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INTRODUCTION TO PASTEUR4OA
**PASTEUR4OA**

**PASTEUR4OA**: Open Access Policy Alignment Strategies for European Union Research

**Grant Agreement**: 611742

**Theme**: Science in Society

**Topic**: SiS.2013.1.3.3-1: Upstream support to the definition, development and implementation of Open Access strategies and policies and to their coordination in the European Research Area;

**Type**: CSA

**Duration**: February 2014 – July 2016 (30 months)

**Budget**: 1.935.940,00 €

**EU funding**: 100% for direct costs and 7% for indirect costs

**Partners**: 15 partners from 10 countries

**Website**: [http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/](http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/)
Partners

http://www.pasteur4oa.eu/partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EKT/NHGF - National Documentation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOS - Enabling Open Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMINHO - University of Minho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTin – University of Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EuroCRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA Konyvtar – Hungarian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITO – Politecnico di Torino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARC Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jisc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacettepe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS FNRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMT – Research Council of Lithuania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals of PASTEUR4OA

1. Increase awareness on Open Access policies and foster the comprehensions of their benefits

2. Support the development of the policies, aiming at their alignment and with Horizon 2020 OA requirements, by
   A. involving policymakers
   B. producing advocacy materials
   C. collecting empirical evidence, good practices and case studies

3. Create a network of experts on Open Access policies: the Knowledge NeT
ROARMAP

- International registry of OA policies
  - Funders
  - Research organisations
  - Sub-unit of research organisations

- http://roarmap.eprints.org/
Policies in ROARMAP

![Policies Adopted by Quarter]

- Research organisation
- Funder
- Sub-unit of research organisation
- Funder and research organisation
- Multiple research organisations

Number of Policies

Year and Quarter

Highcharts.com
Politiche OA nel mondo

http://pasteur4oa-dataviz.okfn.org/
Classification in Roarmap (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added by (partner):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Country:           | Africa: Middle Africa: Congo  
|                    | Africa: Middle Africa: Democratic Republic of the Congo  
|                    | Africa: Middle Africa: Equatorial Guinea  
|                    | Africa: Middle Africa: Gaboon  
|                    | Africa: Middle Africa: Sao Tome and Principe  
|                    | Africa: Northern Africa: Algeria  
|                    | Africa: Northern Africa: Egypt  
|                    | Africa: Northern Africa: Libya  
|                    | Africa: Northern Africa: Morocco  
|                    | Africa: Northern Africa: Sudan  |

| Policymaker type: | ○ Funder  
|                  | ○ Research organisation (e.g. university or research institution)  
|                  | ○ Funder and research organisation  
|                  | ○ Multiple research organisations  
|                  | ○ Sub-unit of research organisation (e.g. department, faculty or school)  |

| Policymaker name: |  |
| Policymaker URL: |  |
| Policy URL:      |  |
| Repository URL:  |  |

| Policy adoption date: | Year:  
|                      | Month: Unspecified  
|                      | Day: ? |  
| Policy effective date: | Year:  
|                        | Month: Unspecified  
|                        | Day: ? |  
| Last revision date:  | Year:  
|                      | Month: Unspecified  
|                      | Day: ? |  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metadatum</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of policy</td>
<td>Administrative/management decision, Faculty vote, Not Mentioned, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit of item</td>
<td>Required, Requested, Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of deposit</td>
<td>Institutional Repository, Subject repository, Any suitable repository, Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of deposit</td>
<td>No later than the time of acceptance, No later than the publication date, By end of policy-specified embargo, When publisher permits, Not Specified, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content types specified under the mandate</td>
<td>Peer-reviewed manuscripts, ETDs, Books, Book Sections, Data, Not Specified, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Journal article version to be deposited:</strong></td>
<td>Author's final peer-reviewed version, Published edition (version of record), Other, Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can deposit be waived?:</strong></td>
<td>Yes, No, Not specified, Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making deposited item Open Access:</strong></td>
<td>Required, Requested or recommended, Not Mentioned, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can making the deposited item Open Access be waived?:</strong></td>
<td>Yes, No, Not Specified, Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date deposit to be made Open Access:</strong></td>
<td>Acceptance date, Publication date, By end of policy-permitted embargo, When publisher permits, As soon as the deposit is completed, Not Mentioned, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is deposit a precondition for research evaluation (the 'Liège/HEFCE Model')?:</strong></td>
<td>Yes, No, Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights holding:</strong></td>
<td>Author grants key rights to institution, Institution or funder retains key rights, Author retains key rights, None of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can rights retention be waived?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can author waive giving permission to make the article Open Access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy's permitted embargo length for science, technology and medicine:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy's permitted embargo length for humanities and social sciences:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can maximal allowable embargo length be waived?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Open licensing conditions:** | ○ Does not require any re-use licence  
○ Requires an open licence without specifying which one  
○ Requires CC-BY or equivalent  
○ Requires CC-BY-NC or equivalent  
○ Requires a different open licence  
○ Other  
○ Not specified |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Gold OA publishing option:** | ○ Required  
○ Recommended as an alternative to Green self-archiving  
○ Permitted alternative to Green self-archiving  
○ Not Specified  
○ Other |
| **Funding for APCs where charged by journals:** | ○ Funder allows APCs to be paid from research grant  
○ Funder provides specific additional funding for APCs  
○ Institution provides funding  
○ Not Mentioned  
○ Other |

| **APC fund URL (where available):** | ○ |
STUDY ON THE ITALIAN OA POLICIES:
GOALS AND METHODOLOGIES
Study goals

Homologate the classification of OA policies of Italian universities on ROARMAP

Develop a methodology to support next ROARMAP entries
Derived research and policy support goals

1. Use the classification to verify the alignment of OA policies
2. Verify the alignment with European and international good practices:
   A. Horizon 2020
Policies OA Italian Universities

AISA
Associazione italiana per la promozione della scienza aperta

Politiche

A oggi, in Italia, solo queste università hanno un regolamento o una disciplina per l’accesso aperto:

1. Università di Bergamo
2. Università di Cagliari
3. Università di Ferrara
4. Università di Firenze
5. Politecnico di Milano
6. Università di Milano
7. Università di Napoli "Federico II" (linee di indirizzo, licenza di deposito)
8. Università di Padova
9. Università di Pisa (regolamento, indirizzo)
10. Università di Torino
11. Università di Trento
12. Università di Trieste
13. Università di Udine
14. Università di Venezia Ca’ Foscari

Listed on AISA website on December 2015
Methodology

1. R1 policies classifications
2. R2 policies classifications
3. Reconciliation Meeting
4. Verification with policy referents
5. Reconciliation Meeting
6. Notification
## Classifications

[https://goo.gl/G9CSjj](https://goo.gl/G9CSjj)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIELD ROARMAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Source of Policy</td>
<td>Faculty vote</td>
<td>Faculty vote</td>
<td>Faculty vote</td>
<td>Faculty vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deposit of item</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Locus of deposit</td>
<td>Institutional Repository</td>
<td>Institutional Repository</td>
<td>Institutional Repository</td>
<td>Institutional Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Date of deposit</td>
<td>No later than the time of ar</td>
<td>No later than the publication date</td>
<td>No later than the pu</td>
<td>No later than the put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content types specified under the mandate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed manuscripts</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETDs</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Sections</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Not checked</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Journal article version to be deposited:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author's final peer-reviewed</td>
<td>Author's final peer-reviewed</td>
<td>Published edition (v)</td>
<td>Published edition (vr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can deposit be waived?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Making deposited item Open Access</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Requested or recon</td>
<td>Requested or recon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can making the deposited item Open Access be waived?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Date deposit to be made Open Access</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is deposit a precondition for research evaluation (the ‘Liège/HEFCE Model’)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rights holding</td>
<td>Author retains key rights</td>
<td>Author retains key rights</td>
<td>Author retains key</td>
<td>Author retains key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Can rights retention be waived?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Can author waive giving permission to make the article Open Access?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Policy's permitted embargo length for science, technology and medicine</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classifications and used criteria

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
1. POLICIES ALIGNMENT
Common factors

• Policies always went through a vote of the University Senate
• Deposit is mandatory in most of the cases, all universities have an institutional repository
• The most common research resources are enlisted within the policies, but very few mention explicitly the research data
• Research evaluation is bound in the majority of universities to the solely items deposited in the institutional repository
• The authors are the owner of the rights on the deposited item
• The embargo for the publications is very often not clearly specified
• There are no obligations for the “gold road” and no specific fundings are mentioned
Discriminant factors

• Date of deposit (acceptance date, publication date)
• Version to be deposited (pre-print, post-print, or both accepted)
• Waiver on the deposit
• OA mandatory, possibility of the waiver, and the date for making the deposit OA
• Waiver on the rights and on the publication in OA
• The use of specific licenses for the reuse of the deposited items
2. ALIGNMENT WITH GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OA by default

- Implemented by 7 policies
- But only in 3 universities the waiver is not allowed

- **Recommendation**: mandatory deposit without waiver
Policy vs Practice

• Gap between policy and practice, ambiguity in some terms

• Causes:
  • technical limitations on enforcing obligations
  • OA introduction is a long process

• Recommendation:
  • reduce terms ambiguity
  • the copyright reform might help handling related issues
Mandatory deposit without waiver

- Mandatory deposit without waiver in 4 universities
- On the metadata, in 9 universities
- Pre-print admitted only in 3 universities

Recommendation:
- no waiver
- a certain tolerance on “dark deposit”
Research data, a neglected resources

• Explicitly mentioned in 4 universities

• Recommendation:
  
  • Data Management Policy + infrastructure (Open Research Data default from January 2017 in H2020)

  • External infrastructures available on http://www.re3data.org/

  • Pave the way to **Big Open Access** in a context of **Big Open Data**
Gold road: an alternative?

- Alternative to self archiving in H2020 (but deposit in repository in still mandatory), additional in Suber-Shieber

- 12 policies “conform” to Suber-Shieber, but financial sustainability is not specified

- Recommendation:
  - Mention sustainable solutions for Gold Road
Reuse licenses

• Free access + libre access

• Only 2 universities make both explicit

• Recommendation:
  • Explicit reference to the use of licenses CC-BY and CC-0
Bottom-up approach

• Vote from Academic Senate in all universities

• Recommendation:

• Continuos, transversal education on OA principles
Limitations

• ROARMAP classification schema does not really match to the Italian legal context

• There are no unique definitions in the schema

• The text of a policy is not easily reducible to binary classifications: a lot of information is lost in the transformation

• Notwithstanding the application of a rigorous methodology, subjective interpretations can still be present
TOOL: OA-CHECKER
OA checker

http://oa-check.nexacenter.org

View H2020 compliance of ROARMAP policies.
Compliance: 42.86%

2. deposit of item: true

3. locus of deposit: true

4. date of deposit: true

5. mandate content types: false

6. journal article version: true

7. can deposit be waived: false
5. mandate content types

value: [ not specified, ]

reason: is 'not specified'

GMGA refs:

Sect. 29.2.1

Sect. 29.2.2.a.2

Guidelines refs:

Sect. 3.1

Sect. 3.3

Sect. 3.4

Sect. 3.11
Conclusions

• This is an exploratory work and should be intended as a contribution and methodological support for specific followups:

  • for the evolution of the existing policies

  • for those universities that will adopt an OA policy

  • to check the alignment between policies, although keeping in mind that context specific needs might always result in misalignments
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