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Share of Scholar Publications in Open Access is far from 100%

Piwowar, Heather; Priem, Jason; Larivière, Vincent; Alperin, Juan Pablo; Matthias, Lisa; Norlander, Bree; Farley, Ashley; West, Jevin; Haustein, Stefanie (2018-02-13). "The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles". PeerJ. 6: e4375. doi:10.7717/peerj.4375. ISSN 2167-8359. PMC 5815332. PMID 29456894.
Share of Open Access scholarly publications is far from 100%

Estimation OA < 25% of the total of scholarly publications

EUA Open Access Survey 2017-2018:

- Yes: 62%
- No, but we are developing a policy: 26%
- No: 12%
Key information

Data collection: August-November 2018

Respondents:
31 Consortia negotiating on behalf of the university sector and other higher education and research performers

Focus: Periodicals
5 major publishers (Elsevier, SpringerNature, Taylor & Francis, Wiley, American Chemical Society)

Data analysed in aggregated fashion
Most data refers to big deal contracts ongoing in 2017 or 2018
Organisations at national level involved in negotiating big deals

n= 31/31

- Consortia of universities and other Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)
- Consortia of universities and other HEIs, plus other organisations
- Consortia of libraries
- Only the national library
- Only the government
- Other
Main points of concern for HE and research institutions in the negotiation process

- Cost control
- Cost reduction
- Inclusion of subscriptions and OA in one agreement
- Maintain content (journals) across contracts
- Early termination rights
- Preservation and access via local, consortium or national infrastructure
- Set embargo periods in accordance with funder requirements on regional, national or European level
- Service-level agreements on OA services provided by publishers (e.g. CC-BY)
- Provisions for TDM
- Number of OA articles in hybrid journals (as a percentage of total articles published)

n= 31/31
Total annual expenditure on big deals

For all subscriptions to electronic resources (including periodicals, databases, e-books) by national consortia:

Total (30 European countries) = ~ 1,025,253,055 EUR (estimate 2018, 3.5% yearly increase)

This is a conservative figure not including:
- Article Processing Charges (APCs)
- Consortia other than those participating in the Survey
- Individual institutional contracts with publishers

For periodicals only in the surveyed consortia:

Total (31 consortia, representing 30 European countries) = ~ 726,350,945 EUR (average yearly increase 3.6%)

Proportion of costs covered by universities in the consortia = 519,973,578 EUR (~72%)
Big Deals Survey 2018

Origin of funds for big deals

- Only universities
- Universities and government/governmental agency
- Only government/governmental agency
- Other

Publicly available information on expenditure on electronic documentary resources

- Yes
- No

n= 31/31
Is there a national Open Access strategy or policy?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do current big deal contracts include specific provisions for OA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions for OA</th>
<th>Currently (%)</th>
<th>In the future (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, only for green OA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, only for gold OA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for both green and gold OA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 31/31
Inclusion of APCs and subscriptions in the same contractual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APCs and subscriptions in same contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (subscriptions and APCs in different contracts)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n= 30-31/31
Big Deals Survey 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When APCs and subscriptions are included in the same contract</td>
<td>Is there any provision or policy to prevent ‘double dipping’?</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When APCs and subscriptions are not included in the same contract</td>
<td>Are there any monitoring systems in place to collect data on the funds spent on APCs?</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laws facilitating the transparency of contracts

Existence of Freedom of Information laws

n= 31/31
The consortia
Big Deals Survey 2018

Representative scope

Universities and other HEIs
Research institutes
National libraries
Governmental agencies
Hospitals
Public libraries

Functions of the consortium

Collection of needs
Negotiation of contracts
Purchase
Payment of suppliers
Formatting and delivery of statistics
Others

n= 31/31. Multiple-choice question

© EUA 2019
University leadership role in the negotiation of big deals

The university leadership has a role:

- Yes [VALUE]%
- No [VALUE]%

As part of the negotiating team [VALUE]%
As the lead negotiator [VALUE]%
Other [VALUE]%

n= 17/18

Other includes: negotiation only for some publishers; defining strategy.

n= 31/31
Big Deals Survey 2018

Most challenging publishers

- Elsevier
- American Chemical Society
- Springer Nature
- Taylor & Francis
- Others
- Wiley

n= 31/31. Multiple-choice question
Periodicals
Number of big deal contracts reported = 12
Total annual spend = 9 671 307 EUR (9 consortia)

- Cost per download (per year)
  range between 0.64 – 3.12 EUR (data for 6 consortia)

- Price per article (per year)
  Only 1 consortium provided data = 4 893 EUR

- APC spend (per year)
  No data provided

- Annual % increase
  Range between 3% - 5% (data for 6 consortia)
Number of big deal contracts reported = 30  
Total annual spend = 246 316 270 EUR (27 consortia)

• Cost per download (per year)  
  range between 0.79 – 2.68 EUR (data for 14 consortia)

• Price per article (per year)  
  Range between 1608 EUR - 3 613 EUR (data for 7 consortia)

• APC spend (per year)  
  Range between 14 088 EUR - 5 071 000 EUR (data for 5 consortia)

• Annual % increase  
  Range between 1.5% - 5% (data for 23 consortia)
Big Deals Survey 2018

**Springer (excl. Nature)**

**Number of big deal contracts reported = 31**
**Total annual spend = 59 726 813 (28 consortia)**

- **Cost per download (per year)**
  range between 0.27 – 4.16 EUR (data for 17 consortia)

- **Price per article (per year)**
  range between 500 EUR – 2 808 EUR (data for 7 consortia)

- **APC spend (per year)**
  range between 77 500 EUR – 9 800 000 EUR (data for 4 consortia)

- **Annual % increase**
  Range between 0% - 10.7% [second highest 5.5%] (data for 23 consortia)
Big Deals Survey 2018

Nature

Number of big deal contracts reported = 20
Total annual spend = 11 969 154 (data for 16 consortia)

- Cost per download (per year)
  range between 0.8 EUR – 9.5 EUR (data for 9 consortia)

- Price per article (per year)
  Only 1 consortia provided data = 3613 EUR

- APC spend (per year)
  N/A

- Annual % increase
  Range between 2% - 5.5% (data for 13 consortia)
Number of big deal contracts reported = 23
Total annual spend = 32 156 200 (data for 22 consortia)

• Cost per download (per year)
  range between 0.69 – 7.34 EUR (data for 15 consortia)

• Price per article (per year)
  range between 897 EUR – 2 150 EUR (data for 6 consortia)

• APC spend (per year)
  range between 2 150 EUR – 3 194 089 EUR (data for 4 consortia)

• Annual % increase
  Range between 2% - 5.5% (17 consortia)
Number of big deal contracts reported = 29
Total annual spend = 74 892 781 (data for 26 consortia)

- **Cost per download (per year)**
  range between 0.4 EUR – 6.5 EUR (data for 17 consortia)

- **Price per article (per year)**
  range between 1 650 EUR – 3 826 EUR (data for 6 consortia)

- **APC spend (per year)**
  range between 51 900 – 4 475 464 EUR (data for 4 consortia)

- **Annual % increase**
  Range between 1.75% - 9% (data for 20 consortia)
Number of big deal contracts reported = 23
Total annual spend = 13 629 033 (data for 21 consortia)

- Cost per download (per year)
  range between 0.72 EUR – 5.11 EUR (data for 13 consortia)

- Price per article (per year)
  range between 1 648 EUR – 5 734 EUR (data for 3 consortia)

- APC spend (per year)
  range between 5 000 EUR – 15 000 EUR (data for 2 consortia)

- Annual % increase
  Range between 2% - 8.5% (data for 12 consortia)
Big Deals Survey 2018

Overview of costs by publisher

Total reported = 440 805 816 EUR (data for 28 countries)
Average annual increase by publisher

- ACS: 4.7%
- Cell Press: 3.5%
- Taylor & Francis: 3.4%
- Nature (only): 3.4%
- Wiley: 3.4%
- Elsevier Freedom Collection: 3.3%
- Springer: 3.3%
- Average: 3.6%
If things would not change ... Projected costs for Periodicals by 2021 for Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, ACS, Taylor and Francis

Current annual spend with 5 big publishers: 440 805 816 EUR (28 countries)

Projected costs for 5 big publishers over 3 years (fixed annual increase 3.6%): 1 370 595 759 EUR

Projected costs for 5 big publishers over full contract duration: 1 421 791 077 EUR
Country comparison
Big Deals Survey 2018

Relationship between amount spent on 5 big publishers (year) and GDP per capita

Calculation: Annual spend on 5 big publishers / GDP per capita

Interpretation: the result represents the number of people that need to work for one year (peson/year), given a certain GDP per capita, in order to reach the same monetary value as the cost with the 5 big publishers in that country.

GDP per capita: source Eurostat (data from 2017)
Main conclusions

• **University leadership** seems to be more involved in big deals (strategy and/or negotiation), but still major differences across countries

• Different level of **knowledge on the total spent** on big deals and other related publication costs (APCs) across countries

• Most contracts do not have provisions on OA (currently)

• Many countries want to **combine subscriptions and APCs** in the same contract; other countries think this is not yet advantageous for their situation

• **APC monitoring** is very variable and, in general, feeble

• **Metrics** vary widely by country (e.g. cost per article)

• Stark variations in big deal costs across countries, and also by GDP (per capita) level
The need for an evolution of the Scholarly Research Assessment Methodologies in the context of Open Science

#ResearchAssessment
#OpenScience

21 Juin 2019
Two main challenges for the future of scholarly publications

Accelerate Open Access (OA) to publications and make OA the main model

Control publication costs both for publishing and reading
Open Science: key objectives and conditions

Key objectives:
• Sharing of research-generated knowledge
• Quality of research and research ethics and integrity
• Transparency of the research process and outcomes publication
• Easy and affordable accessibility to research publications and data

Conditions:
• Investment in Open Access business models (cost of publications)
• Investment in e-infrastructure (deposit and access – FAIR principles)
• Policies fostering Open Access to research publications and data
• Researchers motivation and careers
Constraints for Open Science: Limited engagement of a large part of researchers for many reasons

Necessary (although not sufficient) conditions to make Open Science a reality:

- Clarification of legal issues concerning sharing and reuse of publications and data – copyright regulation
- Original authorship respect – ethical considerations
- Reputation and research career progression – linked to research assessment and outputs
The dominance of the journal impact factor leads to two main problems:

1. the quality of an article produced by researchers is not evaluated directly, rather through a proxy, i.e., the reputation of the journal it is published in;
2. this situation reinforces the dominant position of commercial academic publishers and disproportionately adds to their power in shaping the way research is funded and conducted.

**EUA commitment**

Raise awareness and support universities in the improvement of research assessment approaches that focus on research quality, potential and future impact, and that take into account Open Science practices.
Researchers, universities and other research performing organisations, research funders and policymakers are revisiting their approaches to research assessment:

• Current approaches related to negative trends in academia
• Discussion about the current state and future direction of scholarly research, as well as technical discussions
• Involving a wide variety of actors, highlighting the need for a concerted approach

Source:
EUA (2019) Reflections on University Research Assessment: Key concepts, issues and actors
A systemic overview is necessary for an update of the Scholarly Research system.

Gather and share information
- Briefing on key concepts, issues and actors (Apr-19)
- University survey (deadline: 25-May)
- Big Deals Survey Report 2018
- Open Access Survey Results 2018

Engage in dialogue
- Workshop on researchers’ careers (14-May, Brussels)
- Dialogue with other actors, e.g. Science Europe, Open Science Policy Platform
- Partner in VSNU Event (15 November 2019)

Develop policy and good practice recommendations
- Joint statement EUA-Science Europe
- Policy/Political Positions
- Support to university leadership: rectors and vice-rectors, deans, heads of laboratory, etc.

More information:
Study on Read & Publish Agreements
Context: Recent Transformative agreements

Full list available at https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-agreements/agreement-registry/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Country (consortium)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Netherlands (VSNU-UKB), Germany (MPDL), Slovenia (Slovenian consortium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>Netherlands (VSNU-UKB), Norway (Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer Nature</td>
<td>Germany (MPDL), Netherlands (VSNU-UKB), Hungary (EISZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td>Germany (MPDL), Austria (KEMOE/FWF), Sweden (Bibsam Consortium), Netherlands (VSNU-UKB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>Austria (KEMOE/FWF), Netherlands (VSNU-UKB), Hungary (EISZ), Norway (Unit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achieved by consortia with active engagement of high-level university leadership
Objectives

- To support negotiating consortia in defining contract conditions that best suit the needs of their researchers
- Open new scenarios/routes towards Open Access
- To create a set of scenarios that describe how the To analyse most desirable features of agreements between university consortia and/or funders and publishers that
  - offer the best value for money,
  - avoid unintended consequences and
  - provide the least risk with respect to academic research and to the taxpayer
- Inform further dialogue between universities, research centers and with stakeholders in EU and worldwide, also in the context of Plan S

Work conducted by Technopolis and Vandervooren Consulting
OVERVIEW
Study on Read & Publish Agreements

Supporting organisations

Austria - Universities Austria (UNIKO)
Belgium - Vlaamse Interuniversitaire Raad (VLIR)
Czech Republic - CzechELib
Denmark - Denmarks Electronic Research Library (DEFF)
EUA – European University Association
Finland - Universities Finland (UNIFI)
France - Consortium Couperin
Iceland - University of Iceland
Ireland - Irish Research eLibrary (IReL)
Italy - Italian Rectors’ Conference (CRUI)
Lithuania - Lithuanian University Rectors’ Conference
Luxembourg - University of Luxembourg & National Library of Luxembourg
Netherlands - Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU)
Norway - Direktoratet for IKT og fellestjenester i høyere utdanning og forskning
Portugal - Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT)
Romania - National Council of Rectors (CNR)
Slovakia - Slovak Rectors’ Conference
Slovenia - University of Nova Gorica on behalf of Slovenian Rectors Conference
Spain – CRUE Spanish Universities
Sweden - National Library of Sweden
Switzerland – swissuniversities
Turkey - Higher Education Council (YÖK)
United Kingdom - Universities UK
Poland - University of Warsaw on behalf of KRASP
Summary: 
Actions Enabling Effective Open Science systems

- Mobilisation of
  - researchers
  - universities, research performing organisations, research funding agencies
to encourage the diversification of the publishing models

- Transformation of scholarly research assessment methodologies

- Governance and Policies: institutional, national, supranational (e.g. Plan S, OA 2020 Initiative), assessment of costs of research systems

- Investment in e-infrastructure

- Novel ‘transformative’ agreements with large scholarly publishers, e.g. Publish&Read Contracts and

- Common framework big deal negotiations

More information:
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