

---

## Regional Challenges in Achieving Open Access and Proposed Recommendations Working Together to Promote Open Access Policy Alignment in Europe

**Author: Mafalda Picarra, Jisc**

**Reviewers: Marina Angelaki, EKT and Alma Swan, EOS**

**August 2015**



### **PASTEUR4OA**

The PASTEUR4OA project supports the aim of developing and reinforcing Open Access strategies and policies at the national level that are in alignment with the European Commission's 2012 Recommendation on Access to and Preservation of Scientific Information and the Open Access Mandate for Horizon 2020.

PASTEUR4OA aims to increase national policymakers' understanding and awareness about Open Access (OA) as well as to help develop and/or reinforce Open Access strategies and policies at the national level. In addition, it aims to facilitate coordination among all EU Member States and Aligned Countries by establishing a coordinated network of expert organisations across Europe (which the project is calling the Knowledge Net) and by developing a coordinated and collaborative programme of activities that support policymaking at the national level.

### **Challenges in developing, implementing and aligning Open Access policies**

At the beginning of the project, PASTEUR4OA had identified that EU Member States and Aligned Countries experience challenges in developing, implementing and aligning Open Access (OA) policies:

- European countries experience different levels of progress with regard to OA policy development at the national, institutional and funder levels;
- National policymakers still lack awareness about OA;
- In some countries open access to scientific information is not a priority in policymakers agenda;
- In countries where OA policies have been adopted there is still a lack of information on policies effectiveness.

In December 2014, the project hosted a Europe-wide meeting of national experts that brought together the PASTEUR4OA project partners and Open Access and scholarly communication experts from a total of 33 European countries. At the meeting, issues related to policy formulation, compliance and alignment, best practices, incentives and challenges were addressed. In addition, the European Commission's agenda for Open Access was revised. The meeting aimed to inform participants about the rationale for developing, implementing and aligning OA policies as well as to enhance the establishment of supportive and productive relationships between European countries that can result in an advance of free online access to scientific information.

### **From challenges to recommendations**

At the Europe-wide meeting of national experts, participants worked collaboratively in identifying challenges that are currently acting as barriers to advance open access to scientific information in their countries. Because different

levels of progress have been made at national and regional levels, different approaches are required to assist national policymakers and other national stakeholders.

In regional groups, participants mapped the most pressing challenges that are currently hindering OA in their countries and regions and discussed some of the ways in which those challenges can be addressed. This factsheet illustrates, in the tables below, what the most pressing challenges are. It also makes recommendations on how those challenges can be addressed and makes suggestions on some of the resources that can be provided to national policymakers and other stakeholders that inform them about how to develop and align Open Access policies and how to address other policy related issues.

## 1. Nordic region

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
<i>Overarching challenge: Member States (MS) arrangements with publishers to secure deposit rights and short term embargoes are fragmentary and inconsistent</i>		
↘ Visibility of OA and publishing conditions: there are issues evolving around making a case for OA and challenges deriving from fragmentary embargo periods and licencing conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replicate the University of Liege model (including top-down approach, strong leadership, and basis for evaluation).</li> <li>▪ Require immediate deposit and short embargo periods in funder mandates.</li> <li>▪ Include self-archiving as part of licencing agreements and top level involvement in negotiations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide facts, statistics and indicators on OA to stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ Collect and disseminate success stories.</li> <li>▪ Give feedback to funders and government on their mandates effectiveness.</li> <li>▪ Provide feedback to researchers on increased visibility of the resources they make available on OA.</li> </ul>

## 2. East Europe

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
<i>Overarching challenge: OA has low priority with research performing organisations and funders</i>		
↘ <b>Financial constraints (1):</b> grants are too small to cover for Article Processing Charges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Raise awareness about Green OA as an alternative to publishing in OA journals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information (guidelines, factsheets) on scientific information can be made OA.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Financial constraints (2):</b> some European universities have very limited financial resources and limited visibility, thus being at a disadvantage when compare with other more affluent universities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate that coordination at the European level is very important, especially for smaller universities and countries, to ensure an effective implementation of OA policy and strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide resources to stakeholders (briefing papers, case studies) that emphasise the importance of promoting coordinated activities in Europe.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Financial constraints (3):</b> current project funding is low and poses challenges to projects that need to cover for data curation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider ways in which OA can be supported with the existing funds.</li> <li>▪ Demonstrate the benefits of promoting and funding the transition to OA to publications and research data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate resources (guidelines, factsheets) that demonstrate the benefits and long-term financial savings resultant from OA.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Promoting policy compliance:</b> despite recommendations having been adopted in some countries that are similar to the H2020 OA policy nothing is done in concrete. In other countries where national policies are expected, it is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Initiate dialogue with multiple stakeholders and the scientific community to inform them about OA and the H2020 OA policy.</li> <li>▪ Discuss with policymakers how to define competencies, tasks and responsibilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide advocacy resources to national policymakers that explain the H2020 OA policy and that promote effective policy development and compliance monitoring.</li> </ul>

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
envisaged that they will not produce the expected outcomes.	when developing OA policies and strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support institutions and funders to develop clear strategies that promote effective policy implementation.</li> </ul>	
↘ <b>Green OA vs. Gold OA:</b> research quality is an issue and good research results are published in foreign journals. This means that valuable research can be deposited locally. Therefore, why would institutions support Gold OA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide comprehensive information on the Green and Gold OA routes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate guidelines, factsheets, case studies and reports to stakeholders that explain how scientific information can be made OA.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Low priority:</b> OA has low priority in institutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhance Current Research Information Systems (CRIS) as the way forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information about CRIS and provide examples of institutions that have successfully implemented them.</li> </ul>
<i>Overarching challenge: MS arrangements with publishers to secure deposit rights and short term embargoes are fragmentary and inconsistent</i>		
↘ <b>Publishing:</b> publishers are not concerned about institutions' decisions to save costs. They do not see OA policies and repositories as a rational solution to save costs because there are no convincing cases.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Raise publishers' awareness about OA and about successful OA journals.</li> <li>▪ Advocate for the increase of visibility of OA publications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information to local publishers that raises their awareness about OA.</li> <li>▪ Deliver resources to institutions, funders and researchers that information about OA publishing and provide examples of the most successful journals.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Publishing:</b> research evaluation in some countries is very quantitatively oriented. Thompson Reuters' Web of Science and Journal Citation reports (home of the Journal Impact Factor) are not seen as being compatible with OA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide comprehensive information about the ways in which scientific information can be made available on OA.</li> <li>▪ Raise awareness about OA initiatives such as the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) and the <b>Thomson Reuters Open Access Journals List</b>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information to stakeholders about 'traditional' publishing and OA publishing.</li> <li>▪ Organise informative sessions that address issues related to OA publishing and 'traditional' publishing.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Publishing:</b> If publishers' embargo periods are longer than what their funders or institutions require, researchers will not negotiate embargoes with publishers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase researchers' awareness about OA and about different OA policies' requirements and the resultant implications for policy compliance.</li> <li>▪ Demonstrate the advantages for researchers to make their publications available on OA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate case studies, reports and factsheets to researchers that inform them about OA and publishing agreements conditions.</li> <li>▪ Urge institutions and funders to organise information and training sessions on OA for researchers.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Publishing:</b> publishers' agreements do not allow the option to transfer copyrights to authors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Advocate for the inclusion of a copyright checkbox in publishers agreements.</li> <li>▪ Raise awareness about publishers' policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information to stakeholders about the advantages of publishers' agreements having a copyright checkbox.</li> </ul>

### 3. South East Europe

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
<i>Overarching challenge: OA has low priority with research performing organisations (RPOs) and funders</i>		
↘ <b>OA advantages:</b> the benefits of open access for the research community are still unclear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the Horizon 2020 OA policy as a tool to push OA forward by extending the related provisions to all publications, irrespective of their source of funding (i.e. European or national).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate resources (guidelines, case studies, reports) that explain what OA is and what its advantages are.</li> <li>Disseminate guidelines on the H2020 OA policy and information or case studies that demonstrate how the H2020 policy was successfully replicated in some countries.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Licencing:</b> difficulties in understanding more complex issues such as licencing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise stakeholders' awareness about licencing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate information on OA (guidelines, information sheets) that explains what licencing is and that exemplifies what kinds of licences are usually required in different OA policies.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Awareness raising:</b> low levels of awareness among researchers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase researchers' awareness about OA and demonstrate the advantages for researchers to make their scientific publications available on OA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate information about OA (case studies, guidelines, factsheets) to researchers.</li> <li>Provide institutions and funders with information on OA and support them in organising training sessions for researchers.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Infrastructure:</b> repositories are not sufficient to guarantee the adoption of OA policies. In some cases repositories are in place but there is no support from policymakers on promoting their use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raise policymakers, librarians, researchers and the wider academic community awareness about OA and the role of repositories.</li> <li>Support policymakers in developing a clear strategy about how repositories must be used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate resources to key stakeholders that inform about OA and repositories, that highlight best uses of repositories, that demonstrate how they can be used and what information can be retrieved from them.</li> <li>Provide resources to librarians to hold information and training sessions with researchers on how to use and deposit content in online repositories.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Political conditions:</b> changes in political posts have led to an absence in policy continuity. On various occasions OA advocates have to re-start their work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure a systematic engagement with policymakers and to ensure that relevant information and updates on OA are transmitted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set up meetings with policymakers to inform them about OA and to update them on the latest developments at the national and EU levels.</li> <li>Disseminate relevant OA information (guidelines, case studies, reports, factsheets) to new policymakers.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Latecomers:</b> some countries are latecomers to OA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage policy learning from other countries' success stories as well as from their failures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide resources (case studies, reports, factsheets) to national stakeholders that illustrate success stories and what lessons can be learned from them.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Stakeholder engagement:</b> low level of involvement of stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote dialogue and engagement with a wide range of stakeholders about the processes of developing and implementing OA policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate OA resources to relevant stakeholders.</li> <li>Inform stakeholders about national and international OA networks and about their purposes.</li> </ul>

#### 4. North West Europe

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
<i>Overarching challenge: OA has low priority with RPOs and funders</i>		
<p>↳ <b>R&amp;D:</b> the current research communication system is slowing down research and innovation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Involve RPOs and industries in the process of transition to OA.</li> <li>▪ Demonstrate the benefits of OA in advancing technological innovation and facilitating knowledge transfer to academic-industry partnerships.</li> <li>▪ Provide evidence that the lack of OA to scientific information harms innovation, especially for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide available information to RPOs on the impact that OA has to the private sector, to academic-industry partnerships and to advance economic growth.</li> <li>▪ Provide examples of cases where more advances can be made if OA to scientific information is available.</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Financial constraints:</b> the current research system is time consuming and expensive. It is difficult to find and get access to crucial information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate the time saving and cost saving advantages that OA facilitates to policymakers, funders and librarians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide reports and studies that comprehensively demonstrate the scientific, economic and social benefits of OA.</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Research environment:</b> the current research communication system is extremely harmful for research and researchers and reduces the possibility for problems to be solved in other parts of the world.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate the consequences of disregarding OA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information (case studies, factsheets) that detail the benefits of OA and that exemplify some of the negative effects of not promoting OA.</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Ways of working:</b> the current research communication system is depriving research funders and research managers from doing a good job because they are not getting the most out of the knowledge produced in their organisations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate how the knowledge produced in scientific publications can be better used if made available on OA and how OA is an advantage to academic libraries and universities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide information on successful cases where OA policies have been adopted by funders and institutions. Demonstrate what information and metrics are being collected and highlight the advantages that the transition to OA brought.</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Metrics:</b> the current research communication system lacks evidence on OA metrics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate which metrics have positive effects on visibility – web analytics, repository indicators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information that shows indicators and results that have positively impacted on OA. Provide concrete examples of cases where metrics are being used and on the kinds of information that they collect (e.g. University of Liege).</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Citations:</b> the current research communication system lacks evidence on OA citations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demonstrate that increased citations resultant from open access to academic publications are advantageous for researchers and have a positive impact on the university.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information that provides evidence on OA citation rates and advantages. Give concrete examples of cases where articles are being cited.</li> </ul>
<p>↳ <b>Economic models:</b> the current research communication system lacks information on economic models.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide information on economic models presented in the various Houghton/Swan reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate clear and comprehensive information on OA economic models and provide a list of recommended readings.</li> </ul>

## 5. South West Europe

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
<i>Overarching challenge: developing OA policies is difficult</i>		
↘ <b>Lack of OA policies and expertise:</b> developing policies is challenging due to the lack of expertise and human resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop a toolkit that explains how to develop OA policies. It could be a toolkit similar to the one developed during the <b>MedOANet project</b> (used by the Portuguese national research funder to develop its OA policy).</li> <li>▪ Raise policymakers, funders and librarians' awareness about OA policies and provide them with training and resources on OA.</li> <li>▪ Use H2020 OA policy as a model and a tool to facilitate the development of national OA policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate OA policy toolkit.</li> <li>▪ Disseminate H2020 OA policy guidelines.</li> <li>▪ Provide training and training materials to policymakers, funders and librarians on OA policymaking and on policy related issues.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Embargoes and research evaluation:</b> OA policy does not make reference to the limit embargo period and is not linked to the research evaluation process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Advocate for policy to include an embargo period limit and to link OA to the research evaluation process. The results from the OA policy effectiveness work conducted in the PASTEUR4OA project will contribute with more information on these issues.</li> <li>▪ Advocate for a change in the research evaluation process.</li> <li>▪ Provide information about the University of Liege model. This may lead to the inclusion of open access to scientific information as a research evaluation condition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate OA policy toolkit and guidelines that address essential policy formulation issues such as embargo periods and the relation between OA and research evaluation. Moreover, provide concrete examples of where OA has been included in research evaluation processes, explain the mechanisms that were put in place to monitor compliance and demonstrate the impact this measure has had.</li> <li>▪ Write case study on University of Liege OA policy and on the process linking OA with research evaluation.</li> <li>▪ Raise policymakers' awareness about how OA policies should be formulated at the PASTEUR4OA regional workshops.</li> </ul>
↘ <b>Monitoring:</b> need to address issues regarding policy implementation and monitoring processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide information on how to successfully implement and monitor OA policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information on best practices for policy implementation and monitoring. Give examples of monitoring mechanisms that are successfully being used by funders and institutions in other countries and explain how these models can be replicated.</li> </ul>
<i>Overarching challenge: current infrastructure constrains effective OA</i>		
↘ <b>Infrastructure:</b> important issues relate to the economic sustainability of infrastructures, the absence of a national support institution, lack of investment on technical side (managed individually by each institution)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage policy learning from other countries with integrated infrastructures (e.g. in countries like Spain and Portugal there are national infrastructures that collect information from various sources).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disseminate information that explains how a national support infrastructure can be developed and managed, what resources are required to do so, and provide examples of best practice.</li> </ul>
<i>Overarching challenge: MS arrangements with publishers to secure short term embargoes are fragmentary and inconsistent.</i>		
↘ <b>Embargoes:</b> there are issues concerning embargo periods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Develop guidelines about the position on embargo periods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide information on different OA policies embargo periods and their respective implications. Emphasis should</li> </ul>

---

Challenges	Recommendations	Recommended resources & activities
	<p>Base all the negotiations between institutions and publishers should be based on a common approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Explore the possibility for a European guideline on embargo periods to be developed, making it easier to comply with the H2020 OA policy and other OA policies.</li><li>▪ Explore the harmonisation of embargo periods in countries like Portugal, Spain and Malta where a single institution is responsible to negotiate with publishers.</li></ul>	<p>be made to the importance of having embargo periods that are in agreement with those of the H2020 OA policy.</p>