Open Access compliance:
How publishers can reach the recommended standards
Jisc, April 2016. Draft

Summary

This document outlines what publishers might do to help authors and institutions globally implement Open Access (OA), reduce the administrative burden, and take some of the friction out of the current arrangements. It has been collated by Jisc following discussions with those implementing OA in UK universities, and with considerable assistance from the Research Libraries UK (RLUK), RLUK members, the Association for Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) and research libraries. In addition, these recommendations reflect the comments received from consortia worldwide engaged with OA as well as from international stakeholders which include the Federation of the Finnish Learned Societies, the National Library of Sweden and the German University of Regensburg.

While we acknowledge that this is a fast-changing area, our intention is to crystallise the best steps that publishers could take to provide lasting benefit for their customers and likely attract submissions from authors wishing to meet OA funder requirements. The recommendations also reflect a consultation with members of the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (APLSP) and the Publishers Association (PA) on 8 June 2015. It is acknowledged that compliance with OA policies is the responsibility of those covered by those policies, mainly researchers and their institutions.

A table of the ways in which the academic research sector is asking for publishers' help in reaching OA standards is shown below, reflecting current best practice in OA. Any major developments to these will be communicated. Otherwise this document will be reviewed, updated and the changes communicated annually.

We plan to develop dedicated web pages to explain these recommended standards. They will also be a place where publishers can register their interest and compliance relating to the different requirements. In this way the global community can be kept informed and the evolving issues raised and discussed at a global level.

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
1.	**ORCID IDs:** The publisher should adopt ORCID throughout their workflow from submission to publication and expose (co-)author ORCID IDs in published articles and via Abstracting & Indexing (A&I) services, CrossRef, other discovery services.	To help identify outputs from a given individual and institution To help populate IRs and monitor research outputs, OA compliance etc. Institutions are investing in ORCID as a robust industry identifier Some funders are starting to require grant applications to have ORCID IDs and will expect them to be used.	Discuss with vendors of editorial office systems (for submission, peer review etc.) for solutions. It is noted there are particular challenges in capturing ORCIDs for co-authors and there is scope for publishers, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and funders to work together on this. Sign up to the open letter on "Requiring ORCID in Publication Workflows" (see **https://orcid.org/content/requiring-orcid-publication-workflows-open-letter**) – but also need to go beyond this and collect the ORCIDs of all the co-authors, not just the corresponding author. (However, we recognize the special challenges for "big science" subjects like high-energy particle physics, where papers can have very large numbers of authors.)
2.	**CROSSREF:** The publisher undertakes to register the article's DOI with CrossRef upon acceptance and inform all co-authors	To enable recording of DOI of Accepted Manuscript (AM) deposited upon acceptance. To facilitate deduplication e.g. with later updates from various sources upon publication. SHERPA/Ref can list journals where DOIs are registered with CrossRef upon acceptance and enable the ROUTER service to pass notifications to UK HEIs.	Register DOI with CrossRef on acceptance If AM is not exposed at or near acceptance, DOI should resolve to a more minimal landing page. Notify authors what the DOI will be if this is robustly known in advance.
3.	**CO-AUTHORS AFFILIATIONS:** The publisher should populate co-authors' institutional affiliation fields on CrossRef (including on acceptance if they register the DOI then)	To help funders identify outputs of their research and to help institutions and funders monitor compliance with funder mandates Having co-authors properly identified would help in the general process of analysing bibliographic / metric information, not just in an OA context.	At acceptance: consider ways of picking these up from combination of editorial system metadata and authors' manuscripts. Note that *many* (even smaller) publishers do this already on PubMed; so it is a case of replicating that on CrossRef. At publication: ask CrossRef to ensure their XSLT from JATS picks all affiliations up when present in JATS. (Ditto other DTDs/ workflows.) ORCIDs could perhaps be used as a base here.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
4.	**FUNDING METADATA:** The publisher should populate funding metadata, including funding body and grant number, in both FundRef (on CrossRef) and on the publisher's site.	To help funders identify outputs of their research and to help institutions and funders monitor compliance with funder mandates. There is a need for FundRef to be continually updated so it remains a reliable source.	Population of the FundRef fields is often achieved by typesetters noting acknowledgement of funders within the text of the article. Ask authors for their funding details at an early stage in the process. This also has knock-on effects: the licence applied to the published article may depend on who funded the research. What would be really helpful is if authors and funders were associated – can publishers provide fields or suggested wording that help authors do this? RIN had an example a few years ago – ie. XY acknowledges funding from the EPSRC grant EP/J123456/1
5.	**ARTICLE LEVEL OA LICENSING TERMS:** The Publisher should ensure clarity of OA licensing terms at the article level and make this information available as soon as content is publicly exposed for each version of the article (Accepted Manuscript (AM) and Version of Record (VoR)). NISO has a Recommended Practice on Access and Licensing Indicators (ALI) – see **http://www.niso.org/workrooms/ali/**. Publishers can incorporate these fields into their Document Type Definitions (DTDs), and populate them at the article and version level.	To enable readers/ users to understand what they may do with a given article. To enable repository staff and related services to act upon the correct licensing terms, and to move towards automation of this, to minimize the need for manual searches and other intervention. To move towards machine-readable embargo end-dates that can be acted upon automatically by repositories, for example by passing on this metadata via Publications Router or CrossRef. To facilitate tracking of OA compliance, and whether OA publishing terms have been fulfilled. Would equally apply in an international context, e.g. US Fed-funded articles. To enable discovery systems, knowledge bases and search engines to find and index material that is free to read.	Populate license-ref and free to read metadata as appropriate on publisher site and on CrossRef for at least AM and VoR. Provide a clear, human-readable statement/link on the article-level pages. Include standard (LicenseRef) metadata in article XML (and other files where possible). Ensure a clear statement of date on which the article can be available under OA terms on an open repository. Identify/label Gold OA articles on the Table of Contents (TOC), landing page (e.g. abstract page) and **all manifestations of the full text.** Also see the JATS4R recommendations on permissions: **http://jats4r.org/** Publishers to consider agreeing to use a common language to describe Gold OA.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
6.	JOURNAL LEVEL OA LICENSING TERMS: The publisher should ensure clarity of an overall licensing/policy position at the journal level for each version (Accepted Manuscript (AM) and Version of Record (VoR)) including any embargoes for each.	To enable authors to make informed choice of journal based on what journals permit. To enable repository staff & Sherpa RoMEO to give informed advice about whether a given journal complies with a given funder's requirements, and to do so with maximum efficiency and accuracy.	Use standard terminology and definitions in publisher policies and licenses Work towards a standard schema/ Document Type Definition (DTD) for expressing machine-readable licenses and policies Support Jisc-Publishers Association (PA)-Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) initiative to work towards these aims. Support initiatives to develop a common Scholarly Comms model licence
7.	CC-BY LICENCE FOR GOLD OA: The publisher should ensure a CC BY licence is the *only* option available for authors when the funder requires this.	To enable compliance with OA funders supporting Gold OA publishing	Put measures in place to enforce CC-BY for funders who support Gold OA with this condition (e.g. Wellcome Trust and RCUK in the UK). For example: alert the author at the point where they choose a licence that their funder may have specific requirements, and that they should check their grant conditions *before* making their choice. Ensure client societies understand the benefits of offering CC-BY.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
8.	EMBARGO PERIODS FOR GREEN OA: The publisher should ensure that its embargo periods for Green OA are set with due reference to the views of the funders of the academic research community, and in any case are no more than 12 months for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) subjects or 24 months for Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (AHSS) as absolute maxima. [The standard suggested does not yet meet all the anticipated requirements. For example: Horizon 2020 (OA within 6 months of publication and 12 months of publication in the social sciences and humanities) as well as the COAR guidelines for assessing publisher repository services (12 months, and 6 months for STM). In addition, on a national level, in the proposal for the Swedish national guidelines, the goal for 2020 is that all peer-reviewed articles shall be freely accessible to read and download 6 months after publication.]	To ensure all outputs can comply with funder OA policies.	Some publishers will need to ensure their client societies understand the implications of this for OA policy compliance around the world.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
9.	**AUTHOR'S ACCEPTANCE LETTER:** The publisher should ensure that the acceptance letter to the author includes - A clear acceptance date - A clear statement on what the author may do with the Accepted Manuscript (AM) - A statement asking authors to forward the letter to their librarian or repository manager, and all of the co-authors (if they have not already been copied in) - The article's DOI (even if not yet registered on CrossRef but known internally). Ideally a copy of the letter should go to the designated institutional OA contact	Providing this authoritative statement at acceptance will save staff time at the author's institution in searching for and interpreting any policy on the publisher's web site, a time-consuming task. To prompt author to upload to Institutional Repository (IR), or to ask their IR staff to do so. To ensure all co-authors are also prompted and are aware of date of acceptance. To save IR staff and publishers time in investigating details of the acceptance date. It will also provide clarity for the authors themselves. This would improve the metadata quality in IRs.	The statement should provide the terms under which the article may be deposited and made publicly available, including any embargo period and the license that then applies to the Author's Accepted Manuscript (AAM). This should include details of how the AAM may be (re-) used. Re-send the author agreement alongside the acceptance letter. Do not just send a 'standard policy' document.
10.	**AUTHOR'S ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT:** The Publisher undertakes to supply the Accepted Manuscript (AM) to the author as an attachment to the acceptance email. This should be in the form that they permit to deposit on an open repository (i.e. already including any disclaimer or other statements that they require under these circumstances). The letter should be emailed to all authors, not just the corresponding author. OR: The letter should ask the corresponding author to forward it, together with the attached Author's Accepted Manuscript (AAM), to the other authors	To prompt author to upload to Institutional Repository (IR), or to ask their IR staff to do so. To ensure all co-authors are also prompted and are aware of date of acceptance. To save IR staff and publishers time in investigating details of the acceptance date. To help ensure correct version is deposited – AM as opposed to earlier (or later, if not allowed by the publisher's terms) author versions.	Contact **Jisc** if you want help with suggested wording that publishers can insert into the email.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
11.	AUTOMATED NOTIFICATION OF ACCEPTANCE The Publisher undertakes to deliver an automated notification at or near acceptance of the paper to a designated institutional or representative group service, followed by updates at later stages of the publishing process.	This helps institutions comply with local policies. For example in the UK this helps institutions comply with the Research Excellence Framework (REF) OA policy as efficiently as possible.	The record should include a copy of the paper suitable for deposit into a repository, along with such metadata as can be provided at that point including all authors' institutional affiliations. At the minimum, a metadata-only record should be provided. (An example of the kind of designated service referred to here is Jisc Publications Router in the UK.) For more information contact Jisc.
12.	KEY DATES IN METADATA: The publisher should **pass on key dates** in metadata, as well as on the human-readable article-level pages. - Date of final **acceptance** - Date of **publication** **Start** and **end** dates of any **embargo** period.	To help ensure any embargo period is correctly implemented. These are key dates required for repository deposit.	Publishers will need to investigate how best to pass this information between their various back-office systems so that it can be exposed publicly. For embargo end date, the existing NISO Access and License Indicators (ALI) standard can be used if it a clearly open/ free licence (such as CC-BY or CC-BY-NC-ND) is specified for the post-embargo period – its start date can then be used as the day after the embargo end. An alternative mechanism might be to pass on the embargo length (provided it is accompanied by an unambiguous start date) if that is easier than specifying the end date – and provided agreement can be reached on metadata standards for that.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards

	Standard	Why?	Ways publishers can reach the standard
13.	DATA MINING/ TEXT MINING: The publisher should make it clear that they allow unrestricted machine access such as text/data mining to their OA content in hybrid journals. Non-OA content is mineable for non-commercial use. OA content is minable for commercial use as well. If re-use of results is not allowed it should be explicitly stated.	To allow researchers to make maximum use (e.g. Text and data mining, TDM) of this content. Researchers, need to be able to harvest the whole of the OA (and non-OA) content in order to do meaningful TDM. In the UK text/data mining is a copyright exception	• Create a non-restrictive Application Programming Interface (API) for non-commercial purposes • Make it clear what the publisher considers an acceptable download rate. • Lift restrictions on machine access to OA content – ensuring that the licensing terms and the site functionality allow this. • Ensure that there is an API that enables identification of OA content – and provides access & programmable interrogation of that content. • Revise and make public clear licensing terms that permit data mining: minimum requirements include explicit permission to download and store copies of the whole of the OA content in its Version of Record (VoR), ability to make the results of text mining publicly available, including for commercial purposes. Participate in TDM solutions that facilitate mining across content from many different publishers.

Open Access Compliance: How publishers can reach the recommended standards