

Creating Community-Driven Pathways to Equitable Open Scholarly Publishing

Where Are We Now?

Tuesday 27 February 2024, 2pm GMT / 3pm CET



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.





Session plan

Project presentations: CRAFT-OA: **Clara Armengou and Margo Bargheer** Discussion facilitated with Mentimeter

DIAMAS: **Jan Erik Frantsvåg** Discussion facilitated with Mentimeter

PALOMERA: **Gabriela Manista** Discussion facilitated with Mentimeter

Invited speaker: Presentation by **Victoria Tsoukala** Discussion and questions



Funded by the F European Union N

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Contact us

CRAFT-OA: Sona Arasteh, Communication Officer, arasteh@maxweberstiftung.de

DIAMAS: Oliver Blake, LIBER Project Officer, oliver.blake@libereurope.org

PALOMERA: Ursula Rabar, Project Community Manager, ursula.rabar@operas-eu.org





Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



WP3 update







- T3.1 Development of the open access publishing interoperability framework. Task leader: DOAJ
- T3.2. Challenge and gap identification for OA journals and platforms to comply with standards. Task leader: TSV
- T3.3 Training and education to enable the adoption and implementation of technical specifications. Task leader: TIB





WP3 Deliverables and milestones

D3.1 Report on standards for best publishing practices and technical requirements in light of the FAIR principles (DOAJ) Month 6 Delivered

D3.2 Report on challenges and help measures faced by OA journals and platforms as to standards agreed in T3.1 and T3.2 (TSV) Month 12 Delivered

MS23 Training materials on implementing technical standards and self-assessment toolkit available (TIB) Month 30 In progress





WP3 Next steps

Working towards MS23

Currently gathering an overview on synergies/avoidance of redundancies within the CRAFT-OA project and with DIAMAS.

For example: Infrastructure for DIAMAS self assessment tool maybe to be used for fairifcation toolkit

Contribution to DIAMAS WP4 Task 4.3.EQSIP guidelines as both cross project collaboration and building blocks for WP3 training materials.





Connections within the project:

T5.3: Diamond Discovery Hub (DDH)T4.3: Metadata quality and extensibilityWP2 (summer school, tech event, curriculum)WP7 Technology exploitation & sustainability

Connections with sister projects:

DIAMAS

WP2: Mapping IPSPs in a wide and comprehensive selection of countries of the ERA, primarily for publishing outputs requiring no fees for publishing (Diamond OA)

WP3: Standardising and improving institutional publishing practices

WP4: Building capacity through knowledge sharing









Thank you for your attention!

Contact Information: clara@doaj.org

https://craft-oa.eu







Diamond Discovery Hub

Cross-project webinar 27.02.2024





Diamond definition / criteria (DIAMAS and CRAFT-OA)

- Has a persistent identifier (currently ISSN)
- Does not charge any mandatory fees to authors
- Issues open licences for content and makes that visible
- Is scholar-led
- Does not limit authorship to a certain institution or membership organisation

Most journals can be assessed with described parameters, exceptions maintain to exist (esp. around governance and ownership)





Data for DDH

Journal metadata in the 1st iteration of DDH

Data sources:

- DOAJ

. . .

-

- OpenAire
- Trusted IPSPs
- DDH application form



Human resources

DDH editorial team (to be built)

Possible functions:

- checks diamond criteria for journals, assigns diamond status
- communicates with IPSPs
- defines trusted IPSPs





Mockups

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ct kd3phiIPDwWgOFhCPS-fcrebMHro3gH MesBG_g8FA (not reviewed yet)

- List of diamond journals -->
- Journal information
- DDH editor's view (Incl. verification page: checklist with diamond criteria)



Find diamonds	Di	iamond Journals in DDH			
Search					
In All 🗸 Search					
Diamond status	Lingúistics	Chemistry Biol	ogy Education	Sort by 🗸	
verified by DDH (123256)				·	
 verified by trusted IPSP (873265) 	JEET, Jou	rnal of Engli	sh Educatior	n and	
Diamond criteria	Technolog				
no APC (123256)					
open licence (873265)				Verified By DDH	
🛿 scholar owned/driven (32)			-		
🗹 open authorship (32)	No APC	Open Licence	Scholar-Owned /Driven	Open Authorship	
Licence	Publisher	Asosiasi Dosen Penge Dosen Peneliti (FKDP	embang Masyarakat (ADPEMA ')	S) Forum Komunikasi	
CC-BY (1235464)	ISSN				
🗹 CC BY-SA (35643)	E-ISSN	2721-3811			
CC BY-NC (3456)	DOI	https://doi.org/this-is-a-doi			
CC BY-NC-SA (3325)	Subjects	Languages; Education; Technology			
CC BY-ND (5872)	Keywords	education, technology, english, media, curriculum			
CC BY-NC-ND (235)	- CC	6. <u>8</u> 668	60 300 (4)		
CC0 (52739)					
other open licence (345)					
· ····································	Uniciencia				
Languages	Uniciencia	ı			
 English (4284069) French (34368) 				Verified By Trusted	
Spanish (940698)				IPSP	
German (24759)	No APC	Open Licence	Scholar-Owned /Driven	Open Authorship	
Portuguese (832758)	Publisher	Universidad Nacional, Costa Rica			
Chinese (34467)	ISSN	ISSN 1011-0275			
Arabic (2346)	E-ISSN 2215-3470				
✓ more	DOI	DOI https://doi.org/this-is-a-doi			
	Subjects	General and Interdisc	plinary Journals		
Publisher	Keywords biology, physics, computer science, mathematics, chemistry, geodesy				
Publisher 1 (123)		1.2361 6 10 10	10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -	1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 -	
Publisher 2 (3)					
Publisher 3 (111)	27				
Publisher 4 (1)	Dunnan				
✓ more	Bunron				
Country by journal ?				Verified By DDH	
France (123)			٦ <u> </u>		
🗹 Spain (3)	No APC	Open Licence	Scholar-Owned /Driven	Open Authorship	
Germany (111)	Publisher	Universität Heidelberg	j - Japanologie		
Poland (1)	ISSN				
✓ more	E-ISSN	2199-2754			
	DOI	https://doi.org/this-is-a	ı-doi		
Instanced in	Subjects	Linguistics and Literat	Ine		

DDH technical implementation

Technical goals

- Responsive and WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) 2.2. compliant website layout
- SEO friendly UI, client & server side rendering
- Easy build, deployment and installation (continuous integration, docker)
- Newest and reliable technology stack, open source as a default
- High code quality supported by scrum (agile) methodology, code review process and high automation test coverage
- Code scalability, code easy to maintain and extend in the future





Thank you!







Developing Institutional Open Access Publishing Models to Advance Scholarly Communication

Jan Erik Frantsvåg UiT The Arctic University of Norway WP2 Lead jan.e.frantsvag@uit.no

The DIAMAS Landscape Report

Creating Community-Driven Pathways to Equitable Open Scholarly Publishing – Where Are We Now February 27th 2024







Project background

- Earlier research showed problems with the structure of OA publishing
 - "A wide archipelago of relatively small journals serving diverse

communities"

Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J. E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., & Proudman, V. (2021). OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 1: Findings. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/2enodo.4555/04

- Diamond OA an import part of institutional publishing
- DIAMAS to look at institutional publishing





The work

WP2

- Some 40 competent and interested persons from around 20 organisations participated
- Started in September 2022 and delivered the report end of November 2023





Little to build on

- No data previously collected on institutional publishing as such
- No organisations geared to institutional publishing as such
- Had to start from scratch
- Initiated a large survey
- Institutional Publishing Service Provider (IPSP) a central term
 - Institutional Publishing (IP) activities
 - Service providers (SP) to such IPs
 - \circ $\,$ $\,$ Or combinations of IP and SP $\,$



What we did

- Created a survey
 - Trying to cover many aspects
- Tried identifying possible IPs and SPs in ERA
 - Data we had was skewed towards OA journal publishing
 - Engaged networks we knew of
- Sent out to more than 5,000 e-mail addresses late March-early May 2023 in 10 different languages
 - And to e-mail lists, and to organisations asking them to distribute to their members
- Due to the earthquake, dissemination to Türkiye was postponed until September
 - Country report planned for later this year
- Lesson learnt: The direct e-mails did not work, it was the mass e-mailing to lists, organisations etc. that gave responses



What did we get?

685 responses we could use

- An uneven geographical distribution
 - But most countries adequately represented
- Our numbers indicate that a major part of IPSPs are represented
 - But the smallest ones underrepresented
- ³/₄ IPs, ¹/₄ SP
- 90% publish journals
 - \circ Most publish relatively few journals, <5





Some major findings

- Countries are more different than regions are
- Organisation of scholarly publishing activities on a national scale very important
 - Support and administrative structures
 - Networks and organisations
 - Funding opportunities



Finances & organisation

- >2/3 are non-commercial public organisations
 - SPs more likely to be private companies
- $\approx 60\%$ IPs and SPs part of a parent organisation
- Mainly small-scale activities
 - Heavily dependent on voluntary and in-kind contributions
- The Diamond model is very common
- APC used as a revenue stream by 19% of OA journals publishers
- VAC (voluntary author contributions) used by 23.5%



Finances & organisation cont.

- 54% of all-diamond publishers rely on fixed and permanent funding from parent organisation, 20% on periodically negotiated funding from parent
 - high reliance
- 31% rely on content and print sales
 - \circ low reliance
- Some 70% would consider cooperating with others to save costs At least in some area:
 - IT services, Production services and Training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice the most important, all with more than 40% inclination to cooperate



Open Science practices

- Double-anonymous peer review most common (76%)
- Open peer review used by 17%
 - \sim ~30% of respondents willing to implement in the future
- 90% of journal output OA
 - $\circ ~~76\%~of~conference~output$
 - 58% of academic books
- 97% of journals OA in Eastern Europe
- Academic journals the most important output, >90% of respondents using this format



Open Science practices cont.

- 87% of respondents adhere to OA or Open Science policies on various levels
 - National, institutional, their own
 - Variation between countries, national policies not important in all countries
 - Most important for OA journals
- Only 45% consider their content well indexed, 55% want improvement
 - Satisfying technical and non-technical participation criteria together with metadata criteria a problem for 60%
 - Paying for membership and recurring charges a problem for >40%
 - \circ $\,$ $\,$ More of a problem for smaller IPs $\,$
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB) generally not well implemented



Takeaways

- The typical IP is small and rather alone
- Needs better and more stable, reliable, and long-term financing
- Needs partners to co-operate with
- Needs support
 - Competence must be made available
 - Advice on best practices and how to best align with these
 - Support on how to implement various practices and technical options
- Strong willingness to align with Open Science practices and good publishing practices



Outputs available now

 A treasure trove is found at <u>https://zenodo.org/communitie</u> <u>s/diamasproject?q=&l=list&p=1</u> <u>&s=20&sort=newest</u>





D2.1 IPSP Scoping Report 10.5281/zenodo.7890567

Defining some concepts and giving a precise geographical definition

DIAMAS Survey Questionnaire and Glossary 10.5281/zenodo.10207447

The English version of the Questionnaire used in the survey, and the accompanying glossary

D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report: Institutional Publishing in the ERA: Results from the DIAMAS survey <u>10.5281/zenodo.10022183</u>

The full-length 237-page report including short country reports

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Full country reports <u>10.5281/zenodo.10026206</u> A supplement to the above, with longer country reports for some countries

The European landscape of institutional publishing - A synopsis of results from the DIAMAS survey <u>10.5281/zenodo.10551709</u>

A short version of the full-length report

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Complete country reports <u>10.5281/zenodo.10473494</u>

A companion to the synopsis – the longer country reports for the countries that has one, and the shorter reports for the other countries

DIAMAS survey on Institutional Publishing - aggregated data <u>10.5281/zenodo.10590502</u> Survey data aggregated on a level that allows us to share them



And, of course: https://doi.org/10.7557/19.7418





The PALOMERA methodology and Knowledge Base

Gabriela Manista, The Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Objectives

- 1. To identify, contextualise and collect data and documents relevant to OA policies regarding OA books in ERA: reports, policies, survey results, statistics.
- 2. To collect input on challenges and best practices regarding OA books from various stakeholders from ERA.
- **3.** To process, tag, structure, and make those materials available in the project repository for further analysis and publication.



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Scope

- 1. 39 countries from European Research Area
- 2. Timespan: 2012–2022
- 3. 5 different stakeholder groups:
 - National policymakers
 - Research Founding Organizations
 - Research Performing Organizations
 - Publishers
 - Libraries and Infrastructure providers



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Joint analytical framework (PESTLE)





Funded by the F European Union F

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.







Data collection



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.






Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Quantitative data collection: BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- **Goal:** to collect, generate and prepare for exploration of the quantitative data on OA book publishing across the ERA by surveying available datasets and relevant survey results from other projects
- **Targeted survey** to national libraries and aggregators to learn about library data, including statistics and metadata on open access books:
 - 18 responses
 - 15 data sources
 - ~4 million items
- Main outcome: scattered data space in need of harmonisation and standardisation

National Libraries: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Catalonia (Spain), Sweden, Netherlands, Scotland



Funded by the European Union Exe

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Data source	No. of items
OpenAPC	1,685
BASE	507,509
DOAB	69,358
OAPEN	31,000
OpenAlex	450,360
OpenAIRE	1,102,747
Scielo	1,175
The Lens	433,574
WorldCat	1,185,835
Web of Science	26,032
Scopus	42,403
Dimensions	556,057
JSTOR	10,087
EBSCO	10,802



Represented institutions

Quantitative data collection: ERA-WIDE SURVEY

- Goal: ERA-wide survey on OA monographs policies, filling the gaps in existing studies and sketching attitudes, needs, obstacles, and best practices
- Dissemination
 - Through communication work package and country group coordinators
 - Dedicated spreadsheet to oversee the process
 - Mailing lists
 - Social media channels
 - Websites
 - Newsletters
- The survey was available

from August to October 2023

• Result: 454 complete responses



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)





Funded by the European Union European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Qualitative data collection and annotations: DOCUMENTS COLLECTION

Phase I - Identification

- **Detailed protocol** guiding researchers
- Local experts consulted at the onset ٠
- Types of documents: policies, ٠ strategies, data, recommendations, plans, articles on OA to academic books

RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION

- Policies regarding open access to academic books
- Sources should be informed by PESTLE categories
- Timespan: since 2012 (10 years)

ACADEMIC BOOKS



Scholarly peer reviewed books including monographs, book chapters, edited collections, critical editions, and other long-form scholarly works. When looking for documentation we preserve an inclusive approach, i.e. follow how the academic books are defined in each analysed country.

ADDING RESOURCES TO ZOTERO LIBRARY

Add the document record Add full text Check essential metadata Apply relevant tags

Funded by the

European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them



Qualitative data collection and annotations: DOCUMENTS COLLECTION

Phase II - Collection and pre-processing

- Selecting relevant documents
- Preparing abstracts and excerpts
- Applying relevant tags

Outcome

- 905 documents
- 462 policies
- 1552 excerpts
- 39 countries and 29 languages





Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them

Qualitative data collection and annotations: INTERVIEWS

- **Goal:** uncover the HOW of the OA to academic monographs in different ERA countries
- 39 individual and three group interviews were conducted
- All interviews lasted around 60 minutes

Processing:

Funded by the

European Union

- Transcription with HappyScribe
- Translation into English with DeepL (if needed)
- Anonymised transcript, validated by interviewees, to be published in the KB
- Pre-Coding with PESTLE categories

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s)

only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Gender breakdown

- Female 24
- Male 23

Stakeholder breakdown

- RPO 19
- RFO 10
- Library 11
- Publisher 8
- Policy maker 5

Geographic

- 34 countries one per country
- 3 countries 2 per country (Germany, Netherlands, Belgium)
- 1 country 3 interviewees (Slovakia)
- 3 countries no interview (Albania, N. Macedonia, Montenegro)





Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

International (CC BY 4.0)



Knowledge Base

The Knowledge Base is a collection of

- documents with excerpts
- reports,
- policies,
- statistics,
- survey results
- and transcripts from interviews conducted

During data collection, the PALOMERA Team already was designing the Knowledge Base.



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.





Address of the Knowledge Base: https://knowledgebase.oabookstoolkit.org/

Layout and interface:

- Based on OA Books Toolkit
- Lyrasis environment, DSpace 7

Live demo





Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.





1st and 2nd validation workshop January 17th and 24th, 2024

The participants of this validation exercise included all relevant stakeholder types: RFOs, RPOs, researchers, policymakers, advocacy organisations, publishers, and libraries. All together (excluding the project members) there were **36 participants**, the feedback and notes were gathered anonymously. The countries represented by the participants were **17 in total across the ERA**.

Feedback gathering in between meetings via a Google Form - To collect any suggestions on missing OA book policies, and potential improvements to the KB functionalities



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.







Thank you for your attention!



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.







Appendix – validation exercise feedback



Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.





Other feedback

Filtering by starting letters in authors view gives strange results The "summary" section of each entry gives a good overview of the document and is supplemented by notes of research team. I would double check not to publish notes that have the character of value judgements on the concerned document.

Language of expression and country flags

Include links to website pages detailing open access policies, as well as downloadable policy documents. A 'suggested documents' function might improve the user experience, where a panel at the bottom of the screen or pop-up could appear when you have clicked on a document, suggesting other relevant or similar documents you might be interested in.

Relevante stakeholders like European Commission, Plan-S, COARA I think it would be useful to have an attribute for each document about the stakeholder (i.e. policymaker, funder, library, university, Publisher) Open text search so you don't have to know the first word of the document name. E.g. a search for "politique" would result in both "Politique Open Access de BELSPO" and "Décret visant à l'établissement d'une politique de libre accès aux publications scientifiques". Ideally also all documents that have politique in the description. When showed a list of documents, it would be helpful to have a possibility of sorting them out by date + some facets (type of document ; type of stakeholder...)

> I would change the titles of some of the documents listed under Ireland



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Requests for added functionality in the Knowledge Base

Please indicate which of the following aspects of the Knowledge Base need improvement (these will be discussed further in the next meeting on the 24th of January) 18 responses





Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Suggestions received through the Google form

Countries concerned :

- Finland 2 policies
- Italy 4 policies
- Switzerland 2 policies
- Spain 3 policies
- France 3 policies
- UK 2 policies
- Portugal 1 policy
- Norway 1 policy
- Ireland 8+ policies
- Romania 1 policy
- EU 1 policy



Funded by the F European Union F

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Summary

- We argue to have **the most comprehensive and up-to-date materials** available to describe the OA policy landscape in the ERA countries, enabling us to zoom in on OA book policies as part of the broader landscape.
- The aim has been for **saturation of evidence** rather than full comprehensiveness, and the validation workshops have been instrumental in working towards that
- Data collection has been designed so that
 - materials can be **shared** through the Knowledge Base whenever possible
 - materials can easily be **re-used and extended** by anyone as part of future work.
- The project will publish a first **validation report** in the spring that will be updated as the project progresses with the other validation exercises



PALOMERA, DIAMAS and CRAFT-OA – *Community-driven pathways to equitable open scholarly publishing:*

The EC perspective

Victoria Tsoukala, PhD European Commission Directorate-General for Research & Innovation Unit 'Open Science'

Cross-project webinar 27 February 2024

Important references for further evolution of OA publishing landscape

- 2023 Council Conclusions on Scholarly Publishing + related ERA Actions and policies
- 2022 Action Plan for Diamond Open Access
- 2021-2022 Launch of new HE-funded projects (DIAMAS, CRAFT-OA ...) and infrastructure (ORE ...)
- 2021 UNESCO Open Science Recommendation
- 2019 'Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication' report of expert group to the EC
- 2019 **EC Recommendation** on access to and preservation of scientific information
- Relevant work by other groups, e.g., cOAlition S, Open Research Central, International Science Council 'Fundamental Principles for Scientific Publishing'





2023 Council Conclusions on Scholarly Publishing

Framework conditions

- INVITES MS to update their national open access
 policies and guidelines
- ENCOURAGES the EC ... to examine and propose measures at EU level aiming at removing barriers to access to and reuse of publicly funded research results, as well as publications and data for research purposes
- ENCOURAGES close dialogue between stakeholders, MS, the EC and AC in **reforming research assessment**, in coordination with global partners





2023 Council Conclusions on Scholarly Publishing

Infrastructures

- ENCOURAGES MS and the EC to step up support to the development of aligned institutional and funding policies and strategies regarding **not-for-profit open access multi-format scholarly publishing models**
- CONTINUES to encourage MS to support the piloting of **Open Research Europe (ORE)** into a collective, not-for-profit large-scale open access research publishing service ... and to promote and support other **subject-specific and national not-for-profit**, **open access publishing platforms and models** ...

Skills

- ENCOURAGES MS and the EC to develop **mutual learning exercises on peer review** ... and ... to promote institutional capacity building and to increase **researchers' knowledge of IPRs** and their value ...
- INVITES MS, in collaboration with the EC, to address in a systemic manner the issue of predatory publishing and to ... support training on responsible, open and ethical publishing practices ...





A vision for the future of ORE



A top-quality, trusted **collective OA publishing service** for the public good

Collectively driven, owned and supported by research funders and research institutions, as a service for researchers, with no author fees

Supported by an **open-source infrastructure**

Ambition for a **publishing service without eligibility barriers**, e.g., of funding or institutional affiliation



Enrich and diversify the publishing landscape



The context for the three topics

- Increasingly demanding OA policies for articles and books in EU and across the globe
 - In HE: immediate OA; trusted repositories; licenses; rights retention by authors/institutions; validation of research; no funding for hybrid publishing
- OA as the *modus operandi* in scholarly publishing
- Slow progress in OA to books/monograph and relevant policies
- Significant share of publishing carried out by commercial publishers with whom the research system is tightly intertwined
 - For research communication
 - For evaluation of research, researchers, institutions
- Increasing costs for publishing in OA and for accessing research
- Unclear and undocumented landscape of institutional publishing activities



The goals

- Understand the current landscape of institutional scientific publishing activities across Europe (operational and technological) and monographs/book publishing;
- **Coordination- empower institutions** (i.e. research and other relevant institutions of public interest besides large commercial publishers) in their publishing activities at the European level, creating **efficiencies** (operational and technological);
- Contribute to FAIRness within the EOSC ecosystem;
- **Diversify** the publishing ecosystem;
- Accelerate OA policies for books/monographs and their alignment;
- Map directions for the future (recommendations).



Ultimate aims

 Increased equity, diversity and inclusivity of open science practices in the European Research Area

 Increased capacity in the EU R&I system to conduct open science and set it as a modus operandi of modern science



The present.....

- Very important work done to document landscape and understand where the problems and bottlenecks and possibilities;
- For DIAMAS and CraftOA there is expectation substantially to facilitate the coordination at the European level of IPs and SPs and mainly the first, thus creating efficiencies (at organizational and technological level);
- PALOMERA is expected to facilitate funder policy alignment wrt OA books/monographs.





And the future.....

- The time is ripe to escalate the coordination efforts at the national and European level through the ERA Diamond Centre Hub and the respective national nodes;
- Great potential to improve the quality and efficiency of the services and support institutions in becoming preferred publishing venues;
- Connection necessary with research assessment reform efforts (COARA)- part and parcel! It should not be left out.





Thank you



© European Union 2024

Reuse of this presentation authorised under the CC BY 4.0 license.

