OPEN ACCESS – A DRIVER FOR DRAMATIC CHANGES FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Lars Bjørnshauge

The tipping point will come soon

Academic libraries, librarians and library associations have been and still are one of the driving forces in the Open (Access) movement.

During the latest years other (more important) stakeholders have entered the scene. Universities, university associations, research funders, research councils and their associations, governments and supranational organizations have now gone beyond signatures on various declarations and are implementing Open Access mandates and policies.

The recent developments in the UK, the expected developments in the European Commission and later in the member states will contribute and strengthen the process towards making open access the default in scholarly publishing and in a few years we could reach the tipping point where 50% of the annual output of research publications will be open access. The announcement last month from the SCOAP3 consortium in high energy physics revealed their agreements with publishers. The agreements will reduce the article processing charges (APCs) significantly and furthermore the deal will have the effect that the journals that won the tender will be taken away from the big deals and that revenue generated via hybrid open access will be recycled into reduced licensing fees (to avoid double dipping). This is the first real step in the decomposition of the big deals.

The momentum for open access will in the coming years change the game significantly. It may not happen tomorrow, but it will happen. How this will unfold is difficult to predict, but at some point it will or ought to have significant impact on the operations of academic libraries.

One of the driving forces here will be a much closer look at the costs of operating academic libraries and how individual libraries work and how they work or should work in common.

Can/should libraries collaborate much more to be more efficient?

Academic libraries are already since many years struggling to make ends meet and to be able to renew existing agreements with the traditional subscription based publishers. Libraries have for years been collaborating in consortia to keep price increases down, with some success, but in spite of their efforts prices increase above the inflation rates.

The transition to the provision of digital information through site licenses has made it possible to provide institutional users with access to enormous amounts of information, thus satisfying the continuous demand for access to databases, journal articles, e-books etc. But this development has also generated a lot of back office work (license negotiations, electronic resource management, openURL linking, authentication etc).

In reality, libraries are very much occupied with controlling access in order to secure, that so called non-authorized users cannot access the content, which is largely publicly funded research. Openness is a core value of librarians and libraries, but nevertheless libraries have to guarantee that non-affiliated users will be denied access.

In countries where national library consortia now have been in operation for a decade most of the universities and university colleges are subscribing to the content from all the major subscription publishers. Although there still are differences in the ability of universities to subscribe to all the big deals ,it is fair to say that the institutions in the consortia to a large extent subscribes to the same content, have the same work to do in activating the content in their ERM-systems (electronic resource management) and link-resolvers. At the same time minor institutions, industry, knowledge intensive start-up companies, and ordinary citizens are suffering from lack of access to current research results, which harms innovation etc. Wider access to scholarly publications is in fact one of the most important drivers for the uptake of open access by research funders and decision makers.

Add to this the significant changes that have occurred with the advent of the big deals. In the good old days librarians carefully selected books and journals that (supposedly – but as we have seen far from always) were the most relevant and important for the user community.

Now libraries are buying discovery services with one million records, providing access to content licensed via big deals. No more nitty-gritty selection.

National licenses and centralized back office services?

If libraries, universities and research funders are looking for ways to fund the transition costs associated with open access, why not look for changes that can at the same time reduce the overhead associated with library services and extend access to stakeholders outside the universities and research institutions.

The individual library should no longer operate as an isolated island. The concept of national licenses (instead of consortia licenses) -covering all users in a country - and centralized ERM- and linking services would reduce the workload on the academic libraries at the local level and give more users direct access to the content, with significant benefits to society at large.

That might in the short run mean slightly increased costs, price increases for the licenses with the publishers, but the reduction in the workload for the local libraries would probably outweigh that, and the benefits for society would be significant.
Take in consideration here, that a rapidly increasing share of the annual production (and publishing) of research results would be in open access, which should lead to reductions in the deals with the publishers.

At the local level, the reduced costs to licenses and the work associated with that should then be reallocated into support for open access publishing, more investments in institutional repositories (IRs) and current research information systems (CRIS) and more funding available for paying APCs.

In a networked global environment the individual library should no longer be an island. We are putting a lot of effort into negotiating the general content (the big deals), but neglecting to make our unique collections freely available to the world. Academic libraries are struggling to fill repositories and developing CRISes. But while approving invoices from the Elseviers, Wileys etc. the libraries are afraid that article processing charges will undermine acquisition budgets and hesitate to devote adequate resources to building a common infrastructure for Green and Gold open access. Academic libraries seem way too local in their approach, and at some point it may become obvious that the libraries missed the chance to act collaboratively and proactively to pave the way for open access.

The above scenario might seem idealistic or utopian. But it contains a number of options for libraries and libraries in collaboration to act before someone else tells libraries to act. That is: If libraries do not act proactively here, then others might come in and decide on behalf of the libraries.

The transition to open access incurs costs and will generate a closer look at the total cost of scholarly publishing and how libraries operate.

There is common agreement that a transition to open access as the default will incur transition costs.

Research funders are more and more explicitly expressing readiness to invest in, for instance, paying for publication costs (APCs for open access journals and first digital copy costs for open access monographs, but they are as well looking for ways of keeping the total costs for scholarly communication down. This means that the current costs for the big deals will come into focus, not only from part of view of the libraries, but increasingly so from university managements and research funders.

The fact that research funders and governments are now looking much more into the costs of scholarly publishing is really a new phenomenon. Up until open access came on their agenda the dissemination of research results has been outsourced to the publishers in a market with no competition. The only stakeholder who cared about the costs was the libraries, who most directly felt the problem.

With the recent momentum for Gold open access we can expect a significant increase in open access content paid by article processing charges. The money flow in this business is between an open access publisher and the researcher, her institution or research grant. Only if the library can position itself in the role of handling APCs, managing publication funds the library can still have a role to play in this chain.

Disrupt or be disrupted!

There is no doubt that things will change for academic libraries. We are in the midst of a development where the roles of all stakeholders are changing. Governments, research funders and universities are much more engaged in scholarly communication. Publishers are trying to adapt and find new business models. Libraries have traditionally played an important role in the promotion of open access. The paradox is that a transition to a new paradigm of scholarly communication can put libraries out of the loop.

But there is still time to act. If libraries still want to play a major role in scholarly communication it is about time to consider radical collaboration and not hide behind the complications and challenges of

licensing the subscription based content and the back office processes associated with that, thus leaving open access as a good thing, if we can afford it!

Open access is inevitable and libraries should still play and important role.

It is always better to act, than to be forced to react.

WHO ARE THE PREDATORS?
Jan Erik Frantsvåg

I assume most of you are familiar with Beall's list of predatory publishers. This list contains information on (currently) 195 publishers that, according to Jeffrey Beall, are publishers more interested in getting an income than in publishing quality-assured science.

Now, Beall is undoubtedly pointing at a serious problem. Establishing more or less "fake" publishing ventures is very easy in an Open Access (OA) world, using the ubiquitous OJS software. Something resembling an honest publisher may be set up with only a few hours of work. Such publishers are a problem for the reputation of OA, because their lack of quality will taint the concept of OA. We should all get together and try to rid the world of these publishers. A major step forward will be to demand authors actually try to check the quality of journals they want to publish in, e.g. by reading some recent articles or looking at the editorial board.

In Norway, the body accrediting journals for the Norwegian financing system for the research and higher education sector, this spring withdrew accreditation for nearly 200 journals due to questions about their peer review systems and quality. And we know they actively try to avoid getting more dubious journals into the system. Beall's list has been one of the inputs in this process.

Unfortunately, Beall's list is a very personal one with a lack of stringent criteria. A number of listings have been openly criticised by senior "statesmen" of the OA community. E.g. Beall is automatically negative to publishers and journals with only a few articles to their name. It seems he don't realize even *The philosophical transactions of the Royal Society* had to start with a handful of articles.

If we overlook the problem of these publishers tainting the reputation of serious OA publishers, what about their predation? A constant criticism from Beall is the lack of articles, so most of these journals are unable to draw much money out of authors or institutions. And the overall picture is one of low APCs. If we assume, to take a number out of the hat, that these publishers on average manage to get USD 50,000 per year out of the budget of scientific institutions, this sums up to about USD 10,000,000. This is a lot of money, but a tiny fraction of the cost of science. And my guess is that this is a high estimate.

We could then look at Elsevier, the major traditional publisher. While there is no reason to suspect Elsevier of tampering with quality – though low quality journals undoubtedly are to be found in their portfolio, too – other aspects of their business could be worth looking at under the headline of "predatory". In 2011 Elsevier had an "Adjusted operating profit" of GBP 768,000,000. This is more than 1,200,000,000 USD. Or, 120 times the combined cost of the "predatory" publishers. The operating profit of Elsevier is paid by science, just as the whole income of the predatory publishers.

But if 10 million USD makes 195 publishers predatory, what should one call the single publisher that "gets away" with 1,2 billion USD?

Jan Erik Frantsvåg Universitetsbiblioteket, IT-drift, formidling og utvikling, Universitetet i Tromsö, Norway

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION TO THE MEMBER STATES ON ACCESS TO AND PRESERVATION OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Mikkel Christoffersen

Introduction

On July 17th 2012 the European Commission issued a recommendation to the member states on access to and preservation of scientific information. The recommendation was long awaited and its wording is very clear and concise. The Commission is basically telling the member states that they need to do something about access to and preservation of the scientific record right now.

History

The recommendation traces its history back to traditional research policy discourse in the European Union, but specifically the February 2007 communication from the Commission to the Council, the Parliament and the European Economic and Social Committee from February 2007. That particular communication built on the i2010 Digital Libraries Initiative and the Community policy on research that looked to enhance the social and economic benefits of research and innovation for the common good in the context of the launch of FP7 (the 7th Framework Programme) running from 2007 to 2013 as well as the then plans to develop the European Research Area (ERA).

The 2007 communication explicitly details how access to documents as well as data will not only prevent duplicate work, but ensure faster and more effective research of a higher quality. It then goes on to discuss Open Access issues and rehashes the debate from the perspective of both researchers, policy makers and publishers. The communication also deals with the aspects of preservation from the blunt, practical aspects of there being quite simply too much information produced to intellectually deal with legal, organisational and technical issues. At the same time, much of what the Commission later went on to finance and aid in terms of Open Access is delineated and a call to debate the challenges is issued.

In November 2007, the Council issued its conclusions under the Portuguese presidency jointly prepared with the preceding German Presidency. The conclusions are noteworthy, because they explicitly acknowledges the constrained and diminishing access to scientific information caused directly by the rising prices of academic journals. The conclusions also call to the member states to handle the challenges at a national level and to collaborate, and they reiterate the preservation issues. The conclusions set forth an ambitious roadmap for the member states and in fact too ambitious as would be evident later.

In Denmark, the conclusions that bound the member states to make ambitious plans at the national level led to the formation of the so-called Open Access Committee; a broad selection of stakeholders charged with composing a report for the minister on how to implement the conclusions in Denmark. The result was published in 2010 and it's a visionary report detailing actions at the government, ministerial and institutional level. Unfortunately, Denmark experienced a very long general election campaign that froze many emerging initiatives. Then, when the new government took office, all the new ministers had two months to get acquainted with their ministries before Denmark had the presidency of the Council of the European Union for half a year in the spring of 2012. Since then, the research councils in Denmark have implemented Open Access mandates as have several universities. This has made it all the more easy for the Ministry of Science, Innovation and Higher Education to act on the report, and the minister has indeed recently publicly endorsed Open Access.

The European Commission has pursued an Open Access agenda while taking more and more of an interest in research data management, sharing and re-use since 2007. The Commission appointed a high-level expert group to write a report on these challenges, which became the very influential "Riding the Wave: How Europe can gain from the rising tide of research data" from October 2010. Also, under the 7th Framework Programme a project called GRDI 2020 (A Vision for Global Research Data Infrastructures) has been issuing statement reports and recommendations. In 2011, the Commission staged an open consultation on access and preservation of scientific information, the result of which was published in January 2012. The consultation received 1140 answers from 42 countries, and the results were very clear in several categories. For instance, 89% of the respondents identified high journal prices as a key obstacle to access, and another 85% pointed to the limited library budgets. A similar majority pointed to

the EU level as a natural level at which to coordinate repository infrastructures and policy creation.

The July 2012 recommendation

At the Nordbib June 11-13 2012 international conference "Structural Frameworks for Open, Digital Research: Strategy, policy and infrastructure," both commissioner Neelie Kroes, commissioner for the Digital Agenda for Europe, and commissioner Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, commissioner for research, innovation and science, made very clear and very sharp video presentations on the need for better access to scientific information as a prerequisite for European growth.

The recommendation was published five weeks later. Unofficially, representatives from the Commission have made it abundantly clear that the recommendation has been written, because the member states are quite simply not doing enough following the 2007 conclusions, and the recommendation is certainly a strongly worded text.

Generally, The recommendation makes observations on the connection between Open Access to all kinds of scientific information and the larger European flagships under the Europe 2020 banner. It reiterates the importance of Open Access for research and innovation, and this time the Commission explicitly calls for publicly funded research results to be available for industry as well. It reiterates the preservation issues and again calls for collaboration and coordination at the national level between member states and the European and global level.

Specifically, the recommendations fall into nine specific categories, which are:

Clear policies for Open Access to scientific publications resulting from publicly funded research - meaning at the government level:

- Concrete objectives and indicators to measure progress
- Implementation plans, including the allocation of responsibilities
- Associated financial planning

When research funding institutions are responsible for the management of public funds, it must be assured that:
- Policies are in place at the institutional level
- Funding for Open Access is in place; also for experimenting with dissemination
- Changing the evaluation system for researchers so that those who participate in a culture of sharing are rewarded for it

- Guide researchers on how to comply with Open Access policies
- Negotiate with publishers to obtain the necessary rights and terms
- Describe sufficiently publicly funded research results technically so that it is easily identifiable

Open Access to research data with the same prerequisites as documents (concrete objectives and progress indicators, implementation plans and roles, financial planning), and:

- Put the necessary digital infrastructures in place to share and reuse. There's the added complexity that data may have reservations attached relating to privacy, secrets (trade or national security), intellectual property rights etc. Also, in public-private partnerships, the private actor can keep their data from Open Access.
- Datasets are made identifiable and linkable to other sets
- Institutions put in place mechanisms to reward researchers who share data
- Advanced degree programmes are developed in the area of data handling

Preservation and curation of scientific information especially for re-use by:

- Defining and implementing policies and clarifying roles among stakeholders as well as financial planning
- Ensuring the necessary digital infrastructure
- Preserving outdated hardware and software to handle old information
- Facilitating the possibilities of building value-added services based on the re-use of information

Further developing e-infrastructures by:
-
  Supporting data infrastructures for all stages of the data lifecycle
- Supporting the development of new professions related to data handling
- Building on existing resources to further develop tools for data modelling, visualisation, simulation etc.
- Reinforcing the infrastructures at a national level
- Developing trust in infrastructures through the use of certification mechanisms
- Ensuring interoperability at a national and global level by participating in and supporting

transnational infrastructures and exchange initiatives

Participation in multi-stakeholder dialogues at all national and transnational levels about Open Access and preservation, specifically:

- Linking data to publications
- Improving access while keeping costs down e.g. through joint negotiations with publishers
- Developing new research indicators and bibliographic measurements encompassing both publications and data
- Developing new reward systems
- Promoting Open Access principles in context of national and transnational nal cooperations

Coordinate and follow up on the recommendation by:

- Designating a national reference point that coordinates, serves as an interlocutor with the Commission and reports on the follow-up

Report on the progress in January 2014 and every two years thereafter

Changes

It is obvious that some completely new elements have made it into the talk of the Commission. For instance, the idea of developing new research indicators, impact measures, bibliometric tools and to change reward systems directly addresses the problem of incentive. While most researchers can agree that improved access to publications and data would improve their working conditions, what exactly is the individual researcher's inventive to share data? Especially
 since it may be burdensome, not financed in grants and not netting any merit. There is a lot of work being done on making data have an impact on research evaluation and reward for instance. In April, there will be a two-day workshop arranged by the Knowledge Exchange programme entitled "Making data count."

There is also the added element of developing whole new professions and academic degrees in what is usually known as data wrangling. Data wranglers would find work in Academia and industry supposedly. Using Denmark as an example, there is no data management programme anywhere, no degree, no job opportunities to our knowledge, and there are no current plans to conceptualise something like a data librarian.

The future

The Cypriot presidency working on the resulting Council conclusions that will follow the recommendation. It will most likely not be ready for Council adoption before the Irish Presidency takes over in January 2013. The new Council conclusions will then be signed by the relevant ministers for each member state binding the countries to roadmaps. The cynical view would be that this is what happened in 2007 and not enough happened afterwards anyway. However, though the big national plans and mandates may have been missing, lots of programmes and initiatives have been working at a sub-government level - such as the Nordbib programme. The governments of Europe may find it a lot easier this time to implement national plans, since more and more academic institutions and research councils have already put in place Open Access policies and mandates.

Mikkel Christoffersen, Nordbib Manager

DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE OF RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS - THE CASE OF MALMÖ UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY

Pablo Tapia Lagunas

Introduction

This article presents the results of a small scale study aimed at finding the most common changes and additions to items in Malmö University's institutional repository and to use this information to design an approach and strategy for the repository staff in relation to the researchers registering their publications. The article is a continuation of an earlier project at Malmö University with the aim to implement a new stage of quality assurance in the workflow of the repository.

Malmö University Electronic Publishing (MUEP) is Malmö University's open access repository for scholarly output. It is also the open archive for publication series published by Malmö University. MUEP is based on DSpace open source software.

MUEP has been the institutional repository at Malmö University since 2003. From publication year 2007 onwards, MUEP also forms the basis for local research assessment and aims at having full coverage of what is published. Approximately 20% of the research publications are freely accessible. In November 2010 Malmö University decided on a new open access policy[1].

In order to increase the quality of publication data registered by the academic staff, a project was initiated in March 2010 with the purpose of creating a third stage of quality assurance in the workflow of research publications in MUEP.

The first stage in the registration workflow is the registration process completed by the researcher: the registration of all necessary data and metadata regarding the publication.

The second stage is an accuracy check effectuated by the research officer at each faculty who primarily checks the affiliation of the author. Difficulties can appear when the publication is registered retroactively.

It could be difficult even for a research officer to backtrack the employment history of a researcher.

The third stage, introduced in March 2010, denotes that a special librarian (one of the repository staff) does a complete bibliographic check and adds other relevant data to the publication. This includes information such as subject classifications, keywords and controlled vocabulary, and the full text if available.

Method

The method used to analyze the checking of accuracy of the metadata of repository items was to compare the history and note any changes of items on two separate occasions, before and after the implementation of the third stage in the repository workflow, the complete check by a special librarian. The changes to one or several individual fields of the item were analyzed to obtain data on frequent errors, missing data or missing full texts. This analysis provided valuable information for the repository staff's understanding of academic staff as users of the repository, as well as possible areas of improvement regarding the quality of the publication data. Total additions/changes/deletions for research publications from the year 2009 are 2052 for 698 items.

At the time of the implementation of the third stage - 2009 and the beginning of 2010 - Malmö University had not yet decided on an Open Access-policy. The pursuit of the full text was accordingly not in focus.

Results of the present study

During a large part of 2010, as mentioned earlier, a third stage in the acceptance procedures of MUEP was tested and evaluated. A report was published in June 2011[2] as an internal report. The subjects of the study were publications published in 2009. The aim and purpose of the project was to increase the quality of the registered publications in MUEP, by ways of adding, correcting and double checking the bibliographic information registered by researchers. The issue of quality is a central concern for an institutional repository in relation to national

---

[1] Lindholm, Jessica & Nilén, Peter: A New Open Access policy for Malmö University. ScieCom Info (2011) vol 7, no 1. http://www.sciecom.org/ojs/index.php/sciecominfo/article/view/4910

[2] Widmark, Jenny: Datakvalitet i MUEP. Rapport från datakvalitetsprojektet Bibliotek och IT2010. Revised August 2011 by Peter Nilén & Jessica Lindholm.(Unpublished report, 2011).Contact: jenny.widmark@mah.se

harvesting services as the Swedish SwePub[3] service, search engines like Google Scholar or Scopus, or as a base for bibliometric analyses of research publications (internal and external).

Another aim of the project was to establish a method or workflow that included a dialogue with the researchers in order to obtain a higher understanding of the importance in the quality of the registrations in the institutional repository. Malmö University is not research intensive, and we handle about 600-700 research publications a year.

The result of the project was the conclusion that a third stage in the acceptance procedures played an important role in increasing the quality of the bibliographic data/information. The third stage was then made permanent in January 2011, when a librarian with special focus on open access issues, as well as having the abilities to ensure the bibliographic quality of records in the system, was hired on 70% of a full time. A task takes between five minutes and two hours to complete, depending on the complexity.

This article is a continuation of the project outlined above as an analysis of the changes and additions made in the third stage for the publications in 2009. The aim has been to recognize the most common changes and additions and to use this information to design an approach or strategy for the repository staff in relation to the registering researcher.

The ten most frequent changes or additions to the items in the repository made in the third stage are (total additions/changes/deletions for publications from the year 2009 are 2052):

1. *Identifier citation added/change/removed: 17% (357 of 2052)*
   The citation information not correctly stated. Could also be the result of the researcher copying the citation information from a database. The string of information should be stated in different fields in the repository.

2. *Items added/removed: 12% (242 of 2052)*
   Publications added by the bibliometric department as a result of searches in external databases, i.e. publications not registered by researchers affiliated to the university. Removed publications could be items deleted if registered in the wrong collection in the repository. In 2009/10 it was not possible to change without deleting the item and re-registering it.

3. *Identifier ISSN added/change: 9% (190 of 2052)*
   ISSN information not stated by the researcher.

4. *Contributor author change/removed: 8% (171 of 2052)*
   Name format is not correct. Could be the result when the researcher copies the name format from a database, for instance PubMed lists authors with surname followed by space and initial letter in the name. In MUEP the whole name must be stated.

5. *Subject added/change: 6% (121 of 2052) and*
   subject SRSC/VR change 4% (85 of 2052)
   Both author generated subject terms or keywords and the official Swedish controlled vocabulary (Swedish Research Council) used in SwePub[4] were added. In 2009 the hierarchical drop-down menu implemented posed some difficulties for the researchers. They simply did not understand the structure, often choosing a general term instead of the more specific one, minimizing the potential for a more detailed search in external databases.

6. *Title change: 6% (119 of 2052)*
   Due to the researcher copying the title from a database, often a final dot is included. This is then removed in the third stage. This category could also include corrections of spelling mistakes.

7. *Identifier DOI added/change/removed: 4% (91 of 2052)*
   DOI-number missing or incorrectly stated.

8. *Description abstract added/change/removed: 4% (83 of 2052)*
   Often added to the category of peer-reviewed articles.

9. *Identifier URL added/change/removed: 3% (79 of 2052)*
   Often added to the category of conference proceedings.

10. *Publisher added/change/removed: 3% (78 of 2052)*
    Could be due to abbreviation of the publisher name. A majority of the changes appear in the category of book chapters and were the result

---

[3] http://swepub.kb.se/

[4] SwePub is a national service that harvests academic publications from institutional repositories at approximately thirty (October 2012) Swedish universities. http://swepub.kb.se/

of researchers misunderstanding the data entry form.

As mentioned earlier, Malmö University decided on an open access policy in November 2010. The policy did not stipulate retroactive registrations of full text for older registrations/items in the repository. In accordance the repository staff has not worked on the issue of full text documents to the material from 2009. Nevertheless we found it interesting to analyse if the full text material had continued to be added over the years. In November 2012 seven more full text documents had been added. Few researchers supplement their publications retroactively with the full text.

Conclusion

Analyzing the changes made to specific fields for items in our repositories presents us with valuable knowledge about the tricky parts of registering and the descriptions of publications made by our researchers. Repository staff is able to introduce changes to the data entry forms and to design outreach programmes or instructions to help researchers fully understand the bibliographic aspect of their publications and its relation to Google Scholar or national harvesting services.

The information about corrections to repository items also gives repository staff the opportunity to quality assure the registration process and together with the researcher and faculty/university research officers create conditions for a high level of metadata quality for the research publications of Malmö University. This includes a joint review of the quality of the metadata for the specific faculty. Revising the data entry forms and instructions in dialogue with the research organization is another field of improvement.

The result of this study of 698 publications from the year 2009 will hopefully make a small contribution to a more general approach to quality assurance of contents in institutional repositories at our universities.

Pablo Tapia Lagunas is Librarian at Malmö University, Library & IT since 1998. Works in the field of Digital Information Services and as liaison librarian to Urban Studies at the Faculty of Culture and Society. Alma mater: Lund University. Special interest: university library and IT infrastructure for research and education, innovation and networking as a method.

WEBOMETRICS – RANKING WEB OF REPOSITORIES. TO COUNT AND NOT TO COUNT

Leif Longva

We, who work with repositories holding scientific documents, are keen to see how our repositories develop compared to other, comparable repositories. It is therefore with great interest we examine the ranking of such repositories, whenever a new such ranking is presented. Cybermetrics Lab, a research group belonging to the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC) in Spain, calculate their ranking of the world scientific repositories based on four weighted criteria[1]:

- The size, in terms of number of documents in the repositories
- Visibility, measured by the numbers of links in to the repository's documents
- The number of "rich files", meaning files in formats like pdf and word, to indicate that the repository holds more than metadata
- The degree of scholarly content, measured by documents identified by Google Scholar

We would like to express our gratitude to the Cybermetrics Lab for doing this. The rankings are very interesting to read, and we think the four mentioned criteria make sense.

Visibility

Visibility is an important criterion. The usefulness of our repositories is dependent of how visible the content is, and the number of links into the repository is a good indicator of this. And we therefore thought that the number of links would be interesting to count for the ranking purpose, no matter what kind of links were used. But this is not how Cybermetrics Lab sees it.

We prefer using persistent urls (purls), and our repository therefore allocates a handle, a widely used purl, to each item. And we always recommend these handle urls to be used while linking to documents in our repository, for the very reason why purls are wise to use: No risk of rotten links (as long as the handle

service is alive), regardless of possible future changes in our institution's or server's name. However, by examining the way Ranking Web of Repositories works, we realized that such purls do not count in the calculation of the visibility factor of the ranking. They only count links that carry the name of the institution's web domain. We found that rather strange. It should be possible to keep track of which purls point to which repositories. Surely, this must be technically solvable, we thought.

We therefore contacted Cybermetrics Lab on the matter. And we received a prompt reply, confirming that technical problems were not the issue. The answer said that since the handle system is owned by a private corporation unrelated to our university, we do not have any guarantee of its survival into the future. Moreover, the answer goes, links should include the institution's name in order to carry the information of which institution is behind the document.

Of course, Cybermetrics Lab is right that we have no guarantee for how the future looks like. And urls that include the institution's name do hold some information for the user. But what puzzles me is why this is an issue while trying to measure the visibility of repositories. The handle system is alive and kicking today, so the handle links do add visibility to our repository today. This is a fact, beyond discussion. Cybermetrics Lab has thus defined a way to count links that excludes many links, and therefore produces an inferior measurement. And this is done based on a moral view on how Cybermetrics Lab would like the repositories to build their links. I think Cybermetrics Lab rather should approach their task in a more scholarly way, and measure what is measurable, even those objects who act otherwise than what Cybermetrics Lab prefer. And by all means, Cybermetrics Lab is free to advocate their views on how to link.

So, while reading the Ranking Web of Repositories, beware what this metric is not measuring.

---

[1] http://repositories.webometrics.info/en/Methodology

Leif Longva University of Tromsø, Munin repository manager

THE NEW RESEARCH AND INNOVATION BILL FROM THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT – A COMMENT

Hampus Rabow

Having recently written in this journal about the use of performance indicators for research funding purposes, I would like to briefly comment on the discussion of that topic in the new Research and Innovation Bill from the Swedish Government.

To begin with, it may be useful to state clearly some fundamental principles, even if they are fairly obvious:

1. Any system for allocation of funding that is likely to transfer funds from one area to another will be resisted by some people on the losing end.

2. Any system for allocation of funding that is likely to transfer decision-making powers away from certain groups will be resisted by some people in these groups.

If we apply these simple principles to the allocation of government funding for research, we see that researchers on the losing end of any allocation system are likely to complain, and that individuals who currently influence research funding decisions are likely to be negative as well.

In the above-mentioned article I showed how the inefficiencies, unintended biases, and high costs associated with funding decisions based on peer review led to the increased use of bibliometric methods as an alternative, beginning in the 1960s. During the last half century bibliometric methods and indicators have become increasingly more precise and robust. Especially the quality and extent of bibliometric data have improved enormously. The 1961 edition of the *Science Citation Index* contained 870 000 cited papers. The *Web of Science* of today contains close to fifty million records, and includes about 150 000 conference titles as well as 40 000 scholarly and scientific books. There are of course also many other comprehensive sources for citations and other types of bibliometric data.

A number of studies all over the world have shown that evaluations based on bibliometric indicators generally yield the same results as extensive assessments based upon qualitative peer review, but at a fraction of the cost.

Furthermore, most of the discrepancies between the qualitative and quantitative methods are believed to be caused by flaws in the former systems rather than vice versa (see e.g. Abramo et al, 2011). Finally it should be noted that even qualitative peer review frequently makes use of various bibliometric indicators (e.g. the *h-index* seems to be particularly popular), but often in a haphazard and imprecise fashion.

There are clearly areas of research where bibliometric indicators are inadequate, because the publication data for these areas are insufficient (too few publications or too few citations), too heterogeneous, or simply not sufficiently developed. Some of these research areas should probably shift the publication patterns towards channels that may be internationally cited, but there are also a few areas where it can sometimes be difficult to publish in any international highly cited channels. We are here referring primarily to subjects with a strong national component. In Sweden there are areas such as the Swedish Language, Swedish History, Swedish Literature and so on, where some works are likely to be of less interest to an international audience. There may also be new or highly complex hybrid research areas where it is very difficult to extract the relevant literature. Thus qualitative methods certainly have their place, but because of the enormous costs and high risks of biases, they should generally be restricted to only the fields where bibliometric indicators are less reliable. (They may of course also sometimes be used to complement, evaluate and calibrate quantitative indicators.)

The suggestion in the government bill that Sweden should decrease the role of bibliometric performance indicators for all research areas in favour of a more qualitative peer review thus clearly represents a step backwards. Hopefully the preliminary investigation by the Swedish Research Council and other bodies, as proposed in the bill, will soon come to the same conclusion.

References

Abramo, G., D'Angelo, C. A., & Di Costa, F. (2011). National research assessment exercises: a comparison of peer review and bibliometrics rankings. Scientometrics, 89(3), 929-941

Rabow, H. (2012). Bibliometric research output indicators and university funding in the Nordic countries. ScieCom Info, 8(1).

Regeringen Sverige (2012) Regeringens proposition 2012/13:30.
Forskning och innovation. Stockholm

Sörlin, S. & al (2001). Den humanistiska cirkelns kvadratur: om humanioras möjligheter och framtid : rapport från Humanistiska fakultetens nordiska bedömargrupp november 2000. Göteborg: Humanistiska fakulteten, Göteborgs universitet.

Taylor, J. (2011). The assessment of research quality in UK universities: peer review or metrics?. British Journal of Management, 22(2), 202-217.

Wenneras C, Wold A. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review. Nature 1997; 387: 341–3.

Hampus Rabow, Malmö University, Sweden. hampus.rabow@mah.se

NORDBIB'S FINAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND WORKSHOP : IMPRESSIONS FROM THE ORGANISER

Mikkel Christoffersen

Background

In the Spring of 2011, an international conference to end the Nordbib programme felt like a wonderful idea.

With the knowledge that the Nordbib programme, though evaluated very favourably by external consultants, would not continue in its present form, the secretariat was looking for a way to not only celebrate the programme, but also to point to the future of Open Access as a fitting end to it; a swan song for Nordbib as it was known colloquially at the time. The idea of an international conference was inspired by the present director of NordForsk, Gunilla Gustafsson, who made a presentation in the Spring of 2011 in Copenhagen at a big meeting about the EU's 8th Framework Programme "Horizon 2020." The topic in question was the Swedish 2009 presidency of the EU Council and how the organisers were conceptualising its final days. "Don't make another boring conference" was the advise given by many, but a conference was exactly what the organisers aimed for, albeit not a boring one. In order to give the Lund conference, as it would be known later, an appropriate impact, it would end with a declaration. The subject of the conference was the future of European research, and the rest is history. The Lund declaration has meant that the concept of Grand Challenges has become a fixed feature of European research policy discourse.

There were many possible topics for a Nordbib international conference. However, Open Access has become a much more well-known topic in the years since Nordbib started back in 2006, and Open Access now has its own established meetings and workshops. The mounting challenges of data is a newer concept – especially where it overlaps with traditional Open Access issues. Since a new round of Nordbib would have meant including data in the scope of the programme, it seemed very appropriate to focus on open digital research as a whole. Furthermore, Denmark would be EU council presidents in the spring of 2012, and it was known that a recommendation from the European Commission to the member states in the area of the digitisation of our common cultural heritage would be issued later in 2011. Therefore, it also seemed very fitting to try and look at cultural data and research data together –

especially since the Nordbib board is made up of mostly the Nordic national libraries which are heavily involved with the digitisation of cultural heritage.

The venue was set for the Danish Royal Library's Black Diamond, Copenhagen, June 11-13 2012, and the secretariat hired as scientific consultant Alfred Heller, Ph.D., of the Technical University of Denmark who has been a pioneer in research data management issues in Denmark, and we put together an advisory board with representatives from both the research data field as well as the cultural data field. The final form and theme of the conference was conceptualised during autumn and winter of 2011. The conference not only got its somewhat unwieldy name "Structural Frameworks for Open, Digital Research : Strategy, Policy and Infrastructure," the aim of which was to keep our options open, but it was also decided to let the three focus areas, also known as work packages, of the Nordbib programme itself be reflected in the focus areas of the conference.

The work packages of Nordbib are Policy & Awareness, Content & Accessibility and Infrastructure & Interoperability, and for the conference they were translated into the three segments "Strategy, Policy and Funding," "Infrastructure and Research Input & Output," and "Organisations and collaboration." It was decided that the themes did not necessarily lend themselves well to a classical conference with presentations of various papers. Also, we wanted first and foremost to bring people together and let them talk to each other. The emerging field of data management spans so many different domains that simply having some sort of overview is difficult enough. We came up with the metaphor of a jigsaw puzzle where every participant would bring one piece of the giant puzzle, and the conference itself would be the time and place for assembling it together. This also meant that we would focus more on the presentation of the participants themselves through two five-minute-madness sessions and through four workshops and through social events.

One of the reasons why the Nordbib programme has been well evaluated by external consultants is that the programme has provided a platform for Nordic collaboration extending well beyond the programme's own lifetime. We thought that if we could create some awareness about the Nordbib model of collaboration

and help forge some new strategic bonds across organisations and institutions, this indeed would be a worthy goal. In order to set a more operational goal to guide all the discussion, we let ourselves be inspired by the Lund conference, and we decided to bring all the debate from the various talks and workshops and presentations to a head in the final session where we would agree in assembly on a set of recommendations to the European Commission.

The event

In the spring of 2012, an international conference to end the Nordbib programme felt like quite a horrible idea.

Personally, I have a lot more respect for conference organisers now! We had problems with everything. The conference would open after lunch on Monday June 11 to allow someone to utilise the morning slot for some sort of pre-event, but there were no takers really. The conference software we were using, was highly sophisticated, but it could not handle payments, and we agreed that we could not let entrance be free, because then 500 people sign up, but only 75 actually turn up. We had nine speakers and luckily only one of them cancelled, but we also had four workshop managers and three of them cancelled in the final week leading up to the event. Google maps even conspired against us. Not only would it somehow translate the Royal Library into Madeira Airport in Portugal when links were emailed, it would also show the Black Diamond at a different location in Copenhagen. Then we found out that another conference with very much the same subject matter had later been arranged to take place 200 m. from the Black Diamond on the same days with much the same speakers. There were about 13 different conferences in Copenhagen on the final days of the Danish presidency on everything from counter-terrorism to waste disposal and the tourism season was beginning. We started to receive emails that there were no hotel rooms anywhere in the city. Then there were no available flights either. We had to book a room for a late registered speaker in Malmö. We also learned that the cultural data segment of people was hard to get hold of and they generally have their own conferences and meetings.

Luckily, there were things that went well too. We were lucky to book our main introductory speakers very early. Prof. dr. Tony Hey of Microsoft Research was our first scoop. Adviser to vice-director of the European Commission, dr. Carl-Christian Buhr and CEO of Europeana, dr. Jill Cousins accepted our invitation very quickly as well. We were fortunate to secure dr. Andrew Treloar of the Australian National Data Service and prof. dr. Martin Mueller of Northwestern University as well, and we were lucky to get prof. dr. Sverker Holmgren of Stockholm University, who is involved in basically everything that has to do with eScience in the Nordic region, as well as prof. dr. Søren Brunak of the Technical University of Denmark, who is doing quite stunning research in the field of genomics by re-using already available data. Dr. Octavio Quintana-Trias of the general directorate for research of the European Commission accepted as well and finally dr. Stephan Winkler-Nees of the German Research Foundation filled in admirably for dr. Liz Lyon, director of UKOLN, who had to cancel.

The OpenAIRE programme decided to accept our offer of using our venue Monday morning June 11 for their summer meeting on coupling data with publications, and at the same time the Knowledge Exchange programme's expert group on research data decided to also accept our offer to make a workshop on economic models for data preservation. Then the DataCite programme decided to place their summer meeting in Copenhagen as well on Thursday June 14. Suddenly we had a lot of synergy working for us, and the social events for the two evenings were shaping up nicely. We had a canal tour arranged for Monday evening, and Tuesday the conference dinner would take place on the old military island fort, Flakfortet, in the middle of Øresund.

Evaluation

Amazingly, once the conference started, everything went according to plan without a single accident.

We had 100 people for the main conference and about double that number for all the four events put together. The programme with its switching between speakers, workshops and short presentations from the participants themselves worked very well. Discussions were very lively both at and outside the official programme, and lots of ideas and new ways of approaching challenges were bounced around.

Interestingly, though there were four workshops with four distinct subjects, they all tended to converge on the same sets of problems:

- How do we get researchers to want to hand over their data and describe it sufficiently?
- How can we describe data and make potential beneficiaries aware of its existence - especially across academic domains?
- How can we ensure that we are not all trying to re-invent the wheel on our own?

The issues were debated in the context of both technical, social and strategic considerations.

The programme, all the main speeches, the two video messages from European commissioners Neelie Kroes – commissioner for the Digital Agenda for Europe – and Máire Georghegan-Quinn – commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science – as well as all the five-minue-madness presentations are available on the conference web site: conference.nordbib.net

The letter to the European Commission got somewhat sniped by the major recommendation from the Commission to the member states on scientific information in the digital age that was published the month after. We will await the member states' answers and send the letter once Nordbib turns out the last light in the secretariat at the end of 2012.

The secretariat received a lot of praise for the spirit of the conference at the event itself and we have received a lot of emails afterwards with the same notions. But of course, it is quite easy to become a popular host, when you have outstanding catering and long coffee breaks. All in all, we believe the Nordbib programme got its well-deserved swan song, and in the end, an international conference to end the Nordbib programme was a pretty good idea after all!

Mikkel Christoffersen, Nordbib Manager

REVIEW: OPEN KNOWLEDGE FESTIVAL, HELSINKI

Juho Lindman

The Event

In academic circles it is rare to find yourself in a discussion where the topic of the talk jumps very fast between open datasets, increased sustainability and transparency of services. This is the norm in the annual Open Knowledge Festival, which builds on such unanticipated and sporadic encounters with experts and enthusiast of different fields. Although the event as such did not have, to my knowledge, a lot of Open Access content, related themes were discussed all the time.
OKF or Open Knowledge Festival is an event organized by volunteer open knowledge enthusiasts under the auspices of Open Knowledge Foundation. This year the duration of the festival was extended to one week and held in Helsinki (17th to 22nd of September). The event combined for the first time two previously separate annual events: OGDCamp (Open Government Data Camp) and OKCon (Open Knowledge Conference). Over 800 participants from all around the world arrived to the sold-out event. Only about half of the quests were from Finland. The event was organized in over ten parallel tracks and hosted many other co-located events.

The theme of the year was Open Knowledge in Action. The key focus areas were related in searching for 1) the values behind open data publications, 2) economic value gained by opening up of different datasets, and 3) value provided by the increased transparency. This theme reoccurred in several of the discussions and the participants had very varied viewpoints on the issue.

The main institution behind the event is the Open Knowledge Foundation. Founded in 2004 in Cambridge, UK, Open Knowledge Foundation brings together hackers and political activists to promote open knowledge and open content in society. In addition, the organization included a large set of different communities interested in promoting openness in society. Venue of the conference was Aalto University's Arabia Campus, which offered a nice setting. It was also able to serve the demanding visitors quite well even though their number in the end probably surprised the organizers. Only the food distribution arrangements did not always run so smoothly, as all the visitors wanted to have lunch at the same time.

One of the most famous of the speakers was the Internet celebrity and statistician Hans Rosling, whose main scientific work is on statistics. Most of the festival goers surely knew Rosling better from his TED--talks. The content of Rosling's presentation was a good fit to the theme of the conference and the audience welcomed the speech in an almost religious atmosphere.

When there are over ten parallel tracks in the program, the main task is to find the relevant presentations and discussions. Most participants used twitter and social media to track what was going on. On the other hand, the unanticipated and even surprising discussions provided to be the most valuable ones in hindsight. Naturally, the presentations were streamed on the web pages.

Open Data Research

The festival also provided several avenues to discuss Open Data from a research perspective. This is good, as there is a lot of work to be done in relation to the impacts of open data. Unfortunately, the tracks were organized at the same time, with the result that participants were able to participate to only in one of the research sessions. Thus I mainly focus here on reviewing the open data service business track.

The main findings of the research presentations about open data business were about the potential of opening up data in different domains (traffic, biomedicine, newspaper industry), and what would be the incentives of the actors to open up their data sets.

Is a search for one business model a feasible task? As we know previously from business model research, business models are often thought to be a governance tool, which describes a company's networks, offering, resources, and revenue model. A business model is located somewhere between a description of business strategy and descriptions of business operations. Thus the goal of trying to find "the open data business model" is not likely to be a very good starting point. A more informed approach is to try to identify a variety of different business models and then proceed to map out the different actors in value networks.

Overall, the research on Open Data is dispersed to many different research traditions, with their own methodologies and research outlets. Therefore it is

very important to build links between different scientist who work on similar topics, but, for example, publish their work in different journals. Open Access can have a key role here, since it makes research more readily available for different scientific and, more importantly, non-scientific audiences.

Theory and practice

Academics tend to agree that theoretical discussion might at times take place on a totally different level than would be relevant to solve the issues at hand in the industry. Therefore OKF and similar festivals serve a very important purpose: they bring these communities together. They also give valuable input about the state of industry. However, research should vice versa be able to inform the discussions about Open Data, but in this regards there still remains a lot of work to be done. Interesting audiences for research findings that gather in similar events include for example journalists, public sector officials and decision-makers, service development companies, and of course hackers/individual developers.

From a service development research perspective, the event was quite fruitful. Getting in touch with the actors, who are developing the new applications is very interesting and provides research with a whole set of new research challenges.

Summary

Overall, I think that the event was really good. The program had a lot of interesting elements, although there was too much to follow it all. A lot of very interesting people who develop and promote open data services were around. Enough to actually create a feeling that "everybody" was in Helsinki. The venue was surprisingly good and arrangements seemed to work well.

At least I am already looking forward for the next years' event, presentations and contacts. The organizers really need to do their best to match the organization of the event in Helsinki.

Links:

Open Knowledge Festival http://okfestival.org/
Open Knowledge Foundation http://okfn.org/

Juho Lindman is an Assistant Professor in the Hanken School of Economics in Helsinki, Finland. Juho defended his doctoral dissertation focusing on open source software development organization in the Aalto University School of Economics in Helsinki. In the field of information systems science, his current research is focused in the areas of open source software development, open data and organizational change.

LIBER CONFERENCE IN TARTU
Ludmilla Sööt

The LiBER Annual Conference took place from 27 to 30 June in Tartu. The LIBER (Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche - Association of European Research Libraries) was founded in 1971. It joins scientific libraries and consists of 41 members. The 41st Annual conference of LIBER was organised in Estonia for the first time. Nearly 340 senior specialists of research libraries from 34 countries gathered in Tartu.

The title of the conference was „Mobilising the knowledge economy for Europe".
The main subject of the conference was cooperation between research libraries, but the presentations and seminars concerning mobile solutions, cloud services, a digital repository of the data and Open Access received even more attention.

So what is the Open Access? Open Access provides free and unlimited access to research literature. Research articles can be read, copied and printed for free. They can be used only for educational or scientific but not for commercial purposes. As researchers, physicians and other co-authors of the research papers can publish their articles to a broad audience and the libraries can not subscribe to expensive journals any more.

For example, one of the largest publishers of medical books and journals in Europe – Elsevier –provided 1% of their articles for open access in 2005 and 4.5% in 2012.

The publisher Natalia Timiraos from Great Britain introduced the possibilities of BioMed Central Open Access. BioMed Central is a database of peer reviewed journals on science, technology and medicine. BioMed Central was one of the first publishers who started to publish open access research papers and articles. So they favor complete and free access to research articles. All peer reviewed articles published by the BioMed Central will be freely available online. However, the articles are licensed under Creative Commons. It is also possible to connect to journals through links. The new concept

Threaded Publication was introduced as well. This concept offers the following solution: relevant articles will be added to a particular scientific problem and these articles will be constantly amended. In this way, a specific data set will be created. At present, researchers should register their research in international acknowledged databases, before the researche will be published in journals. The research results should be registered at clinicaltrial.com. Mrs. Timiraos introduced an option, where a database consists of both scientific research and the links to the protocols and their results. This new open access database would also allow for the patients to find more information about their conditions and treatments. And last but not least – this option would also help reduce the time-consuming overlaps in research papers.
With her presentation Mrs. Timiraos also attempted to show how Threaded Publication would act in real life. Because it is difficult to check that open access articles and research are used only for educational reasons, a debate on copyright took place. Who can control or guarantee that nobody copies or obtains the articles for illegal purposes? There was also discussion about how this kind of initiative could benefit the scientific communication. However, a common position was not reached.

Ludmilla Sööt Specialist of the Medical Information Centre of Tartu University Hospital

OER-OPEN POSSIBILITIES FOR LEARNING. A NATIONAL INITIATIVE FINANCED BY THE INTERNET INFRASTRUCTURE FOUNDATION .SE

Ebba Ossiannilsson, Markus Schneider

Background

This national project, OER – open possibilities for learning, conducted in 2012-2013 (Schneider *et al.* 2012), builds on the findings and experiences from the project OER - resources for learning (Creelman *et al.,* 2011), conducted during 2010-2011 and funded by the Royal Library (KB). This earlier project attracted great interest and served to establish an extensive network both nationally and internationally. The project showed that a joint action between Swedish universities is both viable and efficient in opening up ways to generate interest in the use of Open Educational Resources (OER) for learning by means of sharing time, skills and resources across institutions. Open webinars with a large number of participants as a collaborative effort of several universities and other organizations are a new phenomenon in Swedish higher education. Through interactive participation and the web conferencing infrastructure provided by SUNET, the Swedish national research and educational network, new interfaces were created between the participants and the Swedish OER movement and development has thus been able to take off. Figure 1, depicting the project logotype.

Figure 1
OER – increased possibilities for learning.

The 2010/11 project developed a website, which has now been given even stronger foothold through the current project's webpage consisting of OER resources, event calendars, as well as general and linked information www.oersverige.se.

The term OER was first coined at the 2002 UNESCO Forum on the Impact of Open Courseware for Higher Education in Developing Countries, organized in association with the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The term was defined as *the open provision of educational resources, enabled by information and communication technologies, for consultation, use and adaptation by a community of users for noncommercial purposes (*Atkins et al. 2007, Hylén 2005 2007 2012, UNESCO 2002). The main concern was to solve the perennial problem of external educational resources in developing countries where limited funding, computer availability and Internet access, as well as lack of training for students and staff hindered expansion of subscription and use of academic journals and databases (UNESCO 2002). OER include courseware, textbooks, tests, software tools and full courses, among the others. Since the concept was coined a variety of definitions have been explored. One of the most common ones today is the one by COL/UNESCO, which emphasizes processes, stakeholders and pedagogy and not just the resources as such. *The phenomenon of OER is an empowerment process, facilitated by technology in which various types of stakeholders are able to interact, collaborate, create and use materials and pedagogic practices, that are freely available, for enhancing access, reducing costs and improving the quality of education and learning at all levels* (Kanwar, Balasubramanian & Umar 2010).

In recent years, OERs have grown exponentially and have received increasing attention.

Internationally, the OER movement is very strong, especially since the Paris Declaration on OER and since an open sharing culture was adopted in summer 2012 (UNESCO, 2012). In Sweden, however, the trend towards open publication and sharing of educational resources is fairly slow. Swedish initiatives in OER have been appreciated and welcomed from international actors and by projects currently implemented around the world, such as by the OPAL project, by ICDE (2012), UNESCO (2012), the OECD, the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and the OERuniversity.

The main objective of the current project is increased national collaboration between universities, educational organizations and schools on the use and production of OER by:

• harnessing the potential of the Internet to streamline support to teachers and students, with regard to both quality, technical and search related aspects of OER.

• increasing knowledge about the webinar opportunities as a tool for open learning on the net.
• increasing collaboration on support functions across higher education institutions with libraries and ICT pedagogical units as starting points.
• contributing to sector wide labelling standards, distribution and storage of OER.

Project Partners

All project partners from the project OER resources for learning, conducted during 2010 - 2011, now participate in the new project, OER - Open opportunities for learning, during 2012-2013. More universities have joined the new project, a total of nine universities involved.

Karlstad University is the project coordinator in collaboration with Lund University. Karlstad University is committed to develop blended learning with special emphasis on teacher education. The project thus has strong roots in the university's development and strategy.

Special funds are added for technology investments, skills enhancement and development within the university. Karlstad University manages SUNET e-meeting service and acting since 2010 national support centre for other universities. Other constituent institutions and project partners are
Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH), University of Gävle (HIG), Jönköping University (JU), Linnaeus University (LNU), the Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Mid Sweden University (MIUN) and Umeå University (UMU). All participating universities are included in the national
Network ITHU (IT in higher education) and as a special task force (OER) in the network. The project is funded by the Internet Infrastructure Foundation .SE

Project activities

The project will conduct a number of variations of the form "webinar". A combined physical and web event is planned together with UR, on copyright issues and collaboration opportunities. Invited to participate are special national organizations of interest (KB, SULF, SUNET UR, SUHF, VHS, HSV, SVERD, in Swedish). Issues that will be discussed in the webinars are how OER development can be supported, encouraged and developed in a sustainability perspective and how the Swedish copyright law and the so-called teacher's exemption affects national development concerning open educational practices, (OEP). Furthermore, questions will be raised about UR's mission and production facilities and new infrastructural opportunities to foster open dialogue for higher educational institutes' will be discussed.

Webinars 2012 -2013

During the project period, the following webinars will take place as a co-arrangement of the constituent project partners. More and updated information is to be found at www.oersverige.se:

- Webinar 1 - Scientists write to be read!
- Webinar 2 - Open Learning - Challenges and Opportunities
- Webinar 3 - How can I use digital material in my teaching?
- Webinar 4 - What are open educational resources and how can I find them?
- Webinar 5 - Open Education - an international development in higher education
- Webinar 6 - Quality in e-learning?
- Webinar 7 - UR - The right to public service materials for educational purposes?
- Webinar 8 - The digital library
- Webinar 9 - Metadata and standards

The use of existing personal networks as well as open invitations via social media, blogs and journals are undertaken to created awareness for the project. The webinars will also be promoted by SVERD and ITHU. Continued discussion in social media as a follow up on each webinar is encouraged and also part of the dissemination strategy of the project. The webinars will be recorded and made available as OER. Webinars are conducted in the higher education sector wide service for e-meetings, namely Adobe Connect. Each webinar will be evaluated in turn to provide suggestions for improvement of upcoming webinars

A natural part of the project is to make use of a common virtual platform for Swedish OER initiatives and resources. The webinars are recorded and documented and current news, key findings and links to helpful resources and contacts are collected. Project partners at each institution are responsible for dissemination and implementation. Project results will be made available and discussed within the network and at network meetings. The content of this site is licensed under a Creative Commons license CC BY-NC-SA which means that everyone - and not only the Internet Infrastructure Foundation .SE can use the project results.

Discussion and conclusions

The major challenge of the project is to influence decision makers in Swedish education. The first project created good relationships with teachers and librarians, but OER is still an almost unknown

concept among university management and the relevant authorities. The discourse in the field points out the need for both a broad interest in openness among teachers while necessary incentives and support from the top.. UNESCO's Paris Declaration on OER (2012) clearly shows that open education is an international concern, and encourages Member States to take action to create a sharing culture within all educational sectors.

This project focuses not only on OER but offers seminars on current educational issues that can stimulate both teaching staff and decision makers. By using transparency as our motto and creating open webinars recorded and made available we hope to demonstrate in a practical way the benefits of openness.

References and links:

Alexandersson K (2012) Vad är Creative commons. .SE; Webbstjärnan. URI: http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=Yd9dP3vlOyk. Cited 120713.

Creative commons. (2012a) Välkommen till Creative Commons i Sverige. URI: http://www.creativecommons.se/. Cited 120713.

Creative commons (2012b). Välj rätt licens. .SE, i samarbete med creative commons. URI: https://www.iis.se/docs/Creative-Commons-Webb.pdf. Cited 120713.

Creelman A et al. (2011) En resurs för lärande. Slutrapport. URL: http://www.kb.se/dokument/Om/projekt/open_access/2011/OER%20slutrapport%20v2.pdf. Cited 121016.

Klang M (2008-2010) Copyright- Copyleft.

En guide om upphovsrätt och licenser på nätet. .SE 6. URI: https://www.iis.se/docs/copyright_copyleft.pdf. Cited120713.

Schneider M et al. OER-Öppna möjligheter för lärande. IFv2012-0107-senaste.pdf. URI: https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B07w591VoezMSmZBY3o3UEZPaEE/edit. Cited 120716.

UNESCO (2011) Guidelines for OER in Higher Education. URI: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002136/213605e.pdf. Tillgänglig 120829.

OPAL (2012) OPAL | Open Educational Quality Initiative (2012). Hämtad från www.oer-quality.org. Tillgänglig 120829.

Paris OER Declarationen (2012) URI: http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/Events/Paris%20OER%20Declaration_01.pdf. Tillgänglig 120829

Wikieducator (2012) UNESCO OER Toolkit Draft. URI: http://wikieducator.org/UNESCO_OER_Toolkit_Draft. Tillgänglig 120829.

Markus Schneider Karlstad university, Sweden, Project co-ordinator for the project OER- open possibilities for learning

Ebba Ossiannilsson Lunds university, Sweden. Assistant Project co-ordinator for the project OER- open possibilities for learning