance: how publishers can help

A summary of current desiderata as understood by Jisc, March 2015

Introduction

This document describes some things that publishers might do, that would help authors and institutions implement OA in the UK (and probably elsewhere) with reduced administrative burden, taking some of the friction out of the current arrangements. It has been collated through discussions with Jisc and those implementing OA in UK universities, and we acknowledge considerable assistance from RLUK members and others in this work. It is our best attempt to collate these desiderata; while we acknowledge that this is a fast-changing area, we hope we have crystallised some steps that publishers could take that would have lasting benefit for their customers. This document does not suggest that compliance with OA policies is anything other than the responsibility of those covered by those policies, mainly researchers and their institutions.

Background

UK institutions are asking for help from publishers as they seek to comply with the open access requirements of various research funding bodies. Especially prominent here is the need to satisfy the requirements of the policy on Open Access and the REF from HEFCE and the other UK funding bodies, which fund institutions’ salaries and infrastructure. (Further information on this policy is given at the end of this document.)

There are a number of things that publishers can do to help. It would be in their interests to address these needs, not only so that they are seen to be doing so, helping to retain and attract subscribing institutions, but also to attract submissions from the best UK authors, who will be concerned to meet their funders' requirements with the least possible effort.

Several of these measures will also help protect publishers’ business interests from developments that might otherwise be seen as threatening them, for example by making it easier for authors and institutions to identify and adhere to publishers’ licensing terms, including their policies on depositing to open repositories. We would like to help publishers and institutions automate as many elements of this process as we can.

Some of these steps would point readers to the content on publishers’ sites, thereby adding to the usage statistics that libraries take into account when considering renewals. They will also help publishers demonstrate to funders and policy makers that they are assisting compliance.

A table of the ways in which the sector is asking for publishers’ help is given on the following pages.

Desiderata

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Service we would like | Why? | Benefit to publishers |
|  | The publisher undertakes to supply the author’s accepted manuscript (AAM) to the author as an attachment to the acceptance email. This should be in the form that they permit to deposit on an open repository (i.e. already including any disclaimer or other statements that they require under these circumstances).  Ideally, it should be emailed to all authors, not just the corresponding author. Failing that, the letter should ask the corresponding author to forward it, together with the attached AAM, to the other authors. | To prompt author to upload to institutional repository (IR), or to ask IR staff to do so.  To ensure all co-authors are also prompted and are aware of date of acceptance.  To save IR staff time in investigating details of acceptance date.  To help ensure correct version is deposited (AAM as opposed to earlier author versions). | **Correct version.** Helps ensure that any version deposited by the author(s) on a repository is the one that the publisher’s policy allows, and that any publisher disclaimer is included.  If publisher adds CrossMark (or other links back to publisher site) to AAM, ensures these are included in the version deposited, helping to **increase traffic back to publisher site**. |
|  | The publisher commits to deliver a copy of the AM at or near acceptance to a Jisc service (such as Jisc Publications Router) that helps institutions comply with the REF policy, subject only to limitations in their current technical systems, which nonetheless they commit to make reasonable efforts to try to address. | To help institutions to comply with REF OA policy as efficiently as possible. | The **best UK authors are more likely to submit** their best papers if they can be confident that the publisher is actively helping them to comply with the REF stipulations, and so they don't need to worry about depositing onto their repository themselves. |
|  | The publisher registers the article’s DOI upon acceptance, and informs all co-authors. | To enable recording of DOI of AAM deposited upon acceptance, to facilitate deduplication e.g. with later updates from various sources upon publication.  Possible future potential to enable notification of acceptance? | If authors can include a DOI with the AAM they deposit, then the DOI is more likely to feature in the repository metadata and so more likely to **drive traffic to the publisher site**. |
|  | The publisher should ensure that the acceptance letter to the author should include a clear statement on what the author may do with the AAM – that is, the terms under which it may be deposited and made publicly available, including any embargo period and the license that then applies to the AAM. This should include details of how the AAM may be (re-) used. | Providing this authoritative statement at acceptance will save staff time at the author’s institution in searching for and interpreting any policy on the publisher’s web site, a time-consuming task.  It will also provide clarity for the authors themselves. | In conjunction with previous point (sending acceptance letter to all authors), helps ensure publisher's policy (on deposit to IRs) is transmitted accurately to all authors, so that any deposit is **more likely to adhere to publisher's terms.** |
|  | The publisher ensures that its embargo periods are no more than those set out in the REF policy. | To ensure all outputs can comply with REF policy. | The **best UK authors are more likely to submit** their best (and therefore most citable) papers if they can be sure they can comply with the REF stipulations, and so be eligible for submission to the next REF. |
|  | The publisher should ensure clarity of overall licensing/policy position (at the journal level) for each version (AM, VoR…) including any embargos for each.  Use of standard terminology/ definitions in publisher policies/ licences.  Ultimately working towards a standard schema/ DTD for expressing machine-read able licences/ policies. | To enable authors to make informed choice of journal based on what journals permit.  To enable repository staff & Sherpa RoMEO to give informed advice about whether a given journal complies with a given funder's requirements, and to do so with maximum efficiency and accuracy. | Helps ensure any deposit and release on repositories adheres to publisher's terms. **Minimizes any threat to publisher's business** from Green OA. |
|  | The publisher should ensure clarity of licensing terms at the article level   * Clear visible statement/link on article (especially OA ones) * Standard (LicenseRef) metadata in article XML (and other files where possible?) * Populate License-ref metadata on publisher site and on CrossRef.   The above should include clear identification/ labelling of which articles are OA – on TOC, landing page (e.g. abstract page) and on all manifestations of the full text. Also clear statement of *date* on which the article was available under OA terms.  (Note: NISO has now published its final Recommended Practice on access and licensing indicators – see <http://www.niso.org/workrooms/ali/>. We urge publishers to incorporate these fields into their DTDs, and populate them at the article and version level.) | To enable readers/ users to understand what they may do with a given article.  To enable repository staff and related services to act upon the correct licensing terms, and to move towards automation of this, to minimize the need for manual searches and other intervention.  To move towards machine-readable embargo end-dates that can be acted upon automatically by repositories.  To facilitate tracking of OA compliance, and whether promised OA publishing terms have been fulfilled. | Helps **ensure any use** of publisher’s content **adheres to publisher's terms**, including deposit and release on repositories, text & data mining etc. Minimizes any threat to publisher's business from these activities.  Increasing numbers of research funders are requiring this in papers that report research they have funded. **Authors are more likely to choose journal** if they can be sure their outputs will comply with their funder's conditions, thereby avoiding sanctions such as threats to further funding.  OA articles **more likely to be used and cited** if they are readily discoverable (e.g. at institutions that do not subscribe to hybrid journal); discovery services more likely to include in search results for non-subscribers if identified as OA at article level in machine-readable way. |
|  | The publisher should pass on key dates (notably acceptance) in metadata.  Policy on OA & the REF requires the following:   * Date of final acceptance as notified to the author * Date of publication * Start and end dates of any embargo period. | To facilitate compliance with policy on OA & the REF.  To help ensure any embargo period is correctly implemented. | UK **authors are more likely to submit** their papers if they can be sure they can comply with the REF stipulations, and so be eligible for submission to the next REF. |
|  | The publisher should populate authors’ affiliation fields on CrossRef (including on acceptance if they register DOI then). | To enable institutions (e.g. via CRISs) to identify their outputs, and Jisc Publications Router to deliver them to correct institution, in order to populate IRs in compliance with REF OA policy. | **Authors** around the world are **more likely to submit their best papers** if they can be confident that the publisher is actively helping their content find its way to the right repositories, helping them to comply with the stipulations of OA mandates from funders, institutions etc, and especially if they can avoid the need to worry about having to do this themselves. |
|  | The publisher should adopt ORCID throughout workflow from submission to publication. Expose author ORCIDs in published articles and via A&I services, CrossRef, other discovery services. | To help identify outputs from given individual and institution, to help populate IRs and monitor research outputs, OA compliance etc. | **Authors around the world are more likely to submit their best papers** if they can be confident the publisher will help them (and their institutions, funders, peers...) to track unambiguously which outputs and citations belong to them (e.g. also via A&I services like WoS & Scopus - greatly facilitated if ORCIDs captured by publisher/ society at source and then passed on). |
|  | The publisher should populate funding metadata, including funding body and grant number, both FundRef (on CrossRef) & on publisher site. | To help funders identify outputs of their research and to help institutions and funders monitor compliance with funder mandates. | **Authors around the world are more likely to submit their best papers** if they can be confident that the journal complies with their funder’s requirements.  (Also some kudos benefit to journal/ publisher if papers seen to be linked to prestigious funding.) |
|  | The publisher should provide Jisc with data (annually in retrospect) that would enable calculation of total cost of ownership (TCO), including   * Number of APCs paid * Total of APC revenue from each licensee * Above broken down by funder and institution   (Explore possibility of publishers providing detailed tabular breakdown matching RCUK reporting requirements, for example, to help institutions compile these returns.) | To enable Jisc to track total expenditure and be in stronger position to negotiate offsets between APCs and licence expenditure.  To inform future policy development. | Authors and institutions will be more willing to choose and pay for OA option in hybrid journals if they have confidence that charges/ pricing structure is fair and represents a viable transition route to OA rather than extra revenue stream for publishers.  **Reduces risk of losing subs** during transition to long-term sustainable gold OA business model. |
|  | The publisher should explore with Jisc and others how best to ensure that corresponding authors are aware, if a hybrid OA option is available to them, of their institution’s participation in any offset scheme (such as discounted APC as a result of institution holding a current subscription) in time for this to inform their choice of whether to take up the OA option.  Look at options to communicate this to authors in the best way possible. | To ensure authors and institutions take advantage of offsetting arrangements.  To contain costs during transition to gold OA. | As 12 above. |
|  | The publisher should allow unrestricted machine access to their OA content in hybrid journals.   * **Lift restrictions on machine access to OA content** – ensuring that the licensing terms and the site functionality allow this. * **Ensure that there is an API that enables identification of OA content** – and provides access & programmable interrogation of that content.   **Revise and make public clear licensing terms that permit the above** –minimum requirements include explicit permission to download and store copies of VoR, ability to make to results of text mining publicly available, including for commercial purposes. Importantly, need to be able to harvest the whole of the OA content in order to do meaningful TDM. | To allow researchers to make maximum use (e.g. TDM) of this content. | Would help ensure that selecting OA option in hybrid journals is no less attractive to authors than competing “pure” OA journals. |
|  | The publisher should ensure a CC BY option is available for authors to choose. | To enable compliance with RCUK & Wellcome Trust etc gold OA route. | **Authors around the world are more likely to submit their best papers** if they can be confident that the journal complies with their funder’s requirements.  (Also some kudos benefit to journal/ publisher if papers seen to be linked to prestigious funding.) |