



DIAMAS

Developing Institutional Open Access
Publishing Models to Advance
Scholarly Communication

The DIAMAS Project: A presentation to the NUAS Libraries seminar

Open Publishing: A Nordic Perspective

March 21st 2024

Jan Erik Frantsvåg
UiT The Arctic University of Norway
WP2 Lead



The DIAMAS project has received funding from the
European Union's HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ERA-01 grant





Project background

- Earlier research showed problems with the structure of OA publishing
 - “A wide archipelago of relatively small journals serving diverse communities”
Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J. E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., & Proudman, V. (2021). OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 1: Findings. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4658704>
 - Diamond OA an import part of institutional publishing
 - DIAMAS to look at institutional publishing



The work of WP2

- Some 40 competent and interested persons from around 20 organisations participated
- Started in September 2022 and delivered the report end of November 2023



Little to build on

- No data previously collected on institutional publishing as such
- No organisations geared to institutional publishing as such
- Had to start from scratch
- Initiated a large survey
- Institutional Publishing Service Provider (IPSP) a central term
 - Institutional Publishing (IP) activities
 - Service providers (SP) to such IPs
 - Or combinations of IP and SP



What we did

- Created a survey
 - Trying to cover many aspects
- Tried identifying possible IPs and SPs in ERA
 - Data we had was skewed towards OA journal publishing
 - Some data relevant to OA and TA book publishing and TA journal publishing
 - Engaged networks we knew of
- Sent out to more than 5,000 e-mail addresses late March-early May 2023 in 10 different languages
 - And to e-mail lists, and to organisations asking them to distribute to their members
- Due to the earthquake, dissemination to Türkiye was postponed until September
 - Country report planned for later this year
- Takeaway: The direct e-mails gave us few responses; it was the e-mail lists and sending via organisations that resulted in responses.

Some results

What did we get?

685 responses we could use

- An uneven geographical distribution
 - But most countries adequately represented
- Our numbers indicate that a major part of IPSPs are represented
 - But the smallest ones underrepresented
- $\frac{3}{4}$ IPs, $\frac{1}{4}$ SP
- 90% publish journals
 - Most publish relatively few journals, <5



Some major findings

- Countries are more different than regions are
- Organisation of scholarly publishing activities on a national scale very important
 - Support and administrative structures
 - Networks and organisations
 - Funding opportunities



Finances & organisation

- >2/3 are non-commercial public organisations
 - SPs more likely to be private companies
- ≈60% IPs and SPs part of a parent organisation

- Mainly small-scale activities
 - Heavily dependent on voluntary and in-kind contributions
- The Diamond model is very common
- APC used as a revenue stream by 19% of OA journals publishers
- VAC (voluntary author contributions) used by 23.5%

Finances & organisation cont.

- 54% of all-diamond publishers rely on fixed and permanent funding from parent organisation, 20% on periodically negotiated funding from parent
 - high reliance
- 31% rely on content and print sales
 - low reliance
- Some 70% would consider cooperating with others to save costs
 - At least in some area:
 - IT services, Production services and Training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice the most important, all with more than 40% inclination to cooperate



Open Science practices

- Double-anonymous peer review most common (76%)
- Open peer review used by 17%
 - ≈30% of respondents willing to implement in the future
 - Many use OJS for journal publishing, Open peer review not yet an fully developed option in OJS
- 90% of journal output OA
 - 76% of conference output
 - 58% of academic books
- 97% of journals OA in Eastern Europe
- Academic journals the most important output, >90% of respondents using this format



Open Science practices cont.

- 87% of respondents adhere to OA or Open Science policies on various levels
 - National, institutional, their own
 - Variation between countries, national policies not important in all countries
 - Most important for OA journals
- Only 45% consider their content well indexed, 55% want improvement
 - Satisfying technical and non-technical participation criteria together with metadata criteria a problem for 60%
 - Paying for membership and recurring charges a problem for >40%
 - More of a problem for smaller IPs
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB) generally not well implemented



Takeaways

- The typical IP is small and rather alone
- Needs better and more stable, reliable, and long-term financing
- Needs partners to co-operate with
 - Bigger could be better?
- Needs support
 - Competence must be made available
 - Advice on best practices and how to best align with these
 - Support on how to implement various practices and technical options
- Strong willingness to align with Open Science practices and good publishing practices

Outputs available now

- A treasure trove is found at <https://zenodo.org/communities/diamasproject?q=&l=list&p=1&s=20&sort=newest>



D2.1 IPSP Scoping Report [10.5281/zenodo.7890567](https://zenodo.org/record/7890567)

Defining some concepts and giving a precise geographical definition

DIAMAS Survey Questionnaire and Glossary [10.5281/zenodo.10207447](https://zenodo.org/record/10207447)

The English version of the Questionnaire used in the survey, and the accompanying glossary

D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report: Institutional Publishing in the ERA: Results from the DIAMAS survey [10.5281/zenodo.10022183](https://zenodo.org/record/10022183)

The full-length 237-page report including short country reports

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Full country reports [10.5281/zenodo.10026206](https://zenodo.org/record/10026206)

A supplement to the above, with longer country reports for some countries

The European landscape of institutional publishing - A synopsis of results from the DIAMAS survey [10.5281/zenodo.10551709](https://zenodo.org/record/10551709)

A short version of the full-length report

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Complete country reports [10.5281/zenodo.10473494](https://zenodo.org/record/10473494)

A companion to the synopsis – the longer country reports for the countries that has one, and the shorter reports for the other countries

DIAMAS survey on Institutional Publishing – aggregated data [10.5281/zenodo.10590502](https://zenodo.org/record/10590502)

Survey data aggregated on a level that allows us to share them

And, of course: <https://doi.org/10.7557/19.7418>

Open Science Talk

[Current](#) [Archives](#) [Announcements](#) [Subscribe](#) [About](#) ▾

🔍 Search

[Home](#) / [Archives](#) / [No. 55 \(2024\): The European Landscape of Institutional Publishing](#) / [Podcasts](#)

The European Landscape of Institutional Publishing

Sona Arasteh

OPERAS; Max Weber Stiftung.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5725-1922>

Jan Erik Frantsvåg

UiT The Arctic University of Norway
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3413-8799>

Per Pippin Aspaas

UiT The Arctic University of Norway
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6760-9617>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7557/19.7418>

Keywords: Diamond Open Access, Institutional Publishing, Non-Commercial Publishing, Scholar-Led Publishing, Open Access, Diamond OA, OA

#55

Open
Science
Talk



🔊 Listen

📄 Download

📄 Transcript (PDF)

Current Issue

ATOM 1.0

RSS 2.0

RSS 1.0

Septentrio Academic Publishing is
a publishing service provided by
The University Library at



UiT The Arctic
University of Norway

What will come?

Coming later: WP3

- The EQSIP; i.e. the “Extensible Quality Standard for Institutional Publishing”
- And an accompanying self-assessment tool
 - Not an exam, but a tool to measure how well you fit the ideal
 - Will point to areas most in need for improvement
 - A tool for those who owns/funds/performs institutional publishing
- Early versions have been released
 - Names etc. could be changed, content, too. Still useful!
- [10.5281/zenodo.10726731](https://zenodo.org/record/10726731) (EQSIP) and [10.5281/zenodo.10797038](https://zenodo.org/record/10797038) (tool)

More to come ... WP4

- Common Access Point (CAP)
 - A knowledge-exchange hub for Institutional Publishing Service Providers
- The IPSP registry
 - A database over institutions engaged in Institutional Publishing and Service Providing to such publishing
 - A tool to find partners or providers of competence and/or services
- The portal: with resources addressing the 7 core components of scholarly publishing, supporting the EQSIP
- The forum: A virtual space supporting user interaction
- Will lay the foundation of the future ERA Diamond OA Capacity Hub (ERA-DCH)
 - A virtual network of resources and regional/ national Capacity Centers coordinated via a global federation for Diamond OA
 - National Nordic CCs or a common Nordic regional CC?

and more ... WP5

Sustainability

- Building an evidence-base / a picture of the context
 - T5.1 Research into the sustainability of IPSPs. M19
 - T5.2 Identify areas of potential collaboration. M30
 - T5.3 National overviews with institutional publishing policy contexts and funding practice. M21
- Providing tools to take action
 - T5.4 Development of a sustainability self-assessment workflow. M18
 - T5.5 Design and develop a suite of IPSP sustainability resources. M30

and more ... WP6

- Connecting institutions at executive/leadership level with IPSPs in their organisations and provide recommendations, guidelines, and strategies on how to support them locally
- Synergy Report (Feb 2025):
 - High level report introducing institutional leaders to:
 - Institutional publishing
 - Diamond open access
 - How the tools created by DIAMAS can support institutional publishing
- Actionable Recommendations (Feb 2025):
 - A series of co-designed recommendations to support the implementation of diamond OA institutional publishing for:
 - Institutional leaders (including learned societies).
 - Funders, sponsors and donors.
 - Policy makers.

The Nordic picture

Five countries

Doing things in five different ways

- Iceland – small and looks disorganised
 - Might be the University of Iceland plays a larger role than is visible in our data?
- Finland
 - The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies a major player
- Denmark: Royal Library publishes about 50% of journals
- Norway: 6–7 mid-size institutional services are major publishers
 - One commercial publisher also very important, the largest; and one mid-sized
- Sweden: A number of mid-size institutional services are major publishers
 - Royal Library on its way to become the major publisher?



Problems

Nordic problems the same as most:

- Stable, long-term financing
- Access to competence – both money, and finding personnel
- Indexation – e.g. more than 50% of Swedish respondents want more help to get indexed in DOAJ
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB) generally not well implemented – possibly below a low average (bad to awful part of the scale)
- Probably generally too small – maybe not Denmark and Finland, but the others
 - Economies of scale important in publishing! Heavy competence costs as we do it now.

What to do? – my suggestions

- Establish a Nordic capacity centre
 - To work with the ERA Diamond OA Capacity Hub
 - Provide channels to competence
 - Co-operate across borders
 - Too small to operate on a national basis
- Consolidate
 - Within countries
 - Across borders, e.g. within disciplines
 - Discuss merging some national journals into Nordic ones?
- Unearth
 - Journals not visible, e.g. in DOAJ
 - Journals that are Bronze, but easily could be transformed to real OA
 - Helping journals that are TA to convert to OA

Thank you!

Jan Erik Frantsvåg

Academic Librarian/Open Access Adviser
UiT The Arctic University of Norway

jan.e.frantsvag@uit.no