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

The Second Nordic Conference on Scholarly Communication was arranged by Lund University Libraries in Lund, Sweden, April 26-28, 2004

A report by **Ingegerd Rabow**, Lund University Libraries

(As we publish separate interviews with David G. Nicholls and Tim Brody their presentation are not included in this report. Conference presentations are available at **http://www.lub.lu.se/NCSC2004**)

The conference theme *Towards a New Publishing Environment* covered new financial models, intellectual property agreements, and quality control.

Colin Steele's introductory address *The Sound of One Hand Clapping: The Politics of Scholarly Communication Changes* painted the broad perspectives and set the agenda for the conference. Vice Chancellors, Provosts, and Presidents often neglect the big issues in scholarly communication. We need to take political steps from the bottom up to the highest political level to effect the necessary changes. Unfortunately very little money is spent on Scholarly Communication research, e.g. real costs of providing information, marketing etc. We should turn to an article economy and a just-in-time mentality instead of to the Big Deals.

Do we see a scholarly ossification in publishing? What will be the consequences of the Google Age? The NSF report “Knowledge lost in information” predicts that disciplines that today have little interest in grid computing, cyber infrastructure or digital libraries will come to see enormous opportunities. How will these activities interact

with traditional library communities?

“The sound of one hand clapping” means no contact, no sound, and no reaction! Academics rarely talk to anyone outside their own discipline. Is there enough “cross talk” between all the concerned players in the market?

Barbara Aronson, project manager of WHO’s Health InterNetwork Access to Research Initiative (HINARI), changed the focus to the specific information problems of the developing countries. We cannot exclude 80% of the world from our scientific communication system. 75 countries have a GNP below USD1,000 per capita, 50 countries between 1,000 and 3,000, 35 between 3,000 and 10,000, and 30 countries have >30,000.

There are other differences. The scientific methods in the industrial world have developed complex structures based on a series of central assumptions: transparency for replication, peer judgment, author's right to be acknowledged, presentation as the basis for creating new knowledge, preservation, and the purpose of science to produce and share evidence = public good.

Do these assumptions apply to the 3rd world? Can information be supposed to be a public good and can it even be shared? Where there is oral tradition archiving has another function. Advancement does not depend on publishing if you are the only specialist in the country. If information is equivalent to power - can it then be a public good? The technical barriers are huge. Internet connections are slow, unreliable and too expensive. Libraries have no budgets for information. Users do not or cannot search properly.

The situation before HINARI started in 2001 was bleak. 56% of the institutions from the lowest GNP category had no paid subscriptions, 21% had on average 2 paid subscriptions. In the GNP range 1,000-3,000 34% had no paid subscriptions and 34% had on average 2 paid subscriptions.

HINARI is only available to national/official institutions. The poorest countries have free access and the 1 000-3 000 countries pay USD1,000 per institution/year. 50 publishers have joined with 2,400 journals. The number of downloads is growing, average 430 articles/ month.

AGORA, a HINARI clone in agriculture, was launched in October 2003.

Professor **Manfred Thaller**, Humanities Computer Science, University at Cologne concentrated on funding issues. Germany has no central scholarly communication policies for universities or

libraries. Each “Land” follows all sorts of contradictory policies, even if the Federal Ministry would like to implement its own. In addition Germany has four very strong research institutes with large budgets e.g. the Max Planck Society, and the German National Research Council (DFG) with 1 billion EUR for funding research at universities. 20-30 M EUR are dedicated to information infrastructure, including library projects. A general problem is that all funding is start-up funding. When digitization projects no longer are undertaken as objects of prestige they will become much cheaper.

Some examples of what is being done in Germany:
Clio-online is funded within the library program of the DFG and is a central Internet subject portal for historical research.
Digital Peer Publishing NRW / Northrhine-Westphalia. Startup funding for eight electronic journals in a variety of disciplines.
dissonline.de / a library initiative Startup funding for eight institutions to create a model solution for the long term storage of electronic PhD theses.
“Retrodigitization” / funded by DFG within the library program to create digital libraries / information systems in the Humanities, digitizing both as images and text. Scholarly discussions can be linked directly to the “objects” in the database. Examples: **http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de** (manuscripts), and **http://www.mpier.uni-frankfurt.de/dlib/** (civil law).
Prometheus / Federal Ministry of Research. Startup funding - ca. 1,6 Mill. EUR - to create a virtual archive of German art historical institutes. Another example of the new form for SC with personalised work areas where scholars can manipulate images (enlarge, zoom etc) and link discussions to them.

Theodore Bergstrom, Chair of Economics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, presented the “The Peculiar Market for Academic Journals”.

Non-profit groups own the six most highly cited economic journals. For a complete economic journals collection a library would spend 9% of its budget on non-profits and get 62% of the citations. 91% of the budget would go to commercials for 38% of the citations. Non-profit journals cost on average 1/5 per page compared with the commercials.

The economics of academic journals are strange. If one brand of car cost 6 to 15 times as much as others of the same quality, how many would be sold? Almost zero, because people would substitute low priced for high priced. Why do commercial journals continue to sell when they cost 6-15 times as much per cite as nonprofits? Because **readers** tend to see academic journals as complements, not substitutes. Two copies of cheap society journals will not replace a subscription to a commercial journal that costs 10 times as much per cite. Many scientists want to read all significant research in their

area, not just the top papers.

The partial OA solution has shown some examples of authors' willingness to pay. The OUP journal Nucleic Acids Research offers authors the option to pay $530 for OA 90% of their authors choose to pay. A survey by PNAS shows that 49,6% of answering authors would pay $1,000 for OA (note that PNAS is free after 6 months)

OA introduces a real element of competition on the market, as the competition on the author side is likely to be much stiffer than on the readers´ side. Would authors submit to journals that charge 6-15 times more than competitors? Hardly. From the **author's** viewpoint journals are seen as substitutes not complements.

Which guy is willing to pay what is the problem for all monopolists. Force them to deal with individuals because then it is much more difficult to know what to expect, to predict outcome. Librarians should subsidise new journals, and Pay-Per-View. Set a maximum price on citation. Let journals that charge more sell to individual subscribers. Libraries should stop being revenue collectors for high priced journals and should publicize the facts of pricing!

Sally Morris, Chief Executive Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, defines OA as “Free for everyone to research articles”. Surprisingly few authors archive even if 50-60% of publishers allow pre- or post-print archiving.

At least 50% of all academic journals are published by, or on behalf of learned societies or other not-for-profit organizations. Ca 50% of learned societies outsource the publishing to commercials. Sally agrees with Theodore Bergstrom that non-profit journals are, on average, significantly cheaper than commercial journals and also more highly cited. 2/3 of the top-journals in ISI are non-profits.

Calculate the article processing fee, will authors/funders/institutions be prepared to pay, how many authors will be unable to pay, will there be other sources of revenue, and what will be the effect of surplus/profit? Will the journal and the learned society survive, and what will be the effects on readership, citations, and submissions? ALPSP has recently commissioned to Donald King to do a study of all the costs related to the publication chain.

The session on Intellectual Property Rights was introduced by **Michael P. Spinella**, Executive Director of JSTOR, a not-for-profit online archive of the complete runs of some 400 scholarly journals covering 38 disciplines.

Contracts with publishers can be terminated but not revoked, i.e. the content in the archive may not be removed. There is no

copyright transfer. US Copyright law is based on the constitution: “Congress shall have power to… promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries”. The Constitution wanted to strike a balance.

CR is really a bundle of rights that can be transferred as a bundled whole or disaggregated and licensed out separately. Should it be? Spinella refers to the Lund University model licenses. You can choose to transfer CR and still keep specified rights, for example to publish your refereed work on the university server. It is important to consider that the balkanization of rights may make collective works unfeasible Authentication and the protection of the integrity of an author’s original work are other important issues.

Spinella's Modest Proposal:
Scholarly work should have a shorter protection time - 70 + life is too long, educational exceptions should be universalized, archival rights and responsibilities should be retained, some author rights should persist even if CR is transferred (eg classroom use), and authors should never be able to change or take away their original articles.

Bill Hubbard, Project Manager of the JISC FAIR project, SHERPA talked about institutional e-print repositories and IPR-experience from the SHERPA project. There is a certain tendency that academics prefer to publish in journals that grant them certain rights. The use of terminology seems to differ between academics and publishers. Certain publishers define post-prints as pre-prints, i. e. as print-ready articles that have not yet been printed. It is more often considered OK for the author to publish on his own website but not on his university website. Publisher quote: “It can be published on the web but not disseminated.”

SHERPA now manages the RoMEO list of publisher attitudes to pre- and post-prints in a searchable database. Publishers are classified according to the RoMEO colour scheme.
White - archiving not formally supported
Yellow - can archive preprint (pre-refereed)
Blue - can archive post-print (post-refereed)
Green - can archive pre and post
Of the 88 publishers on the list 42% are white, 33% are green, 16% are blue and 9% are yellow.

SHERPA will publish model licenses soon and prefers non-exclusive licenses. Rights are also required for preservation. Policies need to be established for potential withdrawal of e-prints if research is falsified, illegal, libelous or dangerous.

Ulf Maunsbach, Lund University Law Faculty, concluded the IPR-

session with his presentation of Swedish copyright law and the Lund University model licenses.

The intellectual property rights are copyright, trademark, design and patents and can be possessed by ownership. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author. Copyright protects the expression and patents protect the ideas.

The individual right can be transferred (by sale, gift, inheritance) and can be defended against infringements. The copyright includes the exclusive (economic) right to control the work by reproducing it and making it available to the public. The work must be original, i.e. come from the copyright holder, and be the result of his/her personal creative effort and have a certain level of originality – the unique expression. In the digital world it is difficult to differ between the original and the copy. Everything is copied everywhere all the time and there are temporary files. Researchers have to be aware of their rights and they must act to preserve them. The Lund University model licenses were created to that purpose.

The last session of the conference was devoted to methods for quality control and research assessment. **Erik Sandewall**, professor of Computer and Information Science, Linköping University, described the rule of the publication game. Scientific publication is surrounded by a system of generally accepted rules that are not due to legal or economic reasons, but are internal to the scientific community. The Ingelfinger rule has led to either not using preprints or to defining Published as only after peer review! This is most ridiculous. Publish = Make public! Priority of results is established based on the date of the first publication. Open discussion with the peer community is part of the research process but is not compatible with the idea that priority counts from the date of publication and publication occurs only after reviewing.

It is most important to consider whether current rules and practices should be revised as some of thm stand in the way of the best possible use of new information technology for scientific communication.

In 1997 the journal ETAI *Electronic Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* was launched with Erik as its editor-in-chief. The editors and organizers wanted to make the review process more open for authors and readers. A submitted preprint is open to discussions for three months. During this period, the author can choose to modify the article using the feedback from the discussion. After this period confidential refereeing takes place. Referees weigh the article as well as the review discussion and decide whether or not to accept the article. The public discussion is being kept online and the

published version stays online even if it is not accepted/certified by the referees. An annual limited paper edition of the articles, without the discussion, is published yearly.

Gunnar Sivertsen, NIFU, Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education, talked about *"Electronic Distribution and Open Access from the Viewpoint of Research Assessment and Funding"*.

Will the new policies for scholarly communication, i.e. open access to the literature as a public good and a new organization of peer review restrain or promote the important issues of quality, excellence; internationalization, evaluation, and budgeting based on bibliometrics?

Norway has a new overall budgeting model for research in the Higher Education Sector; in total 15,000 researchers, who publish around 8,000 publications per year (excl. local publishing at the institutions; co-authored publications are counted only once). Budget per publication has not yet been decided, but must become high. The effect will be a macro incentive system. The publication channels will be ranked.

Local publishing (institutional publishing) will not be included in the model.
That might mean negative consequences for OA with no funding for publishing in only institutional (local) publication channels or repositories and also lead to a strengthening of the present publication hierarchy and the commercial monopolization of the STM publishing market.

32% of the Nordic articles and 11% of the journals are not covered by ISI. Norart (at The National Library of Norway) will after adjustments cover another 32% of the journal articles. Bibsys (Norwegian research libraries catalogue) may cover 70-80 % of the book publishing.

In addition to the ranking list and in-output statistics the documentation system will provide information about publishing policies, e.g. publisher attitudes to copyright. References may be linked to full text in OA journals or in self- archived documents.

The final presentation was made by **Peter Suber**, who gave his personal assessment of where the open-access movement stands today and his proposal for our future priorities. Peter is one of the best-known international activists for Open Access and the principal drafter of the Budapest Open Access Initiative. He is an optimist about the future of OA. A worldwide network of archives, journals, standards, policies, technologies, organizations and committed scientists and scholars has been created. The number of quality-

controlled OA-journals and OA-archives has increased steadily. This means that the critical mass of content and the institutional commitment is growing. OA should include royalty-producing literature, e.g. research monographs because OA outweighs small royalties and can increase sales as shown by examples like the National Academies Press.

The mainstream search engines are also interested in spreading OA, e.g. theYahoo-OAIster deal, the Google-OCLC-Dspace deal, the Google-IEEE-Explore deal, and Project Ocean. Open Access content does not demand marketing. It will be found by default of doing nothing if indexed in Google etc.

Authors decide on the future of SC. They decide where to submit their work, whether to archive it, whether to transfer copyright. The largest obstacle to OA is still author inertia. Actions by universities, foundations, and governments are helpful primarily for their effects on authors. Universities can link promotion to OA archiving and pay processing fees when funding agencies won't. Foundations and governments can link funding to OA (through archives or journals) and pay article processing fees. We must help authors to see the connection between OA and career- building and research impact and help them archive their works and to retain key rights.

Peter stressed, that the main task is to build OA, not to undermine conventional publishers. It would be a mistake to think that publishers are all the same. That could alienate publishers who might become allies.

Links:
Knowledge lost in information, NSF report June 2003 http://www.sis.pitt.edu/~dlwkshop/report.pdf
HINARI http://www.healthinternetwork.org
AGORA http://www.aginternetwork.org
Clio-online http://www.clio-online.de
Digital Peer Publishing NRW / "Land" Northrhine-Westphalia http://www.mwf.nrw.de/Hochschulen_in_NRW/NeueMedien/DigitalPeerPublishing.html
dissonline.de / library initiative http://www.dissonline.de
Prometheus / Federal Ministry of Research http://www.prometheus-bildarchiv.de
ALPSP Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers http://www.alpsp.org
JSTOR http://www.jstor.org
SHERPA http://www.sherpa.ac.uk
ETAI Electronic Transactions on Artificial Intelligence http://www.ep.liu.se/ej/etai

Agreement between the University of Michigan (OAIster) and Yahoo Inc. http://www.umich.edu/news/index.html?Releases/2004/Mar04/r031004

OCLC- Dspace – Google cooperation
http://www.oclc.org/research/announcements/2004-04-09.htm

Project Ocean
http://www.lisnews.com/articles/04/02/02/1946240.shtml?tid=67