SocPC response to UKRI Open Access review consultation

Background Information Questions

To enable UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) to effectively analyse responses from different stakeholder groups, respondents are requested to provide some background information about themselves. Questions marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory. In the online response for some questions, including mandatory questions, will only appear for specific types of respondent.

I.   **Please provide a named contact and email address so that UKRI can contact you regarding your responses.**
     named contact tbc

II. **Please indicate if you are also happy for UKRI to contact you about the outcomes of the consultation.**
     Yes

III. **Please indicate who you are responding on behalf of**.
     a.   Yourself as an individual
     b.   An organisation
     c.   Other (including part of an organisation, department, informal group) – please specify type
          Informal group of learned societies

IV. **Please specify the name of your organisation.**
     Society Publishers' Coalition

V.   **Please specify the name of your group/department.**

VI. **Please specify which country you, your organisation or your group are based in.**
     United Kingdom

VII. **Which disciplinary area(s) would you associate you, your organisation or your group with? Please select all that apply.**
     a.   Arts and humanities

b.	Medicine, health and life sciences
c.	Physical sciences, engineering and mathematics
d.	Social sciences
e.	Interdisciplinary research
f.	Not applicable

If you, your organisation or your group is responding on behalf of a specific discipline within an area indicated above, please describe it using a maximum of five key words separated by spaces

VIII.	**What best describes the capacity in which you, your organisation or your group are responding?**
a.	Researcher(s)
b.	Publisher (including employees and representative bodies)
c.	Learned society or academy with an in-house publishing arm (including employees)
d.	Learned society or academy which outsources publishing to a third party (including employees)
e.	Learned society or academy which does not publish (including employees)
f.	Providers of scholarly communication infrastructure or services (including employees and representative bodies)
g.	Library or research management (including departments, employees and representative bodies)
h.	Higher education institute (HEI) (including departments, employees and representative bodies)
i.	Business that conducts, uses or publishes research and/or innovation (including employees and representative bodies)
j.	Research and/or innovation funder (including employees and representative bodies)
k.	Member(s) of the public
l.	Other research performing organisation (including departments, employees and representative bodies) - please specify:
m.	Other user or producer of research outputs - please specify:
n.	Other - please specify: Learned societies with both in-house and outsourced publishing arms

IX.	**UKRI will share responses to this consultation (excluding personal data) with its sponsor department, the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), and other UK government departments and agencies, to explore OA issues. Have you or members of your group applied or been part of an application for grant funding from the following? If applicable, please select all that apply.**
a.	UKRI (including AHRC, BBSRC, ESRC, EPSRC, Innovate UK, MRC, NERC, Research England, STFC, as well as predecessor bodies, HEFCE and RCUK)
b.	UK Space Agency
c.	Department for International Development (DFID) and subsidiary bodies

d.   Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) including National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) and other subsidiary bodies

e.   Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and subsidiary bodies

If you or members of your group have applied or been part of an application for grant funding from other UK government departments or their subsidiary bodies, please specify the awarding body:

X.   **If responding on behalf of a company, please provide your Company Registration Number (if known):**

XI.   **If responding on behalf of a charity, please provide your Charity Registration Number (if known):**

XII.   **If responding on behalf of an organisation, please indicate your staff headcount (if known).**
   a.   ≥ 250 (large business)
   b.   < 250 (medium-sized business)
   c.   < 50 (small business)
   d.   < 10 (micro business)

XIII.   **If applicable, which researcher career stage(s) do you, your organisation or your group represent? Select all that apply.**
   a.   Postgraduate researcher
   b.   Post-doctoral researcher
   c.   Research leader (responsible for intellectual leadership and overall management of research projects)
   d.   Other (including retired researcher, citizen researcher) – please specify: retired, citizen researcher, independent researchers and undergraduates.

Section A: Research Articles

Q1. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that it is clear what research articles are in-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy (see paragraph 46 of the consultation document)?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

If anything is unclear, please explain why (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Q2. **Are there any additional considerations that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when defining research articles that will be in - scope of the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Please see paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

Q3. **In setting its policy, should UKRI consider any other venues for peer-reviewed research articles which are not stated in paragraph 47 of the consultation document?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (700 characters maximum, approximately 100 words).

Q4. **Are there any specific challenges for you, your community or your organisation in terms of complying with the requirement in UKRI's proposed policy for immediate OA of in-scope research articles?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. UKRI notes that there will be a period allowing for implementation before the policy comes into force (see paragraph 70 of the consultation document). (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words.)

Members of SocPC are seeking full, sustainable transitions to Open Access. If UKRI are able to commit to funding immediate Open Access to the versions of record, this provides a way forward for our members. This may include a commitment to funding transformative agreements of the kind several of our members have already entered into through Jisc. However, the proposed policy endorses the use of embargo-free Green Open Access as an alternative route, which is not practicable for all of us. Our primary concern relates to subscription cancellations. The future cannot be predicted by the past; few publishers currently permit embargo-free Green, and we have for the last decade been in a period of general economic growth. These factors combined

mean there has been little opportunity for libraries to cancel journals which comply with the proposed policy. The current economic distress, however, suggests libraries will need to find immediate and extensive cost savings (one member's library advisory board reported being asked to do 'extreme' financial modelling in the wake of the pandemic of up to 40% cuts in funding over five years). Where embargo-free Green is available, libraries will logically cancel these journals first. With no income, journals will be unable to continue to publish.

Q5. **Should UKRI's OA policy require a version of all in-scope research articles to be deposited in a repository, irrespective of whether the version of record is made OA via a journal or publishing platform?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (700 characters maximum, approximately 100 words). Please note that some Research Councils already require articles to be deposited in specific repositories, as detailed in the terms and conditions of funding. UKRI does not expect this to change.

Requiring repository deposit of in-scope articles which have been published Open Access in a journal would be an unnecessary duplication of effort since journals already have digital preservation measures in place for all articles. Per our response to question 31, we instead recommend that UKRI mandate deposit of preprints as providing truly immediate Open Access to research articles.

Q6. **For research articles, are there any additional considerations relating to OA routes, publication venues and embargo periods that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when developing the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Please see paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

Given the much wider applicability of REF, there is little possibility of UKRI's being able to fund Open Access for versions of record. The risks identified in our response to question 4 would therefore be multiplied and the requirement for embargo-free Green Open Access articles should definitely not be extended to the REF. For AHSS in particular, the Green route is likely to be adopted for a much greater number of REF articles compared with UKRI-funded articles. The proportion of content published by each journal that is eligible for REF is high, and permitting deposit without embargo could create an environment where librarians would be under financial pressure to cancel their subscriptions.

Q7. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that where compliance with UKRI's OA policy is achieved via a repository, a CC BY licence (or Open Government Licence where needed) should be required for the deposited copy?**

Strongly agree / Agree / Neither Agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't Know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

One of our challenges in answering this question is the lack of nuance in the application of Creative Commons licences. We encourage reuse of content as part of the research lifecycle; applying a CC-BY licence to author accepted manuscripts, however, would permit a third party to commercially publish the article and thus undermine publishers' only means of recouping the cost of peer review and manuscript processing up to the stage of acceptance.

Q8. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that UKRI's OA policy should have a case-by-case exception allowing CC BY-ND for the version of record and/or author's accepted manuscript.**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer. UKRI particularly welcomes evidence supporting: specific cases where ND is considered necessary; an ND exception not being necessary; any implications an ND exception could have for access and reuse (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Some research requires no derivatives as a matter of ethical research, for example articles drawing on first-person accounts (e.g. of people trafficking), where altered testimony would be problematic. In many parts of AHSS, such as territory policy and governance, the precise choice of wording is a critical part of the scholarly process and an ND licence would protect that. Requiring a case-by-case application to be made for a CC-BY-ND licence, article by article, would be excessively burdensome administratively, and we wonder why the same approach as advocated for books – that is, that ND licences are permitted – was not also applied to journal articles. Alternatively, it would be more practical to permit individual Research Councils to select the most appropriate licence for their disciplines than to require case-by-case exemptions.

Q9. **Would the proposed licensing requirements for UKRI's OA policy, which exclude third-party content (see paragraph 55 of the consultation document), affect your or your organisation's ability to publish in-scope research articles containing third-party content?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please explain how (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

There are still a significant number of rights holders, including publicly-funded libraries, archives, and museums, who do not offer Open Access licences of any type for their material, as described in more detail in our response to question 44. Researchers frequently face difficulty in obtaining Open Access licences for third-party material, and where rights holders do allow Open Access licences, they are frequently subject to strict limits and are often more expensive than are licences for traditional online and print use. Though articles, by their nature, will have less third-party material than books (in total, but not in relation to amount of text), the financial

Q10. **Are there other considerations UKRI should take into account regarding licensing requirements for research articles in-scope of its proposed OA policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Q11. **For research articles, are there any additional considerations relating to licensing that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when developing the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Please see paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

Q12. **Which statement best reflects your views on whether UKRI's OA policy should require copyright and/or rights retention for in-scope research articles?**
   a. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain copyright and not exclusively transfer this to a publisher
   b. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain specific reuse rights, including rights to deposit the author's accepted manuscript in a repository in line with the deposit and licensing requirements of UKRI's OA policy
   c. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain copyright AND specific reuse rights, including rights to deposit the author's accepted manuscript in a repository in line with the deposit and licensing requirements of UKRI's OA policy
   d. UKRI should not have a requirement for copyright or rights retention
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

Please explain your answer. UKRI particularly welcomes views as to whether it is necessary to require copyright and/or rights retention if its policy were to require a CC BY licence, which enables reuse. If you selected answer b or c, please state what reuse rights you think UKRI's OA policy should require to be retained (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Please note that views are not sought on whether institutions should hold the copyright to work produced by their employees as this is subject to Section 11 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and institutional copyright policies.

Publishers do not need to take copyright from authors in order to publish their articles (whether Open Access or paywalled); a publishing licence is sufficient.

Q13.   **Regarding research articles in-scope of UKRI's OA policy, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the seven proposed technical standard requirements for journals and OA publishing platforms?**
For each of the seven standards (see paragraphs 67a-67g of the consultation document): Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.
For each of the seven standards (see paragraphs 67a-67g of the consultation document), please explain your answer (700 characters maximum, approximately 100 words, per standard).

- a. persistent digital object identifiers (PIDs) for research outputs must be implemented according to international standards such as DOI, URN or Handle
  agree
- b. article-level metadata must be used according to a defined application profile that supports UKRI's proposed OA policy and is available via a CC0 public domain dedication; the metadata standard must adhere to international best practice such as the Crossref schema and OpenAIRE guidelines
  agree. Clarification of said metadata is required
- c. machine-readable information on the OA status and the licence must be embedded in the article in a standard non-proprietary format
  agree
- d. long-term preservation must be supported via a robust preservation programme such as CLOCKSS, Portico or an equivalent
  agree
- e. openly accessible data on citations must be made available according to the standards set out by the Initiative for Open Citations (I4OC)
  agree
- f. self-archiving policies must be registered in the SHERPA RoMEO database that underpins SHERPA/FACT
  agree
- g. unique PIDs for research management information must be used and must include the use of ORCID to identify all authors and contributors
  agree

Q14.   **Regarding research articles in-scope of UKRI's OA policy, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the five proposed technical standard requirements for institutional and subject repositories?**
For each of the five standards (see paragraphs 68a-68e of the consultation document): Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.
For each of the five standards (see paragraphs 68a-68e of the consultation document), please explain your answer (700 characters maximum, approximately 100 words, per standard).

a. PIDs for research outputs must be implemented according to international standards such as DOI, URN or Handle
no opinion

b. article-level metadata must be implemented according to a defined application profile that supports the proposed UKRI OA policy and is available via a CC0 public domain dedication; this should include the persistent identifier to both the author's accepted manuscript and the version of record; the metadata standard must adhere to international best practice such as the OpenAIRE guidelines
no opinion

c. machine-readable information on the OA status and the licence must be embedded in the article in a standard non-proprietary format
no opinion

d. unique PIDs for research management information must be used and must include the use of ORCID to identify all authors and contributors
no opinion

e. the repository must be registered in the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR)
no opinion. Repository standards are not a matter for publishers

Q15. **To support the adoption of technical standards for OA, are there other standards, actions and/or issues UKRI should consider?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

The consultation document does not present clear standards for all aspects in this policy. UKRI should therefore collaborate with publishers to specify the standards, allow time for publishers to adapt their workflows once those standards are in place, and work with publishing technology suppliers to ensure they are able to support the standards without increases in cost. UKRI should also consider that many societies publish with commercial partners, and therefore cannot make a commitment to adhering to new standards without their agreement.

Q16. **To support the implementation of UKRI's proposed OA policy requirement for research articles to include an access statement for underlying research materials (see paragraph 69 of the consultation document), are there any technical standards or best practices that UKRI should consider requiring?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines as set out at https://osf.io/9f6gx/ may be a valuable addition in some disciplines, but should not be mandatory.

Q17. **UKRI's OA policy is proposed to apply to in-scope research articles accepted for publication on or after 1 January 2022. Which statement best reflects your views on this?**

a. The policy should apply from 1 January 2022
b. The policy should apply earlier than 1 January 2022
c. The policy should apply later than 1 January 2022
d. Don't know
e. No opinion Please explain your answer.

UKRI particularly welcomes detailed evidence as to the practical implications of the choice of date. If you selected b or c, please also state what you consider to be a feasible implementation date (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Given the ongoing coronavirus pandemic and its disruptive effects on the scholarly landscape, we believe that UKRI should not impose additional compliance burdens on researchers and librarians at this time.

Q18. **For research articles, are there any considerations that UKRI and UK HE funding bodies need to take into account regarding the interplay between the implementation dates for UKRI's OA policy and the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Q19. **Do you think the proposals outlined in Section A will have any financial cost implications for you or your organisation?**
Yes / No / Don't Know / No opinion.

Please expand, providing evidence to support your view, where possible (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

There are cost implications associated with several aspects of Section A. First, in respect of technical standards. There is some circular reasoning here, as adherence is required to a standard that has not been clearly defined. As alluded to in our response to question 15, new or changing standards have historically been associated with significant additional costs, for example in platform upgrades to validate ORCID or to ingest, display and allow data mining of JATS. Second, in respect of OA transformative agreements, which frequently require more publisher resources to manage workflows and systems integrations, as well as to report both 'publish' and 'read' (usage) statistics to institutions; these costs are incurred despite our members' best efforts to make such transformative agreements cost-neutral for institutions.

Q20. **Do you think the proposals outlined in Section A of the consultation document will result in financial benefits for you or your organisation?**
Yes / No / Don't Know / No opinion.

Please expand, providing evidence to support your view, where possible (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Q21. **Can you provide any evidence of a changing balance of costs across research organisations arising from an emphasis on publishing costs rather than read costs?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

As spend by institutions moves more towards a publish basis (from a read basis), it follows that research intensive institutions such as Cambridge and Imperial will have considerably higher spend whereas teaching-focused institutions are likely to have lower spend. As key users for many subjects are taught students, this rebalancing of cost between producers and users must be considered. Our members have attempted to make transformative agreements cost-neutral to institutions where it is possible to do so (e.g. the Microbiology Society's Publish and Read offer (https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/publish-and-read), which is similar to that offered by the Biochemical Society, Company of Biologists, and IWA Publishing. The Association for Computing Machinery, by contrast, has offered transformative agreements on the basis of rebalancing spend between publishing and reading institutions (https://www.acm.org/publications/openaccess#acmopen).

Q22. **Can you provide any evidence on cost increases and/or price rises (including in relation to OA article processing charges (APCs)s and subscriptions) and reasons for these?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Factors affecting pricing include (1) proportion of paywalled content, (2) editorial thresholds for acceptance, (3) technological improvements/upgrades, (4) editorial/publishing policy changes that involve more work (e.g. introducing new standards for published content, implementing similarity check or requiring data deposits and data availability statements), and (5) inflation – as suppliers increase their prices, our costs go up. In many disciplines, particularly AHSS, APCs for pure Open Access journals have been heavily subsidised and are therefore artificially low in order to encourage authors to engage with Open Access. With a move towards full Open Access, these subsidies will have to be withdrawn to ensure journals remain viable.

Q23. **Do you think there are steps publishers and/or other stakeholders could take to improve the transparency of publication charges?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand. Views are also welcome on how greater transparency might inform future funding levels (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Publishers should make more effort to show how subscription prices are set (and offset) in response to Open Access income. Again, where societies work with commercial publishers, they may not be able to do this.

A new working group of the SocPC aims to create a list of critical pieces of information that researchers, libraries and funders need to know about all journals.

The goal is to make it easy to see all the information for a journal at a glance, and compare this with what other journals offer. Assessment of the vital statistics for any title would also provide a more transparent view of what an APC 'buys' for that title.

Q24. **Regarding UKRI's consideration about restricting the use of its OA funds for publication in hybrid journals (see paragraph 80 of the consultation document), please select the statement that best reflects your views:**
   a. UKRI OA funds should not be permitted to support OA publication in hybrid journals
   b. UKRI OA funds should only be permitted to support OA publication in hybrid journals where they are party to a transformative agreement or similar arrangement
   c. UKRI Open Access funds should be permitted to support Open Access publication in hybrid journals
   d. None of the above
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

   Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

   UKRI's stated objective is to have the research it has funded published Open Access. This objective is met equally well whether the article is published in a hybrid journal or a pure Open Access journal, and whether it is funded by APCs or under a transformative deal/other new model. UKRI's overall approach has been to make the policy as liberal (un-restrictive) as possible. This approach is to be welcomed and should be applied to the issue of funding hybrid journals.

Q25. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that UKRI OA funds should be permitted to support OA costs that support institutional repositories?**
   Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

   Please explain and, where possible, evidence your view (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Q26. **To help accelerate policy adoption, should UKRI introduce any other restrictions on how UKRI OA funds can be used?**
   Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

   Please explain your answer, including any views on how this could be implemented (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Q27. **There are many business models that can support OA. A common model for journals is based on APCs, but there are also other models (such as membership models and subscribe to open). Are there changes or alternatives to the present UKRI funding mechanisms that might help support a diversity of**

OA models?

Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

There are many experiments underway at the present time, and these should be allowed to run their course to build an evidence base that can contribute to the development of future UKRI policy. However, it is worth bearing in mind that publishing must be able to scale, and that the costs of publishing are unlikely to decrease with the proliferation of technical standards and rising scholarly expectations.

Q28. **As discussed in paragraph 74 of the consultation document, transformative agreements are one way of moving to OA in a more cost-effective way. Are there approaches to managing transformative agreements or other mechanisms and developments that UKRI should consider to help manage the transition to OA in a way that is cost-effective and offers public value to the UK?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

UKRI should make a clear and public commitment to supporting Jisc in developing and funding transformative (read and publish) deals, including informing institutions that the Open Access block grant may be used to fund such deals. We also encourage UKRI to continue working with Jisc to ensure that small society publishers are able to make such deals and are not disadvantaged compared with commercial publishers. Historically, society publishers had not been a priority for consortia, including Jisc, and it is only since Jisc acquired a dedicated member of staff for society negotiations, in 2019, that progress has been made. We are keen to ensure that the resource is maintained, so that we can continue to expand transformative deals.

Q29. **Are there any existing or new infrastructure services that you think UKRI should fund the maintenance and/or development of, to support the implementation of its OA policy for research articles?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please state what these are and explain and, where possible, evidence why UKRI should provide support (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Q30. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that UKRI should provide or support a national shared repository?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Unless a national repository would replace all existing institutional repositories, this would unnecessarily divert funds and resources to building something which would duplicate existing infrastructure (IRs). We instead recommend deploying UKRI's limited funds where they can be most effective, in improving the interoperability of the existing IR network.

Q31. Should UKRI require preprints to be made OA where there is a significant benefit with regard to public emergencies?
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, is there a recognised definition of 'public emergency' and/or protocols that UKRI should consider if this policy is implemented? (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words.)

Preprints have been a feature of scholarly communications since the launch of arXiv in August 1991, and there are now many preprint servers covering a multitude of disciplines in STEM (e.g. biorXiv, medrXiv) and AHSS (e.g. SocArXiv, SSRN), and Crossref report that since November 2016 there have been tens of thousands of DOIs registered for preprints. Despite this route to immediate Open Access, scholars still choose to publish their work in journals. Preprints may also mitigate the problems of Green Open Access to accepted manuscripts, as publishers can ensure that the versions of record – and any subsequent updates – are linked to the preprint.

Given UKRI's stated aim, we are surprised that preprints have not been given due consideration. By mandating preprints for all areas of research, UKRI can achieve its stated goal of immediate Open Access – faster, in fact, than any journal could achieve – without introducing new costs or trying to set policies for journals who serve a global market, and whose publishers are often not headquartered in the UK.

Q32. Are there any supporting actions that UKRI could take alongside its OA policy to support the use of preprints in all disciplines?
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

UKRI should encourage journals to remove any obstacle to the publication of articles formerly submitted as pre-submission preprints (that is, preprints are not considered prior publication).

Section B: Monographs, Book Chapters and Edited Collections

Q33. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that the types of monograph, book chapter and edited collection defined as in-scope and out-of-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy (see paragraphs 96-98 of the consultation document) are clear?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

If you disagree, please explain your view (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

As written, the policy applies to edited collections 'when the editor(s) of the collection acknowledge(s) funding from UKRI'. Where all contributed chapters arise from UKRI-funded research, that is reasonable. In many cases, however, individual chapters will be provided by authors whose research has not been funded by UKRI; for some edited collections, the editor may well have only directly contributed an Introduction. We believe that it is inappropriate for UKRI to attempt to enforce a policy for researchers they have not funded.

On a related matter, we appreciate the inclusion of 'trade books' within the list of 'out of scope' types, but we are surprised that 'trade books' appears to be restricted to monographs, when some edited collections are in fact commissioned for publication as trade books (per the British Academy report Open Access and Book Chapters (2019)).

Finally, we wish to encourage UKRI to exempt highly illustrated scholarly works, per our response to question 44, which raises the issue of exceptions for in-scope books requiring significant reuse of third-party materials: some of this could be addressed by a clearer inclusion of all scholarly illustrated catalogues within the list of 'out of scope' types.

Q34. **Should the following outputs be in-scope of UKRI's OA policy when based on UKRI-funded doctoral research?**
   a. Academic monographs
      Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion
   b. Book chapters
      Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion
   c. Edited collections
      Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion

Please explain your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Monographs derived from theses require significant editorial effort to be publishable. While a mainstay of many book publishing programmes for the past fifty years, there is little expectation of significant sales of such material. The UKRI policy as written risks further limiting the market for thesis-derived monographs, raising the possibility of publishers withdrawing completely from taking on this type of book. If Open Access is to be applied to monographs or book chapters arising from UKRI-funded doctoral research, it must be accompanied by a guarantee that it can be properly supported by Open Access

Q35. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that UKRI's OA policy should include an exception for in-scope monographs, book chapters and edited collections where the only suitable publisher in the field does not have an OA programme?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

We welcome this exception, and UKRI's related commitment to 'maintaining and encouraging a diverse publishing ecology' (para 94). There is a well-known 'long tail' of small publishers who publish one or two books in specialist contexts, and who may lack the financial or technical capacity to meet imposed Open Access stipulations (or may even still only publish in print).

Q36. **Are there any other considerations that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when defining academic monographs, book chapters and edited collections in-scope of the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Please see paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

Per our response to question 6: Given the much wider applicability of REF, there is little possibility of UKRI's being able to fund Open Access for versions of record. It is therefore even more important that there are realistically broad definitions of 'out of scope' types and exceptions. Consideration should be given to extending the definition of 'trade books' in the REF policy to provide more allowance for 'crossover' books.

Q37. **Regarding monographs in-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy, which statement best reflects your view on the maximum embargo requirement of 12 months?**
   a. 12 months is appropriate
   b. A longer embargo period should be allowed
   c. A shorter embargo period should be required
   d. Different maximum embargo periods should be required for different discipline areas
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. If you answered b, c or d please also state what you consider to be (an) appropriate embargo period(s) (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Monographs serve a purpose for many society communities, and while monograph programmes are not usually revenue-generating, they do need to cover their costs. According to the UUK report Open access and monographs: Evidence review (2019), '70% of publisher sales take place in the first two years after publication, with 80% of sales taking place in the first three years'. Sales data from IWA Publishing shows that for books published in 2013, 71% of sales were within 36 months of publication (37% in in year 1), while for books published in 2011, 67% of sales were within 36 months of publication (29% in year 1). That is, a 36-month embargo would lose this society publisher a third of all book sales, while a 12-month embargo thus loses the society two-thirds of sales. These patterns are predicated on existing circumstances. Given known challenges to library budgets, there is a strong possibility that too short an embargo period would lead to changes in buyer behaviour that would reduce sales even further.

If UKRI wishes to achieve Open Access for monographs, then this must be properly funded through appropriate book processing charges (see our answer to question 40); alternatively, if funding is not available, then any maximum embargo period should not be less than 36 months to maintain the viability of book publishing.

Q38. **Regarding book chapters in-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy, which statement best reflects your view on the maximum embargo requirement of 12 months?**
   a. 12 months is appropriate
   b. A longer maximum embargo period should be allowed
   c. A shorter maximum embargo period should be required
   d. Different maximum embargo periods should be required for different discipline areas
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. If you answered b, c or d please also state what you consider to be (an) appropriate embargo period(s) (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Beyond commercial concerns, there are different degrees of time sensitivity in different disciplines, with shorter embargo periods usually applying to STM fields versus longer ones in AHSS, as evidenced by the British Academy's report Open Access and Book Chapters (2019), which found for Green Open Access 'the most commonly stipulated embargo periods are 12 months (sometimes explicitly for science books), and 24 months (sometimes implicitly for humanities and social sciences books).' Against this background, we believe that while the 12 month embargo period may be appropriate for book chapters in the natural sciences, a longer period of no less than 24 months should be set for book chapters in the arts, humanities and social sciences. In both cases, however, we wish to draw your attention to our responses to questions 37 and 40, and note that even delayed Open Access will require some manner of funding.

Q39. **Regarding edited collections in-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy, which statement best reflects your view on the maximum embargo requirement of 12 months?**
   a. 12 months is appropriate
   b. A longer embargo period should be allowed
   c. A shorter embargo period should be required
   d. Different maximum embargo periods should be required for different discipline areas
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. If you answered b, c or d please also state what you consider to be (an) appropriate embargo period(s) (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Please see our response to question 37.

Q40. **Do you have any specific views and/or evidence regarding different funding implications of publishing monographs, book chapters or edited collections with no embargo, a 12-month embargo or any longer embargo period?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Please note that funding is further considered under paragraph 110 of the consultation document (question 53).

The question of funding for Open Access books is a complex one. Using current sales patterns will not provide an adequate model for an environment in which materials become freely available shortly after publication, as purchaser behaviour will change, but we must also recognise the straitened circumstances of many institutional libraries, which may reduce their ability to purchase non-Open Access book output. For each society publisher, staff and Trustees will need to assess whether the relevant society can afford to maintain a book publication programme in this environment.

However, we can offer some thoughts. For example, should a zero-month embargo be required we can suggest that the book or chapter processing charge might need to be set at a rate of cost plus projected sales, where a twelve-month embargo might be set at half that rate, with longer embargoes attracting smaller fees. A significant risk in such an environment arises from commercial players like Amazon, who can realise economies of scale beyond the reach of any society. Should such players see an opportunity, they may offer researchers with funds for Open Access the option to self-publish through their service. We caution against this being seen as a positive move, however, as material published in this way will not have been subject to editorial or peer review processes, nor will it incorporate the rich metadata or be subject to the preservation mechanisms that help sustain the scholarly record.

Q41. **To what extent do you agree that self-archiving the post-peer-review author's accepted manuscript should meet the policy requirement?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain and your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

While the Green route may prove to be the most practical way of achieving Open Access for book content, this should still be subject to appropriate embargo periods being in place (per our answers to questions 37 and 40). We must also reiterate our arguments made in response to question 4, where we drew attention to quality issues associated with Green Open Access. Specifically, problems in maintaining the integrity of the scholarly literature, and the lack of mark-up for accessibility purposes.

Q42. **Regarding monographs, book chapters and edited collections, are there any additional considerations relating to OA routes, deposit requirements and delayed OA that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when developing the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Please see paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

We have argued in our answers above that Open Access for books should be properly funded. As with journal content, we acknowledge that it is highly unlikely that UKRI would be able to fund Open Access for the much larger number of books that will be subject to REF and that, if there is to be an Open Access requirement for books, it is more likely to be met through the Green route. Per the arguments already made above, a maximum embargo period of only 12 months for all REF-eligible books would be extremely damaging to the future health of academic book publication, particularly by society publishers. In order to sustain discipline-specific, not-for-profit society publishers, we recommend that for REF the embargo period should be not less than 36 months, and that consideration should also be given to identifying and clarifying exemptions from the Open Access requirements, for example for highly illustrated works.

Q43. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with CC BY -ND being the minimum licensing requirement for monographs, book chapters and edited collections in-scope of UKRI's proposed OA policy?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

We welcome the inclusion of ND as a permissible element in the CC licence for book content. This is recommended in the UUK report Open access and monographs:

Q44. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that UKRI's OA policy should include an exception for in-scope monographs, book chapters and edited collections requiring significant reuse of third-party materials?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words). Questions 45-46 concern how 'significant reuse' may be defined.

We strongly believe that there should be Open Access policy exemptions for books requiring significant reuse of third-party materials and have argued (see response to question 33) that all scholarly illustrated catalogues should be included within the list of 'out of scope' types.

There are still many rights holders who do not offer Open Access licences of any type for their material. These include libraries, archives, museums as well as consortia of cultural agencies. Researchers therefore frequently face difficulty in obtaining Open Access licences for such material, including text, music, maps, documents, artworks, archaeological material, etc. Where rights holders do allow Open Access licences, they are often time-bound and/or limited by number of downloads. When those limits are reached the licence must be renewed at an additional fee, or the content removed from an article.

In instances where Open Access licences for third-party material can be obtained, they are regularly more expensive than traditional licences. Books, by their nature, have more third-party material than articles, and licensing restrictions may mean a book is financially unviable, or even entirely unpublishable. Open Access policy would be greatly eased if a more joined-up approach could be agreed across government.

Q45. **To what extent do you agree or disagree that if an image (or other material) were not available for reuse and no other image were suitable, it would be appropriate to redact the image (or material), with a short description and a link to the original?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your view (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

The redaction of an image or other unavailable material and its replacement by a 'tombstone' is a highly undesirable approach. Particularly in art history and in the study of 20th-century music and literature, the argument in any book or chapter would be meaningless without the images or texts reproduced alongside.

Q46. **Do you have a view on how UKRI should define 'significant use of third- party materials' if it includes a relevant exception in its policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

'Significant use' is not just a question of quantity. Any piece of intense analysis or criticism of one or more images or pieces of text, and which relies on the reproduction of those for its argument, should be classed as making 'significant use'. For example, a book chapter focusing on just one work of art should fall within the definition.

Q47.   **Do you have any other comments relating to licensing requirements and/or the use of third-party materials, in relation to UKRI's proposed OA policy for academic monographs, book chapters and edited collections?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (1,350 characters maximum, approximately 200 words).

Q48.   **Regarding monographs, book chapters and edited collections, are there any additional considerations relating to licensing requirements and/or third-party materials that you think that the UK HE funding bodies should take into account when developing the OA policy for the REF -after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Please refer to paragraphs 29-31 of the consultation document before answering this question.

The welcome inclusion within the UKRI policy of ND as a permissible element in the CC licence for book content should certainly be extended to the future REF policy.

Given the greater numbers of books that will be affected by any REF policy, it should include an exception for REF-eligible books requiring significant reuse of third-party materials – such as highly illustrated books.

Q49.   **Which statement best reflects your views on whether UKRI's OA policy should require copyright and/or rights retention for in-scope monographs, book chapters and edited collections?**
   a. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain copyright and not exclusively transfer this to a publisher
   b. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain specific reuse rights, including rights to deposit the author's accepted manuscript in a repository in line with the deposit and licensing requirements of UKRI's OA policy
   c. UKRI should require an author or their institution to retain copyright AND specific reuse rights, including rights to deposit the author's accepted manuscript in a repository in line with the deposit and licensing requirements of UKRI's OA policy
   d. UKRI's OA policy should not have a requirement for copyright or rights retention
   e. Don't know
   f. No opinion

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. If you selected answer b or c, please state what reuse rights you think UKRI's OA policy should require to be retained (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words). It is not necessary to repeat here, in full, information provided in response to question 12.

Please note that views are not sought on whether institutions should hold the copyright to work produced by their employees as this is subject to Section 11 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and institutional copyright policies.

As we said in response to question 12, publishers do not need to take copyright from authors in order to publish their books (whether Open Access or paywalled); a publishing licence is sufficient. However, on a practical level if material is licensed CC-BY the matter of who holds the copyright is moot, so this ceases to be a problem for Open Access books. UKRI policy may seek to extend Open Access to academic books, but it does not need to make stipulations about copyright to do so.

Q50.   Regarding the timing of implementation of UKRI's OA policy for monographs, book chapters and edited collections, which statement best reflects your view?
   a.   The policy should apply from 1 January 2024
   b.   The policy should apply earlier than 1 January 2024
   c.   The policy should apply later than 1 January 2024
   d.   Don't know
   e.   No opinion

Please explain and, where possible, evidence your answer. If you selected b or c, please also state what you consider to be a feasible implementation date (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

We note that 'the policy will apply to in-scope monographs, book chapters and edited collections published on or after 1 January 2024, unless a contract has been signed before this date that prevents adherence to the policy' (para 109): the final part of that sentence is crucial, and we welcome it.

Our one caveat is that, before the policy is finally announced, the Research Councils must have made it clear to anyone applying for a three-year grant for a piece of research work how they should budget for any book/chapter processing charges, or how they would be able to access such funding subsequently.

Q51.   **In order to support authors and institutions with policy implementation UKRI will consider whether advice and guidance can be provided. Do you have any suggestions regarding the type of advice and guidance that might be helpful?** Yes/ No.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Q52.   **Regarding monographs, book chapters and edited collections, are there any other considerations that UKRI and the UK HE funding bodies need to take into account when considering the interplay between the implementation dates for**

the UKRI OA policy and the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021 OA?
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

When answering question 42 we noted that, if there is to be a REF requirement for Open Access for books, this is more likely to be met through the Green route. Settling on an appropriate embargo period will be crucial for the future health of academic book publication. We believe that the next REF should be used to encourage rather than to require Open Access publication, and that the opportunity should be taken to test the impact of different lengths of embargo period over the course of the REF cycle.

Q53. **Do you have any views regarding funding levels, mechanisms and eligible costs to inform UKRI's considerations about the provision of funding for OA monographs, book chapters and edited collections in - scope of its proposed policy?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

The costs of scholarly book publishing include editorial curation and selection (particularly for monographs), peer review, language polishing, production, dissemination, preservation, marketing, and more. While groups such as Knowledge Unlatched and individual publishers have experimented with Open Access for books, none have as yet proven to be a scalable, sustainable business model that would allow publishers, including society publishers, to offer pure Open Access books at a price within the reach of researchers, though several member societies are keen to experiment with such models.

Q54. **To support the implementation of UKRI's OA policy, are there any actions (including funding) that you think UKRI and/or other stakeholders should take to maintain and/or develop existing or new infrastructure services for OA monographs, book chapters and edited collections?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please state what these are and, where relevant, explain why UKRI should provide support (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Q55. **Are there any technical standards that UKRI should consider requiring and/or encouraging in its OA policy to facilitate access, discoverability and reuse of OA monographs, book chapters and edited collections?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

UKRI should encourage use of appropriate persistent identifiers such as ORCID, DOI, Grant IDs, etc., as well as inclusion of licence information in the metadata associated with each output (book or book chapter).

Q56. **Do you have any other suggestions regarding UKRI's proposed OA policy and/or supporting actions to facilitate access, discoverability and reuse of OA monographs, book chapters and edited collections?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Section C: Monitoring Compliance

Q57. **Could the manual reporting process currently used for UKRI OA block grants be improved?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please explain how (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Q58. **Except for those relating to OA block grant funding assurance, UKRI has in practice not yet applied sanctions for non-compliance with the RCUK Policy on Open Access. Should UKRI apply further sanctions and/or other measures to address non-compliance with its proposed OA policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Q59. **To what extent do you agree or disagree with the example proposed measures to address non-compliance with the proposed UKRI OA policy (see paragraph 119 of the consultation document)?**
Strongly agree / Agree / Neither agree nor disagree / Disagree / Strongly disagree / Don't know / No opinion.

Please explain your answer (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Section D: Policy Implications and Supporting Actions

Q60. **Do you foresee any benefits for you, your organisation or your community arising from UKRI's proposed OA policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

Please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Funder policy support is a key driver for the spread of Open Access which will benefit the entire research community and the public. The proposed policy will build on the previous (RCUK) policy to further increase the openness of UK publicly funded research. However, the policy as written is a blunt instrument which carries significant risks as well as potential benefits, per our answer to question 61.

Q61. **Do you foresee UKRI's proposed OA policy causing and/or contributing to any disadvantages or inequalities?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand, referencing specific policy elements and including any comments on how UKRI could address any issues identified (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

If policy forces the closure of hybrid journals it reduces the pool of journals available to non-UKRI grant-funded researchers. Many AHSS researchers, in common with those in mathematics and clinical sciences, lack funding for their research and in particular lack funding for publication fees. These authors may not be covered by block grants (e.g. NHS clinical staff), and forcing publishers to withdraw their hybrid journals would inhibit their publishing activities, which creates real disadvantages for their professional development as well as reducing access to high-quality research outputs.

Q62. **Do you foresee any positive and/or negative implications of UKRI's proposed OA policy for the research and innovation and scholarly communication sectors in low-and-middle-income countries?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand, referencing specific policy elements and including any comments on how UKRI could address any issues identified (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

By increasing the level of Open Access to UKRI funded research, there will be a benefit to those LMICs who are currently unable to afford subscription prices (though this is probably a modest effect as most low income countries are eligible for free access through the Research4Life programme). If, however, many journals 'flip' to an APC-driven model there is potential for researchers from LMICs being barred from publishing in journals by virtue of a lack of access to publication funds. Again, the stated goal of increasing access may have an unintended consequence of reducing publication of high-quality research outputs from LMICs.

Q63.   **Do you anticipate any barriers or challenges (not identified in previous answers) to you, your organisation or your community practising and/or supporting OA in line with UKRI's proposed policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand, including any supporting actions you think UKRI could undertake to remove or reduce any barriers identified (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Q64.   **Are there any other supporting actions (not identified in previous answers) that you think UKRI could undertake to incentivise OA?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

UKRI could do much more to make the case for Open Access to the institutions they fund and hence to the researchers, and in particular to encourage those institutions to take up transformative agreements on offer from society publishers. At the present time, many researchers are either lukewarm to Open Access or actively opposed to it. Researcher buy-in is essential for the long term success of the drive to Open Access and thus far little effort has been made to persuade them.

Q65.   **Do you foresee any other implications (not identified in previous answers) for you, your organisation or your community arising from UKRI's proposed OA policy?**
Yes / No / Don't know / No opinion.

If yes, please expand (2,000 characters maximum, approximately 300 words).

Section E: Further Comments

Q66. **Do you have any further comments relating to UKRI's proposed OA policy?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words.)

Q67. **Do you have any further comments relating to commonality between UKRI's proposed OA policy for outputs acknowledging UKRI funding and the OA policy for the REF-after-REF 2021?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words.)

Q68. **Do you have any further thoughts and/or case studies on costs and/or benefits of OA?**
Yes / No.

If yes, please expand (2,650 characters maximum, approximately 400 words).

Signed* by:

Academy of Social Sciences
American Society of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene
Association for Art History
Association for Computing Machinery
Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour
Biochemical Society and Portland Press
British Association of Dermatologists
British Ecological Society
British Educational Research Association
British Institute of Radiology
British International Studies Association
British Pharmacological Society
British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy
British Society of Criminology
British Society for Immunology
British Society for Neuroendocrinology
British Society for Rheumatology
British Sociological Association
Diabetes UK
Economic History Society
EMS Press
European Respiratory Society
European Society of Cardiology
European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology
Federation of European Biochemical Societies
Federation of European Microbiology Societies

Geological Society of London
Geologists' Association
Healthcare Infection Society
ICE Publishing
Institute of Food Science and Technology
Institute of Mathematics and its Applications
International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics
International Sociology of Sport Association
IWA Publishing
Landscape Research Group
London Mathematical Society
Microbiology Society
Mineralogical Society
Political Studies Association
Regional Studies Association
Royal College of General Practitioners
Royal College of Physicians
Royal College of Psychiatrists
Royal College of Surgeons
Royal Geographical Society
Royal Historical Society
Royal Irish Academy
Royal Meteorological Society
Royal Society of Biology
Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene
Society for Applied Microbiology
Society of Chemical Industry
Society of Dairy Technology
Society for Endocrinology
The British Academy
The British Editorial Society of Bone & Joint Surgery
The Company of Biologists
The English Association
The Institution of Engineering and Technology
The Institution of Chemical Engineers
The Linnean Society
The Physiological Society
The Royal Society
University Association for Contemporary European Studies
Universities Federation for Animal Welfare
World Obesity Federation
Zoological Society of London

*All SocPC members were given the opportunity to opt out of 'signing'.