

W2/Tbl 1: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. So much revenue from content registration.
- b. That there were so many other services. Lack of knowledge of these may exacerbate above.
- c. Top tier membership has remained flat, while lowest member membership tier has surged in.
- d. That organization is so financially healthy.

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Increase amount of revenue that Plus is generating. Possibly through pricing.
- b. Emphasize and educate about added value of services in order to increase uptake.
- c. More services directly benefiting members instead of those that indirectly benefit members.
- d. More systematic surveys of membership to understand changing needs.

W2/Tbl 2: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Similarity Check change in 2020
- b. Jump in revenue from \$275 category - now highest - U-shaped spread with the extremes being the highest
- c. 10 to 1 imbalance in the relationship between content registration and metadata users

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. More revenue from metadata users - not for data but for services
- b. Deeper analysis of \$275 category - look at trends

W2/Tbl 3: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Subscriber services were 9% of revenue -positive/negative
- b. Complexity of fees
- c. Discrepancy between consumers and depositors 1:20
- d. The contribution of small publishers to the total revenue
- e. Missing specific R&D Costs/expens line in financials-important signal to members and others

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Reassess the fee structure to better align with the mission....but current model works
- b. Exploit the small member market to re address the balance -must assess on administrative costs etc of having more small members
- c. Waiver for geographical areas/possible tiers for others
- d. Review current cost of registration fees across the board -should be lower

W2/Tbl 4: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. nope

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Purchasing power parity - membership and content reg. fees remains an issue
- b. Align vision with fees - if the mission is a value of the publisher, the balance is fair. If we look at who benefits the most, it would make sense for Plus users to pay more.
Diversify?
- c. Metadata Plus - instead of free vs. SLA, distinguish between commercial and non-commercial
- d. Who are the users? Users should contribute financially and have a say.
- e. Sponsorship GDP criteria should be updated

W2/Tbl 5: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Explosive growth in small members.
 - i. Does this indicate that fees aren't a barrier?
- b. There is a lot of confusion about sponsoring member / org programme. Also recognition that it's helpful.
- c. Surprise around margins.

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Review rationale for fee structure.
 - i. e.g. single membership fee?
 - ii. more equitable fee structure taking into account purchasing power?
- b. Expand metadata services. Diversification of revenues.

W2/Tbl 6: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Who is paying what?
 - i. Largest providers (11 publishers) provide about 1/3 of revenue.
 - ii. Smallest 3 tiers = 46% of revenue, bottom tier 35%
 1. still a big chunk
 2. Limited growth in no these members
- b. Revenue generation imbalance
 - i. Minimal revenue generation from metadata users
 - ii. Total reliance on revenue from content generation
- c. Why are there so few members in the middle
 - i. Does this reflect the industry
 - ii. Who/what are we missing

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Embedding incentives for better metadata into the fee structure
- b. Let's work out a fee structure for metadata users (say, experimental R&D orgs)
 - i. E.g. Clarivate, Wellcome, Institutions and ephemeral entrepreneurs
- c. Enhance/ Focus more on Sponsoring Members and Organizations
 - i. their fee structure could help revenue scale with membership growth/
 - ii. Members and Orgs have voting rights/governance

W2/Tbl 7: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Growth in operating expenses 2018-2019. Focus on staffing
- b. Risk: significant reliance on revenue from 6 publishers
- c. Decrease in revenue for TII
- d. Lack of reserves ... Covers less than one year of operation
- e. Market penetration knowledge appears lacking
 - i. what % of journals articles have a doi?
 - ii. what % of preprints

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Fee structure for developing countries
 - i. PPP example needs to explore DOI registrations too
- b. Predatory publishers
- c. Global fund

W2/Tbl 8: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. The funding model aligns with the purpose from 2000, to support a small group of large publishers
- b. There isn't a breakdown of core and non-core activities in the financials (that we can see with the current reports)
- c. Operating expenses are growing at the same rate as revenue

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Suggestion to look at other similar orgs (e.g. DataCite) and perhaps outside our industry - they may be facing similar issues
- b. Charging per volume of metadata use
- c. Build a future-proof Infrastructure beyond DOIs and content, i.e. adding data, and from registrations fee to access/usage fee

W2/Tbl 9: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

1. **That there has been no price increase on anything in over 10 years**
2. The tiers haven't changed but the membership structure has
3. That small publishers are collectively paying more now than large
4. Middle tiers - small fraction of content/revenue - remove?
5. **That metadata users are very small part of revenue**
6. Surprising Crossref didn't get revenue from document checkings fees before

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

1. More paid services for metadata users, like analytics. Increase fees for using metadata.
 - i. This could allow to reduce content registration fees.
 - ii. Incentives (discounts) for depositing rich metadata
2. Introduce a paying non-member e.g. supporter category e.g. institutions
3. Reconsider the tiers considering the shift in membership. Maybe the lowest tier should be split further into several groups - 0-1 million USD revenue is a huge range

W2/Tbl 10: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Distribution of fee categories and what members w/in each register. (11 vs 11K)
- b. Nothing usage-based
- c. Low overall cost

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Balancing risks
- b. Reduce charge per DOI to offset growing article growth (more deposits per depositor)
- c. Cost per item increasing (pg. 25) b/c of many more smaller contributors
- d. Staff time- no economy of scale, still focused on time for larger publishers

W2/Tbl 11 How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. Incredible growth in proportion of revenue from smallest tier.
- b. Lack of growth in the middle.
- c. Membership fees/content registration fees haven't changed for years.

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. Proportion of revenue from content registration - shift to metadata useage?
- b. Content registration fees - do they work for all communities? Difficult at top end (volume) and lower end (cost)
- c. Board doesn't represent where revenue comes from.

W2/Tbl 12: How is Crossref sustained?

Does anything surprise you about Crossref's revenue streams?

- a. X
- b. X
- c. X

If there was one thing you could change about Crossref's revenue streams, what would it be?

- a. X
- b. X
- c. X