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OA Services & Projects

• Repository discovery
  – OpenDOAR
  – BASE Search
  – Intute Search
  – IESR
• Assistance & support
  – Repositories Support Programme (RSP)
  – RoMEO & JULIET
• Preservation
  – SHERPA DP
  – VERSIONS
  – LOCKSS
IPR & Copyright

Barriers to Adoption

- Copyright restrictions
  - Limited or no OA author rights retained
- Publisher embargoes
  - OA deposition restricted in the short term
- Cultural barriers to adoption
  - Disciplinary differences
- Author apathy more common than opposition
  - 79% would deposit willingly if required to do so
  - Deposition policies can provide motivation

A Need for Guidance

- Cycle of publication
  - Academics publish & assign all rights to publishers
  - Loss of intellectual property for institution
- Institutional repositories need to be legal
  - To avoid difficulties with publishers
  - To avoid institutional liability
  - To protect authors from breaching agreements
- Mysteries of self-archiving
  - Retained rights poorly understood by academics
  - Consequently unwilling to deposit OA materials
A solution to the uncertainty
- Lists author retained OA rights from scholarly publishers
- Academic research perspective
- Searchable by publisher or journal

Based on University of Loughborough research (2003)

Standard rules of interpretation
- Deposition of pre and post-print articles
- ~90% of journals or ~75% of publishers allow something
- Used by a broad OA audience

Listing of journal policies
- Currently lists publisher blanket policies
- Developing listing by individual title for individual variances

Conditions & Restrictions

Two forms of policy rule amendments

Conditions
- Can be easily accommodated
- Do not hinder author archiving
  - E.g. Publisher copyright & source must be acknowledged, not publishers version etc.

Restrictions
- Are more prohibitive
- Require additional actions from author
- May block public access to eprints
  - E.g. 4 year embargo on deposition

S/RoMEO Colour Scheme

Highlights publisher’s archiving policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>Can archive both pre &amp; post-prints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td>Can archive post-print only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>Can archive pre-print only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>Archiving not formally supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prohibitive restrictions reduce colour level
Maintaining S/RoMEO

- Publishers & Journals
  - Information supplied by the British Library & Zetoc
  - Not all publishers as of yet included on S/RoMEO
- New suggestions or updates
  - From publishers, academics, librarians or public
  - Some publishers unknown by the BL
- All suggestions & updates manually examined
  - Ensures elimination of spam
  - Quality assures provided service information
  - Currently pending responses from ~200 publishers

Requesting Exceptions

- Where no explicit permission given to mount a full-text version
  - Often worthwhile writing directly to the publisher
  - Can be true even where permission has been explicitly denied
  - Important to get permission in writing
- Request template
  - Can be used to seek permission to mount material on a repository
  - Some publishers insist on the author directly requesting permission
  - Rather than an unconnected party wishing to re-use published material
- Whom to contact
  - Write to the editor or officer in charge of authors’ rights if possible
Discovery Tools & OpenDOAR

OpenDOAR

• Quality assured directory of repositories
  – Lists 836 sites currently
  – Rated #1 in the world by Johns Hopkins University
• Service Scope
  – Only sites wholly embrace OA concept for full text
  – Sites with metadata only or access restrictions declined
• Harvesting
  – Data harvested manually & by machine
  – Human audit step
  – Provides wealth of data including information on contents, policies and contacts
OpenDOAR Search

- OpenDOAR & SHERPA search tools
  - Powered by Google Custom Search Engine
  - Unlocks research in repositories

- Repository policy tools
  - Use standardised format to define policies
  - Help administrators formulate policies
  - Aids impact & visibility of deposited research
  - Formatted output can be uploaded into repositories
Other Discovery Tools

- Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE)
  - Search engine for scientifically relevant web resources
  - Created and developed by Bielefeld University, Germany
  - Machine based service (autoharvests)
- Intute Search project
  - Developing more advanced search algorithms
  - Machine based service
  - Funded by JISC
- DOAJ
  - Lists approx 2,500 open access journals
  - Only includes scholarly titles
  - Developed & maintained by University of Lund, Sweden

Funding Mandates & JULIET

- Drive from the research funding bodies for Open Access
  - Mandate, or strongly recommend, Open Access deposition in
    some form of OA repository
  - National Institute of Health and Wellcome Trust two of the
    earliest to take a positive position
  - Allow for short embargo periods (6 months-year)
- RCUK statements
  - June 2006 supporting Open Access
  - June 2006 further support and first mandates
  - Deposition must occur within a set period for many researchers
  - Covers all disciplines, not just biomedicine
- Major driver for UK institutional repositories development
  - About half of the research produced at UK universities will
    become open access, through institutional repositories
• Ideal funder support for Open Access would mandate
  – Open Access dissemination of final research outputs
  – As a condition of grant
  – Without any embargo period
• Three key parts to an ideal Open Access policy
  – Whether to Archive - Deposit required
  – What to Archive - Author’s final version or published PDF/version required
  – When to Archive - When accepted for publication
• JULIET assigns an Open Access tick when each condition is met
Reactions to Wellcome Trust Mandate

- Work commissioned by Wellcome Trust
  - In the light of their research Open Access mandate
  - Came into force 1st October 2006
  - Major implications on where research is published
- 171 Publishers approached late 2006
  - 126 explicitly Biomedical publishers
- Publishers asked their response to mandate(s)
  - What are their feelings on the mandate(s)?
  - Are they adjusting their archiving CTA policies?

Some Wellcome Results

- Publisher reaction illuminating
  - Some misinterpretation (deliberate or not) of contact
  - Proactive publishers have produced a response
  - Many remain reluctant to comply
- Results
  - Only 66 (38%) of 171 publishers currently complied
  - 55 (44%) out of 126 Biomedical publishers
  - Non-compliant risk losing market share of publication
  - Information added to SherpaRoMEO records
In 10 Years…?

• Developments in the web and ICT alone
  – Will produce substantial change
  – Irrespective of repositories, author-side charges, open access…

• Other developments will also affect
  – Journals
    • Subscriptions, commercial pressures, staffing . . .
  – Academics & IT
    • What will people expect from IT
  – Research funding and processes
    • How is research changing?

In 10 Years…?

• Who knows? But whatever happens -
  – If definitive versions are of value to research work (and they are)
  – If journals are of value to research work (and they are)
  – If publishers are of value to research work (and they are)
  – If learned societies are of value to research work (and they are)
  – If repositories of work are of value to research work (and they are)
  • Then they will be used

What else can I do?

• As an author
  – Deposit materials in repositories
  – Retain multiple-versions of articles to aid deposition
  – Consider using & publishing in Open Access Journals
  – Consider the implications of funders mandates
  – Sign the EC petition for Open Access

• As an institution
  – Explore the supporting initiatives
  – Develop an embedded and supported institutional repository
  – Sign the EC petition for Open Access

• As an individual
  – Engage with the Open Access debate with colleagues
  – Sign the EC petition for OA
Conclusion

• SHERPA’s work is supporting Open Access and repositories globally
• IRs work alongside traditional publishing
• Repositories are spreading because they offer advantages to academics, institutions & research funders
• Deposition of research in a repository enhances professional visibility
• Services to support authors and repository administrators exist
• OA isn’t an impossibility – but it’s not a certainty
• The future isn’t certain

Questions & Comments