DIAMAS

Developing Institutional Open Access Publishing Models to Advance Scholarly Communication

Institutional publishing in the ERA: Full country reports

A supplement to the D2.3 Final IPSP landscape Report

Author(s): See list inside

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10026207

Funded by the European Union

Version history

Version	Created/Modified	Comments
0.0		
0.1		
0.2		
0.3		
1.0	16.11.2023	
1.1	29.01.2024	Minor text edits, some numbers for Croatia corrected.

DISCLAIMER

The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon -WIDERA-2021-ERA-01 *research and innovation programme.*

Funded by
the European Union

Author list

Authors are here listed alphabetically by (first) country.

Bosman, Jeroen	Utrecht University	0000-0001-5796-2727	Belgium, Netherlands
Kramer, Bianca	Sesame Open Science	0000-0002-5965-6560	Belgium, Netherlands
Stojanovski, Jadranka	University of Zadar	0000-0001-7399-522X	Croatia
Melinščak Zlodi, Iva	University of Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	0000-0001-6477-2016	Croatia
Frantsvåg, Jan Erik	UiT The Arctic University of Norway	0000-0003-3413-8799	Denmark, Norway, Sweden
Klaus, Tabea	Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (UGOE)	0000-0002-2791-1053	Germany
Schima, Julian	Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (UGOE)	0009-0005-2851-3523	Germany
Bargheer, Margo	Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (UGOE)	0000-0001-8246-8210	Germany
Agnoloni, Tommaso	Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems, National Research Council of Italy (IGSG - CNR)	0000-0003-3063-2239	Italy
Peruginelli, Ginevra	Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems, National Research Council of Italy (IGSG - CNR)	0000-0002-9331-4476	Italy
Franczak, Mateusz	The Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IBL PAN)	0000-0002-0416-2491	Poland
Wnuk, Magdalena	The Institute of Literary Research of the Polish	0000-0003-4129-6664	Poland

Funded by the European Union

	Academy of Sciences (IBL PAN)		
Caliman Fontes, Lorena	Universidade de Coimbra	0000-0001-9566-2397	Portugal
de Pablo Llorente, Virginia	FECYT	0000-0002-9581-8301	Spain
Pellin, Elio	University Library of Bern	0000-0002-4076-6743	Switzerland
Stone, Graham	Jisc	0000-0002-5189-373X	United Kingdom
Rooryck, Johan	ESF – cOAlition S	0000-0001-7214-7405	
Manista, Frank	Jisc	0000-0001-6901-1507	

Funded by the European Union

Table of Contents

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Acronyms

AEUP	Association of European University Presses
APC	Article Processing Charges
ATAG	Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines
CC	Creative Commons
CLOCKSS	Controlled LOCKSS
CNRS	Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
COPE	Committee on Publication Ethics
CoARA	Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment
CRediT	Contributor Roles Taxonomy
DOAJ	Directory of Open Access Journals
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
DORA	Declaration on Research Assessment
EASE	European Association of Science Editors
EDIB	Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging
EOSC	European Open Science Cloud
EUR	Euro, the currency of the EU
FEP	Federation of European Publishers
FNSO	French National Open Science Fund
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HTML	HyperText Markup Language
I4OC	Initiative for Open Citations
IP	Institutional Publisher
IPA	International Publishers Associations
IPSP	Institutional Publisher Service Provider
ISBN	International Standard Book Number
ISSN	International Standard Serial Number
JSON	JavaScript Object Notation
LOCKSS	Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe
N/A	Not applicable
OA	Open Access
OASPA	Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association
OJS	Open Journal System
OMP	Open Monograph Press
OPA	Online Publishers Association
OR	Open Research
OS	Open Science
PDF	Portable document format
PID	Persistent Identifier
PKP	Public Knowledge Project
PKP PN	PKP Preservation Network
POSI	Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure
RI	Research Infrastructure

Funded by the European Union

S2O	Subscribe to open
SCOSS	Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services
SP	Service Provider
UAAG	User Agent Accessibility Guidelines
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
URN	Uniform Resource Names
WCAG	Web Content Accessibility Guidelines
XML	Extensible Markup Language

Country codes

In this document we use the ISO 3166 2-letter country code as shorthand for the countries, e.g. in the table captions.

Country	**Country code**
Belgium	BE
Croatia	HR
Denmark	DK
Germany	DE
Italy	IT
Netherlands	NL
Norway	NO
Poland	PL
Portugal	PT
Spain	ES
Sweden	SE
Switzerland	CH
United Kingdom	UK

Table 1 Country codes.

Funded by the European Union

Recurring references

There are a couple documents and websites that will be referenced many times throughout the document. Instead of inserting a formal reference every time, we will use an abbreviation.

Websites will generally be linked to, not necessarily referenced.

Acronym	Name	Link
DOAJ	The Directory of Open Access Journals (*Directory of Open Access Journals – DOAJ*)[1]	https://www.doaj.org/
GOA8	Walt Crawford: Gold Open Access 2017-2022 Articles in Journals (GOA8) (Crawford, 2023)[2]	https://waltcrawford.name/goaj.html

[1] Numbers from DOAJ in the country reports are collected at various dates during the summer of 2023

[2] Data in this report and the corresponding data set is per January 1, 2023.

Funded by the European Union

Introduction

This report is a supplement to the DIAMAS IPSP landscape report: *Institutional publishing in the ERA: results from the DIAMAS survey*, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.10022184. Both reports draw on the 685 valid responses to the DIAMAS survey conducted between March and May 2023. This represents data from 43 countries in the ERA.

For various reasons, which are outlined in the landscape report, there have been challenges in reaching out to all the actors active in publishing in the ERA. Therefore, these country reports are an attempt at describing a snapshot of the landscape of institutional publishing in Europe based on analysis of the data collected in the survey sample. It is hoped that the reports will promote understanding of the diversity across Europe, and that it can help point to areas that need attention, and questions that need further investigation.

All countries have a short report in the main Landscape Report. This supplement to the Report consists of the 13 longer reports written as part of the DIAMAS survey analysis but not included in the Landscape Report itself (highlighted in Table 2). In the Landscape Report itself, shorter versions of these 13 country reports are included. Country reports were written by individual authors or small groups of authors with knowledge about the country and ability to read in relevant languages. Most authors are members of the DIAMAS project. However, for the Portuguese and Swiss reports experts from outside of the project were invited to write these sections. We are very grateful to both authors for their time.

In the Landscape Report, countries are grouped into regions specified in the Scoping document (Bargheer, Bosman et al., 2022). In this supplement, the countries are listed alphabetically. All four regions in Europe are represented with one or more countries in this document.

Table 1 shows the country codes, which are added all table captions in the country chapter, and also in the chapter headings for ease of reference. This allows the List of Tables to indicate which country the table relates to.

Funded by the European Union

Country	Responses	Share of responses		Country	Responses	Share of responses
Albania	1	0.1%		Lithuania	7	1.0%
Armenia	1	0.1%		Luxemburg	1	0.1%
Austria	5	0.7%		Moldova	3	0.4%
Belgium	8	1.2%		Montenegro	1	0.1%
Bosnia & Herzegovina	4	0.6%		Morocco	3	0.4%
Brazil	1	0.1%		Netherlands	17	2.5%
Bulgaria	9	1.3%		North Macedonia	2	0.3%
Canada	2	0.3%		Norway	15	2.2%
Croatia	77	11.2%		Poland	31	4.5%
Cyprus	1	0.1%		Portugal	18	2.6%
Czechia	8	1.2%		Republic Of Ireland	10	1.5%
Denmark	10	1.5%		Romania	17	2.5%
Estonia	2	0.3%		Serbia	79	11.5%
Finland	27	3.9%		Slovakia	1	0.1%
France	60	8.8%		Slovenia	8	1.2%
Georgia	1	0.1%		Spain	74	10.8%
Germany	43	6.3%		Sweden	15	2.2%
Greece	5	0.7%		Switzerland	19	2.8%
Hungary	6	0.9%		Tunisia	1	0.1%
Iceland	3	0.4%		Ukraine	12	1.8%
Italy	52	7.6%		United Kingdom	20	2.9%
Latvia	5	0.7%		**Total**	**685**	**100 %**

Table 2 Responses per country (with the long reports highlighted).

Funded by the European Union

Belgium (BE)

Authors:
Jeroen Bosman, Utrecht University, ORCID 0000-0001-5796-2727
Bianca Kramer, Sesame Open Science, ORCID 0000-0002-5965-6560

Belgium has some 12 universities, four each in Flanders, Wallonia and the Brussels region. Many universities have university colleges or Hogescholen attached to them. While the universities have a strong research focus, the university colleges are more teaching oriented. Next to the higher education sector, there are also a few dozen technology institutes. There are two academies of arts and sciences (ARB and KVAB), promoting arts and sciences. FWO (Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen or Research Foundation – Flanders) is the main funding organisation for the Flemish community, and F.R.S.–FNRS (Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique – FNRS) for the French community. BELSPO is an organisation that prepares, implements and evaluates federal science policy on behalf of the Government. The Universities of Liège and Leuven/Louvain have university presses. The Flemish Royal Academy KVAB publishes scholarly publication series through a commercial publisher.

Both FWO and FRS have open access mandates, requiring green OA but providing some financial support for financing gold OA through grant budgets (for FRS, only for full OA journals and with a maximum of €750, for FWO no limitations specified). Since 2018 there is a federal law for secondary publishing rights. It gives authors the right (with retroactive effect) to make the results of their research in the form of the author accepted manuscript, if at least half of this was funded with public funds, freely available for social and human sciences after a period of twelve months and for other sciences after a period of six months. As yet there is very limited uptake of transformative agreements. In Flanders there is the Flemish Open Science Board that invests 5M EUR in Open Science (mainly RDM), and Open Science KPIs have been agreed upon, one of which strives for an 80% Open Access rate for journal articles resulting from Flemish public funding.

DIAMAS research found that Belgium has 53 journals in DOAJ, two with the DOAJ seal, 41 that let the authors retain all rights. Almost all (50/53) journals in DOAJ are diamond journals. Belgium has 22 institutional publishers in DOAJ (via GOA8), 22 of which publish diamond journals.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS survey received eight valid responses from Belgium, five of which self-identify as publishers and three as service providers. These are modest numbers, so care should be taken in interpreting results. However, the results do give evidence of practices and opinion in a part of the Belgian institutional publishing sector.

More than half of the IPSPs are part of a parent organisation, with three operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation, and two being part of a library. Of these five IPSPs, three only provide services to their parent organisation. In

Funded by the European Union

terms of legal status, the majority (6) are public organisations and two are private not-for-profit. Most have at least some paid staff, with half of the respondents employing more than 5 FTE (Table 3).

	N	%
None	1	12.5
Less than 2	3	37.5
6–10	3	37.5
11–20	1	12.5

N = 8 of 8; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q7 (Belgium, all)

Table 3 Number of paid staff directly employed or contracted (in FTE) (BE).

Most Belgian IPSPs in the sample focus on a subset of publishing activities, with a clear difference between IPs and SPs: the latter focus more on IT, communication, and training/support/advice and the former on average more on editorial functions and production.

Language

Belgian respondents indicated they use either English, French or Dutch as the primary language, with the majority publishing in all three languages. Some also publish in German, Spanish and/or Italian. Two IPSPs publish in French but not Dutch, and one only in Dutch.

Membership engagement

Membership of organisations and signing of charters is very low in the Belgian sample, with just a couple of IPSPs being members of publisher organisations (including OASPA) or signing DORA. Two organisations/initiatives with slightly higher uptake are the Association of European University Presses (AEUP) and the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA), each with three out of eight IPSPs as members or signatories.

Publication types

Regarding portfolios: seven IPSPs say they publish and/or service journals, four say they publish and/or service books. A further five are involved in conference output and four (not necessarily the same) publish grey literature, non-academic outputs or other output formats. Only one IPSP publishes and/or services a single publication type (journals). Others have a more mixed portfolio, with most covering three to six publication types.

In terms of the size of journal portfolios, most IPSPs in the Belgian subset are quite small, with five or fewer journals. Two publishers have 21-50 journals (Table 4). One

Funded by the European Union

service provider did not supply the numbers of journals (and other publication types) they support. The four IPSPs that are engaged in supporting book publishing publish less than 50 books a year, with half of them publishing 10 books or less.

	N	%
1	3	42.9
2-5	2	28.6
21-50	2	28.6

N = 7 of 8; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q9.1 (Belgium, all)

Table 4 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022. (BE)

Table 5 shows the number of articles published by the Belgian sample.

	N	%
1-10	1	14.3
11-50	2	28.6
51-100	1	14.3
101-200	3	42.9

N = 7 of 8; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q9.2 (Belgium, all)

Table 5 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022. (BE)

Unsurprisingly, in terms of disciplines, the majority of IPSPs are active in the humanities, social sciences and multidisciplinary publishing. Two out of the eights IPSPs are active in the natural sciences.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

The majority of IPSPs in the sample have a budget that is formally monitored or administered. However, the size of annual budgets vary greatly from 1-10K EUR to over 1M EUR a year. Four out of the five IPSPs that are part of larger organisations receive at least some kind support from their parent organisation, most often for use of facilities and premises as well as general IT services. Three of the five IPSPs also have salaries of permanent staff paid by their parent organisation.

Five out of eight IPSPS (both IPs and SPs) use a range of external services, most often via in-kind contributions. Exceptions are production services (including typesetting), which are most often outsourced, and editorial services, which most often involve voluntary work (Table 6).

Funded by the European Union

	N of total (n=8)	% total	In-kind		Outsourced		Voluntary		None/Not Applicable	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Editorial services	5	62.5	2	40	0	0	3	60	1	20
Production services	5	62.5	2	40	3	60	1	20	1	20
IT services	5	62.5	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0
Communication services	5	62.5	3	60	1	20	1	20	1	20
Administrative, legal, and financial services	5	62.5	3	60	1	20	0	0	1	20
Training support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice	5	62.5	2	40	0	0	0	0	3	60
N = 8 of 8, multiple answer question; source DIAMAS survey – Q14.1 (Belgium, all)										

Table 6 Use of external services. (BE)

Most types of funding are seen as 'not applicable' for half or more of the responding IPSPs (Table 7). Subsidies from the parent organisations are the funding sources most often mentioned by IPSPs as being somewhat or highly dependent on. Other funding sources that are mentioned at least twice are time-limited grants or subsidies, permanent government subsidy and content and print sales. Overall though, the funding picture is scattered with all sources used, but no clear pattern or reliance on a specific type.

	N of total (n=8)	% total	Very low		Low		Neither high nor low		High		Very high		Not applicable	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisation	6	75	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0	1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7
Periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation	7	87.5	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	4	57.1
Time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation	8	100	2	25	0	0	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	3	37.5
Permanent public government funding	7	87.5	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	4	57.1
Collective funding	8	100	2	25	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	4	50
Voluntary Author Contributions	7	87.5	0	0	0	0	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	0	5	71.4
Content and print sales	7	87.5	1	14.3	0	0	1	14.3	2	28.6	0	0	3	42.9
Author Processing Charges	6	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	5	83.3
Any other income	7	87.5	2	28.6	1	14.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	57.1
N = 8 of 8, single answer question; source DIAMAS survey – Q17 (Belgium, all)														

Table 7 Reliance on funding over the last 3 years. (BE)

The different sources of funding are perceived as stable for most IPSPs. Of the five IPSPs that also rely on non-monetary/in kind support, all but one indicate that reliance is high to very high, regardless of whether they see that as problematic or not.

Funded by the European Union

Producing a real profit/surplus is an expectation for three out of eight IPSPs, while another two are at least expected to break even, with losses/overspend not permitted.

Five out of eight organisations (including one SP) state they would consider collaboration with other organisations: most often on IT services, communication, and training and support.

Governance

Regarding the formal description of activities, five IPSPs say they have formal statutes or by-laws, but only one says there is external legislation or policy requiring that. Regarding their accounts, Three out of six responding IPSPs state that there is an external audit. Most IPSPs have either a management office (4) or a governing board (3). In about half of the cases, the governance model includes representation from the wider scholarly community.

Open Science/Open Access practices

All but one organisation state they have open access policies for journal publishing: they either follow a national policy, may also have a policy of their own or in their parent organisation. Issues addressed in the policies are mostly copyright, self-archiving and licences. Two of the four IPSPs involved in book publishing follow formal open access policies for books, either the policy of their parent organisation or their own policy.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

Even though seven out of the eight respondents are involved in journal publishing, four say that preprints are 'not applicable' to them. The others accept preprinted submissions for some or all of their journals. A similar pattern emerges for self-archiving. It should be noted that two IPSPs that state these activities are not applicable to them are SPs, which might indeed provide the option for, but not make editorial decisions on these issues. Very few IPSPs impose embargoes, just one for (some) journals and one for books. Three organisations provide open metadata and two do not, the others (3) say they 'don't know' if that is the case or that it is 'not applicable' to them. This indicates a potential lack of awareness. Almost all IPSPs work with Creative Commons licences for journals and one also for books. The majority offer CC BY, and sometimes also CC BY-NC or CC BY-SA. Open peer review is not currently offered, but one respondent is considering it. CRediT contributor roles are apparently not known or not considered, as no IPSP is using these.

Over half of respondents are involved in editorial management, performing all or most of the tasks involved in that. Double blind peer review is by far the most common, with a minority also offering single-blind peer review. Open peer review is still relatively rare among the Belgian IPSPs represented in the survey, with only one respondent working with open reviewer identities and none publishing open review reports.

Funded by the European Union

Technical services efficiency

All but one of the Belgian IPSPs responding provide at least one type of technical service, with hosting and full editorial workflow being the most common, closely followed by metadata and quality control and user interfaces. Publishing systems used are mixed, with OJS used by four respondents, and Dataverse, Editorial Manager, Janeway and Lodel also being mentioned. Two IPSPs customise or develop their publishing system in-house, while two use (other) commercial software. Most IPSPs assign PIDs to all or some of their journals, with only two saying they do not assign PIDs at all. All but one IPSP that assign PIDs work with Crossref DOIs, often next to others such as ISSN and ISBN. Openness of metadata is mixed: four say they do not, three do and one doesn't know. PDF is the most popular format for publications by far, with about half also using HTML. The majority of IPSPs do have an archiving policy, with most using national or institutional library infrastructure, rather than Portico or CLOCKSS. In addition, three IPSPs that use OJS indicate they are using PKP's preservation network.

In terms of challenges faced it appears that in general many IPSPs face challenges for most sorts of activities. They are mostly varied though, with IPSPs indicating both different types of constraint and different challenges. However, some challenges do stand out. For instance, there are often financial and human resource constraints to providing adequate infrastructure and services. In addition, multiple IPSPs mention a lack of human resources available to provide sufficient metadata and technical limitations of existing infrastructure hindering interoperability with other services. Indexing seems to be a relatively minor issue, with four out of six responding IPSPs saying their content is already well indexed. The others are looking to be indexed in DOAJ and databases like Scopus, respectively. Challenges in indexing are varied, with more than one IPSP mentioning an issue with communications/requirements/paperwork being only in English.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Most IPSPs have a privacy policy and a data protection policy. Regarding EDIB issues, most IPSPs are not (yet) planning measures or policies, or consider these 'not applicable'. However, two IPSPs have implemented measures or policies regarding language diversity (both), socio-economic background and/or gender, and are either considering addressing other EDIB aspects or are in the process of doing so. One IPSP has a code of conduct, and two others have an accessibility policy, though this is not publicly available.

All but one have their services available in English, as well as either in Dutch (2) or French (2) or both (3). Only two IPSPs provide their services only in Dutch or French, respectively. Quite a few do publish texts in multiple languages.

Funded by the European Union

Croatia (HR)

Authors:
Jadranka Stojanovski, University of Zadar, ORCID 0000-0001-7399-522X
Iva Melinščak Zlodi, University of Zagreb Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, ORCID 0000-0001-6477-2016

Scholarly publishing has a rich heritage in Croatia, tracing back to the appearance of the first scientific and professional journals in 1851. The custodianship of academic journals are primarily universities and learned societies. A defining characteristic of their ethos is their commitment to the not-for-profit business model, a key catalyst in the early embracement of open access principles. This commitment paved the way for establishing HRČAK, a comprehensive national platform nurturing open access journals. Presently, HRČAK hosts a diverse assemblage of 405 active Croatian scholarly, professional and popular open access journals (536 in total), constituting a repository for 285,000 published articles.

In tandem with this ecosystem, the diamond-like facets of the open access publishing model are finely tuned through pivotal government subsidies, which are dispensed following an annual call and evaluation process. An open access approach and a journal's inclusion in HRČAK are mandatory requirements for government subsidies. Remarkably, only a few Croatian journals resort to the 'article processing charges' mechanism, reaffirming the community's dedication to unfettered knowledge dissemination. As proof of this support, 191 journals received government subsidies in 2021, with an average allocation of 7.9K EUR per journal, further underscoring the commitment to nurturing an inclusive and sustainable diamond scholarly landscape.

The transition to publishing OA books/monographs in Croatia is much more restrained, with only a few active institutional publishers, such as MorePress at the University of Zadar and FF Open Press at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb.

DIAMAS survey - General service features

In the preparatory phase, contacts for 252 IPSPs were identified (228 for institutions publishing one or more journals on the HRČAK platform, and an additional 23 journals were identified from external sources), plus SRCE as a service provider of the HRČAK platform itself. Most IPSPs are non-profit public organisations (HEIs, institutes, learned or professional societies, archives or museums).

The survey invitations were sent through Qualtrics, but in addition to that, project members sent individual invites to contacts from identified IPSPs (with reminders later in the process). The survey was also disseminated through the existing Croatian mailing lists dedicated to publishing (list of editors of HRČAK journals, list of members of Croatian Association for Scholarly Communication, 'Izdavastvo-l' general scholarly publishing list and 'szi-bib' list of academic librarians).

Funded by the European Union

This resulted in one of the highest country response rates for this survey (maybe the highest if the country size and the initial sample are considered). There are 77 respondents originating from Croatia.

When deciding how to fill out the survey, as an institutional publisher (IP) or a service provider to institutional publishing (SP), 13 self-identified as SPs. However, many of these self-identified choices could be questioned from their other responses.

Respondents' Profile

To get an insight into the level of institutional structure of respondents, the job title/function data was categorised into seven predefined categories (Table 8)). Although the survey was intended for institutions (not journals), most respondents (40/77) are from editorial teams, and only nine represent institutional publishing departments, services and committees. A possible reason for this could be the scope and complexity of the survey, which is why the contact persons at the institutions turned to the knowledgeable editors of their publications to fill out the survey in the best possible way.

Administration/management (deans, vice-deans, assistant directors, etc.)	6
Editorial (editor-in-chief, editor, technical editor, etc.)	40
IP publishing representative (president of the publishing committee, head of the publishing service, etc.)	9
Librarian	11
Society representative (president, treasurer, chairman, etc.)	9
Director of the publishing house	1
SP representative	1

Table 8 Respondents' Profile. (HR

IPSP profiles

By visiting websites provided in the survey as IPSP publishing service URLs, one of 10 categories was selected for each IPSP (Table 9**Error! Reference source not found.**). Only four institutions (all faculties/universities) have dedicated web pages for their publishing activities and services, and 22 are single journal websites. Croatian IPSPs are mainly universities/faculties (17/77) and learned societies (18/77). The large representation of journals in the survey will certainly result in a weaker representation of other types of publications issued by IPSPs, resulting in skewed results towards journals' practices.

Funded by the European Union

University	17
Institutional publishing (dedicated webpage)	4
Research institute	6
Learned society	18
Museum	3
Library	3
Library repository	1
Single journal	22
National publishing platform	1
Publishing house	1
Error (personal web page)	1
Total	77

Table 9 IPSP categories. (HR)

Publication language and multilingualism

Among the surveyed IPSPs, three exclusively publish content in Croatian, while an additional 38 predominantly publish in Croatian, venturing also into other languages (Table 10). Respondents were prompted to rank languages by their prevalence. This underscores the fact that Croatian serves as the primary publication language for 41/69 IPSPs. Conversely, 11 IPSPs exclusively publish in English. This indicates that 14 IPSPs confine their publications to Croatian or English, while an impressive 55 IPSPs are committed to multilingual publishing (Table 11).

Croatian	3
English	11
Croatian - English	26
+German	25
+Serbian	9
+French	8
+Slovenian	8
+Italian	11
+Russian	4
+Bosnian	3

Funded by the European Union

+Spanish	2
+Hungarian	2
+Czech	1

Table 10 Publication languages. (HR)

One language	14
Two languages	26
Three languages	5
Four languages	3
Five languages	21

Table 11 Number of languages (HR)

A substantial number of 37 IPSPs, accounting for 52% of respondents, disseminate identical content across multiple languages. Among these, 28 IPSPs opt for bilingual presentation within a single document, 17 adopt a simultaneous approach with separate documents for diverse languages, and 12 embrace a sequential strategy with different language versions across distinct journals (Table 12).

	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
Bilingual	28	1	7	24	2	9
Simultaneous	17	1	5	31	2	9
Sequential	12	1	4	32	3	11

Table 12 Multilingual publishing of full-text output. (HR)

The enthusiasm for multilingual communication extends to abstracts, with an impressive 55 IPSPs (71%) offering abstracts in more than one language (Table 13). These abstracts are predominantly provided in English when the original language is different. Furthermore, 25 IPSPs go further by translating metadata into English when the source language diverges, while 33 IPSPs offer translation and/or language-check services to authors (Table 14).

	Yes	No	Don't know
Does the IPSP support multilingual publishing of abstracts?	55	17	1

Table 13 Multilingual abstracts. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
Using toolkits or training to address language bias in peer-review	5	0	7	22	9	24
Improving machine translation literacy (e.g. writing machine-translation friendly abstracts)	6	3	11	19	9	20
Translate metadata into English where the original language is other than English	25	2	7	12	4	17
Providing abstracts in English, where the original language is other than English	45	2	1	5	4	13
Providing translation and/or language-check services to authors	33	2	6	13	3	13
Other (please specify)						

Table 14 Measures for promoting language diversity and reducing language bias. (HR)

A pertinent observation emerges regarding the translation landscape. The complexity of the Croatian language, its relatively limited number of speakers, and the gradual improvement in automated translation tools make effective machine translation for scientific content challenging. Human translators remain indispensable, incurring additional costs for IPSPs. This underscores the significance of these findings, highlighting the scientific community's persistent quest for broader outreach and impact.

Modern advancements in machine learning and natural language processing have opened a new era of machine translation tools capable of producing quality translations of various languages and scripts across websites, software interfaces, and communication tools. Given this, it's intriguing that IPSPs present a relatively narrow array of supported languages for their services. A single language was specified by 10 respondents (Croatian or English), two languages were offered by 46 (Croatian and English), and 18 respondents endorsed more than two languages. This inclination might be attributed to the requisite time and effort needed to master these novel tools, encompassing a robust grasp of IT skills.

Membership Engagement

To gauge the proactive involvement of publishers and editors within pertinent professional circles, IPSPs were requested to indicate their affiliations with institutional or individual memberships in relevant associations, as outlined in Table 15. Predominantly, Croatian IPSPs find their nexus within the Croatian Association of Scholarly Communication (CROASC/ZNAK), with 25/74 IPSPs being members.

Funded by the European Union

Organisations/association/coalition	Yes	No	Don't know
National publisher/scholarly communication association	25	36	12
International Publishers Associations (IPA Academy)	1	50	13
Federation of European Publishers (FEP)	1	50	13
Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA)	4	47	13
Online Publishers Association Europe (OPA Europe)	1	51	12
Association of European University Presses (AEUP)	1	50	12
Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)	7	47	12
European Association of Science Editors (EASE)	13	44	10
Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)	2	49	13
Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA)	0	51	13
Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure (POSI)	1	51	12
Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication (Helsinki Initiative)	2	49	13
Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines	2	48	13

Table 15 IPSP's membership. (HR)

The European Association of Science Editors (EASE) is well represented, amplified by an active Croatian chapter. While many IPSPs embrace the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) within their policies – encompassing author and reviewer guidelines, ethical codes, and more – the proportion of COPE membership among them remains under 10%. Furthermore, Croatian IPSPs are not affiliated with CoARA, and only two IPSPs are signatories of the Helsinki Initiative and TOP Guidelines. A striking observation emerges from the survey, with a relatively significant number of respondents expressing uncertainty regarding their institution's membership status within specific associations. This hints at an area where increased awareness and transparency could be advantageous.

Parent Organisation, Relationship with IPSP, and Staff

In seeking insight into the publishing landscape, we sought to establish the hierarchical entity immediately supervising the institutional publisher or service provider. This overseeing entity could be a university, scholarly society, academy, department, or library. It appears, however, that the term "parent organisation" was somewhat unfamiliar to the respondents, leading to a degree of uncertainty. Of the 36 respondents who engaged with the concept of a parent organisation (Table 15), all 36 provided a parent organisation's name, and a URL address. However, 15 URL addresses associated with the parent organisation coincide with the IPSP's website address provided in the introductory section, while an additional two are email addresses.

Funded by the European Union

Does the IPSP have a parent organisation?	
Yes	36
No	25
Don't know	16
Total	77

Table 16 IPSPs and their parent organisations. (HR)

Finally, only 9/36 IPSPs provided verifiable parent organisation information, thereby introducing an element of uncertainty into the assessment of the nature of relationships between IPSPs and their respective parent organisations. As a result, the ability to rely fully on responses about this relationship's nature is somewhat tempered. This underscores the importance of clarity and precision in future surveys to ensure a more robust understanding of these intricate affiliations. (Table 17).

What is the relationship to the parent organisation?	
Operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation	18
Department of the parent organisation	5
Part of the department of the parent organisation	5
Part of a library in the parent organisation	4
Other (please describe)	3
Don't know	1
Total	36

Table 17 IPSPs relationships with their parent organisations. (HR)

While acknowledging the need for cautious interpretation due to the nuances surrounding "parent organisations," a key insight emerges from the data presented in Table 17. Most IPSPs operate independently while owned or governed by their parent organisations. It's noteworthy to highlight that, within the Croatian context, faculties are integral components of universities while having full legal and financial independence as distinct institutions.

Does the IPSP only provide services to its parent organisation?	
Yes	25
No	10
Don't know	1
Total	36

Table 18 IPSPs and services for parent organisations. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

Concerning services to their parent organisations, 10 IPSPs do not provide such services (Table 18). Among the IPSPs and their parent organisations, a substantial portion (51/77) were identified as public entities (Table 19). Additionally, 19/77 identified themselves as private, not-for-profit organisations; one respondent described themselves as a company with less than 250 employees.

What type of legal entity is the IPSP or its parent organisation?	
Public organisation (e.g. university, research institute, laboratory, research organisation)	49
Private, not-for-profit organisation (e.g. Charity, Foundation, Learned Society, or Association)	19
Other (please describe)	5
Company (owned by Directors; limited liability)	1
Don't know	1
Total	77

Table 19 IPSP's or parent organisation's type of legal entity. (HR)

Five respondents chose the 'other' category, including two non-governmental organisations, two professional societies and one 'society of associations' ('savez udruga' in Croatian). The one respondent who self-identified as a company (a small one, in a category of 2-5 employees and publishing 2-5 journals and up to 50 books and conference outputs a year) is a service provider to institutional publishing. Still, even that for-profit company relies on public financing (from the government) and public infrastructure (HRČAK platform).

A typical example of the Croatian publishing landscape, consistent with the initial sample and with previous knowledge (at least as far as it concerns journal publishing), could be considered as follows: there are no large companies based in Croatia that take part in institutional publishing, and the existing small ones are often reliant on public funding and public infrastructure. Although there is knowledge of large foreign commercial service providers or publishers working with Croatian academic institutions, that fact is not represented in our survey responses (only one respondent mentioned Taylor & Francis, not as a service provider, but as an external funder).

Although it would be very important for a landscape report to come up with an accurate overview of how institutional publishing is organised within particular countries, the survey turned out not to be a precise enough instrument to capture the existing complexities. Several respondents misunderstood the questions and/or provided inaccurate answers. It is expected that associations or public institutes would not have a parent organisation (nevertheless, some answered 'yes' and repeated the same organisation name as an IPSP name). For the IPSPs operating within the HEIs, it was expected that a certain degree of granularity would be recorded. However, the answers do not provide a clear picture. The four largest Croatian universities (Zagreb, Split,

Funded by the European Union

Rijeka and Osijek) have significant publishing activities on different levels: university, faculty, school, and departmental level. Although all four universities participated in the survey, with respondents from different levels (sometimes two departments from the same faculty of the same university would provide separate answers without identifying the university as the parent organisation), their responses are often unclear. This could be a sign of a situation in which most of the publishing responsibilities (especially journal publishing) reside with the editorials of respective journals, and there is a lack of coordination within institutions, but further evidence to this survey should corroborate such a conclusion.

The landscape of Croatian IPSPs is significantly supported by voluntary efforts, with 41 out of 76 indicating an absence of paid staff (Table 20). Among the rest, 20/76 have a staff of 2-5, 11 have less than two, while two IPSPs have a staff of 6-10, and two have more than 30 employed or contracted staff involved in publishing.

How many paid staff are directly employed or contracted by the IPSP (i.e., editorial, production and operational staff in Full-Time Equivalent (FTE))?	
None	41
Less than two	11
2-5	20
6–10	2
More than 30	2
Total	76

Table 20 IPSP's paid staff. (HR)

After a series of questions about demographic data, memberships, parent institutions and relationships with them, and the services they provide (for the parent institution or the wider community), the respondents had to decide whether they would continue to fill out the questionnaire as institutional publishers (IP) or service providers (SP). Perhaps the ambiguous concept of 'service' contributed to the fact that 13 respondents chose to be an SP and 64 IPs (Table 21). However, as a function of insight into the actual situation, the estimated number of IPs would be significantly lower. Although part of the question differed for IPs and SPs, in further analysis, the collated data has been amalgamated for a comprehensive examination.

What type of IPSP do you represent?	
Institutional publisher (the entity that controls publishing operations)	64
Service provider to institutional publishers (an entity tasked by an institution or an institutional publisher with carrying out specific services)	13
Total	77

Table 21 Types of IPSP. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

Scope of Services and Publications

When decoding the array of services IPSPs offer, an emphasis emerges on editorial services comprising manuscript selection, peer review administration, and the like (65/76). These are followed by production services encompassing copy-editing, proofreading, typesetting, and metadata management. Half of the IPSPs offer IT services (such as submission systems, platforms, and websites), communication services involving marketing and dissemination (including social media efforts), as well as administrative, legal and financial services (ranging from contracts to accounting). Additionally, 13/76 IPSPs offer training, support, or counsel regarding publishing policies and best practices. Minor variations arise, with three IPSPs providing other services (such as coordination), while two IPSPs abstain from providing any services (Table 22).

What kind of services do you provide?	
Editorial	65
Production	46
IT	45
Communication	32
Administrative, legal and financial	38
Training, support and/or advice	13
Other	3
None	2
Don't know	1
Total	76

Table 22 Types of services. (HR)

IPSPs mainly publish academic journals, academic books and conference outputs and provide services for the same types of publications but to a smaller extent. Many IPSPs also publish and deliver services for other research output, encompassing media and digital products and non-academic output, including mainly professional journals (Table 23).

Almost all respondents who self-identified as institutional publishers reported that they publish academic journals, with three exceptions (one publishes only professional but not academic journals, and two others for unknown reasons, possibly misunderstood questions - their websites clearly evidence that they are publishing OA academic journals).

Funded by the European Union

Which of the following does the IPSP publish or provide a service for?		
	Publish	Service
Academic Journals	67	8
Academic Books	40	10
Conference output	46	10
Grey literature	8	3
Other research outputs (e.g. media, digital products)	20	2
Non-academic outputs	24	8
Other output formats (e.g. datasets, digital scholarship, software)	11	4

Table 23 Types of publications. (HR)

On average, a Croatian IPSP publishes 1-5 scholarly journals (59/71), 11-100 scholarly articles per year (50/68), 1-10 academic books (36/48) and 1-20 conference proceedings (39/51) (Table 24).

Which of the following does the IPSP publish or provide a service for?			
Scholarly journals in 2022		Academic books in 2022	
1	28	1-10	36
2-5	31	11-20	9
6-10	7	21-50	3
11-20	3	51-100	0
21-50	1	>100	0
51-100	0		
>100	1		
Scholarly articles in 2022		Conference outputs in 2022	
1-10	6	1-20	39
11-50	40	21-50	7
51-100	10	51-100	4
101-200	7	101-200	1
201-500	3	> 500	0
>500	2		

Table 24 Number of publications by type. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

Consistent with our prior knowledge and expectations, a dominance of humanities and social sciences journals was anticipated. Therefore, the revelation of a similar representation observed across different fields is welcome and unexpected. An exception to this trend is discerned in the domain of agricultural sciences, where a comparatively modest presence is noted (Table 25).

What disciplines does the IPSP mainly cover?	
Humanities	28
Social sciences	34
Medical and health sciences	16
Natural sciences	22
Agricultural sciences	6
Engineering and technology	22
Multidisciplinary	27

Table 25 IPSPs' Disciplines. (HR)

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

Scholarly journals are mainly funded by the government (Ministry of Science and Education), applying to the annual call, usually announced later in the year for the current year. So, it would be expected that IPSPs are mainly starting the year without an approved annual budget. However, the survey shows different results (Table 26).

Does the IPSP start each year with an approved annual budget?	
Yes	42
No	27
Other	6
Don't know	2
Total	77

Table 26 Approval of annual budget. (HR)

Other (please specify): Partly, the journals have approved budgets, and books are funded according to available sources; we don't have a budget at all; The Association's revenue and expenditure realisation plan is defined; not funded, nor are the funds required; Funded by the Ministry of Science and Education, and Faculty of Maritime Studies.

If the budget of >1M EUR of an IPSP whose primary business is publishing is excluded, the average budget of an IPSP is below 10K EUR (Table 27). In this context, it is not surprising that Croatian IPSPs greatly rely on voluntary work.

Funded by the European Union

What is the service's annual budget? (EUR)	
<1K	2
1-10K	9
11-50K	13
51-100K	7
101-500K	0
501K-1M	0
>1M	1
Do not wish to disclose	2
Don't know	8

Table 27 IPSP's annual budget. (HR)

Croatian IPSPs monitor their expenses because it is obligatory. Especially when receiving government subsidies, IPSPs are required to provide an annual financial report that they submit to the Ministry that funded them (Table 28).

Are the IPSP's annual income and expenses monitored and/or formally administered?	
Yes, this is obligatory	57
Yes, although it is not obligatory	4
Yes, partly	5
No, this is not obligatory	4
N/A	7
Don't know	2

Table 28 Monitoring expenses. (HR)

Almost consistently with the question regarding the parent organisation, 35 IPSPs described the type of in-kind support of the parent organisation, which is primarily in the form of facilities and premises (24/35) and service-specific IT services like IPSP's publishing platform, website and needed tools (22/35), followed by the general IT services (19/35) and salaries of permanent staff (18/35) (Table 29). Interestingly, human resources management, general financial and legal services were not supported by any parent institution.

Funded by the European Union

Does your parent organisation provide the IPSP with in-kind support, either in the form of labour, facility costs or other (excluding peer review)?	
Facilities and premises	24
HR management, general financial and legal services	0
General IT services (email, hardware, etc.)	19
Service-specific IT services	22
Salaries of permanent staff	18
Salaries of temporary staff	6
Other (please specify)	3
Other (please specify): "All of the above in-kind contributions are provided not by our parent organisation but by the IPSP itself."	
Don't know	1
N/A	4

Table 29 In-kind support from the parent institution. (HR)

Answers to the question about IPSP dependency on other services show that most IPSPs use external services (Table 30).

Does the IPSP use any external services?	
Yes	61
No	10
N/A	5

Table 30 IPSP"s external services usage. (HR)

Editorial services (selection of manuscripts, peer-review, plagiarism-checking services, etc.) are primarily provided voluntarily or as in-kind contributions (Table 31). Production services (copy-editing, proofreading, typesetting, metadata, provision of DOIs, etc.) and IT services (submission system, platform, website, etc.) are mostly outsourced. Communication services (marketing/dissemination, social media, etc.), administrative, legal and financial services (contracts, accounting, documentation, etc.) and training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practices are not represented enough and are often marked as 'None/N/A'.

Funded by the European Union

Does the IPSP depend on any of the following external services and how are they provided to you?				
Service	Voluntary	In-kind	Outsourced	None/ N/A
Editorial services	24	16	6	16
Production services	9	15	35	7
IT services	10	17	26	11
Communication services	14	14	4	22
Administrative, legal and financial services	3	16	12	21
Training, support	16	13	4	21

Table 31 Provision of services for IPSPs. (HR)

As for 'other services', two IPSPs outsource external services for printing, one for CrossRef DOI provided by the National and University Library, and one for translations.

Naming the services they use IPSPs mentioned: SRCE (HRČAK, OJS and OMP), National and University Library (Crossref DOI), ArhivPro software solutions, preparation for printing, copy-editing, proofreading, graphic design, design layout, typesetting, website maintenance, reviews, translations, submission system, text preparation in Latex, tips on publishing ethics, accounting services, distribution services and sale, and author fees to external associates.

To save costs, would the IPSP consider collaborating with other organisations in any of the following areas?	
Editorial services (selection of manuscripts, peer-review, plagiarism checking services, etc.)	12
Production services (copy-editing, proofreading, typesetting, metadata, etc.)	33
IT services (submission system, platform, website, etc.)	32
Communication services (marketing/dissemination, social media, etc.)	25
Administrative, legal and financial services (contracts, accounting, documentation, etc.)	10
Training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice	33
Other (please specify)	4
None	11
Don't know	11

Table 32 Collaboration in providing services. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

The most popular areas where IPSPs could upskill, collaborate, or share services with other organisations to save costs are production, IT services, training, and support. Interestingly, 11 IPSPs don't realise any need for collaboration (Table 32). As for other collaborative services, typesetting, printing and plagiarism checks are mentioned. Only one IPSP touches upon failed cooperation with an individual distributor due to highly complicated delivery methods.

Dominant funding types are fixed and permanent subsidies from IPSP's parent organisation and permanent public/ government funding (international, national, local) (Table 33).

Over the last three years, how much has the IPSP relied on the following forms of funding?							
	very low	low	neither high nor low	high	very high	Don't know	N/A
Fixed and permanent subsidy from your parent organisation	3	3	10	10	22	0	25
Periodically negotiated subsidy from your parent organisation	6	1	10	9	8	0	37
Time-limited grants or subsidies, either private or public from outside your organisation	5	8	13	8	12	0	25
Permanent public/ government funding (international, national, local)	7	3	7	9	21	0	27
Collective funding (e.g. crowdfunding, S2O, SCOSS, subscription fees, membership fees)	14	3	1	3	3	0	46
Voluntary Author Contributions	4	4	2	0	2	0	56
Content and print sales (print on demand)	14	8	4	1	0	0	43
Article Processing Charges/ publication fees	4	3	3	0	1	0	58
Any other income (event organisation, commercial revenue, loans)	12	6	2	5	2	0	43

Table 33 Forms of funding. (HR)

Other (please specify): "Annual public financing through tenders", "organisation of congresses", "we work pro bono", "I do not know."

Most IPSPs consider fixed and permanent subsidies from the parent organisations and permanent public and government funding stable or very stable (39/69 and 32/70, respectively). Delays and remittances did not influence the perception of the reliability of government funds. In contrast, voluntary author contributions, content and print sales, author processing charges, and other incomes from event organisations, commercial revenue and loans are considered very unstable by most of the IPSPs (Table 34).

Funded by the European Union

Considered globally, how stable are these funding sources based on the last three years?						
	very unstable	unstable	neither stable nor unstable	stable	very stable	Don't know
Fixed and permanent subsidy from your parent organisation	3	3	7	18	21	17
Periodically negotiated subsidy from your parent organisation	4	6	9	16	9	21
Time-limited grants or subsidies, either private or public from outside your organisation	7	10	12	16	3	21
Permanent public/ government funding (international, national, local)	10	8	5	17	15	15
Collective funding (e.g. crowdfunding, S2O, SCOSS, subscription fees, membership fees)	16	7	3	5	1	30
Voluntary Author Contributions	21	4	4	2	1	30
Content and print sales (print on demand)	19	6	7	3	1	28
Article Processing Charges/ publication fees	19	3	4	3	2	31
Any other income (event organisation, commercial revenue, loans)	21	5	7	6	1	25

Table 34 Stability of funding sources. (HR)

Other (please specify): organisation of congresses, annual public funding

The results of sorting funding sources according to priorities revealed the government as the leading funder of the Croatian IPSPs and their publishing activities. In the first group of external funders, 44/52 funders are national ministries (Table 35). Ministry of Science and Education is the main funder, followed by the Ministry of Culture and Media and other ministries. Besides national ministries, in the second group of funders, there are counties, national foundations, cities, universities (including university foundations) and private companies. In the third group, state agencies are stated as funders, too. It should be noted that public universities, national foundations, and state agencies are funded by the government, so government funding is the main source, either directly or indirectly.

Funded by the European Union

Please list the names of up to five external funders who have granted the IPSP cash grants or subsidies over the last three years (largest contributors ranked first). You should not include your parent institution:									
1st group		2nd group		3rd group		4th group		5th group	
Government	44	Government	7	State agency	2	Nat. Foundation	2	Company (private)	1
University	1	County	3	Nat. Foundation	2	Sponsors	1	Government	1
Univ. Foundation	1	Foundation (nat.)	2	City	2	Church	1	Learned Soc.	1
County	1	City	2	Company (private)	2	Company (private)	2	Company (state)	1
City	1	University	2	Government	1	Institute	1	Church	1
Co-publ. donations	1	Company (private)	2	Nat. academy	1	Tourist Board	1	University	1
Publishing house	1	Univ. Foundation	1	Learned Soc.	1	State agency	1	I do not know	1
Company (private)	1	State Agency	1	EC	1	Nat. academy	1		
I do not know	1	Learned Soc.	1	University	1	I do not know	1		
		Tourist Board	1	County	1				
		Co-editors	1	Government	1				
		Company (state)	1	Advertisers	1				
		Publ. house	1	I do not know	1				
		Advertisers	1						
		I do not know	1						

Table 35 Five groups of external funders. (HR)

If the funders from all five groups are merged, the government is still a prevalent funder (54), followed by private companies (8), universities (5), counties (5), cities (5), national foundations (4), state agencies (4), and learned societies (3). It is certainly interesting to see the various funders supporting IPSPs in their publishing endeavours, especially minor funders, such as tourist boards, state companies, co-editors, co-publishers, churches, etc.

52 IPSPs engage one funder, 26 two funders, 17 three funders, 11 four funders, and seven engage five funders.

Croatian IPSPs rely highly on non-monetary or in-kind support, but high and very high grades are also given to the monetary income (Table 36).

Funded by the European Union

To what extent does the IPSP rely on the following resources:							
	very low	low	neither high nor low	high	very high	Don't know	N/A
Non-monetary or in-kind support	7	7	8	8	26	4	13
Monetary income	5	7	12	14	19	3	15
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	1	0	1	5
Other (please specify): "pro bono work", "donations"							

Table 36 Importance of the non-monetary and monetary resources. (HR)

In general, Croatian IPSPs are not expected to generate profit, surplus, shareholder value, or to subsidise other organisation activities (Table 37). Limited losses and overspending are permitted and not permitted in the same proportions.

Is there an expectation that the IPSP produces a profit/surplus?	
Yes, to generate shareholder value	1
Yes, to subsidise other activities of the organisation	5
Yes, to invest in our own operation or create a financial buffer	12
No, limited losses/overspending are permitted	15
No, and losses/overspending are not permitted	15
Don't know	7
N/A	16
Other (please specify)	5
Other (please specify): "It does not exist because we are advocating for an open access approach to research and for the break even coverage of costs - printing, reviews, publication"; "No, but there are no losses"; "We have no revenue, we only have a cost for the external service provider's service that the parent institution subsequently refunds us, we always break even"; "Profit would be well accepted, but such journals are not profitable (and are available online)"	

Table 37 Expectations of investments. (HR)

Fund-raising and the Future

Considering challenges to financial sustainability, which was an open question in the survey, challenges are classified into ten categories: continuity, regularity, sufficiency, unexpected changes, financial literacy, high costs, printing, voluntary work, dependence on the parent institution, and other (Table 38). Three main challenges are the lack of continuity/permanency/stability of funding, irregularity and delays in funding, and insufficient funding.

Funded by the European Union

What are the main challenges related to the financial sustainability of the service and how could they be addressed?	
Continuity/ Permanency/ Stability	The challenges outlined revolve around the need for stable and continuous financing to support scholarly publishing. Currently, the state grants for journals are one-year and non-permanent, requiring constant monitoring of tenders and timely applications with limited staff. Seeking long-term funding from the state and parent institution is suggested to solve the funding challenge. According to our participants' comments, publications in the Croatian language are crucial for preserving cultural diversity and advancing knowledge in the humanities. Some IPSPs rely on co-publishers for income, but this doesn't provide a fixed financial solution to ensure uninterrupted operations.
Regularity/ Timeliness	The challenges involve delayed subsidies, late fund acquisition with tight spending obligations – e.g. the first three months of the following year. Obtaining funds from the Ministry could occur on the day before Christmas for the current year, making it extremely difficult to plan effectively. Ensuring the regularity and timeliness of tenders for government subsidies is a crucial concern.
Sufficiency	The main challenge is insufficient state support. Additionally, institutional funding is inadequate, and the parent institutions do not allocate sufficient funds to maintain and upgrade the system.
(Unexpected) Changes	In recent years, sudden changes in the eligibility of journals, depending on the type of parent institution, caused many journals published by universities to remain without financial support from the government.
Financial literacy	Permanent education on financial literacy is needed to gain specific knowledge and skills to ensure financial sustainability.
High costs	The prices of the regular editorial activities are increasing. Considering changes and priorities, finances should be reallocated on a regular basis.
Printing	Print-based IPSPs are increasingly struggling with justifying the costs associated with traditional printing. Moreover, the viability of selling the printed edition of an open-access journal raises growing uncertainties.
Voluntary work	The foundation of IPSPs' operations rests on the dedication of volunteers. Sustaining a skilled workforce becomes challenging when financial compensation is not provided.
Dependence on parent institution	Survey participants emphasised a significant reliance on the financial backing of the parent institution. However, exploring avenues for securing additional stable funding sources is imperative, particularly to support full-time staff. One viable approach is securing employment positions through state budget allocations. Presently, services heavily depend on in-kind contributions. To advance and diversify the publishing landscape, it is crucial to identify supplementary funding channels. One effective strategy involves establishing collaborations with other national open access publishers, fostering a shared infrastructure, and advocating for national public subsidy framework modifications. This proactive approach will contribute to the sustainable growth and evolution of services.

Funded by the European Union

What are the main challenges related to the financial sustainability of the service and how could they be addressed?	
Other	Challenges include overreliance on government support, a decline in external interest (e.g. advertising), the need for team effectiveness, insufficient promotion and innovation of publishing activities, and the importance of securing funding through various avenues. The recognition of co-financing from state and parent institutions and author contributions are emphasised.

Table 38 Challenges to the financial sustainability. (HR)

IPSPs consider the changes in eligibility for government funding without much warning a serious challenge. They also face an increase in the price of printing journals, copy-editing, and providing an online submission system. It is important to note here that a majority of Croatian IPSPs still print their journals, and the main reasons for this are the unclear wording of the Ministry's terms of funding and the reluctance of IPSPs to switch to an exclusively online version. According to previous knowledge, about half of the total budget allocated to publishing goes to preparation for printing and printing. Suggestions for bridging some challenges are increasing financial literacy, getting involved in financing a larger number of scientific institutions, and better promotion of scientific publishing.

Governance

Most IPSPs base their activities on internal documents, like statutes, by-laws or articles of association (Table 39). External legislation, requirements or policies are less represented but still present in many IPSPs. One IPSP declared the university senate decision as the main formal document.

Does the IPSP have a formal document (see below) that describes its activities?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Statutes, by-laws or articles of association (internal regulations)	62	7	5
External legislation/requirements/policies that determine the scope of activities	31	22	13

Table 39 Formal documents describing IPSP's activities. (HR)

Other (please specify): University Senate Decision

Interestingly, the governance model of IPSPs is primarily based on the governing board, while the management office and external audit are less present (Table 40). Other forms or governing bodies are publishing committees, councils (faculty or editorial), teams for IPSP's digital collections management, offices, editors-in-chief, editorial boards and faculty management.

Funded by the European Union

Does the IPSP have a governance model that oversees its activities?			
	Yes	No	Don't know
Management office	21	26	8
Governing Board	44	16	4
External audit of accounts	15	28	13
Other	8	3	2
Other (please specify): "publishing committee", "faculty council", "team that manages IPSP's digital collections", "Office for Research, Arts and Projects", "HRČAK Council", "annual report submitted to the parent institution", "editor-in-chief", "editorial council", "editorial board", "faculty management".			

Table 40 Types of the governance models. (HR)

Involvement and non-involvement of representatives of the wider community in IPSP governance are equally represented (34/76 and 35/76, respectively) (Table 41).

Does the IPSP's governance model include representation from the wider scholarly community outside of your parent organisation, e.g. community governance?	
Yes	34
No	35
Don't know	7

Table 41 Representation from the wider community in IPSP governance. (HR)

Open Science practices

The responses related to open science practices were perhaps the most surprising, given that almost all IPSPs in Croatia publish all journals in open access, as well as a significant number of books and conference proceedings. Additionally, according to prior knowledge, all IPSPs have institutional repositories at their disposal for storing/archiving/publishing all types of content in OA. Only 59/77 IPSPs answered this question, 8/59 did choose between 1 and 74, and 49 IPSPs selected 100% journal open access (Table 42).

The overview of OA shares of institutional publishing activities is one of the crucial insights that this survey should have enabled. The question on the shares of OA content (for each output type) was asked in terms of a sliding scale ranging from 0 to 100. Unfortunately, it seems that this way of stating the question was open to misunderstanding from respondents, which is revealed on more detailed inspection (and comparison of the data provided in the survey with the actual status from the publication websites of certain IPSPs).

Funded by the European Union

How much of the IPSP's published content is in Open Access?					
	0%	1%-25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	76%-100%
Academic/scholarly Journals	0	5	0	3	51
Academic Books	4	7	5	5	9
Conference output	24	4	5	5	29
Grey literature	3	4	1	1	3
Non-standard research outputs (e.g. media, digital products)	4	4	2	0	4
Non-academic outputs	3	5	5	0	8
Other outputs (e.g. datasets, digital scholarship, software)	4	4	1	1	3

Table 42 Representation of OA content. (HR)

For instance, several IPSPs stated that their share of OA content is 1 or 6 (where the percentage was meant), while in reality, it is the case that they publish 1 journal (with 100% OA) or 6 journals (again, with 100% OA). Others who also stated less than 100% of OA journal content would similarly show up in reality with 100% of articles published in the prior year available in OA. Checking the websites of IPSPs that provided their URL addresses, therefore, contradicts the statements from the survey, confirming prior knowledge of the Croatian journal publishing landscape, where journals are almost exclusively published as OA journals.

This picture is additionally skewed if the difference between self-identified IPs and SPs are considered. The largest journal publisher in Croatia (in terms of journal titles published) self-identified as an SP, and the survey branched in a way that the question on the shares of OA outputs was only posed to IPs and not SPs (so this particular publisher didn't have a chance to state they publish all of their journals in OA). That means the actual landscape of journal publishing leans even more toward open access than the survey result would indicate.

On the other hand, the share of books in OA seems overestimated. Nine IPSPs reported having 100% of books in OA, which is inconsistent with prior research in the Croatian OA books landscape (and is revealed to be incorrect upon inspection of some websites).

Open Science/Open Access Policy

While Croatia boasts a long and rich history of engaging with OA publishing since the 1990s, a comprehensive national Open Access/Open Science (OA/OS) policy has yet to materialise. Despite the absence of an encompassing national policy spanning all facets of open science, there is discernible support for open access through various national laws and strategies. For instance, the mandate requiring journals to publish

Funded by the European Union

their content in OA on the HRČAK portal for government subsidy consideration and to archive doctoral and graduation theses in OA institutional repositories showcases a significant stride in this direction. Nevertheless, the ongoing development of a comprehensive policy that institutions can adopt and tailor to their specific contexts is a work in progress.

Given these circumstances, expectations about the extent of responses concerning OA/OS policies were not very high. Surprisingly, 68 respondents made references to IPSP, parent institution, or national OA/OS policies (Table 43). Even more (48) indicated following a national policy, which, notably, Croatia does not currently have. This apparent false positive uptake might be attributed to the seamless integration of OA principles within the scholarly publishing domain over several decades. It seems that the absence of formalised national policies does not significantly impede progress in Croatia's OA/OS realm.

Does the IPSP follow an Open Science/Open Access policy?			
	Only journals	Journals and books	Only books
Yes, it follows a national policy	30	17	1
Yes, it follows the parent organisation policy	15	17	2
Yes, we have our own policy	21	9	2
No	1	1	10
Don't know	0	5	2

Table 43 IPSPs' OA/OS policies. (HR)

Delving deeper into the domain of OA/OS policies embraced by IPSPs, upon closer examination of the 41 provided OA/OS policy URLs, a nuanced panorama emerges. Merely 12 of these URLs directly point to established institutional or journal-level policies. Other URLs mostly lead to journal websites, where open access provisions are nestled within sections addressing rights and licensing, description of the journal or submission instructions. A few IPSPs reference documents that govern the usage of the HRČAK portal, including metadata usage policies and HRČAK inclusion guidelines. Furthermore, three IPSPs submitted URLs of the Creative Commons website, while three URLs proved erroneous, even though an OA policy website exists for one of these IPSPs.

According to the respondents' choice, the referenced OA/OS policies mainly address copyright, self-archiving and the use of metadata (Table 44). This data partially coincides with the insight into the provided URLs of the policies, where they are often located in the section devoted to rights and licensing.

Funded by the European Union

Does the IPSP's Open Science/Open Access policy address the following issues?	
Copyright	56
Self-archiving	41
Use of open licences	29
Use of identifiers	24
Metadata rights	17
Third-party copyright	9
Embargoes	7
Publication of negative research results	3
Other	4
Other (please specify): "This journal provides immediate open access to its content on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge. The journal content is published under the Creative Commons CC-BY-SA licence that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgement of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal."; "The policies of the national platform HRČAK".	
Don't know	6

Table 44 The issues addressed by Open Science/Open Access policy. (HR)

Copyright and Licensing

The overview of copyright and licensing practices and attitudes shows some encouraging trends as well as areas where a certain level of misunderstanding or a lack of awareness exists. Most IPSPs use Creative Commons licences for all journals, or at least for some. As a positive fact, it can be observed that 16 IPSPs report using CC licences for books despite the immaturity of the OA book landscape, as mentioned above (Table 45).

Similarly, most publishers allow self-archiving in repositories (a significant number do so even for books). Many of them do not impose embargoes, which is understandable, given the major prevalence of OA content (many have answered 'don't know' to this question, implying that embargoes for self-archiving are irrelevant for Croatian publishers).

There is a worrying lack of understanding of the emerging culture of preprint sharing, visible from the fact that 'no' was the most represented answer to accepting submissions previously shared as preprints or working papers.

The number of IPSPs that report having all their references openly available in line with the I4OC principles seems high (32 for all journals, 11 for books). Still, it should be taken

Funded by the European Union

cautiously, especially if OA books are rarely published in standardised formats and with standardised and interoperable metadata. Manual checking of some journals whose publishers reported being compliant with I4OC also shows inaccurate responses.

It should be noted that for some of the responses, a share of respondents choosing the 'don't know' option was rather high (13 for I4OC, 11 for embargoes and 12 for accepting submissions available as preprints/working papers), which is a helpful indication of areas in which Croatian IPSPs could benefit from additional support and training.

Please consider the following statements, and mark those that are implemented at IPSP level						
	Yes, for books	Yes, for all journals	Yes, for some journals	No	I don't know	N/A
use Creative Commons (or other open licences)	16	44	10	5	4	6
make references openly available according to the principles of I4OC (Initiative for Open Citations)	11	32	4	12	13	7
allow self-archiving of your published content in open repositories (subject-specific or institutional)	17	49	4	4	5	7
impose embargo periods for self-archiving	3	2	1	38	11	12
accept submissions that have been publicly shared as a preprint or working paper before or on submission	6	14	9	24	12	7
encourage or allow sharing the full text of your published content via academic sharing services (such as Academia.edu or ResearchGate)	12	49	4	4	5	8

Table 45 OA/OS principles adopted by IPSPs. (HR)

Of the IPSPs who reported using CC licences, most use CC BY (28), followed by CC BY-NC (15) and CC BY-NC-ND (14) (Table 46). Most would choose only one licence, but eight IPSPs use several different licences (one is the national platform that provides services to journals that decide on the licences themselves). Interestingly, one respondent answered using other open licensing but specified using the right statement 'In copyright (InC)' (thus confusing the standardised and machine-readable right statement with an open licence). The number of non-users of licences and non-answers (or answers showing some misunderstandings) indicate that this is another area where capacity building would be welcome.

Funded by the European Union

Which licence(s) does the IPSP use or recommend?	
CC BY	28
CC BY-SA	3
CC BY-NC	14
CC BY-NC-SA	2
CC BY-ND	3
CC BY-NC-ND	15
CC0	2
Other	3
Other (please specify): "Copyright protected (InC) - In copyright (InC) The mark Protected by copyright is used for use of digital objects that are protected by copyright, and are freely available online, and permission from the copyright holder must be sought for each reuse. URL: http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC/1.0/"; "Creative Commons Attribution"	

Table 46 Type of Creative Commons licence used by IPSP. (HR)

Open Peer Review

Open peer review is a recommended practice of open science to transform the peer review process into an open scientific discourse. Active participation from authors, open publication of reviewer reports, and the opportunity for the wider community to provide feedback and engage in the assessment, according to the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science, 2021, allow public discussion on research papers before, during or after formal publication. Although numerous workshops on open peer review were held in Croatia, there are still misinterpretations of the meaning present and visible in IPSPs' responses.

According to knowledge from previous studies, no layer of openness in the peer review process, like open identities, open reports, etc., is present in Croatian OA publications. Sometimes, journals apply a non-anonymised peer review process, during which the author's identity is known to the reviewer and the reviewer's identity to the author. However, after publication, information about the reviewers is not publicly available, so it cannot be considered as an open peer review process.

Most responses are expectedly negative – 'No, (we are not enabling any form of open peer review)'. Still, ten IPSPs wrongly reported on already implementing open peer review, two are experimenting with it, and 17 plan to implement it in a later stage (Table 47).

Funded by the European Union

Does the IPSP enable any form of open peer review?	
Yes	10
Yes, we are experimenting with it	2
No, but we would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage	17
No	31
Don't know	2

Table 47 Implementation of open peer review. (HR)

Research Data Sharing and Data Availability Policies

Research data sharing practices in Croatia are still in their infancy. Accordingly, we expected the majority of negative answers to the question about the data sharing policy in place. Despite the prevalence of negative responses (23), we consider the 11 cases of inclusion of data sharing in OS/OA policies, 20 IPSPs implementing research data sharing at the journal level and two at the publisher level as a positive development (Table 48).

Does the IPSP have a research data sharing policy in place?	
Yes, as part of the institutional Open Science/Open Access policy	13
Yes, at the journal level	20
Yes, at the publisher level	4
No	23
Don't know	6
N/A	13

Table 48 Data sharing policy in place. (HR)

New Approaches to Research Assessment

In the context of new research evaluation approaches, where greater emphasis is placed on qualitative rather than quantitative evaluation, the survey asked about implementing the contributorship model. This model, which represents a shift from the established concept of authorship, should improve the possibilities of affiliated institutions and funders to identify the actual contributions of researchers and encourage the creation of successful collaborative teams.

Today, more and more journals require listing contributor roles as part of submission. In this sense, the CRediT taxonomy is most often used, which distinguishes 14 contributor roles to describe the aspects of contributorship, from conceptualisation and data to review and editing. According to the responses, only 12 IPSPs distinguished between contributor roles in their publications, while 28 responded negatively (Table

Funded by the European Union

49). As many as 24 IPSPs marked 'don't know', which could indicate their lack of knowledge about the contributorship model.

Does the IPSP distinguish between contributor roles (as in the CRediT Contributor Roles Taxonomy)?	
Yes	12
No	28
Don't know	24
N/A	11

Table 49 Adoption of the contributorship model. (HR)

Editorial quality, editorial management and research integrity

The answers to the questions about IPSPs' participation in editorial management (Table 50 and Table 51) should definitely be seen in the context of the respondents' structure. Namely, as many as 40 respondents come from the ranks of editorial offices, and 22 URL addresses of IPSPs are actually journal websites. In Croatia, the independent work of editorial offices is fostered, so these results from the survey should be considered with caution.

Is the IPSP involved in the editorial management of your publications?		
	Croatia	All
Yes	53	459
No	19	183
Don't know	3	19

Table 50 IPSP's involvement in editorial management. (HR)

Relationships between publishers and editors can be complex, so it is essential that they are well and transparently defined and follow ethical norms in scientific publishing. The publisher should be involved in recruiting and managing editorial board members, providing financial support, space, equipment, necessary tools and training, ensuring quality and independent editorial work. On the other hand, editors should be in charge of the published content, including the peer review process.

The survey results revealed the major involvement of IPSPs in the editorial management of their publications (53/75). Expectedly, IPSPs are involved mainly in recruiting and managing the editorial board members (44/53). Still, according to the responses, they are also significantly involved in other tasks like sourcing reviewers, coordinating the peer review process, performing basic checks, and even in the plagiarism scan. Only two IPSPs have no tasks in the editorial management.

Funded by the European Union

What tasks does the IPSP accomplish in editorial management?	
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	44
Sourcing reviewers	37
Coordinating the peer review process	37
Monitoring the peer review process	36
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	33
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	37
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	29
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	31
Don't know	1
No tasks in the editorial management	2

Table 51 IPSP's involvement in the editorial management tasks. (HR)

Almost identical results are considering IPSPs' involvement in managing editorial quality. 43/75 of IPSPs are involved in defining quality criteria and taking care of compliance, and 39/43 are involved in creating guidelines and instructions (Table 52).

Is the IPSP involved in managing editorial quality?	Quality criteria, compliance	Guidelines/instructions ?
Yes	43	39
No	25	2
Don't know	7	2

Table 52 IPSP's involvement in managing editorial quality. (HR)

Croatian IPSPs employ primarily double-anonymised peer review, where both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other (33/43), while single-anonymised peer review, where authors do not know who the reviewers are, is employed by 11 IPSPs (Table 53). According to the previous responses regarding open peer review, where nine IPSPs declare open peer review in place, here there are six IPSPs with open identities implemented and one with open review reports. Editorial review is employed by eight IPSPs. It is worth noting that respondents were confident about the type of the peer review process, and no 'don't know' or 'other' options were selected by respondents.

Funded by the European Union

What types of peer review are in use in journals that the IPSP publishes or provides services to?	
Single-anonymised peer review	11
Double-anonymised peer review	33
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	6
Open reviewers' reports	1
Editorial review	8
Don't know	1

Table 53 Types of peer review. (HR)

43/75 IPSPs have a policy on research integrity or publication ethics in place, but 27 don't have such a policy, which is certainly worrying, as well as 5 IPSPs without the knowledge of such policy (Table 54).

Does the IPSP have a specific policy on research integrity/publication ethics?)	
Yes	43
No	27
Don't know	5

Table 54 Policy on research integrity or publication ethics. (HR)

Technical Service Efficiency

Infrastructure Resourcing

IPSPs provide mostly full editorial workflow (41/75), hosting (34/75) and end user interface (31/75). Metadata and quality control (25/75), software (20/75) and partial editorial workflow (19/75) were represented less (Table 55).

Funded by the European Union

What technical services does the IPSP provide?	
Hosting	34
Software	20
Full editorial workflow	41
Partial editorial workflow	19
Metadata and quality control	25
End user interface	,31
Other (Please specify)	3

Table 55 Technical services provided by the IPSP. (HR)

Services are mainly maintained in-house by a dedicated publishing department (25/73) and by IT department or personnel (21/73), while technical infrastructure is maintained in-house by IT department or personnel (24/73) or is mainly outsourced (13/73) (

How are the IPSP's services and/or technical infrastructure maintained and updated?		
	Services	Technical infrastructure
In-house by an IT department/personnel	21	24
In-house by a dedicated publishing department	25	11
In-house across different departments	9	7
Partially outsourced	15	8
Mainly outsourced	7	13
Fully outsourced	2	2
Don't know	9	8
No provision	5	1
Other, please specify	1	0
Other (please specify): The (IPSP) puts PDFs in the system and makes them available on the user's Portal		

Table 56).

How are the IPSP's services and/or technical infrastructure maintained and updated?

Funded by the European Union

	Services	Technical infrastructure
In-house by an IT department/personnel	21	24
In-house by a dedicated publishing department	25	11
In-house across different departments	9	7
Partially outsourced	15	8
Mainly outsourced	7	13
Fully outsourced	2	2
Don't know	9	8
No provision	5	1
Other, please specify	1	0
Other (please specify): The (IPSP) puts PDFs in the system and makes them available on the user's Portal		

Table 56 Maintenance of the services and/or technical infrastructure. (HR)

The main publishing system used in Croatia is the Open Journal System (OJS) (42/75), followed by the customisation or own development of existing open source solutions (12/75) (Table 57). Among open source publishing systems also Open Monograph Press (OMP), WordPress, Editorial Manager and Scholar One are in use. Concerning commercial software, Indigo and Manuscript Manager are in use.

What publishing system does the IPSP use?		
Open Journals System (OJS)	42	
Open Monograph Press (OMP)	6	
WordPress	5	
Editorial manager	3	
Scholar One	3	
Customisation or own development, based on one of the above	12	The portal of Croatian scientific and professional journals - HRČAK; Journal Admin;AMagdic Journal Systems v3.20230307.JS; AH Court
Other open source software (please specify)	1	Crossref
Other commercial software (please specify)	2	Indigo; Manuscript Manager
Don't know	14	

Table 57 Publishing system in use in Croatia. (HR)

Funded by the European Union

Identifiers and Metadata

The situation with PID assignment for Croatian publishers is relatively complex today and could be improved: there is a functional national DOI office (within the National and University Library Zagreb), but it only serves journal publications, and DOIs are assigned only to original scientific articles. Publishers who wish to assign DOIs to other types of content or publications need to take individual memberships in either CrossRef (for publications) or Datacite (for published datasets). In addition, the national repository network Dabar provides URN-NBNs (also managed by the National and University Library Zagreb) for repository content, and a number of book or conference proceedings publishers have started using the repository infrastructure for publishing (thus, assigning this type of PIDs to books and conference outputs).

Such a situation is clearly visible in the response sample (Table 58). Although the usage of CrossRef DOI is a prevalent practice among Croatian IPSPs, it is also evident that not all of them are assigning PIDs (or at least, they do not assign them to all of the published content). As today the use of DOIs is considered a standard practice in journal (and often in book or conference proceedings) publishing, and crucial for enhancing discoverability, there is clearly room for improvement.

Additionally, responses show some level of unawareness of the standard identifiers: although a vast majority of respondents publish journals, and most also publish books or conference proceedings, only 46 reported using ISSNs and 32 using ISBNs (which is most certainly not an accurate presentation of the actual situation).

Does the IPSP assign unique persistent identifiers (PIDs) to published content?			*Please select the persistent identifiers (PIDs):*	
Yes for all publications	27		CrossRef-DOI	51
Yes for all journals	24		Datacite-DOI	1
Yes for some journals	5		Other DOI	2
No	10		URN	2
Don't know	8		ISSN for periodicals	46
			ISBN	32
			Other (please specify)	3
Other (please specify): UDC				

Table 58 Usage and type of persistent identifiers (PIDs). (HR)

(PIDs with zero appearance not displayed)

One of the standard international good practices in publishing is releasing the metadata in a standardised format, under open licence, or even better, under Public Domain Dedication. The situation among Croatian IPSPs in that domain cannot be

Funded by the European Union

considered satisfactory, although 27 IPSPs share metadata under CC BY or another Creative Commons licence (Table 59). Most respondents either do not release metadata in such a way (20/75) or do not know (19/75).

Four stated they do so under the CC0, but one of them is not a Croatian IPSP (e.g. Croatian institution is only co-publisher), and for others, upon visiting their websites, no evidence of such practice is found.

It is important to note here that the national platform HRČAK itself has not yet clearly defined the terms of the metadata it releases with a Creative Commons licence or a Public Domain Dedication CC0 (although its metadata policy, https://hrcak.srce.hr/en/politike, resembles the CC BY licence). Clarifying the HRČAK metadata policy would benefit other IPSPs, as it is the main and most visible and interoperable source of journal metadata).

A significant number of journals state that they do release standard metadata under some CC licence (27 IPSPs), but further manual checking of their practices may be needed (indeed, it might be that those are the IPSPs that are publishing journals indexed in DOAJ, and therefore would have their metadata released under either CC BY-SA for journal-level metadata or CC0 for article level metadata).

Does the IPSP release its metadata openly with a standard metadata description schema (MARC, MODS, DC, ONIX, JATS, TEI)?	
Yes, under Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication (CC0)	4
Yes, under CC BY or another Creative Commons licence	27
No.	20
Don't know.	19
Other (please specify)	4
Other (please specify): "Yes, but not under a public license"; "Yes, but without the licence"; "Just starting with jats XML for the journal"; "Yes, UNIMARC"	

Table 59 Sharing metadata. (HR)

Regarding content formats, PDF is the prevalent format in the Croatian publishing landscape (74/75) (Table 60). One of the reasons may be that the national HRČAK portal did not support formats other than PDF until recently. Also, such a large representation of PDF as the only format in most IPSPs is a consequence of the printed versions of publications, which are still present and not abandoned by IPSPs. Printing companies are sometimes responsible for creating PDFs intended exclusively for printing but do not allow editing, do not store appropriate metadata, etc. The benefits of the PDF format for printing are well known because the layout, fonts, colours, and images will remain stored in that format. It is hoped that there is a greater representation of HTML

Funded by the European Union

and other formats in the future, recent work with editors to accept the XML format is especially welcome.

Which formats does the platform make content available in?	
PDF	74
HTML	18
XML	10
JSON	0
ePub	1
Data formats, e.g. csv	3
Image or video formats (e.g. mp4, .mov)	5
Sound files (e.g. mp3, .wav)	2
Don't know	0
Other (please specify)	0

Table 60 Formats of the content. (HR)

Archiving

47 out of 75 IPSPs who respond have an archiving or backup policy in place, and the published content is actively preserved in the national library, the national infrastructure provided by SRCE, and the institutional library or infrastructure (55/75) (Table 61).

Does the IPSP have an archiving/backup policy?	Yes	No	Don't know
	47	14	14
Is the published content actively preserved in a digital preservation service?			
National / institutional library or infrastructure	55	3	9
PubMed Central	8	18	14
LOCKSS	3	19	15
CLOCKSS	1	19	15
PKP PN	1	19	15
Portico	0	19	15

Table 61 Archiving policy and Digital preservation services. (HR)

Other (please specify): Own Server of the Faculty; Central library; HRČAK

Funded by the European Union

Technical Challenges

The main challenges for Croatian IPSPs are primarily related to financial constraints, lack of human resources, lack of expertise and technical limitations of the existing infrastructure (Table 62). Interestingly, financial constraints are the main obstacle only in providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, while lack of human resources is responsible for inadequate resources, missing or low-quality metadata and PIDs and the lack of interoperability with other services. Lack of expertise is a challenge equally distributed among services.

	Financial constraints	Administrative constraints	Lack of human resources	Lack of expertise	Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	Not a challenge	Other (please specify)
Providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services	48	14	33	9	19	4	0
Metadata, PIDs, supplying and enriching metadata, or making metadata available for use	15	11	33	9	20	9	0
Trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services	9	7	28	11	16	6	2
Archiving, backing up or preserving content and software	11	8	24	7	20	14	0

Table 62 Technical challenges. (HR)

Visibility (including indexation), communication, marketing and impact

Visibility & discoverability

Due to the existing research assessment system in Croatia, which evaluates mainly articles in prestigious journals (Q1 and Q2) indexed in popular bibliographic databases such as the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) and Scopus, indexation in these databases would certainly be one of the most important priorities for Croatian IPSPs. Consequently, 38/71 of them expect better indexing (Table 63). However, in addition to WoSCC databases (including Current Contents, which is still highly valued in some disciplines) and the Scopus database, they also mention other indexes such as DOAJ, DOAB, ERIH PLUS, PubMed, search engines such as Google Scholar, scientific networks such as ResearchGate, and book repositories and search engines such as Google Books

Funded by the European Union

and OAPEN. 33 IPSPs were satisfied with the current indexing level resulting from continuous work with journals and aggregators.

One IPSP highlighted a problem of the content sometimes not being included on time (WoSCC). Previously, the problem was recognised in Scopus, and in cooperation with Clarivate and Elsevier, it will be solved by harvesting the data from HRČAK, which is in the testing phase.

Funded by the European Union

Is the IPSP satisfied with the level to which its published content is included in scholarly search engines and different indexes?		
We would like to see (better) indexing in these search engines (please specify)	38	Scopus, WoSCC, DOAJ, DOAB, ERIH PLUS, Google Scholar, Google Books, OAPEN, PubMed, SherpaRomeo, Current Contents, Research Gate, Contents sometimes not included in a timely manner, A problem with WoS
Our content is already very well indexed	33	

Table 63 Satisfaction with the level of indexation. (HR)

IPSPs are mainly involved in the indexation management (40/61)(Table 64).

Does the IPSP manage the indexation of your outputs in scientific information databases (Clarivate, Scopus, ERIH, journal lists, etc.)	
Yes	40
No	17
Don't know	4

Table 64 Involvement of IPSPs in the indexation management. (HR)

The main challenge in applying for indexation is satisfying the technical participation criteriaTable 65). Other challenges, like satisfying the non-technical participation criteria, satisfying the metadata requirements, paying for membership, and paying for recurring charges, are also considered important or very important by many respondents. English or another language of communication does not present a challenge for most Croatian IPSPs, different from too many technical details related to service, requirements, and paperwork.

Funded by the European Union

Importance of challenges in applying for indexation							
	Very unimportant	Unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important	Not a challenge	Don't know
Satisfying the non-technical participation criteria	0	1	5	18	12	4	13
Satisfying the technical participation criteria	1	1	3	22	17	3	7
Satisfying the metadata requirements	1	3	7	18	9	2	12
Paying for membership, annual or one-time	1	6	10	17	10	3	8
Paying for recurring charges, for example, monthly fees	1	7	7	17	9	2	11
The language of the communications/requirements/paperwork is only in English	3	12	2	12	6	10	7
The language of the communications/requirements/paperwork is another language that is hard to understand	4	12	5	5	4	9	12
The service/its requirements/its paperwork are too technical	1	6	9	15	3	7	12

Table 65 Challenges in applying for indexation. (HR)

Communication, Data Protection, Privacy, Reach, and Impact

Concerning communication, most of the IPSPs have a newsletter, social media or networking profile to inform the community about updates (43/74), data protection policy (42/74) and privacy policy (55/74) (Table 66). Only 31 IPSPs are publicly displaying metrics.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Does the IPSP have a newsletter or social media or networking profiles to inform the community about updates?	43	29	3
Does the IPSP have a data protection policy?	42	12	20
Does the IPSP have a privacy policy per the GDPR guidelines?	55	9	11
Does the IPSP publicly display metrics?	31	29	13

Table 66 Communication, data protection and impact. (HR)

The prevalent metrics data are the data about submissions, acceptance and publication dates (27/31), article-level usage metrics such as visits, views, and downloads (18/31), publication-level impact metrics, such as Journal Impact Factor

Funded by the European Union

(17/31), and publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads (12/31) (Table 67). It is expected that all IPSPs know about article and publication level metrics HRČAK provides to all journals (visits and downloads), but this is obviously not the case. Citation badges provided by Dimensions are not known to IPSPs.

Submission, acceptance, publication dates	27
Article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	18
Publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	12
Article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts	9
Publication-level impact metrics, such as Impact Factors	17
Rejection rates	3
Altmetrics, such as Altmetric, Plum X Metrics	2
Dimensions citation badges	0
Widget showing geographical spread of visitors	1

Table 67 Publicly displayed metrics. (HR)

Other (please specify): "This differs depending on the type of publication (it is not the same for the articles and for the journals, not even for all journals)"

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Among the offered dimensions of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (EDIB); language (24/69) and educational and professional background (25/69) are prioritised by IPSPs, followed by age, gender and ethnicity and culture (Table 68). It should be noted that the highest numbers are in 'not applicable' and 'don't know' choices, showing that these topics are not considered relevant for IPSPs.

Funded by the European Union

	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
Age (career-stage)	21	0	4	8	12	24
Gender	19	1	1	9	10	28
Sexual identity (including LGBTQIA+)	12	0	3	10	13	31
Ethnicity and culture	16	0	4	8	11	30
Religious background	13	0	4	9	12	31
Socio-economic background	15	0	4	8	11	31
Educational and professional background	25	0	5	5	14	20
Language (multilingualism)	24	1	4	10	10	20
Caring responsibilities	12	0	0	9	14	33
Disability	13	0	2	11	12	30

Table 68 Dimensions of equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging addressed by IPSP. (HR)

Other (please specify): "All authorships and memberships in the editorial board are awarded solely on the basis of the quality of the individuals, without discrimination of any kind, in accordance with the law and without quotas being formally met."

The main measure taken by IPSPs to ensure and promote the dimensions of equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging is the code of conduct and non-discrimination or positive discrimination policy (22/75) (Table 69). Still, many respondents selected 'Not applicable' and 'Don't know' options.

	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
Code of conduct/ non-discrimination/ positive discrimination policy	22	2	10	8	8	19
Data collection, monitoring and annual reporting	12	3	8	8	11	26
Recommendation for the use of inclusive language	8	2	7	12	10	28
Training, awareness-raising, anti-bias tools	11	2	9	11	10	24
Tailored support, personal coaching	6	0	11	12	11	28

Table 69 Measures taken by IPSP to ensure and promote the dimensions of equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging? (HR)

Other (please specify): "All the answers offered are completely inapplicable to the correct and unbiased management of a scientific journal."

Funded by the European Union

Accessibility

IPSPs should make their publications accessible to and inclusive of all our users, regardless of their abilities, including those with visual, hearing, cognitive, or motor impairments. To support accessibility, the principles of usability should be followed, and usage of screen readers, speech recognition software, screen magnifiers and other assistive technology should be possible on a publishing platform. The Guidelines for ensuring digital accessibility issued by the Croatian Academic and Research Network (CARNet) in 2018 and the Act on accessibility of websites and software solutions for mobile devices of public sector bodies (Official Gazette 017/2019) regulate some aspects of the accessibility in Croatia.

24/72 IPSPs do not have an accessibility policy; 16/72 have it, and 16/72 have it, but it is not published (Table 70).

	Yes	No	There is an accessibility policy, but it's not published	Don't know
Does the platform have a published accessibility policy?	16	24	16	16

Table 70 Availability of published accessibility policy. (HR)

Accessibility standards are mostly unknown to the Croatian IPSPs (Table 71) except OpenAIRE guidelines are implemented in some institutional repositories. OpenAIRE guidelines on accessibility might be found in OpenAIRE's documentation related to its repository infrastructure, data sharing, and open access policies.

Does the IPSP's platform meet any of the following accessibility requirements?						
	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
ATAG	0	0	3	4	35	16
WCAG	1	0	4	3	34	16
UAAG	1	0	3	4	35	15
OpenAIRE guidelines	11	1	5	2	29	14
DINI certificate	0	0	4	5	33	16

Table 71 Accessibility standards. (HR)

Other (please specify): The (IPSP) accessibility policy (2x), HRČAK

According to the responses, the main challenge that the IPSPs face in meeting accessibility standards is the lack of resources (36/67), followed by the lack of expertise (33/67)(

Funded by the European Union

Considering the challenges that the IPSP faces in meeting accessibility standards, how important (in terms of the IPSP's priorities) would you rate the following?							
	Very unimportant	Unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important	Not a challenge	Don't know
Lack of resources	2	1	2	30	19	5	8
Lack of expertise	3	2	4	23	13	13	7
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	2	1	4	30	15	6	8

Table 72).

Considering the challenges that the IPSP faces in meeting accessibility standards, how important (in terms of the IPSP's priorities) would you rate the following?							
	Very unimportant	Unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important	Not a challenge	Don't know
Lack of resources	2	1	2	30	19	5	8
Lack of expertise	3	2	4	23	13	13	7
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	2	1	4	30	15	6	8

Table 72 Challenges in meeting accessibility standards. (HR)

Other (please specify): "Lack of staff"

Among gender equality measures, a Gender Equality Plan (GEP) is implemented by 17/68, and gender impartial language in communication by 14/68 IPSPs (Table 73)

What measures have you taken to ensure and improve gender equality in services you provide?						
	Implemented	In progress	Considering	Not planning	Don't know	N/A
Gender Equality Plan (GEP)	17	1	7	8	8	26
Policy requiring authors to inform whether the research data are gender-sensitive	7	2	7	11	10	29
Use gender impartial language in all communications	14	4	7	8	10	25

Table 73 Gender equality measures. (HR)

Other (please specify): "The publisher complies with all relevant legal regulations".

Funded by the European Union

Denmark including the Faroe Islands (DK)

Author: Jan Erik Frantsvåg, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, ORCID 0000-0003-3413-8799

As part of the preparations for the survey, 272 scholarly journals/series were found to be published in Denmark, including all types of business models (open access, toll access, paper-based). A rough classification indicates 204 are institution-based, while 58 are published by professional publishers, mostly commercial. 25 of the 58 are published by international commercial publishers. One of the commercial publishers publishing 11 series, is a Danish not-for-profit publishing company with ties to a major university. A further 10 could not be classified.

Among the institutional series, most are published by Danish institutional publishing services at universities. Small societies and museums are well represented among those publishing only one title. What stood out in the Danish data was a national publishing service at the Royal Library, with 90 titles, nearly half of the institution-based titles in the early data set. (In the survey data the number of titles is more than 100 for this service.)

The survey received 10 responses from Denmark. Denmark has 51 journals in DOAJ, four with the DOAJ seal, 41 that let the authors retain all rights, and 50 are diamond journals. Denmark has 22 institutional publishers in DOAJ (via GOA8), 21 of which publish diamond journals. A reasonably large share of Danish institutional publishing appears to be represented by these responses.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The survey targeted 102 IPSPs in Denmark. Survey invitations were sent via Qualtrics, supplemented by individual invitations from project members and local mailing lists. 10 valid responses were received from Danish respondents.

The survey was primarily targeted at IPSPs, but responses from a number of standalone journals were also expected as they were also in the target group.

Among the 10 responses. Five are from IPs and five from SPs. Danish SPs are better represented among the Danish respondents (50%) than among the survey in total (20.3%).

The responses can be grouped by categories (Table 74). Two are from Universities and University-based publishing services, two from other institution-based publishing services, three are single journals, one is a national publishing platform and two are international service providers without their own publishing activities. Among those who publish, one publishes more than 100 titles, one is in the 11-20 bracket while the others either publish one or 2-5 (see Table 75).

Funded by the European Union

University	2
Institutional publishing	2
Single journal	3
National publishing platform	1
Service provider	2
Total	10

Table 74 IPSP categories. (DK)

It appears that the concept of 'parent organisation' was not familiar to the respondents of the survey. Four respondents say they have a parent organisation, this was verified by checking external links. Three are part of a library in the parent organisation, one is operating independently but is controlled by the parent organisation. One answered 'don't know', and five said no. However, except for one international service provider, the last six are small institutional publishers. Among the four with a parent organisation, one serves only the parent organisation, the other three serve others, too.

Four of the 10 IPSPs or their parent organisations are public organisations, names indicate public scholarly organisations. Three are private not-for-profit organisations, names indicate scholarly societies and museums. Of the remaining three, one belongs to the museum sector, one is a private company and one a not-for-profit company. Public organisations are under-represented in Denmark (40%) compared with the survey in general (65.8%).

Only one of the Danish respondents answered the question about the number of people employed by the company or corporation (<250 employees), this was answered by only around 4% of all respondents in the survey.

Two of the respondents say they employ 21–30 FTE. Other information indicates that for one of these, this is more likely to be the FTE in the parent organisation. Two indicate 2–5 FTEs, four less than 2 FTE and one answered 'none'.

IPSPs were asked to indicate what kind of services they provide; here multiple answers could be selected. The most common service provided by Danish IPSPs is IT (70%), for the total survey this is the third most common (69.3%). Second for Denmark is training, support and/or advice, with 60% compared to 44.7% in the survey. Following that is editorial with 40%, which is the most important service in the survey with 79.4%. The structure of services in Denmark seems to be somewhat different from the survey in general, it is difficult to point to reasons for this.

Language

Among the nine respondents who responded, two only publish in English. A further four have English as their first language, two of these also publish in Danish. Danish is the

Funded by the European Union

first language for three respondents, these all also offer English. German and French are offered by three each, Faroese is offered by one, which is not surprising as the Faroes are part of Denmark. One also offers Portuguese. Only one offers the neighbouring languages Swedish and Norwegian, this is in contrast to Sweden, where neighbour languages are offered by a third of respondents.

Language is also an aspect of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging, the last section in this country report.

Membership engagement

Besides 'don't know' responses, only two of the respondents are members of any organisation, both are SPs. Both are members of OASPA, while COPE, DORA, POSI and the Helsinki Initiative have one member each.

Publication types

IPSPs were asked whether they identified themselves as publishers, publishers and service providers, or only service providers. Quite consistently Danish respondents publish to a smaller degree, and to a larger degree either provide services or publish and service than for the survey in total. This corresponds well to the fact that the Danish responders have a higher percentage of responders who declare themselves as SPs than the survey in total. 62.5% of Danish respondents either publish or publish and service academic journals. For other types of output fewer respondents are involved in publishing.

Eight of the 10 respondents have indicated how many journals they publish (Table 75), the remaining two are not involved in journal publishing, but in other forms of output. Single journals are about as well represented among Danish respondents as in the survey total, those publishing 2-5 are fewer than in the survey total. The most striking observation is that 37.5% of Danish respondents are among the 'more than 100' segment, which counts 18 in the whole survey. Two of these three Danish respondents are not actually involved in publishing, but in providing services to a large number of journals. If these two responses are discarded, then on the one hand the small IPSPs dominate, but on the other hand Denmark has a huge IPSP that takes care of about half of all Danish journals.

Funded by the European Union

	Denmark	%	Whole survey	%
1	3	37.5	224	34.7
2-5	1	12.5	203	31.5
6-10			64	9.9
11-20	1	12.5	69	10.7
21-50			54	8.4
51-100			13	2.0
More than 100	3	37.5	18	2.8

N = 8 of 10; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Denmark, all)
N = 645 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (all)
Table 75 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022 – Denmark vs. rest of survey. (DK)

When it comes to the number of scholarly articles published annually, the smallest category (10 or less) is not represented among the Danish respondents. The majority are in the category 11–50 articles, this seems reasonably in line with the survey total. The largest category, with three respondents, actually contains only one publisher. This is still more than the survey total (Table 76).

	Denmark	%	Whole survey	%
1-10			69	10.8
11-50	4	50.0	262	41.1
51-100			95	14.9
101-200	1	12.5	79	12.4
201-500			70	11.0
More than 500	3	37.5	63	9.9

N = 638 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (all)
N = 8 of 10; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Denmark, all)
Table 76 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022 – Denmark vs. rest of survey. (DK)

Only three (30%) Danish respondents say they publish books, for the survey in total nearly 60% publish books. One publishes 10 or fewer, one is mid-sized with 21–50 books and one is among the few with more than 100 books (the survey total is 21). The overall picture is that the Danish book publishers are larger than in the survey in general.

Four of the Danish respondents indicate they publish conference outputs, one of these is an SP not engaged in publishing per se. The remaining three are all in the small to medium-sized bracket when it comes to output size, roughly equal to the survey total.

The respondents also were asked to indicate in which disciplines they publish (Table 77).

Funded by the European Union

	Denmark	%	Whole survey	%
Agricultural sciences	2	20.0	82	12.0
Engineering and technology	2	20.0	163	23.9
Humanities	10	100.0	369	54.2
Medical and health sciences	2	20.0	146	21.4
Multidisciplinary	6	60.0	308	45.2
Natural sciences	2	20.0	183	26.9
Non-academic			41	6.0
Social sciences	8	80.0	376	55.2

N = 681 of 685; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (all)
N = 10 of 10; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Denmark, all)

Table 77 Disciplines covered - Denmark vs. rest of survey. (DK)

All respondents are active in the humanities, 80% in social sciences and 60% are multidisciplinary. These numbers are higher than for the survey total, especially for the humanities where the survey total is 54.2%.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

About half of the respondents have an approved annual budget. One states that the amount is unknown, one has a budget in the 1-10K EUR range, one in the 11–50K EUR range while one is in the >1M EUR bracket. This last IPSP is an international service provider. Those who have a budget are also subjected to formal monitoring and/or administration.

Looking at in-kind support provided by the parent organisation, Denmark is generally quite similar to the survey respondents in total. 60% of Danish respondents use external services, this is somewhat less than the survey total.

When it comes to the various kinds of external services, the number of Danish respondents choosing the various alternatives are so small that results should be looked at with caution. IT services are outsourced by 83.3% (5/6) of Danish respondents who answered this, against 55.6% for the survey total. Similarly, communication services are outsourced by 40% of Danish respondents against 10.9% in the survey total. This looks like the most significant deviation from the total numbers.

Danish respondents see less need for cooperation with others, as 50% have answered 'don't know' to this question. This is nearly double the sum of 'don't know' and 'no' in the survey total.

Danish respondents seem less reliant on fixed and permanent subsidies from parent organisations than for the survey in total. 30% have indicated high or very high reliance,

Funded by the European Union

compared to 44.9% for the survey total. For 60% this is 'not applicable', against 41.4% for the survey total.

Danish respondents also seem less reliant on 'periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisations' than for the survey total. 30% of Danish respondents have such support, as compared to 39% for the survey total, and the very low and low alternatives are more common in Denmark than in the survey total. When it comes to 'time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation' this is applicable to 70% of Danish respondents compared to 43.7% in the survey total. And in Denmark high or very high applies to 40% against 23.2% in the survey total. 'Permanent public government funding' is 'not applicable' to 80% of Danish respondents, compared to 59.8% for the survey total.

Reliance on collective funding varies in Denmark. For 70% it is 'not applicable' (75.5% in the survey total). 10% report this as very low, on par with the total of 9.8%, but 20% report it as very high, this is only 3.4% in the survey total. Reliance on 'voluntary author contributions' is low in Denmark, as for the survey total. The same goes for reliance on 'content and print sales' and on 'Author Processing Charges'.

With regards the stability of the various sources of income, Fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisations seems slightly more stable in Denmark compared to the survey total. Although the 'very unstable' responses are higher in Denmark (25%) than the survey total (8.7%). Periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisations is roughly as stable in Denmark as in the survey total. For other types of support, the responses are too few to form a useful picture.

Regarding Danish reliance on various resources, 'non-monetary or in kind support' looks somewhat more important to Danish respondents than to the survey in general. Denmark also looks slightly more dependent on 'monetary income' compared to the survey total.

Expectations to produce a 'profit/surplus' seems somewhat higher for the Danish respondents than for the survey total. One of the Danish respondents has an expectation to have a profit/surplus in order to generate shareholder value, only five respondents in the whole survey have such an expectation.

Question 21 asked about what respondents saw as the main challenges related to financial sustainability, all answers from the Danish sample addressed problems with finding funding and uncertainty over the long-term sustainability of some sources of funding.

Governance

Formal documents describing activities, 'statutes/by-laws/articles of association' are equally common in Denmark as for other countries. This is also true for 'external legislation /requirements/policies'.

Funded by the European Union

The activities are overseen by a management office for 56.6% of the Danish respondents, which is close to the 52% for the survey as a whole. 40% have a governing board, less than the survey total of 63%. Only 22.2% of Danish respondents are being overseen through external audit of accounts, compared to 31.9% for the survey total. 20% of Danish respondents have a governance model that includes representation from the wider scholarly community, less than the survey total of 38.9%.

Open Science/Open Access practices

Danish respondents who have answered the questions regarding what percentage of their output is OA, have generally given answers ranging from 92% to 100%. All journals are published totally OA except for one respondent that has indicated 92%. Except for one respondent who has indicated 5% (academic books and non-academic output) and 10% (conference output), all academic books, conference output, 'other' outputs, grey literature and non-academic outputs have a 100% OA rate if any rate has been indicated.

When it comes to journals, Danish respondents report following no Open Science/Open Access policy to a slightly higher extent than the survey total (12.5% vs. 4.1%), a national policy is also followed slightly less than in the survey total (37.5% vs. 48.4%). 50% follow their own policy, which is on par with the survey total of 48.1%. In Denmark, no-one follows the policy of the parent organisation (40.5% in the survey total). For books, there are too few responses for this to be commented on.

In Denmark, as in the survey total, the most common issue to be covered by the Open Science/Open Access policy, is copyright. In second place is embargoes with 57.1% compared to the survey total of 27.3%. In third place is metadata rights and use of open licences, both with 42.9% compared to 38.6% and 71.7% in the survey total. It is difficult to say anything about the differences between Denmark and the survey total, and the absolute numbers for Denmark are small.

Acceptance of preprints/working papers in journals and/or books seems somewhat lower in Denmark compared to the survey total, around 33% compared to around 54%, but this could be due to the high percentage of 'don't know (33.3%) and 'not applicable' (22.2%) responses.

Acceptance of self-archiving is lower in Denmark compared to the survey total. This is a question where respondents could choose more than one alternative. A low response rate, combined with a narrower focus - i.e. only publishing books or journals, not both, in contrast to many respondents in other countries - which can distort the picture, makes it difficult to compare Danish responses on this question with the survey in general. No respondent answers No, but 'don't know' and 'not applicable' are one third of the answers. We see the same pattern for encouraging or allowing sharing of full-texts via academic sharing services.

Funded by the European Union

Acceptance of self-archiving is lower in Denmark compared to the survey total. This is a question where respondents could choose more than one alternative. No Danish respondent publishes both books and journals. This could distort the picture as no Danish respondent can say yes to more than one alternative. No respondent answers No, but 'don't know' and 'not applicable' are one third of the answers. The same pattern can be seen for encouraging or allowing sharing of full-texts via academic sharing services.

One Danish respondent reports having embargo periods for self-archiving of some journals, 18.3% of the survey total impose embargoes for some output.

22.2% of Danish respondents make citations in all journals available according to I4OC principles, against 43.4% for the survey total. However, a further 11.1% do this for some journals, compared to 5.9% for the survey total. For books, no Danish respondent does this, compared to 14% for the survey total.

Ignoring 'don't know' and 'not applicable' responses, all the Danish respondents who have answered the question, use a CC licence. This is in line with the survey total, although 5.9% of the total use another licence. There is a good spread of CC licence types but the low number of responses makes it difficult to draw any conclusions.

In the survey total, 51.4% IPSPs either offer, experiment with or would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage, compared to 40% among the Danish respondents.

Only 11.1% of Danish respondents report having a research data sharing policy at any level, compared to 58.4% for the survey total.

Distinguishing contributor roles is done by 11.1% of Danish respondents, compared to 16.9% of the survey total.

Editorial quality, editorial management, and research integrity

Among the Danish respondents, it is clear that peer-review processes are decided on the journal, not the publisher level. All types of review are in use, and most respondents use more than one type of process. For example, all use double-anonymised peer review, 40% each use editorial review, open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors, and single-anonymised peer review, while 20% each use open participation in the peer review process and open reviewers reports.

40% of Danish respondents report being involved in the editorial management of publications, compared to 69.4% for the survey total. Looking at the list of which tasks the respondents are involved in, those who reported being involved are generally involved in all or nearly all tasks, except for plagiarism scanning where only 25% are involved.

Funded by the European Union

In the survey 63.3%of IPSPs have a specific policy on research integrity/research ethics, this is very close to the 60% of Danish respondents.

Technical services efficiency

Among the technical services provided by Danish IPSPs, full editorial workflow is provided by 20% compared to 57.9% in the survey total, and this is where the Danish respondents differ most from others. Services and infrastructures are somewhat more reliant upon inhouse activities by a dedicated IT department personnel among Danish respondents, than in the survey total. Other inhouse activities are less used in Denmark, while outsourcing seems slightly more important.

With 40% of IPSPs using OJS, it is less dominant as a publishing system in Denmark than in the survey total (61.4%). Scholar One and WordPress are slightly more important in Denmark than in the survey total.

Assignment of PIDs seems somewhat less widespread among Danish respondents than for the survey total. CrossRef DOIs are less dominant in Denmark than in the survey total, 57.1% compared to 77%. URNs are more widely used (14.3% compared to 5.6% for the survey total). ISSNs are also more used, 85.7% compared to 71.9%, while ISBNs are much less used, 14.3% compared to 51.2%. The lack of ISBN use is probably due to book publishing being less important for the Danish respondents.

Fewer Danish respondents release their metadata openly with a standard metadata description schema, 20% answer no, compared to 19.1% in the survey total. The 'don't know' responses are 50% in Denmark, compared to 27.8% in the survey total. A CC BY licence is used by 37% in the survey total, compared to 10% in Denmark.

PDF is the dominant format type in Denmark as well as the survey total (90% vs. 97.3%). EPub is not mentioned as a format by any Danish respondent against 17.6% in the survey total, HTML only by 10% compared to 40.8% in the survey total. JSON is used more in Denmark, 20% compared to 2.4% in the survey total.

80% of Danish respondents have an archiving/backup policy, this is in line with the survey total (73.5%). CLOCKSS and LOCKSS appear not to be used by any Danish respondent against 17.8% and 16.8% respectively in the survey total. Use of national institutional libraries or infrastructure in Denmark is lower than the survey total, 50% compared to 71.7%. PKP PN is slightly less used in Denmark, 16.7% compared to 21.7% in the survey total. Portico or PubMed Central is not used by Danish respondents, compared to 13% and 7.4% in the survey total. 50% of Danish respondents report that archiving and backup is not a challenge, more than the survey total of 30.4%. 12.5% of Danish respondents report financial constraints as a challenge, against 27.8% in the survey total, and 25% report lack of human resources against 32.7% in the survey total. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is reported as a problem by 37.5% of Danish respondents compared to 27.9% in the survey total, lack of expertise by 37.5% compared to 17.5% in the survey total.

Funded by the European Union

Regarding providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, 75% of Danish respondents point to lack of human resources, and 62.5% to financial constraints as the most important problems, compared to 55% and 9.8% in the survey total. Lack of expertise and technical limitations of existing infrastructure is seen as a challenge by 50% of Danish respondents, for the survey total the numbers are 18.6% and 23.3%. Therefore, these aspects are more prominent in Denmark.

Resources for supplying and enriching metadata/PIDs seems to be of less significance in Denmark. Lack of human resources is the major difference, 11.1% in Denmark compared to 43.1% in the survey total.

When it comes to challenges with trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services, lack of expertise is the major challenge for Danish respondents, with 55.6%. In the survey total this is only 25.5%. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is the next largest challenge with 44.4%, against 27.2% in the survey total. .

Visibility, communication, marketing, and impact

Danish respondents are somewhat more satisfied with their content's inclusion in search engines/indexes. 70% are satisfied, 30% want improvement, while the survey total responses are 45.4% satisfied and 54.4% want improvement.

40% of Danish respondents say the IPSP manages indexation in scientific information databases, for the survey total this is 64%.

Too few have answered the question about challenges with paying for membership of organisations, and the few answers are spread evenly over the spectrum, so no meaningful comments can be made. Paying for recurring charges is reported as very important or Important by 66.6% of Danish respondents, 43% for the survey total. When it comes to satisfying metadata requirements, and satisfying non-technical participation criteria, Denmark is more in line with the survey total. Challenges in satisfying technical participation criteria is also on about the same level in Denmark as for the survey total, while communications/requirements/paperwork in another language is less of a challenge than the survey total as no Danish respondents rate this as important against 20.1% in the survey total, likewise no Danish IPSPs see communications/requirements/paperwork only in English as a challenge. Such paperwork being too technical is seen as an important challenge by 33.3% of Danish respondents, similar to the 35.2% in the survey total.

70% of Danish respondents use newsletters/social media/networking profiles to inform the community about updates, similar to the survey total of 66%.

70% of Danish respondents say they have a data protection policy; the survey total is 65%. 70% also have a privacy policy, here the survey total is 66.6%.

Funded by the European Union

70% of Danish respondents say they display metrics publicly compared to the survey total of 42.5%. Too few have indicated which metrics they use to merit commenting upon.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

22.2% of Danish respondents have either implemented or are considering implementing mechanisms to address age-related aspects of EDIB. For the survey total 41.2% report having implemented, being in progress or considering.

Most Danish respondents selected 'don't know' or 'not applicable' when it comes to caring responsibilities, with only 11.1% being in progress to implement measures, compared to 26.1% implemented/in progress/considering for the survey total. A somewhat better picture is found for disability, with corresponding numbers being 22.2% for Denmark against 34.3% for the survey total.

44.4% of Danish respondents have implemented mechanisms regarding educational and professional background, 41.2% have implemented, are in progress or considering, for the survey total. When it comes to ethnicity and culture 33.3% have implemented among the Dansh respondents, while 37.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or contemplating in the survey total.

44.4% of Danish respondents have implemented measures related to gender, while 45.3% of the survey total has implemented, are in progress or considering. Language is addressed by 44.4% of Danish respondents, 48.6% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering. 22.2% of Danish respondents have addressed religious background compared to 28.8% for the survey total. Sexual identity aspects are covered by 33.3% of Danish respondents, while 31.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. Socio-economic background is covered by 33.3% of Danish respondents, while 36.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

When asked about what measures have been put in place to address the aspects mentioned above, 49.3% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering code of conduct/non-discrimination/positive discrimination policy, while among Danish respondents 44.4% have implemented or are considering this. Data collection monitoring and annual reporting is in place or being considered by 22.2% of Danish respondents, while for the survey total 35.2% have this in place, are in progress or are considering. 44.4% of Danish respondents have implemented measures or are in progress when it comes to recommendations for the use of inclusive language, 30.5% for the survey total, plus 12.2% considering. When it comes to tailored support or personal coaching, 33.3% of Danish respondents have implemented this or are in progress, 29% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. 11.1% of Danish respondents are in progress to implement training, awareness-raising, anti-bias tools, 34.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

Funded by the European Union

10% of Danish respondents have a published accessibility policy, another 10% have a policy but it isn't published. Corresponding numbers for the survey total are 21.8% and 13.2%.

No Danish respondents meet the ATAG criteria, very few do in the survey total but 7.2% are considering. In addition, no Danish respondents meet the DINI certificate criteria or OpenAIRE guidelines, compared to 12.3% and 26.4% respectively either implemented, in progress or considering in the survey total. UAAG criteria are not met by any Danish respondent, 0.8% of the survey total have implemented while 7.8% are in progress or considering. The Danish respondents fare better when it comes to the WCAG requirements, with 14.3% having implemented against 5.8% in the survey total have implemented while 13% are in progress or considering.

Among challenges in meeting accessibility standards, lack of resources is seen as important or very important by 88.9% of Danish respondents, compared to 67.6% in the survey total. Lack of expertise is rated important/very important by 77.8% of Danish respondents, 58.5% of the survey total. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is seen as important or very important by 77.8% of Danish respondents, 58.3% in the survey total.

While 38.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering a Gender Equality Plan, this applies to none of the Danish respondents. For requiring authors to inform about gender sensitive research data, the percentage having implemented, are in progress or considering is 26.3 in the survey total, but zero among Danish respondents. Requirements to use gender impartial language is implemented/in progress/considering for 45.3% in the survey total, 33.3% among Danish respondents.

When it comes to language services provided or supported, the picture is understandably very different from the survey totals. English is covered by all respondents and only 70% offer Danish. The third most common language, Portuguese, is offered by 30% of Danish respondents.

Bilingual publishing of full text in the form of different language versions in the same document is implemented, in progress or being considered by 66.6% of Danish respondents. Sequential different language versions 11.1% and simultaneous different language versions as separate documents 60%. For the survey total, these numbers are 47.3%, 22.7% and 22.7% respectively. 90% of Danish respondents have multilingual publication of abstracts, 75.8% in the survey total. Improving machine translation literacy is being considered by 10% of Danish respondents, 23.9% of the survey total have implemented/are in progress/are considering. Abstracts in English when the original language is other than English is implemented/in progress/under consideration by 44.4% of Danish respondents, 67.5% in the survey total. Translation and/or language check services are implemented or being considered for 55.2% of Danish respondents, 44.4% in the survey total. Translation of metadata into English is not implemented or being considered by any Danish respondents, against 51.3% in the survey total, including 6.2% in progress. Using toolkits or training to address language bias in peer review is In progress or being considered by 22.2% of Danish respondents,

Funded by the European Union

20.8% of the survey total has either implemented, are in progress or considering such measures.

The overall picture is that Danish respondents are much in line with the overall survey in this area, somewhat better on some aspects, somewhat less good on other aspects but the deviations are not major on many aspects.

Funded by the European Union

Germany (DE)

Authors:
Tabea Klaus, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, ORCID 0000-0002-2791-1053
Julian Schima, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, ORCID 0009-0005-2851-3523,
Margo Bargheer, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, ORCID 0000-0001-8246-8210

Open access and, in particular, diamond OA publishing are increasingly becoming the focus of politicians, research institutions and scientists in Germany. However, even if the gold OA figures of commercial publishers with DEAL contracts, such as Springer, Wiley and Elsevier (since September 2023) are basically encouraging, publishers in Germany published more than 75,000 publications in the journals of DEAL publishers between 2020 to 2022, the concept and the associated costs of DEAL contracts are not suitable for implementing a sustainable OA transformation. To counter the rising costs of commercial publishers for OA publications, funders such as the German Research Foundation (DFG), which recently signed the Action Plan for Diamond Open Access, are increasingly focusing on institutional publishing.

The German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) and the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the federal states (KMK) call in their joint guidelines for the federal and state governments to make Open Access the standard for publicly funded research and explicitly support the strengthening of diamond OA.

In order to gain a better overview of the complex OA and diamond OA publication landscape and its needs, there are various initiatives and surveys in Germany which, like DIAMAS, are dedicated to this topic. A current example is the comprehensive study "Mapping the German Diamond Open Access Journal Landscape" (Taubert, Sterzik et al., 2023), which addresses, among others, the problem of sustainability of small and medium-sized journals.

But what are the current numbers for diamond OA and institutional publishing found by DIAMAS research? According to the diamond OA List Germany (DOAG) (Bruns, Taubert et al., 2022), there are 298 diamond OA journals in Germany. The DOAJ lists 370 journals in Germany, 90 of which have the DOAJ seal. 286 of the journals let the authors retain all rights and 236 are diamond OA journals. Furthermore, Germany has 98 institutional publishers (via GOA8) in DOAJ, 90 of which publish diamond journals. Regarding the software use as of August 2023, there are 34 institutions in German-speaking countries that offer OJS hosting for local and regional researchers (https://ojs-de.net).

A tool that displays open access services at German universities and research institutions is the oa.atlas. Currently the oa.atlas lists 396 institutions that have journal publication funds and 179 that have monograph publication funds.

The KOALA project (Konsortiale Open Access Lösungen aufbauen https://projects.tib.eu/koala/) is approaching the cost issue from a different angle and

Funded by the European Union

has developed a consortial model in which participating institutions (university libraries) jointly fund OA journals and book series.

The 30 university presses that are members of the non-profit AG Universitätsverlage, which represents numerous university presses in Germany, Austria and South Tyrol/Alto Adige, primarily publish scientific publications, monographs and journals from their own institutions. Amongst the university presses in Germany, the most recently founded university publishing house, Berlin Universities Publishing, publishes jointly for four scientific institutions in Berlin.

DIAMAS survey: dissemination, response rate, respondents

In Germany the DIAMAS survey targeted 43 Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSPs), of which 34 (79.1%) identified themselves as Institutional Publishers (IPs) and 9 (20.9%) as Service Providers (SPs). This composition almost completely matches the numbers from all survey respondents, of which 79.7% identified themselves as IPs and 20.3% as SPs. This is also a prerequisite for the comparability of the national numbers with the responses from all survey participants. The survey invitation was sent out via Qualtrics to previously identified IPSPs; additionally individual invitations were sent to thematically suitable mailing lists, as well as IPSP contacts personally known to project members, for example the members of the AG Universitätsverlage.

In terms of organisational form, participating German IPSPs are slightly more affiliated with a parent organisation compared to all survey responses (ALL 56.2%, GER 67.4%). As a clear difference in the international comparison, institutional publishing in Germany is significantly more often linked to the library of the parent organisation (ALL 19.6%, GER 44.8%). The organisational form of IPSPs as a department of the parent organisation, on the other hand, occurs significantly less frequently in Germany (ALL 24.8%, GER 3.4%).

Very similar to the feedback from the international survey participants, approximately a quarter of the German participating IPSPs provide their services with two or fewer than two employees hired or contracted for this purpose (None: GER 25.6%, ALL 27.8%; Less than 2: GER 27.9%, ALL 22.8%; 2-5 employees: GER 27.9%, ALL 28.4%).

When asked about the services participants provided to their users, Table 78 shows a very broad service-portfolio of the 43 participants.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Administrative, legal and financial	25	58.1
Communication	26	60.5
Editorial	30	69.8
IT	35	81.4
Production	39	90.7
Training, support and/or advice	28	65.1
Other	2	4.7

N = 43 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q8.1 (Germany, all)

Table 78 Kind of services provided. (DE)

In comparison to the international survey participants, IPSPs in Germany offer IT support (GER 81.4% vs. ALL 69.3%), production support (GER 90.7% vs. ALL 72.3%) and training, support and/or advice (GER 65.1% vs. ALL 44.7%) to users much more often, while editorial services are somewhat less provided by the German survey participants (GER 69.8% vs. ALL 79.4%).

The disciplines covered by the IPSPs illustrate also the broad orientation of the survey participants with a focus on the humanities and social sciences and a multidisciplinary approach (Table 79).

	n	%
Agricultural sciences	7	16.3
Engineering and technology	11	25.6
Humanities	19	44.2
Medical and health sciences	10	23.3
Multidisciplinary	24	55.8
Natural sciences	16	37.2
Non-academic	3	7.0
Social sciences	21	48.8

N = 43 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Germany, all)

Table 79 Disciplines covered. (DE)

Funded by the European Union

Language and multilingualism

42 of 43 German participants publish in English (GER 97,7%, ALL 95,7%), closely followed by publications in German (32/43). Furthermore nine of 43 publish in Spanish, eight in French, five in Italian and two in Russian. In addition, in one case each, there are also publications in Czech, Danish, Dutch, Greek, Polish and Portuguese. This can be seen as demonstration of the broad diversity of languages required for publications on specific topics or target groups. The high number of respondents publishing in English confirms the position of English as the established academic lingua franca in Europe.

None of the 43 languages listed as answering options for "languages services can be provided or supported" were excluded. Multilingual (bilingual) publications of full text, which means different language versions in the same document, are currently implemented by 17 of 37 IPSPs (13/37 not planning, 1/37 don't know; 6/37 not applicable), multilingual abstracts are provided by 24 of 41 IPSPs (13/41 don't publish multilingual abstracts; 4/41 don't know). To promote language diversity 14 of 36 IPSPs provide abstracts in English for publications in a different original language of the publication than English (1/36 considering, 10/36 not planning, 2/36 don't know; 9/36 not applicable).

Membership engagement

Of the German participants, only very few are members of the 13 listed international organisations associations and coalitions, which is consistent with the trend of feedback from all survey respondents. The association with the most members is the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA) with seven members of 41 (30/41 are not members of OASPA, 4/41 don't know). This is the same quantity as DORA, the Declaration on Research Assessment, which was signed by seven of 42 participants (28/42 didn't sign, 7/42 didn't know). All the other requested organisations have significantly fewer or no members within the German survey participants. The higher membership rates in the AEUP, the Association of European University Presses, (GER 12.5%, ALL 6.1%) can be seen as a special feature of the German feedback. This might be partially influenced by the number of participating university presses in Germany in comparison to other types of IPSPs within the international participants but illustrates at the same time the established European network and collaboration of university presses in Germany.

Publication types

19 of 41 IPSPs support academic journals through publication, 18/41 with publication and service and 4/41 only with service. Academic books are published by 12 out of 27 IPSPs, 13/27 offer publication and service and 2/27 provide only service for academic books. For these two publication outputs, academic books and journals, the German participants differ from the total number of survey participants in terms of the IPSPs perceived tasks. In Germany, 16% more offer services for academic journals and at the

Funded by the European Union

same time publish journals themselves (GER 43.9%, ALL 27.6%). For academic books even 19% more undertake the dual function (GER 48.1%, ALL 28.9%).

13/25 publish conference output, 11/25 publish and provide service in relation to conference outputs and one only provides a service for this type of publication. Grey literature is only published by 10 IPSPs of which five only publish, five offer publication and a service for grey literature.

Regarding the quantity of the publication output in 2022, the answers display substantial differences. 19/41 IPSPs publish just one academic scholarly journal, 12 publish between 2-5 journals, one publishes 51-100 journals and one more than 100 journals. Furthermore, 6-10 journals were published by two out of 41 IPSPs, 11-20 and 21-50 journals were each published by three IPSPs out of 41 (Table 80).

	n	%
1-10	11	27.5
11-50	12	30.0
51-100	9	22.5
101-200	3	7.5
201-500	2	5.0
More than 500	3	7.5

N = 40 of 43; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Germany, all)

Table 80 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022. (DE)

1-10 academic books were published in 2022 by 16 out of 27 German IPSPs. Of the 27 IPSPs, two each published 11-20; 51-100 and even more than 100 academic books. Five IPSPs each published 21-50 books.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

The uncertain and unsustainable budgetary position of IPSPs illustrate the answers to the question on the annual budget. Only 12 of 43 IPSPs have an approved annual budget to calculate and work with, 26 out of 43 on the other hand don't dispose of an approved annual budget (2/43 don't know, 3/43 other).

Consistently with this, the survey participants rate the dependency on the parent organisation's grants over the last three years (Table 81) as high to very high in more than half of the cases, which matches the feedback from the entirety of the survey participants (ALL: high reliance 11.4%, very high reliance 33.5%).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Very low	1	2.5
Neither high nor low	2	5.0
High	5	12.5
Very high	18	45.0
Not applicable	14	35.0

N = 40 of 43; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q17 (Germany, all)

Table 81 Reliance on funding over the last 3 years - Fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisation. (DE)

Only 12 out of 43 survey participants provided insight into the amount of their annual budget (Table 82). However, five of the 12 IPSPs did not know and three did not wish to disclose information. This makes it difficult to make any assumptions regarding budget available to German IPSPs.

	n	%
1-10K	1	8.3
11-50K	1	8.3
51-100K	1	8.3
101-500K	1	8.3
Do not wish to disclose	3	25.0
Don't know	5	41.7

N = 12 of 43; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q11.1 (Germany, all)

Table 82 Annual budget (Euros). (DE)

A glance at the international returns regarding the annual budget highlights the strained financial situation of institutional publishing even more clearly: 48.8% of all 386 responding IPSPs only have an annual budget corresponding to the lower three categories (Less than 1K EUR, 1-10K EUR and 11-50K EUR).

Besides information regarding an approved annual budget the ways of in-kind support provided by the parent organisation were checked (Table 83).

	n	%
Facilities and premises	22	75.9
General IT services	23	79.3
Human Resource management, general financial and legal services	20	69.0
Salaries of permanent staff	21	72.4
Salaries of temporary staff	5	17.2
Service-specific IT services	23	79.3
Not applicable	3	10.3

N = 29 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q13 (Germany, all)

Funded by the European Union

Table 83 In kind support provided by parent organisation. (DE)

The importance of the community for institutional publishing is illustrated by the responses to the question about areas and topics in which collaborations with other organisations would be considered (Table 84). Only seven out of 42 (16,7%, similar to ALL 15,7%) do not see any possibility for cooperation with others.

	n	%
Administrative, legal and financial services	7	16.7
Communication services	10	23.8
Editorial services	11	26.2
IT services	18	42.9
Production services	21	50.0
Training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice	11	26.2
None	7	16.7
Don't know	4	9.5
Other	3	7.1

N = 42 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q15 (Germany, all)

Table 84 Areas in which collaboration with other organisations would be considered. (DE)

Perhaps surprising for Germany in comparison with the survey totals are the different feedback on which areas are being considered or sought for greater collaboration. The German participants are especially interested in working together within production services (GER 50%, ALL 42.4%) and IT services (GER 42.9%, ALL 46.3%). The international participants prefer collaboration for communication services (ALL 37.5%, GER 23.8%) and training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice (ALL 44.9%, GER 26,2%).

Funded by the European Union

Open Science/Open Access practices

Many of the German survey participants are committed to specific and concrete quality standards in the sense of Open Access and/or Open Science, which is in line with the feedback from the international survey participants. The guidelines formulated in an institutional, organizational or national policy serve as a benchmark for the services provided and thus support the movement for free and open access to knowledge and scientific results.

	n	%
No	3	7.7
Yes it follows a national policy	11	28.2
Yes it follows the parent organisation policy	17	43.6
Yes we have our own policy	20	51.3
Don't know	2	5.1
Other (please specify)	4	10.3

N = 39 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q26 (Germany, all)

Table 85 Follows an Open Science / Open Access policy – Journals. (DE)

	n	%
No	3	10.3
Yes it follows a national policy	9	31.0
Yes it follows the parent organisation policy	17	58.6
Yes we have our own policy	12	41.4
Don't know	2	6.9
Other (please specify)	4	13.8

N = 29 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q26 (Germany, all)

Table 86 Follows an Open Science / Open Access policy – Books. (DE)

Funded by the European Union

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

22 out of 41 survey participants confirmed their involvement in the editorial management of publications (17/41 negated such an involvement, 2/41 didn't know). In the follow-up question the 22 IPSPs identified their engagement in the different tasks accomplished in editorial management as seen in Table 87.

	n	%
Coordinating the peer review process	15	68.2
Monitoring the peer review process	16	72.7
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	17	77.3
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	11	50.0
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	19	86.4
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	5	22.7
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	15	68.2
Sourcing reviewers	13	59.1
Other (please specify)	1	4.5

N = 22 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q31.1 (Germany, all)

Table 87 Tasks accomplished in editorial management. (DE)

28 out of 43 are engaged in managing the editorial quality. To support the editorial quality and the editorial process 26 out of 28 IPSPs provide guidelines or instructions for their users. In addition, various peer review procedures are used for publications to ensure quality (Table 88).

	n	%
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	18	66.7
Editorial review	15	55.6
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	14	51.9
Open participation in the peer review process (community)	3	11.1
Open reviewers' reports	6	22.2
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	19	70.4
Other (please specify)	2	7.4

N = 27 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q32.2 (Germany, all)

Table 88 Types of peer review in use. (DE)

Funded by the European Union

Software solutions and technical services efficiency

40 of the 43 participating IPSPs offer at least one or more technical services, with metadata and quality control as the most common (34/41), closely followed by hosting services (29/41) and the provision of a full editorial workflow and a user interface (24/41 each).

Published content is made available in different formats (Table 89). However, PDF is clearly the most used format (41/41), the second most common format is HTML (21/41).

	n	%
Data formats, e.g. csv	10	24.4
EPub	6	14.6
HTML	21	51.2
Image or video formats (e.g. mp4, .mov)	9	22.0
JSON	2	4.9
PDF	41	100.0
Sound files (e.g. mp3, .wav)	7	17.1
XML	13	31.7
Other (please specify)	1	2.4

N = 41 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q39 (Germany, all)

Table 89 Formats content is made available in. (DE)

Looking at the publishing systems used by German survey participants (Table 90) shows a great variety, even if individual favourites stand out. 26 of 41 (63.4%) publish with Open Journals System (OJS), which corresponds to the feedback from all survey participants (ALL 61.4%). In contrast to this with a large deviation from the international survey participants, other open source software solutions are appreciated by the German IPSPs (GER 24.4%, ALL 6.2%).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Customisation or own development (please specify)	6	14.6
Drupal	6	14.6
DSpace	7	17.1
Editorial manager	1	2.4
Janeway	1	2.4
Open Journals System (OJS)	26	63.4
Open Monograph Press (OMP)	5	12.2
Scholar One	1	2.4
WordPress	6	14.6
Don't know	1	2.4
Other commercial software (please specify)	3	7.3
Other open source software (please specify)	10	24.4

N = 41 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q36 Germany, all)

Table 90 Publishing system used. (DE)

In order to enable stable, long-term findability and identification, publications are ideally provided with a persistent identifier (PID). When asked which type of publications are assigned with a unique PID, 36 of 41 IPSPs explained that every publication gets a PID, two of 41 IPSPs provide the PIDs only for all published journals, one for some journals and two participants didn't know. Table 91 shows the usage of the currently available PIDs.

	n	%
CrossRef-DOI	20	51.3
Datacite-DOI	19	48.7
Handle	4	10.3
ISBN	23	59.0
ISSN	29	74.4
URN	12	30.8
Other (please specify)	2	5.1
Other DOI	5	12.8

N = 39 of 43; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q37.1 (Germany, all)

Table 91 Persistent identifiers (PIDs). (DE)

Funded by the European Union

Visibility and Communication

117 of 40 IPSPs are not satisfied with the level of indexation of their published content in scholarly search engines and different indexes and would like to see (better) indexing in those search engines.

Regarding challenges in applying for indexation, 14 of 28 IPSPs identified the satisfaction of technical participation criteria as important and 12 of 29 participants the satisfaction of non-technical criteria.

When it comes to providing adequate resources for the necessary infrastructures and services, the lack of human resources is particularly clearly highlighted and the strongest rated (28/40).

To achieve and maintain interoperability with other services 17/38 IPSPs mention a lack of human resources as the main challenge, nine a lack of expertise. At the same time 12 of the 38 IPSPs don't regard this as a challenge.

Nine of 29 IPSPs declared satisfying metadata requirements as important, five out of 27 as very important challenge.

Other challenges were not considered as a challenge.
Service/requirements/paperwork is too technical (10/24 not a challenge), that the communications/requirements/ paperwork takes place only in English (15/25 not a challenge) or in another language (13/22 not a challenge).

18 of 41 IPSPs use a newsletter, social media and/or networking profiles to inform their community about updates (22/41 don't use these channels, one IPSP doesn't know).

Funded by the European Union

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging:

In relation to their publications and services, German IPSPs already address several dimensions of equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging:

- 15/39 implemented measures related with age (career stage)/ 2 in progress/ 6 not planning
- 13/37 implemented measures related with disability/ 2 in progress/ 7 not planning
- 13/37 implemented measures related with educational and professional background/ 2 considering/ 8 not planning
- 15/37 implemented measures related with ethnicity and culture/ 3 in progress/ 5 not planning
- 16/39 implemented measures related with gender/ 2 in progress/ 4 not planning
- 15/37 implemented measures related with language/ 3 considering/ 8 not planning
- 13/37 implemented measures related with religious background/ 2 in progress/ 6 not planning
- 12/38 implemented measures related with sexual identity including LGBTQIA+/ 1 in progress/ 6 not planning
- 15/37 implemented measures related with socio-economic background/ 2 in progress/ 4 not planning

Furthermore 6/34 IPSPs support their staff by tailored personal coaching, three IPSPs are considering such a support, eight IPSPs are not planning coaching. In addition, 14/37 IPSPs support equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging through recommendations for the use of inclusive language, 4/37 are considering such a recommendation, four are not planning recommendations on that topic.

Funded by the European Union

Italy (IT)

Authors:
Tommaso Agnoloni, Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems, National Research Council of Italy (IGSG - CNR), ORCID 0000-0003-3063-2239
Ginevra Peruginelli, Institute of Legal Informatics and Judicial Systems, National Research Council of Italy (IGSG - CNR), ORCID 0000-0002-9331-4476

In Italy, there is still a lack of a comprehensive policy promoting open access and open science. OA to scientific publications runs the risk of becoming increasingly associated with the business model of large commercial publishers, namely transformative agreements. However, OA scholarly publishing is gaining strength and interest from different actors, in most cases from the institutional world. There are efficient journal platforms that maintain, develop and promote centralised e-publishing platforms dedicated to University-owned OA journals. Good examples are within big Universities, such as Piattaforma riviste UniMI, Rosa, AlmaDL Journals, Sirio@Unito. Italy has 100 publishers indexed in DOAJ, 513 journals in DOAJ, 53 with the DOAJ seal, 409 that let the authors retain all rights and 455 are diamond journals. At the moment 15 university presses in Italy correspond to the diamond OA model(at least for authors internal to the institution.

Although the landscape in Italy is shifting, it is useful to mention two communities playing a significant role in the promotion of OA scholarly publishing. Firstly AISA - Italian Association for the Promotion of Open Science, a nonprofit organisation whose mission is to advance open science at scholarly publishing level, since its creation in 2015. Secondly the Association Coordination of Italian University Presses whose purpose is to explore issues related to the positioning, function and promotion of university and high science publishing. It includes 14 university presses. Although not all of them correspond to the diamond model.

An important step at the policy level to implement Open Science policies and practices in the Italian scholarly publishing sector is the National Plan for Open Science (PNSA), recently published by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR). This plan complements and enriches what was prepared by the National Plan for Research Infrastructures (PNIR). Both are an integral part of the National Program for Research 2021-2027 (NRP), whose actions promote and strengthen the scientific research landscape in Italy. In particular, PNSA aims to create coordination among all the actors involved for the development of an institutional publishing infrastructure of open science results built through the interconnection of repositories operated and/or maintained by the various actors that contribute to national scientific production.

The objective of the Plan is also to establish coordination among all the stakeholders involved, namely the Ministry of University and Research (MUR), research institutions, universities, the National Agency for the Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes (ANVUR), and research infrastructures, engaging the actors of the system in clear and measurable goals. In this scenario, the role of the Italian Computing and Data

Funded by the European Union

Infrastructure (ICDI), is recognized, which is the technical forum bringing together research infrastructures operating in Italy, public research institutions, universities, and other institutional members to support synergies in Italian contributions to the construction of the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC). ICDI also acts as the mandated organisation in the EOSC Association, designing a national infrastructure for scientific data. The Competence Center of ICDI, in collaboration with the service Open-Science.it, provides information and reference tools on Open Science aimed at the scientific community.

These initiatives reflect the strong interest within the Italian scientific community in creating a fertile background at the national level, regarding new modes of scholarly communication and new possibilities for scholarly publishing, through concrete promotion at the national level.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS survey targeted 359 IPSPs in Italy. Survey invitations were sent via Qualtrics, supplemented by local mailing lists. 52 valid responses were received from Italian respondents. The survey was primarily targeted at IPSPs, but a number of standalone journals were also in the target group.

Among the 52 respondents, 45 identified themselves as IPs, the remaining seven as SPs (13.5%).

Respondent's profiles according to answers to job function/title are mostly concentrated in the categories of IP publishing representative, editorial board and director of the publishing house (Table 92)

	n
Administration/management (deans, vice-deans, assistant directors, etc.)	4
Editorial (editor-in-chief, editor, technical editor, etc.)	12
IP publishing representative (president of the publishing committee, head of the publishing service, etc.)	16
Librarian	0
Society representative (president, treasurer, chairman, etc.)	2
Director of the publishing house	12
SP representative	0

N = 46 of 52; source: DIAMAS survey - Q3 (Italy, all)

Table 92 Respondents' profiles. (IT)

The majority of IPSPs (61.5%) are a part or a department of a parent organisation, mainly operating independently but owned or governed by Italian universities or public research institutions. Less than a half (43.8%) of the IPSPs that have a parent organisation provide services exclusively to it.

Funded by the European Union

78.8% of the IPSPs or their parent organisations are either public organisations (28) or private not for profit organisations (16). The rest are either private companies (7), private companies entirely owned by the parent institution (3) or informal groups of volunteers (1).

The majority of IPSPs (57.7%) employed less than 10 FTE staff, with an additional 32.7% employing no staff. Only five IPSPs (9.6%) employed more than 10 FTE. Among these, two organisations had more than 30 FTE. One of the two is a major Italian private academic publisher.

Most IPSPs (80% on average) provide communication, editorial, IT and production services. Administrative, legal and financial services and training and support services are offered by 59.6% and 40.4% of the IPSPs respectively. Other services mentioned by one of the IPSPs were legal deposit, automatic plagiarism detection, DOI attribution and cataloguing services.

Language and multilingualism

44 respondents answered the question on publication languages. Italian is one of the languages used for publications in 36/44 responses (81.8%). 26/44 respondents (59.1%) reported Italian as the most frequently used language. 100% reported English as one of the languages used for publication, usually as the second most frequent in 24/44 responses (54.4%). English is used as the most frequent or unique language of publication in 17/44 cases (38.6%).

Besides English and Italian the other most used publication languages, from the most frequent to the least are: French, Spanish, German and Portuguese. Finally, Dutch, Romansh, Russian, Slovenian are reported as publication languages in one case each (Table 93).

	n	%
English	44	100.0
Italian	36	81.8
French	18	40.9
Spanish	16	36.4
German	11	25.0
Portuguese	3	6.8
Dutch	1	2.3
Romansch	1	2.3
Russian	1	2.3
Slovene/Slovenian	1	2.3

N = 44 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q3 (Italy, all)

Table 93 Publication languages. (IT)

Funded by the European Union

Almost all of the IPSP that answered the question about languages they can provide services in, offer services in English and Italian. The other most frequent languages for services reflect those used for publications (French, Spanish, German and Portuguese). Two IPSPs reported languages supported for service provision, which were not among those used for publications: Basque, Catalan, Galician, Greek, Icelandic, Polish, Swedish, Turkish, Ukrainian, Chinese (Table **).

	n	%
Basque	1	2.1
Catalan	1	2.1
English	45	93.8
French	13	27.1
Galician	1	2.1
German	8	16.7
Greek	1	2.1
Icelandic	1	2.1
Italian	45	93.8
Polish	2	4.2
Portuguese	3	6.2
Romansch	1	2.1
Russian	1	2.1
Spanish	10	20.8
Swedish	1	2.1
Turkish	1	2.1
Ukrainian	1	2.1
Other (please specify)	1	2.1

N = 48 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q56 (Italy, all)

Table 94 Languages services can be provided or supported in. (IT)

As regards multilingual publishing of full text, 42.6% of the respondents have either implemented (29.8%), in progress or are considering bilingual publishing (different language versions in the same document), 22.7% have either implemented (9.1%), in progress or is considering sequential different language versions in different journals, 30.3% has either implemented (9.1%), in progress or is considering simultaneous different language versions as separate documents. The majority of the respondents are therefore not planning any form of multilingual publishing of full texts.

The opposite holds true for multilingual publishing of abstracts: 73.5% of the respondents declare to support publication of abstracts in more than one language.

Funded by the European Union

When asked about the measures to promote language diversity, the publication of abstracts in English when the original language is other than English is the most common measure implemented (50%), in progress (15.9%) or considered (9.1%) by respondents. This is followed by translation of metadata into English implemented (20.5%), in progress (18.2%) or considered (18.2%).

Less widespread measures undertaken to promote language diversity are: translation and/or language check services for authors, which is (implemented, in progress or considered by 33.3% of respondents), improving machine translation literacy (implemented, in progress or considered by 23.9% of respondents) and finally using toolkits or training to address language bias in peer review (implemented, in progress or considered by 19.1% of respondents).

Membership engagement

Most IPSPs in Italy had little membership engagement with the options provided in the survey. The engagement reported was with CoARA (8 IPSPs), DORA (7), OASPA (6), COPE (5), AEUP (2), EASE (1), POSI (1), TOP (1), Helsinki Initiative (1).

Six IPSPs reported membership to a national publisher scholarly communication association.

All of the above memberships involved 20 IPSPs reporting at least one (min. 1, max. 4).

Publication types

Almost all responding IPSPs (96%, 50/52) either publish and/or provide publication services for academic journals. The share of responses between IPSPs who publish (27) or publish and service (22) academic journals is balanced.

On average, the size of IPSPs in terms of the number of scholarly journals published is small. 64% of respondents published one to five journals (36% only one) in 2022. Table 95 reports the shares in more detail.

	n	%
1	18	36
2-5	14	28
6-10	7	14
11-20	6	12
21-50	3	6
51-100	2	4

N = 50 of 52; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Italy, all)

Table 95 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022. (IT)

Funded by the European Union

This is confirmed by the number of scholarly articles published yearly in 2022. 49% of respondents are in the range 1-50 published articles and 59.2% in the range 1-100. However, 40.8% of responding IPSPs declared more than 100 scholarly articles published in the same period, of which four IPSPs published more than 500.

Academic books (34 responses: 14 publish, 18 publish and service, 2 service) and conference proceedings (32 responses: 12 publish, 19 publish and service, 1 service) are the second most published type of output.

In terms of the number of books published yearly, the sample is split with 47% of respondents in the range 1-10 and 47% in the range 21-100 published books. In terms of published conference proceedings, 85.7% of respondents are in the smallest range (1 to 20 in 2022).

Responses above are approximately in line with responses on self-identification as either IPs or SPs (see above) where service providers are less represented in the Italian sample (13.5%).

Less than a third of respondents either publish and/or provide services for 'other research outputs' (e.g., media, digital products), grey literature, non-academic outputs, and 'other output formats' (e.g., datasets, digital scholarship, software).

Table 96 shows the spread of disciplines covered. IPSPs were asked to tick all that applied. Social sciences and humanities are strongly represented in the responses. Engineering and natural sciences are also well represented. Many IPSPs chose multidisciplinary as well as other disciplines.

	n	%
Agricultural sciences	7	13.5
Engineering and technology	17	32.7
Humanities	32	61.5
Medical and health sciences	8	15.4
Multidisciplinary	26	50.0
Natural sciences	14	26.9
Non-academic	3	5.8
Social sciences	25	48.1

N = 52 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Italy, all)

Table 96 Disciplines covered. (IT)

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

53.8% of IPSPs (28/52) report having an approved annual budget with an additional IPSP reporting that the annual budget is approved by its parent organisation (Table 97). In

Funded by the European Union

terms of budget, the most common amount (11/28) is in the range 11-50K EUR. Although the situation is rather diverse with a significant number of IPSPs either in the lower or higher ranges. None of the IPSPs reported a budget greater than 1M EUR (Table 98).

	n	%
Yes	28	53.8
No	18	34.6
Don't know	2	3.8
Other (please specify)	4	7.7

N = 52 of 52; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q11 (Italy, all)

Table 97 Approved annual budget. (IT)

	n	%
Less than 1K	1	3.6
1-10K	3	10.7
11-50K	11	39.3
51-100K	5	17.9
101-500K	3	10.7
501K-1M	1	3.6
Do not wish to disclose	4	14.3

N = 28 of 52; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q11.1 (Italy, all)

Table 98 Annual budget (Euros). (IT)

For most IPSPs (76.9%) a formal administration of income and expenses is obligatory or at least partly obligatory.

For those IPSPs that have a parent organisation, the most common in-kind support offered by the parent organisation consists of facilities and premises (81.2%), general IT services (78.1%), salaries of permanent staff (68.8%), human resource management, general financial and legal services (56.2%), and service-specific IT services (50%). Other services mentioned are printing and shipping.

Most IPSPs reported that they rely on external services (76.9%). Those IPSPs that declared to use external editorial services (23/52) receive them on a voluntary basis (17) and/or outsource them (5) and/or as in-kind contribution (6). External production services are used by 32/52 IPSPs, provided on a voluntary basis (17) and/or as in-kind contribution (6) and/or outsourced (5). IT services are reported to be externalised for 28/52 IPSPs, mostly outsourced (17) and/or received as in-kind contribution (8) and/or on a voluntary basis (5).

Communication services are external for less IPSPs (17/52), mostly voluntary (10) and/or received as in-kind contribution (8) and/or outsourced (1). External services are not typically used for administrative, legal and financial services (19/52), mostly received

Funded by the European Union

in-kind (10) and/or on a voluntary basis (7) and/or outsourced (3). 18/52 IPSPs declared to rely on external services for training support and or advice on publishing policies and best practice mostly on a voluntary (7) and/or in-kind (7) basis, and/or outsourced (5).

Other external services mentioned by three IPSPs are printing services (1), e-Certificate release (1), bibliographic services and legal deposit (1).

External services mentioned by respondents are:

- OJS
- shopify
- 4Science
- CrossRef
- ALPS
- Arxiv
- Orcid
- Antiplagiarism Turnitin
- Print on demand
- Crossref (DOI)
- Blocko (e-certification)
- Youtube (video dissemination)
- Linkedin/Facebook (social communications)
- DOI Codes Registration and Training Services, ISBN Codes Service
- InfoLib Editorial Management Software service
- Cope, Crossref, Web of Science, Scopus, Scilit, Doaj
- OJS (4Science)
- IRIS (CINECA)
- DATACITE
- iThenticate, ISSN Italian centre, ISBN-EDISER srl, DOAJ
- depositolegale.it (BNCF)

When asked about areas in which collaboration with other organisations would be considered, production services (24), communication services (24), training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice (21), and IT services (21) were the most popular. Editorial services (17) and administrative, legal and financial services (9) were less likely to be considered.

Most IPSPs do not have experience of failed collaboration. Three examples were given, one involving unclear terms of contract with an external contractor for which all the hours of the assistance package were spent in the transition to the new supplier, two mentioning excessive paper publication costs.

When asked about reliance on different forms of funding over the last three years, 21/52 (40.4%) IPSPs reported reliance on fixed and permanent subsidies from parent organisations, in most cases high (6) or very high (12) reliance.

Funded by the European Union

Periodically negotiated subsidies from parent organisations are relied upon by 15 IPSPs but only six declare high (3) or very high (3) reliance. Time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside the IPSP's own organisation are a source of funding for 16 respondents but mostly without high reliance (10).

Permanent public government funding is a highly reliable source for five IPSPs. Collective funding and voluntary author contributions are considered by six IPSPs but with low or very low reliance. 18 IPSPs reported content and print sales as a source of funding, highly reliable in five cases. 14 IPSPs considered Author Processing Charges at least with low reliance, high in six cases.

10 IPSPs reported low or very low and two high or very high reliance on other income, such as event organisation, commercial revenue and loans.

As regards the stability of these funds, the option 'Fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisation' is the one considered the most stable, at least by a majority (22) of respondents. Periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation is a form of funding where responses were rather evenly spread in the range from very unstable to very stable. Responses on the stability of other forms of funding, namely time limited grants or subsidies from outside own organisation, permanent public government funding, collective funding, and voluntary author contributions, share a pattern leaning towards low stability, neither stable or unstable at best.

In a non-negligible number of responses, funding coming from content and print sales (9) and Author Processing Charges (8) are considered either stable or very stable.

IPSPs were asked to list up to five external funders who have granted cash grants or subsidies over the last three years (largest contributors ranked first).

Major funders mentioned were: Ministero della Cultura, Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca, Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics (SCOAP3), European Commission H2020 projects.

None of the organisations listed above were the parent organisation of the IPSP.

Funders listed as second include, Foreign institutes of Italian culture, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Università del Salento, Compagnia di San Paolo.

Then, ranked from third to fifth, Sissa, World Blind Union, Università di Milano-Bicocca, MUSE Museo delle Scienze di Trento, Fondazione CARIGE.

Despite a majority of Italian and institutional funders, a wide variety of funders typology (private foundations, private companies, museums and cultural institutes, international organisations) can be observed.

Funded by the European Union

When asked to what extent the IPSP relies on non-monetary or in-kind support, most IPSPs that expressed a preference had a high (7) or very high (17) reliance. Similarly for monetary income, where more IPSPs had a high (7) or very high (8) reliance than low (4) or very low (5).

Table 99 shows the distribution of answers to the survey question on the expectation to produce a profit/surplus. Apart from those who declared that the question is 'not applicable' (18) for their situation, there was a fairly even spread of responses among those IPSPs that are expected to produce a profit (18), mostly to invest in their own operation, and those that are not expected (13), mostly because their organisation does not permit losses or overspending, one being not for profit.

	n	%
No, limited losses/overspending are permitted	1	1.9
No, losses/overspending are not permitted	11	21.2
Not applicable	18	34.6
Other (please specify)	2	3.8
Yes, to generate shareholder value	1	1.9
Yes, to invest in our own operation or create a financial buffer	11	21.2
Yes, to subsidise other activities of the organisation	6	11.5
Don't know	2	3.8

N = 52 of 52; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q20 (Italy, all)

Table 99 Expectation to produce a profit / surplus. (IT)

The financial sustainability of IPSPs presents a multifaceted challenge, encompassing issues related to funding sources, operational efficiency, and the changing landscape of scholarly communication. Key challenges and potential solutions, as articulated by respondents, are summarised below:

1. Creating a Sustainable Business Model: Establishing a sustainable business model while maintaining open access and quality requires collaboration with university consortia and institutional sponsors.
2. Competition with Large Corporations: Small university presses face competition from international publishing corporations. Strategies include securing public funding and creating international distribution networks to promote editorial independence.
3. High Costs and Restricted Markets: High costs and limited markets pose challenges. Strategies include emphasizing open access initiatives and publications for educational purposes.
4. Continuity in Funding: Consistent funding is crucial for stability and growth, and seeking donations from foreign private foundations is a potential source of continuity.
5. Centralized Funding: Increasing centralization of funding tied to project activities can provide a more secure financial base.

Funded by the European Union

6. Publication Variability: Fluctuating publication numbers can impact budget planning and resource allocation, and addressing this challenge may involve better forecasting methods and diversifying publication types.
7. Author Awareness of Costs: Authors should be made aware of the minimal costs associated with open access publishing to encourage voluntary contributions.
8. Investing in Staff: Qualified staff are crucial for maintaining service quality and efficiency. Collaboration with other organizations can provide shared tools and services to reduce resource constraints. Volunteers can complement paid staff to alleviate resource constraints.
9. Peer-Review Service Support: Economically supporting peer-review services is essential, and this can be achieved through dedicated funding mechanisms or collaborations with institutions specializing in peer-review support.
10. IT Service Outsourcing: Reliance on outsourced IT services exposes the operation to market fluctuations, and addressing this challenge entails exploring long-term contracts or strategies to mitigate price increases from service providers.

Governance

IPSPs were asked if they have a formal document that describes their activities. 83.3% of IPSPs declared they have one. In most cases (79.2%, 38) they do have Statutes/by-laws/articles of association. External legislation/requirements/policies are the type of formal documents describing the governance for 68.2% of IPSPs (30).

Regarding governance models overseeing management activities, 76.2% responded they have a governing board (32) and 68.3% responded they have a management office (28). External audit of accounts is foreseen in the governance model in 16 cases (45.7%). Representation from the wider scholarly community in the governance model is not very common with only 30% (15) answering yes for this question.

Open Science/Open Access practices

29 IPSPs out of 40 who responded (72.5%) publish all of their scholarly journals in open access. Three IPSPs publish 75% of their journals in OA, and six IPSPs 50% or less. One IPSP reported they had 1% journals OA.

Among the 29 responses on the share of open access Books, 15 IPSPs publish 100% OA, 22 IPSPs 75% or more of their books in OA, and five IPSPs less than 30%.

Of the 29 responses on the share of open access conference outputs, 22 publish 100% in OA. Two more 85% or more, three responded 50%, and one IPSP reported they had 1% conference output in OA.

Of the 11 IPSPs responding on the share of open access non-standard research outputs, eight IPSPs publish 100% OA, one 10% and the rest over 70%. Respectively 10 and eight IPSPs declared to publish non-academic outputs or other output formats (e.g.

Funded by the European Union

datasets, digital scholarship, software). In most cases these outputs are published 100% in OA or at least 70%.

25 IPSPs (53.2%) follow their own policy for Open Science/Open Access of journals, 14 (29.8%) follow their parent organisation's policy, and 12 (25.5%) follow the national policy. Another three IPSPs (6.4%) are in the process of adopting a policy, either their own or national policy as soon as it becomes operational.

With regards to Open Science/Open Access policies for books, 44.1% of respondents (15) follow their own policy, 35.3% (12) their parent organisation's policy, and 26.5% the national policy. Table 100 shows the issues addressed by the adopted Open Science/Open Access policies

	n	%
Copyright	36	85.7
Embargoes	12	28.6
Metadata rights	12	28.6
Self-archiving	29	69.0
Third-party copyright	13	31.0
Use of identifiers	18	42.9
Use of open licences	30	71.4
Don't know	1	2.4

N = 42 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q26.2 (Italy, all)

Table 100 Issues addressed by Open Science / Open Access policy. (IT)

17 IPSPs accept submissions that have been publicly shared as preprint or working paper for all their journals, seven IPSPs allow this for some journals and nine for books. Only nine IPSPs (20.5%) do not allow such submissions.

IPSPs do allow self-archiving in open repositories for all of their journals in 29 cases, for some journals (7) and for books (22).

23 IPSPs encourage or allow sharing the full text via academic sharing services for all their journals, five for some journals and 12 for books. Six IPSPs do not allow or encourage such practice.

In most cases (31), IPSPs do not impose embargo periods for self archiving. However six IPSPs do impose the embargo for some of their journals and four for books.

Regarding making references openly available according to I4OC principles, responses are varied. 13 IPSPs allow this for all or some journals, six for books, but 16 responded they 'didn't know' or that the question is 'not applicable'. 12 replied they do not allow open access to references.

Funded by the European Union

Almost all IPSPs use Creative Commons or other open licences, either for all or some of their journals (40) or for books (29). Table 101 shows the spread of different CC licences used or recommended

	n	%
CC BY	18	40.9
CC BY-NC	11	25.0
CC BY-NC-ND	15	34.1
CC BY-NC-SA	7	15.9
CC BY-ND	3	6.8
CC BY-SA	8	18.2
CC0	3	6.8
Other open licence (please specify)	1	2.3

N = 44 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q27.1 (Italy, all)

Table 101 Licence(s) used or recommended. (IT)

12 IPSPs enable forms of open peer review with two more declaring they are experimenting, and eight that they would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage. 21 IPSPs responded that they do not enable forms of open peer review for submissions they receive.

A data sharing policy is mostly available as part of the institutional Open Science/Open Access policy (22), at the journal level (18), or at the publisher level (7). 13 IPSPs responded that they do not have one.

The CRediT taxonomy for the distinction of contributor roles is used by 10 IPSPs (20%) while the rest does not use it or doesn't know.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

37 IPSPs are involved in editorial management and quality (74%), while 12 are not (24%). Table 102 shows the different types of involvement. One IPSP specified that the tasks highlighted do not always apply to all publications. They always apply in the case of series/journals and less in the case of books. 43 IPSPs are involved in managing editorial quality (86%) all providing guidelines/instructions.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Coordinating the peer review process	33	89.2
Monitoring the peer review process	33	89.2
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	33	89.2
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	19	51.4
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	31	83.8
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	19	51.4
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	30	81.1
Sourcing reviewers	29	78.4
Other (please specify)	1	2.7

N = 37 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q31.1 (Italy, all)

Table 102 Tasks accomplished in editorial management. (IT)

When asked about peer review, double blind was the most common, followed by single blind and editorial review (Table 103).

	n	%
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	33	76.7
Editorial review	15	34.9
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	3	7.0
Open reviewers' reports	2	4.7
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	17	39.5
Don't know	1	2.3
Other (please specify)	3	7.0

N = 43 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q32.2 (Italy, all)

Table 103 Types of peer review in use. (IT)

32 of the IPSPs (64%) report having a specific policy on research integrity/publication ethics, 12 do not and six did not know.

Technical services efficiency

IPSPs provide one or more technical services, with prevalence of full editorial workflow management, metadata and quality control and hosting (Table 104). Other services provided, or specification of services in the broader categories proposed, include access to DOI and ISBNs, graphic and layout design, video production of presentations of published articles, marketing and promotion, preparation and sending of indexing requests, metadata transmission to libraries and distribution catalogues, anti-plagiarism, management of OAI-PMH API.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Full editorial workflow	36	73.5
Hosting	25	51.0
Metadata and quality control	28	57.1
Partial editorial workflow	9	18.4
Software	17	34.7
User interface	18	36.7
Don't know	4	8.2
Other (Please specify)	7	14.3

N = 49 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q34 (Italy, all)

Table 104 Technical services provided. (IT)

Maintenance and update of the services provided is often reported to be managed in house by a dedicated publishing department or by an IT department. However, the share of outsourcing, either full, or partial is significant in the responses (Table 105). A similar pattern can be observed when asking about the maintenance and update of the technical infrastructure (Table 106).

	n	%
Fully outsourced	2	4.5
In house across different departments	8	18.2
In house by a dedicated publishing department	14	31.8
In house by an IT department personnel	15	34.1
Mainly outsourced	4	9.1
Partially outsourced	7	15.9
Don't know	3	6.8
Other (please specify)	2	4.5

N = 44 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q35 (Italy, all)

Table 105 Maintenance and update - Services. (IT)

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Fully outsourced	3	7.7
In house across different departments	6	15.4
In house by a dedicated publishing department	5	12.8
In house by an IT department personnel	19	48.7
Mainly outsourced	5	12.8
Partially outsourced	14	35.9
Don't know	2	5.1
Other (please specify)	2	5.1

N = 39 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q35 (Italy, all)

Table 106 Maintenance and update - Technical infrastructure. (IT)

Regarding publishing systems, OJS is by far the most prevalent response (65.3%). For books, OMP was the option preferred by seven IPSPs. This is in line with the share of book publishers among the respondents. Other open source software solutions include Drupal (4), WordPress (3), DSpace (1), Dataverse (1), PubPub (1), EPrints (1), Omeka (1). Other hosted software solutions include Janeway (2), Bentus Editorial System (1).

Seven IPSPs use software developed in house (2) or customisation of existing platforms, mainly customisations on Drupal, DSpace or OJS.

When asked about the assignment of PIDs, only three IPSPs responded they do not assign them while five more 'don't know'. PIDs are mostly assigned for all publications of the IPSP (31), or for all journals (8) or at least for some journals (2).

DOIs were the most commonly used PIDs with CrossRef-DOI (18), DataCite-DOI (12) and Other DOI (14). ISSN (31) and ISBN (23) were similarly common among responses. Two IPSPs used Handle and one URN.

Metadata released openly with a standard metadata description schema did not appear as a very common practice with 14 IPSPs replying 'no' and 14 'don't know'. 19 IPSPs release metadata openly with a standard Schema mostly under CC BY or another Creative Commons licence

Not surprisingly, PDF is the publishing format for all IPSPs who responded to the question (49). HTML (15), EPub (11), video formats (10), sound (3), XML (3), csv (2) are also formats used by IPSPs.

39 IPSPs (79.6%) have an archiving/backup policy, with a prevalence for national institutional library or infrastructure (21), followed by PKP PN (10), LOCKSS (5), CLOCKSS (4), Portico (2), PubMed Central (1). Other backup services mentioned were: Aruba, Dropbox, Internet Web Archive, PHAIDRA repository, Bentus Editorial System.

Funded by the European Union

For most IPSPs archiving, backing up or preserving content is a challenge mainly due to financial constraints (18), technical limitations of existing infrastructure (10), lack of human resources (10), lack of expertise (4), administrative constraints (3). Archiving and backup is not a challenge for only six IPSPs.

Lack of human resources, financial constraints, technical limitations of existing infrastructure are the obstacles most frequently reported when asked about challenges for providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, supplying and enriching metadata and PIDs, trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services. A consistent sign of the need of resources and training to improve such services. Rarely, these are not considered as challenges.

Visibility, Communication, Marketing, and Impact

When asked if IPSPs are satisfied with the level to which published content is included in scholarly search engines and different indexes, 29 (61.7%) reported that their content is already very well indexed, whereas 18 (38.3%) would like to see better indexing in search engines like Scopus, Web of Science, DOAJ, DOAB, Erih, Philpapers, Casalini Torrossa.

When asked about specific challenges faced when applying for indexation, the majority of IPSPs found the following challenges important or very important: paying for annual/one time or recurring/monthly memberships of organisations/associations/coalitions, satisfying metadata requirements, and non-technical and technical participation criteria.

Communications/requirements/paperwork in a foreign language or accepted only in English was not seen as an important challenge or a challenge at all. Requirements being too technical received a mix of responses.

Regarding communication, 35 IPSPs (71.4%) have a newsletter or social media or networking profiles to inform the community about updates. 37 (75.5%) have a data protection policy. 41 (83.7%) have a GDPR policy, Three do not and five do not know.

17 IPSPs (34.7%) display metrics publicly. Table 107 illustrates the different methods used.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Altmetrics, such as Altmetric	2	11.8
Article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts	5	29.4
Article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	11	64.7
Dimensions citation badges	2	11.8
Plum X Metrics	2	11.8
Publication-level impact metrics, such as Impact Factors	7	41.2
Publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	8	47.1
Rejection rates	5	29.4
Submission, acceptance, publication dates	11	64.7
Widget showing geographical spread of visitors	2	11.8

N = 17 of 52; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q49.1 (Italy, all)

Table 107 Metrics. (IT)

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Of the various EDIB dimensions proposed, language and multilingualism (25), educational and professional background (23), gender, sexual identity including LGBTQIA+ (22), ethnicity and culture (20), religious and socio-economic background (19) were those reported the most as either implemented, in progress or at least considered. There is less consideration for dimensions such as caring responsibilities (10), disability (17), age (career stage) (16). However, on average for all EDIB dimensions, 50% of responses were either 'not planning', 'not applicable' or 'don't know'.

Based on comments and requests for clarification from Italian IPSPs, the feeling of respondents in a non-negligible number of cases was that such dimensions were addressed by the general policy of the service and did not require specific consideration, hence many 'not applicable' responses.

When asked about measures to ensure and promote EDIB, 12 IPSPs responded that they have a Code of conduct/non-discrimination/positive discrimination policy implemented with two more in progress and six considering. Altogether only 45.4% of responding IPSPs were at least considering having such a policy. Similar percentages emerge on IPSPs at least considering measures such as recommendation for the use of inclusive language (40.9%), training, awareness-raising, anti-bias tools (36.3%), tailored support and personal coaching (35.7%), and data collection monitoring and annual reporting (34%).

14 IPSPs (28.6%) have an accessibility policy (7 published, 7 unpublished), while 26 have no policy (53.1%) and nine do not know. When asked if the accessibility policies meet various accessibility requirements, almost all of the IPSPs that have a policy do not know if it meets requirements. Only two IPSPs have implemented WCAG, with two in progress and four considering. OpenAIRE guidelines is the accessibility policy with

Funded by the European Union

more implementations (6), in progress (4) or considering (3). Lack of expertise, human resources and technical limitations of existing infrastructure were cited by many IPSPs as important or very important challenges.

Measures to ensure and improve gender equality in services provided by IPSPs are well represented among respondents. Among the options offered, 22 IPSPs implemented, have in progress or are considering the use of gender impartial language in all communications, have a Gender Equality Plan (18), require authors to inform about gender sensitive research data (11). Also in this case, lack of expertise, human resources and technical limitations of existing infrastructure were cited by many IPSPs as important or very important challenges to implement such measures.

Funded by the European Union

Netherlands (NL)

Authors:
Jeroen Bosman, Utrecht University, ORCID 0000-0001-5796-2727
Bianca Kramer, Sesame Open Science, ORCID 0000-0002-5965-6560

The organisation of higher education and research in the Netherlands is characterised by relative stability, high concentration and a fairly level playing field. There are 14 universities, including four technical ones, with 66K FTE in 2022, 340K students and 87K scholarly publications. Universities of applied sciences have 43K staff spread over 36 institutions, with 478K students. Despite a push to do more (applied) research, the number of scholarly publications from universities of applied sciences, though growing, is still modest. Both subsectors are well organised in respectively Universiteiten van Nederland (UNL) and the Vereniging Hogescholen. The Netherlands also has a Royal Academy (KNAW), active in discussing and setting community norms, for instance on research integrity. The library sector in higher education is funded through the institutions and also connected nationally through the UKB (for university libraries) and SHB (for libraries of universities of applied sciences). In terms of funding, status and research size and output, the universities are comparable, without any strong hierarchies. Research funding is either basic funding from universities themselves or grant based funding from national funding organisations (NWO and ZonMW) and EC funding programmes, as the main funders, next to private and charitable funders and commercial contract income. The Netherlands is relatively successful in receiving European research grants. Scholarly societies do exist in many fields, though researchers are also often members of US, UK or European societies. In most fields, Dutch scholarly societies do not play a very large role in publishing.

Publishing by researchers at Dutch institutions is in most fields geared towards publishing in journals, mainly English language, and conference proceedings. In some fields (notably humanities, parts of the social sciences, policy studies for instance), the Dutch language is still crucial and other publication types (books, reports) are used. Non-English and non-journal output is on average less visible in databases. Publishing by Dutch organisations themselves has suffered in the 1990s and 2000s by sellout of journals and publication series to international commercial publishers.

There has been a strong push for open access in the Netherlands since 2015, with a national target of 100% OA for scholarly journal articles set by the government and agreed upon by all stakeholders. Institutions, funders and libraries have directed funding and developed policies and support to realise this transition. For OA journal articles there was and is a preference for gold open access. This is supported by a strong investment in 'read and publish' agreements, often negotiated and organised nationally for all universities. All universities have institutional repositories. For short scholarly works (articles, chapters) there is a legal possibility to share the full text after a reasonable amount of time (interpreted by universities to mean after six months and to include the publisher version) through repositories (Article25fa of the Dutch Copyright Law, known as the Taverne Amendment). The combination of national agreements, funder mandates (with NWO taking part in Plan S), legal possibilities for green OA depositing, research grants with possibilities to finance APCs, and relatively

Funded by the European Union

rich institutions, has led to a sharp increase of OA availability of scholarly articles from Dutch universities, from 42% for the publication year 2016 to 89% for 2022. OA for other publication types has received less attention, though some institutions have funds for making books and chapter open access.

Traditionally there were few institutions with a full-blown university press, but institutions and libraries specifically have become more active in OA publishing and in recent years more institutions have created open access publishing units. Six university presses (Delft, Radboud-Nijmegen, Groningen, Leiden, Maastricht, Tilburg) are loosely cooperating in the New University Presses working group. The Delft and Radboud presses are fully oriented at diamond publishing. Amsterdam University Press, though started at the University of Amsterdam, is now a fully independent commercial academic publisher. For diamond journals there is also a national platform, openjournals.nl that hosts and provides service for some 30 mostly smaller existing and new journals against a hosting fee of 2,400 EUR per year, with currently mainly humanities and social science journals using it. OpenJournals is largely financed by the funding organisation NWO and sponsorship from some universities. For the universities of applied science there is a brand new platform Publinova, for open access sharing of publications and other research results. Also, some institutions have diamond funds to subsidise non-profit publishing infrastructure (e.g., PKP or DOAJ), specific journals or support diamond journal article publishing in a more granular, per item manner. Looking forward, the collaborative universities (UNL) and university libraries (UKB) want to give a greater role to diamond in their open access publication policies. Publishing by institutions overall has not been a very visible activity, with much of it focussing on books, institutional and research school publication series, and reports. This situation might improve further with increasing numbers of university publishers and increasing activity of existing ones. Within institutions there are several initiatives, either full platforms with several journals, such as SciPost, or single journals, including student run journals, such as the Journal of trial and Error (JOTE).

DIAMAS research found that the Netherlands has 415 journals in DOAJ, 11 with the DOAJ seal, 98 let the authors retain all rights, and 116 are diamond journals. The Netherlands has 34 institutional publishers in DOAJ (as reported in the GOA8), 29 of which publish diamond journals.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS survey received 17 valid responses from the Netherlands, 11 of which self-identify as publishers and six as service providers. These are modest numbers, but it represents a fair share of institutional publishing activity, given the small size of the country, the concentrated nature of the higher education sector and the publishing history of the recent decades, with most institutions until recently selling or winding down publishing activities and focussing on publishing with 'international' publishers. Taken together, the 11 IPs that responded claim to publish between 70 and 150 journals.

More than half of Dutch IPSPs are part of a parent organisation, with five being part of a library in that organisation. In terms of legal status, about half are public organisations

Funded by the European Union

and about half again are private but not-for-profit. Most are quite small in terms of paid staff, with over half reporting to have no or less than two FTE in paid staff (Table 108). In terms of their formal budget, if they have one, most Dutch IPSPs in the survey are relatively small: only two have a budget larger than 100K EUR.

	n	%
None	5	29.4
Less than 2	6	35.3
2–5	3	17.6
11–20	2	11.8
More than 30	1	5.9

N = 17 of 17; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q7 (Netherlands, all)

Table 108 Number of paid staff directly employed or contracted (in FTE). (NL)

Most Dutch IPSPs in the survey focus on a subset of publishing activities, with a clear difference between IPs and SPs: the latter focus more on IT and production and the former on average more on editorial functions and communication.

Language

Dutch IPSPs indicated they publish in a range of languages, with the majority publishing in English and German, but also some working with for example German and French.

Membership engagement

Membership of organisations and signing of charters is very low, with just a couple being members of publisher organisations or signing DORA. There are two exceptions: eight of the 17 IPSPs say they are OASPA members and six are members of a national publisher organisation, probably the New University Presses (NUP) working group. Regarding portfolios: 15 IPSPs say they publish and/or service journals, 9 say they publish and/or service books, with a further 8 involved in conference output and 4 (not necessarily the same) working on grey literature, non-academic outputs or other output formats. Only 6 IPSPs publish and/or service only a single publication type while the others have a more mixed portfolio, with most covering 3-4 publication types.

Publication types

In terms of the size of journal portfolios, IPSPs in the Dutch subset of the survey results are spread out: half of them are quite small, with five or fewer journals, the other half medium to large, with one claiming to serve over 100 journals (Table 109). This translates into article volumes in Table 110 showing clear concentrations in the 11-50 range and the >500 range.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
1	5	33.3
2-5	3	20.0
6-10	1	6.7
11-20	2	13.3
21-50	3	20.0
More than 100	1	6.7

N = 15 of 17; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Netherlands, all)

Table 109 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022. (NL)

	n	%
1-10	1	7.1
11-50	6	42.9
51-100	1	7.1
101-200	1	7.1
201-500	1	7.1
More than 500	4	28.6

N = 14 of 17; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Netherlands, all)

Table 110 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022. (NL)

There are but two IPSPs in our survey that have a role in producing over 100 books in 2022, the other seven having less than 20 books in their portfolio for that year.

Unsurprisingly, in terms of disciplines, the majority of IPSPs are active in humanities, social sciences and multidisciplinary publishing, with for instance only five out of 17 active in the natural sciences.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

The majority of the Dutch IPSP sample have a budget that is formally monitored or administered. Depending on the type of costs, between four and seven IPSPs receive in-kind support from their parent organisation. All 17 IPSPs report using at least some external services. Production services (including typesetting) are most often mentioned as being performed by external services, and in that case more specifically being outsourced (Table 111). IT services are also often outsourced. Other activities also see substantial in-kind provision. In a few cases there is also voluntary work.

Funded by the European Union

	n of total (n=17)	% total	In-kind		Outsourced		Voluntary		None/Not Applicable	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Editorial services	11	64.7	4	36.4	4	36.4	3	27.3	2	18.2
Production services	13	76.5	2	15.4	10	76.9	0	0	2	15.4
IT services	12	70.6	4	33.3	7	58.3	0	0	2	16.7
Communication services	10	58.8	5	50	1	10	2	20	2	20
Administrative, legal, and financial services	10	58.8	6	60	3	30	0	0	1	10
Training support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice	10	58.8	5	50	2	20	2	20	2	20

N = 17 of 17, multiple answer question; source DIAMAS survey - Q14.1 (Netherlands, all)

Table 111 Use of external services. (NL)

Most types of funding are seen as 'not applicable' for half or more of the responding IPSPs (Table 112). Subsidies from the parent organisations and time limited grants are funding sources that five or six IPSPS mention as being somewhat or highly dependent on. Other than that, the funding picture is very scattered with all sources used, but no clear pattern or reliance on a specific type.

	n of total (n=17)	% total	Very low		Low		Neither high nor low		High		Very high		Not applicable	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisation	14	82.6	1	7.1	0	0	3	21.4	0	0	3	21.4	7	50
Periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation	14	82.6	0	0	0	0	3	21.4	0	0	2	14.3	9	64.3
Time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation	15	88.2	2	13.3	0	0	1	6.7	4	26.7	1	6.7	7	46.7
Permanent public government funding	14	82.6	2	14.3	0	0	1	7.1	1	7.1	0	0	10	71.4
Collective funding	16	94.1	2	12.5	0	0	2	12.5	1	6.2	1	6.2	10	62.5
Voluntary Author Contributions	14	82.6	2	14.3	0	0	1	7.1	1	7.1	1	7.1	9	64.3
Content and print sales	14	82.6	1	7.1	0	0	2	14.3	0	0	1	7.1	10	71.4
Author Processing Charges	16	94.1	0	0	0	0	2	12.5	1	6.2	0	0	13	81.2
Any other income	11	64.7	0	0	0	0	2	18.2	0	0	1	9.1	8	72.7

N = 17 of 17, single answer question; source DIAMAS survey - Q17 (Netherlands, all)

Table 112 Reliance on funding over the last 3 years. (NL)

Funded by the European Union

The funding picture is diverse, as is the assessment respondents give about the stability of funding. For all types of funding, some say that in their case it is stable while others say it is unstable. A clear majority also state that their reliance on non-monetary or in-kind support is very high, regardless of whether they see that as problematic or not. Producing a real profit/surplus is not the case in all but two IPSPs.

Significantly, many organisations state they would consider collaboration with other organisations: out of the 17, for all activities except administrative/financial/legal ones 11 or more would consider collaborating: IT services, production, editorial services, communication, training.

Governance

Regarding the formal description of activities, six IPSPs say they have no formal statutes, and eight say there is no external legislation or policy requiring them to have that, and quite often there is no external audit of accounts. However, most (10) IPSPs do have a management office and (12) a governing board. In about half of the cases, the governance model includes representation from the wider scholarly community.

Open Science/Open Access practices

All organisations have OA policies for journal publishing: they either follow a national policy, and may also have a policy of their own or in their parent organisation. Issues addressed in the policies followed are mostly copyright and licences, and also in a majority of cases self-archiving, identifiers and embargoes. Also, all nine organisations in book publishing follow formal OA policies followed by the responding organisations.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

There are only a few organisations not accepting preprint submissions, and none that do not allow self-archiving. Also, only very few impose embargoes (one for journals and two for books). Five organisations make theirs available as open metadata, but quite a few (6) say they do not know if that is the case, indicating a lack of awareness. Almost all work with Creative Commons licences, the majority offering CC BY and up to six (also) offering one or more other CC licences. Open peer review is only supported by a minority, often still as an experiment, but quite a few are considering it. CRediT contributor roles are apparently not known or not considered, as only three IPSPs support those.

Half of respondents are involved in editorial management, performing all or most of the tasks involved. Single blind peer review is the most common, closely followed by double blind, with about half the IPSPs that offer either single- or double-blind peer review also offering the other form - often due to serving multiple disciplines. Working with open reviewer identities and with publicly open reviewing/commenting is still relatively rare among Dutch IPSPs.

Funded by the European Union

Technical services efficiency

All Dutch IPSPs responding provide at least one type of technical service, with metadata and quality control, user interfaces, and software and hosting being the most common. OJS is by far the most often used publishing system, with 11 installations among the 17 IPSPs answering. WordPress, PubPub and Open Monograph Press are also in use in a few organisations. Only one IPSPS does not assign PIDs at all; 13 assign or work with Crossref DOIs, often next to other PIDs such as ISSN and ISBN. Openness of metadata is mixed: some do, some don't, and some don't know. PDF is the most popular format for publications by far, with only half also using XML and/or HTML. The majority of IPSPs do have an archiving policy.

In terms of challenges faced it appears that in general, for most sorts of activities, the majority of IPSPs do face some challenges. They are mostly varied though, with different organisations experiencing different types of constraints (human resources, financial resources, expertise etc.) for the same challenge (e.g., indexing, providing metadata, guaranteeing interoperability). Some challenges jump out. For instance, there are often financial constraints to providing adequate infrastructure and services, and also there is often a lack of human resources available to provide sufficient metadata and achieve interoperability with other services. Indexing remains a problem with only five out of 15 reporting IPSPs saying their content is already well indexed. Satisfying metadata requirements that search engines have seems to play a crucial role in this.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Though most IPSPs have a privacy policy, only half have a data protection policy. Only a small to a very small minority have implemented measures or policies addressing EDIB issues. Language and gender issues are addressed by five IPSPs, but caring, disability, ethnicity and sexual identity issues only by three at the most. Six have a code of conduct, but only one has a publicly available accessibility policy. Most have their services only available in English and Dutch, though quite a few do publish texts in multiple languages, but again, that is mostly limited to Dutch and English.

Funded by the European Union

Norway (NO)

Author:
Jan Erik Frantsvåg, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, ORCID 0000-0003-3413-8799

During preparations for the survey, 227 scholarly journals/series were found to be published in Norway, including all types of business models - OA, toll access, subscription-based, paper-based. A rough classification indicates around 200 are institution-based, while around 10 are published and owned by professional commercial publishers. Less than 10 are published by international commercial publishers.

Institutional publishing is mainly organised through a handful of publication services, some seeing themselves as service providers, some as institutional publishers, at major HE institutions, five of which publish 11-20 scholarly journals each. In addition, there are similar, smaller services at a number of other HE institutions. A small number of commercial publishers also publish institution-owned journals, the largest publish 60 journals, nearly all institution-owned. There is a high number of standalone journals also in Norway, these are not well represented in the survey.

Norway has 127 journals in DOAJ, 21 with the DOAJ seal, 120 that let the authors retain all rights, 109 are diamond journals. Norway has 42 institutional publishers in DOAJ (via GOA8), 35 of which publish diamond journals. The survey received 15 responses from Norway.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS survey targeted 77 IPSPs in Norway. Survey invitations were sent via Qualtrics, supplemented by individual invitations from project members and local mailing lists. 15 valid responses were received from Norwegian respondents.

The survey was primarily targeted at IPSPs. However, it was expected that a number of standalone journals also would respond, they were also in the target group.

Among the 15 responses, nine are from IPs, and the remaining six responses from SPs. Service providers are much better represented among the Norwegian respondents (40%) than among the survey in total (20.3%). One of the service providers is not at all involved in publishing, they only offer services. It can be seen that some of the institutional services see themselves as publishers, others as service providers. Although it is known from other sources that there are no substantial differences in what these services do.

Public organisations, which here are HE institutions, research institutions or government agencies, are two thirds of respondents. Three are commercial entities and two are professional and scholarly organisations (Table 113).

Funded by the European Union

Company	1
Corporation	1
Other (please describe)	1
Private not-for-profit organisation,	2
Public organisation	10
Total	15

Table 113 IPSP categories. (NO)

12 (80%) of respondents say they have a parent organisation; supplemental information indicates this is correct. Six are part of a library in the parent organisation, two are operating independently but controlled by the parent organisation, two are departments of the parent organisation. Two are part of departments of the parent organisation. One answers 'don't know', and two 'no'. One of these last three is a small commercial publisher, one is an association and one a government agency. Among the 12 with a parent organisation, four serve only the parent organisation.

Public organisations are equally well represented in Norway (66.6%) compared with the survey in general (65.8%).

Only two of the Norwegian respondents answered the question about the number of people employed by the company or corporation (<250 employees), this was answered by only around 4% of all respondents in the survey.

One IPSP claims to employ 11-20 FTE staff. However, this looks exaggerated based on other information. Two say they employ 6-10 FTE, five employ 2-5 FTE and six less than 2 FTE. One says they have no FTE.

IPSPs were asked to indicate what kind of services they provide, here multiple alternatives could be selected. The most common service provided by Norwegian IPSPs is IT (93.3 %), for the total survey this is the third most common (69.3 %). Joint second place in Norway is training, support and/or advice, with 60% compared to 44.7 % in the survey in total; and production with 60 %, somewhat less than the survey total of 72.3%. Following that comes editorial with 53.3%, this is the most important in the survey total with 79.4%. The structure of services in Norway seems to be somewhat different from the survey in general, it is difficult to point to reasons for this.

Language

Among the 14 respondents that are involved in publishing, one only publishes in English, and one only in Norwegian. All others publish in more than one language. 13 offer English (six as the first language), 12 Norwegian (eight as the first language). The neighbouring language, Danish, is offered by nine and Swedish by 10. Spanish is offered by two. No respondent offers any of the official minority languages in Norway.

Funded by the European Union

Language is also an aspect of Equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging, the last section in this country report.

Membership engagement

Four respondents report being members of a national publisher/scholarly communication association. Two of these are commercial publishers and two are societies. One commercial publisher is a member of the International Publishers Associations (IPA Academy), the same goes also for the Federation of European Publishers (FEP). The OASPA has three members, one institution-based and two commercial publishers. None are members of Online Publishers Association Europe (OPA Europe), while the Association of European University Presses (AEUP) has one institution-based member. Two society-based are members of Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), one of them also of the European Association of Science Editors (EASE). Four institution-based respondents are members of the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and of Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA). There are no members of Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure (POSI), one each of the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication (Helsinki Initiative) and the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines. Five of the 14 are not members of any of the organisations listed (or 'don't know'), three of these are HE institution based IPSPs.

Publication types

The responders were asked whether they published, published and provided services, or only serviced various kinds of output. Norwegian responders to a smaller degree publish, and to a larger degree either service or publish and service journals than for the survey in total. For books they might be slightly more active in publishing than in the survey total. For other types of output the numbers are too small to be commented on.

All 15 respondents have indicated how many journals they publish, but one of these reporting more than 100 journals is not actually involved in publishing, only in service providing. This response is not considered in Table 114. Single journals and those in the 2-5 range are less well represented among Norwegian respondents compared to the survey total. The 6-10, 21-50 and 51-100 ranges are better represented than in the survey total. The higher share of mid-sized publishers corresponds well with the structure of Norwegian institutional publishing, but the standalone journals are vastly underrepresented.

Funded by the European Union

Publisher size	Norway	%	Whole survey	%
1	3	21.4	224	34.7
2-5	2	14.3	203	31.5
6-10	2	14.3	64	9.9
11-20	4	28.6	69	10.7
21-50	2	14.3	54	8.4
51-100	1	7.1	13	2.0
More than 100	0		18	2.8

N = 15 (14) of 15; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Norway, all)
N = 645 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (all)

Table 114 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022 – Norway vs. rest of survey. (NO)

When it comes to the number of scholarly articles published annually, two respondents report 'more than 500'. One of these is a service provider that is not involved in publishing per se, so that response has been removed from the discussion here. Another is a society publishing a single journal, and information from other sources indicate that 500 is too high a number for scholarly articles. It could be correct for all articles, but the number of scholarly articles is probably in the 101-200 bracket, which is where it is placed in the table.

It can be seen from Table 115 that the larger output brackets, 101-200 and 201-500, are a significantly larger part of the output in Norway than in the survey total, even if the response of 'more than 500' is removed.

Number of articles/year	Norway	%	Whole survey	%
1-10	2	14.3	69	10.8
11-50	3	21.4	262	41.1
51-100	2	14.3	95	14.9
101-200	4	28.6	79	12.4
201-500	3	21.4	70	11.0
More than 500			63	9.9

N = 638 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (all)
N = 15 (14) of 15; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Norway, all)

Table 115 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022 – Norway vs. rest of survey. (NO)

Only six (40%) of Norwegian respondents say they publish books, for the survey in total nearly 60% publish books. Three are among the small publisher bracket with 10 or fewer, two are slightly larger with 11-20 books, while one is mid-sized with 21–50. The overall picture is that it appears that Norwegian book publishers are about the same size as in the survey in general.

Funded by the European Union

Only three of the Norwegian respondents indicate they publish conference outputs. It is difficult to say something about how they compare in size to the survey total, but it can be noted that they are all HEI IPSPs.

The respondents also were asked to indicate in which disciplines they publish (Table 116).

	Norway	%	Whole survey	%
Agricultural sciences	2	13.3	82	12.0
Engineering and technology	2	13.3	163	23.9
Humanities	10	66.7	369	54.2
Medical and health sciences	5	33.3	146	21.4
Multidisciplinary	6	40.0	308	45.2
Natural sciences	5	33.3	183	26.9
Non-academic	1	6.7	41	6.0
Social sciences	9	60.0	376	55.2

N = 681 of 685; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (all)
N = 15 of 50; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Norway, all)

Table 116 Disciplines covered - Norway vs. rest of survey. (NO)

Humanities (66.7%) and social sciences (60%) are the most common disciplines. Most disciplines are covered by a higher percentage of Norwegian respondents than in the survey total, this is probably due to Norwegian respondents on average being larger and having more journals, thus being able to cover more disciplines.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

Only 28.6% of the Norwegian respondents have an approved annual budget, as opposed to 56.6% in the survey total. One does not want to disclose the size of the budget, one is in the 11-50K EUR bracket while two report more than 1M EUR. Those who have a budget are also subjected to formal monitoring and/or administration, so are 2-3 others.

Looking at in-kind support provided by the parent organisations, Norway is generally quite similar to the survey respondents in total. 78.6% of Norwegian respondents use external services, this is also quite in line with the survey total.

Eight (53%) of Norwegian respondents use external services for editorial services. A majority receive this as in-kind or voluntary contributions, this is also the case for production services and IT services. Communication services are outsourced by 33.3% of Norwegian respondents against 10.9% in the survey total.

It looks like Norwegian respondents see less need for cooperation with others, as 35% have answered 'don't know' or 'no' to the question about in which areas cooperation

Funded by the European Union

could be considered, compared to 27% 'don't know' and 'no' in the survey total. Norwegian respondents are somewhat more inclined to consider cooperating regarding IT services, 57.1% compared to 46.3%.

Norwegian respondents seem less reliant on fixed and permanent subsidies from the parent organisation than for the survey in total. 21.4% have indicated 'very high' reliance, compared to 44.9% for the survey total, and for 78.6% this is 'not applicable', against 41.4% for the survey total.

Norwegian respondents also seem less reliant on 'periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation' than for the survey total. 21.3% of Norwegian respondents have such support, as compared to 39% for the survey total. When it comes to 'time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation' this is applicable to 42.9% of Norwegian respondents compared to 43.7% in the survey total. 'Permanent public government funding' is 'not applicable' to 85.7% of Norwegian respondents, compared to 59.8% for the survey total.

Reliance on 'collective funding' varies in Norway. For 78.6% it is 'not applicable', 75.5% in the survey total. 7.1% report this as 'very low', on par with the total of 9.8%, but 14.3% report it as 'high', this is only 4.6% in the survey total. Reliance on 'voluntary author contributions' is low in Norway, as for the survey total. The same goes for reliance on 'content and print sales' and on APCs.

With regards the stability of the various sources of income, 'fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisations' could seem a bit more stable in Norway compared to the survey total. Although the 'don't know' response in Norway is 50% compared to 22.4% in the survey total. For other types of support, the responses are too few to form a useful picture.

When it comes to Norwegian reliance on various resources, 'non-monetary or in kind support' looks somewhat more important to Norwegian respondents than to the survey in general. Norway could also look slightly more dependent on 'monetary income' compared to the survey total.

Expectations to produce a profit/surplus seems somewhat lower for the Norwegian respondents than for the survey total. One has an expectation to have a surplus, 7.1%, compared to 19.7% in the survey total.

Respondents were asked what they saw as the main challenges related to financial sustainability. One respondent mentions the ever-increasing technical demands of OA without a corresponding increase in income. One mentions problems with advertising revenue, a few mention uncertainty over the future financing of the HE sector in Norway. In addition, lack of resources is mentioned as most work is done as parts of jobs that also cover other kinds of work and competes for available working hours.

Funded by the European Union

Governance

Formal documents describing activities, 'statutes/by-laws/articles of association' are somewhat less common in Norway compared to the survey total, the same goes for 'external legislation/requirements/policies'.

The activities are overseen by a management office for 27.3% of the Norwegian respondents, much less than the 52% for the survey total. 50% have a governing board, less than the survey total of 63%. 40% of Norwegian respondents are being overseen through external audit of accounts, compared to 31.9% for the survey total. 35.7% of Norwegian respondents have a governance model that includes representation from the wider scholarly community, close to the survey total of 38.9%.

Open Science/Open Access practices

Those respondents who have answered the questions about what percentage of their output is OA, have generally given answers of 100%. There are two exceptions, both for journals. One standalone journal gives the number as 20%. However, it is known that all scholarly content in the journal is OA, the rest is for all practical purposes bronze OA, that is made freely available but without an OA licence. The other gives a number of 60%, this respondent has a large number of electronic subscription journals.

With regard to journals, Norwegian respondents report following Open Science/Open Access policies with roughly the same pattern and percentages as the survey total. For books there are too few responses for this to be commented on.

In Norway, as in the survey total, the most common issue to be covered by the Open Science/Open Access policy, is copyright. In second place is self-archiving with 70%, close to the survey total of 70.5% and 'use of open licences' also with 70%, again close to the survey total of 71.7%. In fourth place is 'Third-party' copyright with 40%, also near the 34.8% in the survey total. Norway seems quite close to the standard in this area.

Acceptance of preprints/working papers in journals and/or books appears higher in Norway compared to the survey total, around 78.5% compared to around 54%. Acceptance of self-arching looks to be on the same level in Norway as the survey total. This is also true for encouraging or allowing sharing of full-texts via academic sharing services. No Norwegian respondent reports having embargo periods for self-archiving of anything, 18.3% of the survey total impose embargoes for some output.

42.9% of Norwegian respondents make citations in all journals available according to I4OC principles, against 43.4% for the survey total. 7.1% do it for some journals, compared to 5.9% for the survey total. For books, 14.3% of Norwegian respondents do this, compared to 14% for the survey total.

Funded by the European Union

All Norwegian respondents who answered the question, use a CC licence. This is in line with the survey total. Although 5.9% of the total use another licence. CC BY and CC BY-NC are the most important licences, both 61.5%. CC BY-SA is used by 46.2%, all others less than 30%.

In the survey total, 51.4% either offer, experiment with or would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage, compared to 55.5% among the Norwegian respondents.

50% of Norwegian respondents report having a research data sharing policy at any level, compared to 58.4% for the survey total.

'Distinguishing contributor roles' is done by 14.3% of Norwegian respondents, compared to 16.9% of the survey total.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

42.9% of Norwegian respondents report being involved in the editorial management of publications, compared to 69.4% for the survey total. Looking at the list of which tasks the respondents are involved in, two thirds of those who reported being involved are generally involved in all or nearly all tasks, except for plagiarism scanning where only 33.3% are involved and monitoring the peer review process, which involves 50%. 42.9% are involved in managing editorial quality, this is 74.3% in the survey total. All are involved in providing guidelines/instructions, this is 91.4% in the survey total.

Among the six Norwegian respondents who answered the question about the peer-review process, many use more than one alternative. Double-anonymised peer review is the most common, with 83.3%, slightly higher than the survey total of 76.2%. Editorial review is in use by 33.3%, the same as the survey total. Single-anonymised peer review is used by 66.7%, much more than the survey total of 37.1%. However, absolute numbers for Norway are small. Other forms of peer review are not used by Norwegian respondents.

In the survey total 63.3% have a specific policy on research integrity/research ethics, only 42.9% of Norwegian respondents have such a policy.

Technical services efficiency

Among the technical services provided, hosting with 85.7% compared to 58.4% in the survey total is where the Norwegian respondents differ most from others.

Services and infrastructures are somewhat more reliant upon in house activities among Norwegian respondents, than in the survey total.

Funded by the European Union

With 64.3%, OJS is as dominant as a publishing system in Norway as in the survey total (61.4%). Dataverse, Drupal, Open Monograph Press and ScholarOne are slightly more important in Norway than in the survey total.

Assignment of PIDs seems roughly as widespread among Norwegian respondents as for the survey total. CrossRef DOIs are as dominant in Norway as in the survey total, 76.9% compared to 77%. ISBNs are slightly less used, 46.2% compared to 51.2%, while ISSNs are more used, 92.3% compared to 71.9%. URNs are not used compared to 5.6% for the survey total.

Fewer Norwegian respondents release their metadata openly with a standard metadata description schema, 35.7% answer 'no', compared to 19.1% in the survey total. The 'don't know' share is 28.6% in Norway, compared to 27.8% in the survey total. A CC BY licence is used by 37% in the survey total, compared to 28.5% in Norway.

PDF is the dominant format type in Norway, 85.7% compared with 97.3% in the survey total. EPub is mentioned as a format by 7.1% of Norwegian respondents against 17.6% in the survey total, HTML by 50% compared to 40.8% in the survey total. JSON is not used in Norway compared to 2.4% in the survey total. Data formats are also not in use in Norway, compared to 8.8.% in the survey total. Image or video formats are used by 21.4% in Norway, 13.2% in the survey total, sound files by 21.4% compared to 8% in the survey total. XML is less used in Norway, 14.3% compared to 20.2% in the survey total.

78.6% of Norwegian respondents have an archiving/backup policy, this is in line with the survey total of 73.5%. 27.3% use CLOCKSS against 17.8% in the survey total. In the survey total 16.8% use LOCKSS, 27.3% of Norwegian respondents report using this service. Use of 'national institutional library or infrastructure' in Norway is somewhat lower than the survey total, 58.3% compared to 71.7%. PKP PN is more used in Norway, 36.4% compared to 21.7% in the survey total. Portico is used by 27.3% of Norwegian respondents against 13% in the survey total. PubMed Central is not used by Norwegian respondents, compared to 7.4% in the survey total.

58.3% of Norwegian respondents report that archiving and backup is not a challenge, more than the survey total of 30.4%. Financial constraints are not reported as a challenge by any Norwegian respondent, against 27.8% in the survey total, 16.7% report lack of human resources against 32.7% in the survey total. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is reported as a problem by 25% of Norwegian respondents compared to 27.9% in the survey total, lack of expertise by 8.3% compared to 17.5% in the survey total.

When it comes to challenges with providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, 46.2% of Norwegian respondents point to 'lack of human resources', and 46.2% to 'financial constraints' as the most important problems, compared to 55% and 59.8% in the survey total. 'Lack of expertise', and 'technical limitations of existing infrastructure' is seen as a challenge by 30.8% of Norwegian respondents, for the survey total the numbers are 18.6 and 23.3% respectively.

Funded by the European Union

46.2% of Norwegian respondents report resources for supplying and enriching metadata/PIDs not being a challenge, against 24.2% in the survey total .

When it comes to challenges with trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services, 42.9% of Norwegian respondents report that this is not a problem. For most challenges listed, they are less a problem for Norwegian respondents, or at about the same level as for the survey total.

Visibility, Communication, Marketing, and Impact

Norwegian respondents are somewhat less satisfied with their content's inclusion in search engines/indexes than the survey total. 38.5% are satisfied, 61.5% want improvement, while the survey total responses are 45.4% satisfied and 54.4% want improvement. Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed are among services pointed to among those wanting better indexation.

44.4% of Norwegian respondents say the IPSP manages indexation in scientific information databases, for the survey total this is 64%.

Only 22.2% of Norwegian respondents say paying for membership is an important challenge compared to 44.1% in the survey total, paying for recurring charges is an important problem for 22.2%, this is 43% for the survey total.

When it comes to satisfying metadata requirements, 66.7% of Norwegian respondents report this as an important or very important challenge, compared to the survey total of 59.6%. 'Satisfying non-technical participation criteria' is reported as an important or very important challenge by 66.6 of Norwegian respondents, compared to 59.1% in the survey total. Challenges in 'satisfying technical participation criteria' is reported as an important problem by 55.6% of Norwegian respondents, this is 61.5% in the survey total. 'Communications/requirements/paperwork in another language' is about as much of a challenge in Norway as in the survey total, 22.2% of Norwegian respondents rate this as important against 20.1% in the survey total. No Norwegian respondent sees 'Communications/requirements/paperwork only in English' as a challenge. Such paperwork being too technical is seen as an important challenge by 22.2% of Norwegian respondents, compared to 35.2% in the survey total.

50% of Norwegian respondents use newsletters/social media/networking profiles to inform the community about updates, somewhat less than the survey total of 66%.

64.3% of Norwegian respondents say they have a data protection policy, very close to the survey total of 65%. 85.7% also have a privacy policy, here the survey total is 66.6%.

42.9% of Norwegian respondents say they display metrics publicly on par with the survey total of 42.5%. Too few have indicated which metrics they use to enable commenting upon.

Funded by the European Union

Equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging

28.4% of Norwegian respondents have either implemented, are in progress or are considering implementing mechanisms to address age-related aspects of diversity, inclusion or belonging. For the survey total the percentage having implemented, being in progress or considering is somewhat higher at 41.2%.

Most Norwegian respondents report 'not planning', 'don't know' or 'not applicable' when it comes to caring responsibilities, with only 15.4% answers considering implementing measures. This compared to 26.1% implemented/in progress/considering for the survey total. A somewhat better picture is found for disability, with corresponding numbers being 46.2% for Norway, 34.3% for the survey total.

38.5% of Norwegian respondents have implemented or are considering implementing mechanisms regarding educational and professional background, 41.2% have implemented, are in progress or considering, for the survey total. When it comes to ethnicity and culture 28.5% have implemented among the Norwegian respondents, while 37.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or contemplating in the survey total.

28.5% of Norwegian respondents have implemented, are in progress or considering implementing measures related to gender, while 45.3% of the survey total has implemented, are in progress or considering. Language is addressed by 35.7% of Norwegian respondents, 48.6% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering. 15.4% of Norwegian respondents are contemplating measures regarding religious background compared to 28.8% for the survey total. Sexual identity aspects are covered by 28.5% of Norwegian respondents, while 31.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. Socio-economic background is covered by 15.4% of Norwegian respondents, while 36.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

When asked about what measures have been put in place to address the aspects mentioned above, 49.3% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering code of conduct/non-discrimination/positive discrimination policy, while among Norwegian respondents 35.6% have implemented, are in progress or are considering this. Data collection monitoring and annual reporting is in place or being considered for 28.5% of Norwegian respondents, while for the survey total 35.2% have this in place, are in progress or are considering. 30.8% of Norwegian respondents have implemented measures. are in progress or considering when it comes to recommendations for the use of inclusive language, 42.7% for the survey total. Regarding tailored support or personal coaching, 30.8% of Norwegian respondents have, are in progress or considering, 29% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. 30.8% of Norwegian respondents are in progress or considering to implement training, awareness-raising, anti-bias tools, 34.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

Funded by the European Union

28.6% of Norwegian respondents have a published accessibility policy, another 42.9% have a policy but it isn't published. Corresponding numbers for the survey total are 21.8% and 13.2%.

No Norwegian respondents meet the ATAG criteria, very few do in the survey total but 7.2% are considering. In addition, no Norwegian respondents meet the DINI certificate criteria compared to 12.3% either implemented, in progress or considering in the survey total. OpenAIRE guidelines are in progress with 18.2% of Norwegian respondents, compared to 26.4% either implemented, in progress or considering in the survey total. UAAG criteria are not met by any Norwegian IPSP, 0.8% of the survey total have implemented while 7.8% are in progress or considering. The Norwegian respondents fare considerably better when it comes to the WCAG requirements, with 57.2% having implemented or being in progress - in the survey total 5.8% have implemented while 13% are in progress or considering.

Among challenges in meeting accessibility standards, lack of resources is seen as important/very important by 61.6% of Norwegian respondents, compared to 67.6% in the survey total. Lack of expertise is rated important/very important by 30.8% of Norwegian respondents, 58.5% in the survey total. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is seen as important or very important by 53.9% of Norwegian respondents, 58.3% in the survey total.

While 38.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering a Gender Equality Plan, this applies to 23.1% of the Norwegian respondents. For requiring authors to inform about gender sensitive research data, the same options are 26.3% in the survey total, and 7.7% among Norwegian respondents. Requirements to use gender impartial language is implemented, in progress or being considered by 45.3% in the survey total, 23.1% among Norwegian respondents.

The picture is very different to the survey totals for languages services provided or supported. English is covered by most respondents (78.6%) and 100% offer Norwegian. The third most common languages are Danish and Swedish, both offered by 35.7% of Norwegian respondents. That Frisian and Welsh are offered by 7.1% of Norwegian respondents may not have much practical use, but it is interesting to note. It is also noteworthy that none of the official minority languages in Norway are represented.

Bilingual publishing of full text in the form of different language versions in the same document is implemented, in progress or being considered by 35.7% of Norwegian respondents, sequential different language versions 23.1% and simultaneous different language versions as separate documents 50%. For the survey total, these numbers are 47.3%, 22.7% and 22.7% respectively. 78.6% of Norwegian respondents have multilingual publication of abstracts, very close to the 75.8% in the survey total. Improving machine translation literacy is being considered by 7.7% of Norwegian respondents, 23.9% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. Abstracts in English when the original language is other than English is implemented, in progress or under consideration by 57.1% of Norwegian respondents, 67.5 in the survey total. Translation and/or language check services are implemented or

Funded by the European Union

being considered for 28.6% of Norwegian respondents, 44.4% in the survey total. Translation of metadata into English is implemented, in progress or being considered by 35.6% of Norwegian respondents, against 51.3% in the survey total. Using toolkits or training to address language bias in peer review is implemented or being considered by 15.4% of Norwegian respondents, 20.8% of the survey total has either implemented, are in progress or considering such measures.

The overall picture is that Norwegian respondents generally do not have the same level of awareness or activities in the area of EDIB compared to the survey total. This varies between the different questions raised, but the total impression is that this is an area somewhat overlooked in Norway.

Funded by the European Union

Poland (PL)

Authors:
Mateusz Franczak, The Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IBL PAN), ORCID 0000-0002-0416-2491
Magdalena Wnuk, The Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IBL PAN), ORCID 0000-0003-4129-6664

The history of Open Access publishing in Poland has witnessed notable developments, including an increasing awareness and interest in diamond publishing. Beginning with the formation of the Open Science Coalition in 2008 (Bednarek-Michalska, 2017, pp. 13-28), which engaged scientists, librarians, and NGOs, the country's commitment to OA gained momentum. Support from esteemed institutions such as the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (KRASP) in 2013 further solidified the endorsement of OA principles in scientific publishing. In 2015, the Ministry of Science and Higher Education issued recommendations for the development of OA, including the adoption of institutional OA policies (*Kierunki rozwoju otwartego dostępu do publikacji i wyników badań naukowych w Polsce*). Poland's proactive approach to OA is exemplified by the 2018 Act on Higher Education and Science, mandating OA for articles in journals funded through the "Support for Scientific Journals" program (*Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce*). As Poland advances towards a national-level OA policy, these historical milestones underscore the country's commitment to promoting open and equitable access to research.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS Survey collected 31 responses from Poland, predominantly comprising 23 public institutions, with five not-for-profit organisations and three companies.

Only two respondents, both university publishers, employ more than 30 people. 144 employ up to five people, whereas four declared they have no employees. However, it does not seem possible that a university press has no employees so there might be a misunderstanding. 23 publish in social sciences and 20 in humanities.

Language and multilingualism

Most of the journals are published in Polish (28). Two are published only in Polish, two only in English. 26 journals are multilingual, among the languages are: French, German, Russian and Ukrainian (Table 117).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Croatian	1	3.3
Czech	2	6.7
English	28	93.3
French	7	23.3
Galician	1	3.3
German	6	20.0
Italian	2	6.7
Polish	28	93.3
Russian	6	20.0
Spanish	2	6.7
Ukrainian	5	16.7

N = 30 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q3 (Poland, all)

Table 117 Publication languages. (PL)

11 Polish I|PSPs have implemented bilingual full text publishing in the same document, 10 have different language versions in different journals and 11 different simultaneous language versions as separate documents. 24 respondents publish multilingual abstracts, four do not. Only 13 IPSPs translate metadata to English, three are implementing it and two are considering implementation in the future. 11 IPSPs provide translation and or check-language services to the authors.

Membership engagement

Very few Polish IPSPs are members of international organisations. Two respondents are members of CoARA, four of COPE, one of the Federation of European Publishers, one of the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication, one of IPA Academy, and one of OASPA. However, more IPSPs (15) declare membership of national publisher scholarly communication associations.

Publication types

Almost all IPSPs in the Polish sample publish or provide service for journals (30), 26 for academic books, 20 for conference output, and seven publish non-academic outputs. Only six respondents are involved in other research outputs production, such as media or digital products, and five declare they publish dataset and software.

The majority of IPSPs publish less than 20 journal titles a year (24), 50 academic books (21) and 19 publish up to 20 conference outputs.

Funded by the European Union

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

Polish respondents most rely on fixed and permanent subsidies from their parent organisation, which they consider stable (11) or very stable (12). 23 selected this type of funding as very high, high or neither high nor low, content and print sales being a low source of financial support (13 selected 'not applicable'). Only four IPSPs use APCs as a form of funding. 14 respondents have permanent public government funding. 27 rely on public time limited grants or subsidies, all of them from outside of their organisation. However, 20 consider this kind of funding as unstable or neither stable nor unstable.

Most Polish IPSPs heavily rely on in-kind support (Table 118): facilities and premises (22), general IT services (25), human resource management, general financial and legal services (21), salaries of permanent staff (23), salaries of temporary staff (17), service-specific IT services (17).

	n	%
Facilities and premises	22	84.6
General IT services	25	96.2
Human Resource management, general financial and legal services	21	80.8
Salaries of permanent staff	23	88.5
Salaries of temporary staff	17	65.4
Service-specific IT services	17	65.4
Other	3	11.5
N = 26 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q13 (Poland, all)		

Table 118 In kind support provided by parent organisation. (PL)

Public funding, despite its relative stability, is criticised by some respondents as forcing collaboration with partners who are not necessarily the most desirable. The respondents declared that "public procurement as the main selection factor define the price, which causes two main risks - extending the procedure for acquiring people to cooperate, a small possibility of relying on proven, reliable concealers, editors, deposits or entities that perform other services (printing, IT service, etc. etc.)".

One of the biggest challenges related to financial sustainability was highlighted by one of the respondents, "publishing scientific articles in magazines in the Open Access system. Obtaining funding from organisations outside institutional." Another IPSP stated that "scientific institutions as part of broadly understood humanities are underfunded. The solution would be a systemic increase in subsidies."

Governance

Polish IPSP activities are mostly guided by internal documents such as statutes (26) or by-laws (20). Governance models predominantly rely on representative involvement from the wider community (10).

Funded by the European Union

Open Science/Open Access practices

Poland does not have a comprehensive open access and open science policy yet. There is only a 2015 ministry's document with general recommendations regarding publishing in open access. The majority of Polish IPSP follow their own or their parent organisation policies in terms of access to journals and books.

The majority of Polish IPSPs allow self-archiving in open repositories for all journals (21) and/or books (14), as well as encourage or allow sharing of the full text via academic sharing services. This is especially true for journals.

According to IPSPs answers, the issues that are mostly addressed by open access policies are copyright, open licences and use of identifiers (Table 119).

	n	%
Copyright	24	85.7
Embargoes	11	39.3
Metadata rights	16	57.1
Publication of negative research results	1	3.6
Self-archiving	21	75.0
Third-party copyright	17	60.7
Use of identifiers	17	60.7
Use of open licences	23	82.1

N = 28 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q26.2 (Poland, all)

Table 119 Issues addressed by Open Science / Open Access policy. (PL)

All IPSPs claim they use Creative Commons or open licences for all journals (26) and books (18). Table 120 shows that the most popular types are CC BY (19) and not so open CC BY-NC-ND (14).

	n	%
CC BY	19	63.3
CC BY-NC	5	16.7
CC BY-NC-ND	14	46.7
CC BY-NC-SA	4	13.3
CC BY-ND	4	13.3
CC BY-SA	8	26.7
CC0	4	13.3

N = 30 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q27.1 (Poland, all)

Table 120 Licence(s) used or recommended. (PL)

Funded by the European Union

Most of the IPSPs have not implemented open peer review. Only four respondents claim they enable open peer review, whereas one is experimenting with it. 15 IPSPs make references openly available according to I4OC principles.

10 IPSPs have a research data sharing policy as part of the institutional Open Access/Open Science policy and five implemented it at the journal level. However, only five IPSPs distinguish contributors' roles.

Editorial quality, editorial management, and research integrity

The majority of Polish IPSPs are involved in editorial management of publications (24 respondents) and in managing editorial quality (27). Most of the IPSPs provide guidelines or instructions (25).

Regarding tasks accomplished in editorial management (Table 121), coordinating the peer review process received the highest response rate, with all 24 respondents indicating their involvement in this task. This indicates that coordinating peer review is a common responsibility among the survey participants. Monitoring the peer review process closely follows, with 22 out of 24 respondents confirming their involvement in this aspect of editorial management. Performing basic checks on adherence to authors' and reviewers' guidelines is another crucial task, with 20 respondents mentioning their participation. Tasks related to ethical considerations, such as performing basic checks on ethical consent, also garnered significant attention, with 18 respondents confirming their involvement in this aspect of editorial management. Other tasks, such as plagiarism scanning, recruiting and managing editorial board members, and sourcing reviewers, had varying levels of engagement, with 16 respondents participating in each of these activities.

	n	%
Coordinating the peer review process	24	100.0
Monitoring the peer review process	22	91.7
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	20	83.3
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	18	75.0
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	22	91.7
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	16	66.7
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	16	66.7
Sourcing reviewers	22	91.7
Other (please specify)	1	4.2

N = 24 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q31.1 (Poland, all)

Table 121 Tasks accomplished in editorial management. (PL)

Funded by the European Union

The most common type of peer review among the respondents is double-anonymised peer review (Table 122), where both authors and reviewers remain anonymous to each other. This method was chosen by 23 out of 27 respondents, indicating its widespread use in the surveyed population. Single-anonymised peer review, where authors do not know the identity of the reviewers, was chosen by nine respondents. Editorial review was selected by eight respondents. Lastly, 'Open identities of the reviewers, authors, and editors' was the least chosen option, with only three respondents indicating its use.

	n	%
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	23	85.2
Editorial review	8	29.6
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	3	11.1
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	9	33.3

N = 27 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q32.2 (Poland, all)

Table 122 Types of peer review in use. (PL)

The majority of respondents, 25 out of 30, indicated that they do have a specific policy on research integrity and publication ethics.

Technical services efficiency

The majority of Polish respondents (21/30) reported providing a full editorial workflow (Table 123). Metadata and quality control services are also prevalent (22/30). Hosting, and software services are provided by 15/30 and 16/30 respondents respectively. A smaller but still notable portion of respondents (13/30) reported offering partial editorial workflow services. User interface services, focusing on the design and functionality of the publication platform, were offered by 12 out of 30 respondents.

	n	%
Full editorial workflow	21	70.0
Hosting	15	50.0
Metadata and quality control	22	73.3
Partial editorial workflow	13	43.3
Software	16	53.3
User interface	12	40.0

N = 30 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q34 (Poland, all)

Table 123 Technical services provided. (PL)

Regarding services, 12 Polish IPSPs reported handling maintenance and updates in-house through a dedicated publishing department or IT department personnel, while 20

Funded by the European Union

respondents mentioned partial outsourcing. Full outsourcing was chosen by two respondents, with one respondent stating having no provision. Concerning technical infrastructure (Table 124), a significant majority of 23 respondents manage maintenance and updates in-house through their IT department personnel. Additionally, five respondents handle this in-house through dedicated publishing departments, and four respondents do so across different departments. Partial outsourcing is chosen by 10 respondents, while full outsourcing is indicated just by one respondent, and one respondent stated having no provision. These findings reveal diverse approaches to maintenance and updates within the surveyed institutions in Poland, with a prominent preference for in-house management for technical infrastructure.

	n	%
Fully outsourced	1	3.3
In house across different departments	4	13.3
In house by a dedicated publishing department	5	16.7
In house by an IT department personnel	23	76.7
Mainly outsourced	2	6.7
No provision	1	3.3
Partially outsourced	10	33.3

N = 30 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q35 (Poland, all)

Table 124 Maintenance and update - Technical infrastructure. (PL)

Regarding publishing systems used (Table 125), OJS stands out as the most popular, with 19 respondents indicating its use. Other commonly employed systems include customization or own development, Open Monograph Press (OMP), and DSpace. Additionally, respondents also mentioned the use of WordPress, Scholar One, and other commercial software. Some participants expressed uncertainty, with three respondents selecting 'Don't know'.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Customisation or own development (please specify)	4	13.3
Dataverse	1	3.3
Drupal	1	3.3
DSpace	3	10.0
Open Journals System (OJS)	19	63.3
Open Monograph Press (OMP)	4	13.3
Scholar One	2	6.7
WordPress	3	10.0
Don't know	3	10.0
Other commercial software (please specify)	6	20.0
Other open source software (please specify)	2	6.7

N = 30 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q36 (Poland, all)

Table 125 Publishing system used. (PL)

Five out of 30 respondents do not use PIDs at all, while four use them for all journals, and 16 use PIDs for all publications. Only one respondent uses PIDs for some journals, and another four expressed uncertainty with 'don't know'. Within the types of PIDs employed by 21 respondents (Table 126), CrossRef-DOI, ISBN, and ISSN are the most commonly used PIDs, each selected by 17 of respondents. Handle was chosen by two respondents with 'other DOI' and Datacite-DOI each selected once.

	n	%
CrossRef-DOI	17	81.0
Datacite-DOI	1	4.8
Handle	2	9.5
ISBN	17	81.0
ISSN	17	81.0
Other DOI	1	4.8

N = 21 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q37.1 (Poland, all)

Table 126 Persistent identifiers (PIDs). (PL)

Regarding metadata, 17 out of 30 respondents release metadata openly under a Creative Commons licence, while two use the Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication (CC0). A smaller proportion, six do not release metadata openly, and an additional five are uncertain ('don't know'). In terms of data formats, PDF is the most commonly used format, with 29 of respondents indicating its use. Other formats include EPub (7), HTML (6), XML (5), sound files (3), image or video formats (4), and data formats like CSV (1).

Funded by the European Union

The majority of respondents have an archiving/backup policy (21/30). Most use national institutional libraries or infrastructures for digital preservation.

In the context of archiving, backing up, or preserving content and software, financial constraints are a significant challenge (Table 127), with 12 out of 24 respondents citing this as a hurdle. Lack of human resources (9), technical limitations of existing infrastructure (8), and administrative constraints (1) also emerge as notable challenges in this category. A smaller proportion (4) mentioned a lack of expertise, while three indicate that this is not a challenge.

	n	%
Administrative constraints	1	4.2
Financial constraints	12	50.0
Lack of expertise	4	16.7
Lack of human resources	9	37.5
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	8	33.3
This is not a challenge	3	12.5
Other	1	4.2

N = 24 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q42 (Poland, all)

Table 127 Challenges - Archiving, backing up or preserving content and software. (PL)

When it comes to providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services (Table 128), financial constraints are overwhelmingly the most prominent challenge, with 23 out of 27 respondents identifying it as a hurdle. Lack of human resources (16) is also a significant challenge in this regard. Administrative constraints (5), a lack of expertise (7), and technical limitations of existing infrastructure (7) are mentioned by a smaller proportion of respondents. A total of three of respondents stated that this is not a challenge.

	n	%
Administrative constraints	5	18.5
Financial constraints	23	85.2
Lack of expertise	7	25.9
Lack of human resources	16	59.3
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	7	25.9
This is not a challenge	3	11.1

N = 27 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q42 (Poland, all)

Table 128 Challenges - Providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services. (PL)

In the context of supplying and enriching metadata/PIDs (Table 129), lack of human resources remains a prevalent challenge, with 12 out of 26 of respondents indicating this issue. Financial constraints and a lack of expertise (10 each) are also substantial

Funded by the European Union

challenges. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure (7) and administrative constraints (2) are mentioned to a lesser extent. Meanwhile, four of respondents indicated that this is not a challenge, and two specified other challenges.

	n	%
Administrative constraints	2	7.7
Financial constraints	10	38.5
Lack of expertise	10	38.5
Lack of human resources	12	46.2
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	7	26.9
This is not a challenge	4	15.4
Other	2	7.7

N = 26 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q42 (Poland, all)

Table 129 Challenges - Supplying and enriching metadata / PIDs. (PL)

Finally, in the endeavour to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services (Table 130), financial constraints (13/ 24) emerges as the primary challenge, followed by lack of human resources (9), a lack of expertise (8), and technical limitations of existing infrastructure (7). Administrative constraints and respondents stating this is not a challenge (3 each) are mentioned to a lesser extent, and two specified other challenges.

	n	%
Administrative constraints	3	12.5
Financial constraints	13	54.2
Lack of expertise	8	33.3
Lack of human resources	9	37.5
Technical limitations of existing infrastructure	7	29.2
This is not a challenge	3	12.5
Other	2	8.3

N = 24 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q42 (Poland, all)

Table 130 Challenges - Trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services. (PL)

Visibility, communication, marketing, and impact

A significant majority (21) of respondents expressed a desire for better indexing in search engines, possibly to improve the visibility of their content, while a smaller proportion (7) stated that their content is already well indexed. Indexation in scientific information databases should also be improved according to 22 respondents.

Funded by the European Union

10 respondents consider paying for membership of organisations/associations/coalitions to be an important or very important challenge. A significant proportion of respondents (7) find paying for recurring charges, such as monthly fees, to be a very important challenge and five find it important. The challenge of satisfying metadata requirements is viewed as important or very important by 18 respondents. Satisfying non-technical participation criteria is found as important or very important by 20 respondents, similarly to satisfying technical participation criteria. Communications and paperwork in other languages, including English, is considered an important challenge by 9 respondents only. 13 respondents see service / requirements / paperwork too technical.

22 IPSPs update their community and audience using newsletter, social media or other networking profiles. 24 declare they have a data protection policy (with two stating 'no' and four 'don't know'), 27 declare they have a privacy policy like GDPR.

17 IPSPs publicly display metrics (Table 131). Article-level usage metrics (e.g., visits, views, downloads) are the most frequently considered metrics among respondents, with 10 respondents indicating their relevance. Submission, acceptance, and publication dates are also highly valued by 11 Polish IPSPs. This indicates that a significant proportion of respondents find information about the timeline of the publication process important. Altmetrics and Plum X Metrics are both considered by only four IPSPs. Article-level impact metrics and publication-level impact metrics (e.g., Impact Factor) are considered by four and two IPSPs respectively. A widget showing geographical spread of visitors is the least considered metric, with only one IPSP indicating its relevance.

	n	%
Altmetrics, such as Altmetric	4	23.5
Article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts	4	23.5
Article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	10	58.8
Plum X Metrics	4	23.5
Publication-level impact metrics, such as Impact Factors	2	11.8
Publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	6	35.3
Rejection rates	2	11.8
Submission, acceptance, publication dates	11	64.7
Widget showing geographical spread of visitors	1	5.9

N = 17 of 31; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q49.1 (Poland, all)

Table 131 Metrics. (PL)

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

In the context of addressing 'Age (career stage)', 7 out of 26 respondents have implemented measures, while two are in progress and one is considering it. However,

Funded by the European Union

nine find them 'not applicable', and five don't know how to address it. For 'caring responsibilities', four out of 25 respondents have implemented actions, one is in progress, and two have no plans. Meanwhile, 11 find this dimension 'not applicable'. In addressing disability, five out of 27 respondents have implemented measures, and four are in progress. However, 10 find this dimension 'not applicable'. Regarding 'educational and professional background', eight out of 26 respondents have implemented measures, and three are in progress. Eight find this dimension 'not applicable'. Four out of 25 respondents have implemented actions in the area of ethnicity and culture, and two are in progress. Meanwhile, 11 find this dimension 'not applicable', and six don't know how to address it. Similar results were collected in terms of gender, six out of 25 respondents have implemented measures, and two are in progress. 10 respondents find this dimension 'not applicable'. For 'language multilingualism', five out of 26 respondents have implemented actions, and four are in progress. 10 find this dimension 'not applicable', and four don't know how to address it. For 'sexual identity (including LGBTQIA+)', five out of 25 respondents have implemented actions, and two are in progress. There are several 'don't know' answers in each of the categories discussed above and even more selected 'not applicable'. Five out of 25 respondents have implemented measures in the area of religion, and two are in progress.

Four out of 25 respondents have implemented measures addressing socio-economic background, two are in progress with such efforts, and another two do not have plans to address this dimension. A notable six respondents indicated uncertainty ('don't know') about how to address it, while the largest proportion, 11 respondents, found socio-economic background not applicable in their context.

In response to questions about measures taken to ensure and promote equality, diversity, inclusion and belonging, in the category of 'code of conduct/non-discrimination/positive discrimination policy', a total of 25 respondents reported their approach: five have implemented measures and five are in progress. Two are considering, while four are not planning, four don't know and five respondents state they found it 'not applicable' in their context.

For 'data collection, monitoring, and annual reporting', two out of 25 respondents have implemented these measures, two are in progress, and eight do not plan to implement them. Seven don't know and six claim that this is 'not applicable' in their context.

In the context of 'Recommendation for the use of inclusive language', among the 24 respondents, two have implemented measures, four are in progress, and two are considering them. Seven respondents claim that it is 'not applicable' in their context, six don't know and three are not planning to implement them.

For 'tailored support/personal coaching', with 24 respondents, three have implemented measures, two are in progress, and two are considering them. Seven respondents find this dimension 'not applicable', and six don't know how to address it.

Funded by the European Union

Lastly, in the 'training, awareness raising, and anti-bias tools' category, with 25 respondents, six have implemented measures, four are in progress, five do not plan to implement them, and two are considering them. Four respondents find this dimension 'not applicable', and four don't know how to address it.

The presence of an accessibility policy is reported as follows: nine respondents out of 27 have a published accessibility policy, 10 respondents do not have an accessibility policy, six respondents are uncertain ('don't know'), and two respondents have an accessibility policy, but it's not published.

When considering the Accessibility of Web Content (WCAG), 26 respondents participated in this category. While two respondents have implemented measures, six are in progress, and five are considering it. Notably, 10 respondents are uncertain ('don't know') about their compliance with WCAG.

For the Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines (ATAG), there are 20 respondents. None of them have implemented ATAG requirements, but four are considering it, three do not plan to, and 11 are uncertain.

Concerning the German DINI certificate, with the same 20 respondents, none have implemented it, four are considering it, three do not plan to, and 11 are uncertain.

For the OpenAIRE guidelines, among 21 respondents, only one has implemented them, six are considering it, one does not plan to, and 11 are uncertain.

Lastly, for the User Agent Accessibility Guidelines (UAAG), 20 respondents participated. None have implemented UAAG requirements, three do not plan to, and 11 are uncertain, while three consider them. For the requirement that authors inform about gender-sensitive research data, among 26 participants, two have implemented this requirement, three are considering it, five do not plan to, and four are uncertain ('don't know'). A substantial portion, 12 found this measure 'not applicable' in their context.

Regarding the Gender Equality Plan (GEP), which involved 28 participants, four have implemented a GEP, one is in progress, and one is considering it. However, six do not plan to implement a GEP, and three are uncertain about it. The majority, 13, found this measure 'not applicable'.

Regarding the challenges when it comes to meeting accessibility standards, in the category of 'lack of expertise', 12 respondents out of 31 regard it as 'important', seven respondents find it 'neither important nor unimportant', four respondents view it as 'very important'. Two respondents consider this challenge 'unimportant', and additionally, three respondents responded with 'don't know'.

In the context of 'lack of resources', a substantial 15 out of 28 respondents see this challenge as 'very important', while seven respondents consider it 'important'.

Funded by the European Union

Furthermore, one respondent believes it is 'neither important nor unimportant', and five respondents responded with 'don't know'.

Finally, regarding the 'technical limitations of existing infrastructure', 27 respondents participated. Nearly half, 13 respondents, find this challenge 'very important', while five respondents consider it 'important'. Additionally, two respondents see it as 'neither important nor unimportant', and five respondents responded with 'don't know'. Only one respondent views it as 'unimportant', and one respondent indicated that it is 'not a challenge'.

Two respondents out of 27 have implemented measures to use gender-impartial language in all communications. Additionally, three respondents are in progress with these measures, and another three respondents are considering them. On the other hand, seven respondents do not plan to implement such measures, and four respondents are uncertain ('don't know'). A notable proportion of eight respondents found these measures 'not applicable' in their context.

Funded by the European Union

Portugal (PT)

Author:
Lorena Caliman Fontes, Universidade de Coimbra, ORCID 0000-0001-9566-2397

The Portuguese landscape survey was completed by 18 IPSPs. Thirteen of them identify themselves as institutional publishers (72.2%), the other five as service providers (27.8%).

The publication languages of these IPSPs show that the use of both Portuguese and English is dominant (Table 132): from the valid answers (16), 93.8% of the respondents (15) publish in these two languages. Spanish (75%, 12) and French (50%, 8) were the next most used languages. Italian and German were also cited in the answers (18.8% and 6.2%, respectively).

	n	%
English	15	93.8
French	8	50.0
German	1	6.2
Italian	3	18.8
Portuguese	15	93.8
Spanish	12	75.0

N = 16 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q3 (Portugal, all)

Table 132 Publication languages. (PT)

Half of the Portuguese respondents (9) don't belong to a parent organisation (Table 133). Among those that do, 28.6% (2) are a department inside the parent organisation; One (14.3%) IPSP operates independently but is owned or governed by the parent organisation; one (14.3%) is part of a department of the parent organisation. The remaining ones did not know how to answer or had another relation, although not detailed.

	n	%
Department of the parent organisation	2	28.6
Operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation	1	14.3
Other (please describe)	2	28.6
Part of department of the parent organisation	1	14.3
Don't know	1	14.3

N = 7 of 18; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q5.3 (Portugal, all)

Table 133 Relationship to parent organisation. (PT)

Funded by the European Union

With regards to the association of the IPSPs with collective organisations, associations and coalitions, few participants reported being engaged in them. Two of the respondents are members of the Association of European University Presses (AEUP); the same number – from different respondents – are signatories of the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA); one is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE); one participates in the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA). Three IPSPs are associated with a national publisher or scholarly communication association. Association with other organisations cited in the survey was not found among Portuguese respondents.

Regarding the provision of publishing services, more than half (57.1%, 4/7) of the respondents provide services to institutions other than their parent organisation, but 28.6% only offer services to their own institutions.

Most of the participants (72.2%, 13) parent organisations are public organisations. Another 22.2% (4) are private not-for-profit organisations. Finally, one (5.6%) indicated another type of legal entity; in this case, they explained that the editors own the project (Table 134).

	n	%
Other (please describe)	1	5.6
Private not-for-profit organisation,	4	22.2
Public organisation	13	72.2

N = 18 of 18; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q6 (Portugal, all)

Table 134 Type of legal entity of IPSP or parent organisation. (PT)

More than half of the participants reported having no paid staff directly employed in their IPSPs (55.6%, 10). Another 27.8% (5) have between 2 and 5 FTE, and one (5.6%) has less than two FTE. For 11.1% of the sample (2), more than 30 FTE are hired in their organisation.

In a question allowing multiple choices, the Portuguese sample showed a wide range of services provided. Besides editorial services (77.8%, 14), IT services were also widely offered (61.1%, 11). Production services appeared in 50% of the answers (9), as well as communication services (50%). Training, support and/or advice were reported 38.9% of the time (7). Administrative, legal and financial services were offered 11.1% of the time (2). One respondent reported providing no services at all, and another reported research as the 'other' type of service provided (Table 135).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Administrative, legal and financial	2	11.1
Communication	9	50.0
Editorial	14	77.8
IT	11	61.1
Production	9	50.0
Training, support and/or advice	7	38.9
None	1	5.6
Other	1	5.6

N = 18 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q8.1 (Portugal, all)

Table 135 Kind of services provided. (PT)

Out of 18 respondents, 16 reported providing publication and/or services for academic journals, while only 9 answered about providing it for academic books. Conference outputs received the same number of answers as academic books (9), and grey literature was included in only 4 of the respondents' answers. Publish and services for other types of research outputs appeared four times. Non-academic outputs were present in three of the 18 respondents – the same amount for the "other" outputs.

Half of the 16 IPSPs who published journals (Table 136) published 2 to 10 scholarly journals in 2022 (four between 2 and 5; and four between 6 and 10 journals). Only one IPSP published between 11 and 20 journals and another published 21 and 50 journals. The most frequent situation was when the IPSP published only one journal during that year (37.5%, 6).

	n	%
1	6	37.5
2-5	4	25.0
6-10	4	25.0
11-20	1	6.2
21-50	1	6.2

N = 16 of 18; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Portugal, all)

Table 136 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022. (PT)

Turning to the questions about articles, 43.8% (7) reported publishing between 11 and 50 articles; 12.5% (2) published between 51-100 or 101-200 articles. 18.8% (3) published less than a dozen articles in 2022. The highest number of published articles were reported by one respondent each: one published between 201 and 500 (6.2%) and another one published more than 500 (6.2%).

Funded by the European Union

Six of the respondents (66.7%) publishing academic books (9) published between 1 and 10 books in 2022 (Table 137). Another 22.2% (2) published a number between 51 and 100 academic books, while one of the participants (11.1%) published between 11 and 20 academic books. For those publishing conference outputs (9), 88.9% (8) published between one and 20 in 2022. One of the participants published more than 500 conference outputs in the period (11.1%).

	n	%
1-10	6	66.7
11-20	1	11.1
51-100	2	22.2

Number of academic books published in 2022
N = 9 of 18; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.3 (Portugal, all)
Table 137 Number of academic books published in 2022. (PT)

Disciplines covered by Portuguese IPSPs

17 Portuguese IPSPs responded to the question on disciplines (Table 138). Social sciences (58.8%, 10) and Humanities (47.1%, 8) were the most common. Multidisciplinary publications were present 41.2% of the time (7), but also medical and health sciences (29.4%, 5) and engineering and technology (17.6%, 3) are disciplines covered by the respondents' publishing activities.

	n	%
Engineering and technology	3	17.6
Humanities	8	47.1
Medical and health sciences	5	29.4
Multidisciplinary	7	41.2
Social sciences	10	58.8

N = 17 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Portugal, all)
Table 138 Disciplines covered. (PT)

Annual budget

Do Portuguese IPSPs in the sample start the year with an approved budget? Table 139 shows that between those who knew how to answer this question (16), the result is equal: half of the respondents start the year with an annual budget (8), and the other half do not (8).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Yes	8	47.1
No	7	41.2
Don't know	1	5.9
Other (please specify)[3]	1	5.9

N = 17 of 18; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q11 (Portugal, all)

Table 139 Approved annual budget. (PT)

The approved annual budget ranged from less than 1K EUR (37.5%,3), to 101-500K EUR (25%, 2) with one IPSP with a budget of more than 1M EUR. 25% of the respondents with an approved annual budget were unaware of the amount provided.

Administration and monitoring of the annual income and expenses are obligatory for 47.1% of the respondents (8/17). One respondent reported that the expenses are covered by the editors whenever they appear. Another IPSP reported that only the expenses are monitored since their institution is a public-funded research unit. The monitoring is not applicable for 23.5% of the IPSPs (4). 11.8% reported the monitoring as 'partly' (1) or 'not obligatory' (1).

The parent organisations provide in-kind support (in the form of labour, facility costs or other, excluding peer review) for the Portuguese IPSPs mostly in three ways: general IT services; human resource management, general financial and legal services; and service-specific IT services (4 mentions each). Permanent staff salaries were included as in-kind contributions for 2 IPSPs. Salaries of temporary staff were mentioned once, and 'payment by service' also once.

More than half (52.9%, 9/17) of the respondents use external services. Among the types of services used, the editorial services are mostly in-kind (25%) or voluntary (25%). IT external services are mostly in-kind (62.5%) or outsourced (50%). External communication services, training support and or advice on publishing policies, as well as administrative, legal and financial services, are also mainly in-kind (37.5% in all three cases). External service providers mentioned included OJS & OMP, from PKP, Turnitin (software to identify plagiarism), OpenEdition and SARC.

About Collaboration

The IPSPs were asked about the possibility of collaboration with the aim of saving costs, and in which areas this collaboration could take place. The participants could answer more than one option. Most of the answers cited IT services (58.8%), followed by communication, editorial and production services (47.1% each). Administrative, legal and financial services were considered 23.5% of the time. Some respondents (29.4%,

[3] The explanation for this "other" situation is that they plan to do it but have not yet started. So, the final count goes to the negative answer regarding the approved annual budget.

Funded by the European Union

5) did not know or would not consider collaboration in any area. No previous failed collaboration was reported.

Funding

IPSPs were asked how much they had relied on the different forms of funding over the last three years. As well as the reliance, the survey has also investigated how stable the various types of funding were. IPSPs could qualify the reliance as very low, low, neither high nor low, high, or not applicable. Reliance on fixed and permanent subsidies from parent organisations (16) was 'not applicable' for 75% of these IPSPs (12). Few respondents said the reliance was very low (12.5%), low (6.2%) or high (6.2%). A similar context emerges for periodically negotiated subsidies from parent organisations, with 81.2% (13) reporting not-applicable contexts, and almost no reliance in the three different layers (6.2% each – very low, low or neither high or low). No IPSP reported having a high reliance on this kind of funding.

The situation starts to slightly change when turning to time-limited grants or subsidies (private or public) outside of the organisation, with more relevant reliances, even if in a small number. 12.5% (2) of the valid answers (16) reported a low reliance, 18.8% (3) with a high reliance on grants or subsidies and (12.5%, 2) had very high reliance.

Permanent public government funding (16) was not applicable for 43.8% of the participants (7), but for 31.2% (5), the reliance on these funds was very high and high for 12.5% (2). Another 12.4% have very low (1) or low (1) reliance on permanent public funding.

Collective funding is 'not applicable' for almost all Portuguese IPSPs (93.8%, 15), while only one IPSP has a low reliance on it. Voluntary author contributions are a relevant form of funding for 37.5% (6) of the respondents, which rely on them at a low level (6.2%, 1), high level (12.5%, 2) and very high level (18.8%, 3). Nonetheless, this funding option does not apply to most Portuguese respondents (62.5%, 10).

Similar situations were verified in funding from content and print sales (only 12.5% low reliance, 87.5% not applicable), author processing charges (93.8% not applicable and 6.2% low reliance), any other income (86.7% not applicable) and any other type of funding (100% not applicable for the valid answers).

Stability of IPSPs funding

The stability of funding sources was measured in the survey using the same nine categories used in the funding reliance group of questions: fixed and permanent subsidy from parent organisation; periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation; time-limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation; permanent public government funding; collective funding; voluntary authors contributions; content and print sales; author processing charges; and any other income.

Funded by the European Union

One thing that calls attention to these results is the low stability rate. The only types of funding selected as stable or very stable were only seen in low numbers. Among the stable or very stable forms, there were time-limited grants or subsidies from outside own organisation (stable for 14.3% of the participants and very stable for 7.1%); permanent public government funding (stable for 21.4% of the sample and very stable for 14.3% of them); voluntary author contributions (very stable for 7.7%) and content and print sales (stable for 7.7% of the respondents). These were the only categories in which the participants indicated stability in funding sources.

It is also worth noting that there was a widespread lack of knowledge from the respondents about their funding stability. For seven of the nine categories, more than half of the respondents reported not knowing about the funding stability for a given source.

IPSPs indicated that the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), the country's public science funding agency, was the most cited name of an external funder.

Reliance on resources

IPSPs were asked about their reliance on resources, be it in non-monetary or in-kind support, in monetary income or other. Except for a reported high reliance on non-monetary in-kind support (33.3% of the valid answers), the results were not particularly striking. Monetary income was mostly seen as 'not applicable' (60%) for the respondents.

The Portuguese IPSP sample, in general, do not expect to produce a profit or surplus (60% 'not applicable'), and for 20% of them, overspending is not permitted, or there are losses instead of profit expectations.

The participants had a chance to discuss challenges related to the financial sustainability of the services in one open question. The arguments related to challenges for the financial sustainability of the services included a lack of responsiveness from the parent organisation for the expansion of human resources, the excessive reliance on editors due to the independent nature of one of the IPSPs, and the dependence on the national funding agency and the evaluation of the research centre (parent organisation). On the solutions side, one of the respondents proposed identifying a stable source of funding, and another said that donations from patrons could solve the challenge.

One of the respondents described the situation in a pretty complete answer, that gathered most of the topics from the other comments:

> Scholarly publishing in our institution depends heavily on the research funding allocated to the research units, on the voluntary work of researchers and collaborators on precarious contracts. It seems to me that one way to overcome

Funded by the European Union

> this difficulty would be to create specific public funding mechanisms for academic publishing, infrastructures and diamond open access. On the other hand, professionally valuing editorial work both in research assessment and other careers (such as support staff) would help to justify the allocation of funding (Service provider in the area of Social Sciences and Humanities from a Portuguese University).

The legal framework of the participant IPSPs was mostly defined in internal regulations (statutes, by-laws and articles of association, by 53.3%). Most respondents also reported external legislation, such as requirements and policies: 57.1%. Among the governance models reported, a management office was present 47.6% of the time, a governing board 40% of the time, and an external audit 23.1% of the time. For only 20% of the respondents (3), the governance model included representation from the wider scholarly community. In comparison, most of them (53.3%) did not have it, and 26.7% were unaware of this subject.

Open Science and Open Access Policies

The majority of the sample reported following a national policy for open science/open access for journals (61.5%, 8). A further 23.1% of the respondents follow the parent organisation policy, and 46.2% have their own policy. The reality for books is less developed than for journals, but still, 50% of the respondents said they follow a national policy for books, while 33.3% reported having their own policy.

On open access publications, 75% of the valid answers (9/12) publish all journals in open access. Other research outputs, such as books and conference results did not receive the same attention, as most of the respondents did not answer questions related to them.

The most addressed issues by the IPSPs OA policies were copyright, self-archiving, use of open licences and use of identifiers (Table 140).

	n	%
Copyright	10	83.3
Embargoes	3	25.0
Metadata rights	5	41.7
Publication of negative research results	3	25.0
Self-archiving	10	83.3
Third-party copyright	3	25.0
Use of identifiers	8	66.7
Use of open licences	9	75.0
Don't know	1	8.3

N = 12 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q26.2 (Portugal, all)

Funded by the European Union

Table 140 Issues addressed by Open Science / Open Access policy. (PT)

The survey investigated the following practices and whether they had been implemented at each IPSP: acceptance of submissions that have been publicly shared as a preprint or working paper; the allowance of self-archiving in open repositories; the encouragement or allowance to share the full text via academic sharing services; the imposition of embargo periods for self-archiving; the making of open references according to I4OC principles; and the use of creative commons or other open licences. In the case of this last category, a vast majority of IPSPs (93.8%, 15/16) confirmed their implementation of open licences for all journals. Following this practice, the allowance of self-archiving was found in a majority of responses (87.5%).

Naturally, in a context where practices such as the use of open licences and the self-archiving allowance are a reality, the embargo period for self-archiving was not common among participants (60% of them did not impose it, while 26.7% indicated that this practice was not even applicable for them).

The other practices were not as dominant, but still relevant. For instance, the open availability of references (according to I4OC) was true for 46.7% of the respondents, while the practice was unknown by 20% of the participants.

The encouragement or allowance to the sharing of full text has also seen some variance across participants. Although 43.8% confirmed this practice for all journals, another 25% confirmed it specifically for books or for some journals (12.5% each, 2). Even more fragmented is the context for accepting submissions publicly shared as preprints or working papers. The negative answer was the most frequent (37.5%, 6) and other situations were less expressive.

Focusing on open licences, the most used or recommended was CC BY (57.1%), followed equally by CC BY-NC and CC BY-NC-ND (21.4% each).

The majority of the IPSPs interviewed have not yet enabled open peer review practices. The single most common answer about this topic was 'no' (41.7%), whilst 33.3% said they would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage. 16.7% (2) of participants already enable it, while 8.3% are experimenting. Research data sharing policies are similarly not yet consolidated, with 37.5% of the respondents not having a policy on the topic, while 18.8% have one as part of the institutional Open Science/Open Access policy.

Recognition for contributor roles are also at an initial level, with 25% of respondents (4) distinguishing these roles as in CRediT), while 43.8% (7) are not distinguishing and 25% (4) don't know. For 6.2% (1) this question was 'not applicable'.

Funded by the European Union

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

From a total of 16 valid answers, 11 (68.8%) of the Portuguese IPSPs reported having involvement in the editorial management of publications (Table 141). The most common activities are monitoring the peer review process (72.7%), recruiting and managing of editorial board members (72.7%), followed by coordination of the peer review process (63.6%) and sourcing reviewers (63.6%). Also relevant is performing basic checks on adherence with the authors and reviewers guidelines (54.5%). Performing basic checks on ethical consents appeared and basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication were also common activities (45.5% each).

	n	%
Coordinating the peer review process	7	63.6
Monitoring the peer review process	8	72.7
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	6	54.5
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	5	45.5
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	5	45.5
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	3	27.3
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	8	72.7
Sourcing reviewers	7	63.6
Don't know	1	9.1

N = 11 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q31.1 (Portugal, all)

Table 141 Tasks accomplished in editorial management. (PT)

The less common task performed by the IPSPs was plagiarism scan/automated similarity checking (27.3%, 3). One respondent (9.1%) didn't know about the tasks accomplished.

Involvement in the management of editorial quality was less frequent than the involvement in editorial management, in 43.8% of participants. Amongst those involved, provision of guidelines and instructions and also double-anonymised peer review were relevant for all of them (7).

More than 80% of the respondents declared having a specific policy on research integrity and publication ethics.

Funded by the European Union

Technical services

The most common technical services provided by Portuguese IPSPs are the full editorial workflow and hosting (58.8% each, 10 respondents in a multiple answer question); then user interface cited 41.2% (7). Software (23.5%) and metadata and quality control (11.8%) were also cited. One of the IPSPs offers a partial editorial workflow.

The maintenance and update of the respondents' services are mostly made in-house, by IT department personnel (50%, 6). Partially outsourced maintenance and update was cited three times (25%), as well as in house maintenance across different departments (25%, 3). The technical infrastructure update and management followed a similar pattern, with 50% (5) opting for in-house, but 30% fully outsourced (3).

OJS is the single most cited publishing system amongst Portuguese IPSPs: 16 use OJS (94.1%). DSpace appeared three times (17.6%), Lodel, OMP and WordPress appeared twice each (11.8%).

Persistent identifiers (PIDs) used by more than half of Portuguese IPSPs (56.2%, 9). Among the types of PIDs, ISSN and Datacite-DOI had the biggest share (46.2%, 6 each), followed by CrossRef-DOI and Handle (38.5% each). ISBN was used by 30.8% of respondents and other DOIs 15.4%.

	n	%
ARK	1	7.7
CrossRef-DOI	5	38.5
Datacite-DOI	6	46.2
Handle	5	38.5
ISBN	4	30.8
ISSN	6	46.2
Other DOI	2	15.4

N = 13 of 18; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q37.1 (Portugal, all)

Table 142 Persistent identifiers (PIDs). (PT)

The open release of metadata with a standard description schema was not a well-known practice among the Portuguese respondents. Half of the participants (8/16) didn't know if their metadata was released in that way. Amongst those who knew, the majority of them (6) affirmed that the metadata was released under CC BY or other Creative Commons licence. One IPSP used CC0, and one did not use any.

The content of the IPSPs is mainly made available in the PDF format (93.8%, 15), but also in EPub (31.2%, 5), HTML (4), XML (3) and image or video formats (3).

Funded by the European Union

Most of the respondents report having an archiving/backup policy (66.7%, 10/15). Among digital preservation services available, national institutional libraries or infrastructure were the most popular option, for 72.7% of participants (8/11).

IPSPs were asked if they faced any challenges in providing technical services, in a variety of areas. Regarding archiving, backing up or preserving content and software, the most common challenge was the lack of human resources (4/10), followed by financial constraints (3), administrative constraints (2), lack of expertise (2) and technical limitations of existing infrastructure (2). For 3 of the respondents, this area was not a challenge.

In regard to providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, financial constraints and lack of human resources were even more reported (50% each, 6/12). Again, administrative constraints remained a relevant challenge with 41.7% citations (5). Supplying and enriching metadata was not a challenge in almost half (44.4%, 4) of the valid answers (9). Lack of human resources appeared as the most common challenge in trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services (4/10).

Finally, regarding indexation, only 28.6% of respondents (4/14) believed their content is already very well indexed. 71.4% (10) would like to see better indexing in search engines. The most relevant challenge for indexation was satisfying metadata requirements (very important for 66.7% of the valid answers, 9). Satisfying non-technical participation criteria was also listed as very important for 55.6% of valid answers (5/9), as well as satisfying technical participation criteria (also very important for 55.6%, 5). Other categories received fragmented, non-expressive answers. 'Important' or 'very important' challenges were cited no more than twice, except in paying for recurring charges (very important for 3, 33.3%) and on communications/requirements/paperwork available only in English (also very important for 33.3%, 3).

Visibility, communication and marketing

Regarding communication and marketing practices, the basic activities such as providing newsletters, social media and/or networking profiles of the IPSPs to inform the community were mostly present (71.4%, 10). When turning to data protection policy, more than 70% confirmed having one (73.3%, 11/15).

Privacy policies were a little less present (57.1%, 8), while displaying metrics publicly was a reality for only 28.6% of the participants (4). All of those displaying metrics publicly did it in article-level usage, showing visits, views, and downloads.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Considerations of EDIB are not yet common among the 12 Portuguese IPSPs that answered the question. Only one has implemented them, another IPSP is considering it, while three IPSPs are not planning, and another three don't know about it or regard it as

Funded by the European Union

'not applicable' (4). All of the questions following on these topics received fragmented answers, with no majority of respondents having implemented specific EDIB practices in a range of areas such as language, gender, ethnicity, culture, professional background, age, caring responsibilities, religious background, sexual identity, disability, among other topics.

Codes of conduct/non discrimination/positive discrimination policies were implemented by only two of the Portuguese IPSPs and are being considered by a further two. One IPSP also takes data collection measures to ensure and promote EDIB, while two perform recommendations for the use of inclusive language.

Only one IPSP has a published accessibility policy, while another one has a policy which is not published. Half of the respondents (7/14) are not aware of their IPSPs accessibility policies, while five (35.7%) don't have one. 70% are not aware if they meet accessibility requirements such as ATAG, UAAG, WCAG or DINI certificates. OpenAIRE guidelines are slightly more known (50% are not aware), but four of the respondents meet these guidelines (33.3%), while two (16.7%) are not planning to meet them.

Only one participant requires authors to inform about gender sensitive research data, and two have implemented Gender Equality Plans (GEP). Lack of expertise is a very important challenge for 46.2% of the respondents (6/13). Lack of resources are also very important for 38.5% of them (5).

Use of gender impartial language in all communications is implemented by two of the respondents (16.7%, 2/12).

Funded by the European Union

Spain (ES)

Author: Virginia de Pablo, FECYT, ORCID 0000-0002-9581-8301

Spain has 53 public and 36 private universities, according to the Universities, Centers, and Degrees Statistics (EUCT) published by the Ministry of Universities in 2022-2023. Their publishing departments concentrate on the bulk of scholarly communication in the country.

The Institutional publishers and scientific journal publication services are strongly represented in the Spanish University Publishers Union (Unión de Editoriales Universitarias Españolas or UNE). With 72 registered members, UNE aims to coordinate editorial efforts among its members, facilitate co-editions of university publications across institutions, and promote the dissemination and promotion of the editorial assets of its members. The landscape of university academic publishing in Spain is a compact and well-structured sector, coordinated through the UNE.

In addition to university publishers, there is a small but highly prominent number of research-performing institutions such as the Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas or CSIC), the Center for Sociological Research (Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas or CIS), the Institute of Fiscal Studies (Instituto de Estudios Fiscales or IEF), and some professional associations that publish their own scientific journals, which can be joined by university publishers.

The Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), the largest research institution in Spain, with more than 4,000 researchers.

There is no direct relationship between the number of journals and the quantity of papers published. Scientific journals in Spain encompass a wide variety. According to the data extracted from the survey, there were universities with publication numbers ranging from 51 to 100, and more than 500 papers. More information about scientific journals in Spain can be found at La edición de revistas científicas en España: una aproximación descriptiva and Revistas científicas. Situación actual y retos de futuro.

Dissemination, Response Rate, Respondents

The survey was sent to the complete FECYT journal database (approximately 1,700 titles) and the UNE database (72 members). All emails sent informed the target audience of the survey. The importance of reaching editors was communicated, so that journals, if they deemed it appropriate, could forward the survey to the editorial representatives of the supporting institution.

A detailed analysis of the entities that publish FECYT database journals indicates that a total of 124 publishing entities, including universities, research centres, and professional associations, publish most of the FECYT database journals.

Funded by the European Union

It is unknown how many UNE members are part of the FECYT database through the titles they publish: FECYT works directly with journals, and UNE works with publishing entities. It is estimated that the survey reached 124 IPSPs, of which 74 have provided valid responses.

Only 4 (5.4%) of these respondents consider themselves Service Providers (SPs), while the remaining 70 (94.5%) identify as Institutional Publishers (IPs). Only 5% indicate that their activities primarily revolve around providing editorial services, with a focus on production, communication, and administrative services.

Most of the 74 Spanish IPSPs who responded to the survey claim to be involved in editing and/or providing services in a multidisciplinary environment. Among them, 19 (25.6%) are editors in social sciences and/or humanities, and seven (9.4%) are editors in natural sciences and/or engineering.

18 (24.3%) of the 74 IPSPs claim not to be affiliated with any parent organisation, while nine (12%) state that they do not have access to this information. The remaining 48 (64.8%) rely on a parent organisation for support, which may encompass facilities and premises, human resource management, general financial and legal services, general IT services, and salaries of permanent staff.

Language and Multilingualism

Out of the total survey participants, one works with texts in English, and three publish exclusively in Spanish (Castilian). The remaining 70 respondents confirm that they work with publications in Spanish and at least one other language. These additional languages include both regional languages within Spain (Galician, Basque, and/or Catalan) and international languages such as French, English, German, Italian, Portuguese, or Russian (Table 143).

English is the second most used language after Spanish. It is noteworthy that almost all journals that have versions in both Spanish and Catalan also provide their services in English. Many of the IPSPs who publish in Spanish and Catalan also offer versions in Galician, while no more than five (6.7%) are additionally published in Basque, alongside other national languages. Based on the information gathered during the survey, multilingualism is a well-established practice in OA scientific journal publishing in Spain.

Funded by the European Union

	n
Spanish	73
English	59
Portuguese	11
Catalan	25
Basque	2
French	13
Italian	6
Galician	3
Russian	2
German	2

N = 74 of 74; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q56 (Spain, all)

Table 143 In what languages is the IPSP able to provide and/or support services? (ES)

Membership Engagement

Out of the 74 Spanish IPSPs who responded to the survey, 28 (37.8%) stated that they do not belong to any association or coalition.13 (17.5%) were unsure about their association membership and 24 (32.4%) claimed to be part of an international organisation. Among these 32.4%, various organisations were mentioned in different proportions, with no single association standing out significantly. These associations include OASPA, OPA Europe, the Federation of European Publishers (FEP), CoAra, DORA, and EASE.

Publication Types

Spanish IPSPs primarily engage in the publication of academic journals, followed by academic books and texts or other content resulting from conferences and professional meetings. Fewer IPSPs reported publishing other research-derived products such as datasets, digital scholarship, or software. Similarly, a limited number of respondents mentioned publishing materials directed toward the media, in addition to digital products and non-academic content.

Out of the 74 Spanish IPSPs in the survey, 69 (92%) stated that their primary focus is on publishing academic journals, with some also involved in book publishing. These institutions can be categorised as IPs. The remaining four (5,4%) mentioned that they exclusively provide services for journal publishing, categorising them as SPs.

Funded by the European Union

Most IPSPs indicated that they cover various fields of knowledge, making them multidisciplinary. Only five (6.7%) respondents specified that their publishing scope is limited to a single discipline; humanities, social sciences, or natural sciences.

Seven (9.4%) respondents claimed to publish some form of non-academic content.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

Most IPSPs in Spain, (78.3%, 58), start the fiscal year with an allocated annual budget. They confirm that both their revenues and expenses are monitored, as it is mandatory. Among these 58 respondents, few have budgets ranging from 101-500K EUR, and only one claims to have a budget between 501K-1M EUR. The rest operate with more modest budgets, which can sometimes be less than 1K EUR.

Regarding the question concerning the use of any external services, 56 editors (75.6%) confirm outsourcing services externally, while 14 (18.9%) handle all editorial work in-house.

When detailing the activities carried out by external services, various tasks are mentioned, including editorial services (manuscript selection, peer-review, plagiarism checking services, etc.), production services (copy-editing, proofreading, typesetting, metadata, etc.), IT services (submission system, platform, website, etc.), communication services (marketing/dissemination, social media, etc.), administrative, legal, and financial services (contracts, accounting, documentation, etc.), training, support, and/or advice on publishing policies and best practices. There is a wide range of contracted services, and the percentages do not provide a clear overall picture of which activities are generally outsourced. It is noteworthy that the term 'volunteer' appears repeatedly.

The idea of collaborating with other organisations to save costs seems to be considered. There is no unanimity on this matter, but many IPSPs would consider collaborating in areas such as editorial services, production services, IT services, communication, administrative, legal, and financial services; training, support, and/or advice on publishing policies, and best practices.

Regarding experiences of failed collaboration with external personnel or infrastructure, when providing details on collaboration practices, some of the comments include "each journal operates differently, we share a management platform, and it lacks efficiency as it attempts to generate a standard model", there is "little involvement, little creativity, little dedication from professionals who work as employees in the journal's editing", or "it is difficult to find freelance professionals who, on one hand, can work in Spanish and... (mentions another concrete language) and, on the other, are sufficiently qualified to edit complex texts with the tool we use."

External funding often comes from national or local political entities. Funders mentioned include the Government of Spain or specific ministries such as the Ministry

Funded by the European Union

of Culture, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the Ministry of Innovation and Universities. Additionally, financial support from initiatives such as María de Guzmán, managed by FECYT, as well as municipalities, provinces, and/or autonomous communities where IPSPs operate, are mentioned. In a couple of cases, other management entities, both public and private, such as CEDRO or the University-Company Foundation, are cited.

Only seven (9.4%) of the Spanish respondents confirm that they expect to generate profits or surpluses, stating that they plan "to invest in our own operation or create a financial buffer". The other 67 (90.5%) do not anticipate any type of profit or prefer not to respond.

The main concerns, sustainability challenges, and potential solutions offered by Spanish IPSPs can be summarised in the following points:

- Limited association income poses financial challenges
- Heavy workload and a lack of knowledge in adapting to new publication requirements create challenges
- There is a need for greater institutional support for open access
- Allocate institutional budgets from public projects for open access
- Implement a well-designed culture and research support policy by the Government of Spain and the EU
- Ensure the university budget allocates more funds to support academic publishing services
- A potential transition to 100% open access publishing could eliminate the need for a sales portal
- Journals with embargoes face a gradual loss of subscribers
- Consider Article Processing Charges (APCs) as a potential solution
- The lack of financial assistance or subsidies is a significant challenge
- Dependence on the institution's budget for sustainability
- Acquiring personnel resources for open access publishing
- Increase the allocation of qualified personnel and budget to cover open access publishing expenses
- Request more support in technical personnel, digital infrastructure, and recognition of tasks through teaching credits from the University
- Universities often do not consider long-term savings, which is a common issue
- Addressing open access requires public funding
- Digitising historical collections relies on public funding.
- Historically, funding depended on subscriptions from association members, but sustaining it is challenging due to journal growth and specialised tasks
- Income from book sales does not contribute to the service's budget but goes to the parent organisation's general accounting
- Funding sustainability could improve if the parent organisation facilitated self-financing formulas
- Diamond route journals should receive generous funding, particularly for paper translation into English
- The main challenge is managing the cost of producing and maintaining the journal

Funded by the European Union

- There is a debate about whether authors should bear protection costs for sustainability
- Offering additional services such as personalised manuscript submissions, digital content creation, and organising scientific journal events with participant fees are potential solutions
- Many tasks related to academic publishing are carried out voluntarily.

Governance

The majority of the 74 IPSPs that responded do have a document describing their governance (Table 144). 75.6% (56) of IPSPs answered this question affirmatively, confirming that they have some form of statutes or association regulations (internal rules). Meanwhile, 10 (13.5%) stated that they have no governance model, and five (6.7%) were unsure of how to respond.

Among the 75.6% who responded affirmatively, most have an administrative office and adhere to the directives of a board of directors, although few of them mentioned being subject to external audits.

	n
Statutes, by-laws, or articles of association (internal regulations)	56
External legislation/requirements/policies that determine the scope of activities	29
Other	5

N = 74 of 74; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey – Q22 (Spain, all)
Table 144 Does the IPSP have a formal document that describes its activities? (ES)

Open Science/Open Access practices

The majority of Spanish IPSPs are published in open access. Out of the 74 surveys received, 62 (91.8%) indicate that 100% of their academic/scholarly journals are published in open access.

The levels of OA publishing in other formats, such as academic books, conference proceedings, grey literature, non-standard research outputs (digital products or products created directly for the media), and other research-derived elements like datasets, digital studies, software, etc., have much lower percentages, sometimes as low as 1%.

According to these data, the publication of scientific journals in OA is a widespread and common practice among Spanish IPSPs. Many of these publications can be considered diamond open access.

Institutional publishers mostly have open access policies. Only nine (12.1%) out of the 74 participants stated that they do not follow any open science or open access policy.

Funded by the European Union

Most of them mention that they do not have such policies for publishing books, and only four (5.4%) claim to have no open access policy for either books or journals.

Among the 65 (87.8%) IPSPs that do have open access policies, there is a similar range in terms of whether the policy they follow aligns with a national policy, their parent organisation's policy, or their own policy. These policies tend to give equal attention to both book and journal publishing, although open science and/or open access policies for academic journal publishing, whether self-established, national, or from the parent organisation, have a greater impact than policies for book publishing or combined policies.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

In Spain, 58 out of 74 respondents (78.3%) claim to be involved in the editorial management of their publications, either through hiring, management, coordinating the peer review process, or through checks on compliance with guidelines, ethical consent, or plagiarism control.

Most state their involvement in editorial quality management, and many of those who respond affirmatively to this question confirm having some form of guidance or instructions to maintain quality.

Regarding peer review, and considering the total responses, there is some diversity. The majority (36.4%, 27/74) conduct only a double-blind peer review, although there are also those who add an editorial review to it. Single-blind peer review, confirmed by a total of 10 (13.5%) respondents, is the second most used modality (Table 145).

Funded by the European Union

	n
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	27
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Editorial review	8
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Open participation in the peer review process (community)	1
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Open reviewers' reports	1
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Open reviewers' reports, Editorial review	2
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	10
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are), Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	7
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are), Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Editorial review	4
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are), Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other), Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors, Editorial review	1
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are), Editorial review	2
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are), Open participation in the peer review process (community), Editorial review	1
No information	8

N = 74 of 74; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q31.1 (Spain, all)

Table 145 Types of peer review used in journals that the IPSP publishes or provides services to. (ES)

In response to the question on whether IPSPs have a specific research integrity policy for publication, the majority (71.6%, 53/74) answer affirmatively, while nine (12.1%) state that they do not have any such policy, and a further nine are unaware.

Technical services efficiency

When asked about what technical services provided by the IPSP, only 2 out of the 74 (2.7%) IPSPs state that they offer a full editorial workflow. The other 72 (97.2%) offer, in addition to a full editorial workflow, a range of other services such as hosting, software, metadata and quality control, or user interface.

Both the services and the technical infrastructure of the IPSPs, according to their responses, are managed internally: through an in-house department with technical staff, through the editorial department itself, or across different departments.

Funded by the European Union

In contrast, external contracting for both functions, whether partial (37.8%, 28), primary (13.5%, 10), or total (8.1%, 6), is less common. This demonstrates that institutional publishers in Spain typically handle the editorial structure internally.

When asked about the publishing system software in use, only four (5.4%) participants in the survey claim to use customization or own development in response to the question. Although only three of them (4%) specify the type of development they work with.

When it comes to a proprietary system and OJS, the number rises to five (6.7%), while only one (1.3%) says that they use other open-source software without specifying which one, and another one mentions using WordPress.

The majority of IPSPs (83.7%, 62), use OJS, either exclusively or in combination with other systems such as Drupal, Janeway, Dataverse, WordPress, etc.

Regarding identifiers, 59 out of the 74 respondents (79.9%) state that they use them, either for publications, for all journals, or for some journals, while four (5.4%) say they do not use any identifiers. The main identifiers referred to are CrossRef-DOI, ISSN, ISBN, Datacite-DOI, Handle, URK, and URN.

Almost all respondents state that they use a CC BY licence or CC BY along with some other Creative Commons licence, while four (5.4%) publish their content under CC0. Only seven (9.4%) claim not to use a CC BY licence.

The 74 IPSPs that responded to the survey publish their content in PDF, either exclusively or in combination with other formats such as HTML, XML, JSON, ePub, or various data, image, or sound formats.

The archiving policy leaves no room for doubt. Except for six IPSPs (8.1%) all claim to have some archiving policy. PKP PN is the most used (21.6%, 16).

Financial problems, administrative constraints, and a lack of personnel are, according to the responses, the main challenges facing Spanish IPSPs. However, the lack of experience and technical limitations of existing infrastructure are also mentioned to a lesser extent.

Visibility, Communication, Marketing, and Impact

Most of the Spanish respondents confirm being responsible for the management (inclusion) of their products in scientific information databases. Many claim to be satisfied with the level of inclusion of content in academic indexes and search engines, mentioning Scopus, Clarivate, Scimago, or Google Scholar as their preferences for improving the indexing of their editorial products.

Funded by the European Union

The same importance is given to all the proposed elements as challenges when applying for indexing. Thus, those who consider 'meeting non-technical participation criteria' very important also consider 'language of communications, requirements, and procedures' and 'service, requirements, and paperwork' very important.

Regarding communication, eight of the 74 Spanish IPSPs (10.8%) claim to have an informative newsletter, but two (2.7%) cannot confirm it.

Only one of the participants indicated that they do not have a data protection policy, and two (2.7%) cannot confirm it. All those with a privacy policy adhere to the guidelines of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the European Union.

When it comes to metrics, 17 (22.9%) confirm that they do not offer any type of measurement publicly, and two (2.7%) have no information. Of those who do offer metrics or public measurements, the majority focus on submission, acceptance, and publication dates, as well as usage metrics (both for papers and publications in general) related to visits, page views, and downloads. Impact metrics, rejection rates, and alternative metrics, such as Altmetric or Plum X Metrics are barely mentioned in the survey, as are samples of geographic distribution.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging

Among the dimensions offered in terms of EDIB, the surveyed IPSPs prioritise language and gender equity. In these two aspects, around 30-40% of the respondents consider that they have implemented measures or that they are in progress and/or under consideration. Other elements, such as sexual identity, ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic background, educational and professional backgrounds, caregiving responsibilities, or disability, do not generate as much interest among the respondents. These elements are not considered a problem in Spain.

In their responses, it is common to find 'don't know', 'no answer', or 'not applicable', although there are a few IPSPs that openly acknowledge not having planned any policies in this regard.

Among the responses provided by the respondents, an example is "We accept all diversity if they comply with what is necessary for the journal". Scientific compliance seems to be the primary consideration without discriminating based on other factors.

Most of those who have not implemented policies to promote codes of conduct, non-discrimination policies, recommendations for inclusive language, anti-bias tools, or personalised support do not plan to do so soon.

There is a significant group of IPSPs (43.2%, 32) that have implemented accessibility measures, although they do not highlight specific requirements such as ATAG, WCAG, UAAG, OpenAIRE guidelines, or DINI certification. Some mention compliance with the

Funded by the European Union

Royal Decree 1112/2018 of September 7, 2018, on the accessibility of websites and mobile applications in the public sector.

The non-application of these standards is often associated, when considered of some importance, with a lack of resources, although a lack of experience and certain technical limitations in setting up the necessary infrastructure are also mentioned. Many of those who have not yet taken measures to ensure and implement various dimensions of EDIB do not appear to be prioritising them.

Conclusions

In Spain, the higher education landscape includes 53 public universities and 36 private ones, where their publishing departments are pivotal in advancing scholarly communication. These entities are well supported by the Spanish University Publishers Union (UNE), which comprises 72 members, coordinates editorial efforts, and promotes its members' assets. Research institutions such as the Spanish National Research Council (CSIC) with over 4,000 researchers and 40 scientific journals play a significant role in shaping the country's scientific output.

One key finding from the survey is that there is no direct relationship between the number of journals and the quantity of papers published in Spain. Institutions vary widely in terms of their publication output.

The survey was sent to out of 1,772 addresses with a participation of 124 IPSPs. 74 of them provided valid responses, providing a comprehensive landscape assessment.

Spanish IPSPs actively engage in multidisciplinary publishing with strong support from parent organisations. They highlight multilingualism, using English as the second most common language after Spanish, often offering content in both Spanish and Catalan.

The landscape of membership associations among Spanish IPSPs is diverse, with no dominant group. Most are focused on academic journal publishing, with limited non-academic content.

Financial management is a priority. Many IPSPs closely monitor finances and use external maintenance services. Funding comes from national and local entities, including government bodies and ministries.

Open access is a key commitment, and most journals are aligned with open access policies. IPSPs actively manage editorial processes using Open Journal Systems (OJS) and they implement accessibility measures to expand their reach.

Despite the various Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) dimensions, Spanish IPSPs prioritise language and gender equity to promote inclusivity and diversity in scholarly publishing.

Funded by the European Union

Sweden (SE)

Author:
Jan Erik Frantsvåg, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, ORCID 0000-0003-3413-8799

During the preparations for the survey, 286 scholarly journals/series were found to be published in Sweden, including all types of business models: OA, toll access, paper-based. A rough classification indicates 160 are institution-based, while 123 are published by professional publishers, mostly commercial. 94 of the 123 are published by international commercial publishers, five by Norwegian commercial publishers and some by publishers whose status is unclear.

Among the institutional series, most are published by Swedish institutional publishing services, though some are published by such services in Denmark, Finland and Norway, and some 30 are standalone journals.

Universities are major actors, but scholarly societies are also important, especially among the self-published journals.

Sweden has 56 journals in DOAJ, six with the DOAJ seal, 50 that let the authors retain all rights, 42 are diamond journals. Sweden has 23 institutional publishers in DOAJ (via GOA8), 23 of which publish diamond journals.

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The DIAMAS survey targeted 84 IPSPs in Sweden. Survey invitations were sent via Qualtrics, supplemented by individual invitations from project members and local mailing lists. 15 valid responses were received from Swedish respondents.

The survey was primarily targeted at IPSPs, but it was expected that a number of standalone journals also would respond, they were also in the target group.

Among the 15 responses, nine responses are from IPs, and the remaining six responses from SPs. Service providers are better represented among the Swedish respondents (40%) than among the survey in total (20.3%).

The responses can be grouped by categories (Table 146). 11 are from Universities and University-based publishing services, two from research institutions, one is a single journal and one is a national publishing platform.

Funded by the European Union

University	4
Institutional publishing	7
Research institute	2
Single journal	1
National publishing platform	1
Total	15

Table 146 IPSP categories. (SE)

Only two respondents report having no parent organisation, both are very small, one is a standalone journal. This is 13.3% of Swedish responses, in the survey in general this is 35.9%. Eight are part of a library in the parent organisation, this is 61.5% compared to 19.6% in the survey in general. Two are part of a department in the parent organisation, one is a department of the parent organisation, while two are 'operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation'. Seven only provide services to their parent organisation, of these six are part of the library, one is part of a department of the parent organisation. Of those six who provide services outside their own parent organisation two are part of the library, one is a department, and one is part of a department of the parent organisation, while two are operating independently but are controlled by a parent organisation.

14 of the 15 IPSP or their parent organisations are public organisations, the names in the survey indicate they are mostly universities. The last is a private not-for-profit organisation, the name indicates it is a charity. Public organisations are over-represented in Sweden (93.3%) compared with the survey in general (65.8%).

None of the Swedish respondents answered the question about the number of people employed by the company or corporation, this was answered by only around 4% of all respondents in the survey.

60% have indicated less than 2, 6.7% have no FTEs. In the survey in general, 27.8% responded with no FTEs and 22.8% less than 2. The larger IPSPs with more than 10 FTEs are 12.5% in the survey in general, but they are not represented among the Swedish respondents as none of the respondents in the sample indicated employing more than 10 FTEs.

IPSPs were asked to indicate what kind of services they provide, here multiple alternatives could be selected. The most common service provided by Swedish IPSPs is IT (86.7%), for the total survey this is the third most common (69.3%). Second in Sweden is split between communication, and 'training, support and/or advice', both with 73.3% compared to 59.4% and 44.7% respectively in the survey in total. After that is production with 66.7%. And, finally, 'administrative, legal and financial' and editorial, both with 46.7% in Sweden, compared to 51.9% and 72.3% respectively in the survey in total. The structure of services in Sweden seems to be somewhat different from the survey in general, it is difficult to point to reasons for this.

Funded by the European Union

Language

Among the respondents, one only publishes in English, this is a standalone journal. One publishes only in Swedish and Norwegian; the remainder all publish in Swedish and English. Five publish in Danish and Norwegian in addition to English and Swedish, one of these also in Finnish, one adds French, one German, one Romanian. One publishes in French, Spanish and Portuguese in addition to Swedish and English. As Swedish is mutually intelligible with Danish and Norwegian (at least in written form), cross-border publication in the author's native language is very common. Language is also an aspect of the Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging section in this country report.

Membership engagement

Five of the respondents are members of a national publisher/scholarly communication association, one is a member of International Publishers Associations, four of OASPA, one of the Association of European University Presses (AEUP) (plus one 'don't know'), two are members of COPE while two don't know, four are members of DORA (while two 'don't know'), four are members of Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA) (three 'don't know'), two of Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure (POSI) (one doesn't know). There are no Swedish members of the Federation of European Publishers, The Online Publishers Association Europe (one doesn't know), European Association of Science Editors (EASE), the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication (Helsinki Initiative), and Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines. The responses here are overall in line with what is found in the survey in general.

Five of the respondents have no membership in the organisations/declarations the survey asked about, the others have indicated membership in at least one. The ones with no membership either represent either single or a few journals, one has no information on this.

The number of 'don't know's' indicates that the person responding may be removed in the organisation from the person deciding on membership questions.

Publication types

Respondents were asked whether they published, published or provided a service, or only serviced various kinds of output. A recurring pattern is that Swedish responders to a lesser degree publish, and to a larger degree either service or publish and service than for the survey in total. This corresponds well to the fact that the Swedish responders have a higher percentage of responders who declare themselves as SPs than the survey in total.

In the whole survey, the single journal is the most common publishing volume among respondents, with 34.7%. Among the Swedish respondents they are only 15.4%. On the other hand, among the Swedish respondents the next size group, 2–5, are 53.8%, 31.5% in the whole survey. So Swedish IPSPs also tend to be small. None of the Swedish

Funded by the European Union

respondents belong to the largest groups of 21 journals or more (Table 147). Two Swedish respondents publish no journals, this is relatively more than for the survey in total, probably reflecting the larger share of SPs among the Swedish respondents.

	Sweden	%	Whole survey	%
1	2	15.4	224	34.7
2-5	7	53.8	203	31.5
6-10	2	15.4	64	9.9
11-20	2	15.4	69	10.7
21-50			54	8.4
51-100			13	2.0
More than 100			18	2.8

N = 13 of 15; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Sweden, all)
N = 645 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (all)

Table 147 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022 – Sweden vs. rest of survey. (SE)

There is a somewhat similar pattern when it comes to the number of scholarly articles published (Table 148). The smallest category is smaller among Swedish respondents, but the next smallest is larger than in the survey as a whole. And the largest categories are smaller or non-existent among Swedish respondents.

	Sweden	%	Whole survey	%
1-10	1	8.3	69	10.8
11-50	7	58.3	262	41.1
51-100	2	16.7	95	14.9
101-200	1	8.3	79	12.4
201-500			70	11.0
More than 500	1	8.3	63	9.9

N = 638 of 685; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (all)
N = 12 of 15; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Sweden, all)

Table 148 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022 – Sweden vs. rest of survey. (SE)

Less than half of the Swedish respondents say they publish books, for the survey in total nearly 60% publish books. It could look like the numbers for Sweden indicate those who publish books publish slightly more books than for the survey in total.

Only four of the Swedish respondents indicate they publish conference outputs while nearly half of the respondents do in the total survey. Here, too, it could look like the Swedish respondents who publish, publish more than the average respondent.

The respondents also were asked to indicate in which disciplines they publish (Table 149).

Funded by the European Union

	Sweden	%	Whole survey	%
Agricultural sciences	3	20.0	82	12.0
Engineering and technology	4	26.7	163	23.9
Humanities	11	73.3	369	54.2
Medical and health sciences	5	33.3	146	21.4
Multidisciplinary	9	60.0	308	45.2
Natural sciences	6	40.0	183	26.9
Non-academic	1	6.7	41	6.0
Social sciences	12	80.0	376	55.2

N = 681 of 685; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (all)
N = 15 of 15; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Sweden, all)

Table 149 Disciplines covered - Sweden vs. rest of survey. (SE)

It might seem strange that the percentages are higher for all disciplines for Sweden than for the survey in total. This might be explained by the fact that the average Swedish respondent has more journals than for the survey in total, enabling the average Swedish respondent to cover more fields. The dominance of universities and university-based platforms makes it natural that most respondents are active in many fields, unlike societies or research institutes who will mostly be more narrow when it comes to disciplines.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

About half of the respondents have an approved annual budget. Four of the seven who have an approved budget have a budget in the 51–100K EUR range. One does not know, then there is one each in the 1–10K EUR and 11–50K EUR range. No IPSP has a budget over 100K EUR. It still looks like the average budget might be higher in Sweden than in the survey in total.

For those who have a budget, it generally seems there is a formal monitoring of the income and expenses.

Looking at the type of in-kind support that is provided by the parent organisations, Sweden is generally quite similar to the survey respondents in total. The most marked difference is that salaries of temporary staff is received by only 7.7% in Sweden, while by 31.3% in the survey in general.

Around three quarters of respondents use external services, this is in line with the survey in general. When it comes to the various kinds of external services, the number of Swedish respondents choosing the various alternatives are too small to warrant further comment.

External services for training support and or advice on publishing policies and best practice are received as in-kind services by a majority (55.6%) of Swedish respondents who have answered this question, compared to 26.5% for the survey in total.

Funded by the European Union

It could seem the Swedish respondents overall see less need for cooperation with others, compared to the survey in total, though not necessarily in all areas.

Swedish respondents seem more reliant on fixed and permanent subsidies from the parent organisation than for the survey in total. 66.7% have indicated high or very high reliance, compared to 44.9% for the survey total.

Swedish respondents also seem more reliant on 'periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation' than for the survey total. 57.1% of Swedish respondents have such support, as compared to 39% for the survey total, and the 'high' option is also more common in Sweden. A similar pattern, though not so clearly deviating from the survey total, appears with regards to reliance on time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside their own organisation. This is also the case for permanent public government funding, where high or very high amounts to 38.5% for Sweden compared to 22.5% for the survey total.

Reliance on collective funding is negligible in Sweden, lower than for the survey total even if it is not very important for the survey total either. Reliance on voluntary author contributions is low in Sweden, as for the survey total. The same goes for reliance on content and print sales and on APCs.

With regards the stability of the various sources of income, Fixed and permanent subsidies from parent organisations seems slightly more stable in Sweden compared to the survey total, while periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisations is roughly as stable in Sweden as in the survey total. For other types of support, the responses are too few to form a useful picture.

When it comes to Swedish reliance on various resources, non-monetary or in kind support looks rather similar to the survey in general. Sweden could look slightly less dependent on monetary income compared to the survey total.

Expectations to produce a profit/surplus seems lower for the Swedish respondents than for the survey total.

The survey question regarding what respondents saw as the main challenges related to financial sustainability produced answers addressing funding and funding models.

Governance

Formal documents describing activities, such as statutes/by-laws/articles of association are equally common in Sweden as for other countries, the same goes for external legislation /requirements/policies.

The activities are overseen by a management office for 33.3% of the Swedish respondents, somewhat less than the 52% for the survey total. 63.6% have a governing board, this compares well to the survey total of 63%. Only 9.1% of Swedish respondents are being overseen through external audit of accounts, compared to 31.9% for the survey total. 38.5% of Swedish respondents have a governance model that includes

Funded by the European Union

representation from the wider scholarly community, corresponding well to the survey total of 38.9%.

Open Science/Open Access practices

Those respondents who have answered the questions about what percentage of their output is OA, have given answers ranging from 90% to 100%. All journals are published totally OA, that also goes for conference output and 'other' outputs. Academic books range from 90% to 100%, while grey literature and non-academic outputs have a 95% OA rate.

Swedish respondents report following national and/or parent organisation OA policies for journals to the same extent as the survey total, some fewer follow their own policies, 33.3% compared to 48.1% for the survey total. For books the picture is somewhat different, only 16.7% of Swedish respondents report following a national policy, compared to 38.1% for the survey total. On the other hand, 66.7% follow a parent organisation policy, against 38.9% for the survey total.

In Sweden, as in the survey total, the most common issues to be covered by the Open Science/Open Access policies, are copyright and use of open licences. Self-archiving, which is equally important in the survey total with 70.5%, is only 38.5% for the Swedish respondents. Use of identifiers is 50% in the survey total, but only 30.8% for the Swedish respondents.

Acceptance of preprints/working papers in journals is equally high in Sweden as in the survey total, around 30%, but somewhat higher for books, 23.1% compared to 13.3% for the survey total.

Acceptance of self-archiving is on the same level in Sweden as in the survey total, while encouraging or allowing sharing of full-text via academic sharing services is slightly higher in Sweden (69.2% and 46.2% respectively) compared to the survey total (59.8% and 24.6%).

No Swedish respondent reports having embargo periods for self-archiving, as opposed to 18.3% for the survey total.

30.8% of Swedish respondents make citations in all journals available according to I4OC principles, against 43.4% for the survey total, with 23.1% doing it for some journals, compared to 5.9% for the survey total. For books, the number for books is 7.7% compared to 14% for the survey total.

Use of CC or other open licences is on the same level in Sweden as for the survey total. CC BY is more popular in Sweden (92.3%) compared to the survey total (55.5%), so is CC BY-NC with 53.8% compared to 27.5%. In Sweden only CC licences are used, in the survey total 5.9% offer other open licences.

In the survey total, 51.4% either offer, experiment with or would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage, compared to 37.5% among the Swedish respondents.

Funded by the European Union

30.8% of Swedish respondents report having a research data sharing policy at any level, compared to 58.4% for the survey total.

Distinguishing contributor roles is not done among the Swedish respondents, compared to 16.9% of the survey total.

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

The types of peer review in use is roughly the same in Sweden as for the rest of the survey. The most significant difference is that while open reviewer's reports are in use by 7.2% of the respondents in the survey total, this is not in use at all among the Swedish respondents.

38.5% of Swedish respondents report being involved in the editorial management of publications, compared to 69.4% for the survey total. Looking at the list of which tasks the respondents are involved in, it is clear that Swedish respondents are less involved in any of the tasks mentioned, this includes involvement in managing editorial quality. But when it comes to providing guidelines and instructions, 100% of Swedish respondents are involved in this, slightly more than the 91.4% for the survey total.

In the survey total 63.3% have a specific policy on research integrity/research ethics, only 30.8% among the Swedish respondents.

Technical services efficiency

Among the technical services provided, hosting (84.6% compared to 58.4% in the survey total) and user interface (61.5% compared to 43.9%) is where the Swedish responses differ most from the overall picture in the survey total.

Services and infrastructures are somewhat more reliant upon in house activities by a dedicated publishing department or IT department personnel among Swedish respondents, than in the survey total.

In house maintenance and updating by IT department personnel is somewhat more important in Sweden than in the survey total, 75% compared to 54.1%, partially outsourcing is also more common, 41.7% compared to 22.3%.

With 76.9%, OJS is more dominant as a publishing system in Sweden than in the survey total (61.4%).

Assignment of PIDs seems at least as widespread among Swedish respondents as for the survey total. CrossRef DOIs are more dominant in Sweden than in the survey total, 90.9% compared to 77%. URNs are also more widely used, 27.3% compared to 5.6% for the survey total.

Fewer Swedish respondents release their metadata openly with a standard metadata description schema. 30.8% answer no, compared to 19.1% in the survey total. The 'don't

Funded by the European Union

know' responses are 38.5% in Sweden, compared to 27.8% in the survey total, and a CC BY licence is used by 37% in the survey total, compared to 15.4% in Sweden.

PDF is the dominant format type in Sweden; 92.3% compared with 97.3% in the survey total. XML is somewhat more common in Sweden with 30.8% compared to 20.2% in the survey total.

69.2% of Swedish respondents have an archiving/backup policy, this is in line with the survey total of 73.5%. CLOCKSS is used by 14.3% of Swedish respondents, 17.8% in the survey total. In the survey total 16.8% use LOCKSS, no Swedish respondent report using this service. Use of a national institutional library or infrastructure in Sweden is in line with the survey total, 70% compared to 71.7%. PKP PN is slightly more used in Sweden, 33.3% compared to 21.7% in the survey total. Portico or PubMed Central are not reported by Swedish respondents, compared to 13.0% and 7.4% in the survey total. 41.7% of Swedish respondents report that archiving and backup is not a challenge, more than the survey total of 30.4%. 8.3% of Swedish respondents report financial constraints as a challenge, against 27.8% in the survey total, and 16.7% report lack of human resources against 32.7% in the survey total.

When it comes to providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services, 23.1% of Swedish respondents report this not to be a problem, compared to 12.6% in the survey total. The major problem reported by the Swedish respondents is lack of human resources with 61.5%, slightly higher than the 55% in the survey total. Financial constraints are reported to be a challenge by 38.5% of the Swedish respondents, this is 59.8% in the survey total. Lack of expertise seems to be a bigger problem in Sweden (30.8%) than in the survey total (18.6%).

15.4% of Swedish respondents report supplying and enriching metadata/PIDs not being a challenge, against 24.2% in the survey total. Lack of expertise is the major difference, 38.5% in Sweden compared to 27.9% in the survey total, while the major challenge is lack of human resources with 46.2% compared to 43.1% in the survey total.

When it comes to the challenges with trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services, lack of human resources is the major challenge in Sweden with 53.8%, more than in the survey total where 40.3% have this problem. Both the sample and the survey total report this as the most common problem. Ony 7.7% in Sweden respond they have no challenges in this field, compared to 21.5% in the survey total.

Visibility, Communication, Marketing, and Impact

Swedish respondents are somewhat less satisfied with their content's inclusion in search engines/indexes. Only 30.8% are satisfied, 69.2% want improvement, while the survey total responses are 45.4% and 54.4% respectively. It is DOAJ where Swedish respondents primarily feel a need for better inclusion/indexation.

Just 25% of Swedish respondents say the IPSP manages indexation in scientific information databases, for the survey total this is 64%.

Funded by the European Union

Paying for membership of organisations is a much smaller challenge in Sweden than in the survey total, this is also the case for paying for recurring charges. When it comes to satisfying metadata requirements, and satisfying non-technical participation criteria, Sweden is more in line with the survey total. This is also the case for satisfying technical participation criteria, while Swedish respondents see communications/requirements/paperwork in another language as less of a challenge than the survey total, this is also the case for communications/requirements/paperwork only in English and also for such paperwork being too technical.

Less than half (46.2%) of Swedish respondents use newsletters/social media/networking profiles to inform the community about updates, quite different from the survey total of 66%.

Only 38.5% of Swedish respondents say they have a data protection policy, the survey total is 65%. Although, 92.3% have a privacy policy whereas the survey total is 66.6%.

Some fewer Swedish respondents say they display metrics publicly compared to the survey total. Too few have indicated which metrics they use to merit commenting upon.

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

30.8% of Swedish respondents have either implemented or are considering implementing mechanisms to address age-related aspects of EDIB. For the survey total 41.2% having implemented, are in progress or considering, which is somewhat higher.

Most Swedish respondents report 'don't know' or 'not applicable' when it comes to caring responsibilities, with only 7.7% having implemented measures compared to 26.1% have implemented, are in progress or are considering for the survey total. Roughly the same picture is found for disability, with corresponding numbers being 7.7% for Sweden, 34.3% for the survey total.

30.8% of Swedish respondents have implemented mechanisms regarding educational and professional background, 41.2% have implemented, are in progress or considering, for the survey total. When it comes to ethnicity and culture 23.1% have implemented among the Swedish respondents, while 37.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or contemplating in the survey total.

23.1% of Swedish respondents have implemented measures related to gender, while 45.3% of the survey total has implemented, are in progress or considering. Language is addressed by 15.4% of Swedish respondents, 48.6% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering. 15.4% of Swedish respondents have addressed religious background compared to 28.8% for the survey total. Sexual identity aspects are covered by 15.4% of Swedish respondents, while 31.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. Socio-economic

Funded by the European Union

background is covered by 23.1% of Swedish respondents, while 36.4% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

When asked about what measures have been put in place to address the aspects mentioned above, 49.3% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering code of conduct/non-discrimination/positive discrimination policy, while among Swedish respondents 38.5% have implemented this. Data collection monitoring and annual reporting is in place for 15.4% of Swedish respondents, while for the survey total 35.2% have this in place, are in progress or are considering. 38.5% of Swedish respondents have implemented measures or are in progress when it comes to recommendations for the use of inclusive language, 30.5% for the survey total, plus 12.2% considering. When it comes to tailored support or personal coaching, 15.4% of Swedish respondents have implemented this, 29% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. 7.7% of Swedish respondents have implemented training, awareness-raising, anti-bias tools, 34.7% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or considering.

15.4% of Swedish respondents have a published accessibility policy, 23.1% have a policy but it isn't published. Corresponding numbers for the survey total are 21.8% and 13.2%.

No Swedish respondents meet the ATAG criteria, very few do in the survey total but 7.2% are considering. Furthermore, no Swedish respondents meet the DINI certificate criteria or OpenAIRE guidelines, compared to 12.3% and 26.4% respectively either implemented, in progress or are considering in the survey total. UAAG criteria are not met by any Swedish respondent, 0.8% of the survey total have implemented while 7.8% are in progress or considering. The Swedish respondents fare better when it comes to the WCAG requirements, with 23.1% having implemented. In the survey total 5.8% have implemented while 13% are in progress or considering.

Among challenges in meeting accessibility standards, lack of expertise is seen as important or very important by 61.6% of Swedish respondents, compared to 67.6% in the survey total. Lack of expertise is rated important/very important by 53.9% of Swedish respondents, 58.5% of the survey total. Technical limitations of existing infrastructure is seen as important or very important by 53.9% of Swedish respondents, 58.3% in the survey total.

While 38.4% of the survey total have implemented or are in progress or considering a Gender Equality Plan, this applies to only 7.7% of Swedish respondents, plus one that states the mother organisation has such a plan. For requiring authors to inform about gender sensitive research data, the same percentages are 26.3% and 7.7%. Requirements to use gender impartial language is implemented, in progress or considering for 45.3% in the survey total, 15.4% among Swedish respondents.

When it comes to languages services are provided or supported in, the picture is, of course, very different from the survey totals. Swedish and English are covered by nearly all respondents (92.3%). Interestingly there are respondents that cannot provide or support in English or Swedish. Otherwise, Danish, German and Norwegian are each offered by 15.4% of Swedish respondents.

Funded by the European Union

Bilingual publishing of full text in the form of different language versions in the same document is implemented or in progress for 38.5% of Swedish respondents, sequential different language versions 7.7% and simultaneous different language versions as separate documents 38.5%. For the survey total, these numbers are 47.3%, 22.7% and 22.7% ('considering' is included, no Swedish respondent uses that alternative). 61.5% of Swedish respondents have multilingual publication of abstracts, 75.8% in the survey total. Improving machine translation literacy is not implemented or on the agenda of any Swedish respondent, 23.9% of the survey total have implemented, are in progress or are considering. Abstracts in English when the original language is other than English is implemented, in progress or under consideration by 76.9% of Swedish respondents, 67.5% in the survey total. Translation and/or language check services are implemented or in progress for 23.1% of Swedish respondents, 35.8% (plus 8.6% considering) in the survey total. Translation of metadata into English is implemented or being considered by 30.8% of Swedish respondents, 51.3% in the survey total, including 6.2% in progress. Using toolkits or training to address language bias in peer review is not on the agenda of any Swedish respondent, 20.8% of the survey total has either implemented, are in progress or considering such measures.

Many of these aspects have not been addressed in Sweden to the same extent as in many other countries. It could be that at least some of these aspects need less addressing in Sweden due to legislation or other mechanisms implemented on a national level. But it could also be that awareness about these aspects is less developed in Sweden. A striking aspect is that for many of these questions, some of the Swedish respondents have implemented measures, but considering or in progress are very little used, while these responses are quite common among the survey total. There is, in other words, little progress going on regarding many of these aspects at least, compared with the survey respondents in general.

Funded by the European Union

Switzerland (CH)

Author; Elio Pellin, University Library of Bern, ORCID 0000-0002-4076-6743

Switzerland, which has strong federal structures, formulated and adopted national OA-guidelines and strategies surprisingly early.

- In 2006, both the Swiss National Science Foundation and the Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences signed the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (Hacker, 2023, p. 213; Hirschmann & Verdicchio, 2017, p. 215f).
- Since 2008, the SNSF has obliged grantees to publish their research results in open access. In 2022, the SNSF joined cOAlition S and has committed to implement Plan S.
- In 2014, the Swiss Academy of Medical Sciences (SAMS) published the position paper Promoting open access to research results.
- In 2016, the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences was the first scientific academy in Switzerland to present an OA strategy.
- In 2017, the National Open Access Strategy for Switzerland came into force. In 2015, SERI (State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation) had commissioned swissuniversities to develop a national OA strategy with the support of the Swiss National Science Foundation.

These measures have resulted in a considerable uptake in open access practices. For 2022, the Swiss Open Access Monitor shows 26,835 journal articles (72.7%) in open access compared to 10,092 journal articles (27.3%) in closed access. Unfortunately, the monitor does not provide national figures on the proportion of diamond journal articles.

The SNSF reports an OA share of 77% for projects it supported in 2021: 17% OA Green, 28% OA Gold, 32% Hybrid. Figures for the diamond share of Gold OA publications are not given. The SNSF does not support hybrid publications or diamond journals. The costs of hybrid publications are largely covered by the read and publish agreements that the consortium of Swiss university libraries negotiates with scientific publishers and that can be signed by the universities.

While the National Open Access Strategy and the Action Plan for the National Strategy mention diamond OA only in passing and indirectly ("alternative forms of publication", "alternative funding models"), the swissuniversities Open Access Guidelines recommends that Swiss universities operate publication platforms for journals and books. In the same year, the Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences declared that they support alternative publication platforms and cooperate with universities and libraries for this purpose.

A recent landscape study showed that almost half (47.3%) of the 186 diamond OA journals in Switzerland (Hahn, Hehn et al., 2023, p. 12) are published by HEIs (higher

Funded by the European Union

education institutions). More than half of them, a total of 26.3%, are hosted and maintained on the institutional diamond OA platforms of these HEIs:

- Bern Open Publishing, BOP (University of Bern, since 2013)
- Hauptbibliothek Open Publishing Environment, HOPE (University of Zurich, since 2015)
- eterna (University of Basel, since 2018)
- Open Access Publications, OAP (University of Geneva, since 2018)
- Shared Open Access Publishing Platform, SOAP2 (Fribourg, Lausanne, Lucerne, Neuchâtel, since 2021).

These platforms are powered by OJS, and university IPSPs are networked in the OJS Swiss Community of Practice. Outside of these platforms, Swiss diamond journals are published by academic societies, research institutions or government agencies.

The Swiss landscape study notes that diamond OA journals "largely depend on the support of volunteers and the institutions with which editors are affiliated as well as on grants from academic societies and governmental organizations to cover their costs, mainly for editorial workflows and infrastructure." (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 16). Just under half of the diamond journals are published by HEIs (88 journals, 47.3%). Academic societies publish 37 journals (19.9%). Eleven journals (5.9%) are published by research organisations that are not higher education institutions, such as CERN or the Natural History Museum Geneva. Nine journals (4.8%) are published by government agencies such as the World Health Organization or the Federal Office for Agriculture. And seven journals are published by a non-profit association whose purpose is the publication of the respective journal (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 12).

Higher education institutions (HEI)	88 journals	47.31%
Academic societies	37 journals	19.89%
Research organisations	11 journals	5.91%
Government agencies	9 journals	4.84%

Table 150 Publisher types. (CH)

The Swiss landscape study counts 21 Diamond journals published by for-profit publishers (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 12). These are likely to be collaborations between editors and specialised, smaller publishers, such as Seismo, Chronos, or Schwabe. These journals are often financed by one of the Swiss academies (mostly the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences), via membership fees and the sale of printed copies.

The two major OA publishers also based in Switzerland, MDPI and Frontiers, are largely aligned with the APC business model. However, Frontiers acts not only as a publisher, but also as a provider of publication services, for example for the journals of Swiss School of Public Health (SSPH), whose Globalequity APC Feewaiver program is funded by swissuniversities.

Funded by the European Union

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

19 IPSPs are part of the Swiss sample. 11 of the 19 respondents identified themselves as institutional publishers, eight as service providers. The majority of IPSPs describe themselves as a private not-for-profit organisation (10/19). Another seven are public organisations. 10 IPSPs have more than two FTE for paid staff, five have 2-5- FTE, 2 have none and one IPSP has more than 30 FTE for paid staff.

Seven IPSPs published one academic journal in 2022, five published between 2 and 5, five IPSPs published between 11 and 20 journals and one IPSP states to have published more than 100 journals (Table 151).

Three IPSPs published 1-10 scholarly articles in 2022, four published 11-50, two between 51 and 100, 5 101-200, three published between 201 and 500 and one more than 500 (Table 152).

	n	%
1	7	38.9
2-5	5	27.8
11-20	5	27.8
More than 100	1	5.6

N = 18 of 19; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.1 (Switzerland, all)

Table 151 Number of academic scholarly journals published in 2022. (CH)

	n	%
1-10	3	16.7
11-50	4	22.2
51-100	2	11.1
101-200	5	27.8
201-500	3	16.7
More than 500	1	5.6

N = 18 of 19; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (Switzerland, all)

Table 152 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022. (CH)

Unsurprisingly, the disciplines most represented are those in which publishing without APCs is a tradition (social sciences and humanities), while disciplines with a strong link to the APC business model are significantly less represented (medical and health sciences, natural sciences) (Table 153).

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Humanities	15	78.9
Medical and health sciences	5	26.3
Multidisciplinary	4	21.1
Natural sciences	4	21.1
Non-academic	1	5.3
Social sciences	10	52.6

N = 19 of 19; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (Switzerland, all)

Table 153 Disciplines covered. (CH)

Broken down by diamond journals rather than IPSPs, the Swiss landscape study shows a slightly different picture (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 13). In terms of journals, the social sciences predominate with around 45% (Table 154).

Humanities	39 journals	20.97%
Life Sciences & Biomedicine	39 journals	20.97%
Interdisciplinary	6 journals	3.23%
Physical Sciences	10 journals	5.38%
Technology	9 journals	4.84%
Social Sciences	83 journals	44,62%

Table 154 Disciplines covered by number of journals. (CH)

Publication language and multilingualism

All 19 of the Swiss IPSPs in the survey sample publish in English followed by the two major Swiss national languages: 15 IPSPs publish in French, 13 in German. Five IPSPs publish in the third-largest language (Italian) and one in Romansch, the smallest national language. A further three IPSPs publish in Spanish.

When compared with the Landscape study, 44.1% of the Swiss diamond journals have more than one publishing language. English-French-German and English-French-German-Italian are the most common combinations. 36.6% publish only in English, 9.7% only in German, 8.6% only in French and 1.1% only in Italian (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 14).

Membership Engagement

Five of the IPSPs that responded signed the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), Two are members of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and two are members of the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA). None of the IPSPs are members of the Federation of European Publishers (FEP), Association of

Funded by the European Union

European University Presses (AEUP) or the International Publishers Associations (IPA Academy).

The IPSPs of the HEIs are members in the national open access working group (AKOA). AKOA supports the Swiss Library Network for Education and Research (SLiNer) with position papers on issues such as hybrid open access publishing, secondary publication rights or the development of the national open access strategy (Hacker, 2023).

Parent Organization, Relationship with IPSP, and Staff

Seven out of the 19 IPSPs have a parent organisation. 10 do not have a parent organisation and two surprisingly do not know. The parent organisations support the IPSPs primarily with Human Resource management, financial and legal services, IT services and with the staff salaries (Table 155).

	n	%
Facilities and premises	3	42.9
General IT services	4	57.1
Human Resource management, general financial and legal services	5	71.4
Salaries of permanent staff	4	57.1
Salaries of temporary staff	1	14.3
Service-specific IT services	4	57.1
Not applicable	1	14.3

N = 7 of 19; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q13 (Switzerland, all)

Table 155 In kind support provided by parent organisation. (CH)

Scope of Services and Publications

Most of the Swiss IPSPs indicate that they publish academic journals (11/18). A further four offer publication and service for journals, while three provide a service only.

Academic books are not yet widely established among Swiss IPSPs. Only seven publish books (4 publish, 3 publish and service). Other types of output like grey literature, non-academic or conference output hardly play a role.

The services that Swiss IPSPs provide are mainly IT (15/19), communication (13/19), administrative, legal and financial services; some offer production and editorial services (12/19). Training, support and/or advice is provided by 10 out of 19.

A considerable number of IPSPs would consider collaborating with other organisations for training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice (8/17).

Funded by the European Union

Seven out of 17 would consider a collaboration for communication services, Six out of 17 for IT services and five for production services.

More than half of the Swiss IPSPs use external services (11/18). Five out of nine use in-kind external IT services, three outsourced IT Services. Two out of six use outsourced production services, and two in-kind production services also.

Technical services

The most widely used publishing system among Swiss IPSPs is OJS (14/18). Four IPSPs work with a customisation or an own development and three use OMP (Open Monograph Press).

14 IPSPs out of 18 provide hosting and user interface, 13 full editorial workflow, 10 software, nine metadata control and six offer a partial editorial workflow.

The maintenance and updating of technical infrastructure is mainly done in house: by IT department personnel (8/17), across different departments (3) or by a dedicated publishing department (1).

Eight IPSPs have outsourced the maintenance and updating of technical infrastructure: mainly (5), partially (3).

The maintenance and updating of technical services is ensured in house: by IT department personnel (7/15) or by a dedicated publishing department (5/15). Three out of 15 mainly or partially outsource the maintenance and updating of technical services.

Metadata and Identifiers

Unique persistent identifiers are assigned by most of the Swiss IPSPs. Nine out of 18 for all publications, six out of 18 for all journals (Table 156).

	n	%
CrossRef-DOI	11	73.3
Datacite-DOI	3	20.0
ISBN	5	33.3
ISSN	9	60.0
URN	1	6.7
Other (please specify)	1	6.7

N = 15 of 19; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q37.1 (Switzerland, all)

Table 156 Persistent identifiers (PIDs). (CH)

Funded by the European Union

Metadata are usually released openly under a CC BY or another Creative Commons licence (6/18) or under the Creative Commons public domain licence CC0 (3/18).

Remarkably, in the Swiss Landscape study 14 out of 32 editors stated that they do not know whether their journal provides standardised article metadata (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 35).

Regarding content formats, PDF is dominant with all IPSPs making content available in this format. 13 out of 18 make content available in HTML and only three in XML, while seven provide image or video formats and six sound files.

It is expected that the amount of IPSPs providing content in XML format will increase with the efforts to improve indexing, because indexes like Redalyc or Pubmed require JATS XML and Plan S strongly recommends a machine-readable community standard format such as JATS XML.

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

IPSPs in Switzerland receive stable funding from their parent organisations. Time limited grants or subsidies from outside the organisation and permanent public government funding are less important. Voluntary author contributions, content and print sales or APCs do not play a significant role in the financing of Swiss IPSPs. Swiss IPSPs are under no pressure to make a profit (Table 157).

	n	%
No, limited losses/overspending are permitted	7	38.9
No, losses/overspending are not permitted	2	11.1
Not applicable	3	16.7
Other (please specify)	2	11.1
Yes, to invest in our own operation or create a financial buffer	3	16.7
Don't know	1	5.6

N = 18 of 19; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q20 (Switzerland, all)

Table 157 Expectation to produce a profit / surplus. (CH)

While funding for IPSPs is stable, it is the biggest concern for Swiss diamond journals (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 17). The funding system of OA publications in Switzerland is not designed to support diamond journals; it is largely based on APCs (this is true for the SNSF as well as the publication funds of the universities) and hybrid OA (read and publish agreements).

Possible funding sources for diamond journals are membership fees, sale of printed copies, higher education institutions, foundations and societies, and governmental institutions (Hahn et al., 2023, pp. 17, 37).

Funded by the European Union

Visibility, Communication, and Impact

While eight out of 16 IPSPs consider their content to be very well indexed, the other half would like to see better indexing. 73 Swiss diamond journals are listed in DOAJ. According to the Swiss Landscape study, DOAJ and Google Scholar are the most common indexes for diamond journals in Switzerland. 10 of the 186 journals are indexed in Scopus, none in Web of Science (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 29).

Five out of 10 IPSPS manage the indexation in scientific information databases, and three do not. It can be assumed that they leave that to the journal editors. In this context, the finding from the Swiss Landscape study should be taken seriously "Related to voluntary work, some editors reported challenges with the indexation of content, an area in which they are unable to compete with publishing houses without proper support and resources" (Hahn et al., 2023, p. 17). Unfortunately, the number and distribution of the few responses to corresponding questions in the DIAMAS survey do not allow any conclusions to be drawn about the obstacles to better indexing.

Swiss IPSPs maintain communication channels to inform the community about updates (13/17).

The question about metrics was answered by only four IPSPs. Most important are visits/views/downloads (3), Altmetric (2) and Plum X Metrics.

Eight IPSPs out of 19 have a data protection policy and eight do not. Five out of 17 have a privacy policy (GDPR or non-EU equivalent), eight do not.

Open Science/Open Access Policy

Switzerland has had a national open access policy since 2017 (see above), which, under the leadership of swissuniversities, is currently being updated to cover the years 2025-2028.

Regarding journals, most Swiss IPSPs follow an OA policy. Eight out of 17 follow their own OA policy, seven follow the national policy and three follow the policy of their parent organisation.

Regarding books, all IPSPs follow an OA policy: six out of eight follow the national policy, three follow their own OA policy and three follow the policy of their parent organisation.

The policies make provisions for the use of open licences and for copyright (12/13), self-archiving and third-party copyrights (7/13), use of identifiers (6/13) and metadata rights (4/13).

Funded by the European Union

Submissions and self-archiving

Seven IPSPs out of 17 indicate that for all journals, they accept submissions that have been publicly shared as preprints or working papers.

Swiss IPSPs allow self-archiving in open repositories: 13 out of 17 for all journals, six for all books. Eight IPSPs out of 16 encourage or allow sharing the full text via academic sharing services for all journals, one for some journals and three for books. No IPSP imposes embargo periods for self-archiving.

Licensing

Creative Commons licences or other open licences are common for Swiss IPSPs. Eight out of 16 recommend CC BY, seven CC BY-SA, four CC BY-NC and CC BY-NC-ND, and three CC BY-NC-SA.

Open Peer Review

Among Swiss IPSPs, there is a slight tendency towards open peer review. Two out of 11 enabled forms of open peer review, another two are experimenting with open peer review and four consider implementing open peer review at a later stage.

Five out of 10 IPSPs have a type of peer review where the identity of reviewers, authors and editors is open. Five use editor reviews, four feature double-blind peer review and four single-blind peer review.

Archiving

The majority of Swiss IPSPs have an archiving or backup policy (10/17). Seven IPSPs use PKP PN as a digital preservation service, three use CLOCKSS, three LOCKSS and three a national infrastructure.

Not surprisingly considering the Swiss federal system, national infrastructures (unlike in Croatia with HRČAK or in France with HAL) play a minor role for the archiving of diamond journals in Switzerland. Exceptions are, for example, the E-Periodica platform of the ETH library or e-helvetica of the Swiss National Library, where - besides publishers such as MDPI or Karger - self-publishers and small publishers can archive their books and journals (PDF and EPub formats only).

Five IPSPs indicate lack of expertise as a challenge for archiving and backing up or preserving content and software, four indicate a lack of human resources, three financial constraints and two technical limitations of existing infrastructure. For four IPSPs archiving is not a challenge.

Funded by the European Union

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

Among the questions about the dimensions of EDIB, multilingualism has the most agreement: seven out of 17 consider them implemented, two in progress. Regarding gender, four out of 16 consider it implemented, three in progress and two considering. For caring responsibilities, three have implemented, two in progress. Finally, for age (career stage), two have implemented, with three in progress.

The responses on ethnicity and culture, age, and disability are too low to comment upon. However, it is noteworthy that between five and seven IPSPs indicated that these options in the survey were not applicable to them.

Funded by the European Union

United Kingdom (UK)

Author: Graham Stone, Jisc, ORCID 0000-0002-5189-373X

Journal publishing in the UK has been dominated by vendor consolidation, vertical integration and lock-in with UK institutions spending 110.5M EUR (96.3M GBP) with the top five journal publishers: Elsevier, Springer, Wiley, Taylor & Francis (Informa), and Sage. In July 2023, 96.1% of UKRI funded research articles were compliant and eligible for UKRI OA funds through Transitional Agreements (TAs), or compliant via the green route. There is a growing concern by institutions and funders on the impact of larger publishers' commercial strategies on long term sustainability and equity, including the ability for less well-resourced countries or institutions to publish.

However, in the last 10 years the UK has seen a rise in the number of New University Presses and scholar-led publishers. A 2017 report highlighted a new wave of university presses. In tandem, a small but notable number of academics and researchers set up their own publishing initiatives, often demonstrating an innovative or unique approach either in workflow, peer review, technology or business model (Adema & Stone, 2017). Both New University Presses and scholar-led publishing have used the diamond OA model from their outset. For example, Open Book Publishers established in 2008, University of Huddersfield Press established in 2010 and UCL press established in 2015.

The UK also features a number of 'service providers' based or established in UK institutions, which either offer diamond OA publishing or services that can be used by open access publishers to publish diamond journals. Many libraries in the UK are running OJS servers, but do not consider themselves as publishers.

There are also examples of consortial university publishing where universities with existing collaboration agreements have launched collaborative university presses. These presses have been successful in using the combined strength of participating universities to pool resources to promote diamond OA.

There are also approximately 180 OA journals in the UK using OJS. Many of these use library hosting services. However, a number are based within academic departments.

Finally, a number of new university presses in the UK have now come together to launch the Open Institutional Publishing Association (OIPA), which aims to be a community of practice for institutional publishing in the UK.

The UK has 2,068 journals in DOAJ, 635 with the DOAJ seal, 1114 that let authors retain all rights, 461 are diamond journals. The United Kingdom has 115 institutional publishers in DOAJ (via GOA8), 101 of which publish diamond journals.

Funded by the European Union

DIAMAS Survey, dissemination, response rate, respondents

The survey contacted 98 UK IPSPs, this list was compiled by combining data from the project and a report sent to Jisc by PKP of OJS instances in the UK. The original list compiled by the project gave evidence of the consolidation in the UK journals market as many learned society journals had moved to commercial publishers. A significant number of these had subsequently lost their affiliation to the learned societies. After a low number of responses via Qualtrics, individual IPSPs that had not completed the survey were contacted individually as well as a Jisc owned email list by Jisc of known OA university presses, library presses and journal service providers. In all 20 responses were received from UK IPSPs, this included four that did not formally complete the survey, but after contact approved the data for analysis.

No UK respondents were identified as administration/management or librarians. However, a number of those whose job titles were 'press manager' or 'open access/scholarly communications officer' were also qualified librarians. There was one editor-in-chief. However, the journal is a standalone international peer-reviewed journal published on behalf of a network led by UK universities.

Two of the IPSPs that self-identified as IPs, might also be classed as SPs in that they both publish and provide services to other IPs.

Administration/management (deans, vice-deans, assistant directors, etc.)	0
Editorial (editor-in-chief, editor, technical editor, etc.)	1
IP publishing representative (president of the publishing committee, head of the publishing service, etc.)	11
Librarian	0
Society representative (president, treasurer, chairman, etc.)	2
Director of the publishing house	2
SP representative	3

Table 158 Respondents' profiles. (UK)

16 of the UK IPSPs have parent institutions. These are detailed in Table 159.

	n	%
Department of the parent organisation	2	12.5
Operating independently but owned or governed by the parent organisation	3	18.8
Other (please describe)	2	12.5
Part of a library in the parent organisation	6	37.5
Part of department of the parent organisation	3	18.8
N = 16 of 20; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q5.3 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 159 Relationship to parent organisation. (UK)

Funded by the European Union

The majority of UK IPSPs are located within universities, the different responses to the relationship with the parent organisation show the variety of reporting models. The two responses in the 'other' category are a standalone journal reporting to a community network and a university press operating on a collaborative model.

There were 16 responses to the question asking whether services were only provided to the parent organisation, of these four responded that they only served their parent institution, a society publisher, a journal hosting service, a university press and a standalone journal of a community network.

All of the UK IPSPs or their parent organisations were either private not for profit organisations (6), public organisations (13, including the parent organisations of a collaborative university press) or a Community Interest Company (1).

The majority of UK IPSPs employed less than 10 FTE. Two of the SPs employed no staff and only one IPSP employed over 30 FTE, this is an established university press.

	n	%
None	2	10
Less than 2	10	50
2–5	2	10
6–10	2	10
11–20	3	15
More than 30	1	5
N = 20 of 20; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q7 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 160 Number of paid staff directly employed or contracted (in FTE). (UK)

When asked about the services offered, there was a fairly even split with most IPSPs providing communication, editorial, IT, production, and training, support and/or advice. Other services provided were curation and preservation, and journal set-up and advice.

	n	%
Administrative, legal and financial	10	50
Communication	16	80
Editorial	15	75
IT	16	80
Production	15	75
Training, support and/or advice	14	70
Other	2	10
N = 20 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q8.1 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 161 Kind of services provided. (UK)

Funded by the European Union

Language and multilingualism

14 respondents answered the question on publication language. All IPSPs published in English, the Welsh IPSP that responded to the survey also published in Welsh. The other languages in Table 162 were offered by just 4/20 of the IPSPs

	n	%
English	14	100.0
French	2	14.3
German	1	7.1
Italian	1	7.1
Portuguese	2	14.3
Spanish	4	28.6
Welsh	1	7.1
Publication languages *N = 14 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q3 (United Kingdom, all)*		

Table 162 Publication languages. (UK)

All of the IPSPs that answered the question on which languages services can be provided in, provided services in English (one that answered 'other' noted that it used plugins to provide services in any language) (Table 163). Another IPSP that answered 'other' commented that it would try to accommodate any language if asked. One of the Scottish IPSPs also offered services in Scots. Interestingly, there is a wider range of publication languages than services. However, Bulgarian and Greek are offered as language services by two IPSPs despite no publications in those languages. It might be assumed that this is a result of local knowledge at the IPSP.

	n	%
Bulgarian	1	5.3
English	18	94.7
Greek	1	5.3
Spanish	2	10.5
Welsh	1	5.3
Other (please specify)	3	15.8
N = 19 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q56 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 163 Languages services can be provided or supported in. (UK)

Regarding multilingual publishing of full text, the majority of respondents were not planning to implement this in any way. Only three had implemented bilingual publishing (different language versions in the same document), with one implementing and one considering. One IPSP was also implementing sequential different language versions in different journals. Three IPSPs had implemented simultaneous different language

Funded by the European Union

versions as separate documents, with two in progress and one considering. There is a similar story for multilingual publishing with 5/20 implementing this approach.

Only one IPSP had implemented measures to promote language diversity by improving machine translation literacy, with a further four considering this.

Finally, the question regarding making metadata and abstracts in English when the original language is other than English were not really applicable to UK IPSPs.

Membership engagement

Most IPSPs in the UK had very little membership engagement with the options provided in the survey. The only engagement was with AEUP (2), COPE (6), DORA (10), EASE (1), OASPA (6).

50% of UK IPSPs reported that they were members of a national publishing scholarly communication association. Since the DIAMAS survey closed, the Open Institutional Publishing Association launched a call for expressions of interest and membership applications. The Association aims to be a community of practice for new university presses, library publishing and departmental publishing in the UK. It held its first membership meeting in November 2023.

Publication types

Responses to the questions about whether IPSPs publish and/or provide services for different publishing outputs highlight the issues with trying to define whether an IPSP is an IP or SP. It would appear from the UK data that definitions are fairly fluid. For example, all three SPs provide services for academic journals. However, one also reports that it publishes them. Two IPs report that they only provide a service for academic journals. Indeed one of these IPs reports that it only provides services and does not publish anything, yet it self identifies as an institutional publisher rather than a service provider. 14/17 IPs published academic journals, only one IP did not publish or provide a service for academic journals.

None of the three UK SPs provide services for academic books. Of the 17 IPs, 14 are involved in academic book publishing: 13 publish academic books and three provide services (two IPs publish and provide a service).

Regarding conference output, there is a very mixed approach again from IPs and SPs. One SP publishes and provides a service for this output, as does one of the IPs. Another IP only provides a service, while five IPs publish only.

For other outputs, just one IP publishes grey literature and one SP provides a service. The same SP provides services for 'other output formats (e.g. datasets, digital scholarship, software)', while a different IP publishes this format. Four IPs are involved

Funded by the European Union

with 'other research outputs (e.g. media, digital products)', three publish and one provides a service. Non-academic outputs are published by one IP, while one provides services. Two publish and provide a service (1 IP, 1 SP).

When looking at the number of academic journals published a year, it appears that there could have been some confusion with the number of journals versus the number of issues published. One IP reports that it publishes over 100 journals per year. However, the IPSP's website shows that they currently publish 21 titles. Nearly 80% of UK IPSPs report that they publish between two and 20 titles. One IP is a single journal publisher and interestingly one SP also reports that it only provides a service to one title. The remaining IP publishes 21-50 titles.

Table 164 shows that there is no discernible pattern regarding articles with UK IPSPs.

	n	%
1-10	1	5.3
11-50	5	26.3
51-100	5	26.3
101-200	4	21.1
201-500	1	5.3
More than 500	3	15.8
N = 19 of 20; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q9.2 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 164 Number of scholarly articles published in 2022. (UK)

Of the 14 IPs that publish academic books, only one publishes over 100 titles a year, this is the established university press. The majority (9) of IPs published between 1-10 titles a year.

Five IPSPs publish 1-20 conference outputs a year, the only other IPSP to report numbers publishes over 500 a year. This IPSP is a learned society publisher. Table 165 shows the spread of disciplines covered. IPSPs were asked to tick all that applied. It is clear that the humanities and social sciences are strongly represented by the respondents. Many IPSPs chose multidisciplinary as well as other disciplines. One IPSP selected natural sciences only, and one selected engineering and technology only.

Funded by the European Union

	n	%
Agricultural sciences	1	5.3
Engineering and technology	3	15.8
Humanities	12	63.2
Medical and health sciences	2	10.5
Multidisciplinary	8	42.1
Natural sciences	4	21.1
Non-academic	2	10.5
Social sciences	13	68.4
N = 19 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q10 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 165 Disciplines covered. (UK)

Costs, Funding, and Income Streams

11/20 IPSPs started the year with an approved annual budget, one additional IPSP reported that this is part of the society budget as a whole. Seven IPSPs do not have an approved annual budget and one commented that it had an annual budget but that this had been fixed over a number of years.

Table 166 shows that there is no trend for the amount of budget received. The two budgets over 1M EUR were for the established university press and the IP that provides services only.

	n	%
1-10K	2	16.7
51-100K	3	25.0
101-500K	2	16.7
501K-1M	3	25.0
>1M	2	16.7
N = 12 of 20; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q11.1 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 166 Annual budget (Euros). (UK)

Three of the IPSPs did not return annual expense and income figures, for one it was not obligatory, for another the funds were part of the institutional OA funds and one had no income as it was a voluntary organisation. All other IPSPs return annual figures, for 11 this is obligatory.

For those IPSPs that have a parent organisation, the most common in-kind services provided are: General IT services (12), Facilities and premises (11), Human Resource management, general financial and legal services (11), Salaries of permanent staff (11).

Funded by the European Union

Other in-kind services are less well represented: Salaries of temporary staff (6), Service-specific IT services (5).

All but one IPSP reported that they use external services. The IPSP that answered no is the IP that runs publishing services and is known to have a local installation of OJS and OMP from PKP. Of the 10 IPSPs that use editorial services, seven are on a voluntary basis, two in-kind and one outsourced. Production tends to be outsourced (14), with four using voluntary services and one in-kind. IT services show a similar picture with 16 outsourced, two in-kind and one voluntary. External services are less well used for communications (3 in-kind, 4 outsourced), administrative, legal and financial services (5 in-kind, 4 outsourced) and training support and or advice on publishing policies and best practice (2 in-kind, 7 outsourced).

Respondents were asked to name some of the services they use:

- Westchester (production)
- Bookswarm (website)
- Manifold
- Consonance (Title Management System)
- OJS
- JSTOR
- DOAB
- Editorial Manager (production)
- Atypon (hosting)
- Techset (typesetting) (2)
- Silicom Chips (typesetting)
- iThenticate (plagiarism checking)
- Publons (reviewer recognition)
- Network of copyeditors
- Ubiquity Press (4)
- Michigan Publishing Services
- ALPSP (training)
- Canva
- Mailchimp
- PressBooks
- SCURL Open Hosting Shared Service
- Silverchair
- Aries
- ChronosHub
- MultiPub
- Knowledge Unlatched
- EBSOC
- Charlesworth
- SPUR
- CoSector
- Wiley

Funded by the European Union

Regarding collaboration with other organisations, IT services (14) and training, support and/or advice on publishing policies and best practice (14) and production (12) are the most popular. Communication (10) is also considered by half of the IPSPs. Administrative, legal and financial services (5) and editorial services (5) are less likely to be considered.

Most IPSPs do not have experience of failed collaboration. Three examples were given, one involving an external contractor failing to deliver on a website, loss of editorial staff in an academic school leading to the cessation of a journal title and one open access business model failing to raise enough funds. One IPSP commented that the new Open Institutional Publishing Association in the UK was being established to promote collaboration between IPSPs.

IPSPs were asked about how much, over the last three years, had they relied on various forms of funding. Regarding fixed and permanent subsidies from their parent organisation, all IPSPs where this applied answered high (1) or very high (9). Other options: periodically negotiated subsidy from parent organisation, time limited grants or subsidies (private or public) from outside own organisation, permanent public government funding, collective funding, voluntary author contributions were seen as not applicable by the majority of IPSPs.

Of the 18 IPSPs that responded to the option on content and print sales, all but two (who had a high reliance) either had a low reliance or thought it was not applicable. The same was true for APCs, where only two IPSPs had a high reliance.

When asked about the stability of these funds, there were no particular trends, with very similar answers to each option. Responses were fairly evenly spread between very unstable, unstable, stable, and don't know with perhaps fewer responses for very stable and in some cases a higher response for neither stable or unstable.

IPSPs were asked to list up to five external funders who have granted cash grants or subsidies over the last three years (largest contributors ranked first). None of the organisations listed are the parent organisation of the IPSP. Major funders for UK IPSPs were: Research England, Jisc Open Access Community Fund (3), Arcadia, University of Surrey, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, University of Wales Press, Scottish Government, University of Valencia.

Ranked second by those UK IPSPs that listed more than one funder were: Knowledge Unlatched, Dutch Research Council (NWO), Global Initiative Against Transnational Organized Crime (GITOC), Creative Scotland, Spanish Society of Experimental Psychology. The Austrian Science Fund and Wellcome Trust were also listed as funders.

Most of the funders listed by IPSPs were UK based. In the case of the Spanish funders, they both funded the same SP based in the UK. However, it is interesting to note two

Funded by the European Union

national funders from outside of the UK and a number of international funders on the list.

When asked to what extent UK IPSPs rely on resources for non-monetary or in-kind support, all but one IPSP that expressed a preference had a high (7) or very high reliance (9). The other IPSP had a low reliance. There was less of a pattern for monetary income, although more IPSPs had a high (1) or very high (8) reliance than low (4) or very low (1).

Table 167 shows that there is a fairly even spread for the survey question on profit/surplus. Although more IPSPs were permitted to make losses/overspend than any other category. Of the IPSPs that selected 'other', one had to make subsidies to support their charitable remit, two were working towards income generation to move away from subsidy and one stated that they had always been not for profit.

	n	%
No, limited losses/overspending are permitted	7	36.8
No, losses/overspending are not permitted	2	10.5
Not applicable	2	10.5
Other (please specify)	4	21.1
Yes, to invest in our own operation or create a financial buffer	2	10.5
Yes, to subsidise other activities of the organisation	2	10.5
N = 19 of 20; single answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q20 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 167 Expectation to produce a profit / surplus. (UK)

Governance

IPSPs were asked if they have a formal document that describes their activities. For statutes/by-laws/articles of association, eight responded yes, while nine said they did not and two didn't know. For external legislation/requirements/policies, four replied no, nine yes and four didn't know.

There was also a mixed response for questions about the governance model. When asked about a governance model overseeing management activities, eight said they did, six did not and two didn't know, there was a similar picture for external audit of accounts (6 yes, 8 no, 2 didn't know). Regarding the governing board, there was a much clearer trend with 14 saying that they did and only four saying they didn't. One did not know.

When asked about representation from the wider scholarly community, responses were almost equally split with eight that did and nine that did not have representation.

Funded by the European Union

Open Science/Open Access practices

11 of the UK IPs publish 100% of their scholarly journals on OA. One IP answered 19% and one 65%. One IP reported that they had 0% OA. Eight of the IPs also publish all of their books on OA. Again, one IP reported 19% of their book content was OA, one 63% and one 80%. Two IPs did not make their books OA. Four IPs publish all of their conference outputs on OA, one 85%, one 5% and one publishes no conference outputs on OA. All four IPs that publish grey literature do so as OA. The six IPs that publish non-standard research outputs (e.g. media, digital products) also published 100% OA. Non academic (2 IPs) and 'other outputs (e.g. datasets, digital scholarship, software)' (4 IPs) were also fully OA.

Four IPs follow parent institution open science/open access policy for both journals and books with a further IP following the institutional policy for journals only.

10 IPSPs follow their own policy (9 journals, 6 books). However, three IPSPs answered that they follow the parent organisation policy as well as their own.

One IP does not have a policy, but all content is published with a CC licence. Another IP allows journals to select the CC licence they wish to apply to their journal. Another comment received was that the IP recommends policies and licences, but each journal can operate their own model. However, they currently all follow the recommendations. Table 168 illustrates which areas the policies apply to.

	n	%
Copyright	12	85.7
Embargoes	6	42.9
Metadata rights	10	71.4
Publication of negative research results	2	14.3
Self-archiving	13	92.9
Third-party copyright	8	57.1
Use of identifiers	11	78.6
Use of open licences	12	85.7
Other	1	7.1
N = 14 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q26.2 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 168 Issues addressed by Open Science / Open Access policy. (UK)

10 IPSPs allow submissions previously published as preprints or working papers in all of their journals. Three also allow this for all books, only two IPSPs did not allow this.

All but one IPSP allows self-archiving in open repositories for all journals and/or books, the remaining IPSP allows it for some journals. All but one IPSP encourages or allows sharing the full text via academic sharing services. 11 IPSPs do not impose embargoes

Funded by the European Union

on self-archiving. However, one IPSP imposes embargoes for all of its journals and books, another embargoes all journals and a further IPSP embargoes books.

There is a mixed picture regarding making references openly available according to I4OC principles. 10 IPSPs allow this for all or some journals, four for all books, but four didn't know and four said no.

Only one IPSP does not use CC licences, and one didn't know, all other IPSPs use CC licences for books and all or some of their journals. Table 169 shows the spread of different CC licences on offer

	n	%
CC BY	16	94.1
CC BY-NC	12	70.6
CC BY-NC-ND	10	58.8
CC BY-NC-SA	6	35.3
CC BY-ND	7	41.2
CC BY-SA	5	29.4
CC0	2	11.8
Other open licence (please specify)	1	5.9
N = 17 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q27.1 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 169 Licence(s) used or recommended. (UK)

Four IPSPs were either implementing or were experimenting with open peer-review. A further seven said that they would consider implementing open peer review at a later stage.

It was a very mixed picture regarding research data sharing policies, with a fairly even spread across the different options: no (3), yes, as part of the institutional Open Science/Open Access policy (5), yes, at the journal level (3), yes, at the publisher level (4), don't know (1), not applicable (4). Two others encourage it but do not have a policy and one IPSP has one in theory but does not advertise it.

Finally, only one IPSP has contributor roles distinguished (as in CRediT).

Funded by the European Union

Editorial Quality, Editorial Management, and Research Integrity

Regarding involvement in editorial management and quality, 11 IPSPs are involved while seven are not. Table 170 shows the various types of involvement.

	n	%
Coordinating the peer review process	9	81.8
Monitoring the peer review process	10	90.9
Performing basic checks on adherence with the authors' and reviewers' guidelines	7	63.6
Performing basic checks on ethical consent	6	54.5
Performing basic checks regarding adherence with the scope of the publication	8	72.7
Plagiarism scan / Automated similarity checking	7	63.6
Recruiting and managing the editorial board members	8	72.7
Sourcing reviewers	8	72.7
Other (please specify)	2	18.2
N = 11 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q31.1 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 170 Tasks accomplished in editorial management. (UK)

One IPSP reported that they are more hands-on with the peer review of books, but carry out different tasks in relation to journals in house. Another IPSP recruits and manages its editorial board, which commissions publications, but that while its journal's editorial boards were advised by the press, they operate independently. 10 of the 11 IPSPs that responded provide guidelines/instructions.

When asked about peer review, double blind was the most common, with a fairly even spread across the other options offered (Table 171)

14 of the IPSPs have a specific policy on research integrity/publication ethics, four do not and one didn't know.

	n	%
Double-anonymised peer review (both authors and reviewers are anonymous to each other)	8	72.7
Editorial review	4	36.4
Open identities of the reviewers, authors and editors	4	36.4
Open participation in the peer review process (community)	2	18.2
Open reviewers' reports	3	27.3
Single-anonymised peer review (authors do not know who the reviewers are)	5	45.5
N = 11 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q32.2 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 171 Types of peer review in use. (UK)

Funded by the European Union

Technical services efficiency

All IPSPs offer one or more technical service, with hosting and user interface being the most common (Table 172). Other services offered include: preservation; statistics reporting; training on the platform; proofreading; typesetting; publication; distribution; and subscription management.

	n	%
Full editorial workflow	10	52.6
Hosting	14	73.7
Metadata and quality control	11	57.9
Partial editorial workflow	9	47.4
Software	8	42.1
User interface	14	73.7
Other (Please specify)	4	21.1
N = 19 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q34 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 172 Technical services provided. (UK)

When asked about how UK IPSP's services and/or technical infrastructure are maintained and updated there is no discernible pattern for either services or technical infrastructure (Table 173 and Table 174).

	n	%
Fully outsourced	3	16.7
In house across different departments	2	11.1
In house by a dedicated publishing department	6	33.3
In house by an IT department personnel	6	33.3
Mainly outsourced	3	16.7
Partially outsourced	3	16.7
Other (please specify)	2	11.1
N = 18 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q35 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 173 Maintenance and update - Services. (UK)

	n	%
Fully outsourced	9	50.0
In house by a dedicated publishing department	1	5.6
In house by an IT department personnel	6	33.3
Mainly outsourced	4	22.2
Partially outsourced	2	11.1
Other (please specify)	1	5.6
N = 18 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q35 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 174 Maintenance and update - Technical infrastructure. (UK)

Funded by the European Union

When asked about which publishing system UK IPSPs use, OJS was the most common (6) alongside 'other commercial system', which included Ubiquity Press (2), ScienceOpen (1), Silverchair (1), Chronoshub (1) and Project Muse (1). WordPress had four responses and Janeway three, all other options had one or two responses, including OMS, which was surprising given the number of book publishers that responded to the survey.

Regarding the use of PIDs, only one IPSP does not assign PIDs for all or some of their publications, while two didn't know.

Crossref/Datacite DOIs were the most commonly used (17), with ISSNs/ISBNs both recording 11 responses, again showing the mix of journal and book publishers. One IPSP uses Handle as a PID.

Interestingly, when asked about metadata released openly with a standard metadata description schema, nine IPSPs did not know, which indicates that more awareness might be required in this area. Five IPSPs did release metadata openly, four with a CC BY licence and one using CC0.

As expected, PDF is by far the most prevalent publishing format used (18). XML (11), EPub (10) and html (9) are also well used. Data (4), Image or video formats (6) and sound files (3) are also used by many IPSPs. Mobi (3) was also noted in the 'other' option.

16 UK IPSPs have an archiving/backup policy, a variety of services are used: National/ institutional library or infrastructure (11), CLOCKSS (9), PKP PN (9), Portico (7), LOCKSS (6), PubMed Central (2).

IPSPs were then asked if they faced any challenges in providing technical services. 10 UK IPSPs do not think archiving/preservation is a challenge, others suggested the following challenges in low numbers: administrative constraints (1); financial constraints (2), lack of expertise (2), lack of human resources (3); technical limitations of existing infrastructure (2). However, providing adequate resources for the infrastructure and services is seen as much more of a challenge, particularly lack of human resources (14) and financial constraints (12).

Answers were more mixed when considering the challenges around supplying and enriching metadata/PIDs. Eight IPSPs thought there was no challenge, whereas seven cite lack of human resources and six lack of expertise. Trying to achieve and maintain interoperability with other services also received a mixed response, with lack of expertise (7) and technical limitations of existing infrastructure (6) being the most common responses.

Funded by the European Union

Visibility, Communication, Marketing, and Impact

When asked if IPSPs are satisfied with the level to which published content is included in scholarly search engines and different indexes, five reported either that they were satisfied or that the content is already very well indexed, whereas 13 would like to see better indexing. Examples of search engines given were wide ranging with Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science and Baidu being the most commonly mentioned. Nine IPSPs manage indexation in these scientific information databases, while six do not.

Regarding specific challenges of applying for indexation the majority of UK IPSPs found the following challenges important or very important: paying for membership or recurring fees; satisfying metadata requirements, and non-technical and technical participation criteria. Communications/requirements/paperwork in another language or in English only was not seen as an important challenge or a challenge at all, perhaps predictably. Requirements being too technical received a mixed response.

On communication, 17 IPSPs have a newsletter or social media or networking profiles to inform the community about updates. 13 have a data protection policy, but three IPSPs do not know. 17 have a GDPR policy and one does not know. Although most UK IPSPs have data protection and GDPR policies, there is a need for the remaining IPSPs to understand why they need one.

14 IPSPs display metrics publicly. Table 175 illustrates the different methods.

	n	%
Altmetrics, such as Altmetric	3	21.4
Article-level impact metrics, such as citation counts	7	50.0
Article-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	11	78.6
Plum X Metrics	3	21.4
Publication-level impact metrics, such as Impact Factors	4	28.6
Publication-level usage metrics, such as visits, views, downloads	9	64.3
Publication level impact metrics	1	7.1
Submission, acceptance, publication dates	8	57.1
Other (please specify)	4	28.6
N = 14 of 20; multiple answer question; source: DIAMAS survey - Q49.1 (United Kingdom, all)		

Table 175 Metrics. (UK)

Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging

IPSPs were asked to consider the publications/services they provide with reference to how they address dimensions of equity, diversity, inclusion and belonging. Of the various options offered, disability, ethnicity and gender had the highest number of IPSPs that had either implemented policies, were in progress or considering. Smaller

Funded by the European Union

numbers had implemented or had policies in progress for other options or were considering them. However, as many as half of the IPSPs are either not considering this, do not know or answered 'not applicable'.

Slightly higher figures for implementation, in progress or consideration were recorded for the question covering measures to ensure and promote equity diversity inclusion and belonging relating to code of conduct, data collection and use of language. However, there are no plans for many IPSPs to implement tailored support and personal coaching.

The number of UK IPSPs engaged in EDIB is likely to increase in the future with the launch of OIPA in the UK as many of the founder members are keen to progress EDIB policies and support as an organisation, which individual IPSPs could then adopt.

12 IPSPs have an accessibility policy (8 published, 4 unpublished), while five have no policy and one does not know. However, when asked if the policies meet various accessibility requirements almost all of the IPSPs that have a policy do not know if it meets requirements. Only five IPSPs have implemented WCAG with two in progress and one considering. Lack of expertise, human resources and technical limitations of existing infrastructure are cited by many IPSPs as important challenges.

Funded by the European Union

List of Tables

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union

References

Adema, J., & Stone, G. (2017). *Changing Publishing Ecologies: A Landscape Study of New University Presses and Academic-Led Publishing*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4420993

Bargheer, M., Bosman, J., Drahomira, C., Frantsvåg, J. E., Klaus, T., Kramer, B., Laakso, M., Manista, F., Melinščak Zlodi, I., Peruginelli, G., Proudman, V., Rooryck, J., Souyioultzoglou, I., Stojanovski, J., Stone, G., & Verheusen, A. (2022). D2.1 IPSP Scoping Report_under EC review. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7890567

Bednarek-Michalska, B. (2017). Otwarta nauka w Polsce – rys historyczny. In *Komunikacja naukowa w humanistyce*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Filozofii UAM. http://hdl.handle.net/10593/17593

Bruns, A., Taubert, N. C., Cakir, Y., Kaya, S., & Beidaghi, S. (2022). Diamond Open Access Journals Germany (DOAG). https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/2963331

Crawford, W. (2023). *Gold Open Access 2017-2022 Articles in Journals (GOA8)*. Cites & Insights Books Livermore, California. https://waltcrawford.name/goa8.pdf

Directory of Open Access Journals – DOAJ. https://www.doaj.org/

Hacker, A. (2023). Open access in Switzerland: An institutional point of view. *College & Research Libraries News*, *81*, 212-216. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.84.6.212

Hahn, D., Hehn, J., Hopp, C., & Pruschak, G. (2023). *Mapping the Swiss Landscape of Diamond Open Access Journals. The PLATO Study on Scholar-Led Publishing. Report*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7461728

Hirschmann, B., & Verdicchio, D. (2017). Open Access in der Schweiz. In K. Söllner & B. Mittermaier (Eds.), *Praxishandbuch Open Access. De Gruyter Praxishandbuch.* de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110494068-025

Kierunki rozwoju otwartego dostępu do publikacji i wyników badań naukowych w Polsce. https://www.gov.pl/documents/1068557/1069061/20180413_Kierunki_rozwoju_OD_wersja_ostateczna.pdf

Taubert, N., Sterzik, L., & Bruns, A. (2023). Mapping the German Diamond Open Access Journal Landscape. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14474.64961

Ustawa z dnia 20 lipca 2018 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym i nauce. https://isap.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/DocDetails.xsp?id=WDU20180001668

Funded by the European Union

Consortium overview

AMU	UNIVERSITÉ D'AIX MARSEILLE	FR
PVM	PROTISVALOR MEDITERRANEE SAS	FR
OPERAS	OPEN ACCESS IN THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA THROUGH SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION	BE
CNRS	CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE CNRS	FR
EIFL	STICHTING EIFL.NET	NL
FECYT	FUNDACIÓN ESPAÑOLA PARA LA CIENCIA Y LA TECNOLOGIA, F.S.P., FECYT	ES
TSV	TIETEELLISTEN SEURAIN VALTUUSKUNNASTA	FI
LIBER	STICHTING LIBER	NL
UB	UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA	ES
UniZD	SVEUČILIŠTE U ZADRU	HR
FFZG	SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET	HR
Science Europe	SCIENCE EUROPE	BE
EUA	ASSOCIATION EUROPÉENNE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ	BE
OASPA	STICHTING OPEN ACCESS SCHOLARLY PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION	NL
UiT	UNIVERSITETET I TROMSØ - NORGES ARKTISKE UNIVERSITET	NO
CNR	CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE	IT
UGOE	GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITAT GOTTINGEN STIFTUNG OFFENTLICHEN RECHTS	DE
SPE	STICHTING SPARC EUROPE	NL
UU	UNIVERSITEIT UTRECHT	NL
EKT	ETHNIKO KENTRO TEKMIRIOSIS KAI ILEKTRONIKOU PERIECHOMENOU	EL
IBL PAN	INSTYTUT BADAŃ LITERACKICH POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK	PL
ESF	FONDATION EUROPÉENNE DE LA SCIENCE	FR
JISC	JISC LBG	UK
DOAJ	INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES FOR OPEN ACCESS C I C	UK

Funded by the European Union