

Evaluation of OpenAccess.se,  
The Swedish national OA programme  
2006-2009

*- by Leo Waaijers and Hanne Marie Kværndrup, October 2009*

# Index

<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Part 1 Evaluation, Conclusion &amp; findings.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Preface and assignment .....	8
Information background .....	8
Methodology .....	8
OA publishing in Sweden spring 2009 - short overview.....	9
The strategic OA stakeholders.....	12
OpenAccess.se – concept and facts .....	14
Facts about the OpenAccess.se programme.....	16
Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands.....	18
Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands I..	18
Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands II..	19
Conclusions and findings.....	21
OA Programme – concept and remit.....	21
Organisational structure and governance.....	23
Programme management and operation.....	25
The role of the National Library.....	26
Focus areas and development.....	27
<b>Part 2 Recommendations for future OA funding initiatives in Sweden.....</b>	<b>31</b>
Why ? : Access to knowledge as a mission.....	31
Who? : Committed strategic partners.....	33
What? : Results of four strategic domains.....	35
Infrastructure .....	36
End user services .....	37
Content .....	38
Awareness .....	40
How? : Framework and concept .....	41
Strategic framework.....	41
Vision & objectives .....	43
Organisation .....	44
Programme management.....	47
<b>The evaluators.....</b>	<b>50</b>



## Summary

This report is the result of the assessment of the OpenAccess.se programme made during the period of spring and autumn 2009. A survey, workshops and interviews provided knowledge of the OA programme and identified important issues which can further the discussions on visions for future national initiative.

### ► Main conclusions of findings

*The OA programme has been a catalyst for co-operation, networking and activities on a national scale. The OpenAccess.se programme has managed to get OA on the agenda of several important organisations as SUHF, the Swedish Research Council and the Swedish Knowledge Foundation. Although there have been critical comments with respect to aspects of the programme, the general impression was that without the programme not much would have happened.*

*The coordinating role of the National Library has strongly been pointed out as fundamental in the achievements of the OpenAccess.se programme. It is important to use the role of the National Library more strongly and in a strategic manner.*

*The review show a strong consensus among stakeholders on recommendations for a future OA programme based on a strategic framework with clearer goals, bigger projects and broader commitment.*

Our recommendations have been developed by seeking the views of the key stakeholders and then combined with the knowledge of ongoing trends in international and Nordic OA activities and developments.

Our recommendations concerns the questions on why, who, what and how!

Access to the latest and most important information has become a key factor in the knowledge environment and this creates a growing demand for seamless & mobile information services based on merging facilities and data infrastructures across institutional borders. Growing competition between HE & further educational institutions combined with the change in research evaluation and research funding at international level make the global visibility of the scientific knowledge production extremely important and essential for Sweden. Open Access is the vehicle to achieve this scenario.

- *Open Access is vital in a Knowledge Society*
- *Open Access is a key component in a future information infrastructure supporting the national educational system, research environment and business & industry*
- *Open Access is necessary in the global competition*
- *Open Access is already here and is growing everyday*

### ► Recommendation - Why

*Define a mission to build a national OA strategy which embrace a national OA policy, financing models for development and long term management of future OA research information infrastructure and services*

This has been recognized in Sweden as well. All relevant public research organisations have signed the Berlin Declaration. A recent and important incentive is the new OA mandate decided by the Swedish Research Council in October this year in close collaboration with SUHF. Based on these conditions, the growing need for a well functioning research information infrastructure at a national level is now certainly supported by right timing and right conditions for setting up a new OA funding and development initiative.

► Recommendation - *Who*

*Secure a strong clear policy position and mandate in order to build the future research information infrastructure. The only way to get that is by inviting the important and influential stakeholders on board – those:*

- *Who have influence at political level*
- *Who are able to participate in shared funding of the programme*
- *Who have a national role of coordination*
- *Who are able to mandate the implementation of the OA programme*

The OA Programme has not been the only activity in “the Swedish world of OA “. Stakeholders such as SUHF, the Swedish Research Council and HE institutions are also working with OA development within their own remit. It is therefore most important to watch ongoing developments at national level and be aware of the right timing and the right stakeholders in connection with establishment of a new OA development programme and equal activities.

► Recommendation - *Who*

*The National Library should take the role as coordinator and catalyst for the OA agenda at the national level and take action for future funding of development and maintenance of the digital research information infrastructure in collaboration with KF, RC and SUHF/HE*

► Recommendation - *What*

*The current OpenAccess.se programme has mainly focused on stimulating and coordinating local initiatives. There is now a need to capitalize on these existing activities and move towards a robust and convincing national operation.*

For all OA developments – be they institutional, national, disciplinary or global – three components are always vital for success: a robust interoperable *infrastructure*, sustainable *end-user services* and a critical coverage of good *content*. Although necessary, these components are not enough. OA to knowledge is not yet commonplace in the academic world, and established interests, prejudice and traditions stand in its way. Therefore *awareness raising* must play an essential role in the period ahead. The recommendations for new achievements are structured around these four themes. *Consolidation, sustainability, quality* and *policy based* are the respective keywords in these domains.

► Recommendation - *How*

*To achieve a breakthrough, an authoritative and highly visible policy is needed. Such a policy must be formulated at a national level by a committee or board, representing all*

*relevant stakeholders, in a truly committed setting. The policy should not only include a vision statement, but define a **national Open Access agenda** as well. Promotion of this policy has to cover all echelons, from minister to individual researcher, and this is a professional task of the secretariat of the board. The implementation of such an OA policy belongs to the responsibilities of the management of stakeholders' institutions as well (the National Library, HE institutions and Research Councils).*

Great success of the OA programme today comes from building on top of earlier successes, reusing key competences, networks and corporation networks. This experience supports the approach of building a strategic framework for development projects, provides and secures long term results and contributes to more sustainability in results and products. The point is that the needed interoperability, workflow and integrated services involve and interact across the IT systems in HE institutions, further educational institutions and research libraries. Each of them has to develop and maintain the infrastructure and services and all need to employ professional key skilled people.

► Recommendation - How

*We recommend to elaborate in a committed setting a strategic framework as a basis for a new OA programme:*

- *Capitalizing on the successful ongoing activities and projects*
- *Reusing key competences and corporation networks*
- *Concentrating on few, but large collaborative projects*
- *Consolidating the emerging national infrastructure*
- *Focusing on coordination, sustainability, professional involvement and partnering*
- *Focusing on sustainability in services and financing models*
- *Focussing on seamless end user facilities across institutional borders*

► Recommendation - How

*We recommend to develop a "blueprint" (in the meaning of a map) of the OA environment as a basis for making the strategic framework defining the national information infrastructure and its components relevant for the OA funding programme*

► Recommendation - How

*Build a vision for the OA programme which can be used for creating ownership of a national development of infrastructure & services facilitating the scientific information flow from researcher to end user. The vision can act as a tool for clear communication in order to give prestige and dignity to promotion of OA publishing by visualising the benefits for research & education*

► Recommendation - How

*Set up the future OA programme organisation in a novel way using unconventional methods, making more proactive actions as well as finding new ways and possibilities*

International experience from similar initiatives ([Knowledge Exchange](#) and [DEFF](#)) show that traditional organisational structures have problems, concerning flexibility, as regards adjusting their strategies and developments quickly enough to the ongoing national, or international world and at the same time meeting the needs and mandates at stakeholder level.

<b>OA Task force</b>			
Programme Management			
with expert committees for			
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Services</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Awareness</b>
that are coordinated by responsible			
<b>Nat. Library</b>	<b>Diverse</b>	<b>SRC/SUHF</b>	<b>Prog. Mgt.</b>

► Recommendation - *How*

9 recommendations focus on tasks and instruments for the **programme management** based on the results of the interviews and experiences from international programme management especially [JISC](#), [Knowledge Exchange](#) and [DEFF](#)

► Recommendation - *final*

*Make it attractive to be "member of the club"!*

*It is important to stress that participation in the OA programme - both as member of the committees and as participating member in development projects and activities – will have great impact in means of productive collaboration, influence and insight, excellent competences and institutional position as being an active partner in the Swedish national OA development network.*

*Leo Waaijers & Hanne Marie Kværndrup  
26 November 2009*

# Part 1 Evaluation, Conclusion & findings

## Preface and assignment

This report is the result of the assessment of the OpenAccess.se programme made during the period of spring and autumn 2009.

We have seen this evaluation as a formative review, with the key purpose of providing the National Library and collaborating stakeholders with information on the impact of the running OA programme in order to make recommendations for future Open Access initiatives and a funding programme at national level. During our assessment, that took place while the Open Access programme was in operation, we have addressed the achievement of the strategic objectives of the OA programme in general and the 6 focus areas in specific covering its quality, organisation, funding process, impact and networking. The findings consist of both the direct results such as projects, seminars and workshops and indirect result such as the impact on the development of Open Access publishing within Higher Education in Sweden.

The latest trends within Open Access development in Europe presented in combination with this report on findings from interviews and workshops form the basis of our recommendations for future Open Access initiatives in a funding programme as well as organisational structures at the national level. Finally, there is the future role of the National Library in this connection.

## Information background

The background information for this evaluation has come mainly from the OpenAccess.se web site combined with selected information delivered by Jan Hagerlid, Senior Executive Officer & Programme Co-ordinator of OpenAccess.se.

The background information concerns:

- Board meeting documents (agenda, minutes)
- Project calls and proposals
- Budgets and accounts
- Project reports from the web,
- Evaluation reports concerning 2 special projects:
  - *Tidskrifter elektroniskt, Erik Sandeval*
  - *Långtidsbevarande – från prototyp till fullfärdig verktyg, Herbert van der Sompel*
- Selected articles
- Web <http://www.OpenAccess.se>

## Methodology

The review examined the OA programme's governance and operation, the approach taken, and its success and impact to date. A survey, workshops and interviews provided knowledge of the OA programme and identified important issues which can further the discussions



on visions for future national initiative.

The process has been structured allowing continuing revision throughout its course, allowing issues that have arisen to be fully considered and explored.

During the process, the stakeholders involved have been invited to participate and their views have been sought, after which initial conclusions have been formed.

Our recommendations have been drafted and then developed by seeking the views of the key stakeholders. This final report presents the refined results of the process described.

During March and April, the following activities have taken place:

- On March 16 the Programme Coordinator had an exploring meeting with the evaluators
- On March 24 a Kick off meeting was held combined with a self assessment by the Board and Programme Coordinator
- During April a questionnaire survey was performed by all project managers and stakeholders. The 25 questions addressed the more general issues of the OA programme and its results
- On May 26 a mini workshop was held for all project managers of the OA programme's projects during the 4 years. The focus of the workshop was to unearth the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the OA programme 2006 - 2009
- During May, 11 interviews with Board members and strategic stakeholders were carried out. The primary focus of the interviews was to identify the strategic results and impact of the OA programme as well as the collaboration between the strategic stakeholders and the role of the National Library.
- On October 19 a mini workshop (14 participants) arranged for the Board and invited strategic OA stakeholders has taken place. Here our findings from the evaluation process as well as our recommendations for future OA activities and programme at national level were presented and discussed
- Finally, on December 1 the delivery of the final report is foreseen.

## OA publishing in Sweden spring 2009 - short overview

During the last 10 years, activities to promote OA to research publications have taken place primarily in the research- and university library environment. During this period, the National Library has supported access to scientific information through funding of the development of digital archives and metadata standards, in combination with OA publishing processes and services. The libraries have worked both separately and jointly to establish new facilities, helping the universities in disseminating research output. Taking up these new services and taking part in collaborative developments have been perceived as a logical paradigm shift in the traditional library role, which is taking place not only in Sweden but also at a global level.

The library context changes from a focus on import of knowledge and free access to information in physical form to export of knowledge in digital form. The classical stacks holding library can be seen as a local monopolist, defining their own collection, catalogue & retrieval systems, etc. The future repository and holding library is a small building block in a global knowledge infrastructure based on common standards and protocols in order to secure interoperability.

In Sweden, the National Library has, in addition to its role as National Library, been given the coordinative role on the national level, concerning the library information services for HE education and research, managed and facilitated through the research libraries. This covers development and maintenance of the infrastructure and services, i.e. licensing of information, digital archives, standards and tools.

*"KB har ett uppdrag att främja svensk biblioteksutveckling, med ett särskilt samordningsansvar för informationsförsörjning till högre utbildning och forskning. För att uppfylla detta uppdrag om nationell samverkan har KB byggt upp en inflytandestruktur med en Nationell referensgrupp och ytterligare ett antal expertgrupper, samt arrangerar en årlig nationell stämma."*

*(Resource: KB:s Inflytandestruktur February 2009)*

The National Library has established 11 reference groups and committees giving advice on expert level representing libraries and user environment. The *Steering Committee for OpenAccess.se* is one of these.

Another group is the *National reference group*. It acts as an advisory group, concerning strategy and development questions within the area of the HE education and research. It is the intention of the National Library to use the reference groups to support the communication between libraries, archives, museums, other official authorities, *as well as publishers and information providers*.

Early OA initiatives funded by the National Library turned out to be the building blocks when establishing the OpenAccess.se programme in 2006. The most important ones are the Nordic Conference on Scholarly Communication, a biennial series starting in 2002; The Directory of OA journals (DOAJ) as of 2003; ScieCom – Swedish Resource Centre for Scientific Communication, 2002 – 2004 and SVEP – Electronic Publishing in Swedish Universities & University Colleges, 2003 – 2005.

In the [Kulturutredning](#), spring 2009, the Ministry of Culture has suggested a change in the role of the National Library, regarding an overall coordination of future library development at national level. The National Library will, in addition to its remit of today, have the overall responsibility for all libraries in Sweden, both research libraries and libraries within higher education, as well as public libraries, school libraries and governmental libraries. Such a major change will strengthen the position of the National Library dramatically, and may very well influence future OA initiatives.

The OA Programme is not the only activity in "the Swedish world of OA ". Stakeholders as SUHF, the Swedish Research Council and HE institutions are also working with OA development within their own remit.

The strategic collaboration between SUHF (Sveriges universitets- och högskoleförbund) and the National Library was established in the [Forum för Bibliotekschefer](#), with the primary goal of promoting collaboration and knowledge exchange concerning development questions for library information services. In 2006, a subcommittee - *Arbetsgruppen för Högskolans e-publicering* – was established with the task of mapping the e-publishing status within HE environment. The Swedish survey recommends in the [final report](#), published April 2009, that all HE and further educational institutions should support future e-publishing and parallel publishing through development of e-publishing services, infra-

structure and policies. In 2008 a new agreement has led to the establishment of the network [www.epublishing.se](http://www.epublishing.se) - a national meeting place for everybody working with OA and epublishing issues. The [epublishing.se](http://www.epublishing.se) seems to succeed supporting discussion and knowledge exchange even on Nordic level.

This collaborative approach seems very much in line with the growing demand for new kinds of collaborative working models, especially across institutional borders in the Knowledge Society. The change of end-user behaviour - wanting to get seamless services, easy & quick access wherever they are - demands highly interoperable systems between HE institutions and research libraries. The 'they-have-to-cooperate-with-us' attitude has to change into a 'we-have-to-cooperate-with-them' approach. Intra-operability has to change in inter-operability. This is still not always easy, either for libraries or HE-institutions.

In the same period, the Ministry of Education and Research made a large scale evaluation of the Swedish HE institutions. The result was a decision in 2003, requiring all HE-institutions to report their refereed research output every 4 years to the Ministry. The impact of this initiative, combined with the strong stimulation by the National Library via the project SVEP, did strengthen the ongoing establishment of digital publishing archives at nearly all universities. During the last five years integration with full text has developed and everybody but one supports full text access. The development of an OA infrastructure, i.e. digital archives and epublishing standards, and of services, are strongly supported by the ongoing SwePub project, but still at a different pace in various institutes. Again the epublishing meeting place supports this development, being a showroom window for the [HE institutions](#) and their developments.

The process of engaging researchers, administrators and funders has been a difficult and slow one, and this still seems to be the case. Many information campaigns, which have been managed by the research & university libraries and dedicated researchers, have, however, produced very positive reactions.

The governmental work with the bibliometric evaluation system during the last two years has taken focus and resources away from OA developments in the libraries, but also in the HE institutions, as well as at political level. In August 2008 the Swedish government decided on a new research policy and investment in order to strengthen Swedish research in the global competition but unfortunately without addressing OA.

The Swedish copyright law gives the full copyright to the researcher even if the research is publicly funded. HE & research institutions therefore do not have the remit to demand researchers to deposit a copy of their research result in the institutional archive. Still, the institutions of HE and public funded research are able to make recommendations on OA publishing and give guidance for researchers in how to handle copyright agreements with publishers combined with services for self-archiving.

New Swedish national deposit legislation for digital material will hopefully support long-term preservation of electronic publications in the future. The question concerning long term preservation of the scientific articles published in institutional digital archives remains to be solved. At present, an enquiry has been commissioned by the Ministry of Education and Research, and a proposal was put forward in November 2009.

In the world of scientific publishing, there are a number of very strategic stakeholders who

all have important roles to play. Each of them has, through their specific position and remit, a great influence, when talking about the ongoing transformation from traditional scientific publishing into OA publishing.

### **The strategic OA stakeholders**

The single researcher is a key stakeholder in scientific publishing and is essential when talking about OA publishing. It is in the interest of the researcher to be acknowledged for his scientific work through citations and high impact factors. The primary intention of the author is to get the research results visible and thereby be of benefit for society.

#### [SUHF/HE](#) (Sveriges Universitets- och Högskoleförbund)

SUHF is a membership organisation established for institutional cooperation on a voluntary basis. All 42 universities and university colleges are members with the goal of safeguarding the interest of the institutions and strengthening their international interests. The association addresses strategic issues as well as concrete ones through discussions and decisions. The association has direct contact to the Parliament, the Government and governmental commissions.

SUHF participates in international context via The European University Association (EUA) and Nordiska universitetssamarbetet (NUS).

SUHF have a strategic collaboration with the National Library, established in the *Forum för Bibliotekschefer vid Svenska Universitet och Högskolor*.

The *Forum för Bibliotekschefer* act as contact on behalf of SUHF towards organisations and authorities, concerning information supply issues. The *Forum för Bibliotekschefer* keeps SUHF informed of important development trends as a basis for recommendations and cooperation, concerning issues of development within academic libraries, for example, the Recommendation concerning access to publication archives (REK 2009:3). The issue of OA publishing is addressed through subcommittees. SUHF has signed the Berlin Declaration. *SUHF participates in the OA programme as member of the Steering Committee.*

#### [The Swedish Research Council](#) (Vetenskapsrådet)

The Swedish Research Council is an authority within the Ministry of Education and Research and is the largest Swedish funding agency for basic research at Swedish universities, colleges and institutes. Their budget is around SEK 4 billion annually for top basic research in Sweden.

The Swedish Research Council functions as research-policy advisers to the Government and works on the long-term expansion of knowledge based on analysis, strategy and the monitoring of research and research finance. The remit of the Council covers, among other things, the allocation funds for research and identifying research areas for strategic investment. Raising the awareness of research content and improving the communication between researchers and society in general are high priorities.

Within the Research Council, there are separate decision-making bodies for the different academic disciplines, led by Secretaries General of advanced academic competence:

- The Scientific Council for Humanities and Social Sciences
- The Scientific Council for Medicine

- The Scientific Council for Natural and Engineering Sciences
- The Committee for Educational Sciences
- The Committee for Research Infrastructures

The academic councils and committees allocate funds for research and research infrastructure within their disciplines, taking account of the decisions of the Council on matters of principle and strategy.

The Research Council is responsible for broadening discussion about OA and putting the subject on the agenda and as early as 2005 signed the Berlin Declaration for OA publishing. During the last 6 years the Council has been supportive to the transition to the electronic publishing paradigm and as such have been participating actively in the *OpenAccess.se Steering Committee*.

A break-through was announced 7 October last as the Council informed the Swedish research society in a [press release](#) about the decision on future OA mandate in the wording:

*To obtain a research grant, the Swedish Research Council now requires researchers to publish their material so as to make it available to all. The public and other researchers should have free access to all material financed by public means*

This was followed by the announcement from the Swedish Research Council Formas – which funds research on sustainable development – of an OA mandate for its research on November 23.

#### [The Knowledge Foundation](#) (KK-Stiftelsen)

The Knowledge Foundation has governmental remit and funding for the development of the Swedish educational system (university colleges). The Knowledge Foundation aims to aid the business community, higher education institutes and research institutions in developing leading knowledge and competence environments in priority areas. Co-production is the overall strategy with the objective to promote cooperation between the business community, higher education institutes and research institutions. The Knowledge Foundation works with other stakeholders in society, in jointly identifying needs, opportunities and problems, and jointly producing results for mutual benefit and learning. The vision is to develop world-class knowledge and competence environments with distinctive profiles. The participation in the OpenAccess.se programme has initiated discussions, concerning using the OA infrastructure as the base for building the future educational system. A strong educational system needs open and free access to learning material of all kinds including research.

During 2007 – 2008, the Knowledge Foundation co-funded the OpenAccess.se programme with 2.5 million SEK with a special focus on digital learning resources and later in 2008 also the Nobel Prize OA pilot project.

#### [The Royal Swedish Academy of Science](#) (Kungl. Vetenskapsakademien)

The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences is an independent organisation whose overall objective is to promote the sciences and strengthen their influence in society. The Academy seeks among other things to be a forum where researchers can meet across subject borders and to offer unique research environments. An important task is also to act as a voice of science and influence research policy priorities.

Academy work is very much based upon the Academy's ten classes, each representing a scientific subject field, and at its six research institutes. Committees, such as the Environmental Committee and the Energy Committee work with issues requiring a broad scientific competence. Every year, the Academy awards the Nobel Prizes in Physics and Chemistry, the Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel, the Crafoord Prize and a number of other large prizes.

The Academy has signed the Berlin Declaration and has been a great support in the establishment of the Nobel Prize project.

The Academy has been very important player within the OpenAccess.se programme both in establishment and connection with programme management.

Stakeholders who could have influence and interest in the OA publishing development are the Applied Science Funders and Charity. Especially the following 3 organisations might be interesting actors in connection with future OA publishing initiatives.

#### [SULF](#) (Sveriges universitetslärarförbund)

Swedish Association of University Teachers, SULF, is the association for university teachers, researchers and doctoral candidates. SULF is a member of the Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations (Saco) whose members are professionals with university or college educations. This organisation could be an important player, concerning raising awareness on the scientific OA publishing and copyright of authors.

#### [VINNOVA](#)

VINNOVA (The Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems) is a State authority, which aims to promote growth and prosperity throughout Sweden. VINNOVA chiefly comprises of innovations linked to research and development. Their tasks are to fund the demand-driven research required by a competitive business and industrial sector and a flourishing society, and to strengthen the networks that are such a necessary part of this work. The vision is that: "VINNOVA makes a clear contribution to Sweden's development as a leading growth country".

#### [Sveriges Riksbank Prize](#)

The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel.

## OpenAccess.se – concept and facts

The OA programme 2006 – 2009 was based on the results from the earlier SVEP project funded by the National Library. The SVEP project was a national project, covering a combination of several smaller projects, with a clear goal and an overall framework for development of technical infrastructure and standards for institutional publishing archives. The three projects – SVEP creating infrastructure, ScieCom creating awareness and DOAJ creating a service – have all been successful in setting OA development on the agenda

and in making the need for a more strategic approach visible concerning OA digital archives, access to Swedish research results and transition of traditional scientific publishing to electronic and OA publishing.

This success and the growing pricing problem in licensing triggered the National Library to take the lead in establishing a national OA programme, not withstanding some scepticism from research libraries, the DIVA community and other parties. Timing was difficult with very low awareness of OA among researchers and research funders.

A start up meeting giving an informative presentation of results and pointing to the need for common efforts in OA development was a turning point. The subsequent formal setting up of the Steering Committee changed the sceptical opinion.

Finally the real change in scepticism came with the choice of the former rector, Professor MD Inge-Bert Täljedal, as chairman. His candidature was met with broad support and trust.

In general SUHF/HE, the Swedish Research Council (VR), and The Royal Swedish Academy for Sciences have been very positive concerning the participation in the OA programme. The Knowledge Foundation later joined the Steering Committee as a member and funded projects with a focus on learning objects. The representatives are members as experts and represent their organisations but are *not* mandated to make commitments in policy issues or otherwise on their behalf. They can only make recommendations to their organisations on OA issues.

The OA programme is one of the many major tasks of the National Library within the national remit of coordination and development support.

The mission of the OA programme is

To promote maximum accessibility and visibility of works produced by researchers, teachers and students at Swedish universities and university colleges

The task of the steering Committee is stated in the following 6 objectives

- Promote co-ordination and development of standards and tools for electronic publishing at Swedish universities and university colleges
- Promote a rapid growth of the volume and diversity of material in academic repositories
- Promote access to and use of content in academic repositories and OA journals
- Secure long-term access to digital publications and other material in academic repositories
- Develop quality standards for content and services in academic repositories
- Support publishing in OA journals and the migration of Swedish scientific journals to an OA model

The Steering committee agreed, in the very beginning of the OA programme, *that their*

*mandate was not to recommend OA publishing but to facilitate OA publishing.*

This agreement was based on a strategic discussion in the first meetings when establishing the OA programme.

The OA programme has therefore been a funding programme in a broader sense for development projects initiated by the participating institutions but not a funding programme for development of OA infrastructures or services within a strategic framework.

## **Facts about the OpenAccess.se programme**

The organisational structure has been set up in a traditional way, a Steering Committee consisting of 11 persons – a chairman and 10 members and the Programme Coordinator as secretary. During the period the Steering Committee had 11 meetings and a total funding around 14 million SEK.

### Programme management

The programme management consists of the Programme Coordinator Jan Hagerlid for 60% of his time combined with support from professor Erik Sandeval using 15% of his time assessing project calls and establishing the OA programme in the period 2006 - 2007. For communication and web administration another 0.15 fte has been allocated.

The tasks of the programme coordination have been focused on accomplishing

- 6 projects calls
- 32 projects – communication, administration and funding
- 3 special seminars with around 35 participants each
- 3 conferences with around 120 participants each
- 3 project evaluations
- 1 final OA programme evaluation

All 6 objectives have been addressed, but not in an equal way. The programme intends to promote co-ordination and strategic planning across the 6 objectives in order to move the OA publishing development and change in paradigm. It also aims to provide a new framework for an active co-operation between libraries and leading organizations within Higher Education and Research.

The participating institutions can mainly be found among the leading university libraries and the libraries of university colleges in collaboration with universities and a few research institutions. 2 projects collaborate with publishers and a single company. The libraries of Uppsala, Lund and Göteborg Universities and Blekinge and Borås university colleges are the most active in taking the responsibility for project management. Approximately 35 different organisations are participating in development projects.

Looking at the 6 objectives the 32 projects divide like this:

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Standards and tools for electronic publishing | 5  |
| 2. Rapid growth of content                       | 15 |
| 3. Access to and use of content                  | 6  |
| 4. Long-term access to digital publications      | 1  |
| 5. Quality standards for content and services    | 1  |
| 6. Support publishing in OA                      | 11 |



Some projects address more than 1 objective. The following table shows how.

Ongoing projects	Objectives
Komplexa digitala objekt i öppna arkiv inom det konstnärliga forskningsområdet	2
Open Access för humanister och rättsvetare. En kartläggning av OA Access-publikationer och attityder i Norden	2 & 6
Forskningsdata inom humanistiska och konstnärliga vetenskaper – open access?	2
Open Access till forskningen bakom Nobelpriset - ett pilotprojekt	2
Forskarmöten om OA	2 & 6
Tidskriftsinformation till forskare Journal Info 2.0	1 & 6
OA-publicerade domänmodeller avseende vetenskaplig publicering och gruppstruktur : delprojekt II	1 & 2
Läroobjekt i öppna arkiv – nya krav och spännande kopplingar	2
Best Practices Guide to Open Access Journals Publishing	3
Aiding Scientific Journals Towards Open Access Publishing	3 & 6
Samlad ingång till och redovisning av svensk vetenskaplig publicering	1 & 2 & 3
Upphovsrätt i en ny publiceringsmiljö	6
Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)	6
Inventering av fördelar och nackdelar med Open Access för biomedicinska tidskrifter	6
Automatisk identifiering av citeringar i monografier i öppna svenska arkiv	2 & 6
OER i öppna digitala arkiv	2
Modell för att hantera komplexa digitala objekt i öppna arkiv - med utgångspunkt i konst och design	2
Parallellpublicering av vetenskapliga artiklar (PAVA)	2
Citeringsmönster	2
Open Access och informationsförsörjningen i privata företag	3
Development of Linköping University Electronic Press Publication Service	6
OA Utbildningspaket för forskare	3 & 6
Självarkivering och beslutsstöd för forskare vid publicering	2
Långtidsbevarande - från prototyp till fullfärdiga verktyg	5
Forskningsdata i öppna arkiv och universitetsarkiv	2
Publikationsstöd för forskare rörande Open Access	2 & 3 & 6
Kvalitetssäkring av svenska öppna arkiv genom certifiering	1 & 2
Tidskrifter elektroniskt! Bibliotek som stöd för publicering	6
A portal for doctoral e-Theses in Europe	4
ScieCom - Svenskt Resurscentrum för vetenskaplig kommunikation	6
Testbed för interoperabilitet	1
Söktjänst för svenska vetenskapliga publikationer	1 & 2 & 3

## Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands

In the following tables some national data on Open Access for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands are gathered from international databases in November 2009. The data are taken directly from the respective databases without further checking or correction. Not all databases may be up to date. In some cases repository managers do have to register their data pro-actively. It's not certain if they always do.

Annotations by Leo Waaijers:

1. Of the three countries, the Netherlands have the longest OA tradition. By the end of 2003 all Dutch universities did have an OAI compliant repository and in January 2004 the national OAI harvester and the DARE web site were inaugurated. This longer tradition may explain the higher figures for OA publications (row 45) and the percentage of OA articles in DRIVER (row 51)
2. Sweden is the country with the most OA mandates (rows 8 and 10). Denmark and the Netherlands have had done national cost-benefit analyses of OA (row 16)
3. The Springer experiment in the Netherlands seems to pay off (row 53 and 54) and might inspire Sweden to sort out a similar deal with Springer
4. With an average of 1 (Sweden and Denmark) and 1.5 (Netherlands) journal per publisher the OA journal situation in all three countries is very fragmented. Some form of cooperation might be sought. The successful [SciELO](#) approach (started in Latin America, but now exported to Spain, Portugal and South Africa) might be an interesting option in this situation

### Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands I

*The data are taken directly from the respective databases without further checking or correction. Not all databases may be up to date. In some cases repository managers do have to register the right data pro-actively. It's not certain if they always do. LW.*

Policy	Sweden	Denmark	Netherlands
Signatories of the Berlin Declaration Source: <a href="http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/signatories.html">http://oa.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/signatories.html</a>	8	5	18
OA mandate Research Council Source: <a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/index.php?sortby=country">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/index.php?sortby=country</a>	+ all disciplines	+ for humanities	—
Research Council pays OA fees Source: <a href="http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/authors/funder-policies/">http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/authors/funder-policies/</a>	+	+	+
OA mandates of universities	1 overall + 18 for doctoral	2 overall	7 for doctoral theses

Source: JH1 for Se, HMK2 for Dk, LW3 for NI.	theses		
Mandates registered in ROARmap Source: <a href="http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/">http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policysignup/</a>	4	1	2
Three highest places in top 400 of Institutional Repositories Source: <a href="http://repositories.webometrics.info/top400_rep_inst.asp">http://repositories.webometrics.info/top400_rep_inst.asp</a>	26 104 111	13 211 —	3 11 35
National OA cost-benefit analyses Source (Houghton studies): <a href="http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/Default.aspx?ID=316">http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/Default.aspx?ID=316</a>	—	+	+
<i>Cooperation</i>			
National coordinator	KB	DEff	SURF
<i>International cooperation</i>			
Nordbib	+	+	+
Knowledge Exchange	—	+	+
Europe: DRIVERII/OpenAire/COAR	+	+	+

## Some comparative Open Access data for Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands II

*The data are taken directly from the respective databases without further checking or correction. Not all databases may be up to date. In some cases repository managers do have to register the right data pro-actively. It's not certain if they always do. L.W.*

Infrastructure	Sweden	Denmark	Netherlands
Number of OAI repositories (excluding local sub-repositories) Source: <a href="http://www.openoai.org/countrylist.php?cContinent=Europe#Sweden">http://www.openoai.org/countrylist.php?cContinent=Europe#Sweden</a>	24	9	24
OAI repositories in DRIVER Source: <a href="http://search1.driver.research-infrastructures.eu/webInterface/repositoryList.do?action=load">http://search1.driver.research-infrastructures.eu/webInterface/repositoryList.do?action=load</a>	9	2	27
National harvester Source: <a href="http://repinf.pbworks.com/Harvesters+-+national+and+international">http://repinf.pbworks.com/Harvesters+-+national+and+international</a>	<a href="#">SwePub</a>	<a href="#">DFE</a>	<a href="#">Narcis</a>

<b>Content</b>			
Number of OA journals in DOAJ Source: <a href="http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=findJournals&amp;hybrid=&amp;query=sweden">http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=findJournals&amp;hybrid=&amp;query=sweden</a>	21	12	34
Of these: included in Scopus Source: <a href="http://info.scopus.com/detail/what/documents/Scopus_infosite_OA_list_2008_02_11.xls">http://info.scopus.com/detail/what/documents/Scopus_infosite_OA_list_2008_02_11.xls</a>	4	1	6
Number of OA publishers in DOAJ Source: <a href="http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=findJournals&amp;hybrid=&amp;query=sweden">http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=findJournals&amp;hybrid=&amp;query=sweden</a>	18	11	21
<i>Content in DRIVER</i>			
Total number of OA publications	31,367	6,867	181,094
<i>DRIVER subsets</i> Source: <a href="http://search1.driver.research-infrastructures.eu/webInterface/simpleSearch.do?action=load">http://search1.driver.research-infrastructures.eu/webInterface/simpleSearch.do?action=load</a>			
Doctoral theses	2,966	1,451	27,254
Published in the last 2 years	8,882	3,458	20,215
Published in the last 1 year	3,377	1,977	6,130
Published previous year (≈ 2008)	5,505	1,481	14,085
Rough estimate of production 2008 Source: JH <sup>1</sup> for Se, HMK <sup>2</sup> for DK, LW <sup>3</sup> for NI.	25,000	25,000	55,000
OA% of national production ≈ 2008 in DRIVER	22%	6%	26%
<i>Springer experiment</i> Source: LW <sup>3</sup>	—	—	+
OA articles in Springer 2009 (till Nov) Source: <a href="http://www.authormapper.com/">http://www.authormapper.com/</a>	77	60	923
Articles in BioMedCentral 2009 Source: <a href="http://www.authormapper.com/">http://www.authormapper.com/</a>	366	176	232

<sup>1</sup>Jan Hagerlid

<sup>2</sup>Hanne Marie Kvaerndrup

Data gathered in November 2009 by <sup>3</sup>Leo Waaijers

<mailto:jan.hagerlid@kb.se>

<mailto:hannemarie@kvaerndrup.dk>

<mailto:leowaa@xs4all.nl>

## Conclusions and findings

We have reached our following conclusions based on the interviews, mini workshop and survey results.

### **OA Programme – concept and remit**

#### ▶ Conclusions

- *Open Access is considered most important for the progress of research and education and is therefore an issue for national responsibility and action - also in a future OA programme*
- *The OpenAccess.se programme has been very successful by pushing the OA agenda, stimulating competence development and establishing a good platform for networking within libraries*
- *The OpenAccess.se programme has been utmost productive getting value for money in the successful building on top of earlier project results – build future OA initiatives on top of SwePub, PAVA and a continuation of DOAJ*
- *The OpenAccess.se programme lacks sustainability in development planning and funding*
- *The OpenAccess.se programme lacks a long term strategic framework and broader mandate*
- *International and Nordic collaboration should in future be more focused with the purpose to avoid parallel development and to obtain professional knowledge exchange*
- *Promotion of OA publishing and archiving - there is still a long way to go reaching out to the researcher environment and raising awareness of the OA publishing agenda*

The overall impression is that the OA Programme has been a success.

The coordinating role of the National Library has strongly been pointed out as fundamental in the achievements of the OpenAccess.se programme.

Our understanding is that the OA programme has been a catalyst for co-operation, networking and activities on a national scale. The OpenAccess.se programme has managed to get OA on the agenda of several important organisations as SUHF, the Swedish Research Council and the Swedish Knowledge Foundation. Although there have been critical comments with respect to aspects of the programme, the general impression was that without the programme not much would have happened.

The communication and collaboration between the research libraries has improved a lot during the period. Important key competences have been built up within the participating institutions through project development. Key competences are often owned by a small number of employees which causes a growing demand for collaboration and common development at a larger scale than at local level. Knowledge exchange and sharing of key competences at a national level are therefore seen as a key theme of a future OA initiative.

We have noticed that critical views have been concentrated on the missing strategic framework embracing the 6 objective areas with more focused project calls. A four year funding period seems to be a long time span. The technological development and the OA agenda internationally move at a quicker pace than anticipated. Development programmes normally have had a span of 5 years planning but to day a span of 2 year seems more adequate.

It has been stressed that there is a need for more sustainability in the development results. Many projects end up not having funding for a continuation neither in development nor in future maintenance. End-user services developed within a project may have problems with a running operation.

During the interviews the issue of missing collaboration at international level has been raised as problematic. During the last 4 years the OA programme has supported development projects as part of Nordic collaboration. International collaboration is considered most giving with regard to building up competences, reuse of products and developments already achieved.

Promoting OA is a very difficult task – everybody agrees to that! Much has been done both through the OpenAccess.se programme, strategic seminars, workshops and through the running projects and partners. But still there is a long way to go. The main actor – the researcher – remains to be reached. It is a common view that OA awareness raising is a continuing and important mission.

Our conclusions are supported by project managers views:

- The OpenAccess.se Programme has had a big impact and there was great consensus concerning recommendations for a continuing OpenAccess.se programme with funding for promoting OA publishing and development of services and infrastructure
- The OA programme functioned as a meeting place for OA developers
- The Programme enabled to work closely with the real user - the researcher - through its projects
- Raising awareness and promoting OA are still key issues to be addressed very strongly
- National development programmes have not always been successful but is very much needed
- Setting up national programmes requires involvement of the right organisations, key persons or groups
- Timing is seen as most important in order to meet the right needs and willingness to commitment
- More need for sustainable projects and more room for long term strategies in development projects as prototype development are needed
- There is a need for more focus on funding issues concerning development of national infrastructure and future financing models for publication fees
- A national development network for OA development is very important

Interviews with the Steering group members and stakeholders tells us:

- OA is the most important theme to day and it is not acceptable that society pays twice for research results
- The OpenAccess.se programme has succeeded in getting the university

management and libraries to collaborate much more in connection with implementing the digital archive systems and services. SwePub is the testimony of this operation

- The OpenAccess.se programme supports the local process of collaboration with researcher and HE management
- The National Library has had great influence on development of the infrastructure through its facilitating and coordinating role and by establishing and taking the lead of the OA programme
- The projects have made a difference in the development of an OA infrastructure and raising awareness; the discussion of OA questions have been vivid in the universities but only within a small group of researchers and teachers
- OA should be addressed in collaboration by Research Councils, HE institutions, National Library and research libraries alike

## Organisational structure and governance

### ► Conclusions

- *The Steering Committee and programme management have worked well*
- *The chairman - an important and diplomatic role - has operated in a very professional way*
- *The impact of being a member of the OA Steering Committee has supported a change of opinion i.e. becoming Pro OA*
- *The board need more balance in representations of research libraries and HE institutions and researchers*
- *Scientific publishers view have been missing*
- *Stronger and broader mandate and commitment in Steering Committee could have supported the OA progress more actively*
- *Lack of strategic discussions and project planning*
- *Too many small projects - too few participating institutions*
- *Need for better coordination & communication between programme management and project participants*
- *Need for more reuse and visibility of OA project results*
- *More focus on timing and readiness in order not to lose momentum*

When the National Library in 2005 established the OA programme the awareness and interest in OA publishing were not strong within the research environment and HE institutions were not yet implementing OA publishing policies. Research libraries were still the most proactive organisations at the stage of OA. This picture was reflected in the Steering Committee where interviewees have had the impression of an imbalance in favour of the research library view although the scientist view has been very present as Professor Erik Sandeval participated in a committed way in the programme management.

Based on the situation described it was a difficult task to establish a Steering Committee for OA development. The timing was not yet right for strong mandates and committed representatives from the various strategic stakeholders. The appointment of the chairman has had a great impact on the engagement of the members for the Steering Committee. Interviewees point out that he has played an important and diplomatic role in a very professional way. His background has shown to be very supportive for the progress and

cooperation within the Steering Committee. In the beginning of the programme committee members have been very positioning but corporation improved. All members contentment regarding positive collaboration increased over time.

A common impression is that lack of strategic discussions and planning have influenced the impact of the OA programme and slowed down the progress of OA developments. The choice of the strategic objectives and focus areas for developments are in general considered successful and the results productive. Interviewees have underlined that the impact of the programme in future should be more focused and result-oriented and there seems to be consensus for larger and more strategic development projects. More focus on timing and readiness should be part of a future strategic approach in order not to lose momentum.

Both members of the Steering Committee and stakeholders have underlined that the impact of being part of the OA programme make it more easy to convince other people and colleges at the institute and in organisations of the benefits of OA especially using Pro OA scientist as Erik Sandewall as a champion.

As member of the steering committee and being a chief librarian the conception shows an obligation to inform the HE management on the OA development and the important task of raising awareness among researchers. Participation in the OA programme gives high local impact and a basis for improving implementation of OA publishing policies as well as showing the benefits of OA.

Our conclusions are supported by project managers views:

- Setting up national programmes requires involvement of the right organisations/key persons/groups
- The OA programme should meet more the need for management, coordination, framework and strategic planning
- The mandating of the OA programme has been too narrowly as it is library based only - hopefully future OA programme will be broader in its mandate in order also to include other material as research data and support the researcher more actively in publishing
- Knowledge exchange between the stakeholders in OA is missing
- OA development is missing a "central" corporation for agreement between strategic partners as SUHF and VR. Commitment and funding are needed for building the national infrastructure based on metadata standards & other technical standards
- In order to accelerate the transition from paper journal publishing to electronic publishing there is great need for coordinated support

Interviews with the Steering group members and stakeholders tell us:

- It is evident that a *national mandate* of the OA programme could have had a stronger impact
- The overall impression is that the Steering Committee has worked very well
- Consider the OA question as a general question for all HE institutions in its role for knowledge dissemination, innovation, democracy and interaction with society
- Outside the library sector OA seems nearly unknown especially in the research sector and in the political and funding environment
- A future Steering Committee should have a much more clear position and a more official role in a collaborative way together with Research Council and SUHF



- A future Steering Committee should be more active towards government and coordinate the link between policy makers
- The choice of chair is very important and the age of the members should be considered if possible
- Subcommittees with strong representations from experts both from libraries and research

## **Programme management and operation**

### ▶ Conclusions

- *The programme manager - a dominant role – has been supportive for the funding process, the dialogue and the programme activities in a professional way*
- *Strategic seminars and workshops have been very supporting for knowledge exchange and collaboration*
- *The communication part has lacked a professional journalistic touch*
- *Need for better coordination & communication between programme management and project participants*
- *Focus has mostly been addressing on raising awareness, building infrastructure and OA services*
- *Need for more reuse and visibility of OA project results*
- *The OA projects have been many and of very different size*

The overall impression is that the Programme Coordinator has made a productive administration of the OA programme which has supported the decisions and the implementation of the programme in general.

The Programme Coordinator has been very professional in his guidance, information and feed back. In specific he has been very fair in order to avoid a funding concept of only "sharing the money". The support of the decision process has been very helpful and instrumental. There has been very good focus on quality in the project applications.

From the interviewees and the workshop with projects managers we learned that:

- The programme coordinator has played a dominant role in implementing strategic seminars and workshop activities in order to
  - assure a quality process
  - meet the 6 objectives
  - focus on performance
  - stimulate the dialogue between the programme and applicants
  - support the decisions in the steering committee
- Programme coordination should give more guidance and recommendation to the applicants both in application process and to project managers during the project period
- Feed back between projects has been disappointing and there is a weak coordination between projects. There is an expressed need for project manager meetings and/or workshops
- There is a need for stronger requirement and encouragement for cooperation between both libraries and HE institutions & research. Too few institutions participate in projects development

- Change in the project application procedure could be of benefit in order to involve more institutions and get more innovative projects ideas. A call for project concepts and ideas before defining project calls or for workshops for selling & testing the idea/concept to relevant/strategic partners were suggested
- Future funding requirements should include
  - a long term management and sustainability plan if relevant in projects
  - an international & national development check to avoid parallel development
- Project results and participating partners should be more visible at the KB web - the communication part lack professional journalistic touch
- Need for support systems for the researchers and the research groups in OA publishing

## **The role of the National Library**

### ▶ Conclusions

- The coordinating role of the National Library has strongly been pointed out as fundamental in the achievements of the OpenAccess.se programme
- The National Library has had great influence on development of OA infrastructure through its coordinating role and by taking the lead of the programme
- The National Library made good management and facilitation of the OA programme
- Clear information concerning the National Library role or responsibility in connection with long term preservation was missing
- The National Library should take the lead and facilitating role at national level in a future OA programme
- The National Library should take the lead in the paradigm shift in scientific publishing – but in close corporation with strategic stakeholders as SUHF (HE), VR (research council, Analyse Department, Infrastructure Department), The National Library & Research Libraries
- Achievement of a national mandate for a future OA programme

The overall impression is that the National library has been very good in managing the OA programme but have underestimated their actual role and position. They should feel more secure towards the researcher environment. The National Library should certainly be encouraged to continue their developments and coordination within OA.

It is important to use the role of the National Library more strongly and in a more strategic manner. The National Library has been given the coordinative role at national level within the Swedish library sector and as such has the possibility to take contact directly to the Research Council (VR) and governmental departments in order to raise awareness and promote OA.

Interviewees have told us that there has been confusion about the National Library role concerning long term preservation. There has been no clear information on responsibility and development plans. It is a new and very important task that needs new funding and therefore it is very important that the National Library are aware of the criticism.

Our understanding is based on the following opinions from interviewees and workshop with project managers:

- The National Library could start the discussion on national level for future strategic planning, development, coordination and maintenance of the digital research information infrastructure
- The National Library should invite SUHF on board to discuss the OA agenda based on “what is” , on the obvious benefits of OA for researcher, HE and society and on the existing infrastructure facilitated by the libraries
- The National Library is the most potent organisation in the OA context – could be the one to take the lead for getting things happen
- During the OA programme The National Library has taken responsibility for long term preservation but has not yet been very clear about its role or development plans. It is necessary to be clear about who has the responsibility for funding, development and maintenance of the digital archives – The National Library, Research Council or the HE institutions?
- University colleges should be part of the shared repository infrastructure

## Focus areas and development

### ► Conclusions

*Strong consensus on recommendations for a future OA programme based on strategic framework with clearer goals, bigger projects, broader commitment is needed! Focus on critical mass of quality content to show benefits OA development and network at national level in collaboration with the right stakeholders! Build on top of achieved successes!*

#### *Successes projects:*

- *SwePub*
  - *has had great impact on national level*
  - *raised quality level in the local archives and metadata*
  - *supports higher ranking of the publications*
  - *solved the problem with the different technical platforms for digital archives*
  - *played an important role for quality and government evaluation*
  - *involved successfully the strategic partner, Libris*
- *PAVA*
  - *has had an important impact by getting closer to the researcher and the academic society*
  - *raised OA awareness in researcher environment by involvement of the researcher directly in a practical way*
- *DOAJ*
  - *has made Swedish research results visible on global level*
  - *acts as excellent end-user tool*

#### *Disappointing events:*

- *Copyright project most disappointing event for promoting OA as copyright issues are main focus for researchers*
- *Missing Nordic and international collaboration – Norway seems to be ahead of Sweden with respect to OA*
- *Missing strategic agreement for promotion of OA*
- *Different pace of OA development and missing policies in HE institutions*
- *Quality in content and IR services have not high priority*

- *Government reaction in connection with bibliometric evaluation – would not wait for SwePub*

In general the findings concerning the impact of the OA programme are very positive. The OA programme has succeeded in getting the university management and libraries to collaborate in connection with implementing the digital archive systems and services. During the 4 year programme period this collaboration has improved a lot and SwePub is among others the testimony of this operation. OA programme shows to support the local process of collaboration between library, researcher and HE management.

Strategic seminars and workshops have been very supportive for knowledge exchange and collaboration in a broader sense. The OA programme has functioned as a meeting place for those who work within OA. The OA programme as such is still unknown outside the library sector. The library image continues to be a problem and should be addressed in a future OA programme.

The projects have made an important difference at institutional level in the development of the OA infrastructure and raising awareness concerning the OA publishing issues. The discussion of OA questions are very vivid in the universities but mostly within a small group of researchers and teachers. Direct results are development of standards and products supporting the development of the information infrastructure that everybody needs.

When looking at the priorities of the programme project funding has had higher priority than strategic planning and policies for OA promotion. The OA projects have been many and of very different size. The focus has mostly been addressing objectives building infrastructure, OA services and increase content. The impact has been important and has had very useful results for future developments. The most successful results can be a solid foundation for future strategic OA developments. The OA projects have indirectly pushed the OA agenda in right direction.

Parallel publishing seems to be the easiest way to go and are recommended in the few publishing policies in HE institutions. The argument for parallel publishing is higher citation rate. The PAVA project has been very successful in getting closer to the researcher and the academic society involving the researcher directly in a practical way. Also projects as [Creating Open Access Information for Researchers managed](#) to involve the researchers throughout the country in workshops giving information on OA publishing benefits such as citations. This project is still running and has been supportive to the decision for an OA mandate by the Swedish Research Council on 7 October 2009.

The DOAJ service - in fact an international service - has over the years had great impact making OA publishing visible at global level. This service is an excellent showcase for building sustainable service based on a former development project. The strongest recommendation drawn from the results of this evaluation is that of *building a strategic framework on top of successful projects*.

International and Nordic cooperation have had low priority and there seems to be some parallel development happening were at least some knowledge exchange could support progress in both development of infrastructure, services and raising awareness.

The most interesting lessons learned come from the disappointing events like in the Copyright project with no results and no progress. Copyright seems to be the greatest obstacle for implementing OA. It has been a bad experience for promoting OA as copyright issues are a main focus for researcher community.

As mentioned earlier the intention of this evaluation has not been to look into the results of every single of the 32 projects of the OA programme. 16 projects are still running and the impact will not be known until 2010 or even 2011.

Many of the project have addressed very important issues and the reuse of the results are essential for future benefit in the OA context.

When interviewing the participating stakeholders and projects managers the focus has been on success and lessons learned through disappointing events and experiences. The results mentioned will therefore be focused on the few most important and strategic projects and their impact and results.

It is important to us to mention that we have met very high engagement and the evaluation shows that the successes and results of the OA programme belongs to the participating institutions and employees.

Our conclusions and findings concerning the impact and results of the OA programme are expressed in the following advise and wishes for a future OA initiative:

The following describes opinions on future focus areas and development themes based on both survey, project manager view and members of Steering Committee view.

A future OA programme:

- An overall strategic planning is needed combined with acting on *what is going on just now and long term perspective requirements*
- A yearly adjustment of strategy and objectives
- A strategic goal to provide the best access to scientific knowledge and the best services for OA publishing
- Recommendation supporting green road publishing for near future – support gold publishing for long term future
- Build on top of successful ongoing successful activities and projects, competences and corporations in a broader framework
- Focus on partnering, coordination, sustainability, professional involvement
- Evaluate applications with programme objectives and strategic development plans
- evaluate project results in a more strategic way in order to build on or reuse of results
- Evaluate applications towards earlier results in order to avoid making almost the same solution twice
- Allowing projects in future to focus on many different information/material types as research data and learning objects
- Allow all kinds of projects even small ones but coordinate them in a more tight strategic framework
- Building the bridge between Libraries and Universities

Suggestions for future strategic developments:

- SwePub (building infrastructure)

- Suggestion for using SwePub for future self archiving service
- Libris should take long term preservation up
- ++ adding services and facilities

- DOAJ (concept for end-user services)

Recommendations for future services and projects for researcher services in OA publishing  
++ building new services

- PAVA (sustainable content)
  - Long term maintenance plan for DOAJ as a national service and supporting tool for OA visibility
  - Negotiation of new OA publishing/financing models
  - ++ filling archives activities

Strategic themes for a coming OA programme:

- Promoting OA (green and gold publishing and archives)
- Raising OA awareness
- Copyright issues (guidance, service, mandate, publisher contracts)
- Institutional embedding of repositories (Complex data models, Research data, learning Objects)
- Quality of content and services
- Policy and strategy (Local publishing policies at HE institutions/legal deposit/mandates)
- Funding of OA publishing (financing models, migration from subscription to OA licenses)
- Quality & evaluation tools/methods (Peer review models, Citation & usages metrics)
- Sustainability of results/services
- Stakeholder co-operation and involvement (Infrastructure Committee?)
- International collaboration – direct or indirect by participation or reuse of models and experience?

## Part 2 Recommendations for future OA funding initiatives in Sweden

We here present our recommendations for future OA initiatives based on the results of the running OpenAccess.se programme as well as what we learned from the interviewees and project managers. In our recommendations we also combine the knowledge of ongoing trends in international and Nordic OA activities and developments.

We present our recommendations by answering the questions:

- Why make a new OA programme?
- What should be addressed in a new OA programme?
- Who should participate from the group of important stakeholders?
- How could a future OA programme be conceptualized?

### Why ? : Access to knowledge as a mission

- *Open Access is vital in a Knowledge Society*
- *Open Access is a key component in a future information infrastructure supporting the national educational system, research environment and business & industry*
- *Open Access is necessary in the global competition*
- *Open Access is already here and is growing everyday*

The most important challenges of our time are global by nature and concern climate, health and diseases, energy, water and food. To meet them, international cooperation and open knowledge exchange are imperative.

The ongoing paradigm shift in scholarly publishing during the last years make the needs for standardisation, interoperable infrastructure and services extremely visible and urgent.

Today, the most strategic challenges for further & higher education as well as for research are this very internationalisation, global competition, employability & skills combined with high level of mobility. And you can ask *What has this to do with Open Access?*

The global knowledge society is developing very quickly and all our institutions, whether it be further & higher education and even industrial companies, are interconnected through a complex information infrastructure with growing interoperability.

Access to the latest and most important information has become a key factor in the knowledge environment and this creates a growing demand for seamless & mobile information services based on merging facilities and data infrastructures across institutional borders.

Growing competition between HE & further educational institutions combined with the change in research evaluation and research funding at international level make the global

visibility of the scientific knowledge production extremely important and essential for Sweden.

*Open Access is the vehicle to achieve this scenario*

Furthermore, the knowledge society also embraces the educational system and as Yngve Wallin, who is representing the Knowledge Foundation, has expressed: " *A strong educational system needs open and free access to learning material of all kinds including research. OA publishing supports long term preservation, access, overview, and also quality in the OA archives framework. Knowledge Foundation want to use the OA infrastructure as basement for building the future educational system*".

### **The most important incentive is the new OA mandate decided by the Swedish Research Council in close collaboration with SUHF**

Based on these conditions, the growing need for a well functioning research information infrastructure at a national level is now certainly supported by right timing and right conditions for setting up a new OA funding and development initiative.

#### ► Recommendation

*The question is not **if** there should be an OA programme but*

- *What are the key targets & domains*
- *Who are the key stakeholders*
- *How to design the concept*

#### ► Recommendation

*Define your mission considering the challenging conditions for OA publishing, globalisation and competition in HE and research and the need for international visibility of Swedish scientific knowledge production.*

A mission could be to *build a national OA strategy embracing*

- *Influence and support a national OA policy*
- *Financing models for development and long term management of future OA research information infrastructure and services*
- *Financing models for transition from traditional scientific publishing to OA*
- *Interoperability between CRIS systems and IR*
- *Content - quality and accessibility*
- *Recommendation of Green Road short term & Golden Road long term perspective*
- *International collaborations using the Nordic OA initiatives and EU projects and organisations as drivers (Nordbib, EUROHORC, DRIVER, Knowledge Exchange and others )*

Embarking on such a mission can be very ambitious and may be difficult to agree upon among all strategic stakeholders given the complexity of the different organisational conditions and state of development which the target environments are facing. Yet it will



be essential to do so and define the right level of ambitions and priorities within this framework.

“When you step into the intersection of fields, disciplines, or cultures, you can combine existing concepts into a large number of new ideas”

- Johanssen, 'The Medici Effect'

## Who? : Committed strategic partners

### ► Recommendation

*A new OA programme ought to have a strong clear policy position and mandate in order to build the future research information infrastructure. The only way to get that is by inviting the important and influential stakeholders on board.*

*Strategic partnering for a future OA programme should involve stakeholders:*

- *Who have influence at political level*
- *Who are able to participate in shared funding of the programme*
- *Who have a national role of coordination*
- *Who are able to mandate the implementation of the OA programme*

The OA Programme is not the only activity in “the Swedish world of OA “. Stakeholders such as SUHF, the Swedish Research Council and HE institutions are also working with OA development within their own remit. It is therefore most important to watch ongoing developments at national level and be aware of the right timing and the right stakeholders in connection with establishment of a new OA development programme and equal activities.

Most of the important stakeholders of scientific, scholarly publishing have signed the Berlin Declaration for OA - but have not yet implemented OA requirements actively as mandate or publishing policies.

A crucial step forward happened 5 October last, as the Swedish Research Council decided on an OA mandate - in combination with an expressed interest in using the SwePub database as an input for national research evaluation and funding. In 2008 the OpenAccess.se programme tried to influence the Swedish Research Council to take an OA mandate without result. This decision for an OA mandate will have great impact on the OA development in Sweden and also influence the set-up of coming OA initiatives.

The following stakeholders seem to be the most relevant:

- The National Library
- SUHF, Swedish Association of Higher Education
- VR, the Swedish Research Council
- KK, the Knowledge Foundation
- The Royal Swedish Academy of Science
- Research libraries

In fact all the above are currently members of OpenAccess.se. It could be considered to invite some of the absent organisations to participate in the programme at some level, e.g. organisations as:

- SULF, Swedish Association of University Teachers (researchers and doctoral candidates)
- Scientific publishers

With respect to the interrelations the questionnaire gave the following result:

<b>Possible roles: Stakeholder:</b>	<b>Coordination</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Political influence</b>	<b>Board</b>	<b>Subcom- mittee</b>
<b>NL</b>	x	x	x	x	
<b>SUHF</b>			x	x	
<b>VR</b>		x	x	x	
<b>KK</b>		x	x	x	
<b>Royal Swedish Academy</b>			x	x	
<b>Research libraries</b>		(x)		x	x
<b>Research Institutions</b>		(x)			x
<b>HE institutions</b>		(x)			x
<b>SULF</b>			x		x
<b>Scientific publishers</b>					x
<b>Nordbib</b>		x	x		
<b>EU projects</b>		x	x		

► Recommendation

*The National Library should take the role as coordinator and catalyst for the OA agenda at the national level in direct contact with:*

- *Governmental departments*
  - *Promoting the OA agenda*
  - *Getting a clear mandate and funding for long term preservation in collaboration with the National Archive*
  - *Take action for future funding of development and maintenance of the digital research information infrastructure in collaboration with KF, RC and SUHF/HE*
- *The Swedish Research Council (VR)*
- *SUHF, the HE management*
- *Strengthen the existing collaboration with SUHF in the Forum for library managers*
- *University colleges management for establishing shared repository infrastructure*

The National Library has - based on its remit from the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Education - the national responsibility for and coordinating role of all the Swedish libraries including responsibility for the national information supply to HE and Research through research & university libraries.

The National Library has had great influence on development of the infrastructure through its facilitating role and by establishing and taking the lead of the OA programme. The National Library has turned out to be the most important actor in the OA context.

The National Library could use the timing and momentum of establishing the new OA programme combined with their strategic position as national coordinator to raise the discussion about future strategic planning, development, coordination and maintenance of the digital research information infrastructure to a national level.

Based on the very positive results and evidence from the ongoing OA programme, the National Library has achieved a very solid basis in this context, and should be able to use this support to position itself more strongly and in a strategic manner.

## What? : Results of four strategic domains

### ► Recommendation

*The current OpenAccess.se programme has mainly focused on stimulating and coordinating local initiatives. There is now a need to capitalize on these existing activities and move towards a robust and convincing national operation.*

For all OA developments – be they institutional, national, disciplinary or global – three components are always vital for success: a robust interoperable *infrastructure*, sustainable *end-user services* and a critical coverage of good *content*. Although necessary, these components are not enough. OA to knowledge is not yet commonplace in the academic world, and established interests, prejudice and traditions stand in its way. Therefore *awareness raising* must play an essential role in the period ahead. The recommendations for new achievements will be structured around these four themes.

Although OA needs an integrated approach of practically all stakeholders in the research life cycle, their responsibilities and priorities may be different.

*Infrastructure* typically lies in the domain of the co-operating (national and institutional) libraries with their long tradition of organizing academic content and offering perennial access. Ultimately *end-user services* come down to a form of publishing in the genuine sense of the word, which is 'making public' and adding value. So, 'publishing agents' are the lead actors in this domain. The availability of the research results, or *content*, can be required by those who define the research conditions i.e. the funders. When they ignore the issue – as they have done in the past - their stance often results in access restrictions and complex licensing models by third parties i.e. publishers. Finally, raising *awareness* is a policy item, hence a direct responsibility of a body that represents the relevant policy makers at a national level.

## Infrastructure

The OA infrastructures should be robust, efficient and facilitating. This addresses the following issues: the quality of the metadata (deduplication, validation, metadata proxy, versioning, author and document identifiers), interoperability (common international standards & protocols), long term preservation, easy metadata entry (for non-professionals like authors or their secretaries) and the relation with CRIS-es for the supply of management information (project data, citations, usage). In the near future the OA infrastructure must also be adapted to more complex or structured objects like learning objects or enhanced research publications.

In a natural way libraries have taken responsibility for the development of metadata for research publications in connection with the management of the Institutional Repository and their interoperability on behalf of most of the HE institutions.

In the meantime existing research information systems – CRIS's – have developed or are developing modules for bibliometric evaluation of research based on citations and impact factors. In the Nordic countries the trend is to build the national research information infrastructure on top of both the existing CRIS databases and the network of institutional repositories.

SwePub, harvesting the local repositories and demonstrating the yield in a national portal, reflects these developments and can become the origin of a robust national knowledge infrastructure.

The interviews and questionnaire tell that SwePub:

- Has a great impact for all libraries, research and education HE as it is on national level,
- Encourages collaboration between the stakeholders,
- Supports making the Swedish research results visible on global level,
- Raises the quality level in the local archives in metadata of publications,
- Supports higher ranking of the publications,
- Overcomes the problem with the different technical platforms for digital archives,
- Plays an important role for quality and government evaluation,
- Gives the incentive for getting data correct and comprehensive in the local databases (IR)

It is not difficult to generate a long list of requirements and wishes for a national OA infrastructure based on ideas coming both from the Swedish OA community and from international experiences and developments. The main task for the next programme is the structuring, focusing and prioritizing of these ideas. It is obvious that SwePub should be at the basis for further developments at a national level, in close collaboration with Nordic and European developments.

### ► Recommendation:

*Give high priority (i.e. for the next two years) to:*

- *Smoothing the author workflow by implementing a personal one stop entry station for CRIS and IR*

- *Setting up a national aggregator of validated metadata as a basis for robust (inter)national services*
- *Stimulating the establishment of the national e-Depot for long term access to Swedish publications*
- *Aggregator and e-Depot should be interlinked thus forming the basis for sophisticated and robust OA to Swedish content.*
- *Integration with CRIS's and developing bibliometrics*

Other options compete for priority. One could think of digital author identification, citation and usage statistics, deduplication, versioning, certification of repositories, authority management (eID system), preparing repositories for enhanced publications and eLearning objects, professional repository services. Defining strategic priorities and planning of the OA programme is an ongoing process not only taking place up front.

## **End user services**

OA services can be initiated by practically anyone these days; they range widely, from mini – for example personal websites – via meso – for example institutional websites, publisher websites or disciplinary community portals – to macro services like Google Scholar. Also their business models may vary and range from public services to membership based services or they may generate their income from advertisements or end-users. In any case, they need to be demand driven and the future sustainability of a service should be a point of concern from its infancy.

In the OpenAccess.se programme, the issue of services was included in objective 3: 'Promote the use of material in open archives and OA Journals' but was addressed by other objectives as well, for example objective 6: 'Support publishing in OA journals and transition to OA models for Swedish scholarly journals'. DOAJ (originated outside the programme but supported by it) is an internationally renowned service and the recently started Nobel Prize winners project could become one. The portal of the SwePub project may be the demonstrator of the underlying infrastructure, it is also a service in its own right, and could develop into the national window of Swedish research results. Locally, libraries have developed services like filling the institutional web site and personal web sites with repository content. Sometimes management information could be generated based on combined data from the CRIS and the IR.

The interviews and questionnaire tell us that DOAJ:

- Has put Sweden on the global map,
- Gives great benefit to the researcher in the means of visibility,
- Offers a successful service,
- Is important tool for giving a good overview of OA journals and OA publishing development

It is not so difficult to fantasize about possible future services. To mention a few:

- Educational services (via the [OCW Consortium](#)) ,
- Disciplinary or subject based services (at a Nordic level like [hprints & Humanities](#)),

- Citation services for end-users (like presenting the h-index),
- Cream of Science (Nobel winners)
- DOAJ continuation - long term maintenance plan for DOAJ as a national service and supporting tool for OA visibility
- eID federation services like [WAYF](#) (DEFF) (supporting seamless access)
- Federated search
- Presentation tools for scientific data
- New OA publishing/financing models (in co-operation with [OASPA](#))

#### ► Recommendation

*The main task for the period ahead is selecting a limited number of services on the basis of need, sustainability and added value. Natural candidates are DOAJ, the Nobel Prize winners project (later to extend to Nordic and European level), a Nordic publishing service for one or more 'Nordic disciplines' (in co-operation with [OASPA](#)) and, not to forget, a service in the educational area (to be determined).*

## Content

Research culminates in articles that are indispensable for new research and education, for knowledge transfer to business & industry, for policy decisions and for creating a public cognitive basis in a democratic knowledge based society. OA to this content may be a condition that funders - not only research councils, but also universities, charities, innovation funders and even companies are relevant funders in this respect – could pose to their funding. This makes them the natural agents to stimulate OA coverage. Researchers can comply with such a requirement in two ways. The obvious one is publishing their article in an OA journal. The other one is parallel publishing. In that case the article is published in a classical toll gate journal, but the author either retains the right to circulate a peer reviewed version of her article via an OA repository or gains permission by the publisher to do so.

Funders might take a three step approach.

The first step is at the mission or vision level. It comes down to taking a position vis-à-vis the idea of giving OA to the results of (publicly financed) research results. A good example of such an initial step is signing the Berlin Declaration as has been done now by over 250 (mainly European) organisations

The next step is a strategical one. It implies the recognition that publishing is inherent in the research cycle. As a consequence publishing costs are to be accepted as a normal post in the research budget, just like costs for computers, laboratories, data gathering or visiting conferences. The business model of OA journals is based on this approach. Currently, only about 15% of the journals operate such a model. To accelerate the transfer from the classical toll gate publishing system to OA publishing (a consortium of) funders could stimulate the publishing market.

As long as the OA market falls short, an intermediate tactical step may be necessary. Funders could mandate authors to maximize OA to their work via parallel publishing. This is a new task for authors that may need guidance.

As the Berlin Declaration has been signed by the Swedish Research Council and other relevant national organizations, step 1 seems to be accomplished in Sweden.

On 5 October 2009 the [SRC announced an Open Access mandate](#). This mandate addresses both the steps two and three.

For step 2, several further initiatives can be taken. Like the SRC, universities could accept publication fees as normal posts in a research budget and for example sign in on the [Open Access Compact](#), an initiative of five prestigious research universities in the US. Swedish research funders could sign on to the Compact. But this and similar initiatives may imply that, until the moment that subscriptions can be canceled, extra money is needed for the publication system. The Springer experiment is meant to exactly avoiding this. So, a Swedish attempt to participate in this experiment could be well worth the effort. In the meantime the growth of Open Access options should be stimulated by supporting the transition of classical journals to Open Access mode or by creating an incentive for the creation of new ones.

For some time to come, the majority of articles will presumably still have to be published in toll gate journals. Two-third of these journals allow authors to publicly circulate a peer reviewed manuscript of their article after an embargo period. Most authors do not use this permission spontaneously but funders could make its utilization a requirement for funding as the SRC did. This concerns step 3.

If an author wants to publish in a less-permissive journal, she must find a way to comply with this mandate (unless the mandate has an opt-out clause). She may do so by retaining the right of parallel publishing. For that purpose, the European Commission, who have posed such an overall mandate, have drafted a short license in all European languages that can be used by authors. It complements the usual copyright transfer form of the publisher.

Apart from this legal aspect, parallel publishing comes down to the depositing by the author of the peer reviewed manuscript (post print) of their article in the repository of their institute. The metadata of the manuscript should include the embargo period and a reference to the metadata of the officially published journal version for citation purposes. During the embargo period, potential readers could request a copy of the manuscript from the author.

Authors may need some reassurance in their new role as 'parallel publisher'. It concerns explanation, easy workflows and guarantees that embargo periods and citation counts will be handled properly.

Increasing the volume and diversity of content in open archives has been one of the six objectives of the OpenAccess.se programme, and quite a few projects were related to this objective. Some of the projects were quite specific, aiming at complex objects, research data, educational resources, doctoral theses or Nobel Prize awarded work.

In the interviews and the questionnaire PAVA was mentioned most frequently in this context as successful in:

- getting closer to the researcher and the academic society
- raising awareness in researcher environment as it involves researchers directly in a practical way



## ► Recommendation

*PAVA could be the starting point of a more coherent and structured approach with a focus on OA to top quality content i.e. articles, doctoral theses and lecture notes. The central theme should be: **Author convenience***

A contribution to transparency could be a register of accredited OA platforms that comply with the SRC mandate and can be used by authors without further concern or troubles. Of course, DOAJ could be the start of such a register. It could be extended even further by accepted proposals of a call for OA platforms that meet the funders' requirements. A bundling of such a call at Nordic level could augment its status.

Extra supportive actions could be:

Collecting the material of champions e.g. Nobel prize winners

Offering to authors the automated updating of their personal web sites

Prioritize OA journals in the bibliometric evaluation system

Tuning Swedish actions with the agenda of EUROHORCS

## **Awareness**

Publisher reluctance is not the only factor standing in the way of implementing OA. There may be a general sympathy in academia with OA as a principle, but hesitations and misunderstandings are quite persistent as well. They concern ideas about costs, quality, copyrights and permanence. At a concrete level, most of these problems can simply be cleared but articulated objections sometimes may be rationalisations of an underlying aversion towards change. Yet another complication is that quite a few researchers in universities simply are not aware of the fact that the easy access to practically all content they enjoy is not based on OA but on large sums paid by their library.

In general, the awareness issue has been underestimated by advocates of OA. To them, the OA case was so self-evident that it needed no further promotion. OpenAccess.se suffered from this naivety as well.

Defining a clear OA policy and its advocacy were not included in the six main objectives of the Programme. There has however been one major advocacy project, OA information for researchers, that has built a website with Open Access information and organized a series of seminars for researchers at a number of HE institutions. These seminars have been successful in attracting researchers but of course there is still a long way to go to fulfil the information needs of the whole research community. In a few projects, awareness was a side effect of the primary project goal e.g. in PAVA.

Yet, this objective was dearly missed in the Programme. The questionnaire and the interviews expressed the following re. promotion:

- did not spread the word on AO publishing very well
- did not raise enough OA awareness
- has not been really promoting (there seemed to be disagreement on the strategic goal of promoting vs explaining OA)



And a list of comments referred to the lack of a clear strategy and overall planning. It was often unclear how smaller projects fitted into a national framework.

► Recommendation

*To achieve a breakthrough, an authoritative and highly visible policy is needed. Such a policy must be formulated at a national level by a committee or board, representing all relevant stakeholders, in a truly committed setting. The policy should not only include a vision statement, but define a **national Open Access agenda** as well. Promotion of this policy has to cover all echelons, from minister to individual researcher, and this is a professional task of the secretariat of the board. The implementation of such an OA policy belongs to the responsibilities of the management of stakeholders' institutions as well (the National Library, HE institutions and Research Councils).*

Instruments for this domain could be:

- Publishing policies in HE institutions and research institutions
- National OA policy actions like
  1. agreements with ministries
  2. strategic meetings on government level – supported by experience from Nordic countries and EU
  3. Showcases for political decisions (demonstration of benefit)
  4. Support of gold publishing through highlighting OA journals in the bibliometric evaluating system
- Strategic seminars on political level
- Ambassadors and advocacy for OA at local level (champions & young successful researchers showing the way)
- Celebrating common milestones

## How? : Framework and concept

### **Strategic framework**

We use the concept of a strategic framework to define the environment in which the OA programme will work, the set up of strategic partnering, the funding model including target groups for funding and the development areas both at national and local level.

The strategic framework lays the basis for the mission and vision of the OA programme as well as for the overall OA policies.

► Recommendation

*We recommend to elaborate in a committed setting a strategic framework as a basis for a new OA programme:*

- *Capitalizing on the successful ongoing activities and projects*
- *Reusing key competences and corporation networks*
- *Concentrating on few, but large collaborative projects*
- *Consolidating the emerging national infrastructure*

- *Focusing on coordination, sustainability, professional involvement and partnering*
- *Focusing on sustainability in services and financing models*
- *Focussing on seamless end user facilities across institutional borders*

Based on the lessons learned and the knowledge we received from our interviews as mentioned under *Conclusions & findings*, it seems that the great success of the OA programme today comes from building on top of earlier successes, reusing key competences, networks and corporation networks. This experience supports the approach of building a strategic framework for development projects, provides and secures long term results and contributes to more sustainability in results and products.

The strategic framework should form the basis for defining the overall:

- Framework for strategic partnering
- Funding structure of the programme i.e. stakeholder funding
- Funding and participation requirements
- Decision model for funding
- Communication strategy visualising the
- Scope of promotion and recommendation of OA policies and consequences

In fact, the target groups that the OA programme will address constitute a landscape of many different kinds of institutions and environments. They have all very different remits, policies and realities. Each of them has its own context within which development of technical infrastructure, services, policies, user needs & behaviour are considered most specific to the particular institution, e.g. the impact of the [Bologna Process](#) within the HE environment. But nevertheless, they need a basic research information infrastructure e.g. the institutional repositories with basic components and facilities, with basic work flows which will be embedded in all systems.

The point is that the needed interoperability, workflow and integrated services involve and interact across the IT systems in HE institutions, further educational institutions and research libraries. Each of them has to develop and maintain the infrastructure and services and all need to employ professional key skilled people.

#### ► Recommendation

*We recommend to develop a "blueprint" (in the meaning of a map) of the OA environment as a basis for making the strategic framework defining the national information infrastructure and its components relevant for the OA funding programme.*

If one projects that the future OA programme should have significant impact, it should aim to 'break new ground' and have some innovative and exciting aspects. One of the commonly known ways of getting some originality into one's thinking is to work across knowledge domains.

If change is to be brought about, then it is imperative that everyone involved in, or affected by the transition has a clear and agreed upon view of what the new state, structure, culture, environment or way of working will be.

The intention by making a blueprint as bases for developing the strategy framework is to support the process of defining the environment within which the OA programme will act

more foreseeable and easy to communicate. The funding targets could primarily be the development of system solutions, standards and professional services for building the national information infrastructure and make it interoperable. Secondly, change supportive projects - which means projects that serve change in publishing workflows, OA access facilities in Institutional Repositories, author supporting facilities and services. The idea of having a primary layer and a secondary layer of funding is to support keeping the focus when setting up funding calls and making decisions concerning *invited* development projects.

## **Vision & objectives**

Focus the OA programme on the development of the layer of shared national facilities and information infrastructure as primary target for funding and change supportive project and activities as secondary funding targets.

### ► Recommendation

*Build a vision which can be used for creating ownership of a national development of infrastructure & services facilitating the scientific information flow from researcher to end user. The vision should embrace the specific strategic goals for the OA programme in order to strengthen the mission of building a national and corporative OA strategy. The vision can act as a tool for clear communication.*

Vision is about *ownership, ambition and success criteria* to be achieved through a strong “committed” vision which:

- Gives *prestige and dignity* to promotion of OA publishing
- Visualises the *benefits* for research & education
- Puts the *end-user* in focus
- Sets *ambitions* to strengthen the mission of building a national and corporative OA strategy
- Defines the *success criteria*
- *Prioritizes* ambitious goals and objectives

Define the vision and priorities of the objectives based on recommendations from national and international experts within the issues connected to the four domains:

- The most interoperable infrastructure through high common standards
- The best access to scientific knowledge by having a critical mass of quality content
- The best services for OA publishing facilitating the researcher and end user
- Promoting OA by raising awareness of the OA philosophy and consequences = green (short term) and gold publishing (long term)

Setting up the right vision and prioritized goals for funded development is most essential in order to get sufficient returns on investments. International experience within funding programmes shows the necessity of having the right portfolio of prioritized target areas defined in achievable and measurable goals and milestones in order to meet the strategic goals of the funding programme. A good international adviser on programme development and management is [JISC](#) who have a most effective development programme concept.

The results from the evaluation show that the programme concept with a 4 year

perspective on vision and objectives is too long and a risk for strategic development. The great risks are bad timing, losing pace, parallel development, developing unwanted services or products .

Designing the vision cannot be done without agreeing upon the right level of ambition to be set for the OA programme. Many visions are much too broad and “fluffy” in an attempt to embrace everything. The challenge of a true vision is to be selective. At the same time, the task is to create ownership and set up visionary goals that can be clearly communicated as well as being achievable.

In order to meet this challenge we recommend active “environment scanning”. This can be done through participating in knowledge networks both at national, international and Nordic level. It has to be a prioritisation activity both at task force level, programme management level as well as domains level.

Participation in Nordic and European development projects as DRIVER, Nordbib, Knowledge Exchange and others is highly recommended.

## Organisation

### ► Recommendation

*Set up the future OA programme organisation in a novel way using unconventional methods, making more proactive actions as well as finding new ways and possibilities.*

There will always be a risk when leaving the well-known models and methods. Reliability and robustness may be important and should not be forgotten when implementing a new, innovative solution.

We recommend the following concept for building up the organisation for the future OA programme in order to match the strategic partnership, secure right competences and keep the flexibility in programme management.

<b>OA Task force</b>			
Programme Management			
with expert committees for			
<b>Infrastructure</b>	<b>Services</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Awareness</b>
that are coordinated by responsible			
<b>Nat. Library</b>	<b>Diverse</b>	<b>SRC/SUHF</b>	<b>Prog. Mgt.</b>

International experience from similar initiatives ([Knowledge Exchange](#) and [DEFF](#)) show that traditional organisational structures have problems, concerning flexibility, as regards adjusting their strategies and developments quickly enough to the ongoing national, or international world and at the same time meeting the needs and mandates at stakeholder level.

We recommend that the National Library should take the leading and coordinating role on the national level and make strategic partnering with the major OA stakeholders, representing both the research funders, HE institutions, research environment, library and publishing sectors.

#### OA task force

##### ► Recommendation

*Establish an OA task force where strategic partnering is about getting ownership, funding, commitment and mandate for making decisions and common strategy. The members of the OA task force should represent high level management and political influence.*

The idea of using another name than 'steering committee' or 'board' is that of reflecting the strategic partnering and alternative remit. The *OA task force* should act in a non-traditional set up in the means of acting more progressively and at a higher political level.

Having the strategic mission of building a national and corporative OA strategy one has to think on a larger scale and out of the box. It is therefore important to have those stakeholders on board who have important influence and remit.

The Steering committee of the OA programme to day do in fact have representatives from the important stakeholders and there has also been funding from 3 important partners KF, SRC and the National Library. So what is the difference?

It is important to form a new kind of collaborative organisation in order to really move the OA transition forward and make the coming OA programme *a national OA programme* and hereby share the responsibility and funding for the scientific information infrastructure and services as well as quality content.

The *OA task force* should also in future represent the various key actors within the national scientific information infrastructure – HE & Further education institutions, Research funding as well as the research and library sectors.

Our recommendation may seem somewhat beyond reality and actual possibilities. But the point is that one has to start out with high ambitions and then adjust them to make the solution feasible in the context of the reality of today. As management wisdom has it, 'Think great, start small'.

So setting the right *ambitions and priorities* are key actions in this context.

In order to adjust the expectations of success of both the target groups and stakeholders we recommend you highly to prioritise the action of defining the level of ambitions and right priorities for goals and target issues when defining the strategic framework based on blueprint and professional input concerning the needs and visions for developments within the four domains.

The *OA task force* should act like a governing body with the Programme Manager as Executive. It should:

- Have a clear position and a more official role in a collaborative way
- Have the overall responsibility for the OA programme and funding
- Have the responsibility for the strategic framework and overall action plans based on the advisory from the subcommittees
- Have the responsibility for the strategic OA promotion framework and overall action plans based on the advices of the subcommittees
- Take action on political and organisational level as ambassadors for OA promotion
- Meet twice annually
- Have a strategic seminar every year together with subcommittee chairpersons and special invited national/international experts.

Recommendations from interviews point out that the *OA task force* should be a small and effective group and that the choice of the chair is most important in order to meet the ambition and results of the future OA programme. The age of the members should be considered.

#### Expert committees in four domains

##### ► Recommendation

*Establish 4 subcommittees representing the four domains of the programme in order to have the right key competences on board covering the important skills and knowledge of the domain environment and the subjects of development.*

The subcommittees will be representing the four strategic domains of the future OA programme based on the most successful developments which are SwePub, PAVA , DOAJ and the strategic seminars as mentioned:

- Infrastructure (technical standards, metadata, interoperability, long term maintenance, quality certification)
- Content (critical mass, full text, research data, learning objects, quality management, access management)
- Services (quality in service, advisory, e-publishing....)
- Awareness raising & promoting OA

As mentioned earlier the *OA task force* represents the high level management and funding but it does not necessarily have the skills concerning the development issues of the specific domains. The intention is that the subcommittees should have strong representations of experts both from research libraries, HE institutions, researcher environment and where relevant from the publishing part. The subcommittees should try to involve key persons and key organisations either as chairmen and/or ad-hoc members in specific questions when needed. It is important again not to have excessively large groups.

Each of the four subcommittees should:

- Develop a strategy and a portfolio of innovative projects and actions for the specific domain embracing the strategic goals of the framework
- Develop common visions and priorities of objectives
- Develop work packages and deliverables including milestones, success criteria and

risks as basis for strategic prioritising in the *OA task force* as well as programme management

- Be aware of the right timing in both national and local development/activities
- Be aware of the Nordic and International development and trends
- Have the overall responsibility for the implementation of strategy and action plan within their domain
- Act as experts on their domain towards the *OA task force* in a advisory manner
- Support the programme manager in guiding project applicants and managers as well as advising the task force in domain questions.
- Meet 4 – 6 times a year
- Participate in yearly strategic seminars with the *OA task force*

► Recommendation

*Make it attractive to be "member of the club"!*

Depending on the ambition level for the OA programme and its prioritized activities the involvement of key experts from the institutions as chairpersons for a domain can be difficult. Key competences are important for all institutions and the experts always have a high workload.

It is therefore important to stress that participation in the OA programme - both as member of the committees and as participating member in development projects and activities – will have great impact in means of productive collaboration, influence and insight, excellent competences and institutional position as being an active partner in the Swedish national OA development network.

## **Programme management**

The following 9 recommendations focus on tasks and instruments for the **programme management** based on the results of the interviews and experiences from international programme management especially [JISC](#), [Knowledge Exchange](#) and [DEFF](#)

► Recommendation

*2 years strategy period*

Depending on the nature of the future OA programme and funding conditions it is recommended not to make a strategy framework and a action plans for longer period than 2 years. International trends show that development and change in user behaviour is moving very quickly so it is important to remain flexible in strategy framework and funding strategy.

► Recommendation

*International review*

We recommend to have an international review every 2 years where key persons from international OA initiatives are invited to make a review of the OA programme in general, its strategy, progress and results seen in the light of international trends.

► Recommendation  
*Sustainability*

Sustainability is a most important issue to address when funding development projects. Sustainability can be seen in connection with the long-term strategy framework and funding of OA services or technical infrastructure.

Sustainability can be implemented in connection with funding requirements for the project budget either as a graduate funding method or as a requirement for a sustainable financing plan for the project after the end of the funding.

► Recommendation  
*Evaluation*

We recommend a more strategic evaluation concept in order to

- Evaluate applications with programme objectives and strategic development plan
- Evaluate project results in a more strategic way in order to build on, or reuse results
- Evaluate applications towards earlier results in order to avoid applying what is almost the same solution twice.

► Recommendation  
*Projects as strategic instrument*

Based on lessons learned and international trends we recommend that:

- Projects should focus on many different information/material types as complex publications, learning objects and e-research data
- Allow all kinds of projects even small ones but coordinated in a tighter strategic framework
- Combine both calls for project ideas and invited projects based on the strategic framework and on action plans from the subcommittees

► Recommendation  
*Programme administration*

We recommend that :

- Depending on the level of ambition and activities, *to strengthen and adjust the size of programme management secretariat* to match the strategic framework and organisation
- Programme coordination should give more guidance and recommendation to the applicants both in the application process and to project managers during the project period
- Strategy and action plans for the four domains
  - are clearly focused
  - have clear key goals



- include milestones
- define key responsibilities
- scan the environment concerning right timing in user needs and readiness
- Scan international/Nordic developments in order to avoid parallel development.

► Recommendation

*Communication*

We recommend a communication strategy that:

- Will give promotion of OA more prestige and dignity
- Communication from the OA programme and the task force is prioritised and at a professional level (outsourcing to professional staff?)
- Communication strategy for awareness raising
- On national level for mandating and funding,
- Institutional level for HE publishing policies
- The local level for researcher publishing behaviour
- To celebrate important events like achieving common deadlines, like the opening of SwePub

► Recommendation

*Showcases and strategic seminars*

We recommend using showcases and strategic seminars for political decisions, or directing focus to the benefits and consequences of OA publishing. For example, cost benefit models by new OA publishing concept by John Houghton, Australia (Knowledge Exchange). Showcases can be based on international results or development.

► Recommendation

*A knowledge network*

Building upon successes of the running OA programme – the strategic seminars – has been mentioned as important to continuation.

In order to strengthen the OA field we recommend establishing an *OA Knowledge Network at institutional level* in order to build on and maintain key competences at a national level and to support development strategies for digital OA repositories. A network combining the OA issue with the natural role of HE institutions for knowledge dissemination, innovation, democracy and interaction with society making knowledge transfer. This network could also create more informal structures between IT people and leadership. An *OA Knowledge Network* could also provide a framework for national/international co-operation and lobbying between libraries and organizations within Higher Education and Research.

## The evaluators

Leo Waaijers will act as co-evaluator and cover the European aspect of the evaluation.



Leo Waaijers (1938) studied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics in Leiden. In 1964 an almost lifelong career followed at TU Delft where he started as a scientist, including a Ph.D. in mathematics in 1968. In 1977 he switched to management, at first as the personnel manager of his department, to become member of the University Executive Board from 1984 to 1988. Following discontinuation of this position he was appointed University Librarian. In this function he realized a.o. the new library building for TU Delft, the merger with the Delft University Press and the transfer to the new library system Aleph. In 2001 he accepted a corresponding post at Wageningen University & Research Centre. From 2004 to 2008 he has been manager of the SURF Platform ICT and Research where he managed the national DARE programme. In April 2008 he has won the 2008 SPARC Europe Award for Outstanding Achievements in Scholarly Communications. Currently he is an independent consultant and member of the Advisory Board of the European DRIVER project.

Hanne Marie Kværndrup will act as primary evaluator and cover the Nordic aspects.

She worked as librarian until 1980. During the next 16 years she gained a wide experience of project management as independent consultant and in appointments as project manager from ICT development projects, professional cooperation projects, organisation development and knowledge-sharing projects. From 1996 - 2009 she was employed at the Danish Agency for Libraries and Media., primarily attached to the development and programme management of (DEFF).



Her assignments have been associated with the primary management of Denmark's Electronic Research Library (DEFF). She has as secretary for the DEFF steering committee taken part at strategic level in the preparation of the DEFF mission and vision as well as the policy concerning development of the digital research library through establishing and coordinating a large number of development and cooperation projects. These development projects have involved both research and education libraries, universities and institutions of higher education that do research. The last 3 years she has been involved in the Knowledge Exchange Initiative – a cooperation between JISC in Great Britain, SURFfoundation in Holland and Deutsche Forschung Gemeinschaft in Germany. The work as Partner Representative builds on her experience in international cooperation and particularly the development of knowledge-sharing activities, which she consider a great and very exciting challenge.

In 2003 she was given the responsibility for the preparation of the report on future publishing of scholarly journals in the Nordic countries *Future scholarly publishing – a Nordic collaboration project*. This task was commissioned by the Nordic Publishing Council (NOP-HS). During 2006 - 2009 she gained personal responsibility as programme manager for the Nordic e-publishing programme Nordbib under the Nordic Council of Ministers and Nordforsk. The mission of Nordbib was to extend and support the development of Nordic research infrastructure and research communication, spread the knowledge of Open Access and development of the digital research library in connection with e-publishing.