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The OA Diamond Journals Study
“Call for an informed study containing an analysis and overview of collaborative non-commercial (aka “Diamond”) publishing journals and platforms.

The objective is to identify ways to support publishing initiatives wishing to implement Diamond business models.”

https://www.coalition-s.org/exploring-collaborative-non-commercial-publishing-models-for-open-access/
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Plan S
Making full and immediate Open Access a reality
Study approaches

Database analysis
- Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)
- ROAD database of open access journals
- Walt Crawford’s GOA dataset of open access journals

Survey
- survey of diamond journals with 95 questions and 1619 valid responses
- multilingual global dissemination with some bias towards Europe and Latin America

Focus groups and interviews
- 3 English & Spanish focus groups with journals
- 10 interviews with platforms and infrastructures

Quantitative and qualitative analysis
Study outcomes

- Findings
  - Landscape
  - Compliance
  - Dynamics
  - Sustainability
- Recommendations
OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 1: Findings

Findings Report - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4558704
References Library - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562816
Journals Inventory - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562828
Dataset - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4553103

Context
From June 2020 to February 2021, a consortium of 10 organisations undertook a large-scale study on journals across the world that are free for readers and authors, usually referred to as "OA diamond journals", commissioned by cOAlition S in order to gain a better understanding of the OA diamond landscape.

Presentation
The study undertook a statistical analysis of several bibliographic databases, surveyed 1,619 journals, text submissions and other data from 94 questions, and organised three focus groups with 11 journals hosting platforms. It collected 163 references in the academic literature, and inventoried 1048 journals.

The results of the study are available in the following outputs:

- Findings Report - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4558704
- References Library - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562816
- Journals Inventory - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562828
- Dataset - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4553103

Key Recommendations:
- Strengthen technical support

OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 2: Recommendations

Findings Report - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4558704
References Library - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562816
Journals Inventory - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562828
Dataset - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4553103

Context
From June 2020 to February 2021, a consortium of 10 organisations undertook a large-scale study on open access journals across the world that are free for readers and authors, usually referred to as "OA diamond journals". This study was commissioned by cOAlition S in order to gain a better understanding of the OA diamond landscape.

Presentation
The study undertook a statistical analysis of several bibliographic databases, surveyed 1,619 journals, collected 7,019 free text submissions and other data from 94 questions, and organised three focus groups with 11 journals and 10 interviews with hosting platforms. It collected 163 references in the academic literature, and inventoried 1048 journals not listed in DOAJ.

The results of the study are available in the following outputs:

- Findings Report - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4558704
- References Library - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562816
- Journals Inventory - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562828
- Dataset - DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4553103

Key Recommendations:
- Strengthen technical support
The report & materials

Findings
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4558704

Recommendations
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4562790

Survey Dataset
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4553103
Study outcomes

Findings

Landscape

Compliance

Dynamics

Sustainability

Recommendations

in presenting mode, the blocks above link to the respective parts of the presentation
In summary: we have a wide archipelago of relatively small journals serving diverse communities. OA diamond journals are ...

1. Numerous (up to 29,000)
2. In relative decline looking at article numbers
3. Concentrated in HSS but numerous in STM as well
4. Largely written nationally but read internationally
5. Relatively small & with small publishers
6. Strong in Latin America and Eastern Europe
7. Publishing ~44% of articles in full OA journals
8. Frequently strong in multilingualism
9. Diamond right from becoming online journals
Global journal number estimates, checked November 2020. Numbers are as reported at the moment of checking and not for a particular year, except for Scilit where the numbers refer to 2019. Sources: Listed in table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of definition of 'journal'</th>
<th>Number reported and source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly journals</td>
<td>104,081 (Elektronische Zeitschriftenbank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,970 (Microsoft Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,116 (MIAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38,589 (Scopus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active scholarly journals</td>
<td>56,689 (Scilit (Crossref based))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,616 (JournalTOCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,779 (EBSCO host)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,187 (Microsoft Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,017 (ERA journal list)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,184 (Scopus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,420 (Web of Science)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active scholarly journals, open access, not all guaranteed peer reviewed</td>
<td>37,333 (ROAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17,537 (JournalTOCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,158 (Scilit (Crossref based))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,822 (Ullrichs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active scholarly journal, open access, peer reviewed</td>
<td>15,581 (DOAJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,299 (Scopus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,762 (Web of Science)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Overlap of journals in DOAJ and ROAD. Source: Bruns et al. 2020 (ISSN-Matching of Gold OA Journals 4.0)
Figure 1. Overlap of journals in the Directory of open Access Journals (DOAJ) and the ROAD database of open access journals maintained by the ISSN registry. Source: Bruns et al. 2020 (ISSN-Matching of Gold OA Journals 4.0)
Figure 1. Overlap of journals in the Directory of open Access Journals (DOAJ) and the ROAD database of open access journals maintained by the ISSN registry. Source: Bruns et al. 2020 (ISSN-Matching of Gold OA Journals 4.0)
1. Landscape ◆ diamond journals calculation

70% diamond = 10194 journals

our random sample check: 24% to 65% diamond = 6759 to 18375 journals

overall: 17,000 to 29,000 diamond journals

The low number is journals that explicitly state not to charge an APC, or state being diamond. The high number also includes journals just not stating an APC.

ISSN-Gold-4.0 (n=43543)

DOAJ 14527

ROAD 37333

5594

8933

28400

8933

28400

5594

14527

37333

14527
Figure 2. Business models of a sample (n=382) of journals in ROAD but not in DOAJ. Source: Manual check websites of journals in the ROAD sample
1. Landscape

Figure 3. The overlapping sets of DOAJ and survey journals in the full journal landscape.

Numbers rounded to nearest hundred. Sources: DOAJ, Survey
1. Landscape  ◆  DOAJ additions by year

Figure 4. Open access journals by year of addition to DOAJ. Source: DOAJ

Figure 5. OA diamond journals by year of addition to DOAJ. Source: DOAJ

Figure 6. APC-based open access journals by year of addition to DOAJ. Source: DOAJ
Figure 7. DOAJ: The development of the number of journals added and journals removed in the last three years (numbers include all of 2020). Source: DOAJ public spreadsheet with added and removed journals.
Figure 8. Launch years of (current) open access journals. Source: DOAJ. NB Content for older years probably made online open access retrospectively.
1. Landscape ◆ content types (non-DOAJ)

Figure 9. Content types published. Source: Survey (Q17, n=439, non-DOAJ journals only)
Figure 10. DOAJ article numbers from 2014-2019 by open access model, absolute (left) and as shares of DOAJ total (right). Source: GOA(5)
1. Landscape

publisher locations

Figure 11. Journals by location of publisher. Note: All regions are based on the assignment of Walt Crawford in GOA(5). Source: DOAJ and Survey (Q14)
Figure 12. Shares of OA diamond and APC-based open access models in DOAJ-listed journals. Source: DOAJ
1. Landscape

Figure 13. Journals by discipline. Sources: DOAJ, GOA(5) and Survey (Q40)

DOAJ - OA diamond journals (n=9,848) from GOA(5)

DOAJ - APC-based journals (n=4,090) from GOA(5)

Survey - DOAJ journals (n=962 of 1,136)

Survey - non-DOAJ journals (n=392 of 483)
Figure 14. Journals by funding models for the three disciplinary groups. Source: DOAJ and GOA(5)
Figure 17. Number of journals by journal size in terms of number of articles per annum. Source: DOAJ

Figure 18. Number of articles published by journal size in terms of number of articles per annum. Source: DOAJ
Figure 15. Number of journals by publisher size in terms of journals published (size determined using the sum of OA diamond and APC-based journals). Source: DOAJ
Figure 16. Open access publishers by type for the OA diamond sector (left) and the APC-based sector (right). Source: GOA(5)
Figure 20. Proportion of authors from inside the journal’s owning organisation (by region/discipline of journal). Source: Survey (Q36, n=1,371 (region), n=1,278 (discipline))
Figure 19. Proportion of authors from the same country as the journal (by region and discipline of journal). Survey (Q37, n=1,365 (region), n=1,269 (discipline))
Figure 21. Share of journals stating their readership is mainly inside or outside their country (by region and discipline of journal). Survey (Q80, n=1,274 (region), n=1,202 (discipline))
1. **Landscape** ◆ multilingualism x model

**Figure 22.** Percentage of OA diamond and APC-based journals using one language or two or more languages. Source: DOAJ

**Figure 23.** Percentage of OA diamond journals that report publishing in one language or two or more languages. Source: Survey (Q18)
Figure 24. Databases that index their OA diamond journal, as reported by respondents: DOAJ (green), multidisciplinary bibliographic databases (blue), regional databases (yellow), library systems, including discovery systems (light blue), others (orange). Source: Survey (Q81, n=1,359)
Figure 25. Years journals were created, made available online, made available open access, and made available as OA diamond. NB Data points that appear to go backwards in time have been omitted (e.g. OA diamond date preceding OA date). Source: Survey (Q30, Q31, Q32 and Q33, n=1,550)
1. Landscape ◆ size development x size

Figure 26. Journals by development of number of articles over the last five years. Source: Survey (Q38, n=1,463)

Figure 27. Journals by development of number of articles over the last five years and by journal size group. Source: Survey (Q38, n=1,463)
Figure 28. Journals by development of number of articles over the last five years and by disciplines. Source: Survey (Q38, n=1,463)
In summary: OA diamond journals are on the road to full compliance with Plan S. Of the OA diamond journals ...

1. Only 37% comply with over half of the criteria
2. Compliance overall is lower than that of APC-based journals
3. Bigger journals seem to have better compliance
4. Some 37% use a CC-BY licence
5. Some 49% embed machine readable licenses
6. Some 40% use a standard archiving system
7. Less than 25% provide XML/HTML formatted articles

In presenting mode, the blocks above link to the respective parts of the presentation.
Figure 1. Q52 Compliance with COPE principles
2. Compliance 

Figure 2. Review types used by journal group in DOAJ

Figure 3. Review forms used by survey journals organised by those in DOAJ and those not
Figure 4. Basic statistics published on editorial management related to submission and rejection.
Figure 4. Basic statistics published on editorial management related to submission and rejection
2. Compliance ◆ PID x model

Figure 5. Use of article identifiers by journal category in DOAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier Type</th>
<th>OA diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>All DOAJ journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>9,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Use of article identifiers by journal category in the survey
2. Compliance

Figure 5. Use of article identifiers by journal category in DOAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier Type</th>
<th>OA Diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>All DOAJ Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>5,702</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>9,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Use of article identifiers by journal category in the survey
2. Compliance

Figure 7. Archiving in place by journal category in DOAJ

Figure 8. Archiving solution by journal category in survey
2. Compliance

Compliance archiving x model

Figure 7. Archiving in place by journal category in DOAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OA diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>All DOAJ journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No archiving</td>
<td>7088</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>8368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some archiving</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Archiving solution by journal category in survey
Figure 9. Article level metadata deposit in DOAJ by journal category
2. Compliance

Figure 10. Self-archiving policy in Sherpa Romeo by journal category
Figure 16. Formats used by the respondents (one respondent can use several formats)
## 2. Compliance

### JATS XML deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HTML or XML</th>
<th>OA diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>9,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>5,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,449</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>14,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of journals that offer this format

- **25.0 %**
- **63.4 %**
- **35.6 %**

Table 4. HTML or XML as full-text format by DOAJ journal category
Figure 11. JATS XML automatic deposit by journal type in survey
2. Compliance

OpenAIRE compliant metadata

Figure 12. OpenAIRE metadata standards compliance by survey journal category
Figure 13. Journal requirements on linking to data etc. by survey journal category
2. Compliance ◆ open citation data supply

Figure 14. Citations made available according to I4OC standards by survey journal category
2. Compliance  

2.1 Embedded licenses

Figure 15. Embedded license by journal category in DOAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OA diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>All DOAJ journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5916</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4533</td>
<td>2886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey DOAJ journals</th>
<th>Survey only journals</th>
<th>All survey journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Compliance  ❖  license types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th>Number of journals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>41.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY-SA</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY-NC</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY-NC-SA</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY-ND</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC BY-NC-ND</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>27.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1350/1363</td>
<td>106.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Survey journals applying Creative Commons licenses

Figure 17. License type by journal category in DOAJ
2. Compliance

Figure 18. Author copyright retention policy by journal category in DOAJ

Figure 19. Survey journals that allow authors to retain copyright without restrictions by journal group
Table 10. DOAJ journals conforming to Plan S requirements by DOAJ journal category, percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>OA diamond</th>
<th>APC-based</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>44.1 %</td>
<td>55.9 %</td>
<td>57.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author copyright</td>
<td>49.4 %</td>
<td>50.6 %</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article PID</td>
<td>55.3 %</td>
<td>44.7 %</td>
<td>85.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent preservation OK</td>
<td>19.1 %</td>
<td>80.9 %</td>
<td>56.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine-readable license</td>
<td>43.6 %</td>
<td>56.4 %</td>
<td>73.6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, smaller journals score lower on these criteria than larger ones, OA diamond lower than APC-based, university-based lower than journals with professional publishers, and HSS journals lower than science and medicine journals. Structurally, the smaller journals tend to be more OA diamond, university-based and in HSS, so it is basically the same factors manifesting themselves in various ways.

Size has to do with the possibility and operational need to gain competence: the larger the journal, the larger the need for competence and the better the possibilities to achieve competence. APCs enable the journal to pay costs and buy competence, either by outsourcing functions or by hiring persons in the organisation. This does not mean APCs are the solution, but it indicates that funding, beyond in-kind contributions, must be considered vital to ensure strong and healthy OA diamond journals. It also points to a need for journal owners of all kinds to organise journals so that resources are pooled and competence built up collectively for a number of journals.
Figure 20. DOAJ journals grouped by **number of requirements** satisfied, by DOAJ journal group

Requirements checked:

- License
- Peer review
- Author copyright
- Article PID
- Permanent preservation OK
- Machine-readable license
In summary: there is a mix of scientific strengths and operational challenges. Diamond journals often show ...

1. A lack of legal ownership documents
2. Lack of capacity for monitoring and reporting
3. A variety of peer review types
4. A need to professionalize peer review processes
5. Compliance with editorial quality guidelines
6. Lack of using anti-plagiarism software
7. Using standard OJS software, but run on variety of platforms
8. Indexation in main databases is their biggest challenge
Use of an anti-plagiarism tool. This service is already largely used by the respondents to the survey (820 "Yes" versus 589 "No" and 70 "Unknown"). Thanks to the partnership of Crossref with Authenticate, this service is relatively inex-

- 99 -
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expensive. Yet it adds up to the financial pressure incurred by small journals. Seven respondents have explicitly suggested that funders could provide anti-plagiarism service for free: "Supporting the use of plagiarism detection tools accessible or free of charge for open access scientific journals"; "Provide free anti-plagiarism software"; "Achieve a significant reduction or removal of the fees in dollars for (...) anti-plagiarism tools"; "Be able to pay anti-plagiarism software (now we use a borrowed one)"; "Provision of access to plagiarism detection software"; "Free plagiarism detection service"; "Paying the anti-plagiarism software on time." Nine other respondents raised the issue of the amount spent on anti-plagiarism software in other free text questions.
Figure 1. Q52 Compliance with COPE principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey DOAJ journals</th>
<th>Survey only journals</th>
<th>All survey journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Who owns the journal in the survey? (Q34)
3. Dynamics ♦ ownership x resources

Figure 2. Relationship between ownership (Q34) and resources (Q62)
Figure 3. Is there a document establishing legal ownership? (Q35)
Figure 4. Share of journals with a legal document establishing ownership (Q35) per paid staff in FTEs (Q67) and per total annual costs (Q66)
Figure 5. Share of journal with a legal document establishing ownership (Q35) per country (Q14)
Figure 6. Does the journal provide reporting statistics? (Q29)
Figure 7. Distribution of reporting statistics (Q50) per hosting (Q58)
Figure 8. Distribution of formats (Q17) by disciplines (Q40)
Figure 9. Relationship between outsourcing (Q24) and the use of volunteers (Q69)
Figure 10. Relationship between the review system (Q48) and the annual number of articles (Q16)
Figure 11. Distribution of peer review practices (Q26) per disciplines (Q40)
Figure 12. Areas for support of tools and services from the free text answers to the question on funders’ support (Q75)
Figure 13. The main arguments in the free text for the peer review challenges (Q82). Quantitative analysis with Spacy NLP tree
Figure 14. Solutions for peer review recruitment and management in the free text answers to peer review challenges (Q82)
Figure 15. Distribution of the average number of articles of the respondents when they use academic CMS (Open Journal System, Lodel & Dscape) and other publishing systems.
Figure 16. Formats used by the respondents (one respondent can use several formats)
Figure 17. Distribution of formats (Q27) in three leading platforms (OpenEdition Journals, SciELO, ScienceOpen) and in individual journals using Open Journal Systems (Q13)
3.3.2 Strength

OA diamond publishing journals have made significant steps towards open source software in the past years. OJS has been largely adopted with 60% of the respondents using it as a publication tool: “Open source publishing software has contributed to reducing the design costs of a large number of journals by disseminating automated procedures that have long been applied within large organisations such as Elsevier or Springer.” (Langlais 2016)
Figure 18. Share of preservation plans in the survey (Q28)
3. Dynamics  ◆  PID x host types

Figure 19. Use of article IDs (Q42) across the main types of hosts (Q58)
Figure 20. Types of expected supports extracted from the free text answers to funders’ support (Q75)
Figure 21. The main challenges linked to the use of a standard academic CMS
3. Dynamics ◆ importance of challenges

Figure 22. Importance of the challenges by share of respondents
(1=not important, in green, 5=very important, in dark blue)
3. Dynamics ◆ indexing x annual cost size

Figure 23. Share of indexation (Q81) per annual costs (Q66)
3. Dynamics ◆ typology of journals

Figure 24. Typology of diamond journals through a correspondence analysis of nine questions from the survey. We manually identified five types of journals: voluntary-run (red), institutional (orange), publisher (blue), learned society (violet) and large structure (yellow).
In summary: An economy that largely depends on volunteers, universities and government. OA diamond journals often show ...

1. Very modest annual costs
2. A minimal number of paid staff FTE
3. A high dependence on volunteers
4. 40% break-even and 25% operate at a loss
5. A lack of knowledge of their own financial situation
6. Research performing organizations as main funders & supporters
7. A wide diversity of funding mechanisms

in presenting mode, the blocks above link to the respective parts of the presentation
Figure 1. Previous year annual costs of journals, percentage (n=1,370); survey Q66
Figure 5. Distribution of estimated cost per article for diamond OA journals by journal size
Figure 6. Distribution of estimated cost-per-article for diamond OA journals by region
4. Sustainability ◆ costs <€1,000 x country

Figure 2. Number of journals with costs below $/€1,000 by country (n=340); survey Q66
Figure 3. Number of journals reporting costs unknown by type of organisation in % (n=267); survey Q66
Figure 4. Annual amount paid in $/€ for editing and operational costs in % (n=1,388); survey Q68
Figure 7. The three main expenses/payables by journal (n=1347), survey Q72
Figure 8. Size of paid staff for journal editing and operational work (n=1373); survey Q67
Figure 9. Paid staff by size of the journal, i.e. number of articles per year (n=1211); survey Q67 and Q16
Figure 10. Size of paid staff for journal editing and operational work by owner of the journal/organisational type (n=1373); survey Q67 and Q34
Figure 11. Reliance on volunteers compared to 2019 costs (n=1369); survey Q70 and Q66
Figure 12. Reliance on volunteers by size of paid staff for journal editing and operational work (n= 1,427); survey: Q70 and Q67
Figure 13. What volunteers do (n=855); survey Q71
Figure 14. Who has funded the journal over the last two years? (n=1,421); survey Q61
Figure 15. Funding mechanisms (n=1,408); survey Q62
Figure 16. What journals charge for (n=1,302); survey Q65
Figure 17. Current financial status of the journal (n=1,393); survey Q73
Figure 18. Journals by financial status and how sustainable they consider the journal in the next three years on a scale of one to 10 where 10 is very secure; survey Q73 and Q74.
Figure 19. Journals that consider moving away from the OA diamond model (n=1,426); survey Q76
Figure 20. Journals that are considering moving away from the OA diamond model by journal creation year and percentage (n=279); survey Q76 and Q30
Figure 21. Reasons for journals to consider moving away from the OA diamond model (n=544); survey Q77
### 5. Recommendations

#### List of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1</td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>Better coordinate editorial and quality assurance service provision</td>
<td>Infrastructures and Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formalise legal ownership and governance rules</td>
<td>Institutions, Societies and Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase infrastructure capacity to support biodiversity</td>
<td>Funders, Institutions and Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Raise awareness and understanding of open licenses and promote policy implementation</td>
<td>Funders, Institutions and Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate access to DOIs, particularly for smaller journals</td>
<td>Infrastructures and Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulate and enable journals to preserve their content</td>
<td>Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage self-archiving policy registration</td>
<td>Funders, Institutions and Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve access to formatting tools and services</td>
<td>Funders and Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.1</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Create an OA diamond Capacity Centre</td>
<td>Funders, Infrastructures, Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop an organised marketplace for OA diamond</td>
<td>Infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organise an international symposium and workshop to prepare the creation of the Capacity Centre</td>
<td>Funders, Institutions and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4.1</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Further develop partnerships with the goal to help raise funds and seek out efficiencies</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider using more shared services and infrastructure</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect on the mid- to long-term role of volunteers and in-kind contributions in running journals</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversify journals’ funding streams</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aim to consistently manage formal journal budgets</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Register OA diamond journals in DOAJ</td>
<td>Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.1</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Collaborate on a funding strategy for OA diamond</td>
<td>Funders, Institutions and Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistently finance the operations of OA diamond</td>
<td>Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invest in the future of OA diamond</td>
<td>Funders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion** Towards a new OA commons All
Recommendations

- Technical support
- Compliance
- Capacity building
- Effectiveness
- Sustainability

for: Funders, Institutions, Societies, Infrastructures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness and understanding of open licenses and promote policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate access to DOIs, particularly for smaller journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate and enable journals to preserve their content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage self-archiving policy registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to formatting tools and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOAJ**, the CLOCKSS Archive, Internet Archive, Keepers Registry/ISSN International Centre and Public Knowledge Project (PKP) have agreed to partner to provide an alternative pathway for the preservation of small-scale, APC-free, Open Access journals.
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Further develop partnerships with the goal to help raise funds and seek out efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider using more shared services and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on the mid- to long-term role of volunteers and in-kind contributions in running journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversify journals’ funding streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim to consistently manage formal journal budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register OA diamond journals in DOAJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Effectiveness

Welcome to openjournals.nl
Openjournals provides a professional OpenAccess publishing platform for scholarly, peer-reviewed journals. This platform is made possible by a collaboration between the KNAW, NWO and the OPUS Foundation.
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better coordinate editorial and quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalise legal ownership and governance rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase infrastructure capacity to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibliodiversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate on a funding strategy for OA diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently finance the operations of OA diamond journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in the future of OA diamond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sustainability

### UvA open access policy and Diamond Open Access Fund

4 February 2021

### FAIR OS PUBLISHERS, INFRASTRUCTURES AND INITIATIVES SUPPORTED BY KU LEUVEN

KU Leuven promotes a sustainable implementation of Open Access and Open Science, and especially sponsors non-profit and community-led initiatives through the KU Leuven Fund for Fair OA. On the one hand, the fund supports innovative publishing initiatives and infrastructures. On the other hand, the fund covers membership costs for consortia and advocacy organizations focusing on a non-profit approach to scholarly communication.
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## Recommendations

**Capacity building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create an OA diamond Capacity Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an organised marketplace for OA diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise an international symposium and workshop to prepare the creation of the Capacity Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OA diamond ecosystem

owners
- e.g. university as owner and (in kind) supporter
- e.g. society as owner and (in kind) supporter
- e.g. gov. agency as owner and (in kind) supporter

journals
- Journal platform 1
  - diamond journal A
- diamond journal B
- diamond journal C
- diamond journal D
- Journal platform 2
  - diamond journal E

organizations providing financial support
- diamond ecosystem support by RFO's
- diamond ecosystem support by RPO's

- e.g. grant
- e.g. fee
- e.g. volume based contribution
- e.g. donation
- e.g. membership
- e.g. Crossref services
- e.g. DOAJ
- e.g. OJS

infra x

 disciplinary journal network / community

OA infrastructure
To create a diverse, thriving, innovative and more interconnected and collaborative OA diamond journal ecosystem that supports bibliodiversity and serves many languages, cultures and domains in the future.
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