The changing landscape of open access globally

Stellenbosch Library Research Week
15 May 2019
or how the hound of academia is finally learning to wag the tail of scholarly publishing, rather than the other way around.

- What is wrong with the current system scholarly publishing?
- What is causing the disruption?
- How does it work?
- The way forward
What is the function or objective of an academic library? Why do libraries collect?

• The simplistic answer would be to support the [research,] teaching & learning at their institution.
  
  What are the objectives of an academic library? (Accessed May 14, 2019)

• The main objective of an academic library's selection policy is to provide the college community with a wide range of scholarly materials that are consistent with the institution's mission, curricula/research needs, and academic freedom tenets.
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Iterative process

Chapter 1
Behavioral Science and Research

The "impossibility of proof" philosophy that underlies psychological research illustrates how research is a process rather than a linear event with a clear beginning and end. One study feeds into the literature that is used to spark further inquiry into the phenomenon. As more and more studies accumulate, we gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. But as our knowledge deepens, so do the questions and ambiguities. Eventually, we appreciate that each single study is a small piece of information in a large and complex puzzle.

Source: Evaluating the development of science research skills in work-integrated learning through the use of workplace science tools. SUSAN M. McCURDY, KARSTEN E.
Open Access

Open Access is the free, immediate, online availability of research articles coupled with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment. Open Access ensures that anyone can access and use these results—to turn ideas into industries and breakthroughs into better lives.

Research provides the foundation of modern society. Research leads to breakthroughs, and communicating the results of research is what allows us to turn breakthroughs into better lives—to provide new treatments for disease, to implement solutions for challenges like global warming, and to build entire industries around what were once just ideas.

However, our current system for communicating research is crippled by a centuries old model that hasn’t been updated to take advantage of 21st century technology:
Journal des sçavans
January 1665

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic_publishing

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophical_Transactions_of_the_Royal_Society
Outdated system of scholarly communication

• Cost of research
• Cost of peer review
• Editorial boards
• Surrender copyright
• Page fees
• Paywall – limited access
• Subscriptions Fees Annually
• Purchaser and consumer are not the same

Highly inefficient
• Cost
• Access

“Trapped in publisher proposals – they will always ensure that their benefit will be the same”

- Bernard Rentier
Suppose there was a wholly state-funded bakery, whose aim was to create world-class cakes and to encourage the development of excellent cake-baking. Everyone in the bakery is paid by the state—the master bakers, the managers, the kitchen assistants, the human resources consultants, and the cleaners. But the bakery is not allowed to give or sell the cakes directly to the public. Rather it is obliged to give, free of charge, all the best products to a number of “cake brokers”, each one specializing in a different kind of cake. These brokers are profit-making companies. To maintain baking standards, the brokers ask expert tasters from around the world to give their (unpaid) opinions on the quality of the cakes produced, ranking them and making recommendations about which should be released to the public. The brokers then put the best cakes in nice boxes and sell them back to state-funded “cake repositories” at a price they set themselves. Some cake repositories are free to use, but most of them give their cakes away only to their members, many of whom pay a fee of around £9,000 per year, or more. The cake brokers make a healthy profit and regularly raise their prices, knowing that no self-respecting cake repository would deprive its members of the best cakes in the world.
Recteur honoraire / Rector Emeritus - ULiège. Dedicated to making Science content & information fully, freely and immediately available and reusable.
Deal with the devil

“In short, the Big Deal turned out to be a cuckoo: Once in the nest, it tends to consume everything, throwing out the other fledglings in the process.”

Richard Poynder in his article “The Big Deal: Not Price But Cost”
In 2017 SANLiC member institutions participated in 678 SANLiC negotiated subscriptions, across 57 deals with 48 publishers. The sum of the institutional list prices for the subscriptions was R3.9 billion and yet the sum of the consortium prices paid by the members was R508 million which is a cost avoidance of 87% or R3.4 billion.

Table 2: A three-year comparison of overall member subscriptions, costs and consortium cost avoidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Std Institutional Price - ZAR</td>
<td>R 3057958 458</td>
<td>R 3508510 636</td>
<td>R 3894671 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Avoidance</td>
<td>R 2533578 797</td>
<td>R 3017788 915</td>
<td>R 3386270 755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Price - ZAR</td>
<td>R 524639 661</td>
<td>R 490721 721</td>
<td>R 508400 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Growth</td>
<td>-10.88%</td>
<td>-2.44%</td>
<td>-0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Cost Avoidance</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SANLiC Subscriptions and Cost Avoidance
Paying over and over again

ScienceDirect - SANLiC member 2017 downloads disaggregated by year of publication
Source: Elsevier COUNTER JR5 reports

![Bar chart showing percentage of downloads by year of publication. The highest percentage is for YOP 2017 at 16.60%.](chart.png)
Elsevier Profitability
Source: Elsevier Annual Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue (£ millions)</th>
<th>Adjusted Operating Profit (£ millions)</th>
<th>Profit %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2063</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities

The Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities of 22 October 2003 was written in English. It is one of the milestones of the Open Access movement. The wording of the English version shall prevail.
GROWTH OF OPEN ACCESS

In 2016, journals made 18.9% of papers open immediately on publication, up from 11.5% in 2012.

- Immediate open access (OA)
- Immediate OA (hybrid journal)
- Open after delay

*From Scopus database. †Subscription journals with OA option.
PUBLISHING MODELS

Worldwide, the proportion of subscription-only journals* shrank between 2012 and 2016, giving way to more open-access (OA) and hybrid journals.

Proportion of journals published 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription only</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed OA</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-access</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of journals published 2016

*From Scopus database. Hybrid journals are subscription titles that allow authors to make individual papers open for a fee.
The standard hybrid model

- **Institution**
  - Spending for reading
  - Spending for publishing on top
  - No integrated transaction

- **Publisher**
  - Provides reading access
  - Publishes individual papers open access

**Distinct revenue streams:**
OA is an add-on component with extra costs ("double dipping")
The key phrase is “open access is the new additional content”!
The next phase in the evolution of our licensing activities.
The SCOAP³ Business Model

**Researcher**
- No change in behavior
- No burden
- Retains the copyright

**Publishers**
- Open Access
- APC’s

**Libraries / Consortia**
- Support OA policies
- Use existing funds
- No operations

**Reduction on Subscriptions**

Icon made by Freepik licensed under CC BY 3.0
SCOAP³ Financials ZA

Researcher
- 289 ZA articles in SCOAP³
- ca. 130 articles / year

South African institutions

Value of ZA articles: € 186,000 (each year)

Reduction on Subscriptions
€ 78,400 p.a.

Phase 1: € 5,500 p.a.
Phase 2: € 27,000 p.a.

Source: Google Maps

Icon made by Freepik licensed under CC BY 3.0
Do HEP researchers read preprints or journals?

2013: before SCOAP³
Comparing arXiv and journals

Average downloads/paper/month

Months after DOI minting

6 months before publication

Average Journal

Downloads 3Q13, 4Q13 on arXiv.org and publishers' platforms
What happens when journals join SCOAP$^3$?

2013: journals before SCOAP$^3$
2016: journals after SCOAP$^3$

Average downloads/paper/month vs. Months after DOI minting.

Downloads 3Q13, 4Q13, 1Q16, 2Q16 on arXiv.org and publishers’ platforms 50k non-Open Access articles and 8k Open Access articles
Open Access 2020 is an international initiative that aims to induce the swift, smooth and scholarly-oriented transformation of today’s scholarly journals from subscription to open access publishing.
Enough money in the system

Worldwide Publishing Market

Market today subscriptions

€ 7.6 bn
Current worldwide spending on subscriptions

Market transformed open access

€ 4.0 bn
Estimated worldwide spending on open access publications after transition

45% Buffer

€ 2,000 x 2m

# 2m

open access

possible within the current financial system

# 2m

Number of scholarly articles

7.6 bn/2m

€ 3,800

Current price per article publication

€ 2,000

Estimated realistic price per article publication

Number of scholarly articles
Transformation means re-allocation of budgets and conversion of journals and processes.

Global subscription journal budget
7.6 bn EUR p.a.
(≥3,800 EUR/article)

Global open access journal base budget
4 bn EUR p.a.
(2,000 €/article)

2.8 bn EUR buffer for new & improved services etc.
(without remaining subscriptions)

Assuming 90% conversion
The landscape is in the process of being restructured

- SciHub shock & its de-legitimation of current system
- Rationale and plan for the large-scale transformation
- Evidence that enough money is already in the system
- Data analyses available for cost modelling
- APC evidence collected and documented
- Political initiatives, e.g. oa2020.org (EoI), EU, LERU...
- Roadmap with practical steps (mainly offsetting)
- Emerging standards in handling APCs (e.g. ESAC)
International Developments

• July 2017 – German Universities cancel Elsevier’s ScienceDirect
• May 2018 – Sweden cancels ScienceDirect agreement with Elsevier;
• 4 September 2018 – cOAlition S announces Plan S
• December 2018 - January 2019 - Projekt DEAL and Wiley conclude a nationwide Publish & Read (transformative framework) agreement for Germany;
• February 2019 – cOAlition S welcomes its first African member (National Science Council of Zambia) and the African Academy of Sciences expresses support for Plan S;
• February 2019 – The University of California terminates ScienceDirect subscriptions with Elsevier;
• March 2019 – Norway cancels ScienceDirect agreement with Elsevier
Major German Universities Cancel Elsevier Contracts

These institutions join around 60 others that hope to put increasing pressure on the publishing giant in ongoing negotiations for a new nationwide licensing agreement.

Jul 17, 2017
DIANA KWON
Sweden stands up for open access – cancels agreement with Elsevier

Large science publisher Elsevier does not meet the requirements of Swedish universities and research institutes

Kungliga bibliotekets samordningsuppdrag för öppen tillgång
Radical open-access plan could spell end to journal subscriptions

Eleven research funders in Europe announce ‘Plan S’ to make all scientific works free to read as soon as they are published.

Holly Else
Plan S

Accelerating the transition to full and immediate Open Access to scientific publications

The key principle is as follows:

"After 1 January 2020 scientific publications on the results from research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies, must be published in compliant Open Access Journals or on compliant Open Access Platforms."

IN ADDITION:

- Authors retain copyright of their publication with no restrictions. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY. In all cases, the license applied should fulfil the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration;
- The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of robust criteria and requirements for the services and research infrastructures they fund;
- When Open Access publication fees are applied, their funding is standardised and capped (across Europe);
- The Funders will ask universities, research organisations, and libraries to align their policies and strategies, notably to ensure transparency;
- The above principles shall apply to all types of scholarly publications, but it is understood that the time.
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RELX Group
Company

RELX Group is a British multinational information and analytics company headquartered in London. It operates in four market segments: professional, technical and medical; risk and business analytics; legal; and scientific information.

Wikipedia

Headquarters: London, United Kingdom
CEO: Erik Engstrom (2009–)
Revenue: 7.36 billion GBP (2017)
Net income: 1.73 billion GBP (2017)
Total assets: 12.28 billion GBP (2017)
Subsidiaries: Elsevier, LexisNexis, Reed Exhibitions, M"nchen Messe, Wolters Kluwer, MDPI

Profiles
LinkedIn YouTube Twitter Instagram

RELX share price (REL) - London Stock Exchange
https://www.londonstockexchange.com/prices/stocks/GB00B8RD07CB0GBX
Berlin 14 Open Access Conference – 37 countries
DEMOCRATISATION OF KNOWLEDGE

the integrity of the research process
ethics of publishing
broadening access to knowledge

Ahmed C Bawa
3rd December 2018
OA2020 WS
Berlin
Berlin 14 conference statement

• We are all committed to authors retaining their copyrights,
• We are all committed to complete and immediate open access,
• We are all committed to accelerating the progress of open access through transformative agreements that are temporary and transitional, with a shift to full open access within a very few years.

These agreements should, at least initially, be cost-neutral, with the expectation that economic adjustments will follow as the markets transform.

Publishers are expected to work with all members of the global research community to effect complete and immediate open access according to this statement.
Max Planck Society Ends Elsevier Subscription

The move is a show of support for Project DEAL and the open-access movement.

Dec 20, 2018
ASHLEY P. TAYLOR

The Max Planck Society, an enormous German research organization 14,000 scientists strong and comprising multiple research institutes, has ended its subscription to Elsevier journals, the organization announced in a statement this Tuesday (December 18). It did so in support of the German open-access initiative called Project DEAL, after unsuccessful attempts to negotiate an open-access agreement with the publisher. The organization’s digital library will no longer have access to Elsevier’s approximately 2,500 journals, including The Lancet and Cell, once the subscription expires on December 31.
January 2019 - Projekt DEAL and Wiley conclude a nationwide Publish & Read (transformative framework) agreement for Germany

- Actual contract - [https://www.projekt-deal.de/wiley-contract/](https://www.projekt-deal.de/wiley-contract/)
- Webinar explaining this agreement - [https://www.workcast.com/register?cpak=441417438479529](https://www.workcast.com/register?cpak=441417438479529)
- You will find the FAQ list [https://www.projekt-deal.de/faq-wiley-contract/](https://www.projekt-deal.de/faq-wiley-contract/)
- Standardized language and clauses that can be useful to those in the community who wish to apply similar principles in their own transformative agreements is available via the ESAC Initiative.
cOAlition S Welcomes its First African Member and Receives Strong Support from the African Academy of Sciences

13/02/2019

(Brussels, 13 February 2019) cOAlition S is pleased to announce the participation of its first African research funder and welcomes the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) of Zambia to the coalition. The African Academy of Sciences (AAS) has also expressed crucial support to Plan S.

cOAlition S now has members in Europe, North America, and Africa. Plan S has received further support in the Middle East and Asia, with particular support by China.

NSTC is the main public research funding body in the Republic of Zambia and supports Zambian scientific research with two funds: the Strategic Research Fund (SRF) and the Science and Technology Innovation Youth Fund (STIYF).

AAS endorsed Plan S in a statement issued in January and Dr. Felix Dapare, President of AAS, added “We commend your courage and that of many other ongoing efforts, even in the midst of the world, which we are collectively building together for the benefit of mankind.”
UC terminates subscriptions with world’s largest scientific publisher in push for open access to publicly funded research

UC Office of the President
Thursday, February 28, 2019

As a leader in the global movement toward open access to publicly funded research, the University of California is taking a firm stand by deciding not to renew its subscriptions with Elsevier. Despite months of contract negotiations, Elsevier was unwilling to meet UC’s key goal: securing universal open access to UC research while containing the rapidly escalating costs associated with for-profit journals.

In negotiating with Elsevier, UC aimed to accelerate the pace of scientific discovery by ensuring that research produced by UC’s 10 campuses — which accounts for nearly 10 percent of all U.S. publishing output — would be immediately available to the world, without cost to the reader. Under Elsevier’s proposed terms, the publisher would have charged UC authors large publishing fees to make their work freely available on a speedy online basis.

UC has reached agreement with several publishers to make access to UC research available without charge to the reader. UC’s research is already made freely available through Open Access to the world by the University of California Library System’s occasional publication, Public Library of Science (PLoS). UC also makes its research freely available to the world through the California Digital Library,which is a virtual repository of electronic content that includes articles, videos, datasets, and more.

As a result, UC is taking the following actions:

-终止与爱思唯尔（Elsevier）的订阅
-通过公共图书馆系统（PLoS）和加利福尼亚数字图书馆（CDL）提供免费访问研究内容
-不再使用爱思唯尔的订阅服务
-将研究内容免费提供给读者
Norway Joins List of Countries Canceling Elsevier Contracts

The publisher failed to meet requests for better access to research, a consortium of Norwegian institutions says.

Mar 13, 2019
CATHERINE OFFORD

Norway has become latest country to cancel its contracts with Elsevier following a dispute over access to research papers. In a statement published yesterday (March 12), the Norwegian Directorate for ICT and Joint Services in Higher Education and Research (UNIT), which represents 35 universities and colleges, said Elsevier continued to refuse access to the Open Research Online collection despite the developer’s efforts to negotiate a deal. UNIT praised the Elsevier Alternatives portal, which provides access to papers hosted on other platforms, but said it was not enough. Norway is the fifth country to cancel Elsevier contracts this year, the first of which was Sweden in February. The Netherlands, Japan, and Wales, U.K., have also announced similar moves. UNIT said it is expanding its search for alternative servers and services.
National Site Licensing and Open Access Task Team

- USAf – Universities South Africa
- ASSAf – Academy of Science of South Africa
- NRF – National Research Foundation
- DST – Department of Science and Technology
- DHET – Department of Higher Education and Training
- SANLiC
1. **Convenings**: to reconvene meetings of academics, librarians and research managers to develop a working consensus on how to proceed (USAf and SANLiC);

2. Maintain and build our relationship with OA2020 (USAf, NRF and SANLiC);

3. **Data collection and analysis** vital for transformative agreements to avoid additional investment (The NSLOAP Team);

4. **Engagement on the Governance Model**: the move away from an institution-by-institution approach to a national approach will require the development of a governance model, and especially as this model will have to reach across institutions that are supported by different government departments USAf and NRF will work on a draft governance framework;

5. **Aggregation of National Spend on Journals and Databases** (USAf, DHET, DST, Treasury);

6. **Contacts at Institutions** will be mobilised to co-ordinate efforts (USAf and NRF);

7. The Design of a Roadmap. A draft national roadmap to guide South Africa’s has been designed and will be shared with institutions shortly (The NSLOAP Team).

The briefing document ends with:

The success of the OA2020 campaigns in other national systems is driven by the level of consensus that exists in those scholarly communities. This requires engagement and discussion. There is need for urgency since the negotiations for the next set of contracts have already begun.
TAKE ACTION

The Open Access movement has made many laudable efforts over the past 20 years, but progress is slow and we are still decades away from achieving the envisioned open information environment. Worse, even while new OA strategies make headway, the largest traditional publishers are fortifying their paywalls and extracting booming revenues through annual subscription price increases and hybrid publishing (double-dipping). In order to finally make open access the default in scholarly publishing, we need to take collective action and divest of subscriptions, in order to invest in Open Access.
Creating a Roadmap – University of California

1. https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/initiatives/scholarly-communication

Scholarly Communication

Scholarly communication has become expensive, restrictive, and increasingly falls short of realizing its full potential to make scholarly information broadly accessible. The University of California Libraries are committed to working collaboratively with a variety of partners and stakeholders to provide leadership in transforming scholarly communication into a system that is economically sustainable and ensures the widest possible access to the scholarly record.

Part of this commitment to transforming scholarly publishing at a large scale necessitates transitioning away from subscription-based publishing models, and repurposing our investments into sustainable open access (OA) funding models.

In order to make informed and data-driven decisions about which endeavors to pursue at scale, the UC Libraries prepared an analysis of the various approaches to or models for achieving open access, and the actionable strategies that exist to implement each approach. This analysis, compiled in the Pathways to OA documents linked below, was endorsed by the UC Council of University Librarians (CUL) on 27 February 2018. The Pathways to OA is intended to assist campus libraries and the California Digital Library with individual, and where appropriate, collective decision-making about which OA strategies, possible next steps, or experiments to pursue in order to achieve large-scale transition to OA.

- Pathways to OA: Executive Summary [PDF]
- Pathways to OA: Full Report [PDF]
- Pathways to OA: Chart Summarizing Approaches, Strategies, & Next Steps [PDF]

For more information on the October 16-17 working forum, Choosing Pathways to OA,
### University of California Libraries: Pathways to OA-Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of approach</th>
<th>Green OA</th>
<th>Gold APC-based</th>
<th>Gold Non-APC-Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Authors and/or institutions make otherwise toll-access works freely available in repositories. The right to deposit such works depends on publisher and institutional policy, and any rights that the author or institution retains under both. Copies uploaded to a repository are free to read. They may or may not carry re-use licenses for downstream use.**

**Author pays a fee to the publisher to cover production costs, and publications are made free to readers, potentially but not necessarily with downstream reuse licenses. The author fees may be covered in part or full from a variety of sources, and may be in addition to subscription fees already paid by the Library. Libraries may also negotiate for discounts/reductions in or waivers of those author fees through memberships or other arrangements.**

**Publisher provides permanent and free access to readers with neither author fees nor reader fees, and potentially but not necessarily with downstream reuse licenses. [Sometimes called Platinum OA, or Diamond OA.]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies¹</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institution offers repository platform. (All)</td>
<td>1. Authors pay APCs directly out of grant, departmental, or discretionary professional funds. APCs might be discounted due to library/consortium negotiated contracts or memberships (e.g. Taylor &amp; Francis, MDPI). (UCSC, UCSD, UCSB, UCD, UCSF, CDL, UCLA, UCI, UCM)</td>
<td>1. Society, organization, government, or endowment covers entire costs of publication (e.g. Beilstein Journal of Organic Chemistry; SciELO; Americana: the Journal of American Popular Culture 1900 to present) (All)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional policies / mandates (e.g. OA policies, promotion &amp; tenure implications) (All)</td>
<td>2. APCs are paid on authors' behalf through a fund pool. There are three iterations of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Funder or third party creates (usually discipline-specific) repository. (UCSD, UCSB, UCD, UCB, UCSF, UCLA, UCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Library or University covers entire costs of publication (e.g. Open Library of the Humanities (OLH); various eScholarship Commons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Strategies applicable to all methods.
# UC - Roadmap

**Universal Strategies**

Certain strategies could be utilized across approaches and, in some cases, are essential to the success of those approaches. Accordingly, libraries considering undertaking any of the above approaches should also consider the extent to which they wish to support the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library-led outreach, and funding or investments, to support author communities’ preferred transition modes— as envisioned by the Scholar-owned OA movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Engaging the campus author community, research office, and academic departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support for author-led boycotts of editorial duties to compel more favorable OA terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engagement with author societies and editorial boards to encourage flipping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Back up offsetting or other OA negotiations with cancellations for publishers who refuse to engage or fail to reach terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration with California Digital Library and other UC campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collaboration with national and international research institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Augmenting discovery and visibility of OA scholarly outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation and implementation of any necessary policy or workflow changes, or staff hiring/training requirements to support sustainable OA publishing models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investing in shared open commons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Advocating for campus-wide mandates that OA publishing be considered within the promotion and tenure process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you
Glenn Truran
director@sanlic.org.za
www.sanlic.co.za
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