|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PID: Open Access Publication Venue Gap Analysis** | | | | |
| **Why** | **Background & Need**  UKRI is announcing a new open access policy in 2021. Each policy option will impact on the journals available to UKRI-funded researchers. We need to understand what these impacts will be and what proportion and types of journals and articles will be affected.  This means understanding the availability of different routes to open access, including fully open access journals, journals covered by Transformative Agreements, and adherence with possible Green OA policies relating to things like licensing, repositories, embargo lengths, and copyright retention.  A similar project funded by cOAlition S was completed in 2019 by Kramer and Bosman. This work also asks some similar questions to ongoing UKRI-commissioned work on the Economic Implications of Open Access being conducted by Alma Economics. These projects have provided useful insights into the market but have also highlighted weaknesses in the data available.  If this work was not completed UKRI would have to decide on an Open Access policy with less evidence on the likely impacts on the publication venues available to UKRI-funded authors. | | | |
| **Objectives**  *What must the project achieve? What question is the project trying to answer? (Ideally, objectives should be SMART and are* ***not*** *about what the project will produce). Aim for 2-3.*   1. Understand how many journal venues would be inaccessible to UKRI-funded authors under various policy options based on the journals’ current OA policies. This should also consider    1. how many articles will be affected    2. how the impact will differ between groups (e.g. by subject), and    3. whether there are alternative suitable publication venues. | | | |
| **Benefits**  *What positive outcomes are expected to be achieved beyond the objectives listed above?*  We expect to improve our understanding of the context in which UKRI’s Open Access policy will begin to operate as well as the kinds of impacts we might expect it to have on the publication venues available to UKRI-funded researchers. This should help us respond to concerns about the impact of our policy on researchers.  This will complement the funding work package, the responses to the consultation, the economic implications analysis and the work on Transformative Agreements. It will form part of the evidence package to inform the development of the UKRI’s coming OA policy. | | | |
| **What** | **Scope**  *What aspects of people, place, process (or other) will be "in scope" for the project?**What aspects of people, place, process (or other) will be "out of scope" for the project?*  The scope is all publication venues in which UKRI-funded authors have published peer-reviewed journal articles in a recent year. The wider landscape of UK-published research and/ or research funded as part of Plan S is outside of the scope of this project given resource constraints.  We will consider key elements of potential UKRI policy including fully open access journals, hybrid journals covered by Transformative Agreements, and Green OA policies relating to licensing, repositories, embargo lengths, and copyright retention. Technical requirements and metadata are outside the scope of this project due to poor data availability.  We hope to be able to combine data on articles which acknowledge UKRI funding from Dimensions with data on journal OA policies from Sherpa RoMEO and publisher policies from the ESAC registry of Transformative Agreement. Assuming this is possible we can use this combined data to explore all of our questions. If not we will likely conduct separate analysis of articles and journals using Dimensions (and possibly Unpaywall), and journals and publishers using Sherpa RoMEO and ESAC.  When analysing the data on UKRI-funded articles and the journals they are published in, the following questions are in scope:   1. What proportion and type of articles and journals are fully open access (APC or non-APC based)? 2. What proportion and type of articles and journals are compliant with policies relating to different elements of Green OA (licensing, copyright, embargoes, repositories)? 3. What proportion and type of articles and journals which do not allow UKRI policy-compliant green OA publishing, are covered by Transformative Agreements or equivalent? 4. What proportion and type of articles and journals would not be compliant in any of these ways, and to what degree do alternative compliant publication venues exist for them?   We will also consider how the proportion of articles affected varies by subject/ discipline if possible. | | | |
| **Deliverables**  *What tangible outputs will the project produce?*  For publishing as part of the evidence pack published alongside the new UKRI OA Policy:  Publication Venue Gap Analysis report in Word format with the following subheadings:   * Background and introduction * Current publication venues available to/ used by UKRI-funded authors (t*his chapter could end up with figures on the proportion of articles which are published through different UKRI policy-compliant routes. The following chapter can compare the impact of various policy options against this baseline as well as against all articles acknowledging UKRI funding).*   + Pure gold open access journals   + Gold open access in hybrid journals   + Green open access in hybrid and closed journals   + Closed journals without Green OA which are subject to transformative agreements * Possible impacts of UKRI policy on publication venue availability (*an alternative approach would be to model specific policy options which each consider all the dimensions below)*   + Impact of policies on APCs in hybrid journals (*I.e. What proportion of journals/ articles would be ruled out by various policies on APCs in hybrid journals*)   + Impact of policies on Embargoes   + Impact of policies on Licensing   + Impact of policies on Copyright retention * Appendix   + Assumptions and caveats   + Methodology | | | |
| **Who** | **Stakeholders**  *Who are the key individuals, or groups, who can influence the success of the project?*   * The Open Research team * Open Access Working Group * JISC, who hold a lot of information which might be useful to this project * Jeroen Bosman and Bianca Kramer led similar research and offered to informally review our analysis plan | | | |
| **Organisation**  **SRO:** *Who is accountable for the success of the project (one person)*  Rachel Bruce  **Senior Analyst:** *Who will sign off the analysis?*  Sarah Dimbleby  **Senior Customer:** *Who is the main customer?*  Rachel Bruce  **Project Manager:** *Who will manage the project day-to-day?*  Tom Kenny  **Team:** *Who will be on the project team?*  Tom Kenny  **Peer Review:** *What other teams/professions need to be involved to review and validate the project?*  Relevant analysts from the UKRI analysis team will conduct the QA and analysts from the data team will provide additional QA.  ***Other key people:*** *Who else needs to be involved and why?*  Open Research team and the OA Working Group need to review the draft report. | | | |
| **Governance**  *What are the reporting and control arrangements for the project? Is there a Project Board? Is there a Peer Review group? How are you going to do quality assurance?*  **Quality Assurance**  External experts (Kramer and Bosman) already evaluated the limitations of various data during their research and have agreed to review our analysis plan.  In addition to checks by the project team, a member of the analysis team will be given sufficient time to conduct thorough quality checks of the code and the resulting dataset.  **Governance**  The report will go through standard analytical clearance chains and be signed off by Rosie Cornelius (DD for Analysis) before being presented to the OA Working Group. The report will inform policy formation and the policy impact assessment. | | | |
| **When** | **Project start:** | **September 2020** | **Project end:** | **October 2020** |
| **Milestones**  *Outline key milestones*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **#** | **Timing** | **Milestone** | | 1 | September 2020 | Agree format of deliverables, timetable and sign-offs. | | 2 | October 2020 | Present outcomes and draft report to the Open Research team and the OA Working Group. | | 3 | November 2020 | Submit report to Duncan Wingham and David Sweeney. | |  |  |  | | | | |
| **Dependencies**  *Does the work of this project depend on any other projects? Do any other projects depend on this project?*  The success of the project depends on the availability of the senior analyst and the project manager and the demands in other areas of their work.  The work completed through the Economic Implications project could have a major bearing on this project as it considers similar issues.  The publication of the new UKRI OA policy depends on this project. The publication venue gap analysis should be published before the announcement of the new policy to show that UKRI has considered the impacts on publication venues. | | | |
| **How** | **Resource**  *How much time will people (e.g. team) be expected to commit?*  *What other resources may be required?*  **Commissioner: Rachel Bruce** (clarify requirements, provide feedback to assist in the correct interpretation of the results and to determine whether the analysis has addressed their commission)  **Analytical assurer: Sarah Dimbleby** (supervise report writing and review the final products)  **Senior analyst: Isabel Ruckelshauss** (provide advice on quality assurance and risks to the project)  **Project manager: Tom Kenny (**review current state of knowledge on these questions, write code for the analysis, produce graphs and write the report) | | | |
| **Risks**  *What might go wrong and prevent this project from achieving its objectives, on time and within budget? Include assumptions as risks.*  There is a risk that insufficient time is allocated to conduct the analysis and that it has to be deprioritised due to other work.  There is a risk that the analysis required is either too complex or too time consuming to be completed in the time allocated by the project manager.  The quality of data may limit what conclusions can be drawn for some questions. | | | |
| **Constraints**  *Are there any policies or rules within which this project has to operate? For example: data security, software, legality, etc…* | | | |