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Are you...

a. A librarian or other higher education staff?

b. Representing a Publisher?

c. An intermediary / agent?

d. A Researcher?
Key Players in Austria

**AUSTRIAN ACADEMIC LIBRARY CONSORTIUM**
- Launched in 2005
- 60+ members: public and private HEIs, Austrian Science Fund, Austrian Academy of Sciences, research institutes
- Bottom-up organisation
- Negotiations and licensing
- Since 2015: focus on OA agreements

**AUSTRIAN SCIENCE FUND (FWF)**
- The Austrian Science Fund (FWF) is Austria's central funding organization for basic research.
- OA Policy since 2004, OA Mandate since 2007
- Funding member of cOAlition S

**AUSTRIAN TRANSITION TO OPEN ACCESS PROJECT**
- 2017-2020, 2021-2024
- 24 universities and research institutes
- Analysis
- Networking
- Funding for OA agreements
Milestones in OA in Austria

- **First FWF OA policy**: 2004
- **Consortium established**: 2005
- **1st OA agreement: IOP**: 2014
- **Springer Compact**: 2016
- **Further agreements**:
  - 2017
  - 2018
  - 2021
- **AT2OA 17 consortial agreements**: TA and fully OA
- **Plan S**: 2022
# OA Agreements in 2022: consortial and local deals

## Fully OA Deals
- BioMed Central
- Taylor & Francis Group
- IOP Publishing
- SAGE Publishing

## Offsetting Deals
- Springer Nature
- IWA Publishing
- Wiley
- Royal Society Chemistry
- MDPI

## Read & Publish Agreements
- Emerald Publishing
- Elsevier
- Cambridge
- Thieme
- IEEE
- De Gruyter
- AIP
- Rockefeller University Press
- Brill
- The Royal Society
- John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Oxford University Press

## Local OA agreements @ Uni Wien
- Universitätsbibliothek Wien
- De Gruyter
- ScienceOpen

---
OA Coverage in 2022 among AT2OA participants

- > 84% in OA-ready venues
- 28% of articles published in fully OA journals
- 56% of articles published in hybrid journals participating in transformative agreements in 2022
Challenges: Impact analysis of the transition to OA

**Challenge 1: DATA**

Accurate data on publishing output required for OA deals:

- Negotiations
- Planning
- Cost-sharing
- Data received from publishers: suboptimal

**Challenge 2: MONEY**

- Is there **enough money** in the system in Austria if we were to flip to pay-as-you publish?
- How would a **full transition to OA** affect a given **institution's budget**?

---

**AT2OA dataset**

**AT2OA Post-transition study**

- Inspired by the Max Planck white paper*
- Building on the AT2OA dataset and
- Financial information

*Schimmer, R., Geschuhn, K. K., & Vogler, A. (2015). Disrupting the subscription journals’ business model for the necessary large-scale transformation to open access.
AT2OA Post-Transition Study

Bruno Bauer, Daniel Formanek, and Lothar Höbling,
AT2OA Dataset 2015-2020

**Affiliation:**
one or more authors affiliated with an AT2OA institution

**Document types:**
- articles (research articles)
- review papers
- Other documents

**Web of Science™**
Scopus

**Dataset enriched with data from:**
- Unpaywall
- DOAJ
- open@PC
- FWF Der Wissenschaftsfonds
- Crossref
AT2OA Post-Transition Study

Publishing data:
Subset of the 2018 AT2OA dataset, looking at the cost-relevant publications:
1. Affiliation: one or more corresponding authors with an AT2OA affiliation
2. Document type: article or review paper

Cost element – same year (2018):
1. Institutions’ electronic and print journal subscription fees
2. Institutional OA spend, including APCs currently paid through the libraries
3. APCs paid by the Austrian Science Fund on behalf of its grant holders
So, is there enough money in the system in Austria?

I. Institutional level

- Significant additional investment required
- Relevant spend in 2018

Relevant spend would be more than sufficient

Significant additional investment required
So, is there enough money in the system in Austria?

II. AT2OA-level

- Significant additional investment required
- Relevant spend would be more than sufficient
- c. 240K difference on AT2OA level

Legend:
- N. of articles x €2,500 (avg APC)
- Relevant spend in 2018
Uneven distribution across sectors

This chart looks at the data from another angle:

**Calculated existing spend per article, for each sector**

i.e.: what kind of APC would these institutions be able to afford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Colleges &amp; Universities</th>
<th>'Special' cluster</th>
<th>General Universities</th>
<th>Technical Universities</th>
<th>Life Sciences Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 articles</td>
<td>334 articles</td>
<td>4327 articles</td>
<td>1902 articles</td>
<td>3623 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€ 4454</td>
<td>€ 3853</td>
<td>€ 2975</td>
<td>€ 2189</td>
<td>€ 1650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project level calculated expenses per article: €2,476
1st cost-distribution model
SpringerLink: the pre-compact times

- Legacy pricing: based on previous print and e-sub holdings
- Publisher-led pricing
- No tiers or bands introduced by the Consortium
Springer Compact 2016 - 2018

Our first „read and publish agreement“

- First transformative agreement with a large publisher

Lump sum = set number of articles + reading

- On a consortium level. APCs on a first-come first-served basis.
- Cost allocation: based on previous spend
- Working group set up to assess and monitor the Agreement
Analysis: members spend vs APC value in 2016-2018
Springer Compact* 2019-2021 – new cost distribution model

Basis for the model

- Uneven patterns - data gathered for model:
  - 2016-2018 publishing patterns used a basis
  - Market value of APCs vs subscription spend
  - Gradual move towards a more publishing-output based model

Tiers 1 to 4

- Each institution assigned to a Tier
- Different annual increases applied to each Tier
- Lowest in Tier 1, highest in Tier 4
- Increase must remain under 10% per annum
- Reason: must be a gradual change

*Also rolled out for the 2nd cycle of the Wiley agreement
Aim: gradual move towards a publishing output-based model over time

This is what the future should look like
Tiering model – critical assessment

(-) Arbitrary (based on consensus)

IF increase capped at 10%, then it is not transformative enough

(+ ) Flexible – tiers can be adjusted

(+ ) Transparent (for the members)
What would **YOU** take into account when creating a cost-sharing model?

Please select **up to two** options:

a) Historic subscriptions  
b) APCs  
c) Usage data  
d) FTEs  
e) Institution’s overall income („ability to pay“)
Where are we now?
OA Cost-Sharing Models Working Group

Why? We already have a cost-sharing model…
However…

• So far only previous spend + publishing output considered
• Should we include other parameters?
• No “one-size-fits-all” solution: We need flexible solutions
  • For various business models: currently very wide range
  • Meet local needs

Develop a toolkit for the consortium:
Ability to apply the most appropriate model
What are other consortia doing?

- Publishing output
- Type of institution
- Historic spend
- Various FTEs
- Ability to pay
- COUNTER statistics
- Disciplines

Weights given to various factors:
- 33% - 33% - 33%
- 50% - 50%
- depending on the contract
- various combinations considered
- etc…
Our shortlist for testing: 3 models

A variation on the "Smooth Transition" model, developed by Nina Schönfelder @ Bielefeld University. It combines:

- The share of OA content within the publisher's global content
- The institution's publishing output
- APCs
- The institution's historic spend

**Tiering model:** (as used for our Springer and Wiley contracts): based on the ratio between

- existing expenses vs APC value
- different price increases for each Tier

**"the one third model"**

- 1/3 of fees based on FTEs,
- 1/3 on historic spend
- 1/3 on publishing output
Challenges for Library Consortia

- Increases difficult for institutions
- We need to find viable solutions: keep everyone on board
- Timing: shift towards publishing-based models happening at different time points
- Important that consortium can share costs as they see fit

Publishers continue to double dip:

expect to increase their income, regardless of the publishing output of a country
Wider, global issues

**More international cooperation** needed: countries should join forces

**Balancing act:**
- Publishers’ income expectations
- Money in the system on a national / EU / global level

Opportunity: use **EU’s negotiating power**
What do you think is the most important factor driving the transition to a fully OA world?

a. Researchers' wish for greater visibility
b. Publishers' wish for more money
c. Society’s wish for access to research results
Who will benefit the most from a fully OA publishing system?

a. Publishers
b. Higher education sector
c. Society in general
Questions - discussion
Further reading


Schönfelder, Nina. Proposal for a new model of transformative agreements: A smooth transition from subscriptions to APCs. 2020. DOI: 10.4119/unibi/2939995
Impact of OA Agreements

OA Articles 2013-2016 with Springer

First year of R&P agreement

- OA Articles by consortium members
- Closed articles by consortium members

University of Vienna - APC value vs actual paid to publisher

- **Pub 1**
  - 2021 APC value: short
  - 2021 invoiced thru agreement: short

- **Pub 2**
  - 2021 APC value: short
  - 2021 invoiced thru agreement: short

- **Pub 3**
  - 2021 APC value: moderate
  - 2021 invoiced thru agreement: long

- **Pub 4**
  - 2021 APC value: moderate
  - 2021 invoiced thru agreement: long