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Knowledge Exchange - collaboration, expertise & network

KE are six national organisations working together in Europe to support the development of digital infrastructure to enable open scholarship.

DFG German Research Foundation
Jisc (United Kingdom)
DEFF Denmark’s Electronic Research Library
SURF (Netherlands)
CSC IT Centre for Science (Finland)
CNRS Centre national de la recherche scientifique (France)

http://www.knowledge-exchange.info
Background & method {Scope}

➔ Activity: Monitoring Open Access
   Formed Task & Finish Group within KE Open Access Expert Group

➔ Mission
   Planning & scoping a workshop series around international collaboration addressing challenges & recommendations to monitoring of OA publications & derived cost data

➔ “Mixed method”
   • Integration of qualitative & quantitative data based on KE partners’ status reporting & relevant community keynotes on monitoring OA

   • Provide baseline for breakout groups to discuss KE scoped topics & questions & come up with practice-based recommendations on how to solve the challenges
Goal: pushing transparency in exchange of OA metadata and cost data

Aim: influencing evidence based policy making & promote better outcomes in negotiations with publishers
Workshop meta-monitoring {Scope}

1) international knowledge exchange

2) inter-organisational knowledge exchange

3) knowledge exchange among licensing & Open Access experts

#KEOA16
Revealing the true cost of publishing: Towards a public data infrastructure of scholarly publishing costs (by: Stuart Lawson, Birkbeck, University of London)

Collecting and disseminating OA metadata from publishers at Crossref: the story so far (by: Rachael Lammey, CrossRef)

Collecting cost data and information from offsetting contracts (by: Kai Geschuhn, MPDL & Graham Stone, Jisc Collections)
Country reporting on OA monitoring {Status}

[GER]: The contribution of INTACT to the international monitoring of OA publication and cost data (by: Dirk Pieper, Bielefeld University Library)

[UK]: Monitor Local & Monitor UK (by: Frank Manista, Jisc)

[DK]: The Danish Open Access Indicator (by: Mogens Sandfær, DTU)

[NL]: Monitoring Open Access articles in the Netherlands (by: Just de Leeuwe, UKB)
   + Open Access (Robert van der Vooren, VSNU)

[FIN]: OA publication and cost data in Finland (by: Jyrki Ilva, National Library of Finland)

[FR]: Monitoring OA publication & cost data in France? (by: Sandrine Malotaux, Couperin) +
   Gold OA publishing & APC in a University (by: Jean-François Lutz, Université de Lorraine)

All presentations are available for reading and further examination: http://bit.ly/2jY9jDp
Breakout groups to address topic & questions {Issues}

1. Data collecting & sources
   Quality in collecting data from available sources

LEAD: Maurits van der Graaf (Pleiade Consultancy)
Breakout groups to address topic & questions

2. Workflows
   Efficiency in monitoring workflows

LEAD: Kai Karin Geschuhn (MPDL)
Breakout groups to address topic & questions {Issues}

3. Standards

Aggregation of OA publications & costs via standards

LEAD: Frank Manista (Jisc)
Breakout groups to address topics & questions

4. Governance & Policy
   Trust in monitoring OA & alignment across policy making

LEAD: Angela Holzer (DFG)
Recommendations

1. **Data collecting & sources:**

**Green OA**
- identify corresponding author in metadata schema
- identify potential green OA via Sherpa/RoMEO API
- monitoring of OA after end of embargo

**Gold OA**
- matching metadata from the CRIS with DOAJ or ISSN-Gold-OA list in order to identify pure Gold articles
- APC & administrative handling costs of handling APCs (by authors or by APC funds)

**Hybrid OA**
- requirements for publisher data in offsetting agreements: corresponding author, licence information, exact publishing date, standardized data formats for author affiliation
## Recommendations

### Issues

### Workflows:

- **in offsetting contracts (e.g. in terms & conditions)** publishers should include in Crossref a license statement for each publication
- **OrcID as solution to workflow challenges, e.g. Crossref auto-updating ORCID profiles**
- using CrossMark as a possible container for OA metadata on versions & costs
- capturing the cost & license related metadata, making it visible in invoices: DOI, funder & license info, author names & affiliation, funder identifiers & ORCIDs
- investigate the complexity of many-to-many payments to look at 3. party e-commerce solutions between universities and publishers
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Standards:</th>
<th>Open Access</th>
<th>Cost Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- use standards when depositing articles (check via library validation process)
- be specific about standards from publishers (fx JISC best practice for publishers: [OA-Publisher-Compliance-document-for-publishers.docx](https://scholarlycommunications.jiscinvolve.org/wp/files/2016/04/OA-Publisher-Compliance-document-for-publishers.docx))
- adding a new field for APC/publication to the OAI-PMH
- mixing and matching staff (accounting, licensing, technical, metadata) working with the data entry points
- ensure technical feasibility for publishers to provide data to the repositories (e.g. by using the SWORD API protocol)
### Recommendations {Issues}

#### 4. Governance & policies:

- measuring more broadly: include more types than articles (e.g. books)

- funders (and all stakeholders) should use clear OA definitions in the policies:
  i) support filtering;
  ii) help clarifying if target goals are met, aligning the monitoring results across nations

- monitoring to look beyond current systems to ensure flexibility & adaptability over time

- collecting all cost data in one system. Datasets should be set up in a standard way that the data can be collected & exchanged

- institutional processes making it clear what the *total costs of publication (TCP)* are (including APC, administrative costs, infrastructural costs, and “other costs” like page & color charges)
### Beyond the Workshop series: Outlook

**Key stakeholders - priority areas & future action points**

- **CRIS** - *a key factor for successful monitoring of OA publications*
  
  - Improve the integration between CRISes and institutional repositories
  - Ensure that CRISes follow the OpenAIRE interoperability guidelines.

- Integrate different categories of Open Access in CRISes
- Use CRISes to collect and report data on **Green**, **Gold** and if validated **hybrid OA**
- Create DOI-linkage between accounting systems and CRISes.
### Key stakeholders - priority areas & future action points

- **PUBLISHERS** - are essential actors in monitoring since they hold crucial information.

  - recommended to use standardized data formats for author affiliation, license statements and indicating status: *Green, Gold* or *Hybrid OA*

  - libraries & funders must be specific about metadata they require from the publishers & include these requirements in offsetting or licensing contracts.

  - publishers should include all cost & license related metadata in their invoices: DOI, funder info, license info, author names + affiliation, funder identifiers, ORCIDs
### Key stakeholders - priority areas & future action points

- **LIBRARIES** - have central knowhow in monitoring of Open Access
  - collect as much data as possible and ensure the data to be open (via API) and to be FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable, reusable)
  - obvious as centralized OA funding offices regarding APC administration
  - require transparency to all costs related to everything that has to do with publishing, i.e. non-disclosure agreements should be avoided
  - have processes to openly monitor an institution’s *Total Costs of Publication (TCP)*
“If the monitoring of Open Access is not open, it will fail!”
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Published report out very soon!

Follow KE on @knowexchange