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Definitions

• Pre-Publication Embargoes
  • Press embargoes – journalists like having embargoed access

• Post-Publication Embargoes
  • Access restrictions to Accepted Manuscripts
• Subscription Embargo
  • Access restrictions to Version of Record

• No-Publication Embargoes
  • Deposited content from Government studies (security), proprietary research, patents - may or may not ever be publicly released
What is being embargoed?

• Journal articles
• Data
• Press releases
• Proprietary research
• Security-related research (Governments)
• Other?
Impact of embargoes

• Funders
• Authors
• Researchers, discipline communities
• Institutions, librarians, repository managers
• Publishers
• Learned Societies
• Policy makers
• Journalists
• Consumers (tax payers) – public (e.g. patients), small/medium enterprises, non-affiliated researchers, practitioners
Proposal - research project(s)

- What are the impacts of embargoes on scholarly communication
  - Create evidence base for informed discussion on embargoes
  - Research in the next 12 months to inform OSI 2017
Research questions

• Who needs access?
• How are embargoes determined?
• How do researchers/students find research articles?
• Impact of embargoes on researchers/students?
• Effect of embargoes on other stakeholders?

Need to consider

• Geographical and disciplinary differences
• Changing landscape - use of AMs 5 years +
Preliminary cost estimation

• based on
  • 64 working days
  • $800 per day (or intern/PhD?)

• in the region of $50,000
A title for a really great piece of research, just the best, really

Donald J. Trump
Trump University

Introduction
The current research, and it is really great research, it really is. It relies on the theory – and I have the best theories, you know, I use the best theories in my research. It really is quite amazing just how great the theory is, but I'm not really, in fact – it is a theory. A really good one and I've talked to people and, lots of people actually, and they all think what I said. It has a lot of appeal. It's really just all there and what it is. If people, you know, losers and whatever, if they don't get it, then what are you going to do? It's not like the idea isn't there and that, you know, it's what it is. I have to shake my head. Everyone is just shaking their heads. It really is.

Along with the theory, there's other work. Existing data—and again, I have the best data. You would really, if you had the same great data, be completely happy and the data are there. And they are really, you know, data and we have all kinds. The best kinds. And that is what we base the current work, which is great work, that I did and it's great. If other people want to be walked through like babies or something, then I don't know what their problem is. The data just are there so get off your lazy butts and stop looking for handouts. I'm not here to give handouts, you shouldn't expect that.

everything and it was better, and still cost less – because I am the one paying for this. It is money out of my pocket. And my pockets are deep because I am, and have been, a huge success in everything that I have done. I don't owe, even a cent, to funding agencies at all, this is all mine so I'm not beholden to anyone. The research, and I know research, and this is top-shelf research was the best. One of the best research papers in the world, by the way. Make no mistake. Make no mistake at all – this is what those other people wish they had done or what they wish they were doing, but they aren't because I am. So, you know, they are whatever, not worth the time.

Results
We ran analyses. The best analyses, make no mistake, these analyses were absolutely top notch. And there were, of course, numbers and the best numbers. They really were. The numbers that is. The findings, what the numbers said, they are great. If you look at them, and I have, other people have and it is clear – and you cannot really argue about it – the analyses are, in fact, tremendous. And it is really something. It is. I've seen findings over the years, and I've had a lot of dealings with numbers – big numbers – and, no mistake, these numbers are, even by the standards of bozos who don't believe what they
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time frames</th>
<th>Estimated costed time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing of the brief</td>
<td>Due two weeks from the end of the conference - 6 May 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sourcing funding</td>
<td>Needs to be secured by August 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Literature review</td>
<td>2 months - begin August 2016</td>
<td>10 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Live case studies [Concurrent to Literature review]</td>
<td>Due to be completed October 2016</td>
<td>11 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Survey of the different stakeholders</td>
<td>6 months total - Needs to start by October 2016 at the latest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Creating the survey</td>
<td>3 months. October - December 2016</td>
<td>24 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Identify &amp; engage participants</td>
<td>1 month. January 2017</td>
<td>6 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Analysis of results</td>
<td>2 months. February - March 2017</td>
<td>13 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing the brief/source funding

• Project brief forms report to OSI 2 weeks after the conference
• Funding offers actively sought (responsibility and management)
  • independent organisations
  • research funders
  • library organisations
  • publishers
• Risk that single funding might imply bias. Instead propose a ‘crowdfunding’ model of 12 funders of $5,000 each
  • $10K incl. for O/H and admin
  • $50K for research
RFI / Identify researcher(s)

- Obtain estimate from potential researchers/groups
  - Criteria for researchers:
    - Independence
    - track record
    - global reach
    - acceptance by all stakeholder groups
Literature review / case studies

• identify and gather existing data and other relevant projects

• identify and examine the evidence from case studies (e.g. SAGE, T&F LIS embargo trials)
Survey stakeholders

- analyse data gathered
- identify stakeholder groups
- craft questions
- pilot questions (steering group?)
- design and create survey
Engage participants / collect results

- identify representative groups to extend survey reach to relevant stakeholder groups
- distribute survey
- manage collection of results
Analyse and report

- data analysis
- draft report for OSI 2017
  - easy to interpret summary
  - data in figshare
- potential for peer reviewed OA article(s) - No embargo!
- blogs, The Conversation, Research Information, Inside Higher Ed, Scholarly Kitchen, Against the Grain
- cross-stakeholder webinar
Future work (post OSI2017)

Consider standards work that can come from the findings relating to embargo setting:

• NICE
• NISO
• CASRAI
• Others?
The team

Ann Riley - President, Association of College and Research Libraries
Audrey McCulloch, Chief Executive, Association of Learned and Professional Societies
Danny Kingsley - Head of Scholarly Communication, Cambridge University
Eric Massant, Senior Director of Government and Industry Affairs, RELX Group
Gail McMillan, Director of Scholarly Communication, Virginia Tech
Glenorchy Campbell, Managing Director, British Medical Journal North America
Gregg Gordon, President, Social Science Research Network
Keith Webster, Dean of Libraries, Carnegie Mellon University
Laura Helmuth, incoming president, National Association of Science Writers
Tony Peatfield, Director of Corporate Affairs, Medical Research Council, Research Councils, UK
Will Schweitzer, Director of Product Development, AAAS/Science