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Brief Background

• Founded 2003 at Lund University – launched May 2003 with 300 journals (provided by Bo-Christer Björk!).
• Initially funded by minor project grants from SPARC and Open Society Institute.
• Additional grants from among others SPARC Europe, INASP and OpenAccess.se.
• Membership and Sponsor funding model introduced 2006.
Growth

• Constant growth during the years
• End of 2012 - +8.000 journals
• Increasing importance for the OA-movement
• Slow but steady increase in support (funding from the community)
Higher expectations

• Situation 2010/2011:
• Increasing expectations as OA gets momentum.
• Difficulties in getting resources as expectations grow.
• As OA matures demands from funders and libraries increase and become more differentiated and advanced.
• Increasing backlog and lack of curation of the collection.
Growing concerns

- Stakeholders began more or less explicit expressing their concerns about the future of the DOAJ.
- OASPA approaches Lund University to discuss possible scenarios.
- After 2 years of discussions and negotiations (on and off) an agreement was in place between LU and IS4OA.
www.is4oa.org

Founded by
Caroline Sutton,
Alma Swan &
Lars Bjørnshauge
A not-for-profit Community Interest Company (C.I.C.), registered in the United Kingdom.
What we said we would do!

• IS4OA took over January 1\textsuperscript{st} 2013:

• We said we would:
  
  – Involve the community in the development and operations
  
  – Respond to demands and expectations by
    
    • Developing new tighter criteria
  
  • Reengineer the editorial back office work
    
    – Monitor for compliance and weed accordingly
Develop the DOAJ into a significantly improved service by

- introducing more functionality
- extending the coverage of journals around the world and...
- working more closely with publishers to improve the quality of the information about the journals listed.
- Integrate with other infrastructure services
- Develop sustainable funding
Involving the community

• What we have done:
  – Set up an Advisory Board
  – Done a survey (to learn more)
  – New criteria out for public comment
  – Reach out to organizations and initiatives to address general issues for open access journals
Advisory Board

Community/Consortia

Kevin Stranack, PKP, Canada

Tom Olijhoek, OKNF, The Netherlands

Caren Milloy, JISC, United Kingdom

Jean-Francois Lutz, Couperin, France

Jan-Erik Frantsvåg, University of Tromsø, Norway

David Prosser, RLUK, United Kingdom

Iryna Kuchma, EIFL, Italy

Stuart Shieber, Harvard University, U.S.A.
Advisory Board (contd.)

Publishers/Aggregators

Leslie Chan, Bioline International,

Martin Rasmussen, Copernicus Publications,

Paul Peters, Hindawi Publishing Corporation,

Cameron Neylon, PLOS,

Bettina Goerner, Springer,

Arianna Becerril-García, Redalyc,

Susan Murray, AJOL, South Africa
Improvements

• New platform launched
• Facets search:
  – language
  – publication year
  – license
  – business model (APCs or not)
• Very good feedback!

9911 journals
5593 journals searchable at article level
121 Countries
1516253 articles
Streamlining back office

- Journals added Jan-Oct 2013: 1892
- (Journals added 2012): 1248

- We are weeding as well:

  - August 1st – October 15th 2013:
    - Journals added: 370
    - Journals removed: 397
Survey

- We did a survey among the publishers in the DOAJ (Spring 2013)
- 3000+ e-mails
- 1250 responses
- 56% of journals represented in the response
The long tail
Main Findings

- Persistent Identifiers (DOIs)
- Archiving
- Metadata delivery to DOAJ
- Benefits
Persistent Identifiers (DOIs)

- Has your journal(s) implemented DOIs:
  - Yes: 35%
  - No: 55%
  - Don’t know: 10%
Promoting DOIs

• Discussions with
  – OASPA
  – INASP
  – PKP
  – Redalyc

• as to how to work together on this and with CrossRef for efficient and affordable arrangements
Archiving/Preservation

• Does your organisation or your journal(s) have an arrangement for long term preservation and availability (LPTA) or partake in any LPTA program?
  • Yes: 14%
  • No – I’m not interested: 41%

• Would you be interested in DOAJ providing/facilitating a fee-based LPTA service?
  • I’m interested. Tell me more: 49%
The challenge related to archiving

• Many, many journals
  – lack the financial & technical resources to go beyond just publishing the content.
  – haven´t addressed the archiving issue yet, but would like to do so, provided smart and cheap solutions are available.

• Discussions with OASPA, INASP, PKP, Redalyc, CLOCKSS, Keepers Registry and approached by Portico
• Does your journal(s) provide DOAJ with article-level metadata for the journals listed in the DOAJ?
  • Yes: 55%
  • No: 24%
  • Don’t know: 21%

• Actual figure 56% - up from 50% since January + 1250 journals and + 600,000 records (60% increase) – as of today 1.5 million
The survey

• Important/extremely important benefits of being listed:
  • Increased visibility : 97%
  • Increased traffic : 85%
  • Prestige : 86%
  • Certification : 87%
  • Eligibility for support from OA-publication funds: 64%
  • Better promotion : 80%
  • Increased submissions : 72%
Why tighter criteria?

- Better opportunities for funders, universities, libraries and authors to determine whether a journal lives up to standards – transparency!
- Enable the community to monitor compliance
- Addressing the issue of fake publishers or publishers not living up to reasonable standards both in terms of content and of business behavior.
- DOAJ SEAL – promote best practice
New criteria

• New tighter criteria will address:
  • “Quality”
  • “Openness”
  • “the delivery”
• They will be more detailed
• Publishers will have to do more to be included
• Criteria must be binary (either in or not in!)
This is tricky!

Funders, libraries and researchers want to be able to judge whether a journal is a quality journal.

No quick fixes – no clear, accepted definition!

Only proxy measures available.

......
Proxy indicators

• QUALITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF THE EDITORIAL PROCESS

• The journal must have an editor or an editorial board, all members must be easily identified
• Specification of the review process
  – Editorial review, Peer review, Blind peer review, Double blind peer review, Other (please specify)
• Statements about aims & scope clearly visible
• Instructions to authors shall be available and easily located
• Screening for plagiarism?
• Time from submission to publication
Openness

• CC-license – if Yes, which?
• Reader rights
• Reuse rights
• Copyrights
• Author posting rights
“The delivery”

- Publisher
- ISSN/eISSN
- Journal Title
- URL of Journal Homepage
- Editor
- Editor e-mail address
- Editorial Board
- Contact person
- Contact person –email address
- Country

- Journals must publish 5 articles/year (rule of thumb & does not apply for new journals)

- (name)
- (e-mail address)
- URL to info re editorial board
- (name)
- (e-mail address)
• Article Processing Charges (APC)s (in relevant currency)
• Whether the journal has article submission charges (in relevant currency)
• Waiver policy (for developing country authors, etc)
• Persistent Identifiers
• Link to download statistics
• Start year (since online full-text content is available)
• Please indicate which formats of full text are available (PDF, HTML, ePUB, XML, other)
• Article level: provision of metadata

• Yes/No – if Yes: then currency and amount
• Yes/No – if Yes: then currency and amount
• Yes/No – if Yes: link to information on the journal homepage
• Yes/No
• Yes/No
• Yes/No
• The first draft of new criteria were out for public comment – we received a lot of comments – and learned a lot!
• ”Our” - Western European/North American services, standards and business models are not universal!
• For instance:
Public comment II

• We had **CC-licenses** as mandatory – these are not universal – in fact several countries cannot as yet implement those – we are investigating this with CC and experts

• Regarding **author deposit rights** we recommended listing in SHERPA/RoMEO – there are similar services out there – not as comprehensive – we accept these, while trying to convince those to exchange data

• We promoted **DOIs** – there are other persistent identifiers out there – definitely not as good as DOIs – we will promote DOIs and make it more attractive for the journals to come on board
• We were asking for identification of archiving arrangements – we will clarify which archiving organisations we will endorse

• We promoted machine-readable formats and indicated that PDFs would not qualify in that regard – now we just ask for specification of in which formats the full-text is published

• APCs is not invented in Latin America & Africa – a minority of journals actually implements APCs

• We promoted OAS – it is not well known – yet – we will work with PLoS/SPARC/OASPA on that
A dilemma

• The process highlighted the dilemma:
• Respecting different publishing cultures and traditions
• Not primarily exclude, but rather facilitate and assist the smaller journals from other continents to come into the flow
• **While at the same time** promoting standards, transparency and best practice
DOAJ SEAL

- Promoting best practice (anno 2013/14) – qualifiers for the DOAJ SEAL:
  - DOIs
  - Article level metadata to DOAJ
  - Archiving arrangement with an archiving organisation (list to be developed and maintained)
  - CC-BY (embedded machine readable in article metadata)
  - Authors retain copyright without restrictions
  - Deposit policy registered in Sherpa/RoMEO and the likes
To conclude!

• We believe that we are on track!
• Lots of work ahead.
• We will continue to contribute to the momentum of open access publishing by
  – carefully promoting standards, transparency and best practice
  – without losing the global view
  – collaborating
• This will benefit all open access publishers!
Our ambition: DOAJ to be the white list!

and make other lists superfluous – that is:

if a journal is in the DOAJ it complies with accepted standards
Part of an emerging infrastructure for (Gold) OA
Thank you for your attention!
and
Thank you for your support!
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