

Improving CRIS features to support new Open Access implementation workflows at institutions

Pablo de Castro, Open Access Advocacy Librarian, University of Strathclyde Glasgow and euroCRIS

It was at the euroCRIS Strategic Membership Meeting in Paris almost 10 years ago where this author delivered [a presentation](#) suggesting to enhance the data model for CRIS systems in order to capture the – then emerging – APC payment amounts as part of the bibliographic records for publications [1]. Many institutions are now regularly using the APC fee field that was added to the metadata set for research outputs both for internal and external reporting.

The screenshot displays a CRIS record interface. At the top, it shows the 'FINAL PUBLISHED VERSION' with a DOI (10.1038/123456789) and a 'Show' button. Below this, there's a section for 'Other links' and 'Other files'. The 'Article Processing Charge (APC)' field is highlighted with a red box. It contains a radio button for 'APC paid' with options 'Not set', 'No', and 'Yes' (selected). Below this, there are two input fields: 'APC amount in paid currency' (1758.28) and 'APC amount' (1758.28), both with a dropdown menu set to 'GBP - Pound Sterling'. To the right of the main form, there's a sidebar with a 'View record online:' section containing links for 'DOI' and 'Scopus'.

As the institutional Open Access implementation workflows have become ever more complex with the arrival of Plan S, this is an attempt to repeat that 2015 experience by suggesting a further few features that could provide a much welcome service to institutions using their CRIS to record the metadata for their publications and the Open Access strategies that have been applied for each of these to be made openly available.

Plan S [2] was an initiative released in Sep 2018 by the cOAlition S group of research funders to make full, immediate Open Access a reality. Several policy instruments have been incorporated into Plan S over the years as a means to achieve this goal through different and complementary strategies. Paramount among these are the so-called Transformative Agreements (aka Read & Publish agreements) and the Rights Retention Strategy. Both of them – together with additional mechanisms such as APC-based Gold Open Access and Diamond Open Access – have significantly accelerated the progress towards the ultimate goal of Plan S.

The current design of Current Research Information Systems means however that institutions struggle to use these platforms – which are otherwise extensively supporting Open Access implementation via the various available routes – to report even internally on which mechanism has been used to make each publication openly available. There are widespread discussions within user groups for different CRIS solutions and within the wider scholarly communications community on how to best capture this

information for internal and external reporting purposes. This is important for several reasons, one of the main ones being that significant amounts of funding are being granted to publishers for these R&P deals, so it's critical to monitor their institutional uptake in order to prove these deals offer value for money. While still in their infancy, Plan S-aligned Institutional Rights Retention Policies (IRRP) are also offering an increasingly important route to implement immediate Green Open Access and monitoring their progress is a key aspiration at institutions that have already passed their IRRP.

Some early attempts at figuring out a way to mark publications with specific characteristics have already been made, such as the open source add-on to their institutional CRIS devised at the University of Manchester [3] that allows not only to tick a box for publications to which rights retention has been applied, but also for instance whether the publication carries a Data Accessibility Statement (DAS). This is a potentially useful way to progress in this domain, especially in view of the fact that most institutions are currently using Excel or Sharepoint spreadsheets for this purpose. However, it would be much easier if these relatively simple features could become part of the built-in design for standard CRIS platforms.

This contribution will suggest a few rather simple updates on the bibliographic metadata section of the CRIS publication records that would allow information to be captured on (among others):

- What publisher agreement has been applied to make a specific publication Gold Open Access at no cost for the authors;
- Where the rights retention strategy has been applied to secure immediate Green Open Access;
- Where the publication is following the Diamond Open Access route (meaning no payment whatsoever has been made to make it Gold Open Access)

The talk is also aimed at promoting an discussion with the audience on the strategies currently applied at institutions in different countries for the purpose.

The presentation will also provide a good opportunity to mention the study on the impact of Plan S [4] that the author is currently leading for cOAlition S – with other euroCRIS Board members also part of the team of consultants – and some of its early findings.

References

[1] De Castro P (2015). Challenges in Coding Information on Article Processing Charges (APCs) into Institutional Systems. Spring 2015 euroCRIS Membership Meeting (Paris, 11-12 May 2015).

<http://hdl.handle.net/11366/370>

[2] Plan S (Wikipedia), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plan_S

[3] Ganeshwaran N (2022). The University of Manchester Open Access Compliance Platform (OACP): An Extensible Tool for Managing & Monitoring the Submission & Compliance of Research Outputs. Pure International Conference 2022 (Vila Nova de Gaia, Porto, 2-3 Nov 2022).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DMXYx4FvjEI>

[4] De Castro P (2023). Scidecode to explore the impact of Plan S. Blog post.

<https://scidecode.com/2023/10/06/scidecode-to-explore-the-impact-of-plan-s/>