INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM:
Publishers are increasing their efforts to optimize the availability of research articles in response to changes in policy by governments and funders and growing demand from researchers themselves. Research funders and governments have an interest in ensuring the widest possible availability of research outputs and many are developing policies that require funded researchers choose one of a variety of routes to making their research publications more widely available.

Researchers and institutions want to ensure compliance with funder conditions. Publishers likewise want to signal that the services they provide are compliant with funder requirements. Downstream users may wish to be able to determine what research is accessible to them, or to determine what re-use rights they have, and to be of use to computational users of research papers, all this information is required in a machine readable form.

Many offerings are available from publishers under the banner of "Open Access", "Increased Access", "Public Access" or other names and the terms offered vary both between publishers and within publishers by journal, and in some cases, based on the funder. Adding to the potential confusion, a number of publishers also offer "hybrid options", in which authors of an article can pay a fee to make their paper freely available to readers, while the rest of the content in that journal remains under subscription control. No standardized bibliographic metadata currently provides information on whether a specific article is openly accessible (i.e. can be read by any user who can get to the journal website over the internet) and what re-use rights might be available to readers.

The large open access publishers, the Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA), and the Budapest10 Group have all recommended publishers adopt Creative Commons licenses to clarify readership rights and re-use rights, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY). Publishers with significant subscription businesses have not typically adopted Creative Commons licenses in general or the CC BY license in particular for their wider-access offerings.

This varied environment limits clarity and leads to difficulty in adopting standards. Funders find the lack of information and cooperation between stakeholders creates difficulty in determining whether a specific article is compliant with their policies. Publishers of hybrid journals have no
simple mechanism for signaling the free-to-read status of specific articles or the re-use rights of downstream users. Authors have difficulty determining what rights they will retain and whether they are compliant with a given funder policy. Readers face the burden of figuring out what they can and cannot do with specific articles. Aggregators and service providers have no single mechanism for identifying articles that can be legitimately harvested.

A standardized set of metadata elements that can be shared between publishers would therefore be of value. Two different levels can be addressed. The first level would identify elements that describe the accessibility of specific articles, i.e. can this specific article be openly accessed from an arbitrary point on the internet?

The second level would address re-use rights. Creative Commons licenses (which are available in machine readable form) already addresses this issue. Where other license terms are applied the situation becomes more complex. Nonetheless, transmitting rights information will create significant value in an ecosystem of materials that builds on the openly accessible literature. Specifying technical routes and mechanisms for more specific forms of reuse are out of scope for the current document.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EFFORTS:
The following description of other OA identification projects shows that a NISO OA metadata and indicator set would complement efforts currently underway, although coordination and communication with these projects would be important.

- **CrossMark** ([http://www.crossref.org/crossmark/](http://www.crossref.org/crossmark/)) - CrossRef’s update identification service provides a platform for publishers to display non-bibliographic metadata about content. CrossRef defines a minimum set of information to be deposited with CrossMark. Beyond this minimum, the publisher chooses what metadata to include. CrossRef encourages the use of existing or the creation of industry standards around what metadata could be included; CrossRef supports the development of a metadata and indicator standard for Open Access that could be displayed in CrossMark records.

- **HowOpenIsIt?** - PLOS, SPARC and OASPA collaborated to create this guide ([http://www.plos.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/OAS_English_web.pdf](http://www.plos.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/OAS_English_web.pdf)) that identifies core components of OA and demonstrates how some content can be more open and some less. The tool allows users to assessed the level of openness of journals in the following categories:
  - Reader Rights
  - Reuse Rights
  - Copyrights
  - Author Posting Rights
  - Automatic Posting
  - Machine Readability

  The guide makes qualitative judgments about OA, but does not provide specific metadata guidelines to convey this information. The NISO-recommended OA metadata could specify metadata that could be used by a guide like *HowOpenIsIt?*

- **Vocabularies for OA (V40A)** ([http://www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/howjiscworks/committees/workinggroups/palsmetadatagroup/v4oa.aspx](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/aboutus/howjiscworks/committees/workinggroups/palsmetadatagroup/v4oa.aspx)) This JISC/UKOLN project grew out of discussions within the Open Access
Implementation Group (OAIG) and was taken forward by the Publisher and Library Solutions (PALS) working group. The goal is to achieve consensus on the vocabularies/authority files to be included in open access research output metadata schemas (such as ONIX and Cerif). The V4OA work is aligned with the JISC project: “RIOXX: Developing Repository Metadata Guidelines” - a project to define a standard set of bibliographic metadata for UK Institutional Repositories, to which the V4OA project will reconcile. The V4OA work will deliver a final report in March 2013 documenting recommendations for appropriate vocabularies, profiles and authority lists to use in the OA scholarly communications space. Further information about the project will be available shortly. However, it’s expected that V4OA work will overlap with the work of the NISO Open Access Metadata and Indicators group so it will be important to keep in touch as the NISO work can feed into the V4OA work.

- **ONIX-PL** ([http://www.editeur.org/21/ONIX-PL/](http://www.editeur.org/21/ONIX-PL/)) This project is part of a family of XML formats for communicating licensing terms under the broader name “ONIX for Licensing Terms.” ONIX-PL may allow for the management of the more nuanced license expression information necessary for OA publishing that does not use CC-BY. EDItEUR has already developed ONIX-PL expressions of both CC-BY and SERU.

- **Linked Content Coalition** ([http://www.linkedcontentcoalition.org/](http://www.linkedcontentcoalition.org/)) This international group, initiated by the European Publishers Council, aims to facilitate the more effective management of rights data on the internet through the development of a cross-media standardized communication layer. The European Publishers Council is a high level group of Chairmen and CEOs of leading European media corporations actively involved in multimedia markets spanning newspaper, magazine, book, journal, internet and online database publishers, and radio and TV broadcasting. The LCC aims to provide better rights information to partners in the supply chain and to end users, as well as to facilitate the creation of a voluntary but effective market for automated and semi-automated rights trading.

- **Open Discovery Initiative** ([http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/](http://www.niso.org/workrooms/odi/)) This is a NISO initiative which aims at defining best practices for the new generation of library discovery services that are based on indexed search. These discovery services are primarily based upon indexes derived from journals, ebooks and other electronic information of a scholarly nature. The content comes from a range of information providers and products—commercial, open access, institutional, etc. Part of ODI's output is intended to include recommendations for communication of libraries' rights to specific content (e.g. restricted to subscribers versus open to all users).

**AUDIENCE:**
The audience that will benefit from the successful development of OA metadata and indicators can be segmented into six distinct communities:

1. Readers seeking to understand what rights they have for a given article (e.g., free readership for the published version, limited reuse, etc.).
2. Authors aiming to determine what rights they will retain and whether they are compliant with a given funder policy.
3. Publishers hoping to clearly convey what its audience can and cannot do with the articles they disseminate.
4. Research funders looking to promote the openness of the work they sponsor, and to verify their policies are being followed.
5. Search engines, A&I databases, and other discovery services aiming to help guide their audience toward resources to which they have access and other rights.
6. Academic libraries seeking to more efficiently direct their patrons to resources that are freely accessible and/or reusable.

STAKEHOLDERS:
The Working Group will benefit from the participation of stakeholders within each of the audience segments detailed in the prior section, including both commercial and not-for-profit publishers, research funders (both governmental and non-governmental), librarians, discovery engine organizations (both commercial and non-commercial), and, if possible, an academic professional or two to speak to authors and readers’ interests and concerns. Additionally, the Working Group will likely seek input from organizations that have experience in areas directly related to this project, including CrossRef, OASPA, KBART, EDItEUR, the Copyright Clearance Center, and electronic rights management vendors. Input from these stakeholders will help the Working Group develop concrete business use cases to further define the problem to be solved.

SCOPE:
The current work item should focus firstly on metadata elements that describe the readership rights associated with specific articles. Specifically, the Working Group will determine the optimal mechanisms to transmit the rights, if any, an arbitrary user has to access a specific article, from an arbitrary connection point on the internet. Recommendations will include means for distribution and aggregation of this metadata in machine readable forms, and the Working Group will consider whether existing bibliographic metadata distribution systems can store and transmit this information.

The work item will also consider the feasibility of incorporating information on re-use rights and the feasibility of reaching agreement on transmission of such information within the NISO community at this point in time. Specifically it will consider whether provision of license information is sufficient to provide clarity on re-use rights or whether further mechanisms are required. It may provide a recommendation on adoption of standardized licenses.

OBJECTIVES:
The work item will provide the following outputs:
1. A specified format for bibliographic metadata and, possibly, a set of visual signals, describing the readership rights associated with a single journal article
2. Recommended mechanisms for publishing and distributing this metadata
3. A report on the feasibility of including clear information on downstream re-use rights within the current project and, if judged feasible, inclusion of these elements in outputs 1 and 2
4. A report stating how the adoption of these outputs would answer (or not) specific use cases to be developed by the working group.

WORK TIMELINE (Greg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Proposal</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of Working Group</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of Initial Work Plan</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Completion of Information Gathering**  
June-July 2013

**Completion of Initial Draft**  
October 2013

**Public Comment Period**  
November 2013

**Completion of Final Draft**  
December 2013

**ADOPTION/MARKETING PLAN:**

- **The Working Group needs to be** representative of a broad range of stakeholders: publishers (OA, subscription, hybrid), librarians interested in discovery of OA content, research funders, scholars, and vendors of library system software, especially local link server vendors. The Working Group members will help promote the deliverables.
- **Publishers:** CrossRef will promote the deliverables to its membership.
- **Publishers’ vendors:** publishers will work with their vendors on implementation.
- **Libraries:** the Working Group should consider the impact of the metadata on resource discovery systems.
- **The Working Group should develop a plan** for Working Group members to speak at appropriate industry conferences and workshops.
- **NISO** can run a webinar to promote the deliverables.
- **The Working Group can submit papers** about the deliverables to industry journals and newsletters.