









EMPOWER High-level policy/strategy	
 Approach	 Rationale
<b>Add OA requirements to career assessment policies</b>	► Universities could require researchers to deposit articles or manuscripts in their institutional repository (in OA) to be considered for career evaluations.
<b>Adopt a policy that includes a Rights Retention Statement</b>	► Universities could include requirements for researchers to apply a CC BY licence to author's accepted manuscripts (AAM) in institutional Open Access (OA) policies or even employment contracts.
<b>Assign funding for Article Processing Charges (APCs). Centralise and streamline APC reporting.</b>	► Universities could also set aside an APC contribution fund (authors could contribute from their research funds but would not be forced to pay for these fees out of their salaries).
<b>Advocate policy change by governments and funders</b>	► Universities could advance OA by aligning their Open Access policies, lobby for legislation that protects IPR and anchors CC BY for academic publishing in copyright law, etc.

BUILD CAPACITY Libraries and consortia	
 Approach	 Rationale
<b>Enter into a transformative agreement (TA) with a large publisher</b>	► Universities could join forces with other institutions as well as research funding organisations to form transnational negotiating consortia, in order to contribute to the transition to full OA.
<b>Enter into a TA with a smaller or society publisher</b>	► Since smaller publishers often publish in languages other than English, universities using those languages could form consortia specifically dedicated to negotiating with these publishers.
<b>Enter into a publishing agreement with a pure OA publisher</b>	► Universities could explore joining consortia negotiating such agreements: the larger the consortium, the better deals can be concluded.

REINFORCE EXISTING STRUCTURES Academic community-driven Infrastructures	
 Approach	 Rationale
<b>Support non-commercial, scholar-led publishing initiatives (Diamond OA)</b>	► Universities could map these initiatives, which would also allow them to support and reward such efforts.
<b>Support non-commercial infrastructure for scholarly communication</b>	► Universities could align to collectively sustain these infrastructures and/ or provide in-kind contributions by hosting them and provide (library) staff in-kind service contributions.
<b>Develop and use an institutional (or shared) OA repository</b>	► Universities could actively support their repositories and help them become compliant with Plan S technical criteria so they are fully equipped to host the CC BY AAMs of their own authors.

# EMPOWER

## High-level policy/strategy

 Approach	 Rationale	 Strengths / Opportunities	 Things to Watch
<b>Add OA requirements to career assessment policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Researcher publishing behaviour is closely linked with the publication venue (e.g., a journal).</li> <li>▶ A more balanced emphasis on research output and other academic activities, including open research processes, teaching and service to society is part of a holistic reform of research evaluation and career assessment in academia.</li> <li>▶ <b>Universities could require researchers to deposit articles or manuscripts in their institutional repository (in OA) to be considered for career evaluations.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Incentivises OA publications and FAIR data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Changes to research evaluation and career assessment practices may have unintended consequences to the career paths of (early-stage) academics. Will require impact assessment, monitoring and evaluation of changes.</li> <li>▶ Changes may also lead to resistance by academics. Will require awareness raising.</li> </ul>
<b>Adopt a policy that includes a Rights Retention Statement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Authors or their institutions retain copyright to their publications. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY), in order to fulfil the requirements defined by the <a href="#">Berlin Declaration</a>. The <i>Rights Retention Strategy</i> gives researchers the freedom to submit manuscripts for publication to their journal of choice, including subscription journals, whilst remaining fully compliant with Plan S.</li> <li>▶ Plan S funders use this in their funding agreements, so the CC BY licence will override publisher agreements.</li> <li>▶ <b>Universities could include requirements for researchers to apply a CC BY licence to author's accepted manuscripts (AAM) in institutional Open Access (OA) policies or even employment contracts.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Could allow almost full, immediate OA to AAMs.</li> <li>▶ Makes authors aware of their intellectual property rights (IPR).</li> <li>▶ Ensures that authors and their institutions retain ownership of their AAM, and thus their intellectual assets.</li> <li>▶ Allows authors to freely reuse tables, graphs, and other material from their CC BY licensed articles without asking the publisher for permission to do so.</li> <li>▶ Is in line with Plan S policy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ May lead to disagreements with publishers, who could make it harder for authors to exercise their rights.</li> <li>▶ May require extra library staff work to explain the Rights Retention Statement to authors and advise them regarding publishers.</li> </ul>
<b>Assign funding for Article Processing Charges (APCs). Centralise and streamline APC reporting.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Gold OA journals often charge authors a fee for OA publishing. This fee can vary from €500 - €10,000 per article.</li> <li>▶ Universities could request Price and Service Transparency, in line with the Plan S <a href="#">Price and Services Transparency Framework</a>.</li> <li>▶ <b>Universities could also set aside an APC contribution fund (authors could contribute from their research funds but would not be forced to pay for these fees out of their salaries).</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Supports research publication in venues not covered by institutional or consortia agreements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Funding may be difficult to obtain.</li> <li>▶ APCs can be extremely high.</li> <li>▶ Universities should avoid paying APCs to 'hybrid' journals, as they run the risk of paying twice: once via the subscription and then again via the APC (double-dipping).</li> </ul>

<b>Advocate policy change by governments and funders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Universities could advance OA by aligning their Open Access policies, lobby for legislation that protects IPR and anchors CC BY for academic publishing in copyright law, etc.</li> </ul>	<b>Working Document : draft dated 15 June 2021</b>
--	--	--





## BUILD CAPACITY

### Libraries and consortia

 Approach	 Rationale	 Strengths / Opportunities	 Things to Watch
<p>Enter into a transformative agreement (TA) with a large publisher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Flipping the publishing market from subscription to OA requires better alignment of university subscription negotiators.</li> <li>▶ <b>Universities could join forces with other institutions as well as research funding organisations to form transnational negotiating consortia, in order to contribute to the transition to full OA.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Enhances negotiating consortia's power to achieve advantageous contractual conditions.</li> <li>▶ Allows for better monitoring of costs, since the institution no longer pays twice (once for subscription and once for open access APCs in the same set of journals).</li> <li>▶ Ensures continued access to resources not available in OA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Concerns that TAs are not transformative enough to lead to full OA in long term.</li> <li>▶ Concerns that TAs may not result in an overall cost reduction as they simply transfer subscription cost to read &amp; publish cost.</li> <li>▶ Risk of continued lock-in and concerns about major players' growing market power.</li> <li>▶ In some countries, consortia have decided to cancel big deals with large publishers and to demand better conditions during negotiations.</li> <li>▶ Differences in national law hamper transnational alignment of stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<p>Enter into a TA with a smaller or society publisher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Large publishers already have a quasi-oligopoly. Smaller publishers often have a limited ability to change their business models and publication processes. However, smaller publishers are important for a diverse market that serves the needs of different disciplines.</li> <li>▶ <b>Since smaller publishers often publish in languages other than English, universities using those languages could form consortia specifically dedicated to negotiating with these publishers.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Ensures bibliodiversity, competition in the publishing market, and OA venues for smaller disciplines and languages other than English.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Requires labour-intensive commitments by consortia negotiators, and efforts to increase coordination with other regional university libraries.</li> </ul>
<p>Enter into a publishing agreement with a pure OA publisher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ OA publishers experiment with national-level or institutional-level agreements (e.g. PLOS Community action publishing, Frontiers).</li> <li>▶ <b>Universities could explore joining consortia negotiating such agreements: the larger the consortium, the better deals can be concluded.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Potentially reduces the cost of APCs paid by the institution.</li> <li>▶ Ensures competition in the publishing market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ There is an (often unfounded) concern that some pure OA journals publish lower quality articles, as their business model relies on APCs: more published articles directly generate more income.</li> </ul>

## REINFORCE EXISTING STRUCTURES

### Academic community-driven Infrastructures

 Approach	 Rationale	 Strengths / Opportunities	 Things to Watch
<b>Support non-commercial, scholar-led publishing initiatives (Diamond OA)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Universities, university presses, departments, and researchers are often active as editors and publishers and serve specific communities of various sizes. Institutions are not always aware of these initiatives.</li> <li>► <b>Universities could map these initiatives, which would also allow them to support and reward such efforts.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Directly supports small communities and journals.</li> <li>► Supports diversity, bibliodiversity and academic control.</li> <li>► Small cost but large impact (hugely efficient).</li> <li>► Small contributions (including in-kind contributions) from many institutions can make the difference.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Small journal sustainability is often an issue. (See OA Diamond Journals Study - consolidation efforts are underway.)</li> </ul>
<b>Support non-commercial infrastructure for scholarly communication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Organisations such as the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) or the Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services (SCOSS) are important for supporting community-owned freely accessible infrastructure that allows the academic community to collect, store, organise, access, share, and assess research. These initiatives require sustainable funding.</li> <li>► <b>Universities could align to collectively sustain these infrastructures and/ or provide in-kind contributions by hosting them and provide (library) staff in-kind service contributions.</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Supports diversity, bibliodiversity and academic control.</li> <li>► Small cost but large impact (hugely efficient).</li> <li>► Small contributions (including in-kind contributions) from many institutions can make the difference.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Requires labour-intensive commitments by consortia negotiators, and efforts to increase coordination with other regional university libraries.</li> </ul>
<b>Develop and use an institutional (or shared) OA repository</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► Universities could actively support their repositories and help them become compliant with Plan S technical criteria so they are fully equipped to host the CC BY AAMs of their own authors.</li> </ul>		

# Resources

## List of resources

- COAR Community Framework for Good Practices in Repositories: <https://www.coar-repositories.org/coar-community-framework-for-good-practices-in-repositories/>
- EUA Study on Read & Publish Agreements: <https://eua.eu/101-projects/751-study-on-read-publish-agreements.html>
- European Statistical Advisory Committee ESAC <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/ess/about-us/ess-gov-bodies/esac>
- Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services (SCOSS): <https://scoss.org/>
- Jisc New University Press Toolkit: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/new-university-press-toolkit>
- OA Books Toolkit: <https://www.oabooks-toolkit.org/>
- Plan S Rights Retention Strategy: <https://www.coalition-s.org/rights-retention-strategy/>
- Science Europe Briefing Paper: Open Access Monitoring: Guidelines and Recommendations for Research Organisations and Funders <https://www.scienceeurope.org/media/cqllmhzo/se-oamonitoring-briefing-paper-2021.pdf>
- Society Publishers Accelerating Open access and Plan S (SPA-OPS) project: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.4561397.v3>