University of California Libraries 27 February 2018

	Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
Summary of approach	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.]
Strategies <sup>1</sup>	<ol> <li>Institution offers repository platform. (All)</li> <li>Institutional policies / mandates (e.g. OA policies, promotion &amp; tenure implications) (All)</li> <li>Funder or third party creates (usually discipline-specific) repository. (UCSD, UCSB, UCD, UCB, UCSF, UCLA, UCI)</li> <li>Outreach &amp; personal support (All)</li> <li>Discovery support (CDL)</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>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)</li> <li>APCs are paid on authors' behalf through a fund pool. There are three iterations of such pooling:         <ul> <li>Funders pool resources to pay APCs</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol> <li>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)</li> <li>Library or University covers entire costs of publication (e.g. Open Library of the Humanities (OLH), various eScholarship journals). (UCSC, UCSD, UCSB, UCD, UCB, CDL, UCLA, UCI)</li> </ol>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> UC campus library and CDL participation in each strategy is denoted with a campus's initials (e.g. UCLA, UCB) following each strategy. For strategies adopted by all reporting UC campus libraries and CDL, "All" is used. Library participation was assessed with a very high-level, rough survey to which campus representatives responded. A more robust survey is needed to gauge and verify participation. A response was not received from UCR.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
	<ul> <li>for all awardees (e.g. RCUK, Wellcome Trust, Gates Foundation).</li> <li>b. Universities or libraries offer subvention funds (e.g. BRII at UCB). (UCSC, UCD, UCB, UCSF, CDL, UCI, UCM)</li> <li>c. Libraries or consortia engage in aggregated institutional memberships that pay APCs in full for authors (e.g. Hindawi, PeerJ). (UCSC, UCSD, UCB, UCLA, UCI, UCM)</li> <li>3. Global partnerships to flip journals to OA. (Library, institute, or consortium contributes payments covering the publication costs in full for authors from their institutions. Payments are aggregated by country so that each country is contributing a share of the OA publication costs equivalent to the publication output of that country.) (e.g. SCOAP3) (All)</li> <li>4. Library supports low-cost APCs charged by library, institution, or mission-driven organizations. (UCSC, UCSD, UCD, UCB, UCSF, UCM)</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Journals work with libraries (as funders) and societies to support a flip (e.g. Libraria, Glossa). (CDL)</li> <li>External funder supports or kickstarts transition to a collective fund of money pooled by libraries (e.g. Annual Review of Public Health).</li> <li>Institutional investment in shared open commons.</li> </ol>

	Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
		<ol> <li>Library or consortium negotiates offsetting deals to cover both access to publisher content and making content by institution's authors OA. (CDL's work is in progress.)</li> <li>Institutions establish a combination of funding mechanisms to support scholars in all disciplines, including grant funds, central pool of funds, and individual payments, library publishing, etc. (UCSC, UCSD, UCD, UCB, UCI, UCSF, UCM)</li> </ol>	
Challenges	<ol> <li>Authors' barriers or reticence to depositing.</li> <li>Dependence on publisher forbearance, leading to transience and uncertainty for certain repositories, particularly due to shifting publisher policies which may impact authors' rights to post.</li> <li>Confusion based on creation of multiple versions of same "publication."</li> <li>Perception of lack of authoritativeness for deposited versions.</li> <li>Competing repository options.</li> <li>Duplicated deposits across multiple</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Author-paid APCs: Tracking and accounting for payments to publishers is decentralized, and there may be insufficient funds to cover full APC particularly for certain disciplines.</li> <li>Pooled APC Funds: Each iteration bears risks.</li> <li>Campus or library subvention funds are currently too small to completely replace paywalled content.</li> <li>Where a library or consortium engages in aggregated institutional memberships that pay APCs in full for authors, there are constraints on libraries' ability to dedicate sufficient funds on a publisher-</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Vulnerability of a model dependent upon an entity or collective pooling funds or budgetary resources—especially as budgets remain flat while the costs of participating might rise.</li> <li>Too great a ratio of institutions needed to participate to the number of book titles or journals being funded or flipped.</li> <li>Keeps authors removed from economics of publishing, risking continued separation from a role in managing costs and limits likelihood of creating competition.</li> <li>Impact is limited by ability to fund flips for</li> </ol>

Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
<ul> <li>repositories may result in unnecessary expenses.</li> <li>Costs of maintaining repository (hardware, software, technical costs, outreach, etc.)</li> <li>Challenges in ensuring discoverability.</li> <li>Embargo periods can delay posting and availability of literature.</li> <li>Copyright ownership and licensing issues inherent to work being deposited, and the fact that they do not inherently carry reuse rights/licenses.</li> <li>Limited applicability to legacy literature due to inherent copyright issues.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>by-publisher basis.</li> <li>iii. With more centralized funds pooled by funders, there is a need for infrastructure to support centralized APC payment mechanism, and the risk of authors being dissociated with costs of publishing, as well as potential to further double- dipping through payments to hybrid APC journals.</li> <li>Global partnerships to flip journals to OA: Cost and effort to administer, particularly on a journal-by-journal basis, and to convince journals to participate.</li> <li>Supporting low-cost APCs charged by libraries or mission-driven organizations: Attracting scholars away from expensive but high-impact journals to lesser-known journals.</li> <li>Offsetting deals: <ol> <li>Impediments to successful negotiations, and financial and workflow details of any resulting arrangement reached.</li> <li>Current offsetting exploration involves</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	only certain number of titles at a time.

	Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
		<ul> <li>basic APC subsidy, but likely not full amount.</li> <li>iii. Offsetting, like any APC model, will be subject to fluctuations in author output.</li> <li>iv. Broader social risks include potential financial challenges for Global South countries if financial risk is placed upon authors rather than at institution level.</li> <li>v. There is also a risk that institutions will subsidize arrangements with large publishers at the expense of smaller publishers, including native OA publishers, maintaining current imbalance of power.</li> <li>6. Establishing a combination of funding mechanisms across all disciplines: Establishing infrastructure for a multiple payer model, verifying authors who are eligible for subsidy, and determining how authors with or without grant funding can proceed.</li> </ul>	
Opportunities	1. Potential for automated deposits.	1. <i>Author-paid APCs</i> : By paying directly, authors become part of economic decision- making process, potentially helping to fuel	1. Capacity to transition scholarly literature backfiles (particularly scholarly books) to open access, such as through crowdfunding

Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
2. Distributed costs and infrastructure.	APC competition.	to support rights repurchase or digitization.
<ol> <li>Ability of authors to deposit for free, creating equity in ability to participate in OA publishing irrespective of author or institution's ability to pay.</li> <li>Persistence of repositories due to ownership/control by universities, government agencies, etc.</li> <li>Long term preservation benefits via facilitation of dark archives that preserve publications.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>2. Pooled APC Funds: Each iteration offers possible rewards.</li> <li>i. Campus or library subvention funds: present an opportunity for authors to experiment with OA without financial risk; allow for engagement between libraries and scholars; allow for institutions to experiment with centralized funding for APCs or BPCs (book processing charges), and to</li> </ul>	2. Co-funding options within disciplines or campus academic divisions could make it possible to cover a wider array of journals or books in the OA transition.
<ol> <li>Ability to work with or on top of other scholarly communications infrastructure— reducing likelihood of becoming a siloed site for content access.</li> <li>Facilitation of repository as data source; facilitation of data mining (e.g. for information about researchers' interests and campus productivity).</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>identify stakeholders, workflows, and issues.</li> <li>ii. Where a library or consortium engages in aggregated institutional memberships that pay APCs in full for authors: good return on investment if a significant number of institution-affiliated articles are published in a given journal or with a given publisher in a particular year.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>iii. With more centralized funds pooled by funders: shielding authors from administrative tasks related to APC payment; placing funding agencies at the center of responsibility for</li> </ul>	

Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
	publishing costs. 3. Global partnerships to flip journals to OA:	
	Efficacy of actually flipping journals to OA. Efficacy of actually flipping journals by transitioning library budgets from subscriptions to pay for OA publishing, without financial burden for authors. Libraries pay fairly equitably according to the scholarship generated at their institutions, while at the same time negotiating APCs on a global scale so that they are competitive on a cross-country basis.	
	4. Supporting low-cost APCs charged by libraries or mission-driven organizations: Publishing costs are reduced, and libraries support operatives aligned with academic and non-profit values.	
	5. Offsetting deals:	
	i. Opportunity to facilitate large-scale systemic change.	
	ii. Can significantly increase the amount of material that is published natively as OA	
	particularly if offsetting deals proliferate,	
	potentially yielding an industry-wide OA	

	Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
		<ul> <li>tipping point.</li> <li>iii. Future double-dipping (and potentially current double-dipping) can be eliminated.</li> <li>iv. Once payments are moved to a transactional level, it should be easier to support innovation if money flows to where users are publishing.</li> <li>6. Establishing a combination of funding mechanisms across all disciplines: Establishing infrastructure for a multiple payer model, verifying authors who are eligible for subsidy, and determining how authors with or without grant funding can proceed.</li> </ul>	
Possible Next Steps	<ol> <li>Build into license agreements reuse rights for and deposit of publisher's final version.</li> <li>Engage in outreach to journal publishers to streamline deposits of post-prints into eScholarship.</li> <li>Continue strategic support of disciplinary and subject-matter repositories.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Negotiate offsetting agreements, and/or decline renewals of licenses with major publishers who do not engage in offsetting agreements.</li> <li>Identify and engage with disciplines for flipping their journals to OA.</li> <li>Expand and streamline application of campus</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Identify and engage with disciplines for flipping their journals to OA.</li> <li>Continue to explore memberships and crowd- funding.</li> <li>Explore opportunities to leverage eScholarship as a publishing platform.</li> <li>Explore 2.5% Commitment or similar</li> </ol>

University of California Libraries 27 February 2018

Green OA	Gold APC-based	Gold Non-APC-Based
4. Explore licensing of additional research information management system modules, with potential integration into campus reporting mechanisms, to maximize return on investment in Symplectic's Elements.	OA funds to cover APCs. 4. Continue to explore memberships. 5. Research strategies for and impact of an APC model in the Global South.	commitment to open scholarly commons infrastructure.

[Universal Strategies appear on next page.]

University of California Libraries 27 February 2018

#### **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:

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

Possible Next Steps	Conduct library-led outreach, and allocate funding or investments, to support author communities' preferred transition modes (e.g. as envisioned by Scholar-owned OA movement, f.k.a. "Red OA").	
	Engage the campus author community, research office, and academic departments in supporting an OA transitionand potentially support author-led boycotts.	ting
	Engage with publishers, scholarly societies, and editorial boards to support a flip to OA.	
	Engaging in national and international opportunities for investment in or transition toward OA (e.g. OA2020, ICOLC, OA Publishing Cooperative).	
	Utilize STAR Team processes to evaluate and pursue shared investment in transformative publishing.	
	Augment discovery and visibility of OA scholarly outputs.	