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Open Access Offsetting Deals

Report by OpenAIRE on behalf of the European Commission, ‘Towards a Competitive and Sustainable OA Market in Europe’:

**Four paths for open access to scientific research:**

1. Green open-access archiving: usually an author's accepted manuscript, sometimes with an embargo, within an institutional or subject repository
2. Hybrid gold open access: peer-reviewed articles inside subscription/toll-access journals are made immediately open access, by the publisher, often upon payment of an APC. This can be achieved either directly or through an offsetting arrangement (a kind of “big deal” for open access)
3. Gold open access via APCs: fully open-access journals that require a payment from an author, institution, or funder
4. Gold open access without APCs: fully open-access journals that require no payment and have alternative business models in place (sometimes also called: “platinum OA”).
Open Access Offsetting Deals

Report by OpenAIRE on behalf of the European Commission, ‘Towards a Competitive and Sustainable OA Market in Europe’:

Four different types of OA offsetting arrangements that have been put into place:

1. A local **reduction** from a subscriber's fees of the total amount of all APC revenue from the previous year
2. A **cap**, whereby subscriptions are maintained, but subscribing organizations pay no extra to have all their own outputs made openly available
3. An **APC discount**, sometimes of up to 95% of the standard APC, for authors at subscribing institutions
4. A **voucher system** equivalent to a subscription spend to be used on APCs.
Open Access Offsetting Deals

September 2015, request to the VSNU (Dutch Association of Universities) to collate data on the costs incurred per-university, per-publisher using the Government Information (Public Access) Act:

- asked for “provision of a copy of the open access licenses purchased by your institution in the past year from various publishers such as Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, ACS, SageKarger, Thieme, Walter de Gruyter, RSC, Emerald and any comparable licenses
- with the essential understanding that the institution shall pay a previously-established fee to the publisher, in exchange for which the publisher will publish accepted academic articles by authors affiliated with your institution open access in licensed journals”.
- this request revealed a large variance in spending, with the largest share going to Wiley at €3,818,000, with Taylor and Francis a close second at €2,318,584.

Recent offsetting deals in the Netherlands

Overview of the major contract points with publishers based on the Public Access request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>Sage</th>
<th>T&amp;F</th>
<th>Wiley</th>
<th>Emerald</th>
<th>Karger</th>
<th>OVID</th>
<th>RSC</th>
<th>Thieme</th>
<th>Walter de Gruyter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract until</td>
<td>31-12-2021</td>
<td>31-12-2016</td>
<td>31-12-2017</td>
<td>31-12-2019</td>
<td>31-12-2018</td>
<td>31-12-2016</td>
<td>31-12-2016</td>
<td>31-12-2018</td>
<td>31-12-2018</td>
<td>31-12-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA is integral</td>
<td>Yes, 100%</td>
<td>Approx. 20%</td>
<td>100% on all hybrid titles</td>
<td>100% on all hybrid titles</td>
<td>2016: 15 vouchers / 2017: 30 vouchers / 2018: 45 vouchers</td>
<td>100% on all hybrid journals and fully OA journals</td>
<td>100% on all hybrid journals</td>
<td>157 vouchers</td>
<td>25% discount on hybrid journals</td>
<td>90% discount on APC for hybrid journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of licensing contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic contract expenses¹</td>
<td>$822,423</td>
<td>£748,322</td>
<td>€2,318,584</td>
<td>€3,818,000</td>
<td>€193,199</td>
<td>€330,845</td>
<td>€756,000</td>
<td>£235,331</td>
<td>€50,232</td>
<td>€158,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price increase²</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 licensing contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price increase 2016 licensing contract</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price increase 2017 licensing contract</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price increase 2018 licensing contract</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPI min 0% max 5%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Amounts are exclusive of VAT
² As compared to the previous year (also applies to the other price increases)
Open Access Offsetting Deals

the deal struck in more recent days between Elsevier and Dutch Universities.

- Hindered by severe restrictions only Dutch corresponding authors from the combined institutions are eligible to publish in a very select set of journals in the Elsevier collection: 10% 2017, 20% 2018, 30% 2019
- Simultaneously Elsevier raises its collective fees in 2017 and 2018, with 2.5% and 2.0% respectively from the level of €11,697,147.68 in 2016.
- One of the primary concerns about such setups is that they also perpetuate lock-in. That is, because the libraries have already agreed to pay this group of publishers, it becomes difficult for new actors to mount any substantial market challenge.
Fair Open Access Model

* A bottom-up business model for the transition to Fair Open Access that involves editors of existing journals and libraries in the process

* A strong incentive for commercial publishers to accept terms that are more favorable for academia in the ongoing negotiations for OA offsetting big deals
## Fair Open Access | Comparing publishing models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Journal Publishing Model (CJPM)</th>
<th>Fair Open Access Publishing Model (FOAPM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher-centric</strong></td>
<td><strong>Researcher-centric</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>publisher</em> calls the shots</td>
<td><em>Researchers</em> call the shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publishers own the journal titles and the copyright of the articles</td>
<td>• Researchers author, review, and edit articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publishers set pricing and conditions, determine the marketing</td>
<td>• Editors own the journal titles, and use Publication Services Providers (PSPs) to make articles available online at low cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publishers control editorial assistance, workflow, copy-editing, storage, and indexing</td>
<td>• Researchers own copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dualistic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pluralistic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers vs. Researchers &amp; Libraries</td>
<td>Researchers, university libraries and Publication Services Providers (PSPs) collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User pays</strong></td>
<td><strong>Producer pays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers pay for access to journal articles</td>
<td>Editors/university libraries pay for Article Processing Charges (APCs) with public money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscription based</strong></td>
<td><strong>Production cost based</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University libraries pay increasingly unaffordable yearly subscriptions to the publisher</td>
<td>University libraries pay for the real production costs of online publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fair Open Access | Comparing publishing models

Classical Journal Publishing Model (CJPM)

- Publishers
  - Editorial Management System
  - Copy editing
  - Website
  - Marketing
  - Copyright
  - Journal ownership
  - Editorial assistance, workflow, helpdesk
  - Storage

- Researchers
  - Content
  - Quality control & selection
  - Peer-review

- Libraries
  - Storage
  - Subscription fees
  - Access

Fair Open Access Publishing Model (FOAPM)

- Publication Services Providers (PSPs)
  - Editorial Management System
  - Copy editing
  - Website
  - Marketing
  - Copyright
  - Journal ownership
  - Indexing / links
  - Social media plug-ins

- Researchers
  - Copyright
  - Journal ownership
  - Content
  - Quality control & selection
  - Peer-review

- Libraries
  - Editorial assistance, workflow, helpdesk
  - Storage
  - Subscription fees / Article Processing Charges
  - Access
The conditions of Fair Open Access

Publishers are asked to comply with the following:

1. The **title** of the journal is owned by the editorial board or by a learned society.

2. **Authors retain copyright** and a CC-BY license applies.

3. **Authors do not pay for APCs.** APCs are paid by funding agencies and library consortia such as the Open Library of Humanities (OLH)

4. All articles are published in **Full Open Access** (no subscriptions, no ‘double dipping’)

5. Article processing charges (APCs) are **low** (< 1000 euros), **transparent**, and in proportion to the work of the publisher.
Proof of concept: flipping reputed journals in linguistics to Fair Open Access:
Flipping reputed journals in linguistics to Open Access:

Glossa 2016: 319 articles submitted, 51 published, 54 in production…
Fair Open Access | LingOA

Flipping the journals proceeds in two stages:

1. The transition (3 years)
   ※ The editorial board asks the publisher to comply with the conditions of Fair Open Access.
   ※ If the publisher refuses to comply, the entire editorial board leaves the journals to set up a new journal with a publisher who does.
   ※ APCs are paid for by a 3-year fund. For LingOA, the fund is financed by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research NWO and the Association of Dutch Universities (VSNU). Radboud University Library provides a journal manager for the 4 journals.

2. The final stage (after 3 years)
   ※ Journals have re-established their Impact Factor and indices
   ※ APCs are paid by the consortium of libraries participating in the Open Library of Humanities (OLH) ensuring long-term sustainability
A non-profit, academic-led open access publisher for the humanities and social sciences.

Promotes flipping existing subscription journals to Open Access.

A library consortium model:
- Participating libraries pay an annual membership fee (€500 - €1500) that pays for all APCs of OLH-associated journals.
- Libraries vote on which journals to admit to OLH.
- Over 220 libraries participate, including Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Carnegie Mellon, UCL, Cambridge, UCL etc.

Subscribes to Fair Open Access principles and is willing to work with any publishers who also do so.

Provides a long-term sustainable solution for flipping existing journals from subscription to Fair Open Access, enabling libraries to redirect funds from subscriptions to APCs.
1. **Discipline-based**
   ✩ Within each academic discipline, a foundation is set up that helps flipping established subscription journals to Fair Open Access
   ✩ Existing networks within the discipline are exploited to influence editors to flip their journal to FOA.

2. **No author-facing Article Processing Charges (APCs)**
   ✩ The foundation pays for APCs during the transition period
   ✩ it also covers legal advice costs associated with flipping the journals

3. **Long-term sustainability**
   ✩ After the transition period, journals join a worldwide library consortium such as the one provided by the Open Library of Humanities.
   ✩ The worldwide library consortium durably pays for APCs.
   ✩ Library funds are redirected from subscriptions to APCs.
### Cost comparison

1 journal with 100 articles subscribed to by 400 libraries

Subscription fee €2000 per year

Article processing charge €1000 per article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subscription model</th>
<th>Fair OA</th>
<th>Fair OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current model</td>
<td>Transition period 3 yr</td>
<td>Operational stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscription fee</td>
<td>Article processing charge</td>
<td>Article processing charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>€2000/year</td>
<td>€1000/art</td>
<td>€1000/art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 400 subscriptions</td>
<td>x 100 articles</td>
<td>x 100 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OLH &amp; management fee</td>
<td>€28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k€28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€800,000</td>
<td>€128,000</td>
<td>€100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per library</td>
<td>€2000</td>
<td>€320</td>
<td>€250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per article</td>
<td>€8000</td>
<td>€1280</td>
<td>€1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HumanOA

1. Flipping existing ‘national’ journals to Fair Open Access: Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland

2. This requires transition funds from university consortia and funding agencies

3. The OLH library consortium model must be expanded in order to be able to cover more journals after the transition period
Fair Open Access | Extending the model

1. Two additional disciplines

2. This requires transition funds from university consortia and funding agencies

3. The OLH library consortium model must be expanded beyond the humanities

4. DisciplineOAs must form an alliance
Fair Open Access | Conclusions

※ The LingOA flipping model provides a tested roadmap for flipping subscription journals to Fair Open Access

※ **Investment** in the funding for the transition period is **temporary**, long-term savings are substantial. Downward price pressure on APCs.

※ Library consortia on the model of the *Open Library of Humanities* enable **library funds to be redirected** from subscription to Open Access

※ Change to Fair Open Access is **bottom up**, i.e. driven by editorial boards and libraries

※ Academics face no costs for publishing or accessing research results
How can the library play a role in the future in enabling Open Access publishing for their academics?

How can the library redirect subscription money to funding of Open Access publishing / APCs?

How can libraries help editors (in chief) in their institutions move their journal to Fair Open Access?

How can libraries reach better APC offsetting deals with the publishers?
Fair Open Access / Addresses and links

Johan Rooryck (Leiden University) | j.e.c.v.rooryck@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Saskia de Vries (Sampan) | s.c.j.devries@sampan.eu

Martin Eve (Birkbeck - OLH) | martin.eve.@bbk.ac.uk

www.openlibhums.org | www.lingoa.eu