sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

# OPEN ACCESS IN SWEDEN – GOING FROM WHY TO HOW

Ulf Kronman

## The year things turned our way

The year 2012 has been a year of remarkable advancement for the open access (OA) movement worldwide. The research ministers of Great Britain and Denmark have declared that all research funded by the government is to be published open access and the research councils of respective country have coordinated their policies for OA mandates.[1] [2] The European Commission has declared that open access publishing is set to be the norm for results from research financed by the upcoming research programme Horizon 2020 as from 2014 and urges the EU member states to adopt national policies for open access.[3] The big SCOAP[3] project of CERN that aims at converting the 7500 yearly publications of 10'000 high-energy physicists to full open access is finally about to launch, after six years of preparations. The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) is now listing over 8 300 OA journals and large scholarly publishers as Springer and Elsevier are starting up OA journals each and every day. Research funder Wellcome Trust is starting the OA journal eLife[4] and the OA mega-journal PLoS ONE is well-renowned and publishing over 70 articles a day. The journal PeerJ with its innovative author subscription model has also been started up this remarkable year of 2012.[5] In Sweden, the governmental research bill for the next three years contains a commission to the Swedish Research Council to coordinate the conditions for free access to research results and data among the Swedish research funders in cooperation with the Swedish Association for Higher Education (SUHF) and the National Library of Sweden.[6] The Swedish programme for promotion and coordination of open access in Sweden - OpenAccess.se - is finally seeing a promise of having one of its main goals - a national policy on open access - soon to be fulfilled.

## Going from why to how

As a conclusion from the recent events above, we can clearly see that the movement for open access now is going from a stage when we had to argue for the virtues of open access into a phase where open access seems as being an inevitable technological and societal imperative. We now have to start thinking about *how* to handle the transition from toll access journals to open access of scholarly publications, rather than *why*. Even if everyone agrees that open access is the final goal of our journey, we still might have quite different opinions on how to get there and how to tackle the obstacles in our way during the transition from the old subscription-based publishing model to the new open access model.
Some of the challenges that we need to address during the upcoming transition are among others: How open and free do we want the publications to be, and at what cost? Which route should we take, and when - green or gold, now or later? How to deal with non-serious publishers tricking researchers into paying for publishing in fake journals with non-existent peer-review? How to make ends meet for small scholarly publishers that want their journals to be open access? And how to finance open access publishing for scholars doing research without funding grants?

## How free is open?

At a first glance, the concept of open access seems easy to grasp: Scholarly publications free for all to read on the Internet. But when you start to dig a bit deeper, you realize that openness can come in several flavours. The first degree of openness that has been coined *Gratis OA* means that you remove price barriers and make publications free to read, but only that. You are not entitled to re-distribute or re-use them. Gratis OA is usually what people new to open access thinks is the whole point of it. And of course this is a basic and very important part of open access, but only a part of it. If we for instance look at the OA definition of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI), we find that it goes much further:

> By "open access" to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, *download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose*, without financial, legal, or technical barriers

[1] Research Councils UK, 2012
[2] Styrelsen for Forskning og Innovation, 2012
[3] European Commission, 2012
[4] eLife, 2012
[5] PeerJ, 2012
[6] Utbildningsdepartementet, 2012

> other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited. [Emphasis by me.][7]

So if we want to achieve OA according to the BOAI definition, we want the openness to go beyond reading; we also want to be able to re-use the freed publications. This next level of openness has been coined *Libre OA* and means that you remove barriers for re-use of publications on top of the price barrier removed by Gratis OA. To apply Libre OA, Creative Commons CC-licenses are often used, and the most commonly used CC license for Libre OA is the CC-BY license, which best agrees with the BOAI definition of OA above. CC-BY means that you are entitled to re-use a publication in various ways, as long as the author of the original publication is acknowledged.[8]

The reason we want rights to re-use publications is that we want science to advance to the next step in its evolution. One important re-use of publications is to harvest them for indexing and inclusion in databases to be used for text mining. Text mining can then be used to elevate science to the next level, doing statistical meta-studies on vast amounts of previous research results. Free publications are thus a prerequisite for the next generation of research.

But these different degrees of freeness usually come at different costs. For instance, many commercial publishers give authors the right to re-publish their peer-reviewed manuscripts on a public website or in a subject- or institutional repository, but only as Gratis OA for reading. Giving the author Libre OA rights would mean that publications would be spread freely and is seen by the publishers – rightly or not – to risk the economic sustainability of the toll access journal model. If we want Libre OA, we usually have to pay a higher price, submitting the publications to true OA journals where the producer pays the peer-review process to get free publications. Or we have to resort to so called *Hybrid OA*, where single publications in toll access journals are financed with publishing charges to be free to read on the publisher's website.

The conclusion is that the more free we want the publications and the sooner we want them freed, the more costly the transition to open access will be.

## Going the green way or taking the gold route?

There are principally two ways to get scholarly publications free on the Internet. The first one, which is called *Green OA* is to self-archive the publications by putting a copy of the peer-reviewed author manuscript in a in a subject repository or an open publication archive that is run by the researcher's organisation. The benefits of Green OA are that there is no need to change the old publishing system based on toll access journals and it comes at a relatively small extra cost for the research institutions. The drawbacks of Green OA are that it seldom gives us Libre OA, the openness often comes after a time-delayed embargo, there is a relatively large amount of work involved for researchers and librarians running and filling repositories, and the model is not economically sustainable for the publishers in the long run when larger portions of the journals freely available on the internet can lead to cancellations.

The second way to get publications free is to make them freely available directly at the publisher's journal website. This is usually seen as the true future of OA publishing and has therefore been coined as *Gold OA*. The *gold* in Gold OA has nothing to do with charging money from the author, since there are many Gold OA journals that are run and supported by learned societies that neither charges the author, nor the reader. The benefits of Gold OA are fairly evident; it is the final peer-reviewed and edited publication that gets freed, there are good possibilities to demand a true Libre OA license on the publication, and the model can be economically sustainable for the publishers in the long run. The drawbacks with Gold OA is that it represents a great change of the present publication system and that the change can generate large extra costs while we have to maintain double systems, both old subscription-based access and producer-pays OA.

## Using gratis green to get libre gold

The government in Great Britain this summer decided to follow the recommendations of the so-called *Finch report*[9] and recommend Gold OA over Green OA. This started an intense debate on which way is the right to go and when to choose which model. The critics mean that taking the suggested Gold route too soon will be unnecessary costly and that the same goal could be reached by doing self-archiving for a long time to go. The defenders of the Finch recommendations mean that we need Gold OA to get publications that are Libre OA as soon as possible, and that it will have to come with some extra cost during the transition.

My belief is that we need to go both ways in parallel. We need to start off with Green OA and self-archiving as soon as possible, but at the same time try to change the system and open up funding for Gold OA models. When the portion of publications that are Gratis OA

[7] BOAI10, 2012
[8] Creative Commons, 2012
[9] Finch, 2012

by self-archiving has reached a level where we can start cancelling subscriptions, hopefully publishers have come far enough in their development of Gold OA models to convert the old toll access journals to true OA journals. In short, start massive with Green Gratis OA and successively go over to Gold Libre OA, but don't wait with Gold OA trials and experiments as catalysts of the change to come, while doing the mainstream Green OA.
This strategy is also what Houghton and Swan seems to recommend in their recent paper *Planting the green seeds for a golden harvest*: "Hence, we conclude that the most affordable and cost-effective means of moving towards OA is through Green OA, which can be adopted unilaterally at the funder, institutional, sectorial and national levels at relatively little cost." [10]

## What will the year to come bring for open access?

Year 2013 will inevitably be another exciting year for open access, since many of the initiatives from 2012 will have to be implemented during the year. In Great Britain, the planning for the implementation of the recommendations of the Finch report is already going at full pace, with the Government handing out funding for Gold OA publishing and the British universities are planning on how to distribute this funding to publishing fees.

The European Parliament will process the new EU research programme Horizon 2020 which is destined to have "open access publishing as a norm" and have the details of the programme hammered out during the next year. The big EU project OpenAIRE will presumably play an important role in building an infrastructure for the management of the free publications and research data of Horizon 2020.
In Sweden, the suggested Governmental commissions in the 2012 research bill regarding national coordination of open access will have to be decided by the Swedish parliament and set into practice by the Swedish Research Council and the National Library of Sweden.
There is a good chance that the year 2013 will prove itself to be the first year in the open access history when we could stop focusing on the *why* issue and start the open access *how* journey for years to come.

[10] Houghton and Swan, 2012

## References


BOAI10. "Budapest Open Access Initiative | Ten years on from the Budapest Open Access Initiative: setting the default to open.", 2012. http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/openaccess/boai-10-recommendations [Retrieved 14 December 2012].

Creative Commons. "Creative Commons.", 2012. http://creativecommons.org/ [Retrieved 14 December 2012].

eLife. "eLife | The open-access journal for outstanding advances in life science and biomedicine, backed by the funders of research.", 2012. http://elife.elifesciences.org/ [Retrieved 13 December 2012].

European Commission. "Scientific data: open access to research results will boost Europe's innovation capacity.", 2012. http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-12-790_en.htm [Retrieved 14 December 2012].

Finch, Janet. *Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications.*, 2012. http://www.researchinfonet.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Finch-Group-report-FINAL-VERSION.pdf [Retrieved 14 December 2012].

Houghton, John and Swan, Alma. "Planting the green seeds for a golden harvest: Comments and clarifications on 'Going for Gold'.", 2012. http://blogs.unimelb.edu.au/libraryintelligencer/2012/11/23/planting-the-green-seeds-for-a-golden-harvest-comments-and-clarifications-on-%E2%80%9Cgoing-for-gold%E2%80%9D/ [Retrieved 23 November 2012].

PeerJ. "PeerJ.", 2012. https://peerj.com/ [Retrieved 14 December 2012].

Research Councils UK. "RCUK Policy on Open Access.", 2012. http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/Pages/outputs.aspx [Retrieved 23 November 2012].

Styrelsen for Forskning og Innovation. "Open Access-politik for offentlige forskningsråd og fonde.", 2012. http://www.fi.dk/raad-og-udvalg/det-frie-forskningsraad/open-access-politik/open-access-politik-for-offentlige-forskningsraad-og-fonde [Retrieved 23 November 2012].

Utbildningsdepartementet. *Forskning och innovation - Prop. 2012/13:30.*, 2012. http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/15650/a/201368 [Retrieved 14 December 2012].



**Ulf Kronman** coordinator of programme OpenAccess.se, National Library of Sweden.

sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

# PERSISTENT, UNIQUE IDENTIFIERS FOR AUTHORS – ORCID AND SMALLER PUBLISHERS

Gudmundur A. Thorisson

## Abstract

in October 15th the ORCID initiative (http://orcid.org) launched its long-awaited central registry service for scholarly authors and contributors. The new service enables researchers to obtain a unique, persistent personal identifier and to maintain a centralized record of their published works, grants and other scholarly activities. At the time of writing, over 30,000 users have signed on with the service in the first two months and several 3rd party online services are already linked to it, with many more to come in the next year.

In this article I briefly outline the background to this important initiative and the identification problems it was created to solve, and conclude with remarks on what all this means for small, independent journal operations like ScieCom.

## Building a community

ORCID - short for Open Researcher and Contributor ID - is a global, open, community-based non-profit organization created to tackle challenges relating to name ambiguity in scholarly communication. Established in 2009, ORCID differs fundamentally from previous initiatives which have either i) failed or ii) been successful only in specific countries or disciplines[1] in that the project is backed by broad, diverse community of stakeholder organizations in research. This community includes commercial and non-profit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, funding agencies and many other organizations and individuals. In short, everyone who is constantly dealing with mistaken author or reviewer identity, missing papers, shared names and a thousand other identification-related problems in the scholarly research domain.

## Linking researchers with their research

The organization's slogan - "Connecting research and researchers" - captures the ambition of the project well. The over-arching aim is to not merely provide unique, persistent identifiers, but also to create and maintain the necessary supporting informatics services and tools (aka *identification infrastructure*) that make it possible for organizations to embed identifiers in their information workflows and computer systems and use them to track researchers and link them to their research activities. Currently this is often very problematic for organizations, largely due to the inherent non-uniqueness of person names and the resulting ambiguity in assigning authorship across the rapidly growing body of published literature.

In their recent coverage of ORCID, Nature[2] cited the classic case of Y. Wang who appears to have authored nearly 4,000 papers in the year 2011 alone. A related and entertaining story of name confusion is that of two academics in China who share a common family name and first initial[1], are both physics researchers, and work *in the same university department*, no doubt causing no end of trouble for departmental administrators. Cases like this will trip up even the most sophisticated data mining and disambiguation algorithm approaches (see e.g. ref **3**). The take-home message is that the "author name problem" is big enough and complex enough that it will likely never be solved with automated methods alone.

## Scholars in identity crisis

On the other side of the table, as individual researchers we ourselves also often have to deal with identification-related problems. Some of these are rather obvious; one would expect that the numerous scholars named Y. Wang must have their hands full keeping track of the works they have authored, and ensuring that they are accurately represented, for example, on the Internet and not confused with their colleagues of the same name.

[1] Many Chinese names have identical spelling after transliteration from the Chinese logographic writing system to the Western Latin alphabet.

Mistaken identity can have non-trivial - and even serious - consequences for scholars. For example, Melissa Terras, a scientist working in the humanities, reported a case[4] where an error in a publisher's computer system caused her to be listed as the author of a decidedly non-scientific book on Tarot symbolism. The error was propagated and amplified across the Internet and caused Melissa numerous troubles which took a long time to work out. Another, less obvious example is mis-identification in the selection of expert reviewers for manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals.

## Solving existing problems - creating new opportunities

ORCID is now putting the necessary infrastructure in place to enable the community to start seriously tackling these identification challenges. On one hand, the new tools will help with retroactively sorting out the current mess, i.e. un-tangling authorship for works that are already published. On the other hand, and more importantly, it will be possible to prospectively address the myriad identification-related problems in scholarly publishing workflows, grant management, institutional research management and other settings going forward. These were, after all, the primary drivers for creating ORCID in the first place.

This evolution is already taking place at rapid pace. For example, Scopus, one of the two major literature indexing services, has built and launched a wizard-based tool[2] which enables an ORCID user to seamlessly populate his/her profile with publication lists retrieved from the Scopus system. Another ORCID-integrated service is ImpactStory[3] which builds an impact analysis report of a scholar's research outputs. The analysis goes beyond traditional citation-based measurements, using as input broad evidence of use as diverse as online views and downloads, social media sharing, commenting and bookmarks, and WikiPedia mentions[4].

I and many of my colleagues are especially excited about ORCID's potential to serve an enabling platform to support the creation of new and innovative tools and services, such as ImpactStory. A major area of opportunity is support for the modern-day "digital scholar" - that is, infrastructure that enables researchers to be linked with, and receive credit for, a broad range of so-called *non-traditional* research outputs or knowledge contributions, including (to name a few) research datasets[5], presentation slides, source code for scientific software, curation of biomedical databases, contributions to WikiPedia articles and much more.

## The operative word is *open*

Openness is a key element in everything that ORCID does and this is a major reason why the initiative has garnered so much backing. Most of the organization's ten principles[6] feature openness of one meaning or another. Several deal with openness in governance, organization membership, data and more. For end users (i.e. researchers), the most important principle is the one that states that *anybody* who so wishes can create and manage their ORCID identifier and corresponding profile in the system, free of charge.

In the two months since launch, over 30,000 users have already jumped in and registered.
This is a good start, given that these early adopters can use their IDs with only a small number of ORCID-enabled 3rd party services at the moment. But the long-term scope of the project is international and trans-disciplinary, and the total number of scholarly authors worldwide may be much as two orders of magnitude larger than this (no one knows how many, it goes without saying). So how can ORCID attract the interest of millions of scholars worldwide and get them to register?

## Can ORCID become the new black?

Excited as I am about the potential for new tools & services, in reality such developments will take some time to appear, mature and be adopted (or fail otherwise). They are therefore not likely to be significant in driving early ORCID adoption by researchers. Amongst those who have been following and working in this space, there is general consensus that traditional publishing is where the early action will take place.

[2] http://orcid.scopusfeedback.com
[3] http://impactstory.org
[4] This field of study is commonly referred to as *alternative metrics*, see http://altmetrics.org

[5] Research data are increasingly published in online repositories such as Dryad, see http://datadryad.org and ref. 5
[6] http://about.orcid.org/about/what-is-orcid/our-principles

This prediction is based on the simple fact that most researchers routinely come into contact with publishers when they need to publish their work. For many authors, the time when they submit a manuscript to (say) a journal for peer-review is probably one of the very few key events in their busy[7] academic life when they are likely to be receptive to the concept of author identifiers. Therefore, this is the best time to promote ORCID and highlight the benefits of registering (e.g. that they don't need fill out an author registration form for the umpteenth time). Put another way, *unpublished content* is where both active scholarly authors *and* their publishers (as key stakeholder groups) have the most incentives from adopting ORCID early on, compared to other major publishing-focused use cases (e.g. works published by deceased or otherwise inactive authors)[6].

Following this line of reasoning, a great deal of emphasis has been placed on facilitating integration between the central ORCID service and software used by publishers. Integration means not only embedding of ORCID identifiers in workflows (e.g. ask authors to supply their ID when they submit their manuscript) but also displaying them in author lists on article web pages and full text PDFs, and so on. Several major commercial and non-profit publishers, as well as makers of manuscript tracking systems used by many publishers, are already working on integrating their systems. We can expect to see many of those come online sometime in the first half of 2013.

## ORCID and small-scale publishers

What does this mean for smaller, independent scholarly journals, especially those on a shoestring (or even zero) budget? In particular, how can e-journal outfits like ScieCom, their authors and their readers benefit from this emerging new technical infrastructure? I can recommend as a general background reading a recent paper[7] authored by the ORCID leadership which outlines the main issues and key benefits from integration to publishers, repositories and other organizations. Here I want to highlight a pair of issues which I consider to be of key relevance to smaller players in the publishing space.

First there is the technical obstacle. Connecting to ORCID programmatically via the application programming interface (API) requires certain modifications to the software used to run an e-journal. Journals which run on commercial, closed platforms are tied to whatever functionality is "in the box", and so will not be able to connect until the software vendor gets around implements the required ORCID integration.

Many smaller journals, on the other hand, run on free, open source software[8]. This means that, in principle at least, it is perfectly possibly for each journal to implement ORCID functionality by simply modifying the source code as needed. But the technical expertise required for this is likely beyond most individuals or groups running a small journals, and so most of them are likely stuck in the same boat as journals using commercial solutions. The good news is that the majority of these journals (including ScieCom) are powered by a single platform - Open Journal Systems (OJS)[9] - which is used by thousands of groups worldwide to disseminate knowledge on an incredibly diverse range of topics. The dominance of OJS should greatly simplify the task of bringing ORCID to this community. That is, the required extra functionality can be implemented just once in the OJS platform, and subsequently reused by all the OJS-based journals the next time they upgrade their system.

Second, there is the orthogonal problem of cost. Certain parts of the ORCID API can be used by individuals and organizations free of charge to search and retrieve profile data. But inn order to get the kind of full integration that a journal would need, the journal (or single multi-journal publisher outfit) must have access to the full member API. This is where ORCID's business plan for becoming financially sustainable comes in: organizations who benefit from integration (e.g. by saving costs) will be charged annual membership fees, and those fees will pay for ongoing costs of operating the service.

A membership fee based model in itself is not in itself a bad thing: after all, somehow the bills must be paid to keep the service running. However, for various reasons the membership fee structure[10] that ORCID has started with is inflexible and very biased in favour of larger publishers and institutions with large budgets

[7] Another key event is submission of grant proposals to funding agencies

[8] See the Open Source Initiative (OSI) website: http://opensource.org

[9] http://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs

[10] http://about.orcid.org/about/membership

who are expected to be early heavy users of the system. The consequence of this is a financial barrier to participation for smaller e-publishing outfits with a limited or no budget who would not be able to pay the annual fee. The good news is that ORCID is now in the process of revising the current model and expects to introduce additional membership plan options in 2013 that will better suit this category of "small integrators".

## Conclusions

I have focused here on the publishing-focused use cases for ORCID and prospects for uptake of the service amongst scholarly authors and publishers. For smaller journals, one of the two key factors - improve the membership fee structure - is something that ORCID can influence to facilitate broad adoption. The other one – support in open source software tools - is a task for the journals and software developers themselves to take on, ideally in concert with and as part of the ORCID developer community which is gradually taking form. See the developer portal at http://dev.orcid.org if you are interested in getting involved.

I want to mention another important route to ORCID adoption: namely introduction and integration at the national level. This is a strategy that will not work in larger countries (USA, UK, Germany) because of their sheer size and diversity in research infrastructure. There is, however, substantial interest in going this route in smaller countries with sufficiently advanced research information infrastructure, including some of the Scandinavian & Baltic nations. For further reading on this topic, I suggest the article by Adrian Price elsewhere in this issue of ScieCom where he reports on a plan now in preparation for adopting ORCID nationally in Denmark.

These are interesting times. ORCID now takes its first steps as an organization and as an emerging key piece of scholarly communication infrastructure. At the time of writing, the new registry service is limited in functionality and is experiencing some early growing pains, but wrinkles are constantly being ironed out with the help of a growing and actively participating community, as evidenced by the feedback gather via http://support.orcid.org. I invite you to join us.

## References


1. Fenner, M. **Author Identifier Overview**. LIBREAS 24–29 (2011). Available at: http://edoc.hu-berlin.de/docviews/abstract.php?lang=&id=37867

2. Butler, D. **Scientists: your number is up.** Nature 485, 564–564 (2012). http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/485564a

3. Smalheiser, N. & Torvik, V. **Author Name Disambiguation**. *In*: Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (ARIST) 43, 287–313 (2009). Available at: http://arrowsmith.psych.uic.edu/arrowsmith_uic/tutorial/ARIST_preprint.pdf

4. Terras, M. **What's in a name? Academic Identity in the metadata age, or, I didn't see #tarotgate coming**. Retrieved 14/12/2012. Available at: http://melissaterras.blogspot.co.uk/2012/10/whats-in-name-academic-identity-in.html

5. Vision, T. J. **Open Data and the Social Contract of Scientific Publishing**. BioScience 60, 330–330 (2010). http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/bio.2010.60.5.2

6. Fenner, M., Gómez, C. G. & Thorisson, G. A. **Collective Action for the Open Researcher & Contributor ID (ORCID)**. Serials: The Journal for the Serials Community 24, 277–279 (2011). http://dx.doi.org/10.1629/24277

7. Haak, L. L., Fenner, M., Paglione, L., Pentz, E. & Ratner, H. **ORCID: a system to uniquely identify researchers.** Learned Publishing 25, 259–264 (2012). http://dx.doi.org/10.1087/20120404

**Gudmundur A. Thorisson** Faculty of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Iceland and ORCID

Gudmundur has been involved with ORCID in the past 3 years and as of October he is employed part time by the organization via the EC-funded ODIN project (http://odin-project.eu). His interests include, among other things, technical outreach and building & fostering a vibrant ORCID developer community.

E-mail: gthorisson@gmail.com
Personal website: http://gthorisson.name
ORCID profile: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5635-1860

sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

# AUTHOR IDENTIFICATION IN DENMARK: ORCID AND REPOSITORIES

Adrian Price

In Denmark all 8 universities (and several other institutions in the educational sector) use the same system to register publications, Pure, from the Danish software vendor Atira A/S[1]. As yet there is no central repository of bibliographic data which all universities could subscribe to, to enable re-use in local repositories: each university must ensure ingest of bibliographic data into local systems, by methods which fit in with local conditions. There are several methods used: central registration by libraries, the researchers themselves register publications, or the method could be a "proxy model", whereby a local super-user registers publications for local research groups. Probably in many cases there is a mix of different methods.

A central issue which goes directly to the heart of issues involved in the registration of research publications, is the correct identification of a researcher, the researcher's organisation and the researcher's publications. This triangle of Person-Organisation-Document is the central issue which determines data quality in any system: it is necessary for us to unequivocally be able to identify each point of the triangle and to, in each instance, be able to unequivocally identify the connection between these three points. And as in so many other areas, time here is also an important factor which effects metadata: over time people change names and disappear, organisations change names and disappear, documents' metadata changes, for example journals change names and disappear.

The importance of being able to identify the connection between the three points of the above triangle has grown over the previous years. In Denmark, due to the political focus on the *production* of research publications with the national bibliometric research indicator (a purely quantitative exerciser), it has become essential that systems are able to correctly (i.e. uniquely) identify and thereby quantify a researcher's and an organisation's research output. The Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for documents has played an important role in this quest, and the ResearcherID from Thomsen-Reuters was an attempt to deploy a unique ID for researchers, but with limited effect. For those involved in the daily exercise of having to ensure the uniqueness of each instance of the Person-Organisation-Document triangle, it is also obvious that volume also plays a leading role. That scientists have here and there adopted the ResearcherID might have worked for them and given them, individually, usable functions, but what is essential, is that there are infrastructural functions available to disambiguify (and disembarrass!) scientists on a national basis. Volume, i.e. coverage, is essential, to enable the national Danish research indicator to rest on solid ground, and that it is possible to produce bibliometric analyses based on correct data, not only for individuals but for large groups (whole organisations and countries). What is needed is a solution with a national scope.

Therefore there are at the moment discussions as to how, on a national basis, we can introduce the ORCID identification system for all Danish researchers. After the introduction of the national bibliometric research indicator, there exists a researcher database which is distributed to all Danish universities for use in their individual Pure installations. Here no unique ID is employed, and at best it is a help in the daily registration tasks, but by no means ensures correct combinations of Persons-Organsations-Documents. To be really effective (i.e. correct), the employment of an ID on a national basis will be essential and also essential that at the same time there is a coupling to the large bibliographic and bibliometric databases like Scopus, Web of Science etc. This would enable us to bypass some of the manual processes outlined in the first paragraph, to ensure correct registration. The one without the other would limit their usefulness.

Due to the fact that all Danish universities use the same repository system and have well-established lines of communication, it might just be possible to initiate actions to, on a national basis, uniquely identify people over time, using the ORCID system, to ensure the volume necessary to be effective. At the moment there are discussions just as to how this might be achieved, and which actions which will be required from Universities, libraries, repository managers, repository vendors and not least from universities and their researchers – preferably all of them.

[1] http://www.atira.dk/

**Adrian Price** Information specialist, Library, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Copenhagen

sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

# THE 7TH ANNUAL MUNIN CONFERENCE ON SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING – NEW TRENDS

Emma Margret Skåden

The University of Tromsø Library has hosted the Munin Conference on an annual basis since 2006 and the 7th Munin Conference was held at the University of Tromsø the 22-23 November 2012. The targeted audience is scientists, research administrators, research librarians, publishers, and policy makers from Norway and the other Nordic countries. However, this year we had a total of 104 participants and of these there were 10 plus participants from outside the Nordic Countries.
The theme of the conference is connected to scholarly and scientific publishing and often has an Open Access angle to it. This year the conference focus was on new trends in scholarly publishing.

## The keynotes

The first keynote speaker was Damian Pattinson from Public Library of Science, PLoS ONE. Pattinson has been the Executive Editor of PLoS since 2010 and has overseen the growth of the journal from a promising upstart to an established world leader of the Open Access movement. His keynote address was *Megajournals and what they mean for the future of scientific publishing.* Since it was launched five years ago, PLOS ONE has redefined the scientific journal. The broad publication criteria and absence of page limits allowed PLOS ONE to grow at a rate never seen before in the industry, to a level where it needed its own category: the Megajournal. Recently, other publishers have sought to emulate the success of PLOS ONE with releases of their own megajournals. These new journals all have similar properties: full Open Access, editorial criteria based on sound science and not on significance or impact, fast turnaround, broad scope. In this talk he discussed the features of megajournals, their benefits and weaknesses, and what their arrival means for the future of scientific publishing.

The second keynote spealer, John Willinsky, is a Khosla Family Professor of Education at Stanford University and Professor of Publishing Studies at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Public Knowledge Project which is dedicated to conducting research and developing software aimed at improving the public and scholarly quality of academic publishing. In addition to holding a keynote speech at the conferences' second day, Willinsky held a pre-conference workshop where he talked about Open Monograph Press, just launched from the Public Knowledge Project.

Willinsky also held a post-conference speech, on which he addressed the concept of intellectual property. This lecture was open for everyone to attend, not only the registered participants at the Munin Conference.
His keynote address was titled *The Future of Scholarly Publishing Is the Future of Scholarship.* Here, Willinsky talked about the importance not to overlook the contribution of humanities and social science publishing in comparison with the biomedical publishing currently the beacon of open access publishing. The developments in open-access models, mega-journals, bibliometrics, monograph publishing, open data initiatives, or the dream of the universal library were some of the aspects he talked about. Based on a review of historical and economic elements that tend to distinguish scholarship from research, as well as a decade of working with independent scholar-publishers, the talk made the case for thinking more globally about the common advancement of learning in the digital era.

## Call for papers and presentations

Helle Goldman from the Norwegian Polar Institute and chief editor of their journal *Polar Research*, held a speech with the title *Polar Research: reflections two years after the journal's transition to open access.* She reflected on the journals convention from a traditional journal to an Open Access journal and shared practical lessons learned during the process and also outlined the benefits incurred so far.

Live Kvale from the Science Library at the University of Oslo talked about her master degree study with the title *Sharing of research data – a study among researchers at UMB (The Norwegian University of Life Science).* She showed us her findings regarding attitudes towards the collection and reuse of data collected in the sciences and the opportunity to share these data openly. Her study concluded that the processes of data sharing are far from optimized as researchers today primarily retrieve data from colleagues and a collegial network for data exchange takes time to establish. For the researchers to be willing to share their data certain criteria such as first publication and accreditation for reuse must be

fulfilled. In addition, the fears among the researchers for misuse must be taken into account. The attitude among the researchers towards making data openly available depends much on where the researchers are in their careers.

Just De Leeuwe and Anke Versteeg from Delft Technical University talked about *OA Fund Delft University of Technology.* The topic was the University Open Access Fund as an instrument in promoting the Open Access program at Delft University of Technology. TU Delft faculties or research groups are themselves responsible for funding the Open Access publications of their academics. If a faculty is unable to pay the author's fee, TU Delft Library can assist by financing all or part of it from the Open Access Fund, which was founded in 2008. The researchers' publications need to be reviewed by a recognized publisher who operates with Open Access as a business model. The scope of the Open Access Fund is not limited to sponsoring articles published in journals not included in the subscriptions of TU Delft Library, but also applies to books and book chapters, published as Open Access. They presented the outcomes of the OA fund within the framework of the current Open Access activities at Delft University.

Bård Smedsrød, professor at the University of Tromsø (and co-author Leif Longva), held a speech titled : *Professor, does your university (want to) know what you are doing?* Universities are constantly intensifying and improving their ways of recording and counting the achievements of their scientific staff. Nevertheless, there are still important tasks that go under the radar of the university counting regimes: Reviewing tasks. The scientists spend much of their time doing reviewing work for free for scientific journals. Most of these tasks are pivotal to the scientific society and the society in general. And they are of great importance for journals eager to maintain or improve their scholarly reputation, which next ensures their revenues. Smedsrød and Longva believe that those universities as employers and managers of public research funds, by taking interest in what their employees do and not do, will hold a potentially forceful tool to lead the publishing houses in directions desired by the university and the society.

Simon Thomson from Open Access Key presented an introduction of Open Access Key that was founded in 2011 by a former academic publishing executive and a business software developer who encountered first-hand the challenges facing universities and authors with the growth of open access publishing – both Green and Gold. Thomson elaborated around the question if infrastructures and resources are sufficiently developed to support the additional financial and time pressures that participants now face with the establishment of the 'author pays' scholarly publishing model and the increasing number of open access mandates from research funders. Individual researchers, their universities and research funders, and the publishers themselves, all have a part to play in processing and managing individual fees. Thomson talked about how Open Access Key (OAK) as a new global company with an innovative and cost-effective solution can provide value to the parties involved in such transactions. In addition to this, OAK has the ability to deliver a range of administrative functionalities to the users, such as feeding the repositories with metadata information collected from each article that has passed through their platform. This kind of automatic workflow makes it possible to reduce the tasks for authors and administrators, allowing direct use of resources towards research.

Kaveh Bazargan is the founder of River Valley. With his title *ReView: a new approach to peer review, using WordPress* Bazargan showed us that using WordPress as a foundation for the reviewing system can result in a more flexible system with a user-friendly interface. Most of the systems used for peer-review are robust databases with secure control of user roles. In WordPress one can incorporate modified versions of available plugins, e.g. a social network module, which makes the peer-reviewing more user-friendly.

Jan Erik Frantsvåg from the University Library in Tromsø talked about the experiences from the publication fund of the University of Tromsø. This fund has been operating in almost two years now. Frantsvåg talked about how the fund started and the experiences up until now from both an administrative and economic point of view.

Dirk Pieper is Head of the Media Department and the Digital Library Coordinator of Bielefeld University. The title of his presentation was *A golden era for Open Access or a trend towards the golden road to Open Access?* Pieper's presentation explained The German Research Foundation (DFG) program and highlighted the experiences of Bielefeld University Library within and concluded, that riding on the golden road is not the only way for libraries to support universities making their publication output as visible as possible. DFG started the support program "Open Access Publishing" in 2010 with the overall goal to help universities establish long-lasting and reliable structures for paying OA publications which demand article processing charges.

## Publishers' sessions

For the first time, the Munin Conference had a publishers' session at the conference. We invited publishers to come and talk about their present visions

of how scholarly publishing will work in the future, and how they contribute to the realization of these visions. Four publishers were accepted for this session, Co-Action Publishing, Elsevier, Social Science Direct, and PLoS ONE.

First out was Caroline Sutton from C-Action Publishing with the title *Can small, independent publishers survive in the future?* In her presentation she discussed the role that can be played by smaller publishing houses and the challenges they face within the current marketplace, especially with the current trend with mega journals and large scale operations. Sutton concluded that their strength as a small publisher was that they are able to be flexible in addition to having a close contact with their customers.

Second out was none other than Elsevier. Federica Rosetta is a member of the Universal Access team at Elsevier and with her title *Elsevier's commitment to Universal Access* she informed us about Elseviers commitment to universal access and what universal access means for them. Rosetta talked about how Elsevier has established agreements and developed policies to allow authors who publish in Elsevier journals to comply with manuscript archiving requirements of several funding bodies, as specified as conditions of researcher grant awards. Further, Rosetta talked about how Elsevier offers several ways for authors to make their work available beyond the subscription model in several scientific areas spanning from Immunology to Pharma, Physics, and Genomics, and including well-known brands such as Cell Reports. This is done with 74 journals offering Open Archive and 23 Open Access journal titles available on ScienceDirect and a number already in the pipeline. Elsevier concluded that they believe that both open access-publishing and subscription publishing can co-exist, and that they will continue to close remaining access gaps globally.

Next out was Damian Pattinson from PLoS ONE. The title for his speech was *Article-level metrics and what they tell us about the impact of PLOS publications*. The Article-level metrics (ALM) program was an alternative to the journal-level metrics that scientists had relied on for a long time to identify important research. ALMs allow readers to see how many views, downloads, citations and shares an individual paper has received, and thus to determine its impact on a field. Over the past year, the ALM program has been expanded to include social media information, such as Facebook likes and Tweets, and novel web tools such as Mendeley and Citeulike. Researchers use this information to examine the links between early activity indicators and long-term citation data, and to identify what tools best predict truly high impact research. Pattinson also presented the latest additions to PLOS's ALMs suite, and showed some data on what these metrics can tell us about the impact of papers published in PLOS journals.

Dan Scott from Social Science Direct was the last man out in this session. With his title *From concept to reality: a publisher's experience of setting up in open access* he talked about how he, having worked in traditional publishing for many years, set out to offer a solution to the problem that beset the scholarly publishing industry and research dissemination. This problem stemmed from a boycott of Elsevier titles and the publication of reports (e.g. the Finch report in the UK. Social Sciences Directory and Humanities Directory were conceived as offering both a progressive publishing solution that cut publication times, made research freely available to all and encouraged inter-disciplinary learning, and also responds to changing user behaviour through the concentration of large amounts of materials that are easily searchable by keywords. Scott took us through how they set up the business, how they built the awareness through marketing, how they formed their consortia agreements and how they overcame the opposition and gained support.

## And more

In addition to a publishers' session we had invited four local researchers to hold short presentations about scholarly publishing. Their experiences, reflections and frustrations connected to the topic. Trond Trosterud told us about publication from the Sámi language technology view and Lars Bjertnæs' experiences with the access to research literature for his collaborators in the North West Russia and Baltikum. Benjamin Planque talked about how the focus in the scholarly publishing has shifted from quality in the research to quantity and the number of articles one write. Jan Yngve Sand gave us an update on how things are in England after they've launched a new Open Access policy.

We had also poster- and presentation stands in the conference area. There were 14 posters and 6 stands available for everyone to take a look at and discuss. Our experience from this was that this resulted in some good discussions, both formal and informal, but we should have put a poster session in our program. Next year we will do that.

We hope to see everyone, and also some new faces, again next year at the 8th Munin Conference. We can promise you the polar night period in Tromsø if you decide to come, but unfortunately we cannot promise you that you will see the northern light. But if you don't come at all you will never get to see it…

All of the presentations are available on film here http://tinyurl.com/d64j9qg .

You can read more about the conference here http://www.ub.uit.no/baser/ocs/index.php/Munin/MC7

**Emma Margret Skåden** Rådgiver Avdeling for IT, formidling og utvikling
Universitetsbiblioteket, Universitetet i Tromsø

sciecominfo
Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

# WHAT IT TAKES FOR THE STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED TO FACILITATE THE FULL POTENTIAL OF OPEN ACCESS TO UNFOLD!

Lars Bjørnshauge

*Talk delivered at the Berlin10 conference in Stellenbosch Nov 7th, 2012*

SPARC Europe was founded in 2002 out of LIBER, the Association of European Research Libraries. SPARC Europe is a sister organization – the smaller sister – to SPARC developed in U.S. 1997 by the Association of Research Libraries. We are advocating change and working to correct imbalances in the scholarly publishing system for the benefit of research and society. We are primarily funded by university libraries.

I am sorry to inform you, that I have no slides for you, my talk is deliberately not polished, couldn´t manage with the short notice – if you do not agree with what I am saying do not blame SPARC Europe & SPARC for that matter, blame me and my lack of patience!

It is great to be here, it is good to be able to participate in our discussions as to how we can continue the good work that has taken place during at least the last decade or so, where we have advocated for and worked for open access and the open agenda. As indicated in the introduction my background is primarily from managing academic libraries in Denmark & Sweden for more or less two decades now and from the early days in various ways involved in promoting open access and developing services supporting open access.

My talk is designed to be somewhat provocative and maybe controversial because I think is about time now to send strong messages to those stakeholders, who can facilitate change in the scholarly communication and publishing system. And I actually think, given the work we have done and the progress we have made so far can have the confidence to send strong messages.

At this important conference we will hear a lot of promising projects and initiatives and as well about the obstacles we have to overcome in order to serve our communities and societies the best way possible.

On my way to Stellenbosch during the 11 hour flight from Munich I used the entertainment program provided by Lufthansa, and suddenly this great piece of music entered my ears: All along the watchtower, performed by Jimi Hendrix, and at this stage I will quote Bob Dylan´s lyrics: "There's too much confusion"

## To cut through all the confusion:

Ladies and gentlemen it has become more and more obvious for more and more stakeholders that the still dominant system of scholarly communication and publishing based on subscription barriers and reuse restrictions does not work. It simply does not adequately serve research, higher education, societies and the people.

I mentioned in the introduction that SPARC advocate change and work to correct imbalances in the current system. For my part I think I have reached the point where this is an understatement. What we should aim at is to radically change the system of scholarly communication and publishing. We want a new system! A system that serves research, higher education, our societies and our fellow citizens.

But how come we have such an inefficient system to communicate research? How come that we despite all kinds of technological advances still have a system that essentially still is in the print age?

If we look a research in general, research is funded via grants from research funders, universities (via government funding), international organizations etc. In short: research is funded, paid for upfront – in other words: research is **subsidized directly.**

The dissemination of the output of research – publications – on the contrary is **not funded upfront.**

Instead, scholarly publishing has been **outsourced** --- at first, to scholarly societies and later on to corporate companies, who are doing the publishing and sending the bill to (academic) libraries, which in turn are funded by universities as an overhead – even on grants from funders.

Outsourcing is not a bad thing in itself, as long as those who are doing the outsourcing are able to specifically determine what they expect from the service provider, and as long as it happens in the context of a competitive market.

But that is not the case. There is no competition. We cannot talk about a market for scholarly publishing, because essential features of a free market are absent.

So here we are.

Research funders, universities and governments and the research community have (until recently at least) happily outsourced the dissemination of research output and the result is as system that is dysfunctional and outdated.

Now, there is a tendency to blame the commercial publishers. But in reality, they are just doing what any for---profit company should do --- Maximizing their income and pleasing the shareholders. They just exploit the conditions offered to them as any savvy business would.

The important stakeholders in the scholarly communication and publishing system have allowed them to fine tune a system, that is way too expensive and counterproductive and the same stakeholders are still to a large extent supporting mechanisms that strengthen the commercial publishers and service provider's grip on the scholarly publishing system.

What I refer to here specifically is the Journal Impact Factor. I will not go in depth with this, because Tom Olijhoek will fire us up about this later this afternoon. But I will just say that the research community cannot any longer defend a position and continue to say that in the absence of other and better measures we will stick to that one. JIF has become the symbol of an outdated system, that has – and I am sure we will hear more about that --- devastating effects on research policy and research priorities around the globe.

The lack of attention from all the stakeholders, who contribute to the system and who should have the responsibility to manage not only research, but as well the dissemination of research outputs and their application to the benefit of research itself, societies and the people has facilitated the mess we are in today. I said earlier that we want to get rid of this system. Luckily there are a growing number of the stakeholders who want the same to happen. We will help them!

Earlier this year we celebrated the 10 years anniversary of the Budapest Open Access Initiative, where the concepts of open access were coined. We are here today at the 10th conference following the Berlin Declaration of Open Access and declarations keep coming. Hundreds of universities, research institutions, associations of universities and research institutions, research funders and even governments have signed those declarations. This is great of course, but as we know not enough.
A slowly increasing number of those have moved beyond signatures and have endorsed open access policies and mandates. This is great as well, but still not enough. We need more policies and mandates on publications and research data, we need stronger mandates and we desperately need follow up on compliance with mandates.

What we need is the research community - especially the decision makers in research funding organizations, universities and the governments behind them-- to reclaim responsibility for research outputs, how these are managed, disseminated and curated. This is a strong message that I will encourage us to send today: **Reclaim the responsibility for research outputs and how these are managed, disseminated, curated and measured!**

Despite the increasing momentum for open access to research publications and research data, there is still a long way to go.

From my experience gained from working in universities it is obvious that universities are only beginning to care about their intellectual output. The positive developments in and around institutional repositories is evidence for an increasing ambition to be able to keep an institutional record of outputs, but as we know there are still lots of problems in terms of filling the repositories with content. Even worse is the state of affairs when it comes to management and curation of research data. It seems that many universities are more occupied with getting grants that being accountable for the output of the organization.

Research funders have only recently begun getting an overview of the output of research results facilitated by their grants. One of the curious things here is that one of the problems is the fact that they are not allowed to access the publications resulting from the research they had funded! Laugh or cry, whatever you prefer.

Having worked in academic libraries for 30 years now it is obvious that libraries are part of the picture and part of the problem. I repeat, that I do not blame the publishers, but I think all the other stakeholders including libraries bear a collective responsibility for creating the conditions that enables publishers to do business the way they do.

Just as it is the case of research funding the conditions of libraries are very diverse from continent to continent, and to a large extent libraries faces different problems, depending on where you are.
Indeed the libraries have played a major role in the origin of the open access movement. The open access movement was triggered by two factors: The first one

the potential of technologies and the second one the serials crisis. Early adopters (researchers) started using technologies for better and faster dissemination of research results (Arxiv etc.). Libraries were suffering from skyrocketing subscription prices for prestigious journals. So one of the primary objectives was to solve the problem of access to journals articles behind paywalls. Therefore the focus has been on depositing versions of articles in Institutional Repositories and developing and supporting new business models for open access publishing.

So based on that you can say that the origins of the OA-movement has been focused on solving access problems in the North, access problems that have been a problem for the South in many decades. I am sure that we will hear more about the need to reinvent the concepts of open access in order not only to solve problems in the North.

Nevertheless librarians and libraries want to contribute to a changed system, but the libraries (in the North) are stuck in the big deals. As long as researchers expect to have access to all the content from the big publishers and as long as promotion and merit systems are based on citation counts and the regime of JIF no library director will cancel the big deals with the Elseviers and the Wileys, the one who do that will be a head shorter the day after. **Unless** the library director and the library consortia are supported by their bosses, the university managers and research funders. As long as there is a continuous inflow of articles into the journals of the big publishers this situation will continue.

Librarians and libraries can contribute – and have already contributed to the transition to a better system. Libraries have traditionally been most occupied with the **import** of information to their institution, the researchers and students.

But libraries have been the driving force in setting up and operating the institutional repositories, and with the increasing attention from the research management officers within the university there is an increasing understanding that the librarians have significant skills in terms of managing the **export** of research outputs from the universities.

Libraries are trying the best they can to contribute in these new areas, but again as long as they are forced to continue with negotiating the big deals, doing all the back office work, authentication etc – in fact denying outside users from access to public funded research, which is very far from the core values of librarians – as long as this continues only fractions of the potential librarians can offer in terms of changing the system will unfold.

So, bearing in mind that the conditions of libraries are very, very diverse librarians have one thing in common. They can apply their skills in new areas, where they are highly needed, not only in support to research management but as well as we increasingly see is the case in open access publishing and in curation and dissemination of many other kinds of research output.

So far I have mentioned a number of the important stakeholders in scholarly communication and publishing: Research funders and their associations, universities and their organizations, libraries and publishers. What about the researchers, the authors.

Well: It is indeed great to see that many researchers are embracing open access not only because it is a good thing, but as well because they can see the benefits of exposing their content faster and to a broader audience. But again: we have a long way to go before this will become the default.

Experiences regarding author self---deposit are not the most promising. In the context of institutional repositories I personally do not think we can rely too much on researchers doing additional work here, unless they are told to in capital letters and with indications that their work will not count before it is in the repositories and in the open. That is essentially stronger mandates.

More important but less operational --- I am afraid – is a necessary shift in culture and mindset. The culture of sharing needs to be promoted if not enforced: It should tell that it is simply bad style to put your work behind pay walls, and those who do publish in the open should of course be rewarded.

## So what do we do with all this?

Another quote form Bob Dylan: “There must be some way out of here"

First of all: we have made significant progress. Open access is in the mainstream now and is inevitable. But there are big battles to be won.

One very important thing is that the communication lines are open. All the important stakeholders are discussing the need for open access, open research data, open science and openness.

High level decision makers are now embracing open access. In the European context for instance the decision makers do not embrace open access because it is a good cause, which it is, they do not embrace open access because it has the potential of bridging the digital divide, but mainly because it has become

obvious that science will only benefit itself and societies if the texts, the objects and the corresponding research data are available, interlinked, mined and reusable in an open networked environment without barriers, without walls, or put otherwise the only way to unfold the potential of technology and innovation is to create the universe of science in an open and transparent environment without walls.

OK, then, how do we do that, what does it take:

As indicated earlier: Research funders, universities and the governments behind them **must reclaim the responsibility** for the dissemination of research outputs. They must assist libraries to enable them to come out of the deadlock of the big deals, thus freeing resources to facilitate a system transition.

No single research funder or university can do that. This must be done in **collaboration.** This requires brand new organizational efforts. Research funders, universities, their associations and the libraries must come together and outline bold action plans to accomplish what they all say they want to see become reality. And this accounts not only for research publications and research data, but as well for creating an infrastructure for open access.

And it must happen quickly. We have to increase the speed. And I know we have already entered the sphere of politics where middle of the road and compromise is the easiest way to make things work.

But I must say that I am afraid that we in our eager to monitor progress are too much ready to accept compromises or soft solutions. We definitely must avoid repeating the mistakes that we are trying to repair now, namely to develop a new system which will have the same basic problems as the one we are trying to eliminate: lack of transparency, catering for monopolies and no competition.

The fact that the commercial publishers after 10 years of laughing at us, ridiculing us, later yelling at us are now as well embracing open access makes me a bit nervous.

We must have the self-confidence now after all the work we have done to put forward a very strong message to the decision makers, that if they listen to the commercial publishers they are in fact sacrificing innovation, progress, the health and wealth of their communities and all sectors of society in protecting an industry which has not left the print age and has proven inefficient in terms of serving science and society. We do not want a new open access big deal!

BTW: apart from abandoning the JIF this might as well mean that we will have to abandon the concept of the journal, which is a print age concept as well. The good news is that this is beginning to happen.

In the print age a journal could publish 15 articles every 3 months and thus had to have gatekeepers (editorial boards) to shift what they decided was the best from the worst, is probably not needed anymore, at least not in the same sense. NB: I am not advocating for abandoning peer review, I am more questioning whether editorial boards always have been the best judges.

With the increasing interdisciplinarity of research the traditional publishing in narrow silos becomes more and more obsolete.

With the advent of megajournals and peer review based on soundness of methodologies, data management etc. it makes much more sense to let researchers, research groups and those who apply the research findings in solving problems judge whether the research deserves recognition.

Moving beyond the journal and thus the brands that facilitates the non---competition might be the thing that could rock the boat and as well pave the way for other kinds of research output that is large hidden and invisible today.

And talking about not going too much into compromises that will repeat failures of the past, I have a minor request to the real, dedicated Open Access publishers: please stop flashing your journal impact factors. We do not want to play that game. Let´s focus on getting the alternative metrics rolling!

Things are moving in the right direction, but we have to take a global view on things. Global in terms of global and global in terms of all aspects of scholarly communication and publishing.

I warmly welcome the newly created Global Research Council and I hope it in collaboration with other stakeholders, universities and their libraries can create and implement the promised action plan for open access in the course of 2013. Together we will reclaim our responsibilities for the dissemination of the outputs of research! And we will invite the publishers, but this time the research community will decide the rules of the game!

Final quote from Bob Dylan: “So let us not talk falsely now, the hour is getting late".

On this fine day the 7th of November: Let´s more forward, fast – forward. That´s it.

Thank you for listening. *Lars Bjørnshauge*

**Lars Bjørnshauge** Director of European Library Relations, SPARC Europe