

# InformationToday

The Newspaper for Users and Producers of Digital Information Services | [infoday.com](http://infoday.com)

## Publishers Coming to the Rescue of Open Access?

Text and photos by DICK KASER

■ Ten years ago, open access (OA) seemed to be a cause looking for a revolution. Now it seems more like a condition in need of a serious solution.

Born of mandates starting back in 2002 with the Budapest Open Access Initiative and climaxing last year with the landmark “Finch Report” in the U.K. and a White House directive from the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the dream of freeing up research published at public or foundation expense has turned into an administrative nightmare for the researchers, colleges, publishers, and librarians who must comply with the mandates in order for the promise of OA to be fully realized.

Attempting now to come to the rescue are possibly the most unlikely of suspects, the publishers themselves that a decade ago were the first to resist the OA movement. Yet, if anyone is better positioned to figure out how to track, help discover, and preserve this newly mandated “public record” of science, some might argue the OA community could find no better ally than those who figured out in the past how to keep track of content under other publishing models and prior licensing rules.

You may even recognize some of the leading players in the new OA arena from the roles they played in past publishing lives.

### The New Faces of OA

As OA stands, various funding agencies require the recipients of grant funds to make the results of funded research publicly available either immediately upon publication or after a certain embargo period. The arrangement often requires someone to pay. It may be the funding agency, the aca-

demical institution where the research is completed, or the individual—with rates and terms varying by publisher. Ultimately, compliance requires tracking. Was the paper that was supposed to be OA ever paid for? Was it released? And where can it be found for free? Publishers may not yet have all the answers, but here’s what they’re thinking.

### RightsLink

A longtime conduit between publishers and rights buyers, Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) has been approaching OA as a workflow problem. Last summer CCC announced a partnership with Aries Systems, a supplier of workflow solutions to journal publishers. CCC has taken on author payments for the article-processing charges (APCs) that are involved in some OA publishing models. The fees vary from publisher to publisher, as do other terms of the publishing arrangement. In the RightsLink and Aries integration, a RightsLink API embedded in the publisher/author workflow system will support the author in reviewing the OA options offered by that publisher and then pay for the publishing charges with a credit card. The deployment is in pilot and field testing now, with the hopes of provid-

ing authors with a seamless integration soon.

[www.editorialmanager.com](http://www.editorialmanager.com); [copyright.com](http://copyright.com)



Ed Pentz, executive director of CrossRef

### DOI+

CrossRef, the same company that works with publishers to bring you unique digital object identifiers (DOIs) for journal articles (and thus support the seamless linking to full texts in countless implementations), has approached OA as a database and metadata problem, focusing in particular on the journal



Copyright Clearance Center's Jake Kelleher, senior director of licensing and business development (left) and Chris Kenneally, director of business development

article metadata that is missing or often inconsistently applied about the funding source for individual journal articles. Funding source is a critical data element for tracking articles that are supposed to be OA by mandate. The rub is that without consistent source tags, the agencies themselves can't tell whether their OA mandates have been followed. Just as with CrossRef, the FundRef database will be built by publishers that must agree to deposit their metadata records in a consistent format. They will do this with the help of an API integrated into their author interfaces. When someone submits a paper for publication, the system will request the funding source information, which will then be passed along by the publisher to FundRef upon publication. Voila! Not only will we know who funded what, but we'll be able to data mine it. The system went live last summer. But in many respects it's just a building block for things to come, since the resulting dataset will be open for anyone to use or deploy in other applications via API.

**[crossref.org/fundref](http://crossref.org/fundref)**



Journal publishers are being encouraged to join CHORUS.

## CHORUS

Enter the Association of American Publishers, which in spring 2013 launched an initiative called the Clearinghouse for the Open Research of the United States (CHORUS). By autumn 2013, a pilot had demonstrated proof of concept and Howard Ratner (from Nature Publishing Group) was named to steer it forward. The website notes that CHORUS is now “an independent, not-for-profit public-private partnership to increase public access to peer-reviewed publications that report on federally funded research.” Sitting on top of the FundRef backbone, CHORUS promises to become the master registry for all works earmarked “OA” in the U.S.—with a global solution sure to follow.

Ratner told journal publishers attending a meeting of STM in Frankfurt, Germany, just ahead of last autumn's



Howard Ratner, director of development at CHORUS

Frankfurt Book Fair, that CHORUS as presently envisaged will have four main services. Each service will have a public website and an API for developers. CHORUS search results will all lead back to publishers' sites or “possibly rarely” to a dark archive, he said.

The four services that are currently planned are as follows:

1. Compliance (dashboard access to funded projects)
2. Full-text access
3. Text mining using CrossRef license registry and click-through license approval
4. Digital preservation (according to agency-controlled triggers to free content from a dark archive)

Watch [chorusaccess.org](http://chorusaccess.org) for further developments in 2014 as components start to roll out.

Publishers are not alone in their attempts to solve the OA problem. Academic institutions are also developing a solution called SHARE (SHared Access Research Ecosystem),

under a joint initiative of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), and Association of American Universities (AAU). SHARE, launched last spring, is in the process of developing a road map for how the cross-institutional network it proposes will ensure access, preservation, and reuse of research results while complying with government mandates for OA. “SHARE and CHORUS may have areas of possible collaboration,” Vaughn told publishers in Frankfurt. “We will work jointly on metadata and metrics.” He called for “cooperation for shared public benefits of scholarship and its progress.”

As we enter 2014, it at least appears that everyone is on the same page.

Dick Kaser is Information Today, Inc.'s vice president of content. Send your comments about this article to [itletters@infotoday.com](mailto:itletters@infotoday.com).



*John Vaughn, executive VP at Association of American Universities*