

TRANSCRIPTION

Creative Commons and how it is advancing Open Access

Theme: Community over Commercialization

University of Iceland, 22 October 2024

The speakers during this webinar agree that this transcription is open to anyone who finds it useful. Allyson Macdonald prepared the transcription with the approval of the CC CEO. The oral and slide presentations are available at

https://openaccess.is/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/GMT20241022-145928_Recording_1920x1080.mp4

From CC:

Anna Tumadóttir CEO and Rebecca Ross, Strategy Manager with Monica Granados Open Science

Hosts: Anna Bjarnadóttir, Margret Gunnarsdóttir and Helgi Sigurbjörnsson

The presentation was in English. I am delighted to start this Open Access webinar, University of Iceland, 22nd October 2024 you and thank you for attending this webinar. My name is Anna Bjarnadóttir, representing Educational Research Institute within the University of Iceland and with me is Margrét Gunnarsdóttir from the National Library in Iceland and also Helgi Sigurbjörnsson and together we will manage the questions and comments today, if there are any.

MG: The topic of his webinar is ***Creative Commons and how it is advancing Open Access*** and we are very thankful to our presenters today, Anna Tumadóttir CEO of Creative Commons (CC) and I hope it's OK that I mention that also we are very proud to have an Icelandic person in that position. Anna and her two CC colleagues, Rebecca Ross CC Senior Manager of Strategy and Monica Granados, CC Director of Open Science.

.... on the housekeeping rules, yes, you have it there. So just the participants have the microphones off and use chat for questioning and maybe we can open some discussion if there if you're not too many people listening today. This webinar will be recorded and recording will be available at our website Open Access dot IS later on so I just say *Welcome*. I just thank you so much for this presentation today and to take the time to do this for us and please you can take over – Anna B.

¹ Alþjóðleg vika opins aðgangs 2024 var haldin dagana 21.-27. október 2024. Þema vikunnar var hið sama og árið 2023: „Samfélag fram yfir markaðsvæðingu“

Samráðshópur háskólabókavara um opin vísindi fekk af því tilefni nýráðinn framkvæmdastjóra Creative Commons, Íslendinginn Önnu Tumadóttir, til að halda erindi um CC afnotaleyfi.

Erindið verður á Zoom og öllum opið.

Háskóli Íslands, þriðjudaginn 22. október nk. kl. 15 – 16.22

Anna T

Thank you, yes, happy to be here. Welcome.....to Open Access week. It's going to be a really busy week. One, especially for my two colleagues that are joining me here, lots and lots of Creative Commons related presentations and projects on the go, um. Really happy to be presenting in collaboration with the University of Iceland and the National University Library folks. And I do just want to say a really special thank you to Anna and Margrét and Helgi, and also just the full working group of Icelandic university librarians who spend their time raising the profile of Open Access and Open Science in the Icelandic scholarly community. I'm extra happy to be presenting because I was a student at the University of Iceland and I worked there and my mother recently retired as a professor there. So it was a little bit of a home when growing up and so it's really nice to be able to contribute a little bit back into that ecosystem. So this is our agenda for today. This is what we will be covering. I'll start by introducing myself.

My name is Anna. I am the CEO at Creative Commons. I stepped into this role earlier this year. Um, besides having worked at the University of Iceland many years ago, I spent some time working in startups and my background is not an Open Access, which is why I am joined by colleagues who are experts in that field. Rebecca Ross, Senior manager of strategy, is here with us and we'll be Co presenting. She's a trained librarian and a longtime scholarly communications expert. Also on the call is Doctor Monica Granados. She is Creative Commons and Director of Open Science, and she will be on hand to answer any questions that arise. During the presentation or that come up during the Q&A, we do have time at the end of the presentation for Q&A. But if people want to put questions in the chat and indicate, like it would be great to address this now or this can wait for later, by all means feel free to do so anything that drops into your mind – it can be placed there, the chat is open and we'll see if we can weave any answers into the presentation in real time and make it a bit more interactive.

So we figured we would just start with a little bit of an overview of Creative Commons because it can mean so many different things to different people. From where we sit, this is are a global nonprofit organization. We are a team of about 20 people that are led by folkall over the world who are. **Torture of open** We, the organization steward the widely used Creative Commons license suite that is used for essentially anything other than software being shared on the open web. This is the legal infrastructure that we rely on to make sharing possible and supports the public comments if you will. I will say in advance of this presentation, I was trying to figure out how you would stay Commons in Icelandic and I landed on **Ravine Almaná** Act. I don't know, maybe the Icelandic colleagues on the call have have a better translation than that, but I I could not. Could not think of 1, so I apologize for using a very untranslatable word repeatedly during this conversation.

Our licenses and tools have released probably about 2 1/2 billion works into the Commons at this point, and our focus is heavily on technical, legal and policy. Solutions that enable sharing. So day-to-day it's all about opening things up and encouraging people to share.

So we find the story may be of interest. We came about in 2001 and the licenses were first released in 2002. And this was during a time that sharing on the Internet was effectively broken and the folks

that came together to build this set of tools saw it. At the time, as a patch on the copyright system, it was supposed to be a temporary fix. And at the time they thought, ohh, you know, it will be successful. Even a million things might end up being openly licensed, obviously. It gained a lot of traction worldwide and now has become the global standard for sharing. Like I was saying, yeah, we think over 2 1/2 billion items probably, that's likely a low estimate, have been shared using CC licenses. So we have 6 licenses and two public domain. And the beauty of the licenses is simply that they enable more permissive use and reuse than default copyright would do, though it's the **Some Rights Reserved** model rather than the All rights reserved model. But in addition to being copyright tools, uh, these are also tools that embody a shared sense of value.

So if you are sharing something openly into the Commons, sort of implicit, with that is the spirit of generosity and collaboration and wanting people to build on your work and reuse it. In the very early days of the organization and the movement, there was this perfect overlap between people who wanted to openly share and creators who wanted to have more choice over how their works for use. Because like I said, at the time, it was just it was an all or nothing. Some, uh, and copyright was the default.

Unfortunately, today we are a little bit challenged by the emergence of artificial intelligence because there are people who have shared in the Commons for many, many years and for a long time, who could not have anticipated either works might be used by machines in the modern day? And it's definitely a challenge to find ways to bring those shared needs back together. So while we are still very focused on **openness**, we also have to contend with **sharing** being changed in the age of AI and working to find that common ground that both gives creators choice again but still protects and grows the Commons.

I'm going to fast forward us just up to today's work because we are in the final stages of refreshing the organization's strategic plan to ensure that we are appropriately addressing sharing in the age of AI. The strategy is not yet released, but we just wanted to talk everyone through a preview because this also informs how the organization is going to be thinking about Open Access moving forward. So we are focused on three primary goals at the moment, and this will really steer our work for the coming years. None of these come as a big surprise to people who are familiar with the work of the day.

Our first goal is focused on strengthening **the open infrastructure of sharing**. And so when we think about infrastructure, it is not just species, legal tools, the licenses and the public domain tools which are a critical component of the infrastructure of the open web, but it is also the broader sharing environment in which we operate. So imagine poorly worded legislation coming **through that would less impact. the knowledge or stifle scientific innovation.**

We need to keep a close eye on what is happening in **legislative** environments around the world to ensure that sharing is not impacted.

And there's also **critical infrastructure** that I know you all would be familiar with. Like any kind of servers or platforms where open sharing is made accessible on a nonprofit basis, these are the things

that we need to make sure are invested in and remain and become stronger alternatives to existing concentrations of power.

We also are focused on defending and advocating for a thriving Creative Commons. And here it's really about three particular public interest sectors that we focus our work on, **education and science and culture** and the reason we target our work there, not all, **not all content is created equal** and ultimately our goal would be to try and open up as much as we can in these fields to help solve the world's greatest challenges. The logic being that **it is very hard to solve a problem if you do not have the latest** information or **knowledge** or research about that problem. Finally, we are centering **community** much more heavily than we have in the past few years, not only the people who spent their days **advocating** for openness, but also the **communities** who are beneficiaries of the Commons and all three of these. Work together with the existence of the infrastructure, you can build the Commons for sharing information and content, but ultimately **that does not do much until it's in the hands of community or activism, knowledge production**, etcetera. They **didn't** at the center of this.

There's a little bit of a an **opinionated** tone shift for the organization from being a neutral steward historically, and that is a an emphasis on reciprocity. So while historically the commons have felt like an act of reciprocity, *I shared with you, I've benefitted with what's in there*, people work together.

There's another layer to this that we need to think about in the age of artificial intelligence, and that is the the organizations that are **disproportionately benefiting** from that which has been shared openly. And so this is something that we would certainly love to hear from you all about when we get to the Q&A later is like, how does the scholarly community in Iceland feel about work being used to train artificial intelligence? Are there benefits to it? Are there local models being developed that are helping in the fields of? Education and science. All of these, uh, **three goals as well, and this emphasis on reciprocity** is informing the work that we are going to be doing in the coming months with regards to creator choice, if you will, and artificial intelligence, the working title for a frame **framework that** we're developing is **preference signals**. Which just simply means a system by which you could signal your preferences as to how you would like your work to be used for AI training. And this is being informed in part by the EU legislation that was passed earlier this year. There was a rights reservation mechanism to opt out of AI training for commercial purposes. In that scenario, the only choices that people have are to say no, and if the only choice that you have to say no and that is the only way you can exert control, there is a risk that more and more will be removed from the Commons, will not be shared openly, it will be taken out of Commission. And

So what we are thinking about is what makes the use of something for AI training an obvious yes. What are the conditions under which you would by default be like, of course that is OK for it to be used that way, even though I don't want to This particular use over here and so some uh, fairly sensible signals that are emerging in our research are for instance, **attribution**. You know, in the current system, one of the big, big critiques is that all of this material that is being used to train these systems, no one is getting any credit for that work. And more damagingly, when you think about education and science is if you don't have attribution or citations how can you dig deeper into that

field? How can this be a useful tool to advance knowledge and other signals that are emerging are for instance, um. You know, use within, on within the community.

And this is particularly something that is popping up when thinking about smaller languages and so a key consideration and trying to develop a larger corpus of content in order to train models in these languages? There may be a desire or an appropriateness of limiting the reuse of that content to the community from where it came, because obviously, I mean, as, as we know as Icelanders, it is not a language that is spoken by very many people and there are very deliberate efforts, I would say, both by the public and by the government to ensure preservation of the language.

I remember when the voice assistant came on the scene in Iceland and there was great concern that if people start having to give commands in English that their Icelandic will get weaker and weaker. And I think Icelandic with a very long history of strong strong print tradition /literary tradition is far better positioned than many smaller languages in this area. So when it comes to artificial intelligence that would be the primary area of consideration for our work at the moment additionally, we. Our must inevitably think about what? What open data sets can and should do, and we'll get to that.

Actually now I want to talk through our general areas of impact and their intersections with Open Access, because most of the work that we do directly intersects with AI and aims to contribute to the broader Commons. So for the purposes of our time together today, I promise I will send it over very shortly to dive into the open science component. That is where we will be focusing our time. But when it comes to Open Access, the advent of AI implicates how we think about this because this history of helping to open up data sets. Before it felt like there was no question about the public interest benefit of that at all.

But now there are all these questions arising.

I said like the licensing of data sets, like how the data will be used for machine learning, how we can ensure attribution can be surfaced. So many open considerations like that, but in terms of our overall work, we focus on license stewardship, which is these infrastructures, easy licenses, tools, etcetera. We have a strong learning and training program. So this is where we work with individuals and institutions to upskill and and develop a whole community of well trained advocates and Open Access. Our policy work, like I mentioned, we're keeping track of national and international laws and policies that increase access to knowledge. And in addition to our work in open science that we're going to dive into today, we also focus in the cultural heritage space and in the education space looking and rying to bolster the world of open education resources. So most of our time will be spent talking about Open Access and open science, what with this being Open Access week and all.

So here is, at a glance, a very wordy glance of Open Access at CC. we work to increase open licensing and publications and data sets with the goal to make knowledge more accessible, more transparent, more reusable. **And as you all know, for something to qualify as Open Access, there must be no barriers to access. It must have an open license, preferably CC because that allows full reuse with attribution. We advocate** for both Open Access journals and for self archiving and our approach as opposed to the to the for profit commercial models of Open Access that are purely focused on

shareholder value and these are largely enabled by APC's. It sounds like you all may have had a webinar yesterday focusing on this. So maybe we can get a little bit to that in the Q&A as well, as you know these increased systemic inequities. We are supportive of the Diamond Open Access model and community led Open Access models and infrastructure in general. And so very fittingly the theme this year is **community over commercialization** and. It', I mean, it's a, it's a, it's a great, uh, intersection with what I was talking about earlier with CC's new strategic direction, because community is a central piece of what has driven CC success over the year and also with the Open Access movements success. This is, this is broad, I think all of the different components of the Open movement and in preparation for today, I was so delighted to see all of the activity and resources around Open Access available in Icelandic and in the country supporting this like Open Access, it is open visa deposit is not to mention the guides and the explainers that are localized and point to the local laws and so on.

So it was a **great reminder of just how community driven** this really is and how this tiny team of 20 people that we are a part of **called** so much gratitude and so much responsibility to help ensure that the infrastructure they've online and continues to develop so that this this world can continue to flourish. Uh, when it's done well, we see Open Access **as an act of public interest, reciprocity**, because often the work is funded by governments or philanthropically funded and due to Open Access policies for publishing those knowledge advancements they go back into the ecosystem for maximum dissemination and impact.

And similarly, there's **this symbiotic relationship between** OA and the CC licenses because typically you would apply a CC license to something to make it open. So, so then that way the licenses are an enabler of Open Access, but at the same time without it, without OA, which is considered, you know, obviously not just like the formal definition, but it's like a **model of dissemination**. It's a movement, it's principles and practices. If, if Open Access didn't exist, we would not be able to meet any of our goals or stand up to our mission because that is what drives the growth of the Commons, though arguably it is one of the single most powerful and effective vehicles for contributing to the broader community.

But on that note, let's hand over to Rebecca and dive into Open science specifically. It's easy. Today,

Thanks very much, Anna. So just building from what Anna was talking about, thinking about why Open Access matters, I think really like our goal here is not just open for open sake or to make things Open Access just so they can be open. Access it so that once materials are Open Access, it can meet our needs as a community, as a society, and that it's really through this act of reciprocity, as Anna was saying. And it it really is in many ways **a social justice issue**. So when we don't have when **folks don't have access to the material about their world, about their lives, about their climate, et cetera, that means that power is not evenly distributed**. And that means that folks don't have access to what, you know, many ways has been paid for through through taxes to what is a public good. So we fundamentally believe that sharing knowledge is a social justice issue and and Open Access enables that. And that to accelerate progress.

So we're going to talk a lot about the climate crisis through the rest of this presentation. **We really need equity, inclusivity and global empowerment.** And Open Access also enables that. And of course, **fundamentally** believing that knowledge about our world is a public good. So in that way. Open Access becomes this tool to make sure that the knowledge that we create through the scholarly communication ecosystem is available to everybody. So just a quick kind of bird's eye view, expanded view at Open Science at Creative Commons, we think both about Open Access and its kind of **traditional forms**, of access to scholarly publications and also of course, **open data**, knowing that there are different sets of infrastructures and different sets of recommendations about how we make things open with both publications and data. And we're going to talk a little bit today about some of our OA and open data projects, particularly about opening access to climate publications, climate data. And then also a project about openly licensing preprints. So really thinking about how Open Access can intersect with the entire life cycle of scholarly research and scholarly dissemination.

So turning our attention to open climate and, and when we're out, you know, the **CCTV** in the world talking about Open Access, we really found that talking about climate and access to climate data has been a real enabler to getting folks excited. And feeling energized about the work that we're doing in Open Access.

I know over the last several years there's been this sense of kind of Open Access fatigue. We've all been working at Open Access for a long time and in many ways the for profit publishers have sort of come in and to a certain extent, taking control of of the Open Access dialogue and when we think about open climate, that's a way for us to kind of reclaim Open Access as a community and really focus on that. Open for what? You know, it's not just Open Access to be Open Access. In this case, it's Open Access as a way of aiming to mitigate the climate crisis.

So we believe that Open Access is actually a **necessary condition** for solving the climate crisis. And without global climate solutions built on open and transparent research and data, we risk running out of time. In other words, you know, how much longer can we wait? Or for profit publishers, for example, to address their business models. Or for moving revenue from one column to another when we have this huge existential crisis about access to climate research. And when we think **about models and frameworks like the UN Sustainable Development Goals**, we also know that that access to research through Open Access and open data is a requirement for actually all of the SDG's, not just #13 which is climate action, but truly 11 of them, all of them are supported by research, by data, and also in terms of measurements, in terms of how well we as communities or how well, you know, globally we're doing in terms of meeting these SDG's that needs to be measured and those measurements need to be available. Openly through open data. So open in that way, like **Open Access is so integrated through so many components of our life.** It's just that we don't always think of it in that way.

So as we were kind of considering Open Access from the lens of climate and climate action, we actually did a bit of bibliometric research to get a sense of what percentage of research is actually, what percentage of climate research is actually available as Open Access. And so working with our friends at foci and we looked through the big **trick** research over the last several years and found

that about 50% of all climate research is locked behind a paywall. So that's pretty significant, you know? This is like the one of the greatest existential crises of our time. It's you know, something that's globally important to pretty much everyone in terms of mitigating the climate crisis.

And we only have access to half the research.

And, you know, thinking about where we could be in terms of some of those global mitigation efforts if we had access to 100% climate research, is pretty meaningful and we can also see that of that 50% that is open only about 40% is open through the publisher. So what that means is that the final version of record on the publisher website that a lot of folks are referencing and citing. You know only about 40% is available there and then the other percent is available through open repositories.

So that got us thinking, like, - **what if** we agree that some topics are just too important to our shared humanity, to the planet, to consider them from this really limited vantage point of a business model? Open Access isn't really a business model. Open Access is a tool. It's a movement. It's a set of principles. Cortana was saying. And **what if** this crisis, the climate crisis, is so monumental that we really do need to act now, when we cannot wait for these business models to sort themselves out? What actions can we take today to move forward Open Access and address the climate crisis? So, uh, we got brainstorming and thought about a couple of different projects that I'm gonna walk you through right now. Some of which, you know, we're actively engaged on, some of which we are aiming to partner with and, and profile with, with different folks around the world and, and some of which you know. These are really just kind of thought provocations to think about how we can consider making Open Access to climate research happen. So in I think it was 2006, Peter super at you know, the many think of him kind of as the grandfather of Open Access. One of the OA specialists at Harvard University came up with this idea of *binding knowledge*.

So what if we prioritize our Open Access efforts in an area of critical importance rather than, you know, what happens in a lot of cases right now, where it's just about prioritizing Open Access generally across a publishers portfolio, **what if** we really kind of focused on a variety of different, uh, critical areas of importance? And so Super kind of came up with this, this plan to reach out to publishers that were publishing in these areas of critical importance. And in 2006, I think the topic he had presented was Cancer Research. And of course, we saw this happen in reality, when publishers opened up access to research about COVID-19, we knew that this was collectively an area of such great importance **that we forgot about the business models** and we just made sure that that research was available openly.

So **what would it look like if** we applied the same process and the same model to climate research? And so super kind of speculated that the first step would be to compile a bibliography of this research that has been previously published. Then he sort of talks about this hard working soul, you know, that could be an organization or that could be, you know, even students or whomever groups of librarians would then ask, **just simply ask the journals to make those articles available as Open Access**. Then the journals would hopefully comply and they would do that because they would know that they're contributing to this really good cause. They believe that science is effective in meeting

these challenges. And then also they become more visible. These journalists become more visible as saying *we've contributed to this kind of collective act*.

And it sounds almost a little silly, you know, thinking about it in this way, that we've just reached out to publishers and simply ask for them to make content available as Open Access.

But one of the most important components of this approach is that its previously published research, so, so much of our efforts is in making content available and have access focused on newly published research. This in many cases is research that's been out of an available for a number of years. And we're not asking them to just, you know, widespread make their entire catalog so available as Open Access. We're looking at, you know, a smaller collection based on needs.

So we thought, what would this look like if we applied it to climate research?

And again, we did some research with both **Cookie** and Sesame Open Science, and we thought what would be representative of, you know, a representative corpus of some of the most important climate change research. And we thought it's probably the IPCC reports, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. They put out these significant reports, so we looked at the 6th assessment report and all of the papers cited in those reports to see how many of them are available currently as Open Access. The good news is about 60% of those papers cited in the IPCC reports are available as Open Access. But that of course means that 40% are currently closed. And um, of that 40%, sorry, of that 60% that is available openly and only about 40% of that 60% have CC licenses. So again we know as Anna was saying in our definition of Open Access that research has to be both made **available without** barriers but with this open license, the reason that's critically important from our perspective is if a publisher makes something available, freely available, we've seen this happen without placing a license on it, they can always just lock it back behind a paywall. So we want to make sure that this content is available Open Access in perpetuity. OK.

So we pulled all of the papers cited in the IPCC reports and we matched them to DOI in the Crossref database, and they're about 45,000 papers cited in these reports, which means there's just about 18,000 papers across about 200 publishers that we want to make available as Open Access. When you start to break it down that way it doesn't seem so impossible. Of course there are the set of publishers, you know, the big guys like Elsevier, Taylor and Francis, etcetera. They have a couple of 1000 papers that they need to make available as Open Access. But then there's a number of publishers that just have, you know, 3 or 4. For maybe 20-25, and you start to break it down in that way, we're starting to see publishers say like, **actually this is a pretty small contribution that we can make to**, again, mitigating this huge crisis by making these 20 or 25 papers available as Open Access.

So we have started to have conversations with some of these publishers, most notably at the Alaska Conference, which happened earlier this fall. That's the Open Access Scholarly Public Scholarly Publisher Association. And when we talked about this issue, there were dozens of publishers afterwards **said send me, send me your list. You know, I think we can really make this happen. Definitely some of the smaller publishers like university presses, but also publishers like Wiley, for example, showed a lot of interest in making this happen.** And what we found the more we've talked

about this is that our colleagues in libraries have direct relationships with publishers, of course. And so, you know, working with librarians to also talk to their publishing contacts and say, hey, do you have, you know, some of these papers available and can you make them available as Open Access. As you're renegotiating a deal, for example, is another way we can start to take some collective climate action. So that's one of our big projects.

And then it's also really important for us to address Open Access sort of from the other direction, which is the **self-archiving direction**.

Authors

And so we thought let's divide our efforts both to reach out to the publishers but also by encouraging authors to retain their rights so that when they're publishing research, climate research, they can go ahead and deposit that research in a repository, regardless of if the publisher wants to make an Open Access or not, as long as it's according to their author agreement. So with this, um, this the paper pledge or the planet? The idea is that as an author, you can pledge, you know, just as you would for any sort of campaign or papers to the planet by depositing them into repository. So what we're doing right now in partnership with core, um, the coalition for open repositories, Monica, you'll correct me if I've gotten that wrong in the chat. And I feel as well in creating lists for institutions and institutional repositories or even national repositories of climate change research that has been published in the last five years, where authors have either retained their rights or where the journals allow for the deposit of the author accepted manuscripts into repositories.

And then we've created a mechanism where those repository managers or even us at CC can reach out to the authors and say, hey, we've made this super easy for you. Can you go ahead and deposit these papers into these repositories? And we're agnostic in terms of where it's. Parts of it could be deposited into a central repository like through **Zamato** could be deposited in an institutional repository and then you are taking kind of this individual act of collective climate action so if we get thousands and thousands and thousands of researchers doing this all of a sudden we are kind of chipping away at that 50% of climate research that is not available as Open Access and really with that dual approach both from the publisher perspective and their researcher perspective.

So just briefly in wrapping up, I'm going to talk about two other initiatives.

This one is about, um, the **facilitation** of climate data. So this is a little bit different in terms of talking to publishers and researchers. This is about reaching out to those huge institutional holders of climate data, both. Nationally and internationally and saying like, hey, you've got all of this climate data, what would it look like if you used CC licenses and made it available as Open Access and made it available to be reused? And so through this research and working with a number of these partners we published a report called *Facilitating Better Sharing of Climate Research and Data*. We can actually drop the link to that report into the chat, where we have now a set of recommendations if you are a large folder or publisher or creator of climate data about how to license data, for Open Access and for reuse.

And we've been really proud and happy to work with some of the largest holders of climate data in the world to create this set of recommendations and to work with them to provide, you know, whatever support and training and recommendations they need to make that research available as open.

And then lastly, um and this project isn't specific to climate data, but it certainly with worth mentioning because it can apply to climate or any other type of research is working on a set of recommendations to apply CC licenses to preprints. So we know preprints are becoming more and more valuable as a mechanism for scholarly communication, particularly when publishing with a publisher that does not allow for the deposit of the final version of records, or as a way to kind of get research out there as quickly as possible, is that which is really relevant I think with climate data. So we are working on preparing a set of recommendations for which licenses to use on preprints and then working with print servers to make sure that applying CC licenses is happening as part of their workflow.

So these are just a variety of projects, you know, on the open science side of things about how we are aiming to advance Open Access and, and really, you know, having worked on this now for several months, what we have found is using something like climate. As believer to talk about Open Access and the importance of Open Access has **really** been a significant difference maker and **really** talks about why Open Access matters. It's not just open for open stake, it's open kind of as that **act of reciprocity** and that act of kind of collective action contributing to the Commons.

So just the last thing I'll say is we would love to chat more about all of these issues, but we also provide forums for these conversations like our community groups on copyright, open culture, open education, you know. Monica is also convening some folks to talk about Open climate as well. We have legal open office hours and then there's also tools like the CCC certificate we provide institutional training and consulting, etcetera. So lots of ways to kind of dig in and chat more about these topics. And that's the end of our formal presentation. So happy to open it up for questions, comments, etcetera. Very much, very interesting.

Q and A:

So have you started to use, have you started to get any results from this discussion with the climate, you know, have you gotten any in terms of the publishers, yeah, for the publishers, yeah, yeah, yeah.

R: We, we have actually, you know, I, we weren't very certain what the response from the publishers would be, but we found talking to the publishers kind of as a group was really helpful because ... you know, once one publisher said, yeah, we're interested in doing this, others began to follow. And it is a small ask, you know, to say, like, can you just make, you know, this handful of papers available as Open Access? So our approach has been to work with some of the friendly publishers, if you will, like the university presses, for publishers that have strong affiliations with institutions first as a way of encouraging some of the larger publishers, but so far their response has been very positive. Very smart.

So are there any questions?

Sorry, I do not know how to raise my hand here. Uh, OK, I have just a really Maybe because I'm such a novice and and Creative Commons. So in order to say if I have a data set then I added to our repository just data site or wherever. Is it enough for me to write into that data set? My chosen, uh, license. Such as uh. Assessed by software, Is it enough just that I write it below the data set and thereby it's licensed? Or do I have to take some some other technical steps?

Everyday man, thank you for that question. It really depends on what repository you're using. So the repository will generally allow you to apply a CC license to. Data settubg is fed and will have a specific, uh, designation when you go and upload your data set to select a license. So some of the work that we're doing, for example, on the preprint side is that we want to allow or we want to have repositories have as much information as they need and can provide to potential users so they know what license to apply. Because you're not, you know, you're not alone. Especially for a lot of researchers who are novices when it comes to licenses, you know, they, they get a prompt, they're uploading a data set of coding, a preprint. And, you know, they get prompted with question, what license would you like to apply? And they don't know, they don't, they don't know what they mean. They don't know, you know, what one does. And so, you know, we do have a lot of resources on our website that describes the different licenses that that describes the permissibility of the different instances in the event that the repository that you're uploading your data to does not have sufficient information for you to feel comfortable knowing what type of license you're applying. But the general answer to your question is the. The repository will give you the info. We'll have a step where you designate what license you want to buy into it because it adds it to the meta data or the data set so that when that data set gets used, you know it'll have metadata information on who the wner is, ideally where it's collected, and you know there might be more metadata fields about when it was collected. Having some information about the data and then the license, so that when that gets used by another individual, all that metadata information goes along with it, including the license that you've applied to your data center. Alright, thank you very much.

Cortana, see, your hand is up. Yeah, thank you.

Ragna: It's a very specific question that just came up today. I work at Reykjavik University and there was discussion about student papers, like final papers that are handed in into our university repository. And there was a question about. Whether we were allowed, whether the students were allowed to put the university logo on the front page, if they have it, if they have it as a CC by, if they put the C buy on there, is it allowed them to have the logo of the university? Because some say no and just wondering if if you have an answer for that.

M: I just want a clarifying question before maybe we might just need a little bit more information. So what is the purpose of putting the logo like what is like the intent of putting the logo on the paper? It's it's just something that's always been done on the front page. And so, you know, that's a final project from this university. So they will put the logo on the front page. I mean, it's not OK, Sarah Lee. It's just always been done this way. Suddenly there's a discussion that perhaps it's not allowed.

Yeah. I just wanted to make sure that the logo is not indicating that the content is the intellectual property of the university. It's just its more it's more indicating affiliation. Is that correct? Yeah, I

would think so, Yeah. OK, OK. Yeah. M: which case, I mean, and no one here from CC is a lawyer. So, you know, we always do. I have, I have forwarded this to our lawyer. Yeah, we would like to have. We're not lawyers, but we spend a lot of time around lawyers. And so my interpretation of that would be the copyright still belongs to the student, right? They're the one that created it. And so they are allowed to put a CC license on that regardless if there's a logo. On the front page of the paper, because the logo is really just showing an **affiliation** rather than some kind of copyright transfer to the institution. So the copyright again remains the students copyright and then the student can decide what license to put on. Of course we recommend CC BY license. That's one of our more permissive licenses **can allow for reuse remix things** like translation yeah which we find is one of the most likely uses of our licenses in this context. Yeah because it does say that from the university says that the outsiders use of Logo is prohibited without permission. Yeah. And that's different because that's sort of like, now that's like trademark, which just doesn't have to do with the actual content of the content, right, the paper.

So I think those are sort of two different things. So like you still couldn't have trademark infringement by having someone else use that logo, but that doesn't have to. ... just the content of the paper CC licensed. So that there's no misunderstanding that your CC licensing logo on the front page. Yeah, Yeah. OK.

Well, thank you very much. That answer did very well. Thank you.

X. I 'm the man who was on mute. And it's this little. Yeah, yeah. Thank you. I have just a very basic question - you have a journal that's becoming Open Access the, does it apply for the blacklist?

Also. Like it doesn't do it automatically or you, you know, does it work back in time? And actually the other question, shouldn't you have the CC licenses on every article? Because I sometimes see journals with only the information on the front page. That's not in the articles.

M: Yeah, that's a good question. Um, so if a journal wasn't publishing as Open Access in the past, but then decides to publish as Open Access going forward, it would not be retroactive. But the question really comes down to. Then who owns the rights? So if in the journal agreement with researchers, it says that researchers retain the rights, the copyright to their published research, then it's actually their right to apply. That the license, the Open Access license, whereas if the agreement was between the author and the publisher says that the publisher owns the right, then the publisher can retroactively go back and and make all of that available openly and going forward. So that's really the crux of the issue is, is what the the publishing agreement says. So for example, we work with the publisher now who wants to make a bunch of research available as Open Access, but they have allowed their authors to retain the right, so they need to go back to the authors and say, is it OK if we now make this available as Open Access? And certainly to your point from my perspective and Monica, please jump in, but the **Licensing should be applied at the article level, not just the journal level** because that's what's going to go into the metadata when you know it's distributed and disseminated.

Hey, Margaret, sorry?

Um, I must say that I am just full of admiration for the job you are doing. And do you have certainly given us Food for thought. I don't have at the moment any specific questions, but I just wanted to, to tell you how, how much. **Check my work. No**, thank you so much. Yeah, we are very privileged to get to do this work. And I think as was, you know, as Rebecca talked about, it's really energizing. I know Rebecca has spoken to, you know, to this sort of from a personal perspective. And I echo that that this Open Access movement, you know, is, is over 20 years old and it's difficult to continue to do this work when you see that the status quo remains the status quo and, and that, you know, our ability to solve the greatest challenges that our world is facing is hampered by, you know, **business models that are enriching a few individuals and not seeing that change.**

A: And so seeing a response like yours and for researchers and from other librarians and repository managers, particularly around climate and having something that we can do today has been really, really inspiring for us as well. Yeah. And I would, I would also just say in response like we are grateful to all of those who are carrying this work out, like I said earlier in their, you know, home context and making it work for whatever their field of expertise is or language or the laws that guide things. I was trying to dig through the history and run these to see, and when they start, I I thought I had recalled that they used to say it's fine to pay APC's from grants and when I was looking at it more recently it looked like they were recommending alternate ways to get things openly out there without having to necessarily pay APC's. And like that is just grassroots. Work that's happening on the ground in Iceland thanks to you all. And so it's definitely like an accelerator. So we feel very lucky that we get to do with the licenses and try and have impact in specific sectors. But it's, you know, the world is, you know, hundreds of thousands of times larger than the footprint that we can have. So we do appreciate also the opportunity to collaborate and talk about things with those who are working in these fields. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you so much.

Allyson, you have your hand up. OK, uh, you have to unmute Allyson. I don't think we can unmute for you. Let me see. I've got it. OK, Here we go. Yeah. Yeah.

Since I know that, Anna, you have connections with Africa. I was wondering what your contacts are and how Creative Commons is going to deal with indigenous knowledge, Indigenous practices, something that might be called **Can you bring them bills?** Yeah, these are knowledge, Yes, in the Far East. That's the question.

A: Yeah, yeah, it's a good question. And it's one where I would say the people who are shall we say, like the purists on Open, disagree with the people who take a more nuanced approach to what should be open and for whom to reuse. And, and Rebecca and Monica, by all means chime in here if you have things to add, but we are launching work in the cultural heritage space, which touches heavily on the indigenous knowledge considerations as well.

Trying to build towards a recommendation on open cultural heritage, much like the UNESCO recommendation on open science that you all would be familiar with, but with the particular *caveat* acknowledgement that copyright isn't even an appropriate mechanism for a lot of those materials, it's not really a concept that holds true for some of those communities and furthermore, therefore, openly licensing something that is held in those communities could lead to unintended

consequences, lack of contextualization, you know, misuse by uncaring actors. And so it is definitely not a simple thing, but we I would say that **we do not hold the open for open sake, open is the answer to everything approach. It is a question of where and how that is best applied.** Rebecca and Monica, do you have anything to add on that front?

A: Maybe just really briefly, we also aim to support one possible grassroots efforts from local communities. So one of them, and I'll drop the link in the chat is called open goes to cop, the conference of the parties. So this is a group from Ghana, who are looking to make sure that their perspectives are included in discussions at the Conference of the Parties on climate, you know, the world's greatest stage in terms of talking about climate, and we're aiming to support them by saying, you know, that these perspectives that, that they're bringing to the climate change dialogue is really critical and how can we, you know, learn from them, their perspectives and then also make sure that they are enabled with additional data and research that's relevant to their own work. So it's by no means perfect, but we certainly need to support and augment when possible with these projects. And maybe just worth mentioning that the next Diamond Open Access Summit is being hosted in South Africa. So not directly tied to a question around traditional knowledge, but definitely it's a yeah, Yeah.

By design, it was selected there, Yeah. Because there actually are a lot of advancements in like non APC models in the continent and in Latin America. Basically that the global N should be learning from. Thank you. I think o. Well, this has been very interesting and we have no more time, it is 4:00. So I think we gonna put this to an end - there are no more questions. I just want to thank you all very much for taking the time to be here with us. Anna, Rebecca. Monica, thank you very much for your input. And I'm gonna just turn off the recording now. Thank you.

Thank you so much.

Thank you very much, all of you.

Thank you. Thank you.