

JOSS2024 B3 (2024/6/20 18:00-19:30) 【Q&A】

「オープンサイエンス時代の権利保持を考える(1)—即時 OA 下の論文の権利に着目して」

慶應義塾大学名誉教授・岡田光弘氏から、

内閣府・赤池参事官への質問

Q: 赤池様 他のごこととのトレードオフにより検討するとのこと、*「2025公募からIMMEDIATE OA」*に政府としてコミットしたわけではないということも意味していますでしょうか。

A: 「学術論文等の即時オープンアクセスの実現に向けた基本方針」(令和6年2月16日統合イノベーション戦略推進会議決定)及び「学術論文等の即時オープンアクセスの実現に向けた基本方針の実施にあたっての具体的方策」(令和6年2月21日関係府省申合せ)は政府として決定したものです。これらに基づき様々な施策を行う上で、トレードオフがあるという趣旨で申し上げました。なお、同基本方針には、「国内外のオープンアクセスに関する政策動向、市場動向等を踏まえ、必要に応じて本方針を見直す。」としているところです。

クンツ 真紀・東京大学附属図書館から、

cOAlition S Ambassador, Sally Rumsey 氏への質問

Q: *Dear Sally The OA mandantory is for researches which supported by public funding. Is there no possibility that researchers may make support action by organizing voluntary peer review group and asking to their research funder to run a publication platform? Have you interview to academic societies and their leading authors?*

研究者の方々が自主的な査読グループを組織して、研究助成金の提供機関にオープン出版プラットフォームの協同運営を提案するなどの、能動的な支援行動は起きていないのでしょうか？(クンツ 真紀)

A: I'm not sure I fully understand your question, so forgive me if I have misunderstood. There are some very interesting overlay peer review initiatives. See for example the Peer Community In initiative <https://peercommunityin.org/>. This is a community initiative run by academics. Peer review takes place on preprints. (Sally Rumsey)

Q: *Dear Sally Have you interview to academic societies and their leading authors?*

また、学会や学会誌の主要な著者の皆様のご意見は聴取されていますか？(クンツ 真紀)

A: cOAlition S has been working closely with academic learned societies See for example <https://www.informationpower.co.uk/enabling-smaller-independent-publishers-oa-agreements/> (Sally Rumsey, cOAlition S Ambassador)

**Question from Antoine Bocquet, Vice President, Springer Nature Japan  
to Sally Rumsey, cOAlition S Ambassador**

Q: *Question for Sally: As you say, funders have no “skin in the game” in the relationship between authors and publishers. If institutions create a right retention policy, they are now additionally placing conditions on their employees, and how they can disseminate their research. (Antoine Bocquet)*

A: Institutional rights retention policies are created in consultation with the academic community. They are created IN support of, and WITH the support of researchers. They are not top-down conditions placed on employees – they tend to be written in consultation with staff. This was very much in evidence at Harvard where their policy was supported by a unanimous vote by staff. The UK policies have all been developed in full consultation as far as I’m aware. (Sally Rumsey)

Q: Although we assume that universities will have the interests of their employees at heart, we know from previous disputes relating to intellectual property that researchers and their employer universities do not always see eye to eye. How can we ensure that once universities obtain rights from authors, they will fulfill their obligations regarding dissemination of their research and what is their position if authors wish to withdraw these rights from their university? (Antoine Bocquet)

A: In most situations, institutions DO NOT obtain rights from their employees. The copyright remains with the researcher (or the university waives its right to articles) who merely grants a licence to their university. The rights remain with the researcher. (Sally Rumsey)

Q: Do authors have a choice NOT to agree with their university’s rights retention policy and opt out? (Antoine Bocquet)

A: Most university policies have an opt-out option (Sally Rumsey)

Q: I think the question is relevant in Japan where the relationship between academics and their host universities may be different than in the UK? (Antoine Bocquet)

A: I’m afraid I don’t know how IP typically is structured in Japanese universities. In UK universities, although the university, as the employer would typically own all copyrights, universities tend to waive copyright and researchers/staff hold the copyright. If they didn’t the university, as rights holder, would have to sign every LTP/copyright transfer the author wanted to enter into. (Sally Rumsey)

**Question from Sally Rumsey, cOAlition S Ambassador  
to Springer Nature**

Q: *My question to Springer Nature: Why is it OK for a researcher to share their paper via one freely available personal website, but not another freely available repository website? This is very confusing for authors, it is not helpful for the general public, and doesn't make sense with how the internet operates?* (Sally Rumsey)

A: our policy of allowing sharing of AMs to authors' personal websites without embargo enables researchers to promote their research as part of their career development. However, when it comes to enabling widespread public access to research, as we explain in our [self-archiving policy](#), Springer Nature [supports gold OA](#) as the simplest, most open, and most sustainable route to OA and to open science and research. Unlike green OA self-archiving of accepted manuscripts (AM), gold OA provides immediate access to the trusted, enhanced, and publisher-maintained version of record (VOR), and is not reliant on the continued existence of journal subscriptions.

Just in case, here are the actual links to the above.

- Self-archiving policy: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/policies/journal-policies>
- Gold OA: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/open-research/about/green-or-gold-routes-to-oa>

(Springer Nature)