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Six key national agencies and bodies within Europe responsible for the development of infrastructure and services to support the use of ICT within education and research.
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Goal:
To push transparency in exchange of OA metadata and cost data by creating tangible recommendations

Aim:
To influence evidence based policy making, and promote better outcomes in negotiations with publishers
Knowledge Exchange Consensus on Monitoring Open Access Publications and Cost Data Report

Why:
It has become necessary to monitor OA publications and cost data related to different types of business models in the publishing market; a standardised monitoring is a prerequisite for sustainability of institutional budget allocations in times of economic restraints.
Knowledge Exchange Consensus on Monitoring Open Access Publications and Cost Data Report

How:
Two international workshops were held in 2015 and 2016

We created recommendations by gathering experts from all the KE countries and beyond, to discuss and compare results and ongoing experimentation in the fields of monitoring OA publications and cost data for OA publications.
Recommendations
In summary the recommendations on monitoring OA publications are:

1. If new standards are needed they should be added to the existing protocols

2. With the standards and definitions in place, policies and agreements can require publishers to deliver data in ways that make the workflows open and transparent
Recommendations
In summary the recommendations on monitoring OA publications are:

3. Current Research Information Systems (CRIS’s) can be used as sources for monitoring OA publications and ensure that the monitoring data is open through open API’s (application programming interface) so that monitoring results can be validated, thus ensuring transparency and reproducibility

4. Finally, libraries should play an active role in this area
Recommendations
In summary the recommendations relating to monitoring on cost data are:

1. When monitoring OA cost data accounting systems and repositories should be interoperable so that cost data at all levels can be easily retrieved.

2. Data should be open and shareable, thus the DOI becoming a key tool. Publishers should be required to enter the needed data such as license, DOI, corresponding author and APC in the publication metadata as well as in the publications themselves.
Recommendations

In summary the recommendations relating to monitoring on cost data are:

3.
Such requirements should be settled in contracts with the publishers avoiding non-disclosure regulations at all time.

4.
A transparent overview of the Total Cost of Publication is a key concept and it’s important for consortia as well as for HEI to be able to dissect costs of publishing carefully, underlining that the APC does not cover all costs of publication.
Recommendations for libraries

It was evident from the conversations that libraries have a very important and central role to play.

1. Libraries should be very specific about their requirements from publishers and use the contracts with publishers as instruments to obtain what is required. They should act in common and work in larger consortia contexts and cooperate across countries to present unified requirements to publishers (eg Efficiency and Standards for [Open Access] Article Charges or ESAC)

2. Libraries should collect as much data as possible and ensure the data is open (via API) and findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable (so-called ‘FAIR’ data)
Recommendations for libraries

3. Libraries could be used as centralised OA funding offices regarding payments.

4. Libraries should require transparency in all costs related to everything that has to do with publishing and they should not enter into non-disclosure agreements.

5. Institutions should have processes that make it clear what the Total Costs of Publication (TCP) are, including APC, administrative costs, infrastructural costs and other costs like page and colour charges.
Next steps – beyond Copenhagen

The concrete result of this workshop was a large number of recommendations.

These can be categorised and summarised and brought into further discussions and action points on monitoring of OA publications and cost data in different ways.
Next steps – beyond Copenhagen

The concrete result of this workshop was a large number of recommendations.

These can be categorised and summarised and brought into further discussions and action points on monitoring of OA publications and cost data in different ways.

Any ideas on how we can take the library recommendations further?
THANK YOU!
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