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The context

* More policies and mandates = more dependence on a stable infrastructure
* The new roles for research funders, universities and libraries in terms of funding infrastructure
* Leadership and coordination needed towards securing a scholarly commons
Useful services has left the public domain

- Publisher diversification
  - Mendeley, Publons, SSRN, Bepress
  - Altmetric, Figshare, Overleaf, Symplectic

- Controlled by a small number of commercial players; locked-in; limited choice and influence on policy, priorities, pricing, development etc.
Short background for SCOSS

Work funded by Knowledge Exchange about sustainability for OA services

– Final report published early 2016: “Putting down roots: Securing the future of open access policies”

– Main conclusion: ” Successful implementation of OA policies and mandates are dependent on a number of non-commercial, compliance-enabling services used by researchers and institutions…”
...and then

- SPARC Europe arranged a meeting for international organisations to do work to secure the sustainability of OA services
- Which eventually resulted in the creation of SCOSS - Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services
Some models for crowd funding:

- SCOAP3
- Knowledge Unlatched
- Open Library of Humanities
- DOAJ
- ...

SCOSS Presentation, May 31st 2018
In the US - the 2.5% commitment

Every academic library should commit to contribute 2.5% of its total budget to support the common infrastructure needed to create the open scholarly comms both cash and and in-kind

175 million US dollars
Everything we have gained by opening content and data will be under threat if we allow the enclosure of scholarly infrastructures.
Key stakeholders

- Libraries
- Consortia
- Government
- Research Funders
- Researchers
- Other schol comms support organisations
- Others, incl. service providers
Libraries sharing infrastructure

- Shared cataloguing
- Shared collections
- Shared services

- Funding scholarly communication infrastructures in short and mid-term interest!?
SCOSS vision

“An infrastructure of freely available open science services funded by policymakers and stakeholders, committing to provide sustainable funding for the operations and development of key services”
SCOSS goal

Helping sustain the infrastructure to support the implementation of Open Science
SCOSS is

An Open Science community that evaluates OS services to
ultimately encourage the de-centralised international crowd-funding of essential infrastructure
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SCOSS approach 1/2

- Developed by significant players in the research, Open Science & library community
- Forming a consolidated voice from trusted stakeholders and representatives of the international Open Science community
- Establishes a system to identify and evaluate OS services & recommend them for funding
SCOSS approach 2/2

- Creates a framework to increase efficiency for investors & addresses community needs
- Helps provide more transparency on costs and funding needs to enable fair remuneration to sustain them
- Unspecific to any discipline / OA or OS area
- Strives to keep service sales & marketing costs down
The development process

- Knowledge Exchange: Sustainability of OA services
  - *Putting Down Roots, Securing the Future of Open Access Policies*
- Terms of Reference & The Case
- Coalition-building
- Governance
- A pilot begins: Feb 2017
Governance

**SCOSS Executive Group**
Appointed by Board; manages processes & comms

**SCOSS Board**
SCOSS member representatives; decision-making body

**SCOSS Advisory Group**
Advisory; evaluates applications; makes recommendations to the Board; maintains the registry of OA & OS services
The process of applying for funding

Application → Review → Consensus-making → Feedback → Appeal for funding

SHERPA/RoMEO
DOAJ
The evaluation procedure

- Evaluation criteria
- Evaluators
- 5 point scale
- Reaching consensus
- Feedback to applicants

Reviewing the evaluation procedure
Evaluation criteria

- General: scope, intentions, Neylon principles
- Value proposition
- Technical details
- Costs
- Governance
- Sustainability measures
- Foresight
- Score
Costs

* Approved financial report of the prev. year, incl. income and expenses

* An organisational budget for 2 years
  
  – Expenses
    
    • Number of FT, staff expenses and roles
    
    • IT expenses
    
    • Misc, i.e travel & Other
  
  – Income
    
    • Amount of secured funding
    
    • Expected funding
SCOSS pilot: Feb 2017 -

- Invitations to apply: DOAJ & SHERPA/RoMEO
- Evaluation of proposals
- Evaluation consensus meetings
- Funding model discussion
- Final approval from SCOSS member orgs
- Appeal for funding – Nov 2017
- Appeals for funding by the services
SCOSS funding model I

靶 based on what the *coalition* estimates it needs to reach the targets of each service across the three years

靶 may be reduced based on # of contributors or on the annual figures of each service
SCOSS funding model II

- Large organisations: €4,000 p.a. for 3yrs
- Small organisations: €2,000 p.a. for 3yrs
- Other: €500 +/-
- Funders: €8,000 p.a. for 3yrs
- A 25% discount for consortia of 10 or more
- Transactions between the service provider and organisations
SCOSS support for the selected services

※ Capacity-building / engagement
  – Moving the thinking about funding OSI in the international library / research community
  – Liaison with the international community: OASPA, ICOLC, IFLA, ARL, OPERAS, etc.

※ Monitoring
  – Provision of a funding monitoring tool
SCOSS support for the selected services

※ Dissemination
- Documentation: potential funders / consortia
- SCOSS website and newsletter
- Active dissemination amongst members

※ Troubleshooting
- Services
- Potential funders
SCOSS progress (30 April 2018)

- 39 funders (incl. 1 consortium - Luxembourg)
- €358,200 raised

NEW:
- NZ / AUS committed to an estimated €145k
  At least 20 universities committed

• Discussion with >10 consortia
Funding progress DOAJ  30.04.18

Committed: 34%  
€328,200 of €970,000

Paid: 6%  
€57,781.31 of €970,000

Needed: 66%  
€641,800 of €970,000

Note: Excluding AUS & NZ
Several European Consortia currently discussing supporting the services based on SCOSS recommendations.
Dissemination

- Presentation at IATUL 2018, OPERAS 2018, LIBER 2018
- SCOSS website: www.scoss.org
- SCOSS poster
- SCOSS Newsletter
- The Case for SCOSS

The Global Sustainability Coalition for Open Science Services (SCOSS)
Facilitating funding to ensure the long-term sustainability of the world’s Open Science infrastructure

The case for jointly funding Open Science Services

1. The Issue

Worldwide, universities, research funders and governments are consistently issuing policies to promote better open access to research publications and data. The scholarly communication community has come to depend on many of them when implementing their own Open Access and Open Science goals, e.g. the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) or SHERPA/RoMEO that records publisher copyright and self-archiving policies.

However, currently several of the Open Science services are funded on an unsustainable, localised and temporary basis. Despite their success, they are frequently under financial constraints and pressures to economise. With no alternative sustainable model in place, stakeholders are less likely to be able to build services into long-term strategic solutions for local OA and OS implementation.

Numerous research support services have already been bought up by publishers such as Springer and Elsevier as a result with obvious consequences: Without an alternative sustainable funding model being bought into operation, and one led by the users themselves, the risk is that the services would have to fundamentally change their operations in scope, leverage, accuracy or responsiveness, be forced into charging at the point of use or raising some other paywall, be bought up by a commercial...
Next steps

- Following up on international membership
- Funder outreach
- Making the case for a significant grant
- Evaluating the pilot
  - the funding obtained
  - the funding model
  - other impact
- Invite service providers for the next appeal (2019??)
Challenges

• Collective funding challenges
  – Increasing demands on (library) budgets
  – Open Science policy and priorities & funding
  – The collective action problem
  – Choosing the best funding model

• SCOSS-specific challenges
  – Pricing
  – Pilot status
  – Global membership!
  – Evaluating success
Funding Open Infrastructure models

- Central organisation pooling funding
- Decentralised, crowd-funded and relaying funding to recommended services
- Grant plus crowd-funding
- Grant funding
- Other
Take away message

Organisations, institutions who say they want to see Open Access and Open Science come to reality must realize, that they have a responsibility to provide funding to make essential OA/OS infrastructure services sustainable and to secure them to be in the public domain!!

This requires coordination led by a broad international coalition!

This is what SCOSS is all about!
Links

※ www.scoss.org
※ www.doaj.org/scoss
※ Lars Bjørnshauge: lars@doaj.org