

Enabling Smaller Independent Publishers to Participate in OA Agreements

Workflow Framework for Transformative Agreements

(version: 2022-02-01)

This is an open access resource distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence, which permits unrestricted use and distribution provided the original author and source are credited.



Association of Learned
and Professional
Society Publishers



Plan S

Making full & immediate
Open Access a reality

INTRODUCTION

Scholarly publishing is in transition from business models based on access provision (subscriptions) to an open access paradigm based on the provision of publishing services. This transition touches not only the business relationship between publishers and libraries/consortia on behalf of their authors but all checkpoints and phases of the publishing cycle in fulfillment of the open access publishing agreements they conclude together.

The realization of a transformative deal can be a complex and time-consuming process. Success is not only determined based on the results of the negotiation process, but also in the execution of the contract. To help all parties involved in this journey, this document describes the process in all its phases from initial contact to signing the agreement and from the implementation of an approval process to monitoring and evaluating the fulfillment of the contract. Roles are identified as well as key information that is needed during the process.

Because there is no one route to success and the starting point for every publisher, consortium and institution is different, this document can best be used as a reference, to inform best practices for planning and implementing open access agreement workflows. It aims to create a shared perception of all elements that can be addressed and implemented without defining prescriptive specifications upfront.

Our overview and detailed documentation describe an idealized workflow to underpin Read & Publishing agreements, and as such implementing it in full may be challenging. However, we feel that sharing this is an important step toward automation which will be essential to encourage smaller independent publishers to consider developing such agreements. This is the first publicly available complete workflow that we are aware of as other existing workflows are proprietary. We intend this open workflow to be useful in stimulating discussion about how it can be implemented by system vendors of various kinds, and how it can be further simplified or aspects of it prioritized.

Throughout workflows consistent terminology is important and the CASRAI Open Access Glossary is recommended <https://casrai.org/open-access-glossary/>

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	3
WORKFLOW: NEGOTIATION OF THE CONTRACT	5
WORKFLOW: INITIATION OF THE CONTRACT	9
WORKFLOW: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTRACT	13
WORKFLOW: OPEN ACCESS APPROVAL	19
WORKFLOW: REPORTING AND EVALUATION	22

OVERVIEW

This table provides an overview of the detailed contents for each cell that you will find within this document. The columns outline steps in the lifecycle of the agreement and also the lifecycle of articles to be published. The rows outline different processes or systems that come into play. The workflow for transformative agreements sits across a complex ecosystem of technology, processes, policies, automated functions, and manual functions. These relate to contract management, article submission and peer review, content hosting and dissemination, and financial management.

	<u>Negotiation of the contract</u>	<u>Initiation of the contract</u>	<u>Implementation of the agreement</u>	Submission of the manuscript	Acceptance of the article	<u>Open Access payment approval</u>	Publication	<u>Reporting and evaluation (on article and agreement level)</u>
Contract	P and I use an example model license or addendum example and determine if a derivative is needed.	P drafts a concept license. I reviews it. P finalizes the license. P and I sign the license.	P and I register the contract in the contract management system. I registers the contract on the ESAC registry. I registers the contract in the tender database (if necessary). P and I communicate about the agreement on the relevant website(s).	Based on the terms of the agreement, P informs the corresponding author about institution-paid OA publication options when the article is submitted and/or accepted.		P and I determine the possible end of contract or end of service issues related to the approval process.	P publishes the article OA under the agreement.	P reports on (foreseen) status changes during or at the end of the contract. P closes workflow when the contract ends (whether the end of the contract is related to approval, acceptance, or submission is determined in the contract). P and I determine actions when the contract addresses under/over performance during the contract.
Finance	At the start: P fills in a Negotiation Data Template to provide an overview of historic spending. During negotiations: P adjusts financial information for the new contract.	P and I add financial info in their contract management systems if they have such systems.	P incorporates financial info workflows (e.g. APC prices, discounts. See also Negotiation Data Template).	P determines whether a manuscript falls under the agreement (see next row). If applicable, P communicates to A about costs that are not covered by the agreement. If applicable, A provides information regarding available project funding.		P provides financial information to I (e.g. list price, discounted price, and, if applicable, total amount spent and the total amount available).	P publishes without additional publishing costs.	P reports on progress during and at the end of the contract. P inputs status change during the contract when under/over performance is defined in the contract (or with a capped deal) e.g. increase or decrease in the number of journals in the deal, refund or extra payment, etc.

KEY: **A** (Author) • **P** (Publisher) • **I** (Institution/consortium)

	<u>Negotiation of the contract</u>	<u>Initiation of the contract</u>	<u>Implementation of the agreement</u>	Submission of the manuscript	Acceptance of the article	<u>Open Access payment approval</u>	Publication	<u>Reporting and evaluation (on article and agreement level)</u>
Author Eligibility	<p><i>At the start:</i> In combination with financial status (see above), P fills in the Negotiation Data Template</p> <p><i>During negotiations:</i> I and P determine which journals and publication types are part of the contract and which organizations and authors are eligible to publish under the contract.</p>	<p>P and I define the eligibility elements in the license.</p> <p>P and I determine roles and responsibilities in managing eligibility.</p> <p>P and I add eligibility info in their contract management systems.</p> <p>P provides a journal list to I.</p>	<p>P incorporates eligibility in the publication workflow.</p>	<p>A provides affiliation info and/or P derives this from systems (e.g. drop down, institutional IP range, institutional email domain, ORCID, affiliation on the article).</p> <p>P determines eligibility journal and article type info (automatically /manually).</p>		<p>P and I determine the eligibility of the author and, if necessary, check other points that need attention and are not 100% covered by the publisher workflow.</p> <p>I approves or rejects the OA request.</p> <p>P and I can also determine if the approval process is automated with only quality checks afterward.</p>	<p>P publishes eligible articles, including references to eligible corresponding authors and affiliations.</p>	<p>P and I monitor the quality of contract compliance workflow. Non-compliance issues are resolved. e.g. P retrospectively makes a closed version open.</p> <p>P reports on progress during and at end of the contract based on the data format agreed on in the Negotiation Data Template.</p>
Funder Compliance	<p>I and P address funder compliance requirements and ‘translate’ this to e.g. license type and ownership of the publication.</p>	<p>P incorporates funder compliance into the contract.</p> <p>P and I add funder compliance in their contract management systems.</p> <p>P and I determine if Creative Commons BY is the only license option or if more license types are presented in the workflow.</p>	<p>P implements funder compliance in the publication workflow.</p> <p><i>Option 1:</i> coded (workflow filter).</p> <p><i>Option 2:</i> communication/ author awareness.</p>	<p>A provides funder info (e.g. funder name, funder ID, grant ID) or P derives this from the article.</p>		<p>P provides compliant OA license option(s).</p> <p>A chooses compliant OA license option(s).</p> <p>A signs form (if necessary).</p>	<p>P publishes articles in line with funder compliance guidelines.</p>	<p>P and I monitor the quality of funder compliance workflow and work together to resolve non-compliance issues.</p>
Process	<p>P and I determine the intended start date for the contract, overall planning, and management of the negotiation process.</p>	<p>P and I finalize the contract before the start of the agreement. If initiation takes more time, P and I can agree on a grace period.</p>	<p>P configures all relevant workflow systems based on agreement and informs I and A (process description, screenshots).</p> <p>I provides contact info (for approval, incident management).</p>	<p>P and I monitor progress, user-friendliness, transparency, and quality of the OA workflows on the article and contract level. This is input for process improvement in the short or long term.</p>				<p>P and I determine process improvement.</p>

KEY: **A** (Author) • **P** (Publisher) • **I** (Institution/consortium)

WORKFLOW: NEGOTIATION OF THE CONTRACT

Negotiation of the Contract ('The Agreement') between a consortium or an institution with a small independent publisher. In the framework, negotiation of the contract is a vertical row, separated from implementation and evaluation. This workflow focuses on the first phase. The role of the 'consortium' is referenced in this document, but the workflow is also applicable to negotiation of a contract between a publisher and individual institution.

PHASE 1: INITIAL CONTACT

Goal:

To share information and negotiate an agreement that will remove the need for authors to pay Article Processing Charges (APCs) and other transactional charges for their Open Access publishing. This process can underpin a range of transitional arrangements including for example Read and Publish transformative agreements or Subscribe to Open arrangements.

First step:

A first approach to assess the other party's interest in entering a negotiation. Roles and responsibilities: The publisher or consortium explores the potential for an Open Access agreement.

Process:

- The publisher will contact the consortium to explain that they now have a model which supports the transition to Open Access, and would like to discuss this with the consortium
- OR
- The consortium will contact the publisher to explain that they are interested in models which support the transition to Open Access and would like to discuss these with the publisher.

Further information about developing negotiation goals is available at the ESAC website:
<https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-agreements/reference-guide/negotiation/>

Second step:

Initial exchange of information (to be completed before looking at details such as published articles, etc.).

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher or consortium shares top-level information which will enable the parties to assess the likelihood of success in reaching an agreement.

Process:

- The consortium will provide contract, financial, scope, funder, and process information that will enable the publisher to formulate its offer:
 - ▶ The number of members in the consortium, and who they are. This will include information about whether or not medical libraries are included.
 - ▶ Information about the consortium's practice. For example, do members opt in to deals, do all members participate in contracts agreed by the consortium, or does it depend on the offer?
 - ▶ If relevant, the price tiering or banding system for member organizations (not all consortia share this information externally).
 - ▶ Information about whether the consortium centrally manages institutional licensing and payments, or whether the publisher will do this.
 - ▶ Preferred payment currency.
 - ▶ The process and timeline for receiving and considering offers.
 - ▶ The consortium's reporting workflow requirements for Open Access contracts.
 - ▶ Funder compliance points needing attention, e.g. requirements for eligible authors' retention of copyright and Creative Commons Attribution license.

Consortia will find further elements involved in preparing for Open Access contract negotiations at the ESAC website: <https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-agreements/reference-guide/preparation/>

- The publisher will provide high-level contract, financial, scope, funder, and process information about their Open Access contracts:
 - ▶ Access to current content (years and journals by title and ISSN).
 - ▶ Access to archive content (years and journals by title and ISSN).
 - ▶ Which publication types are eligible to publish under the contract (e.g. research articles, case studies, etc.).
 - ▶ Permitted access/use of content, including, for example, access to library walk-in users and secure remote access to alumni off-campus, text mining, and interlibrary loan (ILL) services.

- ▶ A list of the journals in which eligible authors would be able to publish Open Access (journals by title and ISSN).
- ▶ Compliance with funder mandates, including Plan S.
- ▶ Workflows for recognition of corresponding authors and a straightforward submission process.
- ▶ How the publisher calculates cost-neutral pricing. For example, this may include the previous subscription spend by consortium members and/or the previous spend on APCs (both funded by consortium members and by their affiliated authors).
- ▶ Whether multi-year contracts are available (any special arrangements, such as split payment for OA by the consortium and authors).
- ▶ Whether they are willing to use one of the [example license agreements](#), or the consortium's standard model license with one of the example addenda incorporated.

PHASE 2: DETAILED EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

Goal:

To provide information to the consortium so that it can assess the publisher's offer and understand the current financial engagement between publisher and consortium (or institution), and any current financial interactions involving authors at the institution(s).

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher will provide detailed contract, financial, scope, funder, and process information to the consortium.

Process:

The publisher will:

- Provide the consortium with the data set out in the [Negotiation Data Template](#) so that their offer can be evaluated. This template includes information about the journals included in the offer, the previous subscription spend, the number of articles (Open Access and subscription) published by affiliated authors, and previous APC spend which was not previously covered by a contract. Where possible, publishers should provide information about other expenditures by affiliated authors such as page and color charges.
- Provide any relevant information about conditions of their offer, such as a minimum number of participating institutions.

- Explain the pricing information depending on the context of the consortium's model, e.g. for consortia that operate an all-in model, this can be the total price for the consortium. Or for consortia that operate an opt-in model, it will be the total price for each member of the consortium, should they choose to take up the publisher's offer. The pricing should be transparent: the consortium should be able to see how it has been calculated and be aware of any price increase from previous years (and if so, the reason), and, in the case of a multi-year deal, the price cap for subsequent years.

PHASE 3: THE CONSORTIUM WILL CONSIDER THE OFFER AND CONSULT WITH THE MEMBER LIBRARIES

Goal:

To assess the publisher's offer.

Roles and responsibilities:

The consortium will assess the offer and consult with member institutions.

Process:

- If the offer is acceptable to the consortium and its members, the consortium and publisher will move on to the Initiation of Contract phase.
- If the offer is not acceptable, there will be some negotiation by consortia to improve the offer.

PHASE 4: PLANNING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTRACT

Goal:

Planning the successful implementation of the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher and the institution agree on the intended starting date for the contract, workflow requirements for implementation, communication to eligible authors, and management of the renewal negotiation process.

WORKFLOW: INITIATION OF THE CONTRACT

After successful negotiations, both publisher and consortium must finalize the process officially and exchange information so that they can implement the contract.

The role of the ‘consortium’ is referenced in this document, but the workflow is also applicable to negotiation of a contract between a publisher and individual institution.

PHASE 1: THE CONSORTIUM AND PUBLISHER AGREE ON A SUITABLE TEMPLATE LICENSE

Goal:

To use a robust contract to support the agreement.

Roles and responsibilities:

These may vary because some consortia are required to use a standard model license while others typically use a publisher’s model license.

Process:

A suite of [example licenses and license addenda](#) has been created to support this workflow. Publishers and consortia may use these to support a variety of models include Read & Publish, Subscribe to Open, and community support for diamond publishing.

- The parties will select an example license agreement or, if regulations require the consortium to use an existing model license, an example addendum can be incorporated. The reporting workflow must be included in the contract.
- The term of the contract should ideally be two years or longer, to minimize the administrative burden on both parties. The contract will also provide an option to terminate the contract sooner.
- Further guidance about ratifying the outcomes of negotiations in a written contract and putting into practice new workflows and processes is available at the ESAC website: <https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-contracts/reference-guide/implementation/>

PHASE 2: COMPLETING THE CONTRACT'S FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS AND REPORTING

Goal:

To determine procedures and policies for the administration of financial matters within the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

- Publisher and institution settle on payment terms within the contract, e.g.:
 - ▶ The payment method.
 - ▶ The schedule of payments under the contract.
 - ▶ Payment terms — how soon after the invoice must payment be made.
 - ▶ Financial reporting within the agreement.

Process:

- The payment terms are written into the contract.
- The publisher informs the institution about any dashboards that are available to manage the financial process.

PHASE 3: COMPLETING INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCOPE, FINANCE, FUNDER COMPLIANCE, AND PROCESSES

Goal:

To determine agreement for access to content and the terms for eligibility for Open Access publishing.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher will insert into the contract:
 - ▶ the list of titles that can be accessed (years and journals by title and ISSN).
 - ▶ the list of titles in which eligible authors can publish Open Access (see metadata requirements below).
 - ▶ the types of articles covered under the agreement, e.g. original research articles, review articles, case studies, methodologies.
 - ▶ the types of articles not covered under the agreement, e.g. letters and editorials

- The publisher and consortium will agree and insert into the contract:
 - ▶ Relevant funder requirements for eligible authors' retention of copyright and Creative Commons Attribution license.
 - ▶ How the Version of Record will be delivered to the author, the institution, or relevant third-party repositories and in what format.
 - ▶ Roles and responsibilities in managing eligibility, where applicable this will include waiver eligibility checks for authors from low-to-middle income countries.
 - ▶ Reporting workflows to the consortium and institution.
 - ▶ Any special arrangements, such as split payment for Open Access by the consortium and authors.
 - ▶ The start date for the Open Access services.
- Financial information: publisher and institution will settle on payment terms within the contract, e.g.:
 - ▶ The payment method.
 - ▶ The schedule of payments under the contract.
 - ▶ Information that must be provided on the invoice.
 - ▶ How soon after the invoice payment must be made.
 - ▶ The expectation for financial reporting within the agreement.
 - ▶ Country-specific (or specific to other governmental/society/administrative bodies) requirements for invoicing.
 - ▶ [ESAC recommendations](#) for invoicing and reporting to guide article-level information provided with invoices.

Clear points of contact for the publisher and institution should be established for the exchange of this information and for dealing with ongoing queries or issues.

- Process information: publisher and institution determine which individual or group on each side is responsible for various components of the contract, e.g.:
 - ▶ The appropriate points of contact for settling financial matters.
 - ▶ Responsibility for dashboards and reporting.
 - ▶ Access troubleshooting.
 - ▶ Configuration of publisher in a vendor management system.
- Acquisition of a purchase order if necessary.
- Approval for putting data into new external systems.
- Confirming that the appropriate budget line has sufficient funds and is prepared to make payment as needed.

The institution will involve the relevant departments (e.g. finance, IT, etc.), and ensure that processes are signed off by an appropriate date.

Metadata requirements for the title list in which eligible authors can publish:

(Use list <https://esac-initiative.org/about/oa-workflows/>.)

PHASE 4: SIGNATURE OF THE CONTRACT AND PUBLICATION

Goal:

To complete the contract so that it can be initiated.

Roles and responsibilities:

These may vary depending on the nature of the consortium and its powers. In some cases, the consortium and publisher will sign a contract on behalf of all their members. In other cases, the publisher and each member of the consortium will sign a license agreement.

Process:

- The consortium and publisher (or, if required, the institutions and publisher) will sign the contract.
- The consortium or institutions should not pay the publisher, or enable payment by member libraries of the agreed fee, before the contract has been signed.
- The consortium will register the contract in a contract management system.
- The contract will be published in the [ESAC Registry](#) (and other websites if applicable).

PHASE 5: GRACE PERIOD FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Goal:

To manage delays in implementation.

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher and institution will aim to finalize the contract before the start date of the agreement. However, if there is a delay in completing the contract, the publisher and institution may agree on a grace period.

WORKFLOW: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTRACT

After successful negotiations and completion of the initiation process, both publisher and consortium must implement the contract. Actions can be taken simultaneously.

PHASE 1: THE CONSORTIUM AND PUBLISHER COMPLETE THEIR INTERNAL CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PROCESSES

Goal:

To use a robust contract to support the agreement.

Roles and responsibilities:

Each stakeholder is responsible for finalizing internal administrative and financial processes on time.

Process:

- The publisher makes the last updates to internal administrative and financial systems that are related to the submitting, approval, and publishing workflow. The consortium makes the last updates to internal administrative and financial systems that are related to paying the publisher for publishing services.
- Both publisher and institution ensure that payment is processed promptly and efficiently.
- Publisher and institution trade information about responsible parties for workflow, troubleshooting, etc.
- The publisher informs the institution about any dashboards that are available to manage the financial process.
- The institution ensures that internal processes are completed by the start date of the agreement or as soon after as is feasible.

PHASE 2: THE PUBLISHER IMPLEMENTS THE CONTRACT IN THE SUBMITTING, APPROVAL, AND PUBLISHING WORKFLOW

Goal:

To support authors in making optimal use of the Open Access service.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher implements the workflow as set out in the contract, to enable funder compliance, the article submission, approval, and publishing workflow, and information flow to the institution.

Process:

- The publisher immediately makes Open Access the default route for eligible authors. Eligible Authors may opt-out of publishing Open Access Articles and in such cases, the Publisher is not required to seek the approval of the Institution.
- The publisher provides access and implements the author verification workflow and the reporting workflows as set out in the contract.
- The institution conducts testing to affirm compliance with requirements.
- If a relevant article is not identified on acceptance, and the article is published behind a paywall, the Publisher will contact the Authors to offer them the opportunity to convert to Open Access free of an APC.
- If a relevant article is not identified on acceptance, and published Open Access because an APC was paid, the Publisher will contact the Authors and their Institution and offer to refund the APC.

Goal:

For publisher, consortium, and institutions to have workflow systems in place to support the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher and institution add on their contract management systems: financial information, funder compliance, and eligibility.
- The publisher incorporates financial information into its financial workflow: APCs not charged, waivers, discounted, etc.
- The publisher incorporates eligibility into the publication workflow.
- The institution incorporates eligibility verification into its workflow.

- The publisher and institution determine whether Creative Commons is the only license option, or if more license types can be presented in the workflow.
- The publisher and institution provide information to authors about funder compliance on their websites and in other communications.
- The publisher implements funder compliance in the publication workflow and ideally joins the [Funder Registry](#) and deposits funding data. This will ensure that OA articles carry funder information, either the [CrossMark](#) information or the article landing page; ideally, this information should appear as part of the article metadata.
- The publisher implements the reporting to the institution.

Implementing funder compliancy

- The publisher implements the option for the author to add funder-related information during the submitting process. The publisher configures the workflow to support funder compliance (e.g. funder compliant license choice). Alternatively, If the workflow does not allow this information to be captured during the submission workflow, the publisher can extract it from the acknowledgments section of the article and match it with the corresponding Funder IDs from the [Funder Registry](#).
- The author will include the correct acknowledgment in the article, e.g. ‘This work was supported by the Name of Funder (grant number).’
- The publisher will publish the article with the relevant license identifier, linking through to the relevant website e.g. [CC BY 4.0](#).
- The publisher ensures that the article displays the license information, e.g. ‘Article copyright: © YYYY Author names. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use and distribution provided the original author and source are credited.’
- The publisher provides relevant information in the reports (e.g. funder information and license status), enabling the consortium to monitor funder compliancy.

NISO has a Recommended Practice on Access and Licensing Indicators (NISO RP-22-2015) at http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/14226/rp-22-2015_ALI.pdf

Funders are encouraged to use persistent identifiers to identify a grant (e.g. DOI, RAID) so that grant or project metadata can be used throughout the workflow.

Process:

- *Option 1: coded (workflow filter).* The publisher will:
 - ▶ Identify and verify eligible authors as part of the submission and publication process.
 - ▶ Make eligible authors aware of all the licenses available or offer only a choice of licenses that are compliant with their funder's requirements.

- *Option 2: communication and raising author awareness.* The publisher will:
 - ▶ Provide information about the contract on a dedicated webpage.
 - ▶ Proactively inform authors that an agreement is available that they can use and what the terms are (referring to information provided by institutions/funders/consortia).
 - ▶ Provide author workflow screenshots and update them, if necessary, on a dedicated agreement webpage.
 - ▶ Regularly update the lists of journals included in the contract (see [Completing the Contract](#)) on a dedicated agreement webpage – ideally this information will be available via API.
 - ▶ Provide a dedicated point of contact for support regarding the agreement (especially in case workflows do not work as expected e.g. when authors are not recognized).

- To support Options 1 and 2, the institution will:
 - ▶ Provide information to authors and publishers on funder mandates (e.g. choice of license, repository deposit, etc.).
 - ▶ Provide standardized notes acknowledging funding, as applicable, to be inserted into articles by publishers.
 - ▶ Provide information about the contract and eligibility information on a dedicated webpage.
 - ▶ Provide a dedicated contact point for queries by authors/publishers.
 - ▶ Collaborate with the publisher as required in the wording of communications to authors about the agreement.

Goal:

To ensure that institutions and eligible authors benefit from the contract and that eligibility is built into the submission and acceptance workflows.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The consortium and institutions will inform eligible authors that this contract is open to them, meaning they can publish in the publisher's journals without paying an Article Processing Charge (APC).
- The publisher will implement the author verification workflow, and the reporting workflows as set out in the contract.
- The publisher will immediately make Open Access the default route for the eligible authors.

Process:

- Authors will read information about the publisher's charging policy (if APCs need to be paid) and if, in their case as an author from X institution, this charge is covered by their institution's contract with the publisher.
- This information should be available from the publisher's website and in the submission process.
- Ideally, the publisher should recognize the author's affiliation using standard identifiers or other matching methods to provide only the information on APC coverage/eligibility that is set out in the [example license](#).

PHASE 3: CONSORTIUM AND PUBLISHER COMMUNICATE ABOUT THE AGREEMENT

Goal:

To make researchers, libraries, funders, and other stakeholders aware of the agreement.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher communicates with authors about scope (e.g. participating institutions, journals, article types, how eligibility is checked)
 - ▶ On the website(s)
 - ▶ In the workflow
 - ▶ Through campaigns.

- The publisher will consult with institutions, funders, and consortia on the wording of their communications to authors about the contract and how it complies with funder requirements.
- The consortium and institutions will inform eligible authors that this contract is open to them, meaning they can publish in the publisher's journals without paying an Article Processing Charge (APC)
 - ▶ On the external website(s)
 - ▶ On internal websites/means of communication
 - ▶ By registering the agreement on the ESAC website
 - ▶ If applicable by registering the agreement on a national or regional database of tenders.
- The institution and publisher will provide information to authors on whether license or OA policies or mandates exist (e.g. choice of license, repository deposit, etc.) and how the terms of the contract meet funder requirements.

WORKFLOW: OPEN ACCESS APPROVAL

After successful negotiations and completion of the initiation process, both publisher and consortium must implement the contract. To keep track of fulfillment of the Open Access publishing services, both on article and on contract level, the publisher and consortium exchange, analyze and discuss progress and take any actions to improve or speed up the approval process.

ELIGIBLE AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION

Goal:

To gather information from authors about their eligibility under the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher will set up the system to capture and store the information.
- The author has a role in submitting their data at the submission process, but this should not be so onerous as to discourage submissions.

Process:

Author input of data

- The author will be required to provide their details to support eligibility checks, some of which might be optional:
 - ▶ Name
 - ▶ Affiliation
 - ▶ Email address (authors should be encouraged to use their institutional rather than personal email address if possible)
 - ▶ ORCID (this could be optional but is strongly recommended)
 - ▶ Type of article (e.g. original research articles, review articles, case studies, methodologies)
 - ▶ Title
 - ▶ Abstract (optional)

The author will be required to provide the same details for co-authors and to make it clear which of the co-authors is the corresponding author.

- In addition, the author will be required to state if they received funding for the research, and if so, to specify the funding body and award number. (If it is not possible to obtain this information at the time of submission, it should be collected during the pre-publication process so that an accurate acknowledgment section can be composed, and article metadata derived.) This informs the funder compliance status workflow.
- The author can then upload the files and will be required to review the information they have provided; if it is correct, they must submit the article for peer review.
- The publisher should then send the author an email to confirm the submission.

Parameters for author identification

In addition, or alternatively, the publisher will identify eligible authors through one or both of the following parameters:

- IP ranges specified by the Institution; and/or e-mail domain ('@YY.de', list possible domain variations)
- persistent identifier, such as Ringgold, ORCID or other recognized institutional identifier as provided by the author and published in the Metadata; and/or
- affiliation as stated in the article to be published.

Identifiers, such as Ringgold, ORCID, or other recognized institutional identifiers as provided by the author and published in the article metadata, should be integrated into the workflow.

Some contracts operate with automatic workflows for which institutional checks to validate the eligibility of authors are not required. In other cases, institutions will need to verify eligible authors.

ELIGIBLE AUTHOR APPROVAL OR REJECTION

Goal:

To approve or reject the author under the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher will provide the institution with all author affiliations (if there are more than one) as stated by the submitting authors, as well as all necessary metadata.
- The institution will verify the eligibility of an article as quickly as possible to ensure the timely production and publication of the article.

Process:

- Depending on the terms of the contract, the publisher will either:
 - ▶ Immediately approve/reject the author for OA publishing, or
 - ▶ Forward the required metadata for the eligibility check to be performed by the institution/consortium in question.
 - ▶ (The list of metadata required for an eligibility check to be performed by the institution is available from ESAC Workflow recommendations at <https://esac-initiative.org/about/oa-workflows/>)

PROCESS MANAGEMENT

Goal:

To improve the quality of the workflow and resolve issues.

Roles and responsibilities:

- The publisher and institution will monitor the quality of contract compliance workflow and resolve non-compliance issues.
- The publisher will report on progress based on the data format agreed on in the license agreement.

Process:

- Resolving issues:
 - ▶ If an eligible author is not identified on acceptance, and their articles are discovered not to have been published Open Access, the publisher will contact the eligible authors and offer them the opportunity to convert to Open Access free of an APC.
 - ▶ If an eligible author is not identified on acceptance, and their articles are discovered to have been published Open Access and that an APC was paid, the publisher will contact the eligible authors and their institution and offer to refund the APC.

WORKFLOW: REPORTING AND EVALUATION

To keep track of fulfillment of the Open Access publishing services, both on article and contract level, publisher and consortium.

Goal:

To make Open Access publishing the default route for eligible authors under the contract.

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher will:

- Provide the eligible authors by email with a copy of the version of record (VoR) of the Open Access article, in the format specified by the repository (i.e. PDF, XML) the article's DOI, the funder name, and a human-readable summary of the Creative Commons terms with encouragement to share the article in compliance with it, for example via social media, blogs, and repositories.
- Deliver a copy of the version of record (VoR) of the Open Access article to a repository of the institution. Where agreed, the publisher will also submit the Open Access article and its metadata to all relevant third-party repositories, such as PubMed Central, Europe PubMed Central, Google Scholar (all journals, crawled by Google), CAS, OpenAIRE, Web of Science, Scopus, Embase, Ei Compendex, Semantic Scholar, PsychINFO, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, etc.

Annual Reporting

- In addition to regular account statements*, the publisher will provide the institution with annual reports of the total number of Open Access articles published in conformity with the contract. These reports should include:
 - ▶ Name of the publisher
 - ▶ Bibliographic metadata (journal title, journal abbreviation, journal ISSN, volume, issue, pages, article title, authors' names, Creative Commons license type) or DOI

*Ideally, the institution will receive financial reports at least quarterly (monthly or real-time via a dashboard and download) indicating costs related to each identifiable article published under the agreement - the annual report is useful for reviewing a deal, but the institution may need insight throughout the year for funder reporting etc.

- ▶ Eligible author, including ORCID
- ▶ Institution
- ▶ Acceptance date and publication dates of articles.
- The annual reports will cover the period of the last calendar year and will be delivered in the first quarter of the following year.
- The publisher will also deliver metadata, including license information, to CrossRef and other relevant third parties.

The publisher will report annually all articles published in any publisher's journals outside the scope of the contract from authors affiliated with the institution.

FUNDER COMPLIANCE CHECK

Goal:

To monitor and improve the workflow for funder compliance.

Roles and responsibilities:

The institution and publisher will monitor compliance with funder mandates, discuss improvements in the workflow and communication processes, and work together to resolve issues of non-compliance.

Resolving issues:

- To support a funder-compliant publishing service, the publisher should, if possible, only present authors with funder-compliant options. If that is not possible, a process is required to check for and correct faults:
- If an eligible author has selected a non-compliant funder type, the publisher will contact the author and offer the opportunity to select a license compliant with their funder's requirements.
- If an eligible author is not identified on acceptance, and their articles are discovered not to have been published Open Access, the publisher will contact the eligible authors and offer them the opportunity to convert to Open Access free of Article Processing Charges.
- If an eligible author is not identified on acceptance, and their articles are discovered to have been published Open Access and that an Article Processing Charge (APC) was paid, the publisher will contact the eligible authors and their institution and offer to refund the APC.

PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Goal:

Information sharing and process improvement.

Roles and responsibilities:

The publisher and institution will monitor progress, user-friendliness, transparency, and quality of the OA workflows on the article and contract level. They will meet periodically to share information and discuss improvements both in the short term, before the renewal of the contract, and in the longer term.

At the renewal of the contract, the consortium will contact members who chose not to opt-in to the first agreement to gauge interest for the renewal.

This document was commissioned by the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) and cOAlition S and facilitated by Information Power Limited.

CC by



<https://www.informationpower.co.uk/>

Info@informationpower.co.uk

informationpower

Book design by [eBook DesignWorks](#)