

# sciecominfo

---

Nordic-Baltic Forum for Scientific Communication

Vol 7, No 3 (2011) 7

Vol 7, No 3 (2011)

## Table of Contents

Events	1
News & Notices	2-3
<b>Articles</b>	
OPEN MINDS: An interview with members of the FinnOA working group <i>Turid Hedlund</i>	4-5
OPEN MINDS: An interview with Ian Watson, Bifröst University in Iceland <i>Solveig Thorsteinsdottir</i>	6-7
OPEN MINDS - Interviews with Lithuanian politicians and famous researchers about Open Access <i>Emilija Banionyte, Ausra Vaskeviciene, Gintare Tautkeviciene</i>	8-14
The Mega-journals are coming! <i>Jan Erik Frantsovåg</i>	15-16
Exploring Handheld Devices and Digital Learning: the iPad project at Oslo University College <i>Trude Eikebrokk, Bettina Grødem Knutsen, Jimi Thaulé</i>	17-20
"Carrot or stick, incentives or mandates, or both" <i>Tania Ström</i>	21-24
<i>We have won the argument about Open Access –now we have to bring things together and make it work!</i> <i>Lars Björnshauge</i>	25-28

## Events 2011:3

### **The 6th Munin conference 22-23 November 2011 – Enhancing publications**

The most important annual conference on scientific publishing in Norway, the Munin Conference, is staged each year in November by the University of Tromsø Library. This year's conference is scheduled to take place Tuesday 22. and Wednesday 23. November. A key theme this year is "enhancing publications", meaning any kind of extra services surrounding the publishing of scientific articles. Making available research data is one important issue to be focused.

The conference has two keynote speakers:

- Cameron Neylon, Senior Scientist in Biomolecular Sciences at the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC), UK
- Martin Rasmussen, director, Copernicus Publications

Cameron Neylon has done a lot of work on the issue of modern scientific publishing. He will give a presentation with the following title: "I need to publish more and read less! How new platforms will enable you to publish more effectively while reducing information overload". Cameron Neylon will discuss new tools and new possibilities in the publishing process, and also new possibilities for scholars' in their process of sorting out what they should and need not read.

Martin Rasmussen's presentation has the title "Ensuring Availability and Quality of Research Data through Open Access and Public Peer-Review". Copernicus is doing interesting things on Open Access to research data. Furthermore, their journal Earth System Science Data has an innovative interactive public peer-review, which also will be demonstrated and discussed by Martin Rasmussen.

Several more speakers and issues are covered by this year's Munin Conference. This year the conference for the first time announced a call for presentations and

posters, which resulted in contributions on various topics, within the issue of scientific publishing.

The day after the conference, Thursday 24. November, the University of Tromsø will host a national open access workshop day, primarily for people working with open archives and open access publishing in Norway. This may also become an annual event.

Please visit the conference website at <http://www.ub.uit.no/MC6> for more information, and to register for the conference.

---

### **Meeting Place Open Access – Mötesplats Open Access 14-15 March, 2012 in Norrköping, Sweden.**

An annual event for an active exchange of ideas between research librarians, researchers, administrators etc. Theme: Electronic publishing at the universities. The conference is arranged by the development programme OpenAccess.se at the Swedish royal Library and Linköping University Library. Read [more](#) about Mötesplats Open Access 2012

---

### **Structural frameworks for open, digital research - strategy, policy & infrastructure, Nordbib 2012, Copenhagen**

This international conference & workshop takes place in the Royal Library's conference halls, Copenhagen Denmark, June 11th-13th 2012.

The subject of the conference is the overall political, organisational and technical framework for doing open, digital research both presently and with a view to the 8th Framework Programme (FP8). Many different organisations are sitting with each their piece of the overall infrastructural jigsaw puzzle that needs to be laid before cultural and scientific information and data can really be captured, disseminated and re-used. The conference will bring these stakeholders together to clarify what is being done and what needs to be done. Read more on the Nordbib [website](#)

## News & Notices 2011:3

### DOAJ launches a Greek interface. Current status.

The Directory of Open Access Journals now has more than 7200 titles and more than 650 000 searchable articles

The interface is currently available in [English](#), [French](#), [Turkish](#) and [Greek](#)

#### *The situation in the Nordic-Baltic countries*

[Iceland](#): 3 listed titles

[Norway](#): 26 listed titles

[Sweden](#): 48 listed titles

[Denmark](#): 29 listed titles

[Finland](#): 36 listed titles

[Estonia](#): 20 listed titles

[Latvia](#): 2 listed titles

[Lithuania](#): 23 listed titles

Reported by Linnea Stenson, the DOAJ-team, Lund University, Sweden

---

### British Research Libraries Say No to 'Big Deals

British Research Libraries Say No to 'Big Deals [reports](#) The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 22, 2011.

“As some U.S. research libraries back away from so-called Big Deals with journal publishers, a major British library group has also taken a stand against high serials prices. Late last year, Research Libraries UK announced that its members would not sign any more large deals with two of the biggest journal publishers, Elsevier and Wiley, unless they agreed to significant reductions in what those deals cost.”

### IFLA has established an Open Access Taskforce

Lars Bjørnshauge, Chairman of the Task Force reports that it was established following the endorsement of IFLA's [Statement on Open Access](#) and the subsequent approval of a number of [key initiatives](#)

The taskforce will work on the following issues:

Advocate for the adoption and promotion of open access policies as set out in IFLA's Statement on Open Access within the framework of the United Nations institutions (UN, UNESCO, WHO, FAO)

Build Capacity within the IFLA Membership to advocate for the adoption of open access policies at the national level, through the development of case studies and best practices for open access promotion

Furthermore the taskforce will connect to the various organizations working for Open Access – as indicated in the statement -such as SPARC (US/Europe/Japan), COAR, OASPA, EIFL, Bioline International & DOAJ, among others.

The taskforce has the following members:

Lars Bjørnshauge (CHAIR), 1st Vice-President, Swedish Library Association

Leslie Chan, Associate Director, Bioline International, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Jan Hagerlid, Programme Co-ordinator of OpenAccess.se, National Library of Sweden

Iryna Kuchma, EIFL.Net Open Access Manager, EIFL, Rome, Italy

Rick Luce, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, Emory University, USA

Felipe Martinez, Director, University Center for Library Science Research, National Autonomous University of Mexico

Bas Savenijie, Director, National Library of the Netherlands

Xuemao Wang, Associate Vice-Provost, Emory University Libraries, Emory University, USA

Qiang Zhu, Director, Peking University Library,  
Beijing, China

Ann Okerson, Special Advisor on Electronic  
Strategies, Center for Research Libraries New Haven,  
CT, United States

Derek Law, Professor, University of Strathclyde,  
Glasgow, United Kingdom

---

**SCOAP3 is moving towards the implementation of  
its Open Access initiative.**

*Thanks to Ann Okerson*

An international team of experts from institutions participating in SCOAP3 has prepared a detailed description of the peer-review and open access services that the consortium intends to purchase through high-quality peer-reviewed journals, the conditions for the provision of these services and the implications on existing licensing agreements. CERN has now issued a Market Survey for the benefit of SCOAP3. It is publicly available at:

<http://cdsweb.cern.ch/record/1384149>

Publishers of high-quality peer-reviewed journals carrying content in the field of High-Energy Physics have been invited to answer to this Market Survey, whose purpose is to identify potential bidders for the provision of peer-review and open access services to SCOAP3. The following phase of the process will be an invitation to tender to qualified providers by the end of 2011, for contracts to be placed during 2012 with services commencing 1 January 2013. The deadline for the Market Survey was October 19th.

---

**The UK Parliament's Science and Technology  
Committee has produced a Report on "Peer review  
in scientific publications"**

*Thanks to Fred Friend*

"/---/ if the Committee's recommendations are implemented, will initiate several positive developments for scholarly communication. The Report – available [here](#) – examines the current peer review system thoroughly from different angles. Picking up on the importance of reproducibility of research results, the Committee recommend that "data associated with publicly funded research should, where possible, be made widely and freely available". Also significant for scholarly communication in general, are the Committee's "concerns about the use of journal Impact Factor as a proxy measure for the quality of individual articles". /---/

## OPEN MINDS TOWARDS OPEN ACCESS:

-An interview with members of the FinnOA working group

Turid Hedlund

The Finnish Open Access working group (FinnOA) was founded in 2003 in Helsinki by professionals in academia, libraries, learned societies and publishers. FinnOA was started as an informal working group with the aim to promote open access to scientific research. The group has retained its informal status but during the years it has by initiatives and seminars initiated projects for developing an infrastructure for open access in publication archives and publishing of open access scientific journals. Lately the aim of the working group has been to promote a broader spectrum of access to research, including research data.

For this article three members of the FinnOA working group; LL.D Marjut Salokannel (chair of FinnOA), Ph.D. Claus Montonen, Head of publishing Eeva-Liisa Aalto were interviewed about their membership and activities in the working group and how they see the future for open access.

The discussion started with the question on why each member started to promote open access and joined the FinnOA working group. Claus Montonen, physicist by profession and a background in the research tradition in high-energy physics was one of the founding members of FinnOA in 2003. At that time he was active in the European Physical Society and chair of their publications committee and an early promoter of open access. As we know, this scientific discipline was the forerunner in open access publishing introducing the submission of pre-print manuscripts to the subject-based archive *arXiv*. Claus Montonen found it natural to join the national FinnOA working group when it was started.

Head of publishing Ms Eeva-Liisa Aalto from the Federation of learned societies was also a founder of the FinnOA working group. In Finland learned societies have a national co-operative body for learned societies in Finland called the Federation of learned societies. The learned societies are also very important academic publishers of periodicals and books. The professional interest in academic publishing thus provided Eeva-Liisa Aalto with an incentive to join the FinnOA working group. The Federation of learned societies has hosted many seminars arranged by FinnOA during the years and they also started a project to supports its member societies to convert to e-journal publishing preferably also to open access

publishing.

The present chair of FinnOA, LL.D Marjut Salokannel is a researcher in intellectual property rights focusing on the socio-economic dimension of patent and copyright law. Her research interests in science policy and access to publicly funded scientific research and information lead her to join the FinnOA working group and since then she has actively promoted open access initiatives and mandates in the University of Helsinki as well as a national science policy and intellectual property right legislation regarding open access to research data.

During the years The FinnOA working group has been active mainly in three main areas: policy building initiatives, supporting an infrastructure of repositories for open access copies of research articles and supporting open access journal publishing.

As examples of policy initiatives in Finland where FinnOA members have participated, can be mentioned reports published by the Ministry of Education. In 2005 a memorandum on recommendations for the promotion of open access in scientific publishing in Finland and in 2011 a roadmap for the utilization of electronic data in research. The project OA-JES (2006-2008) promoted the ongoing work in starting, maintaining and improving institutional repositories in the universities and research institutes. Also the support to learned societies in Finland in publishing open access journal was carried out together with the Federation of Learned Societies. Eeva-Liisa Aalto pointed out the important issue of publishing in national languages as a strong motive for support to learned societies. We need to keep up a scientific discussion in the national languages and it is also important for making research known to a broader national audience.

All three interviewees found that there is a maturity process going on in open access activities. The infrastructure is mostly in place and there is knowledge about open access within the research communities. Also within the FinnOA working group the first intensive years has passed and there is a need to make strategies for the future.



When asked about their thoughts on the future of open access Claus Montonen found the future for journal publishing in the new business models for publishing. He sees that the most likely development will become the adoption of the model of publishing fees. Preferably this would not affect the researcher personally and could be handled centrally by the university or research institute or included in project funding. He also finds that the best choice in the future for “green” copies of articles would be large subject-based repositories instead of local university repositories. The idea that the researchers institution should be the first instance to collect the information and provide metadata is only a first step towards access. The data needs to be collected into a more user-friendly service based on broader subjects. The motives for this is better search facilities and thus more secure access to a research article.

One important issue that still has to be resolved is the long-term preservation of electronic journals. Preservation should be an issue for the national libraries and free and easy access to the older material should be secured.

Marjut Salokannel has been actively engaged in promoting the possibility to use electronic research data. Free access to research data is the key to successful research since all research is based on good research data. As research results are linked to research within a research discipline also research data is linked to other research. Also cross-disciplinary linkages are common and needed both nationally and globally to support new aspects in research. The work in this area is only in the beginning and is one of the important future strategic areas of the FinnOa working group. This fall a seminar on the topic will be arranged directed to researchers and persons responsible for research in universities. The hope is to start a discussion and involvement in future steps on how to promote open access to research data.

Eeva-Liisa Aalto was concerned about the situation for national scientific publishing in Finland. Small society journals have a hardship in surviving only in print format. A conversion to open access would free resources to content production. She therefore finds that one of the focus areas in the future will be to support small scientific journals to publish open access. Today tablets and applications for reading e-journals could make reading online versions more attractive to researchers. Another important matter is that publishing book is still an important channel in for example humanities. As an example Eeva-Liisa Aalto mentioned that the center for worldwide exchange of publications within the Federation for Learned Societies previously mostly was occupied with serials publications but today the exchange also includes more monographs. The future for e-books will be very interesting. The problem is that there are many small publishers on the market and some coordination on the e-book format and distribution would be needed. Until now the development has been rather slow but there are expectations for the future.

To sum up the discussion we can argue that the even though open access in its basic aspects is matured and rather well known and the infrastructure is in place there is much work to be done in order to keep up the enthusiasm for free access to research publications. As a result of the discussion in this interview session at least the focus areas in the future for FinnOA could be open access to research data, a continuing support for converting small scientific journals to open access and developing subject-based services on data from the institutional repositories not forgetting the importance of long-term preservation to secure access also in the far future. Furthermore a central task for FinnOA is influencing the legislator to amend copyright legislation towards a more research friendly direction.



**Turid Hedlund**, Associate professor Management and organisation Information Systems Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland <http://www.hanken.fi>

## OPEN MINDS TOWARDS OPEN ACCESS

### An interview with Ian Watson, Bifröst University in Iceland

Solveig Thorsteinsdottir

*Ian Watson is assistant professor of social science at Bifröst University in Iceland, editor of the Bifröst Journal of Social Science, and also manages the library at the Reykjavik Academy, an association of Icelandic researchers and scholars. We asked him to talk a little about his views on open access.*

#### **Why did you start advocating OA?**

It happened by accident in 2008 -- our university rector had started an open, online journal which at first was organized very informally -- just some papers put up on a website. After a few months, the university realized they needed to find someone to devote a few hours a week to managing the journal. I had heard about something called Open Journal Systems which I thought could work as a software platform. It was free and I knew how to install it. Based on that, I was asked to take over the journal.

Once I had set up OJS and was actually running the journal, I was impressed with the low cost and overhead involved, as well as with the number of downloads for each article. We were getting nice-looking scholarship out at low cost and in a way that maximized the number of readers. As I started to read and learn more about OA, I realized that this approach was basically in everyone's interest and I started to find kindred minds elsewhere in the Icelandic academic and library community.

#### **What has happened as a result of your work?**

Most fundamentally, there are articles and knowledge out there, all publicly accessible, which are there because the university has let me promote an OA policy for the journal. Otherwise they'd be buried in library stacks somewhere and no one would read them. More broadly, the effort that all of us in the Icelandic OA community have put into advocacy has at least stimulated debate and at best changed minds. Most people here seem to agree on the merits of open access, and there are more and more open access periodicals in Iceland. At least one of these was inspired by the journal I edit.

At the same time, we're way behind the other Nordic and European countries in official support for open access. The university administrations and research

funders have been very slow to actually take concrete steps to promote open access. For example, an employee of the main research funding body here in Iceland gave a very positive speech about open access at our last OA conference, but nothing about this funding body's actual policies or procedures has changed in favor of OA. I don't really know why, although neglect seems a more likely explanation than deliberate distaste for OA. I think the way forward was already clear in 2007 or 2008. Several years of scholarship that might have been available to the public under a more forward-thinking policy have been lost.

#### **What do you think will happen in the future?**

There are some positive signs, such as the increasing number of OA journals in Iceland, slow progress in official support from the Ministry of Education, and plans to create an OA policy from the University of Iceland. However, Iceland is a country where ISBNs on books were almost unknown well into the 1990s, over 20 years after they had become routine in the rest of Scandinavia. My experience is that this is a comparatively conservative, isolated society and that key decision-makers here do not always manage to keep up with changes elsewhere in the world. Also, I see that some scholars here don't really care that much if nobody reads their work, as long as it was funded, makes for a good line on their CV, and ideally appears in a journal with a long history and reputation so that they feel that they've made it into the "club." I can't completely blame them if these things matter more to them than the public interest. The transition to OA is an example of a multiplayer prisoner's dilemma and it involves collectively rewiring the incentive structure of academic publishing. I hope that we won't deny ourselves the fiscal and intellectual benefits that come through OA, but I am always prepared for the worst, too.

I think the biggest effect of OA in Iceland could actually be in monograph publishing. I am shocked at the number of people here who have written a manuscript about something relatively obscure and then, seemingly without considering any other options, have gone and had 300 offset copies printed, which they then feel under pressure to sell. The book sells poorly, and the author never gives it away for free



because they are sensitive about not having recouped their large investment in printing costs. The net result is that very few people encounter the author's ideas and a whole lot of copies of the book sit somewhere in storage. If the author had just found a good place on the Internet where the book could be downloaded freely, they wouldn't have lost any money on printing, they would have found a larger readership, and the people who wanted a printed copy could have gotten one through a print-on-demand service. The larger readership might have brought other side benefits to the author as well. I have been trying to snare authors during the writing stage and encourage them to go this route, but most don't recognize that it would be in their interest and have a somewhat foggy understanding of how publishing works. People are just used to the old way of thinking and they are also attached to the physical token, the "book," rather than realizing that books are just one potential vehicle for the information, which is what you're really trying to communicate.

#### **What do you see as the main advantages of OA?**

Besides what I've said above, I think that OA has the potential to get a lot of scholarship out there and accessible that would otherwise not get published. Lots of people write good stuff that the gatekeepers in scholarly publishing have previously declined to put out because it doesn't pay well enough.

With the OA business model, sales don't matter. Length doesn't really matter either. As long as there is money to cover editorial time, publishers can make decisions based on the sincerity of the author and the merit of their work.

#### **Do you see any disadvantages/problems?**

Well, I just brought up the issue of "money to cover editorial time." There is still a cost of bringing an article to its readership under OA, even if it's much less than under the old model. Just as authors put time and money into researching and writing a text, they have to get used to the fact that reviewing, editing, and laying out the text takes peoples' time and money too. It used to be that authors didn't experience any of these costs and kind of tended to imagine that they didn't exist. These days, after these tasks are done, the cost of distributing an OA article is basically zero. We have to get authors used to bearing this (rather small) cost of bringing their work to that stage. Of course, it's often not the authors personally, but rather a research grant, an institution, or a journal itself (through subsidies) that pays this extra cost. In this way of looking at it, OA is basically about getting universities to shift money from library purchasing budgets into financial support for the editorial, peer review, and content management process.



**Ian Watson** Assistant professor of social science at Bifröst University in Iceland, editor of the Bifröst Journal of Social Science, manager of the library at the Reykjavík Academy,



**Solveig Thorsteinsdottir**, Director of the Medical and Health Information Centre, Landspítali University Hospital, Iceland

## INTERVIEWS WITH LITHUANIAN POLITICIANS AND FAMOUS RESEARCHERS ABOUT OPEN ACCESS

Emilija Banionyte, Ausra Vaskeviciene, and Gintare Tautkeviciene.

### Politicians on Open Access

*The following politicians were interviewed:*

**Nerija Putinaitė**, Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Education and Science

Professor **Eugenijus Butkus**, Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania, Vilnius University, Faculty of Chemistry

**Vaino Brazdeikis**, Ministry of Education and Science, Director of Information Technology Centre

**There is a lot of talk around the world about open access (OA) to scientific information; various initiatives related to open access are pursued. What do you know about them and what do you think about them?**

*N. Putinaitė:*

From the user's point of view this initiative can be evaluated only positively.

*V. Brazdeikis:*

I think of those initiatives positively, as they represent progress and bring transparency to research and study processes.

**As every initiative, open access to scientific information receives different evaluations. What are the positive and negative aspects of open access to scientific information in your opinion?**

*N. Putinaitė:*

Publishers are interested in pursuing a commercial activity and because of that they want to put up restrictions. There is always a conflict between users who want to get everything free and those, who put efforts into creating the product when after that the product becomes freely accessible. In my opinion, if there is no classified information, the results of scientific research should be freely accessible. The research is paid from EU funds or the budget of Lithuanian Republic, so it should be freely accessed.

**Scientists take into account the system for evaluation of science in their country before publishing their research results. Does the science evaluation system in Lithuania encourage scientists to publish their research in an open access publications?**

*N. Putinaitė:*

Open access is only an instrument. While evaluating there is no difference between open and limited access publications. This issue is on a different plane.

*V. Brazdeikis:*

In my opinion, there is no clear open access promotion (or not promotion) system in Lithuania yet. There are provisions of the European Commission directives, and all research paid from European Union funds in Lithuania must be made open access. Such are the provisions of the Law on Higher Education and Research. But there is no clear and conceptual strategy, and, most probably, it should be the initiative of the scientific community to create such a strategy, as scientists see such a necessity.

**The European Research Council, the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) of the European Commission, and other financing institutions require open access the results of scientific research financed by those institutions. I have not heard yet that the institutions financing scientific research in Lithuania would require publishing the results of scientific research in an open access publications. How do you think, wouldn't it be worth to formalize such requirements in Lithuania?**

*N. Putinaitė:*

Such a requirement is applied to the research funded from the budget. The government has confirmed the order regarding scientific research where it is unambiguously stated that the results of the research (even studies) must be made open access. Steps are taken in this direction, but there is no strict formulation that it must be an open access publications. Why is there no such requirement? If scientist publishes his/her publication in a prestigious journal of other country, this journal usually has its rules, and if the researcher wants to make his publication available for open access, he/she has to pay several thousand Euros. Such payments are not included in the project estimates yet. This issue should be discussed in the future.

*V. Brazdeikis:*

There is a possibility to formalize this requirement. But I think that there is a bigger problem. According to the Berlin Declaration universities have the right to sign it and publish all their work according to the principles of the open access paradigm. Alas, universities somehow don't do that. Do they want the authorities to take the decisions for them? I do not think that the University of Massachusetts or any other would agree to be proclaimed open by the authorities. A university will announce being open because it wants to be progressive. Our universities should be more concrete about their objectives.

*E. Butkus:*

The question is unambiguous. Specific scientific research is rarely financed in full. Usually only part of it is financed. It is hardly credible that all results of all scientific research would be accessible to all scientists. Some preconditions should be made, e.g. scientific results could be made accessible freely after some period to a certain circle of scientists who could familiarize themselves with the data. It is not rational and purposeful to require that a scientist should publish his/her scientific research results in a certain kind of publication. Scientists should have the freedom to choose in which publication, and in what kind of publication they publish their work.

**In your opinion, does the quality of open access journals correspond to the required scientific quality in the journals published by commercial publishers?**

*N. Putinaitė:*

I do not know any strictly open access journals in Lithuania. There should not be any difference. In Lithuania there is a mixed model when publications are made public after a one year embargo period. Most often scientific publications do not have commercial value with a few exceptions (medicine, pharmaceuticals).

The commercial value of other publications is minimal; sooner or later they are made public.

*E. Butkus:*

There are some really high level open access journals, they are acknowledged in the scientific community, their results are reliable, and this fact is especially important nowadays. In later years, the forgery of scientific data, falsification, and incorrect presentations are of great concern. There are many examples. We in Lithuania also face these phenomena, not to mention plagiarism. Open access journals which apply the same rules of reviewing ensure results of high quality. In such cases the journals gain value and acknowledgement in the scientific community. But once a few scientists performed an experiment: they compiled superficial data from various sources and sent them to an open access journal. The article was accepted...

This shows that in certain cases open access journals do not correspond to the accepted standards. Authors or institutions pay for publication and that is enough for them. Such facts discredit the idea of open access itself. In almost all commercial publications the system of reviews is functioning. I would prefer those journals that apply the usual reviewing order of scientific articles. The main and essential argument for publication of scientific work is that its quality must correspond to certain standards.

*V. Brazdeikis:*

There exist certain surveys about scientific works published around the world. According to their data, about 70 percent of reference sources are accessible via Google and other information resources. The quality of the journal is not so important, its openness is more important. It is difficult to say whether the quality of a journal is higher or lower. Some journals are created by a certain circle of people and this may be a problem. If there will emerge open access repositories, the journals may take corresponding strategic steps. It is highly negotiable what is more valuable – articles or journals. Citation is another issue where openness has a role.

**You are not only the leader of the organization but also a scientist. Did you ever publish your work in open access journals? What problems have you met?**

*E. Butkus:*

When you achieve a certain research result, you seek to publish it in the journal, in which this result will grab the attention of other scientists working in the same field. This is the principle for how I choose journals. The scientist always chooses the journals of the highest scientific ranking. I would say, that now a bad routine has taken place: scientists send articles of different

quality to the journals of the highest ranking. Those journals are overloaded, and because of that other problems arise. From the 100 scientific articles I have published in the international press only a few are in open access journals. The access type did not influence my decision. On the other hand, this year I received an invitation from one journal wanting to publish my article. I contacted the publisher in order to discuss additional conditions. They indicated the terms to me and mentioned that this should cost about 2000 Swiss francs.

I was surprised, as I knew that this was the open access journal I had published one article in earlier. I contacted the editorial board of the journal and they explained that the journal had been free earlier. They usually asked the author to contribute to publishing expenses, but if the author could not do that, the article was accepted anyway. Since this year the publisher policy has changed: you have to commit to pay the fee. I had to refuse to submit the article. Some problems still have to be solved before access can be really open both to the author submitting his scientific work and to the reader who can use it.

---

## Researchers on Open Access

*The following researchers were interviewed:*

Professor **Limas Kupcinskas**, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Member of Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, winner of the national award Best scientist 2011

Professor **Juozas Vidmantis Vaitkus**, Vilnius University, Faculty of Physics

Professor **Vytautas Ostaševicius**, Kaunas University of Technology

**Danguolė Rutkauskienė**, Director of the E. Learning Technology Centre, Kaunas University of Technology

Professor **Ruta Marcinkevicienė**, Vice-Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania, Vytautas Magnus University

**There is a lot of talk around the world about open access to scientific information; various initiatives related to open access are carried out. What do you know about them and what do you think about them?**

*L. Kupcinskas:*

We should try to get the journals with high citation rates to become completely free and openly accessible for the medical community. I value open access to scientific articles very positively.

*R. Marcinkevicienė:*

I think that open access is a good thing and it should constantly expand. When we talk about open access we have organized institutional initiatives in mind. Archives of various resources, repositories with large amounts of scientific data, and research evaluations published by various scientists have been opened so that they can be used by other scientists. As I am a representative of the humanities, it is important to me, that scientific publications, including monograph publishing initiatives become open, when more and more scientists transfer their author rights to

the institutions publishing open access. The humanities scientists do not only need the newest publications, y, we rely on the earlier works. . I hope that gradually there will be more openness, because it is very important that the publications are widely read. For me it is important how research supported by us is read and used, and what influence is exerted by it. Eventually open access should prevail.

*J.V. Vaitkus:*

I use profile open access journals. This information is really useful and most easily accessible.

*V. Ostaševicius:*

I assess it positively, because open access allows finding out very quickly what is happening in the scientific world, what research is carried out, what results have been achieved. At the same time it allows you to spread information about your own research and its results.

*D. Rutkauskienė:*

I assess it very positively. I have worked in the field of distance learning for about eighteen years already, and

the availability and openness of information is a very important issue. Open access resources are very important and it is also very important that information to those resources was submitted not only by young, but by other scientists too.

**As every initiative, open access to scientific information receives different evaluations. What are positive and negative aspects of open access to scientific information in your opinion?**

*L. Kupcinskas:*

Even the best publications usually have to deal with practical issues. Journals incur publishing expenses, publishing companies seek after profit. Publication costs must be covered. The largest publishers sell the databases of their journals to universities, and hospitals. This can be understood... A negative aspect is that there exists a possibility that the newest information can become inaccessible to the medical community and this community will not develop. "You do not have money; you cannot access innovations and create yourself".

I doubt if the best journals will ever become open access. Journals policy: after some years they become open. The scientific staffs of the journals strive towards openness of the journals; the so called "embargo" rule becomes not applicable. Sometimes if you ask for the article to be openly accessible, a corresponding fee of (2500-3000 Euros or Dollars) is requested. The problem is unambiguous, it is related to financing, but we should strive for scientific knowledge to become openly, accessible to the medical society.

*R. Marcinkeviciénė:*

The positive aspect is that it is free. There are separate groups of users: scientists, students, all taxpayers. The humanities publications should be widely read. Another positive aspect is that an author writes differently when he/she knows that his/her work will be read not only by colleagues, but also by all people. Another positive aspect is that science crosses the boundaries of a narrow circle, opens the space for a wider evaluation of scientific works, and reduces the number of falsifications. Some open access publishers allow reading texts before they become articles. There is a possibility to cite not separate citations, but to give links to full-text publication archives. There emerges a possibility to adapt an article to a wide auditorium.

*J. V. Vaitkus:*

Open access is a quite complicated part of the information business. That is why various businessmen use open access very differently. Some seek open access only for the purpose of distributing information and becoming known. Others use OA to ensure that everybody uses their information, but they pile all tax burdens on the scientists. There are very good journals

that require substantial amounts of money for articles which are published in open access and thus accessible to the scientific community. A number of highly prestigious journals agree to publish open access articles if the authors will pay a certain amount of money. There is a parallel discussion going on debating how taxpayer's money can be used in order to make those journals available to society.

*V. Ostaševicius:*

It is something like tradition now, that if the journal is easily accessible, you often have to pay for publishing. So, if you have no money, you will not be able to publish, and this is not very acceptable for scientists. A positive aspect is the speed of publishing, but even if you have paid, you have to wait for some time till the publication is out. Another aspect is that if you don't have to pay for the publication it usually is difficult to access. . So in this case, costs, speed, intensity of distribution etc. are important.

**Is it beneficial for scientists to publish the results of scientific research in open access publications?**

*L. Kupcinskas:*

In general, scientists benefit from open access. But if a scientist writes a good article he/she will try to publish it in the journals with the highest possible ranking. Access type will not be important. The deciding factor is the prestige of the journal; access type takes second place. On the other hand, every scientist would also like his/her work to be accessible and well cited. Medics have a sufficient tool, i.e. the open abstract databases (PubMed and others).

*J. V. Vaitkus:*

Actually open access creates better conditions for citing published material, results have better visibility, and at the same time they better represent the scientist or group of scientists to the whole society. On the other hand, OA can have some negative aspects in that information may be disseminated too widely. A negative example can be a very intensive promotion of some achievements of biochemistry or biotechnology. Then a number of so called "quasilaboratories" emerge, producing psychotropic or similar substances endangering our lives

*V. Ostaševicius:*

Scientists belong to various fields and it is not good when "know how" information is disclosed free to everybody with an interest, including businessmen and commercial companies. The companies begin production and release the product on the market quickly, before the scientists have time to patent their ideas and finish their research. So there are two problems.



*D. Rutkauskienė:*

Yes, I suppose that every scientist, no matter whether younger or senior, would like his material to be used more widely and his articles, books, monographs, lectures and other publications cited more often. Open access sources provide the possibility for authors to be accessed easier and quicker. This will be useful for them.

**Scientists take into account the system for evaluation of science in their country before publishing their research results. Does the science evaluation system in Lithuania encourage scientists to publish their research in an open access publications?**

*L. Kupcinskis:*

Scientific results are evaluated based on two parameters: articles in prestigious journals, and patents. At present the evaluation system in Lithuania neither interferes nor helps. Every system has its shortcomings, but there is nothing better for now.

*E. Butkus:*

The question should be formulated as follows: are those scientific results interesting for the scientific community, i.e. will the announcement of such results give impulses to other researchers to look for more information about accomplished research? Evaluation is the next stage of a scientific work. I can state firmly, that in Lithuania it is not taken into consideration whether scientific results are published in open access publications or in commercial publications. The first (and the main) question is the quality of scientific research and evaluation is based on it.

*R. Marcinkevicienė:*

It is not possible to answer this question directly. Scientists are encouraged to publish their work in good peer-reviewed journals, some of which are open access. The Research Council seeks to implement the plan to create open archives for the results of research financed by taxpayer money.

*J.V. Vaitkus:*

Yes and no. The present Lithuanian science evaluation system encourages the publishing of articles in high ranking open access journals, although one has to pay for those publications. One can say that it is a little bit easier to publish your article in journals with author fees than in the journals with a very strict expert control and with no publication charges, but without open access. To be precise, they are freely accessible for research centres in another way – via subscribed journal databases. At present "Lietuvos fizikos žurnalas" (Lithuanian Journal of Physics) is kind of open access, I have personal publications there, as the articles of last year are openly accessible there.

Unfortunately, I don't know if it is registered in open access register.

*V. Ostaševičius:*

In my opinion it encourages, because till now one of the main evaluation criteria has been publications of high level. Only publication in foreign journals with a vast international readership creates the conditions for higher citation rates, and for acceptance by high impact journals.

*D. Rutkauskienė:*

In my opinion it is not encouraged. A model should be created which will encourage scientists to publish in open access journals. Scientific articles, scientific information is very often used in study processes. I represent distance learning, and one of the distance learning aspects is that the learning material is virtual. When scientists publish their material as open access, we can use it to improve study programs as it is very easy to access. It does not matter whether it is formal informal studies or continuing education material, open access sources can be useful as additional information that improves the quality of studying.

**What problems do scientists encounter when they want to publish their research in open access journals?**

*R. Marcinkevicienė:*

I cannot answer because I have never published my material in open access journals. I have only heard the opinions of my colleagues. One of the problems was that the requirement of publishers required manuscripts to be prepared using special software even if publishing houses already offered the possibility to transfer the publications in different format. There is certain instability, for example in the linking systems; some of the links are not persistent

*J.V. Vaitkus:*

Actually there are no problems. The author usually checks if the publication in a certain journal will bring the necessary number of points, and if it will be good enough to provide the qualification.

*V. Ostaševičius:*

As I have mentioned, there is first of all a financial problem: you can rarely find additional funds to publish such publications. Another problem is the time period between submitting and publication.

*D. Rutkauskienė:*

I think that a lot of young scientists do not know how to publish in open access; how can we make this easier. A support system for young scientists is necessary: the mechanism not only to encourage them to get acquainted with the possibility but also to motivate

and to explain in more detail what will happen after publication, and help to submit material for the first time.

**In your opinion, does the quality of open access journals correspond to the requirements in journals published by the commercial publishers?**

*R. Marcinkeviciené:*

There are very good open access journals from the content point of view. Sometimes there are incorrectly edited texts or links disappear from the internet. But you have to get used to the fact that texts are dynamic. This can be compensated by additions or corrections. Authors know this, and feel obliged to review their texts from time to time.

*J. V. Vaitkus:*

Yes and no. Some journals do not satisfy the quality requirements; others satisfy them in full and belong to the journals of the highest ranking. On the other hand, I take part in European discussions about OA. OA is one of the tasks to strengthen the relation between science and society which is being solved by the Science and Society Committee. I take part in European programs representing Lithuania.

*V. Ostășevicius:*

I cannot see the difference. I think that the quality is very similar; maybe I will compare it in the future. While evaluating various publications I have not noticed many mistakes in language, style, terminology or other things. It is possible that OA publishing is of higher quality than commercial journals.

*D. Rutkauskiene:*

I am not very experienced in this field. I suppose that evaluation is similar, models are similar as are the procedures of access to more widely known commercial or to open access journals. I think that open access journals are less known and need more time to become more cited.

*L. Kupcinskas:*

Commercial publishers are like an instrument that helps the editorial boards to publish their journals. Journal prestige depends not on the business model but on the capability of the editorial boards to select articles. I do not see substantial difference in quality in open access journals: all articles are peer-reviewed. . From the point of view of scientific value I do not see any essential difference between open access journals and commercial ones.

**Your journals are included in one of the most famous open access catalogues, i.e. The Directory of Open Access Journals. Has the readership and popularity of the journals changed since they became open access journals?**

*L. Kupcinskas:*

We should be happy that such a database as DOAJ exists. It includes journals in all fields, but in biomedical sciences this database is equal to PubMed (open access journals are reflected in the PubMed database). DOAJ is valuable and needed.



**Emilija Banionyte** - President of the Lithuanian Research Library Consortium



**Ausra Vaskeviciene** - Head of the Administration of the Lithuanian Research Library Consortium



**Gintare Tautkeviciene**- Head of the Information Services, Library of the Kaunas University of Technology



**Nerija Putinaitė**, Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Education and Science



Professor **Eugenijus Butkus**, Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania, Vilnius University, Faculty of Chemistry



**Vaino Brazdeikis**, Ministry of Education and Science, Director of Information Technology Centre



Professor **Limas Kupcinskis**, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Member of Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, winner of the national award Best scientist 2011



Professor **Juozas Vidmantis Vaitkus**, Vilnius University, Faculty of Physics



Professor **Vytautas Ostaševičius**, Kaunas University of Technology



**Danguolė Rutkauskienė**, Director of the E. Learning Technology Centre, Kaunas University of Technology



Professor **Ruta Marcinkevičienė**, Vice-Chairman of the Research Council of Lithuania, Vytautas Magnus University

## THE MEGA JOURNALS ARE COMING!

Jan Erik Frantsovåg

Mega-journals were one of the major and hot topics at the 3rd Conference on Open Access Scholarly Publishing, held in Tallinn September 21st–23rd 2011. Videos are available from <http://river-valley.tv/conferences/coasp-2011>

The impression gained from the talks at the conference is that Mega-journals are coming to stay, and they will have a disruptive influence on STM publishing in the coming years.

### **What is a mega-journal, how is it different from other journals and how will it influence the publishing industry?**

A mega journal is – as the name says – large, i.e. it will accept any number of articles. It also covers a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines and sub-disciplines, generally within the STM fields. Most mega-journals seem to aim at publishing all science that is “good enough” instead of looking for articles that are important or could have a large audience. Here they differ from traditional journals, both OA and TA, which seeks to increase the Impact Factor (IF) of the journal. They also publish continuously and strive to implement processes that keep down the time from submission to publication.

### **PLoS ONE**

The first – and so far only really giant mega-journal – is PLoS ONE. Currently, PLoS ONE publishes about 70 articles a day, and the number is steadily increasing. Other publishers have established or are about to establish journals modeled on PLoS ONE. PLoS ONE published 1,231 articles in 2007, 2,723 in 2008, 4,310 in 2009, 6,784 in 2010 and estimates more than 14,000 articles to be published in 2011. This exponential growth has already resulted in PLoS ONE publishing 1.6 percent of the total annual volume of PubMed (which indexes most STM publications). This growth cannot go on, because that would mean PLoS ONE in only a few years will be the only journal left ...

What mechanisms have allowed PLoS ONE to grow to this size, and so quickly? There are many factors contributing to this. One is that PLoS ONE is all electronic, all internet, all OA. There is no paper edition to restrict size, and it has optimal conditions for dissemination of its content. (PLoS ONE is not actually a journal in the traditional sense; it is a database of articles.)

Criteria for getting published is possibly the major

reason: Articles in PLoS ONE goes through peer review, but they only ask if this is sound science, i.e. is it scientifically rigorous and is it well written. No-one asks about importance (and possible benefits to the journal's IF) or the size of the audience, PLoS ONE will publish anything that deserves to be published. This means that e.g. negative results can be published in PLoS ONE just as easily as ground-breaking scientific results.

One thing this will achieve is that the average number of reviewers going through a manuscript before it finally is published somewhere, will go down. If you send a manuscript to PLoS ONE and it is accepted, it will be published there, is it rejected it probably should not be published at all. Ranking of importance etc. is done post-publication. Articles also should not go back and forth between authors and reviewers for improvements etc. Reviewers are asked if the manuscript is sound enough to be published as it is, and should say yes or no. This saves time (working hours) for both parties and calendar time from submission to publication for all, including the readers/users.

### **Scientific Reports**

Nature Publishing Group has launched Scientific Reports. Nature is one of the journals where it is very is to be rejected, less than 10 percent of submissions result in a published article. Other Nature journals also have high rejection rates. But most rejected articles have gone through peer review. Until now these rejected articles have only contributed to the cost of operating Nature and other journals. With Scientific Reports, Nature and other Nature journals can suggest Scientific Reports as an alternative for rejected but publishable manuscripts; if the author agrees the manuscript will come already peer reviewed and the process in Scientific Reports can be quick and simple. Again, both peer-review resources and time can be saved. And rejected manuscripts will start contributing to the income side, not only the cost side, of the accounts. This makes it possible for Scientific Reports to be able to offer low Article Processing Charges in their competing for manuscripts against other OA journals.

### **The impact of mega-journals**

What will the impact of these mega-journals be? For one thing, they will publish a large portion of the available manuscripts in the STM fields. That means

they will create a lack of manuscripts for existing journals, forcing them either to lower their quality standards or to cease publication. Only specialized, high IF journals will be able to prosper along the mega-journals. And they will dramatically increase the proportion of OA articles, many of the manuscripts they attract would otherwise go to TA journals. Mega-journals will never attain high IF, they will have IFs but middling – anything big enough has to get a middle IF. Thus, high IF journals may still compete with the mega-journals. Another effect of mega journals is that because of their broad coverage they will be seen as multidisciplinary, meaning that the present practice of “field normalizing” the IF to be able to compare authors or research groups across different (sub-)disciplines will be impossible. (Thanks to David Lawrence of Linköping University Press for pointing this out to me.) And when much science is published in mega-journals, it will all have roughly the same IF. May we hope that mega-journals will mean an end to the meaningless IF fetishism we see today? Mega journals taking over a large part of the manuscripts going to TA journals today means that they could seriously erode the basis of many TA journals. (This is also a threat to “traditional” OA journals.) They could easily be the first real new medium in scientific publishing since the Journal des Scavans and the Philosophical transactions saw the light of day some 350 years ago, and they could mean just as profound changes to scientific communications as the invention of scientific journals made then.

My guess is that during the next few years (3–7 years) mega-journals will take over a major part of STM publishing, large numbers of current journals will cease publication and OA will be the norm in the STM field. This could also mean a weakening of the importance of “Big deals”, because that won’t be where the content is. It will be interesting to see if competition among mega-journals will keep APCs at the lower end of the scale ...

#### **Current mega-journals:**

PLoS ONE (PLOS)

<http://www.plosone.org/home.action>

Scientific Reports (Nature Publishing Group)

<http://www.nature.com/srep/index.html>

Open Biology (The Royal Society)

<http://rsob.royalsocietypublishing.org/>

BMJ Open (BMJ Group)

<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/>

SAGE Open (SAGE Publications)

<http://sgo.sagepub.com>

G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics (The Genetics Society of America)

<http://www.g3journal.org/>



**Jan Erik Frantsovåg** Universitetsbiblioteket, IT-drift, formidling og utvikling, Universitetet i Tromsø, Norway



## EXPLORING HANDHELD DEVICES AND DIGITAL LEARNING: THE IPAD PROJECT AT OSLO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Trude Eikebrokk, Bettina Grødem Knutsen, Jimi Thaule

### Introduction

Can handheld devices improve students' study habits? How should we adapt our digital services to new technology? By lending iPads to students enrolled in two different master courses, we set out to explore the opportunities and challenges this new type of technology presents.

After testing the most interesting e-readers/tablets available the choice fell on Apple's iPad. The iPad has a web browser and can display a large number of e-book formats, and was consequently the most compatible with the Learning Centre's already existing digital resources. We believed it would have the potential to improve the students' study situation. We bought 15 iPads, and the project proceeded with training of our employees in an effort to familiarize them with the technology, before moving on the project proper.

Five master students from the Library and Information Science course *Web technologies* and seven master students from *Clinical nursing science* participated in the iPad project. The students and their teachers were all given iPads to keep for the semester.

Due to the iPads' close integration with personal iTunes accounts we chose not to pre-fill the iPads with documents. Instead we chose to set up a joint Dropbox-account for students enrolled in *Web technologies*, and stored their curriculum in that Dropbox-account. (Dropbox is a file hosting service that lets you store and share documents.) This solution was not possible for the students from *Clinical nursing science* as a result of an extensive curriculum of mostly paid-access documents. We could not download the documents for them due to copyrights issues, so we chose instead to publish a list of links on our website, with all the available digital resources. By opening this list on their iPad, they could click on the hyperlinks, access the articles and then save the articles and documents in an app of their own choice.

A librarian from the Learning Centre was present at the first lecture of the semester to hand out the iPads, in addition to an iTunes gift card pre-charged with 100 NOK. This gift card was meant to ensure that the participants would have some money to spend on applications they wanted to test during the project.

The librarian also held a short presentation about how the students could make best use of this new piece of technology. The presentation explained the goals of the project, presented them with how to access the digital curriculum as well as the Dropbox-solution for access to curriculum articles, and showed them how they could read the e-books from DawsonEra and Ebrary online. A few tips on useful apps they should download were also included, such as the PDF-reader-annotation-tool GoodReader. The librarian also came into the class one week later, to give the students the opportunity to ask questions, and help solve any technical problems that might have come up. Throughout the semester the students could contact the same librarian in case of problems. The Learning Centre also established a blog (<http://bibliotekoglesebrett.blogspot.com/>) where the librarians posted tips, tricks and user guides. The students had to complete a midway questionnaire and a focus group interview at the end of the semester, but other than that, there were no other restraints and they were free to use the iPad as they wished.

### Class of Web Technologies

This class is centered on online technology, PHP-programming and protocols for information re-use. We expected the students to be familiar with technology such as the iPad, and that they would feel confident enough to explore the opportunities it presented.

The teacher had agreed to the project beforehand, and chose some of the curriculum accordingly.

The curriculum consisted of seven Open Access articles, from journals with Creative Commons-licensing (D-Lib magazine, arxiv.org), eight technical specifications, also freely available online, a compendium about PHP-programming (provided digitally from the author), and two e-books, bought from our e-book supplier DawsonEra.

Both of the books were about technology, and not something you would typically read from cover to cover. We expected the iPad to work well with this type of book.

The students could either connect their personal Dropbox-account to the joint account, or they could

keep using the joint one. By downloading the Dropbox-app to their iPads they had instant (and offline) access to the curriculum. The Dropbox-account had additional advantages; it gave the students (and the teacher) the benefit of an easily available opportunity to share relevant documents with each other. If one student chose to upload an interesting article – all the students and teacher had immediate access.

The students were very excited about the iPads, and seemed to look forward to exploring the digital opportunities. They were also very pleased with the fact that all of the curriculum was provided for them, and that they didn't have to buy anything themselves. Problems arose quickly; the students were not very happy with the two e-books bought from DawsonEra. Due to DRM-restrictions the books had to be read online, it was not possible to download them as PDFs. This was a major drawback to the students. Another problem was annotations. DawsonEra has an online annotation-function, but the iPad's 10" screen is not large enough to read and type (keyboard visible on screen) simultaneously, especially as the annotation box is situated on the side of the actual e-book text. These two problems combined rendered the e-books pretty much useless, and most of the students ended up buying the books in print instead.

The students also encountered difficulties with getting the e-books in printable format. If we ever repeat this project we have to make sure that the students are able to get a hold of print copies of e-books, as some unquestionably will prefer this format.

### **Class of Clinical Nursing Science**

Seven students between the ages of 20-30 attended the iPad testing. None of them had tried an e-reader before or even tried to read an e-book on a computer. The student's approach to finding articles and books pre-iPad was to search for the curriculum in the library's database, print the article or borrow the book and then take notes by hand. The workload, both in practical and theoretical terms, in this course is extensive and therefore it would be of great use to the students if they could electronically collect and have immediate access to all the articles, e-books, documents and notes on one single device.

The nursing curriculum consists mostly of journal articles. HiOA (Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences<sup>1</sup>) has electronic subscriptions to most of these articles. It was important for us not to raise the bar too high when the students got their iPad. With that in mind we linked all the accessible articles,

documents and books that HiOA had electronic access to and published the linked list on our website. Seeing as the iPad only had a WIFI internet connection, ensuring offline access was crucial. By clicking on the hyperlinks and saving documents in apps, they students were able to open and read the articles anywhere.

In addition to articles, the electronic curriculum contained e-books, judicial texts and reports. The e-books were to be found in Ebrary and NB digital (books digitized by The National Library), the laws in Lovdata (a Norwegian database of law) and some independent websites were also represented in the curriculum.

Three e-books on the curriculum were accessible via Ebrary. Currently, the e-books can only be read online and does not offer download possibilities (this functionality is underway and launch is scheduled by the end of 2011). Ebrary is currently working on an app for iPad, but as of now reading Ebrary books on an iPad has many issues. The students were not satisfied with Ebrary's interface: no full screen option, a small portion of the screen dedicated to the book page while the rest of the screen is covered with information about the book (you can hide this information and have it replaced with an empty space) and limited search functions. Reading e-books from NB digital had the same challenges and in combination with the lack of e-ink on the iPad (a technology which makes reading easier on the eye), the students gave up on the e-books and borrowed the printed versions instead.

The nursing students have a variety of laws on their curriculum. These laws can be found online at Lovdata. Lovdata have adjusted their web pages so that they will be more compatible with using an iPad. But even then the students preferred to borrow the print version.

The linked list of electronic articles and reading these articles on the iPad were the most useful experience the students had with the iPad. Most of them stored the articles in iBooks, which is a free Apple app integrated in the iPad. The documents are lined up in a virtual bookshelf which helped the students to get an overview of the curriculum. The annotation in iBooks and the other apps they tried (Goodreader, iAnnotate, PDF-notes) did not match up to their expectations and they ended up taking notes by hand.

The students concluded that the iPad was well suited to read articles, but not very useful for longer texts. It was easy to transport and gave quick access to dictionaries, encyclopedias and their curriculum, but they needed better options for annotations on the iPad.

---

<sup>1</sup> Oslo University College was merged with Akershus University College August 1st 2011, and is now part of Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences.

## Method of Evaluation

To assess and evaluate the practical use of the iPads we created an online poll, for the students to answer. The poll was then supplemented by focus group meetings with more loosely structured questions. The online questionnaire contained queries concerning the use of curricular texts, the use of the iPad during lectures, ease of use and included options for open ended comments regarding the iPad in general. The findings were analyzed, and the students were called upon to give further insights as a group.

The findings were relatively consistent: the students did not find the technology itself to be a barrier in terms of user friendliness and they felt little or no need for support and training in order to use the iPads. However, the poorly developed options for taking notes, printing and accessing documents were of major importance to the students. The two first problems were inherent in the software and device itself, while the latter was a problem with our supplier of e-books, related to restrictions placed on downloading and copying.

The group conversations further verified the results of the poll, and underscored our initial discovery that although the technology itself is user friendly, the available services and contents are poorly customized to this sort of use.

Another discovery we made during the test project, which was further confirmed by the poll and consequent conversations, was the fact that the need for a personalized iTunes account contributed a barrier with regards to use for the students. Lending the device to students was made difficult by its targeting of the private market. The iPad is a personal handheld device, and as such is not necessarily meant to be shared in this sort of projects.

## Consequences in Terms of Policy Changes:

The most wide reaching and direct consequences of the iPad-project have been in terms of our acquisition policies. Our experience with Digital Rights Management (DRM) in eBooks led us to include a clause in our policy stating that for the future we only would buy DRM free digital solutions. DRM is a barrier when in terms of sharing notes and downloading documents to your own devices, something that often conflicts with the end user's needs.

The Open Access articles and technical specifications were the most useful for the students to have electronically. The articles were easy to find, easy to share, and short enough to read comfortably on the iPad. Many of the technical specifications were

formatted as HTML webpages, and therefore contained hyperlinks. The links made it easier and more natural to navigate in the text, and here the iPad really came into its right.

One of the reasons we chose the iPad was its ability to display e-books from our suppliers that would otherwise be unavailable via Kindle or other e-book readers. Hence, the idea was that the iPad had the inherent advantages present in both e-book readers and computers. The biggest barrier is that most of the e-book market is still dominated by DRM solutions, but we hope that more widespread use of digital content in libraries across the world, including our own, might have the effect that suppliers increasingly move away from this technology, in favor of more user friendly solutions. Library users, and especially students, have requirements to accessibility of material that are significantly more difficult to fulfill unless the material is available without technological barriers, both in terms of platform and interface. Open Access, either green or gold, is another way to avoid many of the issues that arose in this project, such as not being able to give the students the material beforehand, they had to go online and save the documents themselves.

Currently our institution is preparing negotiations over new contracts with our book supplier – including suppliers of digital books, and our experience with e-books in this project has had significant impact on that process. First of all we decided to separate our contracts into physical material and digital content. The difference between the two types of material, technology and associated delivery systems led us to the conclusion that they should be treated separately. Additionally we now have higher demands to technology itself. We decided to focus on other aspects of the technology as well: the need for universal accessibility via all widely used platforms and formats, opportunities to easily make and share notes and easy off campus accessibility. We also need documents to be at least partially available for interlibrary loans.

While our present suppliers have met most of these demands, in part at least, we see that increased attention to technology is necessary for future subscriptions and acquisitions. The end user's opportunity to download and print out the desired document is a key element. As a public educational institution catering to a diverse range of needs our users have high demands and expectations to our services. DRM, along with proprietary platforms and formats makes it difficult to meet the demands of our user groups: scientists, researchers, students and teachers.



**Trude Eikebrokk** is a librarian working with digital services. She is responsible for the technical solution for HiOA's institutional repository and for the Open Access publishing platform OJS.



**Bettina Grødem Knutsen** is a librarian working at Oslo and Akershus University College. She also acts as a liaison librarian for the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education.



**Jimi Thaule** is the liaison librarian for the institutes of primary school teacher education, and preschool teacher education. He works with acquisition and collection development, both physically and digitally.

## CARROT OR STICK, INCENTIVES OR MANDATES, OR BOTH

Tania Strom

### Introduction

The interest for Open Access has developed quickly within the last couple of years. In June 2010, Oslo University College (OUC) was one of the last Higher Education (HE) institutions to get an institutional repository. Mid-June 2010 the Open Digital Archive at Oslo University College, ODA, went public. This article will look at the key events that resulted in ODA. Furthermore I will present the incentive scheme implemented at OUC.

### Timeline

*2005*

In my email archive, I found the first reference to “open access” and “free access to research articles” dating back to June 2005. It was at that time Nora opened.

*2007*

A committee was appointed at the end of 2007 to recommend whether the OUC should have an institutional repository (IR), what content this archive should contain and which system should be selected. It has been very important that the work around the IR was NOT to be an employment measure in the Learning Centre, but at all times related to the OUC's strategy and policy around the dissemination of research. Therefore, the committee was composed of academic staff from several departments and the widespread support in management has been necessary to employ interest in ODA and for the information to the whole institution about open access.

*2008*

The establishing of an IR was adopted in the Board Proposal 44/2008.

The Learning Center of OUC immediately took action and hired an IT-librarian with the responsibility to build, operate, develop and maintain the repository.

*2009*

The first OA-Policy:

All peer-reviewed journal articles written by staff at OUC should be made available in ODA as quickly as possible after publication, provided that the journal's publisher allow self-archiving of the scientific work. (R & D committee proposal 19/2009)

*2010*

The Incentive scheme at OUC was adopted: Published

journal articles that are added to the IR are given full benefit of the publication points in OUC's internal model for allocation of research incentives. While scientific articles not added in the IR only receive half the publishing points and loses the equivalent in monetary value that otherwise would have been budgeted to the faculty or department (Board Proposal 3 / 2010). The incentive scheme applies from 01.01.2010.

ODA opened in mid-June 2010.

*2011*

In August OUC merged with Akershus University College to become Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences (HiOA).

In September HiOA decided on a new open access policy.

### Incentive scheme

The incentive scheme is based on The Norwegian documentation system for research funding (NVI). NVI is designed to facilitate a performance-based distribution of research funding to the institutions based on their academic publishing activity. Academic publishing serve as the basis for the research component of the budgets for universities and university colleges. Publishing-data will be reported at the departmental level and will form the basis for calculating publication points at the institutional level based on the quality level, publication type and weighted publication figures. (Read more about the Norwegian documentation system for research funding: <http://dbh.nsd.uib.no/rapportering/publisering.action>)

OUC reported in 2010 315.8 publishing points to the Database for Statistics on Higher Education (DBH) to be included in the Ministry's basis for setting the research component of the budgets. 50.8% of the publishing points were related to scientific articles. This amounts to 160.4 publishing points. The distribution of research incentives are based on the results of two years before. This means that the results from 2010 are the basis for the budget allocation in 2012.

The value of each publication point for the 2012 budget is NOK 33875. Academic articles are valued at



NOK 5,434,000. This represents a negligible amount of the university college's total budget.

At the Oslo University College, where faculty and Research Centers earn a certain number of publication points that trigger internal research funds each time they publish an article, the board decided that the scientific articles that are not deposited in the IR receive only half of the monetary value of the obtained publication points. There will be no subtraction when the publisher prohibits deposit.

When journals do not allow parallel publishing in an institutional repository the articles will be archived in a closed repository. The Learning Centre is managing the copyright clearance process.

Of the 219 articles published in 2010, 209 articles were self-archived in full text in Cristin, i.e. more than 95 percent. Of the 10 missing articles, 6 of them had good reasons: the co-author did not allow self-archiving, lack of access to the PDF-file, or that the employees had quit during the year, etc.

For the last four articles, we have not managed to get the author to deposit their articles.

Of the 209 articles, 120 articles are published in ODA. OUC incentive scheme requires researchers to upload full-text versions of their articles in the research documentation system Cristin.

The incentive scheme at OUC has been widely accepted.

#### Amount of scientific content in the other Norwegian repositories

We have no empirical data to lean on when it comes to whether scientists would have self-archived their articles to the same extent without the incentive scheme. But when we look at figures from other higher education institutions in Norway, we think that the scheme has had an influence.

Of the total content in ODA 282 of 657 documents are peer-reviewed.

The most popular thesis was downloaded 634 times (<http://hdl.handle.net/10642/270>).

The most popular journal article/book chapter was downloaded 762 times (<http://hdl.handle.net/10642/606>).

It is interesting to note that more and more higher education institutions have mandates related to the disposal of articles in the IR. But this alone does not seem to affect the self-archiving of documents.

#### Success factors

Some of the success factors related to the good results might be:

- The Learning Centre- Digital Services has worked extensively with information aimed at researchers, creating web sites, visits to all departments, and have otherwise been available for guidance.
- It is important to us that the workflow is as simple as possible for all. As the scientists register the scientific activity they self-archive their post-print or the publisher's PDF of their scientific paper. Thus, there are no additional administrative procedures for the researchers to self-archive the documents.
- Digital Services has overall system responsibility for both Cristin and the IR ODA, and can provide technical solutions between the systems. This makes it possible to work closely together in terms of solutions, workflow, etc.
- Copyright management is handled by the Learning Centre.

Institutions	Opened	Total number of journal articles, NORA	Journal articles, 2010, DBH
NTNU (DiVA)	2000?	99* journal articles	2234
University of Oslo (DUO)	2002	202 journal articles	3639
University of Bergen (BORA)	2004	645 journal articles	2059
University of Tromsø (Munin)	2006	446 journal articles	1059
University of Agder (AURA)	April 2009	143 journal articles	285
Oslo University College (ODA)	June 2010	231** journal articles	199*

*Journal articles in the Norwegian institutional repositories (12.10.2011):*

*\*It does not seem to be a correlation between the contents of the DiVA and the contents of NORA.*

*\*\*ODA welcomes all peer-reviewed articles. Number of peer-reviewed articles for 2010 was 219, while the number of scientific articles reported to DBH was 199.*

- OUC researchers who self-archive two versions of their articles in Cristin. When the researchers upload both post print and the publisher's PDF they facilitate the work of copyright management significantly.
- The workflow of research registration in Cristin. At OUC each faculty has a Cristin superuser who is part of the R&D coordination and administration who work closely with scientists and help them to self-archive.
- Internal decisions and incentive scheme has been essential. Open Access work has had strong support from management at OUC, and the R & D Department.
- We've also been very lucky with the timing in relation to guidelines from the government. The Norwegian authorities have in recent years actively advocated for more public access, visibility, and access to research results. They point out that there should be free access to publicly funded research. (Report no. 30 to The Storting (2008-2009) Climate for Research).

### Open access policy

In September 2011 HiOA decided on an open access policy. The policy should be considered in the light of the objectives set for the institution.

HiOA aims to ensure that the results of research at the institution shall be made publicly accessible in the institutional repository to ensure a free exchange of opinions about the research.

Journals and working papers published by HiOA should follow the principles of open access to scientific publications.

Students and researchers can choose the publishing channels that provide the most favorable access to the material, either because they have a good policy with regards to permitting self-archiving or because the publishing channel is an Open Access publishing channel.

HiOA's open institutional repository, ODA, will include peer-reviewed or editorially evaluated scientific publications.

In addition to the open access policy the board adopted guidelines for the establishment of OA journals by HiOA. As of today, HiOA publishes 6 OA journals.

Furthermore, the Board adopted guidelines for self-archiving of publications in the institutional repository, ODA:

All peer-reviewed journal articles prepared by researchers at HiOA are to be made available in HiOA's IR, ODA, as soon as possible after publishing, provided that the publisher allows self-archiving and parallel publishing of the scientific work. Everyone must self-archive their scientific journal articles in Cristin. This applies to documents published after January 1st 2010. If the journals do not allow parallel publishing, or where the co-author does not approve of publishing in IR, the documents are stored in a closed repository.

HiOA's main rule is that students and researchers self-archive their documents to be published in ODA.

### Quality requirements

ODA contains:

- Peer-reviewed scientific articles registered in Cristin.
- Approved theses by students from HiOA's own master's programs.
- Approved doctoral theses by students from HiOA's own research programs.

The Learning Centre and Library (LSB) is responsible for copyright management issues related to accessibility.

### Conclusion

It is emphasized that the growth in the number of openly accessible articles very clearly shows that OUC's incentive scheme works: the requirement of self-archiving in the IR to receive the monetary value of academic publishing.

But I think several things are contributing to the lack of resistance to demands for self-archiving. I think the timing was right: all other HE-institutions had IR in place. Furthermore, we had good ambassadors through involvement of all departments and research administrations, and the workflow was made easy for the researchers. And a lot of information through websites, and meetings with all departments and guidance during the process were provided. It's equally important that it's the same R & D coordinators who remind researchers to register their research in Cristin who also ensure that they remember self-archiving their articles.

The new policy will probably be relatively easy to implement, since it is a continuation of the policy that has worked one year already. The incentive scheme is not yet adopted by the new board at HiOA. But it is indicated that the scheme will be continued.

There are no financial incentives to encourage publishing in OA journals when this means article processing charges. The R&D Department signals that an institutional fund for paying these charges should be considered established in the 2012 budget.

What will be interesting going forward is whether HiOA manages to get all researchers to self-archive their articles in the future. Researchers are perhaps motivated to self-archive their articles through a combination of mandates and

incentives. At OUC, the scheme is seen as a reverse incentive in that researches not complying will receive less money, but it has created negligible concern and debate and instead has led to self-archiving of articles.



**Tania Strom**  
Manager of digital ServicesOslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences Learning Centre and Library

## WE HAVE WON THE ARGUMENT ABOUT OPEN ACCESS – NOW WE HAVE TO BRING THINGS TOGETHER AND MAKE IT WORK!

Lars Björnshauge

*Talk delivered at PKP<sup>1</sup>-conference in Berlin September 26<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup>, 2011*

I am delighted to be here, so much energy, so many promising projects – for me it is one of these feel good conferences, where we despite all the problems and challenges we see ahead of us never the less can see significant progress and feel that what we are doing is important and basically good.

I had the opportunity to listen to John Willinsky Monday evening, and I learned a lot, among other things that power-point is out! So I will give that a go. So here is my note book, a pile of paper sheets! The title of my presentation might seem a bit bold. The first part of the title is inspired by a number of presentations by the former executive director of SPARC Europe, David Prosser – the latter is an attempt to give an indication as to what I think should be done now!

At this stage I would like to emphasize that I am standing here as a member of the Board of SPARC Europe. But if you don't like what you hear, blame me and not SPARC Europe.

Talking to the audience here at this conference I will not talk about the many important digitization projects that have been conducted and are under way. They make a very important contribution in making lots of works freely accessible to the public. I will neither go into discussion about Green open access. Subject based repositories and institutional repositories, parallel publishing and self-archiving etc. make as well very important contribution to access to research output, and libraries have been the driving force here (as well).

I will concentrate on Gold Open Access – primary publishing of scholarly works in an Open Access mode, without reader payments and with no embargo, with extensive usage rights etc. with an emphasis on peer reviewed open access journals.

I am aware that a lot of promising things are under way when it comes to peer-reviewed open access

monographs; in fact I am involved in the preparation of one such project

It might be good to look a little bit back in time now. It often gives you an opportunity to put things in perspective. Monday evening John went some 17 centuries back in time; I will only go some 17 years back.

I have my background in academic libraries and I remember very well the discussion that took place on e-mail from summer 1994 and nine months ahead and which eventually was published by Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Office of Scientific and Academic Publishing as a monograph with the title: Scholarly Journals at the Crossroads: A Subversive Proposal for Electronic Publishing.

Among the contributors were Stevan Harnad, Paul Ginsparg, Andrew Odlyzko, James O'Donnell and Ann Okerson.

The editors (Okerson & O'Donnell) wrote in their conclusion of the debate that "This is a book about hope and imagination in one corner of the emerging landscape of cyberspace. It embraces passionate discussion of an idea for taking to the Internet to revolutionize one piece of the world of publishing." It was definitely an eye opener for me. Electronic journals, scholarly skywriting, open peer review etc. A few years earlier Ginsparg and colleagues launched the HEP archive – ArXiv – which is still in operation and by the way – referring to another issue raised by John Monday evening - recently struggling with sustainability issues.

I am not pretending to write the history of open access, but here are some of the milestones in the journey that has brought us to where we are today – the list is incomplete and I probably missed important things, but anyway:

- 1993: BioLine launched,
- 1997: SPARC founded by ARL, SciELO launched,
- 1998: African Journals Online (AJOL) launched,
- 1999: Electronic Information for Libraries

<sup>1</sup> PKP: Public Knowledge Project, Simon Fraser University, Canada

- (EIFL) founded,
- 2000: BioMed Central publish first OA-article.
- 2001: PERI launched by INASP, Wikipedia launched, deadline for the open letter from Public Library of Science (PLoS).
- 2002: SPARC Europe founded, Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) launched by Open Society Institute (OSI), Creative Commons launched, OJS launched by PKP.
- 2003: DOAJ launched by Lund University Libraries (300 journals), Wellcome trust endorses open access, PLoS launches first OA-journal, the Berlin Declaration launched (a few hundred meters from where we are right now! – and as we all know a very important initiative where universities and research funders for the first time in numbers called for open access)
- 2004: CrossRef announced.
- 2005: Wellcome Trust implements open access mandate.
- 2006: European Research Council (ERC) issues a Statement on Open Access, PLoS launches PLoS ONE. The European University Association (EUA) releases Statement on Open Access. ERC issued guidelines that allows for payment for publication charges in OA-journals. The European Commission launch the Open Access pilot within the FP7.
- 2008: Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association (OASPA) founded,
- 2011: IFLA publish Statement on Open Access, Howard Hughes, Wellcome Trust and Max Planck announced plans to launch a mega OA journal

### The balance so far:

There are some 10000 installations of OJS<sup>2</sup> and several thousand journals running on OJS and the majority of those are Open Access. The DOAJ counts more than 7000 OA journals and many in process. Hundreds of institutions have signed the Berlin Declaration and other similar declarations. Universities, university associations and research centers have issued policies that mandate open access. According to ROARMAP, the Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies there is now 132 institutional OA mandates and 52 research funder mandates.

High level decision makers in governments, in supranational organizations like the European Commission are more and more explicitly demanding

and working for and supporting open access and increasingly Gold open access.

There has been many attempts to stigmatize open access publishing as poor quality publishing, that open access publishers publish rubbish, that business models based on article processing charges corrupts peer-review. There has been and still are attempts to blur the concept – free access, delayed open access, universal access etc.

But the times they are a ‘changing: here are a couple of quotes from the Annual letter to customers from Nature Publishing Group published a week ago: “‘Gold’ open access continues to gain acceptance as an attractive solution for authors, readers and publishers alike. Open access has been at the heart of NPG’s expansion for the last two years”.

We won the discussion, the argument about open access, no doubt about that.

### What needs to be done now?

There is no doubt that sociologist would tell that what we accomplished so far is the results of a global social movement based on a bottom up approach, in collaboration with innovative scientists, developers and lately as well innovative commercial open access publishers. We have been lucky to have the support from significant developments in technology and innovative individuals. But like any other social movement there comes a time when things have to become a bit more organized and focused without losing momentum and creativity.

We have to bring things together, in order to really make it work, in order to really have lasting impact on the scholarly communication system and in order to be well prepared for the moment when we reach the tipping point.

First of all we must build on the collaborative efforts that have brought us to where we are today. For instance when it comes to open access journals I find it very important that the 4-digit number of “lonely” journals find a home by one of the aggregators or platform providers. There are a number of good examples of aggregation and consolidation – SciELO, BioLine, Redalyc and PKP of course – aggregation and consolidation adds significant value to the journals in terms of technical functionality and capacity, visibility and impact.

PKP and OASPA are doing a good job here, but more could and should be done.

As Eelco mentioned yesterday morning mega journals were the hot topic at the OASPA meeting last week. Following the impressive accomplishment of PLoS

<sup>2</sup> Open Journal System – developed by PKP



ONE the concept is now being copied by a number of established publishers. This could be considered a threat to the many open access journals published in many, many countries. But on the other hand it might as well be a good idea to consider that the core features of the mega journals – namely conveyor belt peer-review and production, broad scope and huge editorial boards – could be applied in certain disciplines. For instance a mega journal in agriculture or food science, which could integrate the many journals publishing extremely important research for local communities and regions around the world. This might even facilitate much more exchange between researchers that do not even know each other. That would be a different form of aggregation and consolidation. We need research in open access, we need to demonstrate the benefits of open access.

There is an abundance of examples of journals that have transitioned from a subscription based business model to open access, often triggered by the fact that the traditional publishers wanted to close the journal. Many of these journals have experienced a massive growth in visibility and downloads. We need research to communicate this. OASPA have decided to work on this one, but more needs to be done. In general we need additional metrics and indicators. Again lots of good work is already underway here. We probably need standards and consolidation here as well.

Not only must we challenge the regime of the journal impact factor – don't blame Garfield, don't blame Thomson Reuters. But using the Journal Impact Factor as the prime measure of impact of science, and in this case the impact of science on science itself is a very problematic thing as we all know. What we need is much more differentiated indicators and measures of impact that goes beyond measuring impact of science on science itself. We need measures that can inform about the impact of science on higher education, on human health and wealth, on societies and on equality, participation and democracy. But the worst thing about this regime is its devastating effects on research in developing countries and countries in transition. The push for researchers from those countries and continents to publish in high impact factor journals has decisive influence on the subject of their research and much more so is a big obstacle for open access publishing.

Therefore we need to support and foster sustainability for the services that are underway that can in a much more socially responsible way demonstrate the impact of science.

We need an overview in order to set our priorities and focus our efforts. There are an abundance of promising projects and initiatives out there. I do not think

anyone has the overview. This might be a research project in itself.

But it might be an idea to ask the brilliant brains in PKP, OASPA and SPARC and similar organizations to come together and create such an overview and come up with suggestions as to how we make the most of all the innovative skills and power we can see is at hand. We need sustainability.

There are organizations that work for the same cause as we do. These organizations need critical mass, they need membership support, they need funding in order to gain strength.

There are initiatives and service providers that constitute an emerging infrastructure for a new, more efficient, and transparent and open system of scholarly communication. These initiatives and services need as well critical mass, sustainability and support. University libraries have for a number of years now organized themselves in consortia to negotiate better deals with the publishers. I will not discuss the actual outcome of these activities, but these consortia have a tremendous turnover. Imagine, as Leslie Chan, associate director of BioLine has put it, imagine if these consortia were able to allocate equivalent to 1% of their turnover to support organizations and services that support the cause that the library directors of the consortium member institutions (that is the academic libraries), their vice-chancellors and their organizations, want to see become reality – namely open access. That would definitely make a hell of a difference.

We need to continue and focus our advocacy and lobbying. I mentioned earlier that high level decision makers are now embracing Open Access publishing – probably not because it is a good cause in itself, probably not because it has the potential of bridging the digital divide, but probably mainly because it has become obvious that innovation, industry and societies will only benefit from science if the texts, the objects and the corresponding research data are available, interlinked, mined and reusable in an open networked environment without barriers, 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. Next thing for these decision makers now is to realize that this transition will not come to reality without costs, without investments, without author publication charges, without investments in infrastructure. All this gives me at least some hope that the combined efforts of the bottom up approach provided by us and our allies, the continued advocacy and lobbying by organizations like SPARC and others and the increasing call for Open Access and openness in science by research funders, governments and

supranational and global organizations will continue to push the case forward. Despite the efforts from those who still want to project the barriers, the walls.

Coming back to the beginning of my talk:

Remember SPARC was founded as an international alliance of academic and research libraries working to correct imbalances in the scholarly publishing system. We are not there yet. But I am confident that we are coming closer.

And coming back to Ginsparg's HEP-eprint server:

Just a couple of days ago the lasting importance of this huge subject repository and the strong community behind it has once again demonstrated its groundbreaking potential in that the SCOAP3 consortium now after 4 years of consortium building have started its tendering process, which probably will lead to a transition of high impact and very expensive physics journals into fully open access journals and

with the condition that these journals should be unbundled from the big deals.

This is promising indeed. Coming back to the book I mentioned earlier: 17 years after we can definitely say that: Yes, Scholarly journals are really at the crossroads!!

*In conclusion:* We have been working on moving the scholarly communication system away from a culture of shareholders to the culture of sharing, collaboration and networking.

It is a privilege to having been able to contribute to this process.

Let's continue the good work.

Thank you for your attention

Lars Bjørnshauge



**Lars Bjørnshauge** Member of the SPARC Europe Board