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How this session will work

- Lots of topics! Grouped into three themes
- Take a vote on which theme the group is most interested in
- Presentation on the topics followed by discussion
Discussion

- Run a concurrent Twitter feed during presentation – use the hashtag #ALIAOA
- If you don’t have a device, try to look over someone’s shoulder
- We will read out the questions for discussion
- Roving mike – volunteer?
- Type notes on screen – will be uploaded in conference notes
Pick a box!

- **Encouraging open access**
  - Complying with mandates
  - Advocacy for & issues with open access
  - Support for open access providers

- **Open access on the world stage**
  - International mandates
  - Compliance with mandates
  - Implications for Australian researchers
  - Implications for editors of Australian journals

- **Open access in Australia**
  - NHMRC mandate
  - ARC mandate
  - Institutional mandates
  - Compliance with mandates
Encouraging open access

Complying with mandates
Advocacy for & issues with open access
Support for open access providers
Australian Open Access Support Group (AOASG)

- Launched in Open Access Week 2012
- Work started at the beginning of 2013
- Collaboration of six institutions who are actively promoting OA*.
- All have provided financial or in-kind support
- 0.6FTE Executive Officer (Dr Danny Kingsley)

* Supporting institutions:
  - ANU
  - QUT
  - Macquarie Uni
  - Newcastle Uni
  - Charles Sturt Uni & Victoria Uni
AOASG Goals

1. Help inform the discussion about open access in Australia
   • Want to develop a forum to allow the academic community to discuss open access issues
   • Twitter account @openaccess_oz
   • Already had some media exposure – Interviewed on ABC AM program, ABC666 local radio, on The Project and for a couple of stories in The Conversation

2. Provide practical assistance with the implementation of open access policies
   • Providing informed advice to university administrators, academics and funding bodies
   • Currently building website – www.aoasg.org.au
CAUL support for open access

Until December 2012 CAUL had two committees:
1. CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Service (CAIRSS)
   • to develop a community of practice with repository managers in Aust & NZ
2. CAUL Open Scholarship Initiative Advisory Committee (COSIAC)
   • to provide information about and help libraries with open access
3. From January 2013, a new joint committee - CAUL Research Advisory Committee (CRAC)
   • broader remit. 1st meeting late Feb/early March
Training – required

• Several studies show a pressing need for repository management training

• All have similar conclusions:
  • the professional profile of the repository manager is a multiform and complex one. It requires cross-functional and highly specialised competencies
Training available

To date not been much formal training available:
• Arbitrary mention of ‘repositories’ in Australian library courses
• ARMS module in research data management - doesn’t mention open access.
• Some online options:
  • COAR has several training materials for repository managers
    • http://www.coar-repositories.org/working-groups/repository-and-repository-networks-support-and-training/training-materials/
  • Metadata for digital collections: Online learning workshop – Uni Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Information Studies Professional Development Institute
    • https://pantherfile.uwm.edu/mll/www/MDC.html
  • Digital Stewardship Certificate (Online program) - Simmons Graduate School of Library & Info Science
    • http://www.simmons.edu/gslis/academics/programs/post-masters/dsc/?msrc=dsc
Compliance – publishers’ conditions

• Elsevier ‘authors rights’ page
  http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights
  – Authors have: “The right to post a revised personal version of the text of the final journal article (to reflect changes made in the peer review process) on your personal or institutional website or server for scholarly purposes, incorporating the complete citation and with a link to the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of the article (but not in subject-oriented or centralized repositories or institutional repositories with mandates for systematic postings unless there is a specific agreement with the publisher)"

• Wiley Blackwell - Copyright Transfer Agreement
  – No to placing an Accepted Version into a repository UNLESS they are funded with a funding organisation that has a specific agreement with Wiley Blackwell
## Compliance – publishers’ agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Policy requirement</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>In PMC within 6 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits Accepted Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>In PMC within 12 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits &amp; authors can place in IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telethon</td>
<td>Must be in PMC</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold. Telethon is directly invoiced by publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>Publish in gold (copy to PMC)</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold, Wellcome reimburses author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Science Fund</td>
<td>Publish in gold</td>
<td>funder pays gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Elsevier has 14 agreements  
  [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements)
- Wiley has 5 agreements  
Compliance – rule enforcement

• Wellcome Trust (UK) will withhold final grant payment if research results are not published OA. In addition, research papers will not be counted if they are not freely available when Wellcome reviews future applications for funding. Details http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/28/wellcome-trust-scientists-open-access

• NIH March 2013 will delay funding grants if any papers related to the research it supports fail compliance with their policy
Compliance – tying OA to reward

- Two Belgian universities have clamped down on OA - University of Leige & Louvain Catholic University:
  - In its meeting of 2 July the Academic Council of UCK adopted a policy of mandatory deposit in its DIAL repository of all bibliographic metadata as well as full-texts as of 1 January 2013. As of that date, the Academic Council will only consider duly deposited publications in its internal research performance evaluations and that deposit will also be one of the criteria in the allocation of institutional research funds.

- The UK equivalent of ERA – Research Excellence Framework (REF) is considering an OA requirement for 2020 round submissions
OA books (international)

• Since 1999 expenditure on books has fallen by almost a fifth in real terms & from almost 12% of libraries’ total spending to just over 8% (RIN/SCONUL 2010)

• Limited opportunities for monograph publishing deals for scholarly books, especially for researchers in the humanities and social sciences
OA books (international)

• Experiments with OA books: Knowledge Unlatched
  http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/

• Directory of Open Access Books
  http://www.doabooks.org/

• Variant of traditional University Press – print copies for sale (print on demand) & digital versions free of charge

• Humanities
  http://www.openlibhums.org/category/featured-panel/february-2013/

• Max Planck Society & De Gruyter Agreement publish OA books
Resources

• Plenty is happening in Australia
• Next three screens are very detailed (download from the conference website to read)
  – Local initiatives @ QUT, UQ & ANU
  – References
  – Email lists
## Local initiatives - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Access Initiatives</th>
<th>ANU</th>
<th>QUT</th>
<th>UQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repositories</strong></td>
<td>The ANU Research repository is based in DSpace – holding over 8,000 items. This includes more than 490 open access theses and 90 restricted theses. The Open Access Research collection is more than 4,000 items strong with a heavy weighting towards 'grey literature’ – such as working and discussion papers and unpublished conference papers. The remainder of the items are in the Research Collections from the Archives and the Rare Books collection in the Library.</td>
<td>QUT ePrints the University’s open access publications repository was launched in 2003. It currently provides full-text access to over 23,000 publications plus more than 17,000 metadata-only records, many of which include hyperlinks to a full-text version that is available to subscribers (or pay per view) on the publisher’s website. Cumulative full-text downloads (excluding all known robots) are in excess of 8.5 million. The average monthly download figure for open access documents is now over 200,000.</td>
<td>UQ eSpace, running on Fez software [<a href="http://fez.library.uq.edu.au/wiki/Main_Page">http://fez.library.uq.edu.au/wiki/Main_Page</a>] UQ eSpace is the single authoritative source for the research outputs of the staff and students at UQ. At November 2012 of the 162,117 items in the repository, approximately 14,000 (9%) are OA scholarly items. Effort is underway to expand the OA content. Procedures for OA input are available: <a href="http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/faq#q9">http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/faq#q9</a> UQ eSpace is in the top twenty world repositories <a href="http://repositories.webometrics.info/en/world">http://repositories.webometrics.info/en/world</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local initiatives - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Access Initiatives</th>
<th>ANU</th>
<th>QUT</th>
<th>UQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>Presented several talks to celebrate Open Access Week 2012</td>
<td>Regular keynotes, talks and events held Open Access Week 2012</td>
<td>Several events during Open Access Week 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>The ANU is a 15% member of BioMed Central and supports arXiv.com. While there is no central fund for open access publishing ANU academics publish in PLoS and other OA journals.</td>
<td>QUT Library is providing financial support for article processing fees for articles accepted by fully open access journals (provided the journal meets certain quality-related criteria).</td>
<td>Supporting memberships with the primary Gold Open Access publishers, PLOS, BioMed Central, SpringerOpen, Royal Society for Chemistry and F1000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Digitisation Projects</td>
<td>Embarking on a digitisation project of early ANU PhDs which will be made available through the repository under the 200AB exclusion in the Copyright Act</td>
<td>After her death in 2011, Diane Cliento's family donated her collection books, play-scripts, letters, posters and other memorabilia to QUT Library. While many of the physical items are on display in the Library, approx 100 play-scripts have been digitised and will be made available online via QUT Library's Digital Collections website which will be revamped and launched in early 2013.</td>
<td>An extensive range of digitized original and historic materials: <a href="http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/faq#q19">http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/faq#q19</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selective Open Access References

**Encouraging open access**
Budapest Open Access Initiative. from [http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/read](http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/read)
Creative Commons. (2013). History. from [http://creativecommons.org/about/history](http://creativecommons.org/about/history)

**Open access in Australia**
References - 2

Open access on the world stage


Shieber, S., & Suber, P. (2013). Good practices for university open-access policies. from http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/hoap/Good_practices_for_university_open-access_policies


Email Lists

- **GOAL – Global Open Access List**
  - Moderated by Richard Poynder
  - [http://www.mail-archive.com/goal@eprints.org/info.html](http://www.mail-archive.com/goal@eprints.org/info.html)

- **JISC REPOSITORIES**
  - Discussion list for repository technologies and policies.
  - [https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=JISC-REPOSITORIES](https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=JISC-REPOSITORIES)

- **RepoMan**
  - a forum for managers of institutional repositories to pose questions and share information on running and maintaining IRs.

- **ScholComm discussion list**
  - designed to meet the increasing interest in scholarly communication issues and to allow librarians and other interested parties to exchange opinions, views and news.
  - [http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/scholcomm/scholcommdiscussion](http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/scholcomm/scholcommdiscussion)

- **CAIRSS**
  - CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Service
  - Not sure if new people can join now
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Open access in Australia

NHMRC mandate
ARC mandate
Institutional mandates
Compliance with mandates
NHMRC Mandate

• Publications arising from an NHMRC supported research project must be deposited into an open access institutional repository (IR) within a twelve month period from the date of publication.

• Mandate applies to material accepted for publication after July 2012 (based on date publication agreement is signed or date author notified – whichever comes first).

NHMRC Mandate

- If material cannot be included in an IR, then a justification must be provided in Final Report.
- It can be the author’s accepted manuscript version or the publisher’s formatted/copy-edited version that is deposited.
- If the material is publicly accessible via a publisher’s website or service such as PubMed Central, then it is sufficient to deposit just the metadata in the institutional repository and link to the OA fulltext.
- NHMRC grant identification number must be included when the material (or metadata) is deposited in an IR.

NHMRC Mandate

Issues:

• Local processes may need to be developed by institutions to help funded researchers comply with the mandate.

• Some Research institutes may not have their own IR

• Some publishers want embargo periods longer than 12 months on ‘Green’ OA – especially if they offer a fee-based ‘Gold’ OA option.

Australian Research Council

• New policy as of 1 January 2013

– any publications arising from an ARC supported research project must be deposited into an open access institutional repository within a twelve (12) month period from the date of publication.

Any publications?

• Yes, all publications – including books

Any grant?

• No. The policy relates to Funding Rules and Agreements released after 1 January 2013. It will not be applied retrospectively to pre-existing Funding Rules and Agreements.
University-based mandates

- 161 institutional mandates currently listed in the Registry of Open Access Policies (ROARMAP)
  http://roarmap.eprints.org/view/type/

- In Australia, 23 universities have open access policies.

- 3 NZ universities have OA policies.
University-based mandates

- Some policies only ‘encourage’ researchers to provide OA – others ‘require’ OA for certain types of publications.
- Compliance increases with the strength of policy
  - Required rather than encouraged
  - Tied to performance evaluation
  - No waiver on immediate deposit (even if access must be embargoed).
Compliance – publishers’ conditions

• Elsevier ‘authors rights’ page
  http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights
  – Authors have: “The right to post a revised personal version of the text of the final journal article (to reflect changes made in the peer review process) on your personal or institutional website or server for scholarly purposes, incorporating the complete citation and with a link to the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of the article (but not in subject-oriented or centralized repositories or institutional repositories with mandates for systematic postings unless there is a specific agreement with the publisher)”

• Wiley Blackwell - Copyright Transfer Agreement
  – No to placing an Accepted Version into a repository UNLESS they are funded with a funding organisation that has a specific agreement with Wiley Blackwell
## Compliance – publishers’ agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Policy requirement</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>In PMC within 6 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits Accepted Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>In PMC within 12 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits &amp; authors can place in IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telethon</td>
<td>Must be in PMC</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold. Telethon is directly invoiced by publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>Publish in gold (copy to PMC)</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold, Wellcome reimburses author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Science Fund</td>
<td>Publish in gold</td>
<td>funder pays gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Elsevier has 14 agreements  
  [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements](http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements)
- Wiley has 5 agreements  
Compliance – rule enforcement

• Wellcome Trust (UK) will withhold final grant payment if research results are not published OA. In addition, research papers will not be counted if they are not freely available when Wellcome reviews future applications for funding. Details [http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/28/wellcome-trust-scientists-open-access](http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/28/wellcome-trust-scientists-open-access)

• NIH Spring 2013 will delay funding grants if any papers related to the research it supports fail compliance with their policy
Compliance – tying OA to reward

• Two Belgian universities have clamped down on OA - University of Leige & Louvain Catholic University:
  – In its meeting of 2 July the Academic Council of UCK adopted a policy of mandatory deposit in its DIAL repository of all bibliographic metadata as well as full-texts as of 1 January 2013. As of that date, the Academic Council will only consider duly deposited publications in its internal research performance evaluations and that deposit will also be one of the criteria in the allocation of institutional research funds.

• The UK equivalent of ERA – Research Excellence Framework (REF) is considering an OA requirement for 2020 round submissions
Open access on the world stage

International mandates
Compliance with mandates
Implications for Australian researchers
Implications for editors of Australian journals
Finch Report

‘Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications’

- Report produced by a Working Group led by Dame Janet Finch (Commissioned by UK Minister for Universities and Science). Released June 2012
- In July 2012, the UK Government announced its acceptance of the Working Group’s recommendations.

http://www.researchinfonet.org/publish/finch/
Their recommendations included:

- Policy should be set in direction of Gold OA (including hybrid journals)
- Funding bodies should establish arrangement to meet the costs associated with OA publishing
- Restriction on re-use rights should be minimised (especially for non-commercial purposes).
- Future negotiations with publishers on pricing of subscriptions should take into account the money being allocated for OA publishing.
- Role of IRs to curate datasets and grey literature
Research Councils UK (RCUK)

- RCUK new open access policy – effective from April 2013.
- Funded researchers will be expected to publish only in journals which offer an OA option (preferably Gold OA).
- Block grants to (30) institutions to support payment of article processing fees (APCs).
- Gold OA articles must be CC-BY if publisher has been paid.
- Green OA articles must have no restrictions on non-commercial re-use (such as text and data mining) within a defined period.
Research Councils UK (RCUK)

- Explicit intent is to nudge subscription-based journals to adopt Gold OA business model.

Issues

- Low number of compliant journals. Currently, only 29% of the journals in DOAJ use CC licences (only 11.8% use CC-BY).
- Some UK researchers (and scholarly societies) have expressed concern about the CC-BY licensing.
- If all non-compliant journals introduce a Gold OA option, there be insufficient funding to pay all the APC fees.
Research Councils UK (RCUK)

Implications of the RCUK preference for Gold OA

- This may lead to some publishers withdrawing support for Green OA (as this will channel RCUK authors to their paid Gold OA option). They don’t even have to drop subscriptions to be compliant.
- Fee-free OA journals may introduce APCs.
- Early career researchers in the UK may not have access to funds for APCs.
- Researchers in other countries who currently rely on Green OA will be affected if publishers withdraw support for Green OA (or lengthen embargos).
Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP³)

- Consortium (led by CERN) facilitating a discipline-wide switch to OA publishing in high-energy physics (HEP).
- The major HEP journals will ‘flip’ to OA provided their current revenue (approx $10 million) can be maintained.
- National federations of funding agencies and libraries will ‘contribute’ a sum of money which reflects their share of the HEP publishing outputs.
- Individual authors will not be charged.
Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP³)

- The proposed model may be feasible in high energy physics because the output is not spread across hundreds of journals.
- Publishers tendered bids to be included in SCOAP³
- 12 journals (from 7 publishers) may be offered contracts to provide publishing services.
• From 2014 articles arising from its research & innovation grants must be OA
• Funded researchers can pay the publisher’s OA fee for immediate OA
• Up-front publication costs can be eligible for reimbursement by the European Commission; or
• Or researchers can deposit a copy of the accepted manuscript in a repository no later than 6 months (12 months for articles in the fields of social sciences and humanities) after publication in a subscription journal
• The Commission will also start experimenting with open access to the data collected during publicly funded research, taking into account legitimate concerns related to the fundee's commercial interests or to privacy.

• Objective similar RCUK policy – hasten transition from toll to OA

  • Details [http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/07/17/us-science-publishing-idINBRE86F0UD20120717](http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/07/17/us-science-publishing-idINBRE86F0UD20120717)
  • Policy background: [http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/open_access](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/open_access)
Research Works Act (USA)

- Introduced to the US House of Representatives, Dec 2011 – supported by Association of American Publishers & Copyright Alliance
- Objective to prohibit OA mandates for federally funded research
- Means to block NIH OA policy
Research Works Act (USA)

- Timothy Gowers, University Cambridge, mathematician led opposition – online petition created [http://thecostofknowledge.com/](http://thecostofknowledge.com/) & signed by 13,000 scholars pledging to boycott Elsevier journals (as authors & reviewers) because of Elsevier’s support for the bill
- Feb 2012 Elsevier withdrew support for the bill
PubMedCentral (PMC)

• The PMC repository is designed to provide permanent access to all of its content.
• It is the world’s largest full-text biomedical repository. At February 2013, PMC comprises 2.6 million articles, provided by 1213 journals, 247 NIH portfolio journals and 1962 selective deposit journals
  • http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov PMC/
Compliance – publishers’ conditions

• Elsevier ‘authors rights’ page
  http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/rights
  – Authors have: “The right to post a revised personal version of the text of the final journal article (to reflect changes made in the peer review process) on your personal or institutional website or server for scholarly purposes, incorporating the complete citation and with a link to the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) of the article (but not in subject-oriented or centralized repositories or institutional repositories with mandates for systematic postings unless there is a specific agreement with the publisher)”

• Wiley Blackwell - Copyright Transfer Agreement
  – No to placing an Accepted Version into a repository UNLESS they are funded with a funding organisation that has a specific agreement with Wiley Blackwell
## Compliance – publishers’ agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Policy requirement</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hughes Medical Institute</td>
<td>In PMC within 6 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits Accepted Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>In PMC within 12 months</td>
<td>Wiley deposits &amp; authors can place in IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telethon</td>
<td>Must be in PMC</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold. Telethon is directly invoiced by publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Trust</td>
<td>Publish in gold (copy to PMC)</td>
<td>Authors comply by paying for gold, Wellcome reimburses author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Science Fund</td>
<td>Publish in gold</td>
<td>funder pays gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Elsevier has 14 agreements [http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/authorsview.authors/fundingbodyagreements]
- Wiley has 5 agreements [http://olabout.wiley.com/WileyCDA/Section/id-406074.html]
Compliance – rule enforcement

• Wellcome Trust (UK) will withhold final grant payment if research results are not published OA. In addition, research papers will not be counted if they are not freely available when Wellcome reviews future applications for funding. Details [http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/28/wellcome-trust-scientists-open-access](http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2012/jun/28/wellcome-trust-scientists-open-access)

• NIH Spring 2013 will delay funding grants if any papers related to the research it supports fail compliance with their policy
Compliance – tying OA to reward

• Two Belgian universities have clamped down on OA - University of Leige & Louvain Catholic University:
  – In its meeting of 2 July the Academic Council of UCK adopted a policy of mandatory deposit in its DIAL repository of all bibliographic metadata as well as full-texts as of 1 January 2013. As of that date, the Academic Council will only consider duly deposited publications in its internal research performance evaluations and that deposit will also be one of the criteria in the allocation of institutional research funds.

• The UK equivalent of ERA – Research Excellence Framework (REF) is considering an OA requirement for 2020 round submissions
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Discussion session

Questions from the floor & from Twitter feed
#ALIAOA
Discussion

Q: Should we tell our researchers to put up works on Google Scholar as the best way to foster OA?

A: Computer science researchers (who generally provide camera ready copy to conference proceeding publishers) began uploading their articles more than a decade ago on to their personal webpages. However, this is not suitable strategy for Universities for several reasons:

- Having the files in a repository makes them more visible (due to the structured metadata)
- The file is preserved (personal web pages tend to have limited longevity).
- University websites have an obligation to operate within copyright law
Discussion

Comment: Newcastle University includes unpublished reports (grey literature) in its repository and many have high hit rates (one was so popular it crashed the system temporarily).

Comment: Newcastle repository staff asked Blackwell-Wiley if an alternative publishing agreement (which allowed use of the accepted version) could be used. They said yes if you could find a Wiley Blackwell contract which allowed this. If generic agreement is replaced, you need to keep copies....

Comment: IEEE rules changed – can no longer make published version available in repository after January 2011, but repository managers are still making IEEE published earlier available. Complexity of the publishing agreements situation shows there is a need for training.
Discussion

Questions:
Q: What is the status (interest in) open access data in this context of change upon researchers?
A: Open Data will be the next’ big thing’ and many research funders already have this on their future agenda. Researchers in some disciplines are a little uncomfortable with the concept but this would change if academia were to implement suitable rewards for data publishing. See Australian National Data Service for more information - http://www.ands.org.au
Discussion

Q: Why do the governments in oz hesitate to mandate OA for all public funding research?

A: The Australian Research Council (ARC) and the National Health & Medical Research Council (NHMRC) have both mandated open access for the research that they fund. These entities were set up by the Australian Government to distribute public funding for research. AusGOAL – [http://www.ausgoal.gov.au](http://www.ausgoal.gov.au) provides support to government and other sectors to enable open access to publicly funded information. What happens in the UK as a result of the UK Government’s recent mandate covering all publicly funded research (not just research funded via their Research Councils) may influence the all publicly funded research in Australia.
Q: I’d be interested to here more about Gold OA. Does the panel support this approach?

A: (note: see next slide for definition of Green OA and Gold OA). Green and Gold OA are complementary. Some disciplines have embraced Green OA (eg physics) but others have a strong preference for Gold OA (eg biomedicine). Ideally, researchers should be able to choose which option best suits their circumstances and the nature of the scholarly work they are publishing. There may be a suitable open access journal that is free (or affordable). While the majority of scholarly journals are still subscription-based, Green OA is really important as it does not limit the choice of where to publish. Gold OA cannot be mandated as that would severely limit journal choice.
Open Access (OA) Definition

Green Self Archiving - authors publish in a journal and archives a freely available version of the manuscript in their institution's repository, or in a national repository (for example, PubMed Central) or post them on other OA sites. Green journal publishers are those that allow self-archiving.

- Gold OA journals provide free, immediate access to the articles via publisher web sites that may or may not carry author fees. The Public Library of Science (PLOS) is an example.
- There are hybrid OA journals providing Gold OA for authors who pay an up-front-fee to publish on their journal’s web site.
Discussion

Q: If open access becomes the norm what will happen to publishers?

A: The Internet has been a game changer for many industries. Publishers (including non-profits) that adapt to the new environment will survive. Some will pare back operations and charge for services provided (administration of peer review, copy-editing, marking up. Many publishers have already identified that their main value proposition in the open access environment will involve filtering, aggregation and connecting. For university-based publishers, charging authors may not be necessary if the operating costs are minimal (due to the availability of open source software and subsidised accommodation). New forms of peer reviewed publishing, which harness the power of networks, are gaining credibility as an option for research dissemination. Publishers that do not evolve may become irrelevant.
Discussion

Comment: Open access research discussions tend to ignore grey literature #greylit although it is a great way of getting around subscriptions.

Response: Archiving and disseminating grey literature is one of the really valuable services provided by institutional repositories. There is no lack of appreciation for its value by researchers (as evidenced by the phenomenal download stats for some of this material). Some subject repositories like RePEc http://repec.org are predominantly grey literature. Perhaps the lack of discussion about grey literature in open access fora is due to the fact that there is no great obstacle or resistance to overcome. Also grey literature does not have any ‘value’ in the reward system focused on established journals with impact factors.
Q: finding repositories is hard because all institutions seem to want their own...

A: Most users access repository content via a search engine such as Google. Only a minority of accesses are by people who come to the home page of the repository and browse. The magic of repository software is that it stores structured metadata about digital resources including; a description of the resource, rights information (who owns it and whether or not there are any restrictions on reuse) together with a link to the digital resource itself. Search engine crawlers come and collect this metadata and add it to their own database. Later, should anyone run a search which includes terms in the metadata, the relevant record will appear in the search engine results. Repository records tend to appear closer to the top of the results set due to the structure of the metadata. In Australia all repositories are harvested into the National Library’s facility Trove - http://trove.nla.gov.au
Discussion

Q: If I'm about to start a digital repository, what's the most important OA step I can take from the beginning?

A: Join a community of practice such as repository-related email list (see the lists suggested in an earlier slide of this presentation). This will provide insight into the issues you might have to deal with. Some issues are specific to the type of content in the repository but others (such as metadata, copyright, content recruitment and visibility) are common to all.
Discussion

Q: Can other unis engage with the new open access support group?

A: Yes. The broader open access community in Australia is invited to contribute to the AOASG discussion on the Australian OA Discussion list. This will go live in the next fortnight and notifications will be sent out via all lists.

Anyone can engage with the group by following the Twitter feed @openaccess_oz

The AOASG website [www.aoasg.org.au](http://www.aoasg.org.au) will be also live in the next fortnight. Universities may wish to point to resources on this website instead of maintaining their own OA news site.

This site will host regular blogs on OA issues.

In the future, membership may be opened up to other Australian universities with a commitment to advancing the open access agenda.

(This would involve the institution making a contribution towards the costs of maintaining the AOASG website and employing the Executive Officer)