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Welcome to the PASTEUR4OA website!

PASTEUR4OA (Open Access Policy Alignment Strategies for European Union Research) aims to support the European Commission’s Recommendation to Member States of July 2012 that they develop and implement policies to ensure Open Access to all outputs from publicly-funded research.

PASTEUR4OA will help develop and/or reinforce open access strategies and policies at the national level and facilitate their coordination among all Member States. It will build a network of centres of expertise in Member States that will develop a coordinated and collaborative programme of activities in support of policymaking at the national level under the direction of project partners.
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The global overview of OA-policies

- Work Package 3 of the PASTEUR4OA project involved a set of tasks:
- Describe and enumerate the policy picture in Europe and around the world
- Rebuild ROARMAP, including the development of a new, detailed classification scheme that describes policy elements
- Collect data on the levels of Open Access material in institutional repositories around the world
- Analyse what elements of a policy contribute to its effectiveness
PASTEUR4OA Project
OPEN ACCESS POLICY: NUMBERS, ANALYSIS, EFFECTIVENESS
Alma Swan, Yassine Gargouri, Megan Hunt and Stevan Harnad
Enabling Open Scholarship
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The ROARMAP "makeover"

• New classification scheme including
  – Criteria for deposit
  – Licensing conditions
  – Rights holding
  – Embargo lengths
  – Gold Open Access publishing options
Making ROARMAP comprehensive

• 250 additional OA-policies discovered
• March 2015: a total of 663 entries
  – 66% are institutional policies
  – 10% are funder policies
  – More than 50% are mandatory policies (requiring rather than requesting deposit)
Open Access policies worldwide

- Europe (389)
- North America (145)
- Central & South America (34)
- Africa (16)
- Asia (40)
- Oceania (39)

[Image: Pie chart showing distribution of Open Access policies by region]
Open Access policymakers worldwide

- Research institutions (461)
- Research funders and institutions (53)
- Sub-units of institutions (69)
- Multiple research organisations (8)
- Research funders (72)
Open Access mandates worldwide

- Europe (237; 62%)
- North America (75; 19%)
- Central & South America (18; 5%)
- Asia (24; 6%)
- Africa (10; 3%)
- Oceania (20; 5%)
Examining policy effectiveness

- measuring deposit rates
- measuring deposit latency
- examining deposit rates in relation to different policy criteria
- examining the correlation between deposit latency and different policy criteria
Deposit rates

• Metadata-Only
• Full-Text
  – Open Access
  – Restricted Access (embargo)
Deposit rates (institutional repositories)

- Based on published articles according to Web of Knowledge in 2011-2013 measured Autumn 2014
- 122 institutions with mandates adopted 2011 or earlier and 10 institutions without a mandate – potentially 350,000 articles

Results:
- 77% had no records at all!!
- 8% were Metadata only
- 12% were Open Access
- 3% were Restricted Access
- That is: 15% Full text!
Strong mandates deliver (better than soft policies)

• Deposit of Open Access material was over four times as high (14%) for institutions with a mandatory policy than for those without (3%)
Deposit latency

• Open Access items tend to be deposited later than Restricted Access ones
• Latency periods tend to be longer in mandated institutions than in non-mandated ones (reason (?): probably because authors who deposit voluntarily are self-motivated and will do it early.
Deposit rates and policy criteria

- **Positive** correlations: Open Access and Restricted Access deposit rates and these policy criteria:
  - *Must deposit*,
  - *Cannot waive deposit*,
  - *Link to research evaluation*,
  - *Cannot waive rights retention*,
  - *Must make item Open Access*
Deposit rates and policy criteria II

- **Negative** correlation between Open Access and Restricted Access deposit rates and this policy criteria:
  - *Cannot waive Open Access*

- **Significant** correlation between Open Access deposit rate and
  - *Must deposit*
  - *Cannot waive deposit*
Deposit latency and policy criteria

- **Positive** correlation btwn early deposit and
  - *Age of the mandate*
  - *Cannot waive rights retention*
  - *Deposit immediately.*

- **Significant** correlation btwn early Open Access deposits and
  - *Age of the mandate* (the longer a mandatory policy has been in place, the more effective it can become).
An efficient policy is

- A Must Deposit policy
- Cannot Waive Deposit policy
- A policy linked with Research Evaluation/Assessment
- 5 of the funder policies include these criteria
- 13 of the institutional policies include these criteria
Policy criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (Green OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
<th>Criterion (Gold OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository required (Green OA)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>OA publishing required</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository requested</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Recommended alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository not specified</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Permitted alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified/other</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>663</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>663</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Open Access policies: Green and Gold OA criteria*
### Funders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (Green OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
<th>Criterion (Gold OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository required (Green OA)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>OA publishing required</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository requested</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Recommended alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository not specified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Permitted alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified/other</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Open Access policies: Green and Gold OA criteria – research funders*
Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (Green OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
<th>Criterion (Gold OA)</th>
<th>Number of policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository required (Green OA)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>OA publishing required</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository requested</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Recommended alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit in repository not specified</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Permitted alternative to Green OA</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified/other</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Open Access policies: Green and Gold OA criteria – research institutions*
Observations

• Research Funders and mixed Funder and Research Organisations from Europe are much more likely to have stronger mandates.

• No significant difference in the ”strength” of mandates in Research Organisations (Universities etc.) across the continents.

• Funders are more likely than institutions to:
  – require deposit
  – recommend Gold OA and
  – allow and/or provide funds for APC payments
So far:

• We have seen the characteristics of an efficient OA-policy
• But the deposit rates in general are with a few exceptions IMHO depressing!
• Can repositories deliver OA??

• We must not forget what is was all about!
What does BOAI mean by "open access"?

Here is the definition of "open access" from the BOAI:

"By open access to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself."
Open Access is...

• **Immediate** access to published content – especially scholarly articles!
• There are not many scholarly articles in the repositories.
• And - embargo is a legal barrier!
Something to think about!? 

• Have we been too eager to see progress by seeking compromise and consensus??
• Did we refrain from telling funders and decision makers that transition is associated with investments and costs??
• Were we afraid of promoting (real) Open Access publishing (Gold – not Hybrid!!), because the are bills to be paid??
• While we are desperately trying to make Green OA work the publishers have regrouped their troops!
• Facilitated by the UK and the RCUK they are back in business with the Hybrid stuff!
• Is it time to rethink strategy? Will Green OA ever deliver the transition?
• And if Green OA is coming closer to deliver, what will happen to the embargoes??
Trendspotting !?

• Not all are as patient as we are!
• Some funders and large research institutions demonstrate more determination towards facilitating real transition:
• There are updated mandates from WHO, CERN and the Norwegian Research Council and of course
• The exiting OA-policy adopted by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation! Way to go!
And finally!!

• While we are diving in the new exiting (and complicated stuff) like Research Data and OER please do not forget that we are far, very far from fixing Open Access to publications!!

• First things first, or what???

• Let´s keep our eyes on the ball!!
Finito!!

Lars Bjørnshauge
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Useful links

- PASTEUR4OA - http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/
- ROARMAP - http://roarmap.eprints.org/
- The report: http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/news/109#.VSz5a5NXr-4
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