

Open Access by UKB - Results, Outlook and Reaction to Plan S

UKB is active in The Netherlands in implementing open access. In this document UKB lists her results in realising this ambition so far, shows the road ahead and responds to Plan S. Overall UKB sees Plan S as a vehicle to accelerate open access. UKB finds it important to emphasize that we should keep the good parts of the current infrastructure, take into consideration the role of small and society publishers, and thereby acknowledge that establishing new publication venues and have researchers adopt them is a lengthy process that takes time.

Results achieved

- Inclusion of an open access component in the current license deals ('big deals') at no additional cost. These read and publish deals allow Dutch-affiliated researchers to publish open access, free of charge for them, in more than 9000 scholarly journals.
- [In 2017, 50%](#) of the peer-reviewed Dutch articles were available in open access; [23%](#) of these open access articles benefitted from the offsetting (transformative) license deals negotiated by the VSNU.
- Most of the offsetting agreements which have been negotiated grant continued reading access and perpetual access rights to publishers' portfolios.
- Based on our first transformative license deal, closed in November 2014, UKB created a [checklist](#) of items to be negotiated.
- UKB introduced a [journal browser](#) that allows our researchers to select relevant and trusted (open access) journals for submission of their articles. The journal browser also serves as a tool to easily identify journals that offer (discounts to) open access publication to Dutch researchers.
- Since 2001 we developed a repository infrastructure that is being improved continuously.
- We created a national platform to share information about [open access](#).

Outlook

- We expect that 70% of our peer-reviewed articles will be open access in the short term by continuing our negotiations of transformative license deals. In our future publishers' deals, we will strive to meet Plan S requirements for transformative agreements.
- We have learned that it takes time to implement this transformative strategy, especially for smaller publishers. Furthermore, the international scale on which most of these publishers (and researchers) operate increases the complexity. Therefore we ask cOAlition S at the time of the foreseen evaluation in 2023 to consider an extra round for transformative deals.
- We expect additional positive results from our ["Taverne" pilot](#), which aims to improve the uptake of (green) open access.
- Going forward, we will also focus on negotiating deals with open access publishers, as we have [already done](#) for a number of individual institutions.
- We are confident that we are heading in the right direction to achieve 100% open access, but it takes time to arrange open access to our own publications, while also making sure that our researchers and students can easily and legally access scholarly content needed for their work or study within the framework of our current budgets. Still if other consortia around the world align with the Dutch and European ambition, and where necessary we accept "green" open access, the goal to achieve 100% open access can be realized.
- We would like to work on an appropriate framework for the transformative deals, together with our national stakeholders in the National Platform of Open Science and European

partners. The [requirements for transformative open access agreements](#) as published by JISC, and the [principles, guidelines and best practices for transformative agreements](#) from ESAC, are an excellent starting point for this framework.

Reaction to Plan S

Plan S is a good step forward to make all output open access within reasonable costs. We hope that the publishers take up the invitation to respond properly to the three routes offered. We also think that some requirements as presented in the principles and the current implementation guidance need some further specification or adjustment.

Dutch researchers do not equally take part in journals as a producer or as a consumer of scientific information. Therefore, the need for access to journals to gain the latest insights in scholarly communication, both by researchers and students, might be hindered by the aim to strive for open access publishing. This is a nondesirable countereffect of our ambitions to provide full open access to all stakeholders. It should also be noted that open access serves a much broader social purpose and is also good for the 'citizen' (in all its gradations) and SMEs.

We cannot and should not lose ourselves in the sometimes detailed elements of the implementation. We plea for Plan S to be a lightening example, but not a stringent set of instructions. We trust that we will be consulted in the further realisation towards 100% open access, and know that this already has been the case with our Dutch funding organisation, NWO.

Next to our remarks in our Outlook for the coming years, we have chosen to pick just a few more elements for our comments, especially those related to our role as libraries:

- We would like to know if cOAlition S sees a role for institutions in monitoring compliance. Will institutions need to adjust their infrastructure or report to funders to be able to monitor compliance?
- We would like to see simple criteria for authors to be able to check whether they are compliant, and would stimulate a clear outline of the review in 2023. What criteria will be used to evaluate the interim results of Plan S and what requirements will need to be fulfilled?
- Given our comments about the necessity to maintain sustainable reading access for our users as well as making our own publications open access, we would like the review to look at this broad view of access, including reading rights.
- cOAlition S should differentiate between publishers with only a few journals and large commercial publishers. We ask the cOAlition to allow for one more round of transformative deals after a positive evaluation to accommodate the smaller (society) publishers.
- We refer to the formal response of the Dutch Pure Usergroup (NL-PUG) to the Guidance on the Implementation of Plan S with regards to the mandate for repositories to deliver the JATS-XML.
- By putting too much emphasis on requirements that belong to traditional publishing models, we believe that Plan S could interfere with the development of innovative publishing models. Open Access is not the only part of scholarly communication that is changing. The plan should leave space for, and stimulate initiatives we cannot even imagine.

[UKB](#), the Dutch consortium of university libraries and the National library of The Netherlands, has as its main [ambition](#) the acceleration of scholarly and scientific advances by sharing, concentrating and bringing together expertise in national and international networks. The consortium works closely with [the VSNU](#) and [SURFmarket](#) in order to realize the Dutch ambition of achieving 100% open access in 2020, and to support the principle that publicly funded research results should be publicly accessible at no additional cost, as stipulated in the [National Plan Open Science](#).

31 January 2019, UKB