ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

Ny OECD-rapport om tillgång till forskningsresultat

I september publicerade OECD en ny rapport om vetenskaplig publicering, den snabbast växande sektorn inom mediaindustrin med intäkter på mellan 7 och 11 miljarder USD år 2004. Rapporten är en del i ett större projekt om digitalt innehåll. Författare är John Houghton, Victoria University, Australia och Graham Vickery vid OECD:s Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry. **http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/12/35393145.pdf**

Nya affärsmodeller för både OA-system (t.ex. OA-tidskrifter med "Author-pays", institutionella och andra öppna arkiv) och system baserade på prenumerationsavgifter (t.ex. campuslicenser, "Big Deals") har analyserats för att se se om och hur forskning och kunskapsspridning påverkas.

Man har sett att forskningspraxis influeras av den ökade tillgängligheten till forskningsdata. Användarnas växande krav på direkt tillgång till primärdatakällor leder till förändrade affärsmodeller för förlagsindustrin.

På regeringsnivå gäller principen om maximal tillgång till offentligt finansierade data för att stimulera innovationer, främja vetenskapliga framsteg, underlätta forskarutbildning och få bästa möjliga samhälleliga avkastning på gjorda investeringar. För att nå dessa mål krävs samordnade insatser på både nationell och internationell nivå. Redan i januari 2004 antogs faktiskt principen om maximal tillgång till offentligt finansierade data vid ett möte med OECD:s vetenskapsministerråd. Se "*Declaration on Access to Research Data from Public funding*". **http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,**

en_2649_34487_25998799_1_1_1_1,00.html

Roller för forskningsråd och andra anslagsgivare
Rapporten understryker att forskningsråd och andra anslagsgivare har ett antal viktiga uppgifter vad gäller utveckling och spridning av digitalt innehåll:

- Uppmuntra en forskningsevaluering som är neutral i förhållande till publiceringsmodell och som bevarar eller tom höjer kvaliteten
- Utveckla nya metoder för att mäta signifikans och användning av OA- arkiv i syfte att förbättra sina egna och andra aktörers utvärderingar
- Samarbeta med andra institutioner och forskare för att bättre hantera problem i samband med spridning av forskningsresultat via nya media.
- Främja en mångfald av offentliga och privata informationskällor för att få en optimal tillgång till vetenskaplig och teknisk information.

CIBER rapport visar ökning av OA-publicering

I september kom rapporten "New Journal Publishing Models: An International Survey of Senior Researchers", en uppföljning av en tidigare CIBER rapport från 2004. (CIBER - **C**entre for **I**nformation **B**ehaviour and the **E**valuation of **R**esearch – delas mellan City University och University College i London). Rapporten är skriven av Ian Rowlands och Dave Nicholas och baseras på en enkät till 5 513 seniora forskare, som 2004 publicerat i tidskrifter indexerade av ISI.

29 % säger sig nu ha publicerat i någon OA-tidskrift, en uppgång med 18 procentenheter jämfört med den tidigare studien. Antalet som väl eller mycket väl känner till OA har ökat med 10 procentenheter och gruppen som inte hört talas om OA har minskat med hela 25 procentenheter. 81% säger nu att de har viss kännedom om OA mot 66% år 2004.

Författarna har en stark tro på att deras artiklar blir mer tillgängliga via OA och 75 % instämmer med påståendet att höga priser försämrar tillgång.

CIBER rapporten är beställd av The Publishers Association samt International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers.

Hela rapporten finns på
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ciber/ciber_2005_survey_final.pdf

The Open Content Alliance

The Open Content Alliance (OCA) **http://www.opencontentalliance.org/** är ett stort nytt projekt för att scanna tryckta böcker och indexera dem så att de blir sökbara i ett permanent öppet arkiv. Projektet lanserades den 3 oktober av ett internationellt konsortium av både kommersiella och icke-kommersiella organisationer. The Internate Archive står bakom idén och sköter administrationen. Brewster Kahle, grundaren av The Internet Archive beskriver OCA så här:

"Is Open Content the next step in the traditions of Open Source and an Open Network? Many people seem to think so (and wouldn't it be great?). Working with libraries, government institutions, archives, technology companies, web companies-- and we all are saying the same thing-- it is time to have more great material available on the Internet and to be able to have it be open and free. The opportunity before all of us is living up to the dream of the Library of Alexandria and then taking it a step further-- Universal access to all knowledge. Interestingly, it is now technically doable. Then the question became-- is it in the interest of enough people and institutions to get there? "

Yahoo indexerar innehållet, Adobe och HP Labs tillhandahåller teknologin. Innehållet kommer från de institutioner som anmäler intresse att delta. F.n. deltar University of California, University of Toronto, National Archives of the UK, European Archive, Biodiversity Heritage Library, the Smithsonian Institution Libraries, Columbia University, Emory University, Johns Hopkins University Libraries, McMaster University, Rice University, York University, Universities of British Columbia, Ottawa, Pittsburgh och Virginia. Dessutom deltar Research Libraries Group (RLG) och Microsoft.

Det blir Open Access till de böcker som ligger i den publika domänen och till böcker med tillstånd från rättighetshavaren.

Till skillnad från Google kommer OCA att scanna in böcker först efter tillstånd från rättighetshavarna, medan Google scannar direkt om rättighetshavarna inte aktivt meddelat att de inte ger tillstånd.

De inscannade böckerna återfinns i **Open Library** **http://www.openlibrary.org/**

Öppet brev till universitetsledningar om allt dyrare tidskrifter

Theodore Bergstrom, professor i ekonomi vid University of California, Santa Barbara (en av föreläsarna vid NCSC2004 **http://www.lub.lu.se/ncsc2004**) och professor R. Preston McAfee, Professor of Business, Economics & Management vid California Institute of Technology, har publicerat ett intressant förslag,

utformat som ett öppet brev till alla universitetsledningar. Brevet inleds med ett antal slående exempel på prisskillnader mellan kommersiella och icke-kommersiella utgivare; prisskillnader som finns inom alla ämnen. Kostnad per sida resp. kostnad per citering redovisas (se tabell nedan).

Mot denna bakgrund rekommenderar Bergstrom och McAfee följande:

1. Universities should assess overhead charges for the support services of editors working for journals that have basic library subscription rates of more than a threshold level of cost per measured unit of product.
2. University libraries should refrain from buying bundled packages from large commercial publishers and should set clear minimal standards of cost effectiveness for individual journals to which they subscribe.

Enligt Bergstrom och McAfee är det rimligt att tänka sig att en tidskriftsredaktör som hanterar ca 100 artiklar/år använder ca 20 % av en sekreterares tid plus kontorsutrymme, material och annat. En overhead på minst $12 000/år borde därför lämpligen kunna debiteras tidskriften/förlaget.

Läs hela brevet *"An Open Letter to All University Presidents and Provosts Concerning Increasingly Expensive Journals"* **http://www.hss.caltech.edu/~mcafee/Journal/OpenLetter.pdf**
Se också *"The Costs and Benefits of Site Licences to Academic Journals"*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Jan. 04, by C.T. Bergstrom and T.C. Bergstrom. Några exempel:

	Cost per page		Cost per citation	
	For-profit	Non-profit	For-profit	Non-profit
Ecology	$1.01	$0.19	$0.73	$0.05
Economy	$0.83	$0.17	$2.33	$0.15
Atmosph.sci	$0.95	$0.15	$0.88	$0.07
Mathematics	$0.70	$0.27	$1.32	$0.28
Neurosciences	$0.89	$0.10	$0.23	$0.04
Physics	$0.63	$0.19	$0.38	$0.05

ALPSP-rapporten 11 oktober

http://www.alpsp.org/publications/FAOAcomplete.pdf

I oktober kom den ivrigt väntade rapport som beställts av *Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP)*, *American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)* samt *HighWire Press* och med data även från *Association of American Medical Colleges*. Rapporten **'The Facts About Open Access'** har

studerat OA effekter på vetenskaplig publicering och utförts av den oberoende konsultfirman Kaufman-Wills Group LLC.

Fas ett bestod av en enkät mailad till tidskrifter publicerade av ALPSPs och AAMCs medlemmar, till HighWires tidskrifter med Delayed OA samt till tidskrifterna i DOAJ. Svarsfrekvensen var låg med svar från knappa 500 titlar (248 från DOAJ, 85 från HW, 34 från AAMC och 128 från ALPSP).
Fas 2 innebar djupintervjuer med 20 förlag av alla typer och storlekar representerande över 4000 tidskrifter.

Ett intressant resultat är att 52 % av OA-tidskrifterna inte tar ut artikelavgifter medan en betydligt högre andel av övriga tar ut någon form av sidavgifter. Prenumerationsavgifter representerar mellan 67 och 72% av de totala intäkterna för ALPSP, AAMC och HW. 75 % av ALPSP-tidskrifterna redovisade vinst medan 22 % gick med förlust.

En överväldigande majoritet ansåg att OA tidskrifter "would be prevalent or successful". Studien ger ingen klar bild av "the economics of OA". Det framgår klart att traditionella prenumerationstidskrifter av alla typer och storlek känner press från OA och ett behov av att reagera.

Studien har fått en viss faktakritik. bl a för att man jämfört väletablerade tidskrifter (ALPSP, AAMC och HighWire) med mycket unga tidskrifter (DOAJ) och för uppgifter rörande peer-review och OA-tidskrifter. Se bl.a. Jan Velterop, **https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/2438.html**, Fred Friend , **https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/2447.html** och BioMed Central, **https://mx2.arl.org/Lists/SPARC-OAForum/Message/2444.html**

Kritiken har resulterat i ett Post-publication Addendum den 24 oktober. **http://www.alpsp.org/publications/pub11.htm**

Se också Peter Subers intervju med Cara Kaufman i SPARC Open Access Newsletter,2005-11-02 **http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/11-02-05.htm - kaufman**

"The Adelphi Charter" för en balanserad upphovsrätt

The Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (RSA) grundades i London 1754 och är en ytterst respekterad institution över hela världen.

The Adelphi Charter on Creativity, Innovation and Intellectual Property lades fram av RSA den 13 oktober. Det är ett mycket viktigt och välformulerat manifest som yrkar på en återgång till den traditionella balansen mellan rättigheterna för kreatörer och för användare. Bakom manifestet står en internationell kommission av framstående forskare som Sir John Sulston, nobelpristagare i medicin 2002, välkända jurister som professorerna Lawrence Lessig och James Boyle och biblioteksledare som Lynne Brindley, chef för The British Library.

I manifestet uppmanas världens regeringar och det internationella samfundet att anta följande nio grundläggande principer:

1. Laws regulating intellectual property must serve as means of achieving creative, social and economic ends and not as ends in themselves.
2. These laws and regulations must serve, and never overturn, the basic human rights to health, education, employment and cultural life.
3. The public interest requires a balance between the public domain and private rights. It also requires a balance between the free competition that is essential for economic vitality and the monopoly rights granted by intellectual property laws.
4. Intellectual property protection must not be extended to abstract ideas, facts or data.
5. Patents must not be extended over mathematical models, scientific theories, computer code, methods for teaching, business processes, methods of medical diagnosis, therapy or surgery.
6. Copyright and patents must be limited in time and their terms must not extend beyond what is proportionate and necessary.
7. Government must facilitate a wide range of policies to stimulate access and innovation, including non-proprietary models such as open source software licensing and open access to scientific literature.
8. Intellectual property laws must take account of developing countries' social and economic circumstances.
9. In making decisions about intellectual property law, governments should adhere to these rules:
   - There must be an automatic presumption against creating new areas of intellectual property protection, extending existing privileges or extending the duration of rights.
   - The burden of proof in such cases must lie on the advocates of change.
   - Change must be allowed only if a rigorous analysis clearly demonstrates that it will promote people's basic rights and economic well-being.
   - Throughout, there should be wide public consultation and a comprehensive, objective and transparent assessment of public benefits and detriments.

Manifestet kommer att sändas till världens regeringar och till cheferna för internationella organisationer som WIPO, WTO, UNESCO och FN.

Det är viktigt att biblioteken engagerar sig både nationellt och internationellt för att få gehör för att de nio principerna i The Adelphi Charter skall fungera som ett rättesnöre för lagstiftning och licenser på det upphovsrättsliga området.

The Adelphi Charter. Texten, kommissionsmedlemmarna, kontaktinfo:
http://www.adelphicharter.org/

Kvartalsrappport Oxford Open

Resultaten från det första kvartalet visar markanta skillnadrt mellan discipliner. *Oxford Open* lanserades 1 juli i år av Oxford Journals (Oxford University Press) och ger författare till accepterade artiklar möjlighet att välja OA mot betalning.

21 tidskrifter deltar i första vändan. Ytterligare 19 kommer med efter årsskiftet. *Oxford Open* innebär omedelbar fri tillgänglighet och obegränsad användning för utbildning och forskning.

Sett över all ämnesområden har OA valts av 9 % av författarna men bara inom områdena biovetenskaper och medicin. Inga författare inom humaniora eller samhällsvetenskap har hittills valt OA-vägen.

9 av de 21 tidskrifterna har publicerat OA-artiklar. Skillnaderna är stora mellan tidskrifterna. Vissa biovetenskapliga titlar har publicerar knappa 5 % OA-artiklar och andra ca 17 %. De flesta författare som väljer OA kommer från institiutioner som har prenumeration. Dessa institutioner får enligt *Oxford Open*-modellen rabatt på artikelavgiften: £800 istället för £1500.

Oxford Open är den senaste av de fyra OA-modeller som testas av Oxford Journals. Övriga är delfinansierad OA med *Journal of Experimental Botany*, sponsrad OA med *Evidence-based Complementary and Alternative Medicine* (eCAM) samt full OA med *Nucleic Acids Research* (NAR). NAR är en av de första viktiga naturvetenskapliga tidskrifterna som gick över till full OA (jan 2005). Eftersom NAR fått positivt gensvar från både läsare och författare och antalet insända manus stadigt ökat kommer full OA att fortsätta 2006,

Läs mer om Oxford Open
http://www.oxfordjournals.org/oxfordopen/

NHS England förnyat avtalet med BMC till mars 2008

Medlemskapet innebär att 1,4 miljoner anställda inom *National Health Services England (NHS)* kan fortsätta publicera sina artiklar i BioMed Centrals referentbedömda OA-tidskrifter utan att dra på sig direkta artikelavgifter.

I studien *"How accessible is NHS-funded research to the general public and to the NHS's own researchers?"* fann man att mindre än 30% av NHS-finansierad forskning var tillgänglig för allmänheten och bara 40 % var direkt tillgänglig för NHS-anställda, NHS England tecknade sitt första medlemsavtal med BioMed Central i april 2003 och därefter har det varit en kraftig ökning i support och användning från forskare vid NHS England. Antalet insända manuskript har ökat nästan sex gånger jämfört med första året. 2004 - 2005 (11 nov) har NHS-artiklar i BMC tidskrifter ökat med 51 % och antalet nerladdningar av deras artiklar har ökat fem gånger.

Nyheter och Notiser är sammanställda av **Ingegerd Rabow**, projektledare ScieCom, förste bibliotekarie Lunds Universitets Bibliotek, Biblioteksdirektionen
Ingegerd.Rabow@lub.lu.se

ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

Electronic Publications - Access Now and in the Future

A Seminar at the Royal Library, Stockholm, Sweden, 18 October 2005

Tomas Lundén, Librarian, Lund University Libraries, Head Office
Tomas.Lunden@lub.lu.se

Introduction

Swedish universities and government authorities are increasingly making their publications electronically available on the World Wide Web, either on web sites or in local systems, so called institutional repositories. Standardisation of metadata is a way of increasing access to these publications. Tools and workflows are also being developed to secure long term preservation and access. On 18 October 2005, a seminar presenting and discussing different initiatives and issues in this area, was held at the Swedish Royal Library (KB). The seminar was arranged by BIBSAM, the Royal Library´s Department for National Co-ordination and Development. Entitled "Electronic publications – access now and in the future" the seminar was broad in scope, ranging from technical and organisational issues to political ones, taking in perspectives from both universities (and their libraries) and government authorities, as well as from KB. On the agenda was also the matter of legal deposits of electronic material. [1]

In this brief report, I will focus on the issues raised that concern scientific publications, mainly the results from the SVEP project and the question of legal deposits of electronic material.

The SVEP project

The SVEP project was presented in brief by project coordinator Jan Hagerlid (who was also the moderator of the seminar). SVEP aims

at promoting, coordinating and supporting electronic publishing at Swedish universities and university colleges. The project started in September 2003 and is finished by autumn 2005.

The project has been funded and coordinated by BIBSAM and carried out in close collaboration between nine Swedish university and university college libraries and KB. The major participants besides KB is Uppsala University Library and Lund University Libraries. The project was divided into five work packages, two of which were presented at this seminar. [2]

Stefan Andersson from Uppsala University Library, head of WP1, presented the work concerning interoperability. The project has produced recommendations for metadata (description) formats for electronically published scientific publications, and also common subject categories. The subject categories are based on categories on Swedish research used by Statistics Sweden (Statistiska Centralbyrån) and the Swedish Research Council. These are recommendations that are intended to serve as a guide for universities and university colleges that maintain and develop (or are in the process of starting to develop) institutional repositories for electronic fulltext publications. The implementation of the recommendations will promote the exchange of information and is a prerequisite of developing advanced search services.

The recommendations for fulltext documents function on two levels. On the minimal level the documents will be made available for international service providers through OAI-PMH [3] and on the expanded level (“SVEP level”) they will form the basis for advanced search services and be compatible with other bibliographic databases, for instance Libris, the national library catalogue.

National recommendations have also been developed for local research databases (where the full academic output of a university is registered as references, not necessarily with fulltext linking). The adoption and implementation of these recommendations by universities and research institutions would make it possible, for example, to conduct comparative studies between universities and maintain statistics. It could also be desirable to make Swedish research visible through a joint search service, based on these recommendations. The board of the Association of Swedish Higher Education (SUHF) decided on 31 August to adopt the recommendations.

So all in all, there is a lot to be gained through common formats and standards, perhaps most importantly to avoid duplication of efforts, to make the process of registration and publication as automated as possible, and through intelligent use and re-use of data and metadata support maximum visibility and accessibility of Swedish research output.

Another very important issue concerns long term preservation of electronic publications. This has been the object of WP 2 in SVEP. The aim has been to create a workflow and technical solutions for long term preservation of electronically published documents at Swedish universities.

Considering the development pace of software there is today no guarantee that a specific document or file format will be rightly interpreted in the future, or possible to open and read. As Eva Müller, head of WP2, from Uppsala University Library made clear, these issues are important from several different viewpoints: for researchers (and students), it is of course important to know that their work will be possible to find, read and interpret in the future. For universities, it is important for keeping track of their own research results. For libraries, it is of course part of their fundamental task of providing access to information. And in a larger perspective, it is a matter of preserving our cultural heritage for future generations.

WP 2 has developed the groundwork for an infrastructure which will make easier the process of gathering and preserving documents and their metadata. This is meant to generate a standards-based, automated workflow between the local repository and the Royal Library (KB). The idea is a system of persistent identification of documents, called URN:NBN. [4] A resolution service will keep track of the document and point to the current URL where the document is located. If the URL changes the resolution service will point to the new address thanks to the persistent identifier. Since a copy of the locally published document is to be kept at KB, even if the local repository closes down and its data is lost forever, the resolution service will still point to KB´s copy.

To automate the workflow between the local system and KB, WP2 has been working on something called standardised information packages. These packages contain the document and appropriate metadata (including technical and rights metadata). A prototype for a package tool has also been developed, whereby the creation of the packages could be standardised.

Another part of the workflow is the development and maintenance of a format registry, where information on software and file formats will be stored. This of course will be vital information for securing future access to electronic documents.

The format registry and the package tool are still only prototypes, and the workflow is yet to be realised in practice. This is however the object of an upcoming project lead by Uppsala University Library, to further develop tools and establish the workflow. No

doubt an important part in establishing this will be played by KB.

Legal deposit of electronic material?

KB´s role in the question of long term preservation is to a large extent dependant on if or when a law regulating the legal deposits of electronic material (e-deposits) will be made. There is currently the Statutory Deposit of Copies Act (SFS 1993:1392) regarding printed material (and Sweden has had legal deposit of copies of printed material since 1661), and the e-deposit report was published in 1998 (SOU 1998:111), but has not so far led to any legislation.

Gunilla Jonsson from KB brought this up in her presentation, which dealt with a project on digital deposit to KB. KB has had digital deposits since 2000, and the current project has aimed to improve the technical solutions and develop an infrastructure for deposit of electronic material. The project was similar to SVEP´s WP2 and part of the workflow is a collaboration between the two projects. (It would seem to be a good idea for KB to further coordinate this work in the future.)

The digital deposits originally grew out of an interest from the external parties (small webbased publishers, universities, government authorities etc.) that wanted to preserve their digital output but did not know how or did not have the finances for it. The deposit of material is wholly optional, but is bound by an agreement between KB and the supplier. KB has also since 1997 an automatic harvesting of Swedish web pages, the Kulturarw3 project. What is needed now are guidelines for what the suppliers should deliver and what material can be left to the automated Kulturarw3.

With the support of an e-deposit legislation, Jonsson argued, KB could more efficiently build on their experiences and develop further automated functions in the workflow.

Susanna Broms, Legal Advisor at KB, talked about e-deposits from the legal perspective. She pointed out that several countries have varying kinds of legislation on e-deposits, among them Norway, Denmark, France and Great Britain. The major obstacle in the current system of harvesting and depositing e-material is caution of infringement of copyright and the Personal Data Act (Personuppgiftslag, SFS 1998:204). There is a proposal for a law on e-deposits, this would put the responsibility of delivering the material on the provider and that would mean avoiding the copyright restrictions. Regarding the Personal Data Act, this was stressed by Maria Ljungkvist from the Division for Research Policy, an operational division under the Ministry of Education, Research and Culture. The act aims to prevent the violation of personal

integrity in the processing of personal data, and the Ministry of Justice has according to Ljungkvist, tended to regard even reference lists in official reports and documents as possible sources of violation, if processed in the wrong way.

However, the government wants to investigate the question of e-deposit, as is said in the latest Government research policy bill (2004/05:80). [5] Ljungkvist argued that a new act on e-deposit will be proposed some time in 2006 at the earliest. And since 2006 is an election year, we cannot know how a new government would prioritise the issue. So when an e-deposit legislation actually will come is still unclear.

During the presentations on e-deposits, the issue was raised on what type of material that should be encompassed by an e-deposit legislation. Of course there is a huge diversity of material on the web, so definitions of this are much needed. For example, personal web pages could perhaps be included in Kulturarw3, but not necessarily included in legal deposits. E-deposits should encompass documents with durability, rather than perhaps, dynamic web pages.

At the same time, if this is the case, then we must consider the changing world of scientific publication. Increasingly, research articles can be of a dynamic character, contain multiple objects in different file formats, streaming content, links to data sets and databases etc. So definitions will have to take into account not only technical format, but content and purpose of publication as well.

Discussion and final remarks

Gunnar Sahlin, National Librarian, stated in his concluding remarks that the seminar had focused on questions of the utmost importance, electronic publications and their preservation for the future. The development of electronic journals and other electronic media has of course been vital for the research communities. And the infrastructural matters discussed and presented are essential for the research itself to function. He pointed out that the European Union has acknowledged the need for digital preservation, and that it is included in EU´s Seventh Framework Programme, and hopefully this will lead to a coordination of efforts within the Union.

An interesting question was asked regarding coordination of registration of Swedish research output. Instead of relying on data from Thomson ISI (since ISI has limits), could a national initiative for gathering this data be started? Jan Hagerlid answered that the question has been investigated for some years, and that the Swedish Research Council was interested in building its own database. It was decided that this would probably violate copyrights, since the data would be based on ISI´s data. But

hopefully the recommendations that was produced in SVEP will be adopted and implemented by universities in Sweden, which would make it possible to use the data as a basis for statistics.

Sahlin concluded that better coordination is the next step. KB has more frequent contact with both the Swedish Research Council (VR) and the Association of Swedish Higher Education (SUHF), and the organisations have a greater understanding that cooperation in matters of research infrastructure is needed.

--

[1] The full programme (in Swedish) with powerpoint presentations is available at **http://www.kb.se/BIBSAM/kursokonf/ovriga/elpubl18okt2005.htm**

[2] The results of the other work packages: WP3 has built a national search service for Swedish undergraduate theses and diploma work, while WP4 and WP5 have worked with advice and support on e-publishing – tools, standards, overview of software, seminars and workshops. Full information (in Swedish) including final reports and an independent evaluation of SVEP can be found on the project´s web site: **http://www.svep-projekt.se/**

[3] Open Archives Initiative - Protocol for Metadata Harvesting, is a standard whereby electronic publications in a local repository can be harvested in a simple format by service providers globally. See: **http://www.openarchives.org/**

[4] Uniform Resource Name:National Bibliographic Number. More info: **http://www.kb.se/urn/**

[5] Government research policy bill 2004/05:80 (Forskningspolitiska propositionen), pp. 108-111. **http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/04/11/35/6effb2fa.pdf**

--

Svensk sammanfattning

Svenska högskolor och myndigheter publicerar alltmer material elektroniskt på webben. Den 18 oktober 2005 hölls ett BIBSAM-arrangerat seminarium på KB, betitlat ”Elektroniska publikationer - tillgänglighet nu och i framtiden”. Det var ett brett seminarium som behandlade olika aspekter av e-publicering, tekniska, organisatoriska och politiska. Standardisering av metadata, verktyg och arbetsflöden för att säkra tillgång och bevarande i framtiden, var exempelvis saker som togs upp. Denna artikel berör frågor

som främst rör vetenskapliga publikationer.

SVEP-projektets resultat presenterades, med fokus på två delprojekt, DP1 och DP2. DP1: Interoperabilitet, presenterat av projektledaren Stefan Andersson, har utvecklat rekommendationer för metadatabeskrivningar av elektroniskt publicerade vetenskapliga publikationer, samt även för s.k. publiceringsdatabaser (lokala register för akademisk publicering). Syftet är att genom en harmonisering av metadatan främja utbyte av information och ge förutsättningar för olika tjänster. DP2: Långtidsbevarande, som presenterades av Eva Müller, har utarbetat grunden till en infrastruktur för att kunna bevara och återfinna elektroniska dokument i framtiden. Systemet bygger på ett automatiserat arbetsflöde mellan det lokala institutionella arkivet och KB, där flera olika komponenter ingår, som en uppslagstjänst och ett format- och datamiljölexikon. Dessa är ännu prototyper, men ska utvecklas vidare.

På seminariet togs också frågan om e-pliktlag upp. Gunilla Jonsson tryckte på vikten av en sådan lag för KB:s del, för att man effektivt ska kunna fortsätta utveckla automatiserade funktioner och förbättra hanteringen kring digitala leveranser. Susanna Broms tog upp det juridiska perspektivet, och presenterade det förslag om e-pliktlag som finns. Upphovsrätten och personuppgiftslagen är frågor som är knutna till insamlande av elektroniskt material och som Maria Ljungvist från Forskningspolitiska enheten framhöll, är det frågor som måste lösas innan e-pliktlagen är ett faktum. Men möjligen kan det bli en proposition under 2006. Beroende bl.a. på resultatet i riksdagsvalet hösten 2006, så kan man dock inte säga exakt när en e-pliktlag kommer.

Riksbibliotekarie Gunnar Sahlin avslutade seminariet med att poängtera att mer samordning kring forskningens infrastrukturella frågor är nästa steg. KB har tätare kontakter med Vetenskapsrådet och SUHF och en större förståelse finns för samarbete i dessa frågor.

ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

Modes of Publication and Scientific Quality

Thomas Brante, Professor,
Department of Sociology, Lund University
Thomas.Brante@soc.lu.se

In her article *Open Access and Journal Publication in the Social Sciences and the Humanities*, Director Ulla Carlsson raises interesting questions concerning the currently strong tendency to steer the "softer" sciences to adopt quality criteria employed in the "harder" sciences. One frequently suggested way of doing this is by measuring scientific quality primarily or solely by degree of publication in international, peer-reviewed journals. Such a method would facilitate comparisons between individual authors, departments as well as universities, locally as well as internationally. It would also provide simple, mechanic measures for resource allocation.

In order to make clear what the suggestion might imply, let me take up an example. In a recent, well-known study by Simon Hix, London School of Economics, political science departments are internationally ranked. Hix measured quality by counting how many articles a university department had published in certain international journals using anonymous referees. The sum was divided by the number of researchers at the department, and the resulting figure is used to position the university on the quality list.

Swedish universities unfortunately ranked quite low. Gothenburg ended up at position 223, Stockholm 318 and Uppsala 377, out of 400 universities – a result that, unsurprisingly, started some heated debate in Sweden where one professor claimed that in order to make Swedish universities climb on the list, from now on, national resource allocation should be governed by this measure only, in all disciplines.

Now Hix himself raises some doubts about his method. For example, referee-evaluations are subjective, political scientists publish in different ways, e.g. by writing whole books or articles in anthologies, and these publications are not included or 'caught' by his measure. Further, many social scientists prefer to publish in their own language.

However, there are more problems, of a structural kind. First there is the selection of journals that you must publish in. These are selected after 'impact', which is the number of citations the journal generates. (The citations are counted from a sample of primarily North American journals.) Of the 63 journals, at the top position we find *American Political Science Review*, followed by *American Journal of Political Science*, and the list shows that almost exclusively, American or Anglo-Saxon journals are involved (only 6 journals are not written in English).

So which universities are the best in the world? 1. Columbia, 2. Harvard, 3. Stanford, 4. Ohio State, 5. European University Institute (English-speaking), 6. California, San Diago, 7. California, Irvine, 8. Indiana, 9. Princeton, 10. Yale, 11. California, Berkeley, 12. Michigan State, 13. Chicago, 14. California, Los Angeles. And so on.

It is not difficult to discern a clear connection here. It resides between American journals of political science with American political scientists as editors, in which American political scientists quote each other at the same time as they work at American universities and belong to the same American associations and meet at national American congresses.

It would have been interesting to see alternative lists, in which the selection of quoted journals had been undertaken by Russian, Chinese, French, German or Brazilian political scientists. I suspect that the ranking order would have differed substantially, and that the American universities quite naturally would have ended up in considerably more modest positions.

Examples of proposals for introducing methods of this kind for measuring and ranking scientific quality can be multiplied. Their virtue is of course their simplicity and straight-forwardness. However, serious doubts can be raised concerning their validity. Do they really measure what they are supposed to measure?

The issue of validity is what Ulla Carlsson also raises, in her last but one paragraph: - "How fair a measure is publication? Does something go lost if we concentrate too narrowly on international publication? What are the consequences of the fact that what we call "international publication" today is in essence publication in the

Anglo-American sphere?"

In my opinion, the validity of these measures must be very low. First, productivity is not tantamount to quality, and second, productivity is not tantamount to publishing in Anglo-American journals. Thus, I don't think Swedish universities, or for that matter Russian or French, which for self-evident reasons also rank low on Hix's scale, should care or worry too much about results of this kind, and above all, they should not let them govern their research policy.

Another way of discussing and evaluating proposals for new quality measures is to start with the current research- and publication situation for the social sciences and the humanities. (Obviously, behind all proposals for new measures is the assumption that the present situation is poor, badly in need of improvement.) Let me do this by presenting four types of Swedish social scientists (the examples are real):

> Scientist A writes ten articles per year, in the right journals. Hence, A is obviously productive. The problem is that by and large, A writes the same article all the time; the differences concerns the title, some ways of reasoning, some references. A frequently visits international congresses, presenting the same thesis year in and year out.
>
> Scientist B sends out a questionnaire to 500 individuals. It contains questions about some background variables plus 50 other questions. The answers are run through a statistical computer program. Thereafter, B takes the background variables and one or two of the other questions and writes a five-page article of the results. It takes three days. B does the same with the other variables, generating 25 articles that are published in refereed journals suitable for the purpose. This procedure is repeated each year, engendering an enormous productivity.
>
> Scientist C publishes one article every second year. The article is always very well formulated, well thought out, original and innovative. (C thinks that far too much rubbish is written – writing for its own sake – and does not want to contribute to the overproduction of trivialities.)
>
> Scientist D writes his own books, participates in anthologies, publishes articles in Swedish journals and debates in the media. Keeping á jour with the research front, D writes textbooks that are used in university education. However, he writes in Swedish only.

If the suggestions for increasing productivity would be firmly implemented, C (the intellectual) and D (the nationally oriented) are indeed unproductive and superfluous at the future university. What remains will be the to the American norm well-adapted 'publication neurotics'.

Is this a desirable scenario? Is Swedish social science (and the humanities) to be pursued in order to enhance Sweden's international reputation? Or should it be pursued in order to increase our knowledge about social reality, and to deliver it also to the Swedish people, who indeed picks up the bill for it?

The problem with Swedish social science is not that we are not sufficiently subordinated to American journals and research orientations. And it is not that scientists need new structures of incitement, that is, are stimulated to obtain means to their department by working strategically in order to increase publication in the right journals. The problem is what has been emphasized in several reports during the last decade; that decreasing funding and increasing work-loads (more students, more of the third task, more administrative work, more applications for decreasing external research funds, more political steering etc) leads to decreased research time. You cannot "do research" effectively for one hour between two hours of lecturing and another administrative meeting about the Bologna process. Research requires longer uninterrupted time intervals, which is in short supply at Swedish universities today.

The solution to the problem is not more steering, not more centralization and slow large-scale programs, but the opposite: the return of resources to the faculties, departments and single scientists. With increased autonomy, social scientists and humanists can more easily adopt to the international research front. In this context, open access publications would be a powerful tool for improving scientific discussion and quality per se. And quality should be measured with several criteria, including perhaps more difficult and cumbersome but also much more valid criteria such as originality and depth. The standards of science should not be sacrificed on the altar of bureaucratic rationality!

ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

The Why and How of JISC Support for Open Access

Frederick J. Friend, JISC Consultant, OSI Open Access Advocate, Honorary Director Scholarly Communication UCL
ucylfjf@ucl.ac.uk

What is JISC?

The acronym JISC stands for Joint Information Systems Committee, and it is funded by and responsible to the UK Higher Education and Further Education Funding Councils.[1] Although still a Committee, it is in practice also an organisation, with an Executive and a budget. The Committee agrees the overall strategy and much of the implementation of that Strategy is carried out within six sub-committees and working groups responsible to those sub-committees. The commitment to support open access – for example JISC's signature to the Berlin Declaration - is set at main Committee level, but the implementation of the commitment to open access falls under the Content Services Sub-Committee and the Integrated Information Environment Sub-Committee, and in turn much of the detailed work is carried out within the Journals Working Group, the Repositories and Preservation Advisory Group, and the Scholarly Communication Group. Each of these sub-committees and groups has in membership a mix of academic and library staff from universities and colleges, together with members of the JISC Executive and when appropriate some international members.

What does JISC do?

On the JISC web-site [2] the answer to this question is that "JISC provides a centralised and co-ordinated direction for the development of the infrastructure and activities" in respect of "new

environments for learning, teaching and research; access to resources; a world-class network (JANET); guidance on institutional change; advisory and consultancy services; regional support for FE colleges". It will be understood that JISC's role is complementary to and supportive of the role of institutions in determining their information strategies. The commitment to open access is intended to assist universities and colleges as they move into new information environments for learning, teaching and research, using the opportunities provided by the networks to improve access to academic resources. Support for open access has developed as JISC staff have listened to the needs of teachers, researchers and students, monitored national and international developments, and investigated the applicability of new models of information provision to the UK situation.

Why does JISC support open access?

The support for open access has developed out of JISC experience of a variety of models of information provision. The Journals Working Group, for example, has many years' experience of both the benefits and problems of national purchasing models, through the Pilot Site Licence Initiative (PSLI), the National Electronic Site Licence Initiative (NESLI), and currently NESLi2. These programmes have provided good value for money for UK universities and colleges in purchasing large sets of text and data, but much of the content needed by users could not be purchased under a national programme because of the time taken to negotiate a national deal. The open access model provides an opportunity to make available to lecturers, researchers and students all the content they need on open web-sites.

Of particular concern to the JISC Scholarly Communication Group has been the fact that much of the content produced by the UK's own academic community has been locked away behind subscription barriers, and its use by UK lecturers, researchers and students restricted under licensing terms favourable only to publishers and not to authors and users. The open access model respects authors' rights but cuts through the Gordian Knot of restrictions, making UK research outputs available world-wide, including to our own community. Statements such as the Berlin Declaration support open access as a principle, but JISC's support for the principle has developed from practical experience of supporting UK academic staff and students in their need to secure the information resources they need.

How does JISC support open access?

1. Support for open access journals
In its work to improve access for teachers, researchers and students to articles in academic journals the JISC Journals Working

Group is aware that high-quality content is now available in many open access journals, and that some publishers wish to trial an open access business model. In order to encourage these developments the Group proposed a three-year programme of funding for publishers moving from a subscription model to an open access model. [3] Only a small sum (£150K per annum) in relation to the huge size of the UK journals market could be made available for this programme, but JISC's commitment has been important as a sign to publishers that JISC wishes to work with them on open access developments. It is recognised that the biggest risk for publishers lies in the transition period, until authors and funding agencies support open access publication costs through research grants. It is clear from the reports received from publishers during the first two years of this programme that submissions by UK authors to open access journals have increased and that quality of publication has been maintained. These issues and the effect upon the publishers will be considered in an evaluation of the funding programme currently being commissioned.

2. Support for open access repositories

The support for institutional repositories began within JISC before the spotlight was turned upon open access as a principle. The JISC Executive was hearing from universities and colleges that electronic teaching packs were being developed, that some students wished to submit their theses and dissertations electronically, and that some authors were asking for a secure place to deposit electronic copies of their journal articles. Aware of international developments such as the OAI Protocol, the JISC Executive proposed a programme called Focus on Access to Institutional Resources (FAIR). [4] Fourteen projects were funded under the FAIR Programme 2002-05 to explore how staff and students could deposit academic content in a secure institutional repository. Although the initial motivation was to enable sharing of UK-developed resources across the UK, the FAIR projects adopted an open access approach in opening up those resources to users across the world.

The success of the FAIR Programme provided the stimulus for a broader programme of repository support, the new Digital Repositories Programme. [5] The aim of this Programme is "to bring together people and practices from across various domains…. to ensure the maximum degree of coordination in the development of digital repositories". The emphasis upon coordination (while still respecting institutional autonomy) is a strong feature of the new Programme, as is the inclusion of a subject as well as an institutional approach to repository development. Twenty-one new projects have been funded with the £4 million made available for this Programme, and a further substantial sum has been allocated for repository and preservation developments from funds just released. Support is also being given by the Scholarly

Communication Group to the development of a UK PubMed Central, a development led by the Wellcome Trust and other medical research organizations.

3. Support for fact-finding

Everybody working for JISC is conscious that we are exploring new territory in the changes taking place in scholarly communication, and at each stage developments are assessed on a factual basis. Evaluation plays a key role in each programme and project. The JISC Scholarly Communication Group has also commissioned a number of studies to help us learn about changes taking place within various stakeholder groups. The Group has supported Key Perspectives in two surveys of author attitudes to open access, the first survey in collaboration with the Open Society Institute. [6] A recent study by a distinguished publisher, Mary Waltham, has contributed to our understanding of learned society business models, while another report by RightsCom highlighted both the differences and the similarities between researchers from various disciplines in their use of resources. [7] The Scholarly Communication Group is about to commission further work on version identification in repositories, and on the use of research content in e-learning. Such work may be used to inform future policy decisions.

Collaboration the key to success

Throughout its open access work JISC has made collaboration with other stakeholders in the UK and internationally a high priority. Because funding for JISC is top-sliced from funds available for teaching and research, JISC has a particular wish to work with staff and students in UK universities and colleges. Publishers are also recognised as an important stakeholder group and many discussions have taken place with publishers on open access issues. Some of the developments within institutional repositories – such as the procedures for the electronic submission of theses – do not relate to publisher interests, but when they do JISC listens to the publishers' point of view. The close collaboration between related organizations in the UK is illustrated by the open access commitment contained in a statement from four organizations: Research Councils UK, CCRLC, the Research Information Network and JISC.[8]

Equally important to JISC is collaboration with organizations in other countries undertaking similar work. The partnership between JISC and SURF, the Netherlands information organization, has been particularly valuable, for example in studying the copyright aspects to open access. Close contact is also maintained with work on repository development in Australia, through an agreement for regular sharing of information. The Berlin Declaration meetings and the continuing work under the Open Archives Initiative provide fora

where JISC staff can discuss developments with colleagues from a wide circle of countries, and the JISC Executive is keen to contribute its experience and to learn from experience in any organization committed to open access. All of us within JISC who support open access developments as part of our commitment to foster the sharing of high-quality academic content know that collaboration with colleagues who share our vision is the key to success.

--

[1] JISC´s annual budget is GB £65 million. In addition to that JISC receives some special grants, for example for repository development

[2] **http://www.jisc.ac.uk**

[3] The press release describing the third year of funding under this programme was issued on 18 October 2005 and is available at **http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=open_access3rd**

[4] **http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=programme_fair**

[5] **http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=programme_digital_repositories**

[6] The two surveys are available at **http://www.keyperspectives.co.uk/openaccessarchive/reports.html**

[7] A press release with links to both reports is available at **http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=schol_comms_reports**

[8] The statement and open access questions and answers are at **http://www.jisc.ac.uk/issue_qaopen.html**

--

ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

The Simple Book

Sara Gidlund, Editor at Gidlunds Förlag, which publishes around 30 titles a year

The development of technology has made the manufacturing of your own book a common option. As a publisher, this makes me very happy. Almost everyone knows how to use a computer for word processing or knows someone who may help them. Handbooks can teach you how to typeset your text in a correct way, how to have the printouts cut down to a manageable format, how to get them bound, and how to send the obligatory copies to the university libraries, making the book available to anyone that wishes to read it. To have your book printed in a modest edition need not cost more than a skiing vacation. By selling the book you can earn back your expenses – perhaps you can even make a profit. Most importantly, you can delight in the book's existence. You leave behind something of lasting value to yourself and maybe, but not necessarily, to others.

However, the printed book seems to demand a complement in our contemporary world. As an artifact, the book is practical and enriching, but it appears to play an increasingly supportive role in the learning society. In a scientifical context, it's often deemed as insufficient as regards our expectations of information. Our public libraries must now offer access to the Internet to be worth their salt. The universities present a large part of their research via open access. Anything else would be unthinkable. In theory, you may gather knowledge enough for a master's degree without unfolding a single book.

The major part of the books published by my company (run by three persons) are wholly or partially financed by foundations or

other institutions. Approximately 50 per cent is made up of dissertations from the field of humanities. The financial support accorded to us pays for production, copyright costs, editorial work and storage, marketing and distribution. The finished book will be found in libraries and book stores, indexed in publication databases, and sent to the press for review.

Computerization has led to the publishing houses taking over many of the printer's traditional tasks: typesetting, image reproduction, proofs, make-up. The printer will nowadays mostly "just" print. The first copy to come out of the printing press carries a cost approaching the cost of a small car, the second will cost about the same as a loaf of bread. It's understandable if the doctoral candidate, instead of turning to the expensive services of a publishing house, will make stencilled copies for use and distribution within the academic world, or choose digital methods of publication. Even so, I know that the result of the editor's efficient and often rewarding work together with the author is noticed and acknowledged well beyond the sphere of academics. The book has been made a part of the tried and tested literary chain, and takes its self-evident place in the arena. For future projects, it may also be a good thing to have an established contact with a publisher whose routines and workflow you are acquainted with.

Gidlunds also publishes books aimed at the market: course books that year after year are used in humanistic education. The workload and costs is effectively the same as for dissertations, the difference lies in bigger editions and the royalty to the authors. Dissertations may sometimes also become course books, and thus printed in second editions, generating an income for the ex doctoral student. It probably won't be a large amount of money, but it demonstrates the dissertation's potential for widespread interest – something which the publishers may hope for, but never presuppose, when making publication decisions.

Open access in humanities

The humanistic research that we publish is written in Swedish and aimed mostly at the universities and the book market in Scandinavia – our field of activity is limited. By allowing open access to digital versions of our publications, we obviously diminish the amount of sold and lent books, which will in turn increase the need for funding. I therefore think that the author and the publisher ought to agree at an early stage which form of publication should have priority. The author must ask himself if the published text is the text to be offered for free, and what the intention of the publication is.

An important aspect that needs to be taken into special

consideration is the rights and costs of the graphic images in the book. Most photo libraries offer no free use of graphic material in a scientific context. The right of publication that the publisher pays for is for usage in the printed book only. If the image is to reproduced electronically, this means additional and significant extra costs.

Many of our titles are available in digital versions through Bibliotekstjänst (BTJ – provider of information services and media products to libraries, book sellers, publishers, companies and institutions). Our co-operation with them is easily manageable, as their terms do not differ much from the ordinary library agreements. For every copy that is borrowed, compensation is paid to the author and the publisher. They also operate an e-bookstore where you can pay for and download the book. For every title to be published digitally by BTJ, a contract is signed between the author and the publisher that gives BTJ the sole rights of digital publication, and states the responsibily to render account of the number of copies lent or sold. As a publisher, we appreciate the precise and familiar way of such a co-operation. The author as well as ourselves needs to know that the book we've envisioned before and during our work continues to be presented in accordance with our intentions.

Relevant resources on the Internet:
http://www.littvet.uu.se/lsoc/index.htm
http://www.kb.se/nvb/

Svensk sammanfattning

Vi på Gidlunds ägnar oss till största delen åt hel- eller delfinansierad bokutgivning. Omkring hälften av den utgörs av humanistiska doktorsavhandlingar. Produktionsstödet vi erhåller rymmer kostnaderna för teknisk produktion, rättighetskostnader, redaktionellt arbete samt lager, marknadsföring och distribution.

Ett bokförlags omkostnader är höga och det är begripligt om en doktorand offentliggör sin avhandling genom stencilexemplar och/ eller elektroniska publiceringsformer. De fördelar som följer med förlagsutgivning rör de standardiserade rutinerna, framtida samarbeten och bokens erfarna plats på den offentliga arenan.

Författare och förlag bör tidigt komma överens om vilken publiceringsform som ska komma i första hand. Författaren bör fråga sig om just boken är den text som ska släppas fri, samt vad han eller hon har för avsikt med sin offentliga publicering. En viktig aspekt att uppmärksamma är publiceringskostnader och rättigheter för böckernas bildmaterial. Ska bilder publiceras elektroniskt tillkommer stora kostnader. Produktionsbidraget som förlaget erhåller måste täcka även det.

Som förlag uppskattar vi den tydliga och väl inarbetade formen för samarbetet med Bibliotekstjänst, då deras rutiner rörande e-boken inte skiljer sig nämnvärt från de vanliga biblioteksavtalen. Vi och författaren vet att boken vi båda haft i åtanke under vårt gemensamma arbete, presenteras i enlighet med våra avsikter.

ScieCom info
Svenskt Resurscentrum
för vetenskaplig kommunikation
www.sciecom.org

Trials and Tribulations? Editing *Information Research*, an Open Access Electronic Journal

Tom Wilson, Professor, PhD,
Publisher and Editor-in-Chief
Information Research: an international electronic journal

Introduction

The title of this piece is tongue-in-cheek, since the process of developing Information Research (**http://InformationR.net/ir/**) has been almost totally free of 'trials and tribulations', from its inception as the electronic version of a departmental newsletter, to its present status as a fully peer-reviewed scholarly journal with a world-wide readership.

The journal was first published in 1995, at the beginning of the revolution in information provision over the Web and its development since then has mirrored the rise and continued rise of the electronic journal as a serious medium of scientific communication.

That rise is indicated by the size of the archive at *NewJour*, a Web-site that lists new electronic journals and from which an e-mail service of announcements is run. NewJour began life in 1993 as part of the Association of Research Libraries directory of electronic resources. In early 1995 there were 250 items in the archive, there are now (October 2005) 16,453 items. Not all of these are serious, academic journals: NewJour lists newsletters, popular magazines, trade journals and, indeed, any item that can be described as a periodical publication. A similar story could be told by examining the *Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)*, which, at its launch

included 350 titles and now (11 November 2005) has 1,904 quality controlled (editor or peer-reviewed) journals.

Information Research is now in its eleventh year of publication. It had its origins in a small newsletter, *CRUS News*, which reported on the work of the Centre for Research in User Studies. *CRUS News* came to a natural end on the cessation of the Centre's contract and it was decided to expand the role of *CRUS News* and to use it (under the title *Information Research News*) to publish working papers on research in the Department.

IRN was published from 1990 to 1997 in paper form and, from April 1995 (under the title *Information Research*), also in electronic form. During 1994/95 it became evident that continuing to publish *IRN* on paper did not make economic sense: when all costs were included, the income from the small number of subscriptions barely covered production costs, and in the course of 1995 it became evident that the electronic version, *Information Research*, was reaching many more readers than the paper version had ever done and, therefore, in 1997 the decision was taken to publish only the electronic version.

The aims and functions of *Information Research*

Information Research was originally designed to publish working papers, rather than fully elaborated papers that could be exposed to referees. However, from the response to the papers, in terms of the usage data as well as e-mail messages, it became evident that the journal was accepted as a 'normal' academic journal. Over the first three years, therefore, the aims of the journal changed from publishing mainly working papers based on research carried out in the Department of Information Studies at the University of Sheffield, to publishing working papers, invited papers (known as 'guest papers') from outside the Department, and then (from 1998), fully refereed papers. We now publish research papers of a quality that would be acceptable in a print journal, using referees who serve in the same role for other leading journals in the field, some of whom are members of the Editorial Board.

Production and use

The production process

The production process of *Information Research* is quite straightforward: submissions are received as e-mail attachments and, if thought within the scope of the journal, are sent either directly to referees or to one or other of the regional editors. Referees' reports (on a standard response sheet) are received and returned to the author by e-mail, with the decision whether to publish, to publish with revisions (which may or may not require re-

submission), or to reject. Currently, approximately 30% of submissions eventually make publication.

Authors are asked to submit their final version in HTML using a template available on the journal site. This usually means that some HTML editing is needed before the paper can be published. Generally, however, most of the preparation has been done by the author.

Economics

In its original form, the economics of *Information Research* were relatively trivial: the Department used the University's Web server and, therefore, no capital costs were involved, one person (the author) converted original papers into HTML format and passed them to the Department's Computer Manager for uploading to the Web-site. In all, the work-load was probably not more than two person-days a month at a cost (if it was to be charged) of, say, £150.00. Since the Web-site was run and maintained by the University's central computer services, there were no readily identifiable maintenance costs separately attributable to Information Research. Material costs were similarly insignificant, since the papers were already in electronic form and all editing and conversion was done on the electronic versions.

Editorial work of one kind or another is generally accepted as falling within the normal work of an academic member of staff in a British university, and in many others around the world. We are encouraged to serve on Editorial Boards, to act as referees, and to serve as Editors. These tasks are seen as part of the involvement in research. In a real sense, universities subsidise the activities of publishers through the involvement of staff members. It would seem curious if any single university was to seek to prevent similar involvement in electronic journal production from within the institution itself! For both commercial publishers and for the institution itself, this kind of involvement is seen as "cost-free" by the university because it adds to the research reputation of the institution.

The production of a *free* electronic journal has certain benefits in terms of costs: it is not necessary to keep records of subscribers, no accounts need to be kept or audited, no letters have to be sent to subscribers urging them to renew, we pay no commission to other businesses to act as agents, we have no offices within which all of these activities are carried out and employ no staff to perform them. These costs are quite significant for both paper and electronic subscription journals: for example, Fisher in a paper to the Conference on Scholarly Communication and Technology in 1997, provided a comparison of the overhead costs associated with an 'issue' of the e-journal *Chicago Journal of Theoretical Computer*

Science (a subscription journal) with those of an issue of the paper journal *Neural Computation*.

She concluded that the overhead costs of the e-journal (per issue) were more than 1,000% higher than the print journal. However, she goes on to note that this disparity is largely a function of the amount of content published by CJTCS in the 18 months over which overhead was calculated, compared with the distribution over 12 issues of the print journal, NC. In other words, like was not being compared with like. In addition, Fisher counted the costs of the Digital Projects Laboratory, both staff and hardware, into the overhead costs of CJTCS, but did not count in similar technology costs (e.g., machine maintenance of printers) into the overheads of *Neural Computation*. If these costs had been included, as well as other overheads not found in e-journals (e.g., distribution), the contrast would have been much less.

This comparison suggests that the key to overhead costs is whether or not the journal is freely distributed. If you do not have subscribers, but only readers, a significant overhead costs is clearly removed: in the case of CJTCS these were calculated at $31,050.

In the case of *Information Research*, there are no direct management costs, since I am providing my time freely. However, we can ask what the editorial costs would be if I was working for a publisher. Fortunately, I have some guidance on this as I was offered £2,500 a year to serve as Editor by a publisher who wished to take over the journal. Let us assume that I spend two days a week over the course of the year – less holiday time – in my Editorial role. This means that the publisher values my time at £20 (€30) a day (i.e., excluding weekends and four weeks' holiday), rather than the £75 an hour the University would have charged for allocating my costs to other projects! There are four issues a year, so the editorial costs of each issue would amount to £625 (€925). In volume 10 of the journal we published 41 papers, giving a per paper management cost of £61. Scholarly papers are generally between 15 and 20 printed pages: if we assume the lower of these numbers, the overhead cost per page would be £4.00 or €5.9, which happens to be about half the cost of the print journal referred to by Fisher.

As in the case of print journals, the costs of referees, Editorial Board members, book reviewers, etc., are not met by me as publisher, but by the employing institutions, since these persons provide their time freely.

In reality, therefore, as none of these costs are actually charged, the journal costs no one anything to produce.

Usage

2005-Rank	Domain	% 2005
1.	United States	17.7
2.	United Kingdom	14.6
3.	Australia	4.5
4.	Canada	3.5
5.	US Commercial	2.9
6.	US Educational	2.7
7.	Malaysia	2.6
8.	India	2.2
9.	Network	2.2
10.	Sweden	2.0
11.	Spain	1.9
12.	China	1.8
	Total	58.6

Table 1

Information Research is a heavily 'hit' site: the counter statistics of usage since 1st April 1998, show (at 8th November 2005) that the top page of the journal has had 250,651 hits - or approximately 2,700 a month. This, of course, is not the true total - since users go directly to specific papers, as a result of search-engine hits and back to the same papers to re-read or pick up references, or whatever. Users come from 178 Internet domains, plus 8.8% from unknown domains. The highest-using domains are shown in Table 1.

The fact that these twelve domains cover almost 60% of usage and that 8.8% is from "Unknown" means that the remaining domains have very small usage.

Hits are a relatively crude way of assessing usage, but one of the few ways we have when producing electronic journals. We also suggest, however, that readers should register to receive information on the timing and contents of new issues and there are currently approximately 3,000 registered users. Seventy percent of the registered readers came from 13 countries out of the total of 104 (twice as many countries as in 1998): these countries are shown in table 2:

USA	500	18.63
United Kingdom	439	16.36

Australia	231	8.61
Canada	142	5.29
India	115	4.28
Netherlands	75	2.79
Malaysia	72	2.68
China	70	2.61
South Africa	56	2.09
Indonesia	48	1.79
Iran	46	1.71
Brazil	45	1.68
Finland	42	1.56

Table 2

The future of *Information Research*

The main issue to be faced by the publisher of a journal such as Information Research is how to ensure its continuation, dependant, as it has been on one person. Recently, the situation has changed in two ways: first, I have recruited three volunteer regional editors for North American, the Luso-Hispanic countries, and the 'rest of the world' outside these areas and Europe – i.e., Africa, the Middle East and the Far East. These regional editors manage the refereeing process, thereby relieving the Editor in Chief of some of the work. Secondly, the physical site has been moved to the University of Lund Libraries and will be managed by the team that already manages the Directory of Open Access Journals. This will enable some technical development to take place, which will reduce the Editor-in-Chief's work and enable the automatic production of the author and subject indexes.

The collaborative model is a very interesting one from the point of view of the scholarly journal because it distributes whatever workload there is over several institutions and allows for more institutions to join the consortium if the workload grows. To a degree, it is also the model employed by the print publishers, but the fact that much work is undertaken free of charge at the cost of employing institutions is not often publicized.

Conclusion - the future of the free scholarly journal

The growth of free electronic journals depends upon a number of factors:

a. the extent to which researchers in new and/or multidisciplinary fields find it difficult to publish in core

journals and difficult to persuade commercial publishers of the existence of a big enough market for a print journal;

b. whether speed of publication and world-wide exposure will outweigh the perceived value of the citation of papers in print journals;

c. how quickly electronic journals come to be covered by the citation indexes;

d. how much longer academic institutions and governments will be prepared to tolerate the present uneconomic situation in which they are, effectively, subsidising the profits of commercial publishers;

e. whether the scientific societies will find new sources of income through gaining sponsorship of free electronic journals to replace the income they get by contracting commercial publishers to produce their journals.

All of these are big questions and papers could be written on each of them, but I hope that the logic and economics of the free publication of scholarly research will be overwhelming and that we shall see a return to the ethos of the free interchange of knowledge in a genuine community of scholars. The collaborative model that is now emerging in Information Research offers a model for institutions world wide and it is becoming more and more obvious that we no longer need to depend upon the technology that has served research well for the past 350 years, and the new technology offers not only speedy publication but multimedia publication, which is very attractive for many fields. The new technology will give rise to new models of the process of scientific communication and, for academic institutions, new models of the research dissemination activities of their staff members. When all the circumstances are right, the trickle of new, free e-journals will become a flood - and will cause new problems for librarians and users.

Note: an earlier and somewhat expanded version of this paper, with which comparisons can be made, can be found at **http://informationr.net/tdw/publ/papers/isipap98.html**

References

Fisher, J.H. (1997) *Comparing Electronic Journals to Print Journals: Are There Savings?* Paper delivered to the

Conference on Scholarly Communication and Technology, Emory University, April 24-25 1997. Available at: **http://www.arl.org/scomm/scat/fisher.HTML** Site visited 25th August 1998.

NewJour: electronic journals and newsletters. (1998) [*Archive site*] Available at **http://gort.ucsd.edu/newjour/** Site visited 25th August 1998.