



IOP Publishing



IOP's credentials in open access publishing

- Four open access journals in portfolio of 65
 - *New Journal of Physics* launched in 1998 in partnership with DPG; leading open access journal in general physics
 - Three more fully open access journals including *Environmental Research Letters*, the top-ranked open access journal in its field
 - 15% of all papers published in IOP-owned and co-owned journals in 2012 were open access
- Three open access Conference Proceedings
- More than 30 'hybrid' journals, publishing individual papers on an open access basis within subscription-based journals
 - Open access publication fees fully taken into account in subscription pricing

IOP Publishing



IOP's credentials in open access publishing

- Working with partners to add hybrid option to their journals
- CC-BY our standard licence for gold open access publication
 - All IOP-owned journals compliant with RCUK gold open access policy
- Green open access policy allowing deposit of accepted manuscript in a repository after embargo period, usually 12 months
- 'Free-for-thirty-days' policy
 - Version of record made freely accessible for first thirty days following publication

The benefits of gold open access

- Immediate universal access to the Version of Record with extensive rights of re-use
- Extends current levels of access to Version of Record
 - But current levels of access very good
 - Other means of doing so – licence extensions, public library access, special licensing to SMEs, etc
- Facilitates text- and data-mining
 - CC-BY helps but not the whole solution
 - CrossRef working on a cross-industry initiative to support mining
 - Publishers already semantically indexing their journals
 - All IOP journals already semantically indexed
 - Thesauri created; Astronomy thesaurus donated to community

The benefits of gold open access

- More citations?
 - Possibly more downloads, but not more citations
 - Davis PM, Lewenstein BV, Simon DH, Booth JG, Connolly MJL. 2008. Open access publishing, article downloads and citations: randomised trial. *BMJ* 337: a568.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a568>
 - Craig et al. Do Open Access Articles Have Greater Citation Impact? A critical review of the literature,
<http://www.publishingresearch.net/Citations.htm>
 - Kurtz, Henneken. Open access does not increase citations for research articles from The Astrophysical Journal.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.0896>
- Opportunities for re-use
 - Very few examples of this

IOP Publishing



The benefits of gold open access

- However...
- If funders want open access publication of the outputs of the research that they fund, and are willing to pay for publication services, then publishers will support that business model
- “The Wellcome Trust ... supports unrestricted access to the published output of research as a fundamental part of its charitable mission and a public benefit to be encouraged wherever possible. “
 - “...will provide grantholders with additional funding, through their institutions, to cover open access charges, where appropriate, in order to meet the Trust's requirements.”

IOP Publishing



Finch recommendations and Government policy: gold

- A clear policy direction should be set towards support for publication in open access or hybrid journals, funded by APCs, as the main vehicle for the publication of research, especially when it is publicly funded.
- The Research Councils and other public sector bodies funding research in the UK should – following the Wellcome Trust's initiative in this area but recognizing the specific natures of different funding streams - establish more effective and flexible arrangements to meet the costs of publishing in open access and hybrid journals.
- The Government agrees with both of these recommendations . We recognise that whilst Open Access (OA) means free access to the user and full right of search, it does not follow that OA has no cost. Support for publicly funded research institutions will be needed to pay the cost of APCs [and] this funding will come out of existing research funds.

IOP Publishing

Finch recommendations and Government policy: gold

- Support for open access publication should be accompanied by policies to minimise restrictions on the rights of use and re-use, especially for non-commercial purposes, and on the ability to use the latest tools and services to organise and manipulate text and other content.
- The Government welcomes this recommendation which is consistent with our aspirations for implementation of the Hargreaves recommendations. Where APCs are paid to publishers, the Government would expect to see unrestricted access and use of the subject content and the details of how this should be best achieved will be addressed in the detailed policy statements to be published by funding bodies.

IOP Publishing

Finch recommendations and Government policy: UK access

- During the period of transition to open access publishing worldwide, in order to maximise access in the HE and health sectors to journals and articles produced by authors in the UK and from across the world that are not accessible on open access terms, funds should be found to extend and rationalise current licences to cover all the institutions in those sectors.
- The Government understands and supports the objectives behind this recommendation. The extent to which funds can be made available for this purpose will be a matter for the independent funding bodies.

Finch recommendations and Government policy: UK access

- The current discussions on how to implement the proposal for walk-in access to the majority of journals to be provided in public libraries across the UK should be pursued with vigour, along with an effective publicity and marketing campaign.
- The Government welcomes this imaginative and valuable initiative by the publishing industry. We encourage the working group that has already been set-up to address it, which includes public library representation, to press ahead and implement the proposed two-year pilot scheme at the earliest opportunity. We hope it will become a permanent feature of the UK's public library service.

Finch recommendations and Government policy: UK access

- Representative bodies for key sectors including central and local Government, voluntary organisations, and businesses, should work together with publishers, learned societies, libraries and others with relevant expertise to consider the terms and costs of licences to provide access to a broad range of relevant content for the benefit of consortia of organisations within their sectors...
- Future discussions and negotiations between universities and publishers (including learned societies) on the pricing of big deals and other subscriptions should take into account the financial implications of the shift to publication in open access and hybrid journals, of extensions to licensing, and the resultant changes in revenues provided to publishers.
- The Government encourage the various stakeholders to pursue these two recommendations. We look to JISC to contribute its long-standing experience in this field to help in such negotiations and particularly with regard to implementing ... the proposed extension of licensing to high-technology Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs).

Finch recommendations and Government policy: monographs

- Universities, funders, publishers, and learned societies should continue to work together to promote further experimentation in open access publishing for scholarly monographs.
- The Government welcomes this recommendation.

Finch recommendations and Government policy: green

- The infrastructure of subject and institutional repositories should be developed so that they play a valuable role complementary to formal publishing, particularly in providing access to research data and to grey literature, and in digital preservation.
- The Government has recently provided £150 million for the development of e-infrastructure that should benefit these OA objectives. ...but, generally, the development of infrastructure for subject and institutional repositories will primarily be a matter for institutions themselves.

IOP Publishing

Finch recommendations and Government policy: green

- Funders' limitations on the length of embargo periods, and on any other restrictions on access to content not published on open access terms, should be considered carefully, to avoid undue risk to valuable journals that are not funded in the main by APCs. Rules should be kept under review in the light of the available evidence as to their likely impact on such journals.
- Where APC funds are not available to the publisher or learned society, for the publication of publicly-funded research, then publishers could reasonably insist on a longer more equitable embargo period. This could be up to 12 months for science, technology and engineering publications and longer for publications in those disciplines which require more time to secure payback. Even so, publications with embargo periods longer than two years may find it difficult to argue that they are also serving the public interest.

IOP Publishing

Finch recommendations and Government policy: summary



IOP Publishing

RCUK policy and implementation

- “A car crash.” Russell Group PVCR, December 2012
- “RCUK has done the impossible. It has brought universities and publishers together on the same side.” Russell Group PVCR, December 2012
- “Ambiguity is required.” RCUK spokesperson, December 2012
- “RCUK did not consult or communicate effectively with key stakeholders in the publishing and academic communities when implementing its open access policy.” Lords Krebs, February 2013
- “The lack of clarity in RCUK policy and guidance, and the consequent confusion, especially given the imminent start date of 1 April 2013, are unacceptable.” House of Lords S&T Committee, February 2013
- “Green with a six-month embargo is not a sustainable option ... someone has to pay for academic publishing.” David Willetts, 25 February 2013

IOP Publishing

RCUK policy and implementation

- “A journey, not an event”
 - RCUK, December 2012-March 2013
- Policy and guidance as published in July 2012 reflected the destination, not the journey
 - Policy on embargo periods assumed full funding for APCs, whereas it is estimated at no more than 45% in 2013/14 – assuming 20% contribution from universities - and a maximum of 75% in 2017/18
- Implementation of policy from July 2012 was carried out without consultation with other stakeholders
 - Successful implementation depends on close cooperation of all institutional stakeholders
- RCUK statements have failed to provide clear, unambiguous and actionable guidance which will not slow down the publication and dissemination of research

IOP Publishing

RCUK revised policy and guidance – issued 6 March

- Decision tree now incorporated but hedged with obfuscatory or contradictory language
 - “In some circumstances, where funding for APCs is unavailable during the transition period, longer embargo periods may be allowable”
 - “However, journals which are not compliant with RCUK policy must not be used to publish research papers arising from Research Council funded work apart from in the special cases during the transition period.”
 - “Where an author’s preference is ‘pay-to-publish’ and their first choice of journal offers this option, but there are insufficient funds to pay for the APC, in order to meet the spirit of the RCUK policy, the Councils prefer the author to seek an alternative journal with an affordable ‘pay-to-publish’ option or with an option with embargo periods of six or twelve months.”

IOP Publishing

RCUK revised policy and guidance – issued 6 March

- Decision tree now incorporated but hedged with obfuscatory or contradictory language
 - “RCUK recognises that this may not be a feasible option in all cases, especially in non-STEM disciplines.”
 - “Research papers in biomedicine should be published with an embargo of no longer than six months, as has been the MRC’s mandated policy since 2006.”
- “However, RCUK recognises that embargo periods are currently used by some journals with business models that depend on generating revenue through journal subscriptions.”
- Licence requirements for green open access are confused – no particular licence required but must be equivalent of CC-BY-NC and ideally CC-BY. These raise further issues of sustainability.

IOP Publishing



HEFCE draft policy

- Letter issued 25 February 2013 notifying of an intention to consult on HEFCE's requirement for open access publication of submissions to the post-2014 REF; responses requested to inform fuller consultation process
- Consultation late Spring/early Summer; policy in place before year-end
- "Not appropriate to express any preference" between "gold or green routes"
- Policy essentially green
 - No additional funding for gold
 - Requirement for deposit of accepted manuscript in institutional repository
 - However, requiring form of licence usually associated with gold
 - Embargo periods to follow Research Councils' policy (not Government policy)

IOP Publishing



Open access initiatives outside the UK

- United States (15% of global research output)
 - Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) memorandum published 22 February 2013
- European Union
 - Horizon 2020
- Germany (7% of global research output)
 - Possible amendment to copyright
 - Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) gold policy
- China (13% of global research output, and growing)
 - Some limited support for open access
- SCOAP3 (high-energy physics, global)
 - 'Reconciliation process' underway

IOP Publishing

The state of play at 6 March 2013

- Publishers ready to implement Government policy and any RCUK policy aligned with it
 - Support for gold through open access and hybrid journals
 - CC-BY broadly adopted, with some reservations
 - Acceptance of green embargo periods of 12-24 months in absence of funding for APCs
 - Public library access close to implementation
- Universities largely ready to implement Government policy and any RCUK policy aligned with it, with some flexibility
 - Some concerns about funding, administrative burden, blanket requirement for CC-BY

IOP Publishing

The state of play at 6 March 2013

- Researchers generally not ready for implementation of RCUK policy
 - Lack of awareness of RCUK requirements, little understanding of CC-BY licensing, concerns about implications for where they can publish, how frequently they can publish, what publication will cost, impact on budgets for science, their intellectual property rights
 - Programme of education and advocacy required
 - *Open access in the UK and what it means for scientific research*, Royal Society, 25 February 2013
 - <http://royalsociety.org/events/2013/open-access-workshop/>