The Envisioning a World Beyond APCs/BPCs international symposium was held at the University of Kansas on November 17 & 18, 2016.

More information, including recordings of the opening session and participant biographies is available at https://openaccess.ku.edu/symposium.

Apollo 13 Assignment:

As a culminating component of the *Envisioning a World Beyond APCs/BPCs* international symposium, on the morning of Friday, Nov. 18, participants were asked to form teams and then develop a proposal for a publishing regime that will:
- present a solution that is free for readers and for authors;
- work in the local context and create partnerships that incorporate a variety of global situations, including those individuals and groups marginalized by historical, political, and economic power structures;
- address barriers to or opportunities for authors (i.e., the focus should be on the creators of the work, rather thans on the producers or user);
- present an agenda for action;
- envision a 5- to 10-year transition that includes universities as the major stakeholder in a knowledge production and sharing environment that will benefit all readers and authors.

The following are three proposals that came out of the Friday morning session (which were further developed in the weeks immediately following the symposium).

Proposal 1:

Title
Global Knowledge Commons 2025

Team Members
Kathleen Shearer, Ivy Anderson, Jean Claude Guédon, Heather Joseph, Rebecca Kennison, David Shulenburger

Vision
Academic institutions and research organizations are the foundation of a global knowledge commons in which institutions collect the content created by their

communities, make it openly available, and connect globally through the adoption of common standards. Community-based peer review services are developed on top of this global knowledge commons by research groups, communities and scholarly societies.

Institutional Roles
- Research institutions create and produce research outputs
- Research institutions and organizations ensure long-term preservation and access to research outputs.
- Learned societies, research communities, and editors provide assessment and peer review services.
- Funders and institutions require that all outputs be part of the knowledge commons to be eligible for evaluation/recognition.

Characteristics of the System
The system will fulfill the following conditions:
- Cost-free to read
- Cost-free to author
- Managed and governed by the research communities themselves, and their institutional partners (universities, research institutions, funders, etc.).
- Internationally distributed and discoverable

Requirements
- Adoption of common and community-based practices and standards across all participants (networking, document types, etc.)
- Guaranteed participation for all institutions and societies, publishers and presses
- Collective funding model(s) for assessment and peer review layer (and other networked services)
- Governance model based on participating institutions (e.g., W3C)

Transition
- Socialize the vision broadly with a range of stakeholders
- Institutions agree to incrementally withdraw their subscription budget and reallocate funds to the "inside-out" library, which collects and provides access to content produced locally, and shared open access services over a 10-year period
- Begin with pilot projects targeting the more fragile societies and journals
- Libraries adopt common standards for exposing their content

Proposal 2:

Title
Economics of Prestige: Strategies to Change the Scholarly Communication System

Team Members
Martin Eve, Charlotte Roh, Williams Nwagwu, Neil Jacobs, Lorraine Haricombe

Why do scholars persist in publishing in a system, with closed access for-profit publishers, that has been demonstrated in so many ways to be contrary to the rights and aims of academic authors? Determining the pressures on academics, both individuals and organizations, seemed the first step in determining a strategy that would help to change existing scholarly communication practices to more open and equitable publication habits. Our group looked at societies, universities, academics, funders, libraries, platforms, and publishers to discuss how prestige and revenue are tied together, in ways that privilege North American and European scholars and inaccurately reflect the realities of the value of scholarship. This was a theme that we came back to again and again in the conversation, that regional ranking and indexing should be more aggressively undertaken and valued in order to subvert the inaccuracies of current prestige metrics, which can harm scholarship.

Societies are frequently contracted with for-profit publishers in order to publish their society journals, for two reasons: revenue and prestige. It cannot be ignored that many societies do, in fact, exist on the income from their publications. The fact that this revenue comes from exorbitant library subscription fees and per-article charges that are too expensive for most individual scholars is seldom considered by society members, who often receive journal access as a perk of society membership. The importance of prestige – whether a society journal is affiliated with Taylor & Francis or Cambridge or Elsevier – is more or less important depending on the society itself and how established the journal is in the discipline. Certainly there are journal editors and editorial boards who feel that affiliation with a well-known publisher lends repute to their work, despite the fact that no work on the actual content is done by the umbrella publisher.

Universities also seek prestige in publication, so much so that tenure and promotion is tied frequently to publishers with prestige or brand-name recognition over quality of work, impact, or even best fit.

This is problematic for academics who might prefer to publish open access, but are constrained by the outdated validation schema of tenure and promotion. The value endowed by high impact factor publications (a very imperfect if not dangerous metric) has real consequences for many scholars – not just in tenure and promotion, but also for additional opportunities – in speaking, publication, and even grant funding.

Funders have attempted to address this double bind that many academics find themselves in through open/public access mandates. The rationale is that since the research funded is for the public good, both public and private funders should receive returned value for the money invested, either in the form of open data or open access articles (sometimes both). However, this is often still tied to the requirements of academics to publish in certain venues for promotion and tenure. As a result, academics are a captive market for open access fees – they must publish in an outlet for their careers, they must publish open access in order to satisfy funding requirements.

Libraries, sensitive to the injustices of pricing and access through their experience of the serials crisis, have through their open access efforts, played a key role in providing fee-free open access publication platforms for both authors and readers. This is true for subject repositories as well, but many struggle with a role that is not necessarily intrinsic to the goals and concerns of individual authors. Why is this the case? The two items that came up again and again were prestige and revenue, and how they were tied together. How to change this problem?

Two solutions were offered in our group: new entities for publication and changes to existing entities.

New entities for publication have in many ways already taken place in open access publishing platforms. However, many of these platforms are also tied to the core concerns of revenue and prestige and are at risk of reiterating existing inequities. What is suggested is a platform alliance for university presses and society publishers, who already have prestige and therefore have no need to seek it further. The revenue problem could be solved by collective or cooperative funding. Where would this funding come from? University presses should, and many already are, subsidized by universities, but there is a strong argument for better funding for the sake of prestige of the university. There is also an already existing model of societies subsidized by its members, who might not be adverse to funding society journal publication for open access, which would only make publications more accessible and therefore more visible and citable.

As an aside, one of the areas that publishers have moved into, that has value for universities, is metric fulfillment. This could be solved – and should be solved - by regional indexing and ranking, like Alternative Report for Africa. Arguments for regional ranking as opposed to ranking by publishers abound, and this is a strong argument for establishing prestige based on actual value as determined locally rather than determined by the narrow perspective established by North American and European publishers.

Proposal 3:

Title
Federation [needs spiffy name!]

Team Members
Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Raym Crow, John Willinsky, Michael Roy, Mary Rose Muccie, Josh Bolick

We propose to develop a federation of related scholarly communication projects that, while differing in their approach and focus, have a common purpose in exploring and developing new ways of sharing research and scholarship on an open, sustainable, noncommercial basis. The federation will seek to clarify, for libraries, societies, funders, and other interested parties, the contribution and value of, as well as coordination and collaboration among, its member projects. It will work toward the financial integration and systemic interoperability of existing open-access projects and networks, as well as creating a collaborative structure for incubating and accelerating collectively funded projects. This backbone organization will be governed by representatives of the participating projects and institutions contributing funding, and it will work to create shareable content, interoperable infrastructure, and a shared community network.

The federation will be open to all academic domains (humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields), all content types, and all infrastructure models, and will be open to the participation of new and existing projects that share these common goals. It will work toward creating economies of scale in organizing collective action around funding.

In particular, we will work together to create a federated model for ongoing institutional support of the participating projects, and we will create a collective approach to academic institutions and libraries, foundations, government agencies, and corporate partners around transition support.

Projects and networks that might benefit from this federated model include (but are not limited to):

- Humanities Commons
- Public Knowledge Project
- Open Library of the Humanities
- Open Book Publishers
- Knowledge Unlatched
- Lever Press
- OAPEN
- [ ]ArXiv and other subject-based repositories
- SciELO
- Redalyc
- African Journals Online
- BioLine International

Certain commercial projects, such as Reveal Digital, might be considered as partners as well.

NEXT STEPS

- Refine goals based on feedback/input from possible participants
- Expand list of possible members of the federation
- Develop letter of intent proposing a two-year research process to determine and develop requirements for interoperability, sustainability, and governance
- Develop MOU to explore how to create this federation, spelling out what would be expected from members
- Develop models for interoperability, sustainability, and governance
- Explore potential relationships with other collective funding projects (e.g., OAN) and differentiation from other efforts (e.g., OSI).

Interoperability of existing projects + networks

Federation of collective funding models
- backbone organization
- governance?

STUPID

context + infrastructure + community

NEXT STEP
Letter of intent proposing 2 year research process to determine + develop requirements for interoperability + sustainability + governance

cover all domains
all content types
all infrastructure
new + existing projects

Funders
Foundations
Corporations?
gov't agencies

economies of scale
organizing collective action

global benefits
inclusivity

SciElo   OBP (+)
Redyloc   KU
          HC
          DJS
          Reveal Digital
          [ ] ArXiv
          Lever Press

OAPEN
OLH