



UiT The Arctic University of Norway

OJS is not enough

Presentation at the PKP 2019 Conference, Barcelona

*Jan Erik Frantsvåg
Open Access Adviser
UiT The Arctic University of Norway
The Library*

OJS

- A powerful publishing tool
- Designed for electronic publishing
 - Good workflow capabilities
- Functionality that supports Open Access-publishing
- Plug-ins for communication with OA services and infrastructures
- Much used by smaller and scholar-led publishing activities

What does the OA landscape look like?

- OA publishers are many, but small measured in the number of journals they publish
- Can they be competent?
 - When it comes to publishing and technology
- Can they be efficient in an economic sense?
 - Economies of scale

Table 4. Publisher size statistics.

Publisher Size	No of Publishers	No of Journals	Percentage of Publishers	Percentage of Journals
1	4446	4446	80%	36%
2	522	1044	9%	8%
3	187	561	3%	5%
4	108	432	2%	3%
5	69	345	1%	3%
6–10	137	1029	2%	8%
11–20	70	1019	1%	8%
21–50	33	1002	1%	8%
51–100	4	293	0%	2%
>100	10	2179	0%	18%
	5586	12,350	100%	100%

Frantsvåg, Jan E.; Strømme, Tormod E. 2019. "Few Open Access Journals Are Compliant with Plan S." *Publications* 7, no. 2: 26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7020026>

Problems for editors

- Used to the paper world
 - Lot of thinking need to be re-learnt
- Limited understanding of Open Access
 - No understanding of the infrastructures of OA
- Generally not technology-wise
 - Exceptions exist, but as exceptions
- No idea about economics
 - They don't have financial funding, either

What can we observe?

- A large number of journals not listed in DOAJ
 - Crawford: 5,988 (2015)
 - A DOAJ listing is a sign of acceptable scholarly and OA quality
 - A DOAJ listing is also a distribution tool for metadata
- Those listed in DOAJ still lack or are weak on a number of quality aspects

Plan S requirements (the original ones)

Non-APC publishers	Small (1–5 journals)	meet 1.1 of 4 technical criteria on average
	Large (>100 journals)	meet 3.5 of 4 technical criteria on average
APC publishers	Small (1–5 journals)	meet 1.6 of 4 technical criteria on average
	Large (>100 journals)	meet 3.8 of 4 technical criteria on average

- Significant differences between small and large publishers
- Some difference between non-APC and APC publishers

But also

Non-APC publishers	Small (1–5 journals)	meet 1.9 of 3 policy criteria on average
	Large (>100 journals)	meet 1.7 of 3 policy criteria on average
APC publishers	Small (1–5 journals)	meet 2.4 of 4 policy criteria on average
	Large (>100 journals)	meet 3.0 of 4 policy criteria on average

- If we look at policy criteria, we find that there is not much difference between large and small, and APC journals and non-APC journals
- So it is on the technical side the problems lie.

What are the technical problems?

- Lack of DOIs
 - Which also reduces dissemination of metadata
 - OJS helps with assigning DOIs, and submitting to CrossRef
 - But one need to understand why and how – and have the money
 - Many small journals have no financial economy, and cannot pay bills
- Lack of long-term preservation arrangements
 - Even if PKP offers an easy, free solution
- No machine-readable full-text format
 - Fully understandable! XML is not for amateurs!
 - Will be costly, and need financing
- No embedded license info in text files
 - Lacking for 46 per cent of journals

Why?

- Publishing entails a number of important competences
- Scholar-led publishing is led by scholars
 - They are very competent, but probably not in publishing
 - There is a huge cost associated with acquiring the necessary competence
 - Time is money! Or costs to other activities, or family life ...
- The average OA journal is APC-free, published alone and has few articles
 - The cost of competence has few articles to be divided between
 - i.e., the model is very expensive per article
 - And no income to buy competence with
 - Not being competent also has costs!

The future

- Plan S relented and the final criteria were less demanding
- But: Plan S will be evaluated in 2024. Clear signs that the criteria softened now will be toughened up from 2025 – most are already recommendations
- Meaning: Very few small, scholar-led/institution-based journals will be compliant in 6 years from now
 - While Plan S may have grown to become more important
- The demise of scholar-led publishing, unless something is done!

Solutions?

- More APC-based scholar-led publishing?
 - Allows outsourcing of competence-demanding activities
- More and better tools, esp. regarding XML
- Larger publishing entities?
 - More resilient entities
 - Allows costs to be spread over more articles
 - Economies of scale
 - But what scale is needed?
 - Probably rather large – 50+?
- Institutional willingness to provide better funding!
 - And to enter into inter-institutional publishing arrangements to create large entities

Questions?

- Remember to keep a look-out for the Munin conference
- This year's next week in Tromsø 27-28 November
 - <https://site.uit.no/muninconf/>
- But there will probably be one next year in November, too
- The Munin Conference is an annual conference on scholarly publishing and communication, primarily revolving around open access, open data and open science

Thanks for listening!