

UKSG An Introduction to open access online seminar 2024 - day 2

0:02

Good morning to everyone and you're all very welcome to this second day of this UKST seminar and Introduction to Open Access.

0:13

My name is Emmanuel Lin and I'm based at Malmö University Library in Sweden, but I'm here today as part of the UKST working group that have arranged today's seminar and I will be your chair today.

0:31

Let me just start by telling you by sharing my morning.

0:36

This morning, my morning was a bit chaotic.

0:40

I bicycled to work, didn't check the weather forecast beforehand, and two minutes into the ride into the city, the rain poured down.

0:52

Halfway to work I fell off the bike, climbed up again, but it turned out my phone had jumped.

1:00

And after some time when I tried to mend it, I gave up and ended up taking the bus to work.

1:12

And so I'm really glad this session is on video because I was soaking wet, very dirty and full.

1:20

Love covered in oil.

1:23

So that was my morning.

1:25

I hope you had a much better morning.

1:30

But I'm very glad that we are gathered here today via video and get to get a chance to learn more on Open Access.

1:41

Just to recapitulate what we learnt 2 days ago, two days ago Phil Jones from GISC gave a history and the current landscape of today on Open Access.

1:55

Then we'll listen to your own Sundervan who works at the Dutch Research Council.

2:02

Colleen Campbell talked about Open Access and the the library perspective and how to ease the burden for the researcher.

2:11

Mark Green from Annual Reviews talked about different models for Open Access and more in depth about subscribe to Open.

2:20

It was a very interesting day and I'm sure we'll have another motivating day on the subject Open Access today.

2:29

So this is the programme for the today's seminar.

2:35

First we'll listen to James Bissett and Martin Gleghorn about green Open Access and right retention strategy.

2:43

And then we'll listen to Tom Grady and Lucy Barnes and Sam Nesbisch who will talk about Open Access and monographs.

2:53

And then we'll have a 15 minute break.

2:56

And then we have Emma Ely who will talk about Open Access from a publisher perspective.

3:04

And the our final speaker is Kelly Woods, the few who will talk about future of academic publishing.

3:13

And then we'll we'll have a summary and close so with so to our first session, a brief introduction to green Open Access and rights retention.

3:28

What we we have James James Bissett and Martin Gleghorn from Durham University and James is a senior manager on Research Services.

3:41

He provides training to researchers and gives advice on areas like Epinex, publishing publication metrics and keeping up to date as a researcher.

3:52

And Marchin is a repository repository coordinator, and he has worked on the Open Research team since 2021.

4:01

So with no further ado, the floor is yours, James and Martin.

4:12

Thanks very much, Emma.

4:14

I'm hoping now we're sharing the right screen, some slides you can see slides for everyone.

4:19

Great.

4:20

Hi everyone.

4:20

Yes, my name is James and my colleague Martin is also with us as well.

4:24

We're both here from Durham University.

4:26

I think Martin, we both had less eventful mornings than Emma did in terms of getting in.

4:32

So we're hopefully well prepared for this morning.

4:36

So we were asked to deliver a short overview of green Open Access and rights retention.

4:42

So we'll we'll try and give kind of that general overview.

4:45

We'll bring in some kind of Durham flavour as well in terms of what that means to us at Durham and what are having implemented the rights for attention policy, what that is there as well.

4:55

So that's us.

4:56

You've got our job titles on the screen and we'll welcome people to contact us afterwards in the future.

5:01

People have queries.

5:02

We've got more contact details at the end of the slides as well.

5:05

So in terms of the next 2530 minutes or so, what we thought was we'd give a quick introduction, who we are, what we're going to cover in this session, provide some definitions in terms of green Open Access generally and the role of institutional depositories.

5:20

Realised that on Monday we had a session looking at the history of Open Access and where we are at the minute more generally.

5:26

So we'll try and touch on that in the context of green Open Access and some of the changes we've seen we even before either of us working in kind of the open research area, building up to where we are now.

5:37

And then a focus on rights retention in particular might not close off as well, looking at some of the challenges and opportunities we feel there are within the space around green Open Access and rights retention, where universities, publishers, researchers and funders find themselves by themselves at the minute.

5:56

So that's what we plan to do this session.

5:58

And hopefully there'll be time at the end as well for kind of questions, which I'll be able to chair and coordinate and hopefully it'll be rewarding for everyone.

6:07

So just to give some context, in terms of Durham, we're kind of one of the smallest universities or certainly a smaller university within the Russell Group here within the UK.

6:16

So research intensive university.

6:19

And we have quite a breadth of kind of the broad areas of disciplines covered at the university in

terms of the research, in terms of this, our Open Access repository has done research online that goes back nearly two decades now.

6:32

We originally started as a pilot within the university, initially internally and it was two strands coming together.

6:40

First of all, internally wanting be able to see what was being published at the university and having access to that for various internal processes for academic progression, etcetera.

6:50

And also kind of looking towards that development of Open Access and repositories in the library, being interested in developing a repository there.

6:57

So we've formally launched in 2008 and we stayed roughly the same for a full 15 years until last year where we had a significant change moving to a new platform for our and from doing research online at the minute, we provide access to about 34,000 full text publications, mostly authored by colleagues at Durham at present or previously at the university.

7:23

And just to highlight one of the changes there, we've got 34,000 full text.

7:27

You'll also have a nice little screenshot of the repository, which highlights there were close to 80,000 publications in total.

7:34

Because with our new repository, it has kind of a dual purpose as a research portal for the university and an Open Access depository providing access to publications authored by our staff and to give that cool view, full view of what's being at the activity at the university.

7:51

So we've got our Open Access depository.

7:53

And then also last year in 2023, we implemented our rights retention policy or research publications policy, which implements rights retention.

8:01

So we'll talk about that shortly as well.

8:04

I should also say we do have separate repositories covering data and theses.

8:07

We'll talk about those much today.

8:09

But just to highlight, we do have separate repositories which also cover those.

8:13

So that's where we're at in terms of, I will pass over now to Martin in terms of just giving some definitions for green Open Access.

8:23

That's great.

8:24

Thanks, James.

8:25

So yeah, I'm kind of mindful that I'll try not to provide too much crossover from Phil Jones from Jisk's talk on Monday, because I know he covered this a little bit as well.

8:35

But just kind of thinking broadly about what green Open Access is in relation to gold Open Access as well.

8:44

And I guess the sort of first key difference is the location of where work is accessible.

8:51

Access to green Open Access work will be provided through a repository, be that an institutional repository like ours or perhaps even a subject specific repository.

9:00

And it's where content would otherwise be behind a pay wall or would be kind of dependent upon, say, institutional access to a journal of a book as well.

9:10

And obviously that's in comparison to gold Open Access as well, in which a publication will be fully accessible from a publisher platform.

9:19

And I guess it's kind of important to stay at the outset as well.

9:23

Thinking about this from an author point of view, Green still allows them to publish where is most suitable for them.

9:30

It is kind of doesn't matter if that work is going to be behind a pay wall, we're still keen to ensure they publish where's most suitable for them.

9:38

And we kind of never advise on that either.

9:44

So another key difference is the version that's shared as well and namely with Green, that's the author's accepted manuscript or AAM as opposed to the published version of Record or VOR, which is more associated with GOLD.

9:58

And when we talk about the AAM, we talk about work that has been accepted for publication.

10:04

It's gone through peer review, it's gone through any necessary revisions of rising from peer review, but it will not have undergone any additional work from the publishers.

10:15

So no copy editing, no formatting, no proofing, no typesetting, nothing like that.

10:22

So while we might end up sharing a version that perhaps doesn't look as polished as what ends up on a publisher platform, what is kind of key to emphasise is that content wise it will be exactly the same.

10:35

And I suppose kind of in fact this in my, they will list those, it requires a degree of trust on our side from authors.

10:44

So we will always kind of check any manuscripts that we share in our repository.

10:50

But particularly if they've kind of provided us with work on acceptance, which is what we encourage as well, We might not necessarily have a way of being able to confirm yet that the content is exactly the same as what will be finally published.

11:04

So this kind of informs a lot of our ongoing advocacy work as well, ensuring that academics and any, any relevant support staff within the university know what's required from them and know what we can and can't deposit in a repository.

11:21

So another major characteristic of green and how it differs from gold comes in terms of cost, or I suppose more accurately the kind of lack of with green.

11:31

So while with gold you might pay an article processing charge and on average that can be kind of north of 2000 lbs for a sort of single journal article.

11:42

Green is a really kind of useful alternative in that sense in that it offers us a route to Open Access that is sort of ultimately cost free to author an institution and will in the vast majority of cases still be in line with say, for instance, ref rules, any institutional policies, any funding requirements as well.

12:04

So that's really useful.

12:06

But I suppose the trade off for bat comes in the sense that green Open Access often doesn't mean immediate Open Access in the sense that gold would.

12:18

Things are starting to change in a sense with rights for attention and we'll, we'll cover that a little bit more shortly.

12:23

But traditionally kind of journals and publishers will impose embargo periods before we can share the full text of work in repositories as well.

12:35

So while we can kind of deposit work on acceptance, frequently we have to wait much longer than that before we can actually share the full text of work in a repository.

12:46

And these embargoes can be really kind of variable between different publishers, between different journals, even between different disciplines as well.

12:54

Some will allow us to share work immediately on acceptance.

12:57

So before it's even been published, which is great in extreme cases.

13:02

At the other end of the scale, we can see kind of three, five years.

13:07

I don't know if anyone even goes longer than that, but they're kind of they're sort of some of the top ends of it.

13:15

Could I have the next slide, please, James?

13:19

Thanks.

13:20

So when we think about gold and repositories and the relationship between them, when we kind of say that one of the defining characteristics of gold Open Access is that it is immediately and freely available on a publisher platform, we will still share such work in our repository as well.

13:38

And we we have a few reasons to do in this.

13:42

The first one of those is digital preservation.

13:45

So say an article is gold on a journal site, if that journal becomes obsolete, it stops publishing, its website gets taken down, it means we then still have a scholarly record of that publication and it's still accessible.

14:01

It's also really important in terms of research visibility.

14:04

So I know at Durham, and I suspect this is the case for a lot of other institutions as well, when we deposit work in our repository, a link gets provided to that on the relevant authors kind of public facing university profile too.

14:18

So it's kind of really key in sort of them from being able to promote their research and also kind of more broadly on reporting and advocacy purposes as well.

14:29

Having gold publications in our repository allows us to kind of report on and do advocacy around all of our institutions research, not just research that has been kind of published via a certain route.

14:43

So yeah, we still kind of are very keen to make sure that any gold work is deposited in DRO 2.

14:51

Could I have the next slide please?

14:52

Yes, thanks.

14:55

So kind of working back a little bit I, I guess thinking about what we mean when we try to define what an institutional repository is.

15:03

Very broadly speaking, it's an online archive that sort of houses and preserves academic research that is associated with a specific institution.

15:11

And they're open in the sense that the work that is available there is accessible to anyone with Internet access in theory sort of irrespective of any kind of institutional affiliation or lack of and sort of location where they are in the world as well.

15:29

While there is a focus on accepted work, although we do kind of have some published work there, it's that's a big difference in comparison to say subject specific repositories or preprint service like archive in which authors can post work that is kind of prior to peer review still or prior to acceptance still.

15:50

So again, it kind of means that any work that we share there will be the same as what kind of comes out on the publisher platform once it's been published.

16:01

As I've touched upon before there repositories do play a really important role in terms of increasing research discoverability by deposit and work in a repository and ensuring that all of the kind of relevant metadata with the publication is kept sort of that you written up to date.

16:18

That work becomes much more likely to be harvested by sort of services and sites like Google Scholar.

16:24

Aggregate isn't harvesters like Core as well And off the back of that we can be confident that the research that's in our repository is sort of accessed and used globally as well.

16:37

We can see this through using reporting services like Iris from disc.

16:42

The sort of image I've got on the slide there, you maybe can't see it so well, but there's sort of statistics by country for our most downloaded article over the last month, and it's a list sort of country by country, sort of where and how many times it was accessed.

16:57

So it's kind of really useful to be able to see that as well.

17:00

And we know as well that while it kind of may be the case that a lot of the research there is primarily accessed by sort of scholars at other institutions for academic purposes.

17:11

We know through the sort of work that we do with a lot of our academics and our kind of research centres and groups at the university that the work is kind of accessible to and sort of really valued by sort of charities, schools, other practitioners and just kind of wider members of the public as well.

17:30

So I'll pass back to James now.

17:35

Thanks.

17:35

Thanks, Martin.

17:36

So I'm just going to come in and give a brief kind of overview of just some history.

17:40

I don't really want to repeat kind of full history of Open Access, which Philip did on Monday.

17:48

But just to give some context maybe to green Open Access, some of the changes we have seen and where we where we are at present thinking in particular these kind of three questions is why is green Open Access important?

17:59

How is that provision developed, developed over the speed of time?

18:03

And what will institutional Open Access repositories provide within that space?

18:14

So in terms of a rough outline, a very rough kind of timeline and we've, we've a with a bit of AUK focus as well.

18:26

Although this, when I talk about this and the rights attention, our rights attention policy, we can't do that to the exclusion of everything else happening globally.

18:34

That's one of the advantages of Open Access is providing that access to our research, to a kind of global as well as a local audience.

18:42

But thinking about the development of green Open Access, look back to the 90s, the 1990s, we had various drivers appearing all kind of roughly aligned or in line in time with each other.

18:55

So we have that broader concern certainly within the library community in terms of the cost inflation for journal subscriptions in particular, and the increasing barriers to accessing scholarly research.

19:06

That was coupled with looking at how to best harness the Internet to provide new means of accessing research and the freedoms that's potentially offered.

19:16

And at the same time, we also saw, I say we, I was a bit younger then and some, some people who always might be as well, but they, the, the, the sector saw the establishment of new traditions or exploring new ways to communicate scholarly research.

19:31

So we saw that with archive, which is a large preprint server, especially kind of covering the kind of physics, astronomy, computer science and other related areas as a means of sharing research and early stage preprints to within their community and in line with publishing.

19:48

We also saw in terms of for example, the original ideas of what became put bad central along similar lines as these kind of preprint services and opportunities developed.

19:58

We also looked at or the sector was looking at how best to make sure those are visible, how to make sure there was able to be communication between all of these potentially disparate repositories as well to make sure things were discoverable and interoperable etcetera.

20:13

So we have the development of AIPMH.

20:17

As well as a means of communicating that and sharing that information, kind of emphasise the kind of the importance of green Open Access and providing a mechanism for authors to provide that Open Access to facilitate discussion, to allow dissemination of the research which wasn't limited by paywall barriers, especially in that context of cost inflation.

20:39

And also making the best use of an online environment as that became the norm for communicating research in the UK.

20:47

We have GISCA leading a fair programme focus of access on institutional resources and that really wanted to look at what those opportunities were that repositories might offer and looking at some of the technical, cultural, the organisational legal challenges which might face institutions and funders and researchers and developing that.

21:07

And then looked at how best to develop an infrastructure to support depositories.

21:11

So some of the key things that those projects under the FAIR programme identified was the need for authors to be able to understand and check what their permissions were.

21:19

Could they self archive?

21:20

Could they make their research available through a green Open Access route?

21:24

Was the repository available to them?

21:27

And then also to develop services to make sure if they did do that, it remained that research was discoverable by those we want they wanted to reach.

21:36

This is all about one of services such as Sherpa and where people can go and look and see what different publishers permissions are for authors or what funder requirements might be.

21:46

And later, later services such as open door, open air Choir as well in terms of lending that authority or ability to check to see if a repository was met authors requirements.

22:00

We also saw kind of a shift in funders in terms of looking at what the benefits Open Access brought to them and the further research they funded.

22:08

So we have policies coming out from US, UK welcome also in Europe in terms of statements from European Commission.

22:15

And then that increased the importance of all has to be able to check what they could do.

22:19

And if that aligned with Thunder requirements, there was discussion of what those restrictions are.

22:25

It's worth highlighting certainly at this stage, one thing that those projects looked at, around 50% of the journals people could publish in allowed authors to self archive in some way.

22:38

Some of those restrictions we're looking at whether they could share their manuscript before or after publication.

22:43

But embargoes were significantly difficult, different to some of the later discussions, and quite a few of the major publishers at the time allowed authors to go green immediately.

22:53

And there was no requirement for an embargo from quite a few of the major publishers at this time.

22:58

2012 saw the Finch Report and the UK, and rightly or only that, placed an emphasis on gold Open Access as a strategic priority in the UK, but also have wider reaching implications globally in terms of how publishers offered and supported Open Access to the research they published.

23:16

What it often saw certainly is our fit.

23:19

Funders responded and provided funding for authors to cover the costs of publishing Open Access as we saw a shift from several publishers to bringing in embargoes or extending our embargoes on every search made available through repositories who've been Open Access.

23:37

As several publishers which previously allowed an author to self archive their research immediately on publication suddenly brought in embargoes which matched the maximum funders would allow at that time.

23:47

Some of the publishers in terms of a positive development and some of the publishers which previously hadn't supported self archiving now did, but again, bringing in embargoes for those authors in line with what the funders allowed for or required.

24:04

So as we move forward, we saw different for our funding policies develop and this often meant that the requirements were linked to funded authors.

24:12

Those who weren't in receipt of direct funding often relied on green Open Access, but had that case of having embargoes on their work, et cetera, or didn't engage fully in some areas.

24:25

But what we did see in the UK was REF policy in 2016 bringing in a requirement for office to deposit their research and Open Access depositories.

24:34

This drove an institutional focus on making sure we have repositories up to task.

24:40

They're a focus on developing policies, increasing communication advocacy for authors, allowing us to check compliance of those requirements.

24:47

REF being a key driver in the UK in terms of the funding going out to universities and based on assessment of the research being done across across the UK sector.

24:56

What we also saw then was a reaction from some publishers to reduce their embargo periods.

25:01

So the authors keen to make sure their research was eligible for the REF could still share their research in line with those requirements.

25:09

So it showed some of the flexibility publishers could have around embargoes and some of that ongoing discussion about what place embargo has had in terms of Open Access through Open Access depositories.

25:20

We saw development traditional agreements which expanded use of Open Access in terms of publishing options through authors.

25:26

So there was a lot of change in this area.

25:29

What we did see in 2019 was coalition S This was kind of a, an approach for a group of a large, large group of funders, particularly in Europe and the UK, but also in globally as well, trying to line the requirements, their fund of requirements around Open Access.

25:45

To try and make sure this was less of a confusing mix of policies for authors to try and understand and to try and build an approach for funders and authors and publishers to deliver Open Access in the future to a clear road map for what was hopefully intended.

26:02

One thing that came out of Coalition S and their plan S announcement was their rights retention strategy.

26:08

So that right retention strategy was aimed at supporting green Open Access and maybe looking at

reducing that delay and when we could provide access to content made available from repositories and making sure it was on an equal part of publishing Open Access in terms of ensuring we use rights for those who wish to, to wish, wish to and use that route.

26:30

And we saw in the UK the first rights retention policy coming in from Edinburgh University in 2022.

26:36

This is followed by Cambridge, by Imperial, by Oxford, by the N8 universities, including ourselves at Durham, Sheffield Hallam.

26:42

And now I believe there's about 50 universities in the UK either have rights retention policies published and launched or in development at present.

26:53

So in terms of just summarising some of those key questions in terms of the importance it was providing that mechanism to authors to share their research where maybe they didn't have access to funding to cover costs, et cetera, to make sure they could still communicate their research freely and openly.

27:09

It has changed.

27:10

We have seen some air change.

27:12

We've seen more publishers look at and offer options for authors to share their research through Open Access depositories.

27:18

We've also seen changes in whether that how far that's delayed in terms of embargo is placed on there and the reuse rights and institutional repositories, especially in the UK after the REF policy became important.

27:30

As As for some of the reasons Martin alluded to in terms of provided that and repository resource for authors to be able to share their research in this way and for universities to be able to keep track of what we were sharing or what proportion of our research we were making Open Access.

27:46

So if I go on and have a look at rights retention in particular now and try and explain what rights for attention is.

27:54

So as mentioned, usually with green Open Access, the terms under which it's previously provided, an

author would publish as normal with a journal and they'd sign a contract to publish or licence with that publisher.

28:06

And the publisher would generally say, well, you can sell for archive your work, you can make it available for green Open Access.

28:12

But they would determine under what terms that could be shared.

28:15

They would say it could only be after one year, after two years after publication and and they might also determine what use rights are placed on that right.

28:24

Retention is an approach intended to ensure authors of institutions can retain or assert their own rights and their work, and certainly retain sufficient rights in the work to allow them to share their author accepted manuscript from an Open Access depository on their terms or the terms of their funder, either immediately on publication or on acceptance.

28:47

Just to be clear what rights attention doesn't intend to do, it doesn't intend to remove the choice of journal from an author.

28:53

The intention is they can publish where they want and still retain sufficient rights to share their work in an Open Access form.

29:00

Doesn't prevent the author from transferring copyright or granting a licence to the publisher.

29:04

It's asserting their rights to the accepted manuscript before that transfer happens following acceptance, and it allows the author to freely share that.

29:14

It doesn't allow the author to that last slide is slightly wrong on the slide.

29:19

It doesn't allow an author to freely share the final published version.

29:22

It allows them generally to share the accepted manuscript version.

29:25

The published version might still sit behind a paywall barrier.

29:29

Just to give some background to this, because it hasn't just come out of a vacuum in terms of development under Coalition S, it does have a bit of a history.

29:39

So if we look back to Harvard University in 2008, they had a new honest agreement to launch their their licence or policy, which essentially meant that Harvard researchers granted a non exclusive right to their future articles to the university, allowing the university to share their research in this way accepted manuscripts in their repository.

30:01

Within the UK there was work, certainly from 2015 led by in particular Imperial and Manchester universities, but a lot of universities involved looking at trying to implement a similar model referred to as the UK scholarly licence and for UK universities.

30:17

And this ended up being overtaken by Plan S Rights Retention Strategy which saw Edinburgh launch its first policy.

30:24

But as I said, now followed by multiple policies as well.

30:28

It's worth force highlighting that certainly across Europe there's a slightly different approach or there is an alternative approach, secondary publishing rights in where establishing kind of the national legislation and approach where authors have the right or an attempt to make sure they have the right to share an accepted manuscript where that's in receipt public funding under their terms.

30:51

So enshrines kind of within their law and the right to authors to they deserve the right to legal right for authors to make their work openly available.

31:02

Normally the accepted manuscript from a repository got some dates there.

31:05

And when different legislation was passed in those different countries, a lot of those German lately, Austria, they still say well, yes, fine.

31:12

But after six months, so acknowledging that publishers at the time had embargoes they like to enforce.

31:19

Spain in 2022 brought in similar legislation and that requires immediate sharing of that manuscript in terms of the rights retained by authors.

31:31

So in terms of how does rights attention approach work generally, an author can initiate this by including a statement in their paper, their submission manuscript they submit, basically informing a publisher that they've reserved these rights.

31:45

And if that publisher does not object, then it makes sure that the author can then share their accepted manuscript from an Open Access depository under whatever licence they've applied to that, normally a Creative Commons licence.

31:59

Durham and of universities have instituted policies to try and make sure we can support authors and doing that we have in terms of implementing our policy, set out this policy saying that the author grants a licence to the university similar to Harvard, allowing that manuscript to be shared from Open Access repository.

32:18

A key component is letting the publisher know, so we encourage authors to include a statement in manuscripts they might submit.

32:26

But we also took action as a university to contact just over 100 publishers to notify them of this policy coming in.

32:33

We did this in line with other universities as well, to forming a letter and sending this out to publishers and telling them that our policy was coming into force and waited for any objections, of which there were none, particularly for many publishers in terms of springing in this policy.

32:51

And now when we receive a manuscript, we can share this from a repository as long as it was submitted to a publisher after the date our policy came into force and from our Open Access from Durham Research Online under an open licence.

33:04

So with our policy as an example, we launched this in January or announced it in January 2023.

33:09

We launched it in April 2023, applying to all manuscripts submitted from that date and notified over 100 publishers about as I've indicated that at that point leading up to it, and it does provide a fall back to authors.

33:24

So if they're not publishing gold Open Access, they have this option available to them to share their manuscript freely upon publication under an open licence.

33:34

They're not bound by any requirements set by a publisher to live there.

33:39

Limited that to 1224 months after publishers.

33:42

We provided that prior note just to publishes.

33:44

This prior licence exists.

33:47

So since October 2023, which is really when we started to properly enforce their policy and apply this wherever possible, we've made 311 of our article outputs or publications available Open Access entirely under our rights retention policy, which accounts for quite a small portion overall because a lot is still being published, the old Open Access and there's a lot of our articles were submitted prior to our policy, which are coming through the the process as well.

34:15

But increasingly we expect to see that increase as more articles are made Open Access under this route.

34:22

So if I pass over to Martin now.

34:26

Thanks, James.

34:27

So yeah, I am just going to kind of briefly go over some of the key challenges and opportunities that we've sort of encountered around adopting the rights retention policy.

34:38

And this is both in like an anecdotal sense and my own experience of sort of helping to implement and promote the rooms on a day-to-day basis as part of my role, but also in like the broader context of the sort of wider scholarly publishing landscape as well.

34:54

So I guess kind of starting locally as well.

34:57

And what one of the main concerns that we did meet at first from authors while developing the policy was the question of whether the university would support them in any issues that kind of might arise with publishers, given that we were now kind of going against their established policies.

35:16

I think once we could guarantee that that would be the case, authors were like largely really supportive of the principles of rights retention.

35:25

So that was great.

35:27

That being said, there are still challenges in doing advocacy work around kind of any new policy with academics, as I'm sure a lot of you will know, specifically kind of trying to get past this idea that this is something that's going to add to their workloads as well.

35:46

And I, I guess as James kind of touched upon there, one way that we have done this at Durham is that we haven't required authors to include rights retention language in their manuscripts.

35:57

We can still include their work in scope of the policy regardless of that.

36:02

But that does mean that we're still kind of dealing with the question of how we can get authors to kind of more actively engage with rights retention and kind of actively using rights retention language as opposed to it kind of being something that we like merely do to their work.

36:19

So we want to try and move away from that.

36:23

Similarly, we didn't receive any explicit objections from publishers.

36:29

We maybe got the odd sort of query back saying kind of what is this?

36:33

What does it mean?

36:34

But there is still a degree of apprehension around pushback that we might get in future from publishers, I think, especially as more institutions continue to adopt similar policies as well.

36:48

And I guess one quite creative example of this is compensated the American Chemical Society.

36:56

Last year they brought in what they call an article development charge, and in practise that charge

applies to authors if they've included rights retention language in their submitted manuscript, and it applies at the point of submission too.

37:10

So that means there's kind of feasibly a scenario in which an author gets charged \$2500 for work that subsequently goes on to be rejected from an ACS journal anywhere.

37:23

So that's not ideal, but along somewhat similar lines as well, it still remains to be seen how relevant rights retention may or may not come to be when it comes to other types of publication as well, as opposed to just journal articles and some confident outputs as it currently is.

37:43

I know it's kind of unlikely to be the case now, but given that there was that possibility of additional urban access requirements for the next REF cycle and I mean coupled with the sort of costs of Megan books and chapters Open Access more generally, it's kind of really brought in into focus that question of how right for attention might work for longer form publications.

38:06

So that's something we're still thinking about.

38:09

And similarly on that front with publishers as well, we are kind of seeing self archiving policies for long form publication shift a little bit as well.

38:19

Oxford University Press for a good example of this.

38:21

They've kind of recently changed things to only permit 25% of a chapter from an edited collection to be deposited in repositories as opposed to contributors whole chapter.

38:34

And I think there are kind of valid reasons for doing this.

38:37

I guess, you know, it's sort of it stops an entire collection being kind of shared piece meal across repositories for instance as well.

38:46

But again, it's really forcing us to think about how green Open Access currently works in relation to these types of publications.

38:55

And that's especially if other publishers are going to end up following their lead as well.

38:58

In fact, if I could just have the next slide, please, James.

39:03

So just quickly in terms of opportunities as well, kind of very broadly speaking, an increased amount of work being published by rights of attention means an increased amount of work where the rights are staying in possession of the authors rather than being signed over to publishers, which I think is a good thing.

39:21

And as much as advocacy around this can be a challenge, I think we've found that the policy has really provided us with a really good opportunity for us to inform authors about green Open Access, about rights of attention, and about their rights as authors more generally as well.

39:36

So we've tried to take advantage of that.

39:39

And again, James touched upon this.

39:42

We kind of never advocate for one particular route to Open Access as such, but rights of attention is really useful in the sense that it does provide a fall back of sorts if an author's in a situation where they don't have the means to pay for Open Access but still meet and meet requirements.

40:02

And I think as much as there may be sort of certain concerns about this sort of effectiveness of transitional agreements as well, it's worth kind of pointing out that rights of attention doesn't really offer an alternative to, to such deals and gold Open Access.

40:18

You know, we, we kind of recognise that we do still need publishers as well as much as we might advocate for green too.

40:27

Finally, just having more research available via via rights retention and the green route again, it's really significant in terms of research, discoverable discoverability, particularly through tools like on paywall as well, which can be used to identify sort of any legal urban access versions of work and that includes accepted manuscripts too.

40:47

That's a really useful tool to be able to have.

40:50

And finally, just alignment with our other library services as well.

40:56

I think that having more work immediately available enables us to improve our wider library service in the sense that sort of Open Access publications, regardless of how they're made, Open Access can function as a kind of counterpart to, for instance, inter library loan requests.

41:15

They can also be included in reading lists, even if it's an accepted manuscript, which kind of helps us out as an institution, but we realise it can help other institutions out as well.

41:26

So kind of anyone, regardless of how much funding they may receive as an institution, can still access that most recent research as part of their teaching as well.

41:36

And I guess as well it kind of works in a wider university context too, just in terms of kind of being able to do kind of marketing and comms work about research that's being published as well.

41:47

So that's really helpful as well.

41:49

So I'll pass back to James to round up.

41:51

Yeah, you're muted James.

42:08

Thanks a lot.

42:08

And as I sat there talking to myself, So just to finish off just some wise.

42:14

So hopefully we've got some questions, got a couple of definitions there.

42:17

Just hopefully to make it clear in terms of green Open Access and rights retention what those are.

42:22

So what we've tried to cover today.

42:24

So green Open Access where an author publishes where they normally would but hopefully shares an usually an accepted manuscript version of their research via an Open Access repository that might be delayed embargo might have some restrictions and how it can be reused, but it still provides that opportunity to access the research for those who have otherwise been locked out by payable barriers.

42:49

However, however, restrictions and then rights attention as an approach to try and make sure authors sustain sufficient rights to their work to be able to share it more on their terms immediately on publication hopefully, and including a clear licence which allows reuse of the accepted manuscript for different purposes.

43:10

So hopefully we'll finish there.

43:11

As I say, we've got our contact details there and if I pass back a moment, I don't know if you've got any questions we can answer.

43:21

Thank you for your beautiful speak and clarification on all the different aspects.

43:30

John, do you have any questions?

43:34

We, we don't at the moment, Emma, no, just say thank you to James and Martin for that.

43:40

Yeah, two massive areas that are green Open Access and and rights retention.

43:43

Really fantastic context of something that can seem quite static.

43:48

You know, sharing with our repository has gone on for a long time, I think.

43:52

I think what James and Martin have shown is that it's sort of dynamic and such lots of thinking going on everywhere about how we make our research available.

44:01

So we had your own talking on Monday about secondary publishing rights, which which James mentioned before and about the Netherlands model where that's enshrined in in law your rights share your research and rights attention is a sort of different approach to that.

44:15

So interesting themes running through from from Monday.

44:21

We yeah, we have a couple of questions come through.

44:25

I can't tell who was, so I'll go with it with Jodie's question first.

44:29

Oh, Jodie just says, not a question, but just to say thank you.

44:32

This was really helpful.

44:34

And Eva says I am working in a Belgian institution.

44:38

No, universities in Belgium have adopted a rights retention strategy yet.

44:43

They are, they are looking into it as we have, as they have secondary publishing rights, but pursuing options for immediate Open Access instead of having to adhere to the embargo.

44:55

Set by the publisher, apprehension remains to the effectiveness of rights retention as the publisher is not obliged to comply.

45:04

Fear of authors is that they may be rejected and include this rights retention language which you mentioned.

45:10

Any advice or experience with with that?

45:15

Yes, I think, I think so.

45:17

I think yeah, definitely there are apprehensions.

45:20

I think of what certainly Martin alluded to those in terms of the advocacy with authors.

45:25

I think in terms of the Durham context, when we were bringing our policy through, we tried to make sure there was quite broad kind of advocacy around this, to speak to departments within our university to make sure it's clear generally on the principle of ensuring the authors had that right to share their research.

45:45

There was a lot of support for that.

45:47

Certainly when it ended up in University Senate for final agreement, that was that.

45:51

The support was generally there, but there was that that concern.

45:56

What happens if a publisher challenges this?

45:58

What difficulty does that put the authors in?

46:01

So the university as part of our policy essentially says that we will support authors.

46:07

If that happens, we suspect it's more likely the university will approach as a publisher would approach the university and say, can you take this down?

46:15

So we've established quite robust processes and how to deal with should we get a request from a publisher for an individual article in relation to anything in terms of how we do that.

46:24

And I think through certainly the disc repository resources around rights attention, that certainly includes a copy of our kind of work process workflow in there and also contributions from other universities as well and how they implement their policy.

46:40

So we recognise that authors can have a little apprehension about this.

46:46

What we've seen so far though is no objection from any publisher to our policy.

46:52

We've not aware of any author at Durham receiving an objection from a publisher or request them to remove that language from a submitted article or to only share under the permissions offered by a publisher.

47:06

And as I say, we've got quite a robust process in place should that happen on how we would deal with that.

47:12

We have received one objection so we do have an opt out from our policy in place so an author can request knocked out from the policy if they have a specific kernel concern.

47:26

The only time that has so far been used was not from a publisher race and objection.

47:30

Martin, correct me if I'm wrong but it was a co-author at another institution who had concerns and they have the accepted manuscript.

47:38

Our author didn't so they provided the accepted manuscript on the condition it was not shared under our policy.

47:45

We ended up going into discussion with the author about that and opted not to share under our rights attention policy in that in that instance because we felt that was the right approach to take.

47:58

Hope that answers the question.

48:06

Yeah, that was brilliant.

48:07

James, if it's just said, thanks for that.

48:11

I think I mean, just tell me if I'm wrong.

48:14

Are we, are we at the end of time for questions?

48:18

Yes, we are.

48:19

I just have one final question if I may.

48:22

I just wondered, have you cancelled any of your transformative deals as a result of the right retention strategy?

48:31

Short answer is no, no, we haven't cancelled any of our deals directly.

48:34

Is that I think there's ongoing discussions, not just the doing but across the UK in terms of the value transfer transition agreements offer and the actual costs, the additional costs universities have faced from those.

48:46

But I think as Martin alluded to, rights, attention and green Open Access work and are dependent on our relationship with publishers.

48:55

So there's nothing to share if an author doesn't have a journal to submit to and doesn't have an article which is accepted.

49:04

So now we haven't can't we know other institutions in different different circumstances.

49:09

And all of this is looked at in the round in terms of do publishers, in terms of how we might be looking at do publishers have a clear road map and how they will support authors to deliver Open Access.

49:21

So that is that is part of the discussion.

49:23

It's not just the costs anymore, but it's how publishers support Open Access is one of the considerations of sound of universities are looking at now.

49:31

It's not just about cost.

49:33

It's about actually the ethics of publishing and whether we're comfortable with the relationships we have.

49:39

Thank you, James and Martine.

49:41

Thank you and our thank you.

49:46

Our next session is about an introduction to Open Access for monographs and we have 3 speakers at this session.

49:55

It's Tom Grady, Lucy Barnes and some Nesville.

50:00

I'll just give a short presentation about the the speakers.

50:05

First we have Tom Grady.

50:08

He is a work package lead on the Kapim Open book Futures project where he runs the opening the future revenue model for Open Access books.

50:20

And Lucy Barnes is senior editor and outreach coordinator at Open Book Publishers, a leading non profit scholar LED Open Access book publisher based in Cambridge.

50:35

And we also have Sam Nesbill at from University of Sussex.

50:42

He's a research and open scholarship manager at the University of Sussex Library in Brighton.

50:50

His team manages the institutional repository and and the Open Access publication Service and the libraries Open press, as well as supporting researchers across the research life cycle.

51:07

So the floor is yours.

51:09

Tom, Lucy and Sam.

51:14

Hello.

51:14

Hello.

51:15

Hopefully you can hear us.

51:17

Yes, hello.

51:20

I appeared halfway through the last presentation.

51:22

I'm really sorry about that.

51:24

After all these years, I still don't know how to work the equipment.

51:27

Thank you very much for having us and what a great session to follow James and, and, and Martin.

51:33

That was a really interesting session and actually very relevant for a lot of the glossary of terms and, and concepts we're going to talk about.

51:39

So, so thank you for paving the way.

51:42

So without further ado, I know we're pressed for time.

51:44

I'm going to share my screen queue me doing the the thing where we all peer at our screen one moment.

51:55

OK, if someone could tell me if they can see my slides.

52:00

Yes, I've got a thumbs up.

52:01

Brilliant.

52:02

OK, fantastic.

52:04

Thank you.

52:04

Right, so straight into it.

52:07

So my job this morning is to give you all some kind of general background to all of this Open Access specifically for books.

52:15

We're going to talk about some of the opportunities and challenges around OA for books.

52:19

Lucy's then going to talk about the specifics from the publisher perspective, and Sam's going to talk on the specifics from a library perspective.

52:27

And between us, we hope to give you a good general picture from a few angles.

52:30

We would love some Q&A, so please have your questions ready.

52:35

I should say we'll share the slides afterwards.

52:37

I'm sure everyone does that.

52:38

I've embedded loads of links to further reading at the end of mine for anyone that wants to delve further into the topic, because this is necessarily a very quick skim.

52:47

So first of all, a quick word about COPEM, Open Book Futures, the project to which I and Lucy are attached.

52:55

COPEM is a project funded by Arcadia and Research England.

52:58

We're composed of librarians, scholars, infrastructure providers and some publishers based in the UK, in Europe and in the States.

53:06

And together we're working on fostering various different community approaches to Open Access for monographs.

53:13

By the way, I will probably use the term books and monographs interchangeably this morning, but what we're really talking about is the long form academic research monograph.

53:21

We're not talking about general trade books here, for example.

53:27

So let's talk for a moment a little bit about why we might even need Open Access for books.

53:31

All the conversations are very often about Open Access for journal articles.

53:35

So we're specialising on books and why now's a good time to be talking about it.

53:41

Well, as with articles, the possibilities for global dissemination and increased citation are already pretty well documented.

53:48

There's loads of articles and reports on this, but you can find a really good short summary by Mittu Lucraft on the LSE Impact blog.

53:55

There's a link to that at the end of my slides.

53:57

But Mittu's study found that downloads of Open Access books were on average 10 times higher than those of non OA books.

54:04

Citations were 2.4 times higher on average.

54:08

Higher downloads were persistent over time.

54:10

Were downloaded 61% more countries than non OA books and there's also evidence that OA books see higher usage in lower income and lower middle income countries.

54:20

These are pretty compelling figures for the usefulness and reach of arts, humanities and social sciences research who are typically publishing monographs, particularly at a time when many humanities and social sciences departments in the UK find themselves under threat, redundancy and closure.

54:38

And then you can add to this as well that the publishing world has changed fundamentally in the last 20 years.

54:44

If you read reports from the Ethica Group in the States and even the Jeff Crossick report here in the

UK, which is now almost 10 years old but still pretty relevant actually, you could argue that the traditional sales of humanities and social science academic books are declining.

54:58

Yet we're still working as a sector in much the same way we always have, largely based on a print paradigm.

55:05

That's not quite true, but it's largely kind of true.

55:07

So we do need to adapt to the changing world.

55:11

Open Access is a factor in those changes.

55:13

Like it or not, though, side note, a lot of the challenges around open are often conflated with the challenges of simply digital rather than open.

55:21

But we can talk about that more in the Q&A perhaps.

55:25

But Open Access is, is a factor, particularly when the work has been publicly funded and when much of the labour involved has been given freely by scholars in peer review, that kind of thing.

55:37

And if you cast your minds back too, to the COVID pandemic, you know, that kind of exposed how vital Open Access could be to the future of scholarly comms when no one could get into the library buildings, while at the same time it put library budgets under even more pressure than ever.

55:52

And those library budgets, those pressures are even bigger now.

55:57

I'm sure Sam will expand on that later.

56:01

Now, if you add into this mix, we're also seeing a number of policies and mandates, as we heard earlier, but they're also appearing at around OA for books.

56:10

And here we've got a bit of an elephant in the room because just last week, Research England announced there'll be no OA mandate for books in the next ref cycle, though they did indicate that from 2029, monographs will need to be OA and to be compliant.

56:26

I kind of wanted to mention that now though, because it's topical, but also because we have a few colleagues from Europe attending this this call today.

56:33

And with this decision, the UK does now seem to be kind of out of step with the rest of Europe.

56:38

If you look, this table is pinched from coalition S again, links at the end.

56:44

Elsewhere in Europe, we've got book policies from funders in the Netherlands, Austria, Norway, Ireland, Portugal.

56:52

The Council of the EU said for publicly funded research, Open Access should be the norm for monographs as well As for articles.

56:58

In the UK we do have the UKRI policy that went live this January, with an Open Access requirement for books funded by them.

57:06

That's only something like 15% of EU KS total monograph output, so they're not the only game in town.

57:12

But it is a firm policy nonetheless, and it does affect libraries who have to administer the money that comes with the policy.

57:20

OK, so we've got some good reasons there to consider publishing Open Access books.

57:24

We've got some funders requiring it, which leads to the question of right, well, how do we do it?

57:29

How do we fund them?

57:31

On this slide, I've noted a few differences between how we fund traditional or closed books versus how open books get funded.

57:38

If you look at the right hand column, you'll see that BPCS or book processing charges get mentioned several times as the main mechanism for funding.

57:46

Keep that acronym in your head because we're going to look at that in more detail in a minute because it brings us to what I think is the central challenge, and that's the economics of it all.

57:55

How to pay for a transition to Open Access for books in such a way that is fair, is sustainable to libraries, institutions, publishers?

58:06

Well, one thing we could do is to look to the journal world where as we've heard, Open Access has been a thing for much longer, where there are quite a few mature and embedded models for publishing articles openly.

58:20

But over in the journal world, the most embedded and the most dominant model for funding the production of open articles is the author pays model or APC article processing charge.

58:29

So in removing the barriers to read as we've kind of instead erected a barrier to the authors and that's just not great.

58:36

And when you look at the book equivalent, the BPC or book processing charge, it gets more complicated.

58:41

Books cost a lot more to produce.

58:45

BPCS do kind of look good in a sense because they can be attached to specific research outputs, they correlate the book with the funding, but they do concentrate costs in the wealthy institutions and they don't scale well.

58:56

So even if it's true that the money is in the system, it's not in the right places.

59:01

And don't get me started on the money in the system being spent on big journal deals.

59:05

We can save that one for the Q&A or for the pub.

59:08

Non research intensive universities really suffer with this model.

59:12

So they're privileged, funded researchers, wealthy institutions and established academics on permanent contracts.

59:19

I always like to say here that's not to demonise the BPC.

59:22

I'm not saying there's no use for it at all.

59:23

What I am saying is that if it becomes the dominant model for books, then we've got a problem as a sector.

59:30

So there are these kind of ethical concerns of equity around BPCS and then there's also the simple financial concerns.

59:39

It's kind of hard to see how the maths adds up.

59:41

They concentrate costs on specific research projects.

59:44

That's not good value for money for libraries and it's not sustaining the press as a whole.

59:48

The presses that are publishing these books that they've got underlying infrastructure to run their business, what I've heard referred to as the plumbing.

59:56

It's just paying for one book and it's costs.

59:59

Now, more than this though, there is another layer of infrastructure beneath the plumbing underlying the publishers and that's the other components of the publishing workflow.

1:00:07

Discovery layers, platforms, metadata production, dissemination, aggregation, hosting, archive.

1:00:13

I mean, publishing academic books is a really complex process.

1:00:17

And if we want open publishing to be successful, then we need to ensure that all of those elements can be provided by partners who are not just, you know, huge commercial corporations outside the university who can just put the prices up when they want or switch off access when they want.

1:00:34

So the other point the the financial point I wanted to make really is that the average BPC is around about 10,000 pounds, though they can't actually be as much as double that.

1:00:47

One reason for a higher BPCS might be that some presses are seeking to recoup some of their infrastructural costs.

1:00:54

Some presses might be just seeking to make profit.

1:00:57

But more often than not, really the nub of it is that humanities researchers don't have access to that kind of money.

1:01:02

Departments don't often have it.

1:01:03

Most libraries don't have it lying around.

1:01:06

So we need other revenue models to work alongside that.

1:01:09

And I would argue we need libraries to actively engage with those models so we don't end up with five mega publishers hoovering up nearly all the available money as has happened in the journal world.

1:01:21

You know, if there's anyone on hold to call today that's ever signed off an 8000 LB APC to Elsevier for one journal article, you know, you know that this scenario is a fast track to financial trouble when multiplied by book production costs.

1:01:35

Because in that scenario, there's a risk that the small mission LED and university presses gets kind of squeezed out and they go to the wall.

1:01:41

So in that sense, another of the challenges here is that the big stick of mandates and policies could actually backfire.

1:01:48

In trying to push the sector more quickly towards Open Access for books.

1:01:52

A policy could inadvertently make life very difficult for smaller publishers if they don't have a funding mechanism of their own.

1:02:00

So what funding mechanisms are out there now?

1:02:04

This is a deliberately confusing slide.

1:02:06

I you know you're not supposed to put wordy slides up and then talk over the top because people can't, can't concentrate.

1:02:12

So maybe ignore this for now and and please read it later at your leisure.

1:02:16

But I kind of wanted to include it to demonstrate a few points.

1:02:21

One is to show how quickly things are moving.

1:02:24

It's already out of date.

1:02:25

It was originally published by Oapen only two years ago, though I've added some embellishments myself.

1:02:32

Again, there's a link to the original at the end of the slides.

1:02:36

It's showing that you can categorise these models in a number of ways.

1:02:39

You know, like what does embargo freemium mean?

1:02:41

What does library membership mean?

1:02:44

Explanations of that those categories are on the website.

1:02:48

My purpose really is to show it's a pretty complicated picture, with funding models proliferating at quite a pace.

1:02:55

I also think it's interesting that one of the main objections surfaced by the consultation this year on the REF mandate seems to be that there aren't enough avenues for authors to publish away without doing it through BPCS, which their libraries don't have.

1:03:08

But this table does seem to indicate that there are in fact lots of ways to publish Open Access books out there, and none of these ones listed here rely on BPCS.

1:03:18

There's no real neat way to tabulate these models.

1:03:21

Lots of people have tried.

1:03:24

Many of the presses on this table use several funding streams.

1:03:27

We're going to hear from one in just a moment.

1:03:29

So they don't fit in one single category anyway.

1:03:31

Many of them will access accept BPCS too.

1:03:34

If an author comes with funding, why would you turn it away?

1:03:37

So the table really demonstrates that there's no doubt it's complicated picture for authors and for libraries to engage with and to manage in their workflow.

1:03:46

Some of these involves subscriptions, memberships, back lists, front lists, EBA embargoes.

1:03:53

And that's not even talking about green OA as an option, though Martin from Durham spoke a moment ago about publishers beginning to make moves on how libraries and authors may or may not share long form works on repositories.

1:04:04

I'll leave that conversation with librarians in the Q&A.

1:04:09

Will it remain this complicated?

1:04:11

I suspect so for a while yet.

1:04:14

Ultimately, I think we're going to have to get comfortable with the picture for now that presses are going to need to employ mixed models of funding and libraries are going to have to somehow work out how to engage with them.

1:04:24

Now that might be through disc, it might be through aggregators, it might be through kind of increasingly one stop shop kind of platforms.

1:04:32

And that could be around for a while yet.

1:04:34

And it's going to involve some pain points, particularly around budgets, budgets that are currently being spent on big journal deals, but also being spent on acquiring closed local content.

1:04:45

It's kind of a big shift for libraries, a big cultural shift for libraries and administrators above the libraries, as it were, to instead be thinking about paying to enable open global content.

1:04:57

I think it's Dominic at Salford, the library director there has a nice expression about how they're trying to shift away from acquiring content to enabling content.

1:05:05

There are lots of kind of thought leaders.

1:05:07

I don't like that expression, but there's lots of library leaders talking about this and making moves in this area.

1:05:12

If you want to know or be put in touch with any of those, Coving Project can put you in touch.

1:05:16

But off the top of my head, you know, Salford, Sheffield, Sussex, some of these libraries are making great strides in Recon, reconfiguring their library budgets.

1:05:28

So lastly, I mentioned at the start our work on the Coving Project.

1:05:33

This slide isn't just a clumsy plug.

1:05:36

If you're interested in knowing more, please do take a look at the websites on this slide.

1:05:41

All of the challenges I've just highlighted just now we're trying to tackle in various ways.

1:05:45

The OBC Open Book Collective is attempting to bring together many small OA presses and infrastructure providers in one place where they can more easily attract funding.

1:05:55

They can make small library payments go further, basically opening the futures, doing something similar, working with legacy publishers who are trying to flip to OA in good faith after many years of traditional publishing.

1:06:06

That's also a community funding model and the Tote team are also working on that critical open infrastructure, trying to ensure that OA books can be found, their metadata that is open and can be passed between publishers, libraries and readers usefully and freely without being monetised by commercial platforms.

1:06:25

So I think that is me.

1:06:27

I'm going to hand over now to Lucy to talk in more depth about the publisher perspective and I hope you'll join us for some questions in the Q&A.

1:06:37

Now, how do I stop sharing?

1:06:44

Thanks, Tom.

1:06:44

I think I may have taken the controls from you.

1:06:49

So hi everyone.

1:06:51

My name is Lucy Barnes.

1:06:52

And as was introduced at the beginning, I'm editor and outreach coordinator at Open Book Publishers, which is a scholar LED Open Access non profit press based in Cambridge.

1:07:02

And so I think my role is, is partly to give a kind of press perspective on this.

1:07:07

But as we are an Open Access press, it will be a kind of particular perspective, I suppose.

1:07:12

We're very embedded in Open Access.

1:07:13

We've always published our books Open Access.

1:07:16

And so in some respects we're kind of unusual.

1:07:18

Not a lot of presses operate like this, although a growing number do.

1:07:22

But I think it, it helps because, you know, we are very embedded in these issues.

1:07:26

We know quite a lot about them.

1:07:27

And we can, I can hopefully today lay out some of the issues from that kind of press perspective.

1:07:37

So I'm going to talk a little bit also about finances to begin with, because this is sort of the probably the main issue that people think about when they first begin to grapple with Open Access, including Open Access for books.

1:07:48

So the book processing charge is probably a model that you're familiar with.

1:07:51

Certainly Tom's talked about it.

1:07:52

I imagine the previous session talked about certainly the APC, if not the BPC.

1:07:57

And as Tom said, it can be usually around 10K, it can be less, can be around 5K, or it can be more up to about 20 K.

1:08:03

You pay that to the publisher.

1:08:04

They make your book Open Access via their platforms, via their different distribution channels.

1:08:09

And for many presses, this is how they do Open Access for books.

1:08:12

If they do Open Access for books, I think particularly it's fair to say the more prestigious presses, large commercials, large university presses tend to rely on the book processing charge.

1:08:23

It's I suppose you can think of it as a hedge against risk because a lot of presses say, well, we don't know if we'll lose sales if we make a book Open Access.

1:08:29

We expect that we will.

1:08:30

So we're going to charge this upfront fee, but it's also a way of keeping Open Access as an expensive add on to a closed system.

1:08:38

So a book processing charge is evidence that you're saying, well, most of our books are closed access.

1:08:42

That's how we fund most of our operations.

1:08:44

This is something that we'll do if somebody wants it for a fee.

1:08:48

And for obvious reasons, it's very unpopular with authors who don't want to try and find the money for a book processing charge.

1:08:53

For obvious reasons.

1:08:54

It's, as Tom has laid out, pretty unsustainable for libraries and I'd argue for funders as well.

1:09:01

And fundamentally, it's a kind of failure of the imagination.

1:09:06

It's a way of saying, well, Open Access is going to be, as I've said, a kind of an add on and not all presses that use it love it.

1:09:13

So some presses that use it are trying to find ways to move away from it.

1:09:17

And I'm going to talk about some of those ways today.

1:09:21

And I think as we've said, if we want more people to publish Open Access books, which I'd argue we do, and if we want that participation to be equitable and open for all, which I'd also argue that we do, then the book processing charge is not going to be the way to do it.

1:09:34

We can't make this work if a single book can cost up to 20,000 lbs to make Open Access.

1:09:39

That is not a sustainable way to run publishing in a kind of broad sense.

1:09:44

So what are some of the alternatives?

1:09:48

Well, we've got collective diamond funding models and I'm going to talk a little bit about these because this is how ABP sustains what we do.

1:09:57

So diamond, you may have come across this as one of many different words of colour stone, precious metal related words.

1:10:04

For Open Access, diamond is where no one individual has to pay a fee.

1:10:08

The author does not pay a fee and the reader doesn't pay a fee.

1:10:11

The book is Open Access and it's funded by other means.

1:10:14

And for collective diamond funding models, they're funded via collective support for an entire publishing programme.

1:10:19

So a large number of institutions or funders or whatever it might be, pay a small amount and then collectively that becomes a large part for a press to fund either an entire list or in some cases it's entire operations to make them all Open Access without having to charge individual fees.

1:10:35

And so it's a kind of abstract or theory that's maybe a bit difficult to to get a grasp on how it works in practise.

1:10:40

So it's worth just saying a little bit.

1:10:41

I think about how it works at the press that I work for.

1:10:45

So open book publishers, as I've said, is a scholar LED press.

1:10:47

It's a non profit press.

1:10:48

It was founded in 2008.

1:10:50

So it's relatively old for an Open Access press, not for other kinds of press, obviously.

1:10:56

And it's mission driven.

1:10:56

So the academics who founded it did so because they wanted high quality research to be available everywhere for everyone and they didn't want to put barriers in front of readers.

1:11:05

But as authors themselves, they didn't want to put barriers in front of authors.

1:11:09

And just to give you a bit of a sense of the scale of what we do, we're not enormous, but we're also not completely tiny.

1:11:14

We publish between 40 to 50 peer reviewed books per year.

1:11:17

These are all Open Access from the data publication.

1:11:19

There is no embargo.

1:11:21

We publish PDF and HTML editions that are freely accessible.

1:11:25

And then we also charge for paperback card back and E pub.

1:11:28

We keep the amount that we charge for those as low as we can.

1:11:31

But we do charge.

1:11:32

And as I will explain, that is an important income, income stream for us.

1:11:37

So the books are accessed worldwide every 80,000 times each month.

1:11:40

They're downloaded, I think in pretty much every country in the world.

1:11:43

Now, in some cases they're prize winning books.

1:11:46

So authors can sometimes be worried about prestige when they publish with a smaller press.

1:11:50

But these books can be well recognised and often are.

1:11:53

We also are interested in innovative types of publishing.

1:11:55

So we're very happy to publish a straightforward monograph that's just text and no images.

1:11:59

That's fine.

1:12:00

But if you are an author, or you know of an author who wants to do something a bit more innovative, adventurous, taking advantage of the possibilities of digital, we're interested in doing that as well and we make sure the books are as widely available as we possibly can.

1:12:13

So that's what we do and we fund it via partially via a library membership programme.

1:12:19

And this is the kind of collective aspect of the funding of our work.

1:12:23

So we have over 270 library members.

1:12:26

They pay an annual fee for membership, which is for smaller institutions around £300, for larger institutions around 700, then that works out at around 400 euros, €800 respectively.

1:12:38

And in return for that there are some benefits that those institutions get.

1:12:41

So in addition to all the the PDF and HTML editions, they get free access to the E pub editions.

1:12:47

Anyone on the library, on the library or the institutions network can access those for free, can download them, can keep them even if the membership lapses, if the library chooses not to renew, they keep those books and they also get discounts on paperbacks and hardbacks.

1:13:00

Again, anyone on the network gets that.

1:13:02

We supply good metadata, so libraries can ingest the books into their catalogues easily.

1:13:06

If they want me to, for example, to come and talk at the institution or if they want Flyers for Open Access week, you could do that for them.

1:13:12

And this kind of collective approach is being taken up by other publishers.

1:13:15

And I'll talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

1:13:17

But the main reason that libraries fund us is not to get free ebooks for books that are Open Access anyway.

1:13:22

The reason that libraries do this is because they see it as a way to fund Open Access books for everyone in a way that does not incur a disproportionate cost on anyone institution, anyone individual and anyone funder.

1:13:35

And so how does this fit into our broader sort of revenue?

1:13:39

So we publish, as I've said, 40 to 50 books per year On average they cost £5500 per book.

1:13:45

That is very much an average cost.

1:13:46

Some cost less if they're very straightforward.

1:13:48

Some can cost a lot more if they're more innovative or if they have demands on them for particular reasons.

1:13:54

And these are the sort of three main revenue streams that we use to cover our costs.

1:13:58

The smallest one, the green one is non standard production charges.

1:14:01

It's very small.

1:14:01

So I'm kind of discounting it for the purposes of this run through, but you'll see the blue segment there is the, the second largest segment that's sales.

1:14:10

So if a press ever tells you if the book's Open Access, we won't sell it.

1:14:13

That's untrue.

1:14:14

They will be able to sell copies if they have copies for sale.

1:14:18

There's a question mark over whether Open Access does impact sales.

1:14:21

I, I think there's probably not enough research yet to to say definitively one way or the other, but certainly it does not eliminate sales.

1:14:29

We still sell a large number of books.

1:14:31

And then the other, the yellow segment, which is the smallest segment, is title grants and donations.

1:14:35

So if authors can apply for grants to support the publication of their work, we'll ask that they do so.

1:14:41

But if a book passes peer review and an author has no funding whatsoever, we will still publish that book without any funding whatsoever.

1:14:47

And to give you an idea of how many books we published without funding last year, we published as it says there are 49 titles, 35 of those had no funding attacks whatsoever.

1:14:57

Four of them had partial funding, 10 of them were fully funded.

1:15:00

So if we were ABPC based publisher, if we, if we published Open Access purely 3 BPCS, we'd have published 10 books last year and instead we published 49.

1:15:08

So this gives you an indication of the kind of power of the library membership programme because that's the largest chunk there, that's the the red chunk.

1:15:14

That is the largest revenue stream that we received last year.

1:15:17

It's been the largest revenue stream for about the last two years.

1:15:20

And we're trying to get to a point eventually where we eliminate reliance on title grants entirely.

1:15:26

So that's all to say that's how it works and it can work.

1:15:31

And there are other examples of presses that are using this model or experimenting with this model.

1:15:37

So Pumpkin Books use it.

1:15:39

They're a fellow scholar LED Open Access press.

1:15:42

The Open Book Collective, which is a Cochrane development, enables a large number of smaller presses who wouldn't by themselves necessarily be able to do this, to come together and to put themselves forward to libraries.

1:15:53

It makes it easy for libraries to choose which ones they want to invest in or not.

1:15:58

And it also gives libraries, if they wish, a stake in the governance of the ABC.

1:16:01

So the ABC let's libraries who subscribe to it take part in the governance to have a vote and a voice in the future direction of the ABC.

1:16:08

You've also got opening the future that Tom can maybe talk a bit about in the Q&A, which is a different model that uses closed access academic books as a kind of sweetener for a subscription that supports Open Access front list.

1:16:20

And then you've got perhaps more well known presses or larger presses like Taylor and Francis starting to experiment with these kinds of approaches with the pledge to open with a couple of lists.

1:16:28

Bloomsbury have a similar model, and MIT Press have actually converted their entire frontlist to Open Access using a model like this.

1:16:36

So these kinds of things are beginning to grow and develop, and presses are beginning to experiment with them.

1:16:41

As I'm not a librarian, I don't really want to talk too much about how libraries might respond to this.

1:16:44

I think Sam might say a bit more about that, but I would say two things.

1:16:48

If you are in the position where you are assessing a model like this, ask for transparency on costs, because otherwise you don't know where this money is going.

1:16:56

If what they're asking for is reasonable, look at how many books you're going to be getting or how many books are going to be made Open Access as a result of the support for this model.

1:17:05

And beware of woolly language that make the the initiative sound like it's really community minded and beneficent.

1:17:12

Because around Diamond you often get quite loose use of words like community LED or community approach.

1:17:18

And I'd ask if you see that kind of language, what does it mean?

1:17:21

So for example, something like the ABC, which offers a role in governance to libraries.

1:17:25

You're not just customers then you are you do have a stake in in the direction of the the infrastructure.

1:17:31

So to that degree it is meaningfully community LED, whereas if you're just helping to fund it, is that really community LED?

1:17:38

I don't know.

1:17:40

And so as well as diamond models, there is a growth in institutional Open Access presses in the UK and elsewhere.

1:17:47

Now these presses may not all be diamond or they may offer a diamond route for their own institutions authors, but not for other institutions authors.

1:17:54

But they are a growing response to Open Access and they often support book publication.

1:17:59

The Open Institutional Publishing Association is a really good network in the UK, which is bringing some of these institutional presses and projects together.

1:18:07

There are other networks as well.

1:18:09

There's NUP in the Netherlands and there's the institution.

1:18:13

There's the IOAP in Ireland, and there's a number of different networks like this that are coming together across Europe.

1:18:21

So be aware of these kinds of things and think about how your library might want to participate or your institution might want to participate in networks like this.

1:18:30

I want to touch just briefly on green Open Access as well.

1:18:33

The previous session was talking about this quite a lot in relation to journals, certainly, and for books, it's maybe a bit more complicated.

1:18:40

Some presses allow green Open Access for books that they published.

1:18:45

Some of them charge a fee, some of them don't.

1:18:48

For a small number of presses, the Goldsmiths is the is the main one I'm aware of in this regard.

1:18:53

It's actually how they enable Open Access.

1:18:55

So if an author publishes with Goldsmiths, Goldsmiths will put the author's accepted manuscript in the Goldsmiths repository to be openly accessible.

1:19:03

Although the actual published version of the book is, is a standard closed access book.

1:19:10

I would argue it's probably not particularly popular with authors in the sense that I've published an article, not a, not a book or you know, can access.

1:19:17

And it was a tick box exercise.

1:19:19

I wasn't excited about sharing it.

1:19:21

It was just there because it had to be there.

1:19:22

And that's fine.

1:19:25

And also, I think as a publisher, you know, books are, are more complicated than articles.

1:19:28

There's a lot of work that goes into making a book navigable.

1:19:31

It's much longer obviously, than an article.

1:19:33

You might have things like an index that a publisher might embed cross references to different chapters.

1:19:39

Often we receive manuscripts for which images are crucial, but the manuscript that the author sends us does not have the images inside.

1:19:45

That's something that we add as part of the typesetting process.

1:19:48

So if they're not there in the in the green version, that's not great.

1:19:52

And also copy editing.

1:19:54

For some books, the copy editing involved is minimal.

1:19:56

The authors have done a spectacular job.

1:19:58

For other books, particularly if English isn't always the authors first language, we do quite an extensive job of copy editing.

1:20:03

And in those cases.

1:20:05

It's you know, the books can be long, they can be two hundred 304 hundred 500 pages.

1:20:09

So the copy editing, the longer the book gets makes more of a difference, I think to the to the reader's experience.

1:20:16

And then just to wrap up a few links again, I hope we'll we'll share these slides.

1:20:20

So if you want to explore them, you can.

1:20:22

But if you are an author or if you need to support authors who are thinking about Open Access, these are some networks that bring a number of publishers together and that have sort of quality controls effectively on on the presses.

1:20:32

So they have to meet certain standards to be part of these different networks.

1:20:36

And there are also resources out there that can offer knowledge and support about Open Access book publishing.

1:20:41

So the O 8 and O Eight Books tool kit is great for authors.

1:20:44

It's written with them in mind, guides them through the different stages of publishing an Open Access book, The OABN, the Open Access Books network, which I helped to coordinate, that's really available for all sorts of different stakeholder groups.

1:20:54

So for authors, but also for librarians, for publishers, for funders to find out more about Open Access book publishing.

1:21:00

And we also have a page there of information for for authors, which we're going to be developing and sharing in Open Access Week in October.

1:21:08

So that is everything.

1:21:09

I hope I didn't go on for too long and happy to take questions obviously now or at the end.

1:21:23

I think we'll keep the questions until the end and we'll hear from Sam first.

1:21:29

Thank you, Lucy.

1:21:31

Oh, this.

1:21:32

Thank you, Lucy.

1:21:33

My turn to faff around.

1:21:37

So hopefully.

1:21:38

Can someone just confirm you can see that?

1:21:42

Yes.

1:21:42

Great, brilliant.

1:21:43

Thank you very much.

1:21:45

Hello everyone.

1:21:45

My name's Sam.

1:21:46

I'm the research members of Scholarship Senior manager at University of Sussex down in Brighton.

1:21:51

Thank you for for the invite to speak today and thanks to Tom and Lucy for their fascinating presentation so far.

1:21:56

They've covered an awful lot.

1:21:57

What I'm going to do is, is drill down a little bit and give a brief snapshot of how we navigate all this complexity here at Sussex.

1:22:04

Well, I will examine at the beginning of the presentation anyway, some of the challenges.

1:22:07

I'd like to start by echoing the kind of the general sense of positivity from the previous speakers.

1:22:12

Despite the complexity of Open Access in the book space, and perhaps precisely because of it, I think there is a real opportunity to examine the kinds of Open Access we want to see in the book space, and not necessarily replicate the kind of commercialisation of scholarly research that we've seen in the article space.

1:22:28

And whilst someone's honestly respecting and including more traditional notions of the book in our explorations.

1:22:34

And so the challenges, the sentiment from many colleagues or authors at Sussex is one that many of you as as library Co workers will probably recognise a kind of weary concession that yes, Open Access is now a thing in the arts, humanities and social sciences.

1:22:49

And yes, it's the future of publishing.

1:22:50

But yes, I also still want to publish my book with Routledge or CUP in hardback, as if somehow the weight of the physical object relates to the double weighting it might get in REF 2029.

1:23:01

These kinds of legacy publishing predispositions contained within them the hoary notions of prestige that have influenced the direction of travel of Open Access in the article space.

1:23:11

But one of the most surprising aspects of our institutional survey recently in response to the REF 2029 Open Access consultation was how our authors across schools and disciplines could think that the proposals for articles were too wishy washy and not radical enough.

1:23:25

And they were surprised that embargo was still being included, for example, but that the proposals for long form outputs were unachievable, misguided or even dangerous.

1:23:33

And the main reason was quote unquote cost or what others more accurately called pricing.

1:23:39

And we've heard a lot about the cost of publishing Open Access and mainly high onto the BPC model.

1:23:44

And we'll talk a bit more about that.

1:23:46

But the knock on effect of this focus on what Open Access books cost leads to a perceived threat and colleagues and disciplines as as as both of speakers have mentioned, who have seen disproportionate cuts to both funding and resource in their fields.

1:23:59

They see these enormous BPCS and the dominance of the corporate publishers that tend to charge them.

1:24:04

There's yet further evidence that the the higher education sector sees their work as somehow secondary, as an intent on more on supporting open science.

1:24:11

And we have to be careful the lot in the terminology we use here at Sussex to not just say open science, open research, open scholarship are the terms that we choose to to use.

1:24:20

A recurrent comment in our consultation was that the threat that the BPC model poses to smaller independent presses will result in a a further decimated humanities sector.

1:24:29

It will reduce vital biblii diversity and specialisms and further deepen the chasms between the disciplines.

1:24:35

And now I personally don't see Open Access as a threat in any way in that regard, but I do see that threat coming from the BPC model.

1:24:42

So again, there's a bit of a pivoting that we have to do in these conversations as librarians.

1:24:47

That's a big picture.

1:24:48

And we've seen already from from Lucy and Tom's presentation is that there's an awful lot going on and it's a big picture to try and explain away just because open is good.

1:24:55

We're used to being able to advocate for Open Access for articles and conference proceedings, largely because it's been around for a lot longer and it's quite a simple transactional relation between, for example, an APC or a different form of article funding and what you get out of it.

1:25:12

We don't have as much experience I don't think to draw on as proponents of Open Access for books, and that's certainly something that we're looking to cultivate here at Sussex.

1:25:19

And all of this is before we even get to the nitty gritty of what Open Access throws up as applied to long form material.

1:25:26

Some of the pushback we get is that there are too many unanswered questions.

1:25:29

If you're anything like me, the librarians in the room would have been in the situation where you're discussing Open Access with the researcher and you suddenly realise that there are deeper depths to their questions and what you thought you knew suddenly makes very little sense and you've gone down the wormhole.

1:25:42

It's what makes our work really interesting a lot of the time.

1:25:44

But it's challenging and the standard model of Open Access as applied to articles doesn't fit with books in ways that both previous speakers have linked.

1:25:52

Questions around copyright and licencing, but especially the third party permissions abound in this space to the the extent that you care over the new policy of dedicated guides that they need to make to help their authors navigate all this stuff.

1:26:05

So it's definitely complicated.

1:26:07

Books are fundamentally different to articles and the application of perhaps what could be called article centric policy to Open Access books has seen a backlash.

1:26:16

But none of what we've seen with UK RISE policy or the proposed ref policy detracts from the fundamental benefits of Open Access itself that Tom so eloquently described in in the first presentation.

1:26:25

And this is where I think we have a real opportunity to perhaps use the compliance based or dry conversations that we have to have with our authors to pivot towards more interesting ones in examining what kind of Open Access could look like for books.

1:26:39

And this is also where the kinds of sensible, informed voices that preceded me here today are key allies.

1:26:44

And they're able to bypass perhaps the knee jerk responses and advocate for for changing more measured ways.

1:26:50

It's certainly complex.

1:26:52

Books are different, but there are answers to these naughty questions and it just may take a bit more time to unravel them.

1:26:58

After all, as this picture illustrates, there are different ways to write a book and different ways to read one.

1:27:02

And this often in our conversation, in our experience, leads onto more interesting questions such as what is a book or what will the book be in the future.

1:27:11

Putting aside for a moment the kind of related notion of the book as a measure of a researcher's progress in academia, which is very important.

1:27:19

It's standing as a cultural object and what that how that can stand in for reputation advancement and focusing more on the kind of the format of the technical aspects, we can see real opportunities to augment the form here.

1:27:33

I should note here as a caveat, though, that I consider myself among the leaders who prefer the physical object.

1:27:38

But when we're talking about the future of the book and its shape, and I think that's where we try to direct our conversations at Sussex, what the digital realm affords us is really exciting.

1:27:46

And it's really exciting to see what kind of shapes emerge.

1:27:49

I've just got 3 examples on this, the slide here.

1:27:52

The first one is a mediaeval manuscript, an early recognisable form of what we understand as the book, but now with the functionality of the zoom in and closely examine the digital, the digital parchment.

1:28:03

And this is in Lucy's Open Book Publishers catalogue in a book called Piety in Pieces.

1:28:09

The second one is University of London Press, again collaborators with us as part of OIPA, which I'll talk a bit more about later, which is a forthcoming project called Living with Machines, which is a multi authored collaborative project containing interactive maps, data mining, visualisations, embedding of multimedia content, all of which goes towards examining the industrial age and its technologies with our own updated, quote unquote, industrial technologies.

1:28:36

And lastly, we have a micro book.

1:28:37

I came across this very recently.

1:28:39

It's a micro book within the book, an Open Access book, again with the University of London Press called Queer Between the Covers, which was a history of queer publishing.

1:28:47

And it reminded me of the idea that publishing has always taken many forms.

1:28:50

Books have always taken many forms, not least as an act of resistance and a way of platforming marginalised voices.

1:28:56

And I think again, there's an opportunity there for how Open Access can be aligned with missions, values, etcetera.

1:29:02

And it's often useful to use these kinds of terms when selling things to library leadership, for example.

1:29:07

You broaden out the scope of what a single decision can be and all of a sudden you're having a more interesting conversation.

1:29:14

So, so far, so highfalutin.

1:29:16

What are we actually doing at Sussex practically on the ground?

1:29:21

As I mentioned, cost comes up again and it's been a focus of the the two previous presentations because it is the most immediate and the most prevalent questions that we get.

1:29:29

So it would be remiss of me not to mention money and how we try to put our money where our mouth is.

1:29:34

Like most of you, we're working with restricted budgets, ever dwindling amounts of money and higher education.

1:29:40

And generally the sector is in a bit of a rough shape at the minute.

1:29:43

But in closely examining our budgets, we've had an opportunity to really choose about what we commit to.

1:29:50

My predecessor in my role, Bethany Logan, who's now our Associate Director, sets up what's called a resource evaluation group, where we bring in acquisitions, collections, Open Access research teams, all to evaluate what we spend the budgets on as a collective.

1:30:05

And we have certain key criteria that we brought in that we didn't have before around commits to sustainability.

1:30:11

And especially when it comes to the open initiatives that we fund, we've actually found it very easy to justify the spend because as Lucy has pointed out is minimal compared to certain other things that we spend our money on.

1:30:23

And so supporting initiatives like the Open Access Community framework, the Open Book Collective and models like Opening the Future, as well as the infrastructure that Tom mentioned like you know,

directory of Open Access Books, it's been an easy sell to library leadership when the focus of the the dwindling budgets we have is understanding we've been on the huge prices that we pay for transformative agreements.

1:30:45

It doesn't actually cost us that much to support this initiatives.

1:30:48

And the kind of prices that we're talking about are dwarfed by your average APC even.

1:30:54

But a simple case if you, if you need a justification was to look at how other budgets are apportioned.

1:31:00

So your acquisitions budget or your reading this budget and how they are apportioned across schools or disciplines.

1:31:06

I imagine there would be an emphasis on fairness and distribution and then look at what you spend on OA.

1:31:11

And I imagine like us, you might after a tricky data analysis, don't, don't get me wrong, might find that there there is a tilt towards STEM and that the majority of APC payments, for example, might have gone towards colleagues publishing in STEM.

1:31:22

And so there's an imbalance there that needs to be redressing.

1:31:25

And I think the monograph or the book as the primary output for colleagues in Arch manages and social sciences is one way to focus that that rebalance for BPCS.

1:31:35

It's still the most common query we get.

1:31:37

Understandably, we'll often agree to commit a portion around an average APCS worth to essentially educate our authors.

1:31:43

So we use it as a kind of an advocacy tool, as a way both to start a conversation to illuminate how much a full BPC is.

1:31:51

And 10,000 is, is the not just the cap for UK ARRI, but also the average price.

1:31:57

And we've already seen that once you're guaranteed 10,000 lbs funding from UK ARRI, for example, then the prices creep up and up and up.

1:32:03

And universities, libraries have to find that shortfall.

1:32:06

So another reason why the BPC isn't really sustainable.

1:32:09

So while we commit to paying BPCS depending on the one-on-one queries we get, we try to focus those conversations more on Ecrs and PGRS who come to us about turning their thesis into a book and to get them early, essentially to try and educate as much as we can with digital information that we can gather because it's still quite a nascent space.

1:32:28

We do also deny more established academics money for BPCS.

1:32:33

We don't have a monograph pot like some places do, lower leadership.

1:32:37

We're very keen to avoid that because then you just chip away at it with 10,000 lbs of pop or more and it disappears very quickly.

1:32:44

So we try to spend a little money that we have in engaging conversations with our researchers.

1:32:52

Talking about all this is one thing.

1:32:53

The main thing we like to do is listen.

1:32:55

Our recent REF consultation was a valuable exercise in taking universities temperature about all this stuff.

1:33:01

The weird mixture of frustration and relief might validate Research England's decision to postpone a REF mandate, but it pointed to very real concerns that our researchers have and so we have a duty to understand these better.

1:33:13

So again, it's about engagement really for us.

1:33:16

One thing we're doing in terms of engagement is to begin what we're calling our open press.

1:33:23

It's an adventure in open publishing essentially based very much on the author demand.

1:33:27

It started with a trial of an open educational resources platform called Press Books and the publication of a textbook, primarily because the editor of the textbook was very interested in open publishing.

1:33:39

But also the hiking costs for textbooks has been well documented by the Ebook SOS campaign.

1:33:46

And so again justifying that approach as a money saving venture often gets things passed through certain committees etcetera.

1:33:53

That's often an approach we use.

1:33:56

But it's been a wonderful opportunity to really get hands on experience in terms of what publishing means and what publishing long form outputs means.

1:34:04

The the ethos of our press as it stands in this nascent form is very much in the scaling small spirit that so many lucid voices in the Open Access discourse advise.

1:34:14

We don't want to grow too much or too quickly.

1:34:16

And really it's all internally funded at this stage.

1:34:18

And so we'll be looking at the diamond models that Lucy talked about as a way to sustain us going forward.

1:34:24

There are other initiatives that seek to tilt the balance as well.

1:34:27

There's the wonderful initiative called Trail Blazers with Liverpool University Press and Liverpool Lancaster and Salford, who have been mentioned before, and it was talking to colleagues at these institutions that made us decide to to kind of dip our toes in the water.

1:34:41

What we're doing with our open press is not to try to circumvent the challenges that have been described today, but it's more about trying to experiment and innovate with open research more generally in line with the university's strategic goals.

1:34:52

And again, that makes it quite an easy sell towards university leadership.

1:34:55

Anyway, I can't emphasise enough how interesting it's been to talk to librarians and publishers alike about how we might do things differently.

1:35:04

It's generated a lot of energy and across the sector I feel that there's sympathies being forged amongst the scholar D comms community around Open Access books in ways that maybe the weariness of Welsh Schmerz that has developed over Apcs and transformative agreements or maybe moving away from that.

1:35:21

It's still early days with our press, but one of the major focal points will be our membership of OIPA that Lucy mentioned before the Open Institutional Press Association.

1:35:27

We're learning an awful lot from colleagues across the publishing spectrum and I think this highlights our general approach to some of the challenges that we face in Open Access and books.

1:35:38

Elaine Sykes at Lancaster put it very well in their UK SG talk with with Tom earlier this year when she said that maybe we need to know a bit more about how books are made before we start to advocate fully for change.

1:35:49

And that kind of immersive learning is, is central to how we're we're understanding things and how we'll undertake our approach in future in the interest of time.

1:35:58

I think I will stop there on a slide to say that collaboration is key.

1:36:02

AIPA has been a wonderful eye opening collaboration so far.

1:36:06

We're also members of ALPSP and we want to collaborate with anyone and everyone because we find that learning in that way and developing in that way is the best way to go about things.

1:36:18

Thank you very much.

1:36:29

Thank you, Tom, Lucy and Sam for these attention grabbing talks.

1:36:35

John, I suspect you have some questions for our three speakers.

1:36:45

Yeah, we've not had any come through yet, so do do get your questions in for our speakers if you have any.

1:36:50

There are no stupid questions as ever.

1:36:54

Yeah, just thank you to our three speakers for that absolutely fascinating area.

1:36:58

And and as you've outlined there an area where there's there's so much innovation and, and, and thinking going on again.

1:37:07

Yeah, it was a real surprise when when the the ref.

1:37:10

Well, to me it was a real surprise when when those long form requirements weren't included in the ref.

1:37:15

So it's it's it really is a hot topic at the moment.

1:37:21

One of the things that seems to come out quite strongly from from all three of you is that that green Open Access for books seems to be a no goer.

1:37:31

Or if we're looking further down the line, that's not where that's not where sharing of long form materials is probably going to end up.

1:37:39

Is that, is that right?

1:37:47

I think it it might be a route that I think it's a route that some libraries are keen to support because they think it might be effective and because it may well be cheaper than other routes.

1:38:01

But I think as I said from my perspective, from the publishing perspective, I don't think it's very user friendly for the reader.

1:38:08

And so personally speaking, I hope it's not the sort of main way that that we go with Open Access for books.

1:38:15

But yeah, I think it's, I think one of the interesting things about Open Access for books at the moment is that it is still very much in flux.

1:38:22

There is a lot of new developments, as you know, Tom laid out with his terrifying slide.

1:38:25

And as Tom and I, Sam and I have both talked about as well.

1:38:28

So I think it's it's hard to make firm predictions, but I suspect it's not going to be as popular a week as it is for journal articles.

1:38:36

Brilliant, thank you.

1:38:37

You've got a question from from James from Durham, who we heard from earlier on Green Open Access you mentioned about some universities making strides in refocusing library budgets.

1:38:48

Do you have any advice for how librarians can advocate within their institution, but outside of the library as well, for the need to repurpose library budgets to support some level of altruistic funding models?

1:39:01

I hope that made sense.

1:39:02

I don't know who wants to tackle it.

1:39:03

Did yeah, absolutely.

1:39:04

I, I, I can attempt to that.

1:39:06

Thank you, James.

1:39:06

It's, it's, it's something we would grapple with a great deal.

1:39:10

I think a focus on the numbers has helped us here in that when people realise how much things cost or you know, your average APC, etcetera, but all about the kind of the big deals, the transformative agreements and how much money we're funnelling towards normally the same 5 commercial players.

1:39:30

It's quite easy to make a case for investigating on alternatives because everyone's under similar sorts of pressures and, and they, they vary the higher up or the lower down you go.

1:39:38

I suppose we found it.

1:39:40

We've got very supportive VC here at Sussex who is very much about open.

1:39:45

And so any kind of divergent of funds from closed subscription paying to read towards open is generally well supported.

1:39:52

And when it comes to more nascent adventures like books, it's a bit more of a struggle.

1:39:59

But then when you hear people talk like Tom and and Lucy about how straightforward they make it sound, it's actually becomes quite, a, quite an easy sell.

1:40:08

And especially when the, the, the money's involved are dwindled, dwarfed rather by the kinds of hundreds of thousands of pounds that we're, we're forking out to, to Elsevier and, and the like.

1:40:17

So it's not much of a kind of practical answer, but really just to say that we found it quite straightforward here at Sussex.

1:40:23

And I'll probably think up some more practical steps and contact James offline.

1:40:29

We we actually wrote a couple of blog posts with some practical steps in it, if that's any use.

1:40:35

There's a link to the first one at the end of my slides.

1:40:39

So if it's OK for us to share slides with everyone, I think it's the very final link on the very final page.

1:40:46

It's kind of, it's called how can I persuade my library to support Open Access books?

1:40:51

So hopefully there's some kind of practical stuff in there.

1:40:53

It's all crowdsourced from librarians.

1:40:55

And we've got Part 3 coming up.

1:40:56

I think.

1:40:57

Lucy, is that right?

1:40:59

We have, yeah.

1:41:00

And I think I'd also maybe slightly push back on the idea that it's entirely altruistic to fund models like ours, because as I mentioned, you know, last year we published 35 books without charging an author a fee and without any kind of funding support.

1:41:15

And although that's not an enormous amount, we're not the only press that's doing that.

1:41:19

And I think if you're, if you think you may have authors who need or want to publish an Open Access book, then paying say £300 or £700.00 for the library membership programme to help support operations like ours is much, much cheaper than being stuck in a position where presses like us go under because nobody's supporting us.

1:41:35

And therefore you have to pay 10K or 15K or whatever it might be.

1:41:38

So I think there's a maybe there's there is a kind of self interested maybe if that's the right phrase or

kind of an economic argument to support presses like ours, even though the content would be a can access anyway, that would wouldn't be a mandatory fee for the author anyway.

1:41:51

It's still, you know, it's worth supporting us because it's worth having options like that out there.

1:41:55

Basically.

1:41:57

We could just add to that as well and say that the the idea that's been started by Robert Kylie etcetera, that the publishers become more service providers in ways or the bigger publishers we treat more service providers now has been a useful hook for us in that we we can demonstrate with the smaller omission aligned values driven publishers like OBP and to some extent some of the Open Access community framework ones where the service that they're providing in the open book space is far exceeds that that you get from the bigger players.

1:42:26

You pay ABPC and then your book is made open with them.

1:42:28

Whereas there are mentorship schemes that University of London Press are trialling and it's part of the Trail Blazers initiative.

1:42:35

There's a real kind of hands on.

1:42:36

We will work with you to develop your book and you can, you can, you can provide tangible evidence for what that cost is painful.

1:42:44

And it's much more straightforward, much more easy to evidence with the smaller process than it is for the larger ones.

1:42:49

And so we've used that a great deal.

1:42:55

Thank you, everybody.

1:42:56

And I think I'm right that the slides will be shared with attendees.

1:43:00

I think Vicky will correct me if I'm wrong.

1:43:02

I'm, I'm 99% certain that happens.

1:43:05

So sorry.

1:43:06

We can share them.

1:43:06

Yeah, we can share them afterwards.

1:43:09

So you will be able to access that link that, that Tom's mentioned there.

1:43:12

Yeah, if you have any more questions, we do have about I think 5 more minutes for questions.

1:43:17

So do get those in.

1:43:20

One of the things that I was thinking about when when we've been talking is about prestige and the prestige that authors academics apply to, to to certain publishers.

1:43:31

And a lot of the the problems that we have when helping to administer authors looking to publish books is that they want to publish with with specific publishers.

1:43:41

Is that is that a problem?

1:43:42

Does that limit the help that we can offer And does that there's loads of innovative models out there and loads of options out there.

1:43:49

But if, if, if authors are looking at specific publishers, does does that complicate things this this notion of prestige it can do?

1:44:00

Yeah, definitely.

1:44:01

And I think it's worth acknowledging that authors want to publish with prestigious presses not only

because they are prestigious, but, you know, because that prestige means that there is a community of readers who are always looking for what that press is producing.

1:44:12

So it's not simply obviously a kind of transactional, I want the CV points necessarily.

1:44:17

But I think at the same time, it's worth emphasising that, you know, there are other options out there and that that kind of cache or prestige that those presses have can sometimes translate into things like higher BPCS.

1:44:30

So it's not that.

1:44:31

It's just simply, you know, I'm going to publish with this press and they'll they'll maybe accept my work and then I'll get that kind of benefit.

1:44:37

But there's a cost to it as well.

1:44:39

And I think maybe we don't always talk frankly about those costs.

1:44:42

And I think once the costs are being aimed at the authors in the form of BPCS, sometimes that can become a frustration With Open Access.

1:44:48

It's like, well, this is a problem with Open Access.

1:44:50

It's like, well, it's not actually.

1:44:51

It's a problem with how this press is funding their Open Access books.

1:44:54

And this is indeed inequitable and a problem.

1:44:57

And so I think maybe from that perspective, you can say, well, if you're thinking about Open Access rather than just publishing, you know, there are presses like mine who may not be as well known as some of the big university presses, but we are very, very well versed in how to publish an Open Access book.

1:45:10

We can do innovative work with your book if you want to do that.

1:45:13

Your book will be properly archived.

1:45:15

It'll be really widely distributed.

1:45:16

There's expertise that we can offer as Open Access presses.

1:45:19

And although that means that we're smaller and perhaps less prestigious in a kind of broad sense, we've got a kind of prestige of our own, I suppose, in that kind of world.

1:45:27

And also kind of practically speaking, you know, you can give authors advice about, for example, if you're publishing with a press that's less well known, you're concerned that might impact your, your CV, for example, contextualise it on your CV and say, I published without publishers because I wanted, you know, broader readership or whatever it might be.

1:45:42

And my book has been read and downloaded X number of times.

1:45:44

You can kind of you can give that kind of context, I think as well as an as an author.

1:45:51

Thank you, Lucy, that's really useful.

1:45:53

And so I think reframing that thinking is something that will be something that I'll be doing with academics.

1:45:57

That's really helpful.

1:45:58

Thank you.

1:46:01

We do have a question from from Alex.

1:46:03

What are the best ways to stay up to date with the developments of Open Access?

1:46:09

Are there concerns with the scalability of Open Access publishers?

1:46:12

So I think around around books, what are the best ways to stay up to date with the developments of Open Access?

1:46:17

And are there concerns with the scalability of some of these publishers that we've talked about?

1:46:26

Please, Tom and Sam jump in.

1:46:27

But just quickly, I suppose two ways to do that.

1:46:31

One way is to keep up with what Copem is doing because I think Copem is doing some exciting work in this area.

1:46:35

So copem.ac.uk and we have a pub, pub as well, which has, we've got detail on all of our work as it goes, but also the Open Access Books network that I mentioned.

1:46:44

Not only do we have blog posts and events related to developments in Open Access Books on our blog post page, we also have a widget that includes the Open Access tracking project feed, which is a really useful source.

1:46:55

I use it a lot for any new developments in Open Access Books.

1:46:58

So from any kind of source, people just tag them with that tag and they appear in that feed.

1:47:02

And so you can obviously subscribe directly to that feed or you can view it via the Open Access Books network.

1:47:06

So there are two ways.

1:47:09

Well, if I could jump in on, I think the other part of that question was about questions of scale.

1:47:14

And you know, where, where, where does this lead?

1:47:16

One of the things we've talked a lot about in the Coping project has been about, you know, why does success look like expanding to have 100 staff and publishing 400 books a year?

1:47:28

What is that the aim of every single press in, you know, no, you know, like presses should be scaling the, the speed and the size to which they're comfortable with and to, and what their aim is, right?

1:47:41

Their strategic, strategic aim.

1:47:42

It isn't necessarily to be the next OUP it maybe is to publish the best possible books on archaeology or, or whatever, you know, subject is their specialism.

1:47:51

And I think we really, really need to kind of engage with that argument about what, what do we mean by scale?

1:47:57

Scale doesn't necessarily mean size.

1:47:59

It might, it might mean engaging with open practises, you know, expertly for example.

1:48:06

And I think capacity is part of that as well.

1:48:08

So certainly with coping, part of the infrastructure work that we're doing is intended to build the capacity for Open Access book publishing by enabling more presses that may not all be enormous to publish Open Access books so that in that way you grow the capacity of the system as a whole to to publish Open Access.

1:48:24

Thank you.

1:48:26

Some.

1:48:26

Lucy and Sam, it's now time for the break and we'll have a 15 minutes break.

1:48:33
So see you 5 past 12.

1:48:36
Is that correct, Vicky?

1:48:39
That's correct.

1:48:40
Yeah.

1:48:41
Yeah.

1:48:43
See you in 15 minutes.

1:48:45
Thanks for having us.

1:48:46
Thanks for this.

1:48:47
Cheers.

1:48:47
Thank you.

1:48:56
I think we have one minute.

1:48:58
No, it's 5 past 12.

1:49:02
So welcome back from the break.

1:49:04
I hope you've had a chance to get a cup of coffee or a cup of tea or whatever you'd like.

1:49:11
Now we are moving on to our next speaker, Emma LA.

1:49:17

She is executive editor at the Royal Society of Chemistry with responsibility for the Energy and Iron Environmental Gold Open Access journals.

1:49:32

Emma, are you there?

1:49:44

Yes, I'm here.

1:49:45

Sorry.

1:49:46

I was just trying to unmute myself.

1:49:48

Sorry, let me turn on the camera as well.

1:49:52

Brilliant.

1:49:53

Thank you.

1:49:57

Hello.

1:49:58

Hi.

1:50:09

OK, so let me share.

1:50:13

My screen doesn't seem to be allowing me to click the share button unfortunately.

1:50:42

Let me try again.

1:50:48

Thank you.

1:50:48

There we go.

1:50:52

Great.

1:50:53

Is this appearing as they should see my slides?

1:50:57

It is brilliant.

1:50:58

Yes, great.

1:51:00

Wonderful.

1:51:02

Well, I'm happy to get started then.

1:51:04

And thank you everyone for coming back during the after your coffee break to hear about Open Access from a publisher's perspective.

1:51:15

And as, as per the introduction, my name is Emma Ely and I'm Executive Editor at the Royal Society of Chemistry.

1:51:23

You can contact me if you have any questions on this e-mail address as well.

1:51:27

Let me just hide this button for a moment.

1:51:31

And for those of you that are less familiar with the Royal Society of Chemistry, we are a professional body for scientists with a global membership of over 50,000 people and we're really well known internationally for being a publisher of high quality chemical sciences knowledge.

1:51:47

Further to that, we are not-for-profit organisation, so we really invest in supporting science education and outreach and we hold many scientific conferences and symposia and workshops etcetera as well.

1:52:01

Ultimately, our purpose at the RSC is to help the chemical science community make the world a better place.

1:52:07

And everything that we do here is geared around that that mission.

1:52:11

And within my role, as mentioned, I look after the environmental energy and sustainability Open Access journals at the RSC.

1:52:18

And what I do is manage the the journals and ensure that we're attracting the best new science and promote the articles that we publish in our journals.

1:52:26

And also make make sure that we have really rigorous processes and fair and efficient peer review for the journals.

1:52:34

Of course, it's not a solo endeavour.

1:52:35

I I also work with a team of editorial colleagues that are pictured here as well and we collaborate really closely together.

1:52:44

More broadly though, at the Royal Society of Chemistry we have a journals catalogue of over 50 journals with a range of different topic areas spanning the chemical sciences and also a range of different impact factor tearings as well.

1:52:59

More details if you're interested can be found on the QR codes here.

1:53:03

But what we're really well known for and have a reputation for in terms of excellence is our rigorous and fair peer review and fast times to publication in our in our journals catalogue.

1:53:16

And I wanted to highlight this as well because it does factor into our Open Access agenda as well.

1:53:22

The Royal Society of Chemistry is a not-for-profit organisation.

1:53:25

So beyond the publishing business, we also operate the the kind of outreach programmes and a lot of thought leadership issues as well.

1:53:35

So we publish a lot of studies, findings and reports and some of them are highlighted here, a lot of them on the themes of sustainability, circular economy and etcetera as well.

1:53:46

So just wanted to illustrate here that for the RSC and beyond our publishing operations, we do have kind of a much more diverse set of things that we do at the organisation.

1:53:59

But obviously what I want to talk about is the Rs CS perspective on open science and Open Access.

1:54:06

So obviously I'm talking to an audience here that knows a lot of this stuff really well, I hope.

1:54:11

But of course, if anyone has any questions, please do say so.

1:54:15

Open science to us is really about the scientific knowledge openly available, accessible and reusable for everyone.

1:54:23

And there are different components here within open science that that we consider as important.

1:54:30

And for the RSC, the reasons why we think Open Science is the future direction is many fold, I think.

1:54:40

But in terms of efficiency, the increased access to scholarly information to reduce duplication and build and expand upon reported work is really important.

1:54:53

Also the quality aspect, we we're able to publish more reproducible and validate data claims within manuscripts that we publish.

1:55:02

Also the innovation aspect, there's more ideas that are more broadly available through Open Access publishing and that in turn leads to new ideas being propagated as well and also collaboration globally.

1:55:17

Our content, if it's published, Open Access is more widely available globally.

1:55:21

And in turn, that accelerates the development of the field and the transfer of knowledge within the field.

1:55:29

And from the RSC perspective, we're really committed to open science.

1:55:33

And as I mentioned previously, our purpose at the RSC is to help the chemical science community make the world a better place.

1:55:41

So we really want to work with the community to break down barriers to advancing the chemical sciences and also make sure that we're in a position to have equitable global access to knowledge and data.

1:55:56

There's more details about this specifically on our website here and we'll share the slides and everything after so you can have a look at these links as well.

1:56:08

And at the RSC, the main things in terms of open science that we focus on are open research data, open peer review, research assessment and culture, and of course Open Access in terms of scientific publications as well.

1:56:23

In terms of the open research data, it's, you know, data that can be freely reused and redistributed.

1:56:32

And what we're doing in this space is to facilitate all data associated with the research in a manuscript to be in line with the FAIR principles.

1:56:44

So this is data that is findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable in order to allow other researchers to replicate that research and in turn ensure the rigour of the research that has been published and also to build upon that research as well and again, advance the field in any particular area.

1:57:07

And in terms of open peer review, what we're doing is we're really wanting to illuminate the peer review process and make that publicly available after publication for accepted articles in our journals.

1:57:25

And in, in, in, in that regard, by the end of this year, all RSC journals will offer transparent peer review for for authors.

1:57:34

So when a reader looks at an article on our on our journal landing page, they'll be able to access the review reports and edited decisions as as well.

1:57:48

So this is something that we hope will really shine a light on the peer review process and open that up in in the spirit and within the principles of open science as well.

1:58:00

So of course, Open Access is one of the big components of the open science work that we're doing here at the Royal Society of Chemistry.

1:58:12

And our view on the Open Access area is that we really want the global transition to Open Access to be sustainable, secure and inclusive.

1:58:26

And as I mentioned previously, we really do want to work directly with the community to support them to, to publish Open Access with the RSC.

1:58:35

And we really want no one to be left behind in in this kind of transition.

1:58:40

And we're trying to future proof against that and adopt new, new processes and tactics to ensuring that that that happens.

1:58:52

And we've committed to publishing 100% Open Access by the end of the year 2028.

1:59:00

And we announced this in October, nearly two years ago actually, that we were going to commit to a fully Open Access future.

1:59:09

Prior to this commitment, we had a strategy whereby we plan to publish 50% of our journal content Open Access by a certain date.

1:59:20

But we've since evolved that strategy to move to commit to 100% Open Access publishing by the end of the year 2028.

1:59:29

Of course, there's a lot of things that we need to deliver upon in order to meet that that timeline.

1:59:35

And we're really working very actively to ensure that that happens for the RSC.

1:59:43

And as I mentioned before, in terms of achieving 100% Open Access for the RSC, what's really

important to us as an inclusive society publisher is being able to ensure that everyone, regardless of where they're from and what funder requirements, are still able to publish with us.

2:00:03

So we really want to remove all barriers so the authors have the same potential to access and publish their research with RSC.

2:00:10

And we want to make sure that our Open Access models accommodate for regional differences.

2:00:16

So for example, we have reached research for live countries and we will publish that their work for free and Open Access for free.

2:00:26

And All authors have the opportunity to apply for Open Access waivers.

2:00:31

But something we're really working very hard on is partnering with institutions and consortia to develop new Open Access models that work for those people and for our authors as well.

2:00:48

So we really are focusing on transforming our current institutional deals to new Open Access models and that is obviously something that is dealt with through our sales teams in collaboration with those institutions or consortia etcetera.

2:01:05

And we really do want to move away from article processing charge models that really rely on the authors to pay that on kind of a one to one interaction.

2:01:16

And it to be minimally burdensome for authors and for us to be able to facilitate that directly with their institutions rather than adding another burden, as I say to the authors and make it as straightforward as possible.

2:01:33

So we like to try and provide some resources to help authors identify Open Access options at the RSC.

2:01:41

And we have this useful page, which is our journal Finder tool and more details can be found.

2:01:47

Well, the website can be found on this QR code here.

2:01:51

But what this enables authors to do is to type in a keyword, for example, related to their research and then it will identify journal publishing options with the RSC, what an APC would be for example, to

publish in that journal or whether they have entitlement to publishing under the remit of an Open Access deal with the RSC as well.

2:02:18

So it just gives a lot more detail on a more granular level about what open up access options are specifically available to them to publish Open Access with RSC.

2:02:33

And also in addition to that, we have many Open Access journals already.

2:02:40

And this is part of the, the prior strategy mainly as I mentioned before, the before we had the 100% Open Access by 2028 strategy, we had a 50% Open Access strategy.

2:02:52

And as such, we had launched a variety of new Born Gold OA journals within the catalogue.

2:03:01

And, and these are all, all, all listed here and all, a lot of these journals have fees completely waived until they receive their first impact factors, which is attractive to authors.

2:03:18

You know, if there's no article processing charges, then then they're more likely to submit to these journals.

2:03:24

So we do have these Born Gold OA journals available as well.

2:03:33

Also, we publish chemical Science, which is our flagship journal in in the area of chemistry.

2:03:38

And this journal is a diamond Open Access journal, which means that all content is Open Access, but it's also free, completely free to publish in in the journal as well.

2:03:52

And that we're able to facilitate that because the RSC covers the cost of publications in chemical science.

2:03:58

And we feel that this is really important with chemical science being our flagship journal, that it's the really the very best literature available that's published in this journal.

2:04:07

And that we're able to disseminate that as widely as possible through Open Access and at no cost to the authors as well.

2:04:18

So I'll talk a little bit about the, the future of Open Access at the Water Society of Chemistry as well.

2:04:24

And very much as as we've heard already, the Open Access landscape is transitional and, and the, the publishing industry is very much in transition at the moment.

2:04:36

So across the board, we're seeing publishers move towards Open Access environments.

2:04:43

So we'll know about the Coalition S funded research post 2021 and UKRI funded research post April 2022.

2:04:52

And across the board, many publishers are focusing on signing Open Access agreements.

2:04:57

So that could be read and publish type agreements or publishing read type agreements.

2:05:03

But Plan S funding for this ends in 20/20/24.

2:05:08

So that's something that that we're having to think about.

2:05:12

And also the the US has relatively recently revealed that their requirements for immediate access to federally funded research starting 2026.

2:05:28

And publishers are adapting to all of these developments here as well.

2:05:31

So I've spoken a lot about what the RSC is doing, but other publishers have made similar commitments.

2:05:38

For example, Cambridge University Press has publicly committed to transitioning their entire portfolio by the end of next year.

2:05:45

ACS have committed their entire portfolio to transformative journal status likely within the next three to five years.

2:05:54

And other publishers are really heavily investing in transformative agreements and growing the level of institutional agreements as well.

2:06:07

So in terms of the the RSC and where we're at currently, as mentioned, we have the hybrid journals, transformative journals and also our dedicated Born Gold Open Access journals.

2:06:21

So for the transformative hybrid journals, the the growth of Open Access within those journals depends on the subscription deals to Open Access deals and converting more of our sales deals with institutions to Open Access deals.

2:06:42

And for Open Access journals, as as I mentioned, we really want to shift away from from APC or author pays models to have this covered by institutional agreements or consortia level agreements as well.

2:07:04

So I can talk a little bit about Open Access and Apcs because I think for a lot of people, a lot of researchers in particular, when they hear one word, they think the other and vice versa.

2:07:15

But a lot of the times these things are kind of decoupled in some ways, especially for RSC as a professional body, a professional body and society organisation.

2:07:26

So there are many reasons why somewhere along the lines publishing needs to be paid for and that's the value of of a quality publisher as well, that they can really add value to research that is published in journals and then that trust to maintain the scientific record for until the end of time basically.

2:07:50

So there's lots of ways in which publishers add value and making research more discoverable, ensuring the typesetting processes are done in a very good way and and making research as easily as discoverable as we as we can to advance the the field of research.

2:08:16

And typically of course traditional publishing under the subscription model we're all very familiar with and Open Access publishing until now has very much been under the article processing charge model.

2:08:32

And also, as I mentioned with chemical Science, we offer the diamond Open Access publishing model as well, whereby it's, it's the APC costs are covered by the OR Society of Chemistry.

2:08:44

And it's really important to us as a society organisation that we decouple the financial aspects of Open Access from the editorial aspects as well.

2:08:57

So in terms of editorial aspects, I'm talking about peer review, quality, rigour and decision making based on editorial criteria and that is decoupled from the financial aspect.

2:09:12

So the ability or inability for authors to pay article processing charges.

2:09:17

So those things are really separate for us and it enables us to maintain our editorial criteria at, you know, at a decoupled perspective from the financial aspect.

2:09:33

So as I mentioned, we're really looking to advance the transformative agreements that we have with institutions.

2:09:43

So I'm sure everyone's quite familiar with a lot of this already.

2:09:47

So this is agreements between the publisher and an institution that covers the cost of Open Access pay publication.

2:09:54

And what it means in terms of benefits for authors is that they don't have to worry about the author payment side.

2:10:01

It really reduces the burden on authors to have these types of deals available to them and streamline their publishing experience with us.

2:10:13

And I can touch a little bit about Open Access licences as well as I know that this can be quite confusing for researchers.

2:10:22

And at the RC we have two different types of Open Access licence.

2:10:29

We offer the industry standard Creative Commons licence for class access publication.

2:10:35

So we offer CC BY licences and CC BY NC licences.

2:10:41

The NC meaning non non commercial with full author attribution.

2:10:47

And just as a bit of a reflection for RSC with other publishers as well, there's a variety of different licences that are offered by different publishers in the chemistry and sciences area.

2:11:01

So the American Chemical Society is the pink and they offer a different type of licence to RSC, but all publishers will offer the CC BY licence, which is the least restrictive Open Access licence available.

2:11:18

So I think that that was what I wanted to talk about really.

2:11:23

Yeah, I'm very happy to take any questions.

2:11:26

More information is available on the the QR code here as well.

2:11:31

But I hope that gives a little bit of an insight into what RSC has been doing and how we're navigating this quite transitional time for publishers as well.

2:11:42

So thank you.

2:11:47

Thank you, Emma.

2:11:50

John, do you have any questions for Emma?

2:11:55

Yeah, thank you, Emma.

2:11:56

That was that was brilliant.

2:11:57

We do have a question from, from Martin from, from Durham on Creative Commons licences, which I don't know whether you'll be able to answer this one.

2:12:05

It's quite difficult.

2:12:07

And I've noticed when adding gold RSC articles to our repository that they'll be under version 3.0 of the relevant Creative Common licence rather than 4.0.

2:12:17

I was just wondering if you knew why that's the case.

2:12:21

Not an issue with such as queries.

2:12:24

No, I'm not aware of why that's the case, but I'm making a note of this so that I can try and uncover it for you.

2:12:30

So it's currently operating on 3.0 instead of 4.0, is that right?

2:12:36

Yes.

2:12:37

Yeah, that that's Martin's question.

2:12:40

Yeah.

2:12:40

Just just for attendees who who aren't that familiar with, with the Creative Commons licences, they are replaced every so often with a new version.

2:12:49

So we are on 4.0 for for most of them.

2:12:52

I think.

2:12:55

Yeah, it's getting into the weeds a little bit.

2:12:57

But they do, they do differ slightly and what you can do with that, with that, what research depending on what version it's under.

2:13:05

I've got a question from from Kelly who will we'll hear speak a little a little bit shortly.

2:13:10

Can you say a little bit more about how the navigation to open peer review is going?

2:13:16

Yeah, I can.

2:13:17

So we trialled open peer review on a subset of journals 234 years ago just to test the waters with how that went, how it was received by both the reader, author and reviewer communities.

2:13:33

So we trialled that on chemical science, environmental science, Atmospheres, which is an Open Access journal as well.

2:13:40

And we found that there was decent level of uptake from authors to publish the the transparent peer review and it was working well for us.

2:13:52

So we decided to roll it out across the the whole journals catalogue.

2:13:56

And currently, yeah, as I mentioned, we're trying to have this all all done by the end of the year, this year.

2:14:05

And we are on track for that.

2:14:07

Some of the things that we needed to navigate within that are buy in from editorial boards to adopt this, this new peer review process.

2:14:19

And, and largely editorial boards have been really supportive of that because they see it as, you know, illuminating the, the peer review process and really demystifying what happens behind the scenes.

2:14:30

And also our associate editors do a really good job.

2:14:33

So it's nice to be able to to add that to to the reader community as well so that they can see that the decisions made on manuscripts published in our journals are really robust and that they're based on well, well founded referee reports, etcetera.

2:14:48

So yeah, a lot of the journals have already adopted the Transparent peer review and it's currently in place.

2:14:56

There's a few more journals left to go and some of mine included there.

2:15:00

But yeah, it's actually going quite, quite well.

2:15:02

And I think we'll be able to deliver on the end of the year time frame for implementation of Transparent peer review.

2:15:12

Lovely.

2:15:12

Thank you.

2:15:13

Yeah, any more questions do get them in.

2:15:15

We've still got a few more questions for a few more minutes for questions for for Emma, just a very general one, Emma, but how I don't know if you'll know how typical is RSC in terms of well, in terms of both the society publisher, but compared to the the sort of big commercial publishers, how typical is what you do and the sport you offer to your to your authors?

2:15:41

Yeah, I think for Open Access, a lot of commercial publishers are looking to do a lot of the same things that we are so pivoting to Open Access, looking to secure some of those institutional deals, Open Access deals, platinum type deals as well.

2:15:59

What we've seen from commercial publishers as well is the adoption of what we would call mirror journals.

2:16:05

So you would have an established hybrid journal and then there would be a mirror type journal which has the same scope, but is the Open Access version of of that same journal, but has the same editorial criteria really.

2:16:20

So that that's the difference I think that we observe between what our seeds doing and more broadly across commercial publishers.

2:16:29

I think a lot of other society publishers are doing really similar things to us as well.

2:16:34

The the ACS has taken so ACS is American chemical Society.

2:16:39

So kind of the across the pond version of RSD really, but they've taken some alternative tactics and have implemented article development charges as well.

2:16:50

So there are some differences between what we're doing and what other society organisations are doing as well.

2:16:56

And I think it's very much a learning curve for everyone.

2:16:59

We want to kind of observe how things are received by the the reader and author communities and we want to make things as straightforward and simple and pleasant for them as possible.

2:17:11

So we really want to listen, observe and respond to what we see as working and what we see as, you know, not working potentially and and adjust accordingly.

2:17:22

So that's what I would say.

2:17:28

Lovely.

2:17:28

Thank you.

2:17:29

That's it.

2:17:29

Yeah, that's it.

2:17:31

Brilliantly helpful answer.

2:17:34

And, and yeah, we're all trying to, I think we're all trying to do the same thing, but yeah, in slightly different ways, aren't we?

2:17:39

Trying to help, help authors and understand what they, what they want.

2:17:45

Haven't had any more questions come in.

2:17:48

So I don't know if we want to, to leave it there because that's been, I think that's given us a lot to think about.

2:17:54

And yeah, really, really illuminating in in of, of one of the.

2:17:59

Yeah, one of the society publishers that it really is active in this sphere.

2:18:03

So that was that was really, really great.

2:18:06

Emma, Thank you.

2:18:07

You're welcome.

2:18:08

Thank you.

2:18:09

Thank you, Emma.

2:18:12

So let's move along.

2:18:16

Our next speaker and final speaker is Kelly Woods.

2:18:20

Kelly Woods joined F-1000 in 2021 to lead the launch of to Lead Open Research Europe, which is the publishing platform in collaboration with the European Commission.

2:18:38

Kelly, are you there?

2:18:42

I am.

2:18:44

Hello, Kelly.

2:18:45

Nice to see you.

2:18:46

You too.

2:18:47

I'm handing over the floor to you.

2:18:50

Perfect.

2:18:51

Let's share this screen and we should be good.

2:18:56

Is that looking good for you?

2:19:00

Perfect.

2:19:01

All right, cool.

2:19:03

OK, so thank you so much for inviting me to speak to you today.

2:19:06

So I'm going to talk to you about Open Research Europe, which as was just introduced, it is the European Commission's solution to scholarly publishing and they launched it a couple of years ago in collaboration with F-1000.

2:19:18

So I'm coming at you from sometimes I feel like I'm speaking as the enemy in these sorts of events because I am based at a commercial publisher.

2:19:26

But hopefully I'll try to show you how we're not all evil and show you the good side of what we can do.

2:19:33

So the European Commission wanted to launch a publishing platform that would lead the way in

promoting open science, and they had a number of requirements that they wanted the platform to adhere to.

2:19:45

When launching the platform, they wanted it to have fully open peer review.

2:19:49

They wanted it to have immediate publication with open data deposited in what they termed trusted repositories.

2:19:57

They wanted the platform to focus on new generation article metrics and not use, uh, venue based metrics as a proxy for a measure of quality for the articles published within.

2:20:08

And they needed full transparency over all of the policies and the fees.

2:20:13

So they really wanted to explore new sustainable Open Access publishing business models that they didn't feel like existed already in the publishing sphere for all of their funded researchers.

2:20:25

So at the time of launch, it was open to submissions from researchers funded through Horizon 2020 grants.

2:20:34

It ultimately then expanded to include Horizon Europe beneficiaries and then it expanded again earlier this year to include all European Commission funding from from 2020 onwards or well, from Horizon 2020 onwards.

2:20:48

So from I think that was about 2014 onwards, which includes staff at the European Commission, so members of the Joint Research Council for example, and also all of the decentralised agencies.

2:21:00

So that includes the European Environmental Agency for example or the European Centre for Disease Control.

2:21:05

So they can publish their content as well.

2:21:09

Open Researcher was identified as an example of successful implementation of Plan S in the 2022 Annual report.

2:21:17

It was also well policies of open researcher were also called out in the June 2022 Council of the

European Union conclusions, where they said that we should recognise all forms of research and innovation, output and processes.

2:21:31

And they stressed that data should be made fair, that's findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable.

2:21:38

The May 2023 Council Conclusions of the European Union concluded that they were encouraging member states to support the pilot programme of Open Research Europe to create a large scale Open Access research publishing service, as well as promoting open peer review practises more generally.

2:21:58

And Kowara also supports placing a value on the diversity of outputs that researchers produce and other activities and practises that they undertake.

2:22:06

So there's just a few examples there of how the Open Research Europe itself or the policies and practises that we employ on the platform have been called out by a variety of different bodies as being good examples of Open Access models or publishing models in the current ecosystem.

2:22:22

So it was launched in 2020 one, I want to say yeah, 2021 and that was when it was opened.

2:22:31

And we worked with the European Commission for the first four years there to launch the, the platform, build the platform and launch it in 2020, build it and then launch it in 2021.

2:22:41

And we ran it until 2024.

2:22:43

The process or the platform then went out for re tender and F-1000 was very happy to win that tender again.

2:22:50

So we now continue to run the platform until 2026/2027 seven and umm, we'll see what happens after that.

2:22:57

But how does the model actually work?

2:22:59

So you can see on the screen a bubble diagram of kind of the process of the open research publishing model.

2:23:06

So first of all, authors come and submit their research via a single page submission system and they choose one of the different article types that we have to offer, which I'll talk a little bit more about later.

2:23:17

And so we think it's really important that this is a one page form because all the questions we're going to ask you about are in that page.

2:23:24

You can see them straight from the beginning.

2:23:25

There's nothing hidden round page number six.

2:23:29

Everything you need to tell us is, is right there.

2:23:30

So it's quite transparent.

2:23:33

During the submission process, you will be asked to enter in your Horizon grant ID number, or as I said, the platform has expanded to include other programmes now, but you'll be asked to include your eligibility your your grant ID number that gives you eligibility to publish on the platform, whether that be Horizon or a JRC grant or whatever.

2:23:55

We check that in our system to make sure that that grant is actually eligible to publish on the platform.

2:23:59

And also that you do seem to be the person that is associated with that grant and that the work that you're submitting to us is relevant to that grant.

2:24:07

So we try to make sure there's not any fraud of people just submitting Horizon grant numbers just to publish on the platform.

2:24:14

Once the paper is submitted, our in house team of professional editors carry out a comprehensive set of pre publication cheques to ensure that all of our policies and ethical guidelines are adhered to.

2:24:25

And there is actually a lot more information on our website about what these pre publication cheques entail, but I'll just mention a couple of them briefly.

2:24:35

So these include image manipulation cheques, plagiarism cheques.

2:24:39

And we'll check that the appropriate ethics approval has been acquired either through your funding or through your institution.

2:24:47

If the if there's need for consent, we check that informed consent was given.

2:24:51

We check that the methods have been described in enough detail for them to be reproducible for the work to be replicated and reproduced.

2:25:00

And we also check the data.

2:25:02

So there's a bunch of other stuff we check as well, but I'll drop a link in the chat later that you can have a look at if you're interested.

2:25:09

During that time, we often have to send requested revisions back to the author.

2:25:13

We might need additional information about something, one of the methods or the ethics or something.

2:25:19

So there's a bit of back and forth between the authors and the editors editorial team at that stage.

2:25:26

But once we're happy with that, we also check that the data has been publicly deposited and that a data availability statement is included in the paper.

2:25:35

There are some reasons why the data may not be shared and these are detailed in the Horizon Europe grant agreement.

2:25:42

So because we were launched obviously in collaboration with the European Commission, the platform really adheres to the Horizon Europe policies in the grant agreement at the moment.

2:25:52

So there are specific details there why data may not be shared and we comply with those policies as well.

2:25:57

But generally speaking, the data should be deposited and should be made publicly available without having to request it.

2:26:03

And we check that and make sure that it is actually accessible.

2:26:06

Once all of that is fine, we publish the article kind of like a preprint, but it's a bit bit we've we've conducted much more stringent checks than you might see on other preprint servers.

2:26:16

So it's a bit kind of like a verified preprint on the Open Researcher platform.

2:26:21

And it has its fully typeset, it has its own DOI, meaning it can be immediately viewed and cited.

2:26:27

And it's also indexed in Google Scholar.

2:26:31

And at this point, once the article is published on the site, it cannot be sent to another journal for publication.

2:26:36

It should be considered published at this stage.

2:26:39

We then start inviting the expert reviewers and so our team will identify relevant reviewers with the right expertise and we check for things like conflict of interest and bias and previous relationships and stuff as well.

2:26:53

And we send those invitations out once the peer review have accepted.

2:26:58

Once the reviewers have accepted to peer review the article, we send them a form and they fill it in and we check the forms that we receive back to make sure that the tone of them is correct.

2:27:08

So we do operate on a fully open peer review model, meaning the review report and the name of the person writing it is published alongside the paper on the website.

2:27:18

So we do make sure that the review is constructive, that it is helpful, that it is thorough, and that the

reviewer has actually read the paper and has something useful to contribute to the improvement of the paper.

2:27:29

We don't just publish everything just in case we get someone just being excessively mean.

2:27:34

So we do check those to make sure that they're coherent and that they are polite, and then we publish them alongside the paper.

2:27:40

So the author will receive a notification that a peer review report has been published.

2:27:46

They'll be able to read the full peer review report and there's also a status associated with the reports, which I'll talk a little bit more about in a minute.

2:27:54

We then invite the author once they've received two reviews and to revise their article based on the peer review feedback and submit a revision of that article.

2:28:03

And also to respond directly to the reviewers kind of point by point and explain, you know, why they've changed certain things or why they haven't changed certain things in response to the reviewers feedback.

2:28:13

So we then publish a second version of the article on the website.

2:28:17

The original version also remains on the website and you can flick between the first version and the second version.

2:28:23

And just so you can really see how the paper changed as a result of the peer review process.

2:28:28

So the whole process is completely transparent.

2:28:30

We do flash up a little warning on the screen if you are looking at an older version of the paper, just to let you know that there is a newer version, but you can always navigate to the old one if you want to.

2:28:40

After the new version's been published with all the changes, we send it back to the original reviewers and ask them to have another look at it.

2:28:46

And hopefully they come back and they're now happy with the changes that the authors have made and they change their review status again.

2:28:53

I'll come back to that in a second.

2:28:54

And we would have, we would mark the paper as having passed our peer review process.

2:28:58

And it's at that point that we send the paper to relevant indexes and repositories that we work with, which I think I've got a slide later, which flashes up all the ones that we work with currently.

2:29:08

And so I said I'd talk a little bit more about the peer review reports and what passing peer review means.

2:29:13

So we have three different statuses of peer review reports on open researcher we have approved, meaning the paper is scientifically sound in its current form and there's only minor, if any improvements been suggested.

2:29:24

And that's a nice green tick.

2:29:25

Everybody likes a green tick.

2:29:27

We have a green?

2:29:28

Which is approved with reservations that this means either that there's a number of smaller changes that need to be made, or sometimes one or two more significant revisions that are required to address specific details and improve the papers academic merit.

2:29:42

So that's approved with reservations.

2:29:44

The green?

2:29:45

We then have a Red Cross which is not approved.

2:29:47

This means there's fundamental flaws in the paper that seriously undermine the findings and the conclusions of the paper.

2:29:53

So we do still ask at each of these stages for the reviewers to provide comprehensive feedback as to what changes the authors need to make in order to improve their article.

2:30:03

From a not approved or an approved with reservations up to an approved.

2:30:07

You can't just say not approved with no help.

2:30:09

You have to explain why it's not approved and what the authors should do to improve the the paper.

2:30:16

In order for a paper to pass peer review and you either need to receive two of the reviews in the approved status SO2 green ticks or one approved status review and two approved with reservation.

2:30:28

So one green tick and two green question marks, umm, those are the thresholds that we have to consider an article having passed peer review.

2:30:35

And it's at that point that we would send it to all of the reviewers that we work with.

2:30:40

And as I said, it's important to remember that once the article is published, it cannot be removed or published elsewhere.

2:30:46

So even if it receives 2 not approved statuses in its first version, you cannot then take that article and submit it somewhere else.

2:30:53

The whole sort of premise of this model was to remove this repetition from the process.

2:30:59

So under conventional models, a researcher would submit their paper to us, perhaps get not not approved or rejected under conventional model.

2:31:06

And the the time and effort that was spent by the reviewers on that paper in that journal would be wasted.

2:31:12

A lot of times that that feedback is not shared with the authors.

2:31:15

The authors then take their paper somewhere else, resubmit it, go through the whole process again, maybe get the same feedback from different people.

2:31:22

And so we're trying to remove this this duplicity in the process by saying you publish it here, you receive the feedback, you make the changes, we send it back and and so on.

2:31:33

And so, yeah, even doesn't matter what review you get, you can't really take it down.

2:31:37

Obviously we do still have a retraction policy in line with like all other journals and we haven't actually had to retract any papers on Open Research Europe yet, but we do have that there if we need it.

2:31:48

So I talked a little bit about revising the paper.

2:31:51

So the authors are encouraged to respond to the reviewers directly through our comment system.

2:31:57

So on the website on the right hand side is a little pop out box where you can see all the details of the peer reviews.

2:32:03

So who wrote it, what they said.

2:32:06

And then right at the bottom you should Scroll down and be able to see the the responses from the author.

2:32:11

So they can state step by step where they've made changes or explain the reasoning behind the choices in the original article.

2:32:18

These responses are linked to the published peer review reports, and so reviewers and readers alike can see them.

2:32:26

I mentioned already that when a new version is published, we invite the original reviewers to have another look.

2:32:31

And we just feel that by making the whole process open and accessible, we ensure that both readers and authors understand the necessary criteria to pass peer review and really get to look behind the screen at what is happening during the peer review process that normally happens behind closed doors.

2:32:48

Another core feature of the platform that we do allow is Co reviewing.

2:32:52

So if you are a more junior colleague and you're just starting out to peer review papers and you maybe don't have the necessary experience to do it alone, we do have the option for you to buddy up with a more senior researcher in your department or even elsewhere and kind of Co sign the review together.

2:33:09

So this can be really helpful when someone's just starting out in their research career.

2:33:13

The first time they peer review an article, they want to do it with some support, but they actually want to get the credit for it.

2:33:18

Because what we know is happening, or what we feel is happening in most cases is the more junior members of the team are doing these peer reviews, but they're being signed by the original, by the more senior colleagues.

2:33:28

So this way the junior colleague gets the help and support that they need in their first peer review process, but they also get the credit for having taken part and conducted the peer review themselves.

2:33:39

So I mentioned that Open Research Europe supports all European Commission funded research and that really does stretch across the broad spectrum of research that the Commission funds.

2:33:49

So everything from life sciences, medical and Health Sciences, engineering and technology all the way along to social sciences and humanities and arts as well.

2:33:58

And in order to do that we have a wide variety of different article types and some of those article types are only offered to specific disciplines.

2:34:06

So for example, we have the essay that is only available to humanities and arts and social sciences, and then we have case reports, which is only available to sort of medical and health, natural sciences and also engineering and technology.

2:34:19

So hopefully here we can really capture some of the content from the research projects that maybe doesn't find a home in other journals.

2:34:26

So we have a couple of article types that are quite novel, like the data note and the software tool article that allow you to give more information about how you captured this data, how you analysed it and how people can access it.

2:34:37

And the software tool article, it describes a new software explanatory, but these are article types that don't really exist elsewhere.

2:34:44

So we're really hoping that we can try and capture the broad variety of research outputs that's coming from the European Commission grants, and also that we can capture content from across all of the disciplines.

2:34:56

And this allows us also to support research across the lifespan of a project.

2:34:59

So when you first start out in the concept and the planning phase of your project, you might want to write a review or write a method detailing what you're planning to do as part of your research project.

2:35:10

Later on, you start collecting the data.

2:35:12

Maybe you have a little side project that doesn't really fit into your main story, but it's still an interesting little nugget of research that you did.

2:35:18

You might want to publish that as a report, drop a data note up there of all the data that you've collected to date, or leading all the way to the end where you want to publish your sort of final research article.

2:35:27

So we're allowing authors the opportunity to publish throughout the life cycle of their projects rather than just trying to save it all up and squeeze it into the research article at the end.

2:35:37

It was also really important to the Commission that they had the academic community involved in Open Research Europe as an initiative.

2:35:43

So I think these numbers are slightly out of date.

2:35:45

So forgive me, but we have around about 28 scientific Advisory Board members and, and these cover all the disciplines that we cover on the platform.

2:35:53

And we meet with them three times a year and to discuss various different policies on the platform to inform them of how the platform is doing, how it's growing, how we're performing in different subject areas.

2:36:04

Do we need to, you know, do a little bit more promotion in the life sciences to raise awareness of the platform in that area?

2:36:09

Is there something different we should be doing for the humanities researchers to make sure that we're meeting their needs?

2:36:14

It's a really useful group of people.

2:36:17

We then have the community gateway advisors and the collection advisors.

2:36:21

These are responsible for looking after specific thematic areas on the platform.

2:36:25

So obviously when the platform launched, it was just one big site full of all of this stuff ranging from life sciences to humanity.

2:36:33

So we decided to break it down into thematic areas called communities that are all headed up by advisors.

2:36:39

And then we broke it down even further into collection.

2:36:41

So these can be particularly large grants or collaborations of multiple grants that have joined together to research on the same topic.

2:36:50

Or they can just be thematic collections about a specific niche subject area where we can collect, you

know, papers from from all different grants that maybe didn't even know each other were working on the same, same project.

2:37:03

I mean, I engage with all the different levels of advisors about things like issues with peer review or if there's a particular ethics case we're not sure about, or we don't know if a method has been described accurately.

2:37:15

We can call upon the expertise of all our different Advisory Board members to give their share their knowledge with us about their, their relevant research areas.

2:37:26

We also have a really global authorship.

2:37:28

So we now have over 1800 authors publishing from more than 340 institutions and across more than 45 different countries.

2:37:35

And the top author locations at the minute are Spain, Italy and the UK.

2:37:39

It's actually surprising to see the UK still holding so strong after they were kind of, well, we let ourselves fall out of Horizon Europe and now we're back in.

2:37:48

So it's OK.

2:37:49

But we did still stayed up there as really engaging with the platform.

2:37:53

So I mentioned that after the article was passed peer review, we send it to our various indexes that we work with.

2:38:00

Now, Openresearch Europe has experienced quite huge success in terms of indexation in a very early part of its life.

2:38:07

So the platform was only launched in 2021.

2:38:10

It's only just over three years old, but we have managed to achieve indexation in in pretty much all of the major databases.

2:38:17

So Scopus and the DOA J Pub Meds, which yeah, Pub Med is on there.

2:38:22

Good in spec, um, and a numerous other national approved journalists and a few other more disciplined specific, um, indexes as well.

2:38:32

We are not indexed in Web of Science.

2:38:34

Um, and that's because it was for many different reasons, but the European Commission doesn't really support the use of impact factors as a proxy for measuring, uh, the quality of an article.

2:38:46

But in addition to that, our model just doesn't really align with the way Web of Sciences assesses content at the minute.

2:38:53

So because we have content on the website that it has not yet done peer review, is undergoing peer review and has completed peer review, but maybe hasn't passed and then we have content that has passed.

2:39:04

So that's just a little bit too much for them to process at the minute.

2:39:07

And we don't really fit into one of the buckets that they have.

2:39:09

So we're not in the Web of Science, but we do continue working with Clarify on that to try to understand how they could maybe adjust their systems to kind of fit us in or you know, there's a bit of flex on either sides there, but not currently.

2:39:25

And I did just want to talk a little bit about the level of support that we have for this model.

2:39:30

So obviously, I came today to talk primarily about Open Research Europe, but I also have there's a lot more support for this model than just the European Commission.

2:39:39

And just the European Commission is big enough support as it is.

2:39:43

But we also have other partner platforms as F-1000 with the Wellcome Trust, for example with Bill and Melinda Gates.

2:39:50

We also have a partnership with the Health Research Board in Ireland.

2:39:53

We have a platform with them and also the National Institute for Health Research in the UK.

2:39:58

We have another platform in collaboration with the Association of Medical Research Charities in the UK and another one for African researchers, with a collaboration between different funders and organisations in Africa, including Science for Africa, the Africa Research Excellence Fund and the African Academy of Sciences, and then on our.

2:40:19

What's the word?

2:40:20

Our original platform, it's not the word I'm looking for, but it'll do F-1000 research, which is the one that we own and the first one that we launched.

2:40:28

We have a number of gateway partners on that platform.

2:40:30

So people like the NC3RS or Elixir or Heel Link, where we have collaborated with them to create rather than a whole platform for them, just a space on the F-1000 research platform where they can publish content that they are producing from their researchers.

2:40:45

So we collaborate in a number of different ways with a huge variety of different partners, too many for you to actually put on this slide, but hopefully you get the gist.

2:40:54

And then I did just want to spend the last couple of minutes, if I have time, introducing you to the newest amendment, if you like, that we've made to our model.

2:41:03

So we're aware that aware that the F-1000 model and that encapsulates the Open Research Europe model as well.

2:41:10

It's a bit quirky, it's a bit weird.

2:41:12

It's quite different to what else is out there.

2:41:14

But we're also trying to be quite innovative and make sure that the model that we have is actually meeting the needs of the community that we're trying to serve.

2:41:22

And so through our collaboration with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as you may be aware, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is changing their preprint policy as of January 2025.

2:41:33

And they are mandating that all research be published, um, as a preprint, umm, and they're also discontinuing support for article processing charges.

2:41:43

And this is so that they can take that money that they would have spent on paying for article processing charges, uh, to use it to support new Open Access business models and infrastructures.

2:41:52

They're trying to foster a new Open Access publishing ecosystem that has a bit more promise in terms of equity, umm, than the current system.

2:42:01

So we partnered up with them to develop Vericiv, which is our new preprint server.

2:42:07

Now you might look at this model and say, Kelly, this is very similar to the model that you just showed me in the ORE colours and now I'm showing it to you in the very kind of purple.

2:42:16

And the truth is it is a very similar model and there's just a couple of key differences.

2:42:21

So when authors first submit, they submit as a preprint using the same submission system.

2:42:27

The paper then undergoes the same pre publication checks and then it is published well and the data also has to be deposited and then it is published on Vericiv which is our preprint server.

2:42:42

After that papers can authors rather can opt in to undergo open peer review on that platform.

2:42:49

It's not a mandatory feature or as it is on Open Research Europe and on the Gates Open Research platform at the minute, which is the platform we already have with the Bill and Linda Cates Foundation.

2:43:00

So authors can opt in to peer review and they can submit a revised version of the article if they want to, but they don't have to.

2:43:07

If they do opt in for peer review and they ultimately go on to past peer review, then the paper will be sent to our existing platform, Gates Open Research, which has all of the indexation advantages similar to Open Research Europe.

2:43:20

And we can curate the article over there and send it to the indexes.

2:43:23

So the core model remains the same, but just the separation of it between the pre print and the review stage and the curation stage of the article that has passed peer review.

2:43:34

To try to make it clearer.

2:43:36

What stage in the publishing process is this paper at?

2:43:39

Is it a preprint?

2:43:40

Is it undergoing peer review?

2:43:41

Is it just a preprint without peer review or is it actually a fully fledged past peer review article?

2:43:46

Hopefully the new Vera Kive model makes that a little bit clearer and actually enables the Gates open, Gates Open reset.

2:43:53

The Bill and Melinda found Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation beneficiaries to comply with the new preprint policy of their funder.

2:44:02

What we're also going to do on Vericiv, that's a little bit different to the other platforms is we're going to be much more transparent about the level of cheques that we are doing and the cheques that each individual article has passed in order to be published on that paper on that platform.

2:44:16

So each of the articles will have a number of different badges.

2:44:19

The first three, these orange ones, these are mandatory.

2:44:23

Every single paper published on the platform has to pass these cheques.

2:44:27

And these are the same cheques that are happening on Open Research Europe.

2:44:30

We're just being a lot more transparent about it here.

2:44:32

And then the final set of cheques we have on Vericiv is this blue one, which is our open research cheques at the moment.

2:44:38

These are optional and if you ultimately want to go on and have your paper published on Gates Open Research, you do have to opt in for these open research cheques as well.

2:44:47

But if you just want to publish as a pre print on Vericiv, you don't have to do it again.

2:44:51

These open research cheques are something that's already being done on Open Research Europe and all of our other open research platforms.

2:44:58

We just don't visualise those cheques on the papers at the moment.

2:45:01

So this is another thing that we're trying to do to be more transparent about what our process is and help contribute to court towards improving trust in science.

2:45:10

So that was a lot of information I just threw at you there, so apologies for that, but do let me know if you have any questions.

2:45:16

I've also dropped up here the link to the Open Research website, my e-mail address, our Twitter.

2:45:22

We have a generic publishing inbox if you want to contact that as well, or you can scan the QR code at the bottom there to sign up to our newsletter.

2:45:29

We send out four newsletters a year.

2:45:31

They just give you a little bit of an update of all the strange and quirky things that we're doing on the Open Researcher platform at the minute.

2:45:38

And that's it from me.

2:45:46

Thank you, Kelly.

2:45:48

Very good.

2:45:48

No worries.

2:45:51

John, do you have questions?

2:45:55

We have the existing ones.

2:46:01

They no, we don't have any questions at the moment.

2:46:04

So do you get those in for Kelly if you have any questions?

2:46:10

I was just thinking, you mentioned at the right at the start of your your presentation, you mentioned about commercial publishers being viewed as the villain of the face, which is really interesting.

2:46:22

Is that, is that an attitude you come across a lot and is that a barrier to to the work that you do?

2:46:30

I know that a lot of people have have very strong views about how Open Access should work and how about how publishing should work and about how research dissemination should work.

2:46:41

Yeah, it's really interesting.

2:46:42

So F-1000 is a really small publisher.

2:46:46

It doesn't really make a huge amount of profit.

2:46:48

It's really trying to be new and quirky and innovative and try new things.

2:46:52

And I think a lot of people respect that as a small publisher just trying to, you know, try new things, trying to improve the system as it is.

2:46:58

We recognise it's not amazing and we're trying to do it a bit differently.

2:47:02

However, when we were bought by Taylor and Francis, which you can't really argue is not a huge commercial pub, Michelle, it did kind of change people's opinions a little bit.

2:47:10

And we did see a little bit more hesitation, for example, when people found out that F-1000 had won the Open Research Europe contract.

2:47:17

I think at first, if we hadn't been bought by TNF, it would have been like, oh, cool, kind of a small little publisher doing something quirky.

2:47:24

But because we were owned by TNF, there was a little bit of hesitation there.

2:47:27

People didn't really like the fact that this publicly funded platform was being run by a kind of huge commercial.

2:47:33

So it is some hesitation that I do see sometimes.

2:47:36

That's why I don't really give out my TNF e-mail address.

2:47:39

I always use my F-1000 e-mail address.

2:47:42

But yeah, I do see it sometimes.

2:47:43

But I think it's a bit of an oversight to treat us that way because I think you can't deny that publishers play a key role in this ecosystem at the minute.

2:47:53

And I think by excluding them from conversations about how we should change it in the future, you're just really removing a key stakeholder from that conversation.

2:48:01

And I think there are ways that we can valuably contribute to that discussion without just thinking about, you know, profit, profit, profit from the commercial perspective.

2:48:10

So it's a difficult line and a balance to find.

2:48:14

But I think with Open Research Europe and, and with F-1000 and other sort of similar publishers that are doing similar other things but are still technically commercial, we can still provide a really interesting perspective and show you that we can actually still add value.

2:48:28

Publishers do add value to to papers in the publishing process.

2:48:31

And I think that's been a little bit forgotten in this kind of enemy piece, but it's a bit of a joke, but it's rooted in in truth.

2:48:40

Thank you.

2:48:41

Sorry, that's quite a difficult question to start with, but yeah, thank you for such a full answer.

2:48:46

Yeah, it's, it's still no questions.

2:48:49

We just still have a few minutes if anybody does have any.

2:48:52

I just, I had a very general one about the the the future of Open Research Europe.

2:48:58

Is this something that will be a long term thing in its current format?

2:49:02

Are the plans to develop it?

2:49:07

Yeah.

2:49:07

So as I mentioned, the European Commission originally launched it back in 20.

2:49:11

Well, they launched the tender for it back at the end of 2019, I think maybe 2018 and saying that they wanted to build this platform and it was originally just for Horizon 2020.

2:49:21

They felt that it went really well in the first three years that we ran it.

2:49:25

And so they decided to extend it and expand it out to include the new programme which was Horizon Europe and also all the decentralised agencies in the European Commission staff, as I said.

2:49:36

So that will run until 20, 262027.

2:49:38

And the reason I don't know how long it will run for is because of what the European Commission is doing in the background.

2:49:43

So in the background they separately from F-1000 because obviously we would have commercial interests and that would be a bias for us to be involved in that conversation.

2:49:51

So we don't own the platform, we just run it.

2:49:53

So this is a conversation that the European Commission is having, but I can tell you a little bit about what I know about what they're doing.

2:49:59

So they are having conversations with a number of different national funders, predominantly across Europe, and also some institutions about how they could expand the platform further, but to remove all eligibility requirements from it.

2:50:12

This is probably the number one hesitation I get about the platform is, oh, especially from librarians.

2:50:17

You know, I don't want to promote this platform in my institution because not all of my researchers here can benefit from it.

2:50:24

So they really want to try to remove that eligibility requirement from the platform by getting other national funders to add money to the pot essentially.

2:50:32

So the idea is to take the ownership of the platform away from the European Commission and give it to another organisation, not a not a not-for-profit organisation, but not the European Commission purely for red tape reasons.

2:50:45

It's really difficult for them to receive money from other funders.

2:50:48

So give it to someone else, kind of like an open air type organisation.

2:50:52

They would then be responsible for running it and they would receive money from these other national funders and institutions that want to pitch in.

2:50:58

And the money that they receive from those funders and institutions would cover all of the costs for publishing on the platform for anybody.

2:51:05

So even if your funder hasn't pitched in, you would still be able to publish on the platform.

2:51:11

So they're having these discussions with a number of different national funders across Europe to try to make this a reality.

2:51:17

And we'll see how those conversations go.

2:51:19

I'm not Privy to them.

2:51:20

I don't know.

2:51:21

We'll have to see what comes out of it.

2:51:22

But that's why I'm not really sure whether we'll run it until 2026 or 2027.

2:51:28

They have the opportunity to extend our contract, depending on how those conversations go.

2:51:33

What I do know is that the European Commission is very committed to Open Research Europe as a publishing platform.

2:51:38

They won't just let it disappear.

2:51:40

If these conversations with the other funders fall down, what will happen is likely they will just have another tender to run the platform in the same way that it's run now as a platform for European Commission beneficiaries.

2:51:51

And that will continue to run.

2:51:53

I think they confirmed funding for it for at least 10 years.

2:51:56

And so they are very committed to this platform.

2:51:58

They're not going to let it go, but they're hoping that they can actually grow it into something, a fully diamond model that will be for everybody and not just for their researchers.

2:52:09

That's brilliant.

2:52:10

Thank you.

2:52:10

Yeah.

2:52:11

So it sounds like it's something that's going to be.

2:52:13

Yeah, having an impact down the line.

2:52:16

And you watch this space as to the.

2:52:19

Yeah, sign up to the block.

2:52:21

That way.

2:52:22

We'll let you know in the newsletter what happens.

2:52:26

I think we we don't have any other questions.

2:52:28

I think there's been so much there to digest and, and so much throughout the day to think about that.

2:52:32

I think, yeah, we might.

2:52:35

We might leave it there and, and let you go, Kelly, But thank you so much for that.

2:52:38

Thank you so much for inviting me today.

2:52:40

I really enjoyed it.

2:52:42

Thank you, Kelly.

2:52:43

I think it's also a sign that it's afternoon and people are.

2:52:47

Yeah, keeping people from their lunch.

2:52:49

That's what's happening.

2:52:53

So I've learned many things today that can relate relate to my universal library and I hope that when

you soon will leave this session and this seminar, you go with more knowledge than you did when you entered this seminar.

2:53:11

So now we have come to the summary and close and I will try to just do that.

2:53:21

We have heard of the Open Access advantages, advantages like increased readership, increased usage and increased citation.

2:53:32

But we have also heard about challenges with funding of Open Access monographs.

2:53:38

We have learned about alternatives to book processing charges like library member programme and we have learned the important importance of working with budget advocacy and listening.

2:53:58

We got to know the similarities and differences of green Open Access and right retention and and also the the those green Open Access and right retentions were related to historical context.

2:54:16

And we learned that Royal Society of Chemistry has embarked on a journey towards 100% Open Access by 2028.

2:54:28

And they are also moving away from Apcs and also that their that their flagship journal is Diamond Chemical Science.

2:54:41

And lastly, we heard about a new sustainable platform, Open Research Europe.

2:54:47

I look forward to follow to follow the development of this platform in the future.

2:54:53

And this very last year here here at Mummy University, we have started talking more about publishing as an infrastructure.

2:55:08

So thank you for all the questions from the audience and thank you John for the brilliant Q&A and big give all the brilliant work in the background.

2:55:17

And of course to all our fantastic speakers for today, there will be an e-mail with a link to an evaluation form.

2:55:28

Please do fill it in.

2:55:30

It will help us improve our seminars.

2:55:34

Thank you for today and have a beautiful afternoon.