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What are the biggest obstacles to OA publishing in LMICs?

1st: Lack of funding
2nd: Low levels of OA knowledge/awareness
3rd: Lack of incentives for OA publication
4th: Insufficient training and guidance
5th: Inconsistent APC waiver policies/workflows
6th: English language dominance
7th: Lack of technical infrastructure
8th: Poor indexing of local journals
Who are the key stakeholders in the move towards equitable OA?

**Publishers**
- Commercial
- Society
- Library

**Research4Life**

**EIFL**

**INASP**

**Researchers**
- Early career
- Mid career
- Late career

**Government/Policy makers**

**Institutions**
- Senior leaders
- Libraries
- Research office

**Funders**
- Research funders
- Development funder

**Data and solution providers**

**Abstracting & indexing services**

**Science communicators/journalists**

**Journal editorial boards**

**Regional platforms/infrastructure**
What actions should be taken forward?

Showcase the role of international collaboration in increasing OA uptake for global south

Publishers: keep working with journal editors on diversifying peer review pools and ed boards

Large Publishers to collaborate with local journals/publishing platforms to help improve discoverability, best practice etc

Work with institutions and government to help ensure that metrics and other cultural factors to recognise / prioritise OA

Publishers: contribute to forming evidence base on publishing behaviour and challenges for OA publishing in LMICs

Cross publisher/industry collaboration on training support for authors

Researchers should make sure that they cite articles from global south

Publishers to identify easier ways of making waiver policies transparent to authors
Next steps

• Publish white paper based on Scopus dataset

• Explore signposting of APC waiver policies on Research4Life website

• Pilot study on transformative agreements in the Global South, led by Information Power, funded by Wellcome Trust and with support from EIFL

• Audit of capacity development resources for authors
Improving Peer Review Support for Researchers

Identifying the challenges

Speedboat

- Tables brainstormed on issues concerning librarians, editors, researchers, publishers, technologies
- Mixed stakeholder groups put challenges by sector anchors slowing speedboat

What you selected to put through to the second session and why

- Independent peer review
- Lack of standardization
- How to help peer reviewers
- Training
- Incentives
Improving Peer Review Support for Researchers

Working through the problems

• **Give a flavour of the discussions, focus on the content**
  • Should the peer review process be more transparent?
  • Do we need speed or forward movement in peer review?

• **Was there anything surprising that was drawn out through the process you used**
  • The role of the university (not just the library) is often ignored
  • Peer reviewers should be a distinct stakeholder group

• **Where was there agreement/disagreement**
  • Agreement:
    • Concrete rewards are needed
  • Disagreement:
    • Faster isn’t always better
Improving Peer Review Support for Researchers

Considered ease of implementation vs. impact in final session

Credibility
Training institutions
Training publishers
Concrete rewards
Recognition

Low impact, but easier

High impact, but more difficult
Transformative Agreement
Collaboration

*Identifying the problems*

- Diverse group, representing views of institutions, societies, commercials
- “Transparency” seen key to any solution(s)
- “One-size-fits-all” is non-operative
- *Everyone wants to transform, but no one wants to change.*
Transformative Agreement

Collaboration

*Working through the problems*

- Collaboration happens, built upon trust
- ”Transparency” was widely welcomed
- Transformative Agreements are only one aspect of movement to “open”
- Brainstorming on evolution & innovation
  - How about funders underwrite societies?
  - How about shared (standardized) billing and accounting taxonomy?
  - How about societies create endowments to fund Diamond OA?
Transformative Agreement

Collaboration

What we resolved (and didn’t)

• ... To relieve researchers of the OA “burden” (and remember the value of reading)
• .. To leverage relationships and identify partners
• .. To involve all stakeholders (and be vocal/informative about accomplishments)
• .. To start at the top in discussions (leading to negotiations)
Transformative Agreement
Collaboration

*What comes next?*

- Unite stakeholders on single, transparent, data-driven platform
- The “transformative amoeba” (watch for viruses)
- Push transparency in our organization and expect it from others (how “radical” can you be?)
Workshop – Practicality & Purity
Commerce in the Academy

Objective: Agree on recommendations for a sustainable and successful environment for the development and dissemination of scholarly research
Main Conclusions

• The key to success is a more realistic system for research assessment and incentives
• This requires solutions support of - and compromise by - all stakeholders
• Impetus almost certainly must come from government and funders, but other stakeholders have responsibility to help shape policy
But also

- The polarisation of ‘practicality’ (e.g. commercial) vs. ‘purity’ (open research) is false dichotomy
  - It exists more on Twitter than in the real world
  - The issue is not profit vs free, but rather the distortions in the system and how these skew resources and rewards
## Key Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>What do they want?</th>
<th>What can they do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Promote economic prosperity; stay in power</td>
<td>Create a more accurate research evaluation and incentive system that addresses current distortions in a sustainable way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>To fund the research that brings the most social value or advances their mission</td>
<td>Support a more accurate research evaluation framework and incentive system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Provide environment for research (and thus the institution itself) to thrive</td>
<td>Expend effort and political capital to support a more realistic assessment regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers</td>
<td>Serve customers, survive disruption; be sustainable/profitable</td>
<td>Re-align business model around new incentives; accept lower profit margins (in some cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovators</td>
<td>Market access and opportunity to create sustainable or profitable businesses</td>
<td>Take the risk of focusing venture to support future assessment and incentive system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>To carry out research that helps society, and be rewarded and recognised appropriately</td>
<td>Take the risk of focusing research based on true social value and new incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More collaboration needed!
Thank You
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do they want?</th>
<th>What can they do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly societies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identify what their mission is.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetuate their existence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance the profile of their field nationally and internationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support their community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use their discipline to inform evidence-based policy-making by governments and other policy makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise to be valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publishers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implement Universal Open Access and Open Science</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to support researchers and the research environment</td>
<td>Act to create competitive market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to innovate</td>
<td>Price/cost transparency (open contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to serve their customers</td>
<td>Unbundle services and value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to survive disruption</td>
<td>Experiment with different services and offerings - share what works and what doesn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to make money (from being sustainable to make huge surplus/profit)</td>
<td>Share experiments Avoid expanding for the sake of expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept lower profit margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support more realistic assessment regime</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in power (<em>present govt.</em>)</td>
<td>Accept that Scholarship is a global collaborative endeavour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote economic prosperity</td>
<td>Have some respect for evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve big challenges in their jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be seen to be a good player</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What do they want?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>To understand, create, and share knowledge, to solve problems, to have a good work-life balance, to help science &amp; society, &amp; to be rewarded and recognised appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Become more business-savvy Align Incentive &amp; reward system with the mission of the institution (provide environment for research to thrive - research culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovators</td>
<td>The ability to compete ‘fairly’ in the market Use technology to provide better services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>More cost-effective Disaggregated/unbundled services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funders</td>
<td>To advance their mission e.g. Wellcome: improve health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Health, comfort, security, information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do they want?</td>
<td>What can they do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly societies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetuate their existence</td>
<td>Identify what their mission is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance the profile of their field nationally and internationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support their community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use their discipline to inform evidence-based policy-making by governments and other policy makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise to be valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publishers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to support researchers and the research environment</td>
<td>Implement Universal Open Access and Open Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to innovate</td>
<td>Act to create competitive market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to serve their customers</td>
<td>Price/cost transparency (open contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to survive disruption</td>
<td>Unbundle services and value add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to make money (from being sustainable to make huge surplus/profit)</td>
<td>Experiment with different services and offerings - share what works and what doesn’t Share experiments Avoid expanding for the sake of expansion Accept lower profit margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in power (*present govt.)</td>
<td>Support more realistic assessment regime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote economic prosperity</td>
<td>Accept that Scholarship is a global collaborative endeavour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve big challenges in their jurisdiction</td>
<td>Have some respect for evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be seen to be a good player</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practicality and Purity – Commerce in the Academy

Working through the problems

- Give a flavour of the discussions, focus on the content
  - Multiple points of view
  - Held very strongly
- Was there anything surprising that was drawn out through the process you used
- Where was there agreement, disagreement
- Where was there clarity, complexity
Practicality and Purity – Commerce in the Academy

Identifying the problems

- **What were the problems?**
  - List the stakeholders
  - What do they want?
  - What would they do, or have to give up, to achieve the goal?
    - Not everyone was in agreement here!

- **Polarisation**
  - False dichotomy – Extreme polarisation exists on Twitter but not in the real world.

- **Key Takeaways**
  - The research evaluation and incentive system needs to be changed
  - That will require actions and compromises from all stakeholders
  - But the impetus likely must start with government/funders
Practicality and Purity – Commerce in the Academy

What we resolved (and didn’t)

• Were there clear decisions
• What was resolved
• What was unresolvable
**Pros**

- Opens transport to people who don't have it
- Possibly takes cars off the road
- Don't need ticketing infrastructure
- Possible job gains

**Cons**

- Transitioning to a public model
- People who can pay for different service (e.g., users) will lose any chance. Likely that service won't be as good.
- Job losses
- Increase taxes? Funding model would need to shift.
Practicality and Purity – Commerce in the Academy

What next, actions arising

- Working group?
- Articles or reports?
- Outreach to stakeholders?
- Etc.
Framework for the transparent communication of OA prices and services

Chris Banks (Imperial College London)
Arend Kuester (Springer Nature)
Alicia Wise (Information Power)
Part I: The Plan S Principles

"With effect from 2021", all scholarly publications on the results from research funded by public or private grants provided by national, regional and international research councils and funding bodies, must be published in Open Access Journals, on Open Access Platforms, or made immediately available through Open Access Repositories without embargo."

*For funders agreeing after January 2020 to implement Plan S in their policies, the start date will be one year from that agreement
publications. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY), in order to fulfill the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration.

02 The Funders will develop robust criteria and requirements for the services that high-quality Open Access Journals, Open Access platforms, and Open Access repositories must provide:

03 In cases where high-quality Open Access journals or platforms do not yet exist, the Funders will, in a coordinated way, provide incentives to establish and support them when appropriate; support will also be provided for Open Access infrastructures where necessary;

04 Where applicable, Open Access publication fees are covered by the Funders or research institutions, not by individual researchers; it is acknowledged that all researchers should be able to publish their work Open Access;

05 The Funders support the diversity of business models for Open Access journals and platforms. When Open Access publication fees are applied, they must be commensurate with the publication services delivered and the structure of such fees must be transparent to inform the research and Funders potential.

06 organisations, libraries, academies, and learned societies to align their strategies, policies, and practices, notably to ensure transparency.

07 The above principles shall apply to all types of scholarly publications, but it is understood that the timeline to achieve Open Access for monographs and book chapters will be longer and requires a separate and due process:

08 The Funders do not support the ‘hybrid’ model of publishing. However, as a transitional pathway towards full Open Access within a clearly defined timeframe, and only as part of transformative arrangements, Funders may contribute to financially supporting such arrangements;

09 The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliant beneficiaries/grantees;

10 The Funders commit that when assessing research outputs during funding decisions they will value the intrinsic merit of the work and not consider the publication channel, its impact factor (or other journal metrics), or the publisher.
The Funders support the diversity of business models for Open Access journals and platforms. When Open Access publication fees are applied, they must be commensurate with the publication services delivered and the structure of such fees must be transparent to inform the market and funders potential standardisation and capping of payments of fees;
• A project funded by Wellcome and UKRI on behalf of cOAlition S to engage with stakeholders to develop a framework for the transparent communication of Open Access (OA) prices and services.

• cOAlition S aims to help make the nature and prices of OA publishing services more transparent.

• To enable conversations and comparisons that will build confidence amongst customers that prices are fair and reasonable.

• Ultimately, it seeks a framework which enables publishers to communicate the price of services in a way that is transparent, practical to implement, and insightful.
Report

https://www.informationpower.co.uk/final-report-price-transparency-project/
### Section 1 - Basic title metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI or ISSN for Title (or Titles if all other data in the framework is the same for each of the titles)</td>
<td>Note this is a title DOI, not an article or issue DOI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal discipline area</td>
<td>Choose from physical science &amp; technology or humanities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner of journal</td>
<td>Use standard organisational identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher of journal</td>
<td>Use standard organisational identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC list price or price range for primary research articles</td>
<td>Indicate currency; use currency symbols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription list price</td>
<td>Indicate currency; use the currency symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Information Submitted</td>
<td>dd/mm/yyyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URL for additional information about price and services</td>
<td>Publishers are encouraged, but not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Contextual metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Section 2 - Contextual metadata</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articles published / annum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of publication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median number of reviews / article</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median time from submission to first decision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median time from submission to pass peer review and full publication of the article</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median citations / article</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unique_Item_Requests for the previous calendar year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Item_Requests for the previous calendar year</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3 - Pricing Information

| % of price for journal and community development | e.g. identifying need for the journal, aims and scope development, investment in funding for field, editorial board costs, commissioning content, competitor analysis, benchmarking, policy development, portfolio development |
| % of price from submission to desk reject or accept | e.g. triaging [NB this line is separated from the next in order to accommodate the Open Platform publishing model] |
| % of price for peer review management | please do not factor in time or resources donated by editors or reviewers; please include specialist reviews; e.g. recruiting and training peer reviewers and the editors who work with them, peer review management and tracking systems |
| % of price for services from acceptance to publication | e.g. platform, copyediting, formatting, typesetting, proofreading, assigning and depositing DOIs, XML file conversion (if content is not born XML), tagging, quality assurance checks, integration with a&I databases/aggregators/repositories/APC management systems, figure relettering or other improvements, dealing with article enhancements such as video abstracts, proofing process and author engagement around this, issue compilation, issue line up, printing, alignment with synchronous articles, vendor management, article pipeline management, systems support, systems development; addition of ORCIDs and other IDs to support funder/institutional disambiguation, checking references, design |
| % of price for services after publication | e.g. handling ethical queries, provision of usage statistics, longterm preservation and access, reader services, postage, inventory and stock control |
| % of price for sales & marketing to customers or of articles | e.g. sales teams, sales administration, legal costs for contracts, integration with and promotion on social media networks, sponsorship |
| % of price for author and customer support | e.g. helpdesk, usage/impact/other reports, training, author queries about copyright or CC licenses |
Current activity

Pilot of the framework

Ongoing discussion, including here @R2R
Workshop participants

- Publishers
- Content and data intermediaries
- Service providers
- Librarians
- Funders
A framework in three parts

- Basic journal title metadata
- Contextual metadata
- Pricing information
Framework as viewed by participants

- **Basic journal title metadata**
  Straightforward

- **Contextual metadata**
  Differs by publisher/journal: stage?

- **Pricing information**
  Qualitative: needs collaborative iteration/refinement
Unpacking the discussions

- Trust: two-way trust is essential
- Value proposition – need to understand this
- There is considerable variety
  - Disciplines
  - Publishers
  - Systems
- Cost
  - Data not commonly held or scrapable – costing some publishers a lot to gather
- Concerns
  - How will the data be used?
  - By whom?
  - Would it lead to over-engineering?
To build trust and consensus

Needs to be collaboration between publishers and users of the data

Needs standardisation and further systems development to enable automation of data gathering

Needs further iteration, nuancing and contextualisation
Conclusions

Difficult but worthwhile through collaborative iteration and systems and standards investment

Implement in stages
YOU can join in the conversation via padlet:

https://padlet.com/chrisabanks/R2R Pricing Transparency

PW: R2RTransparency