

## Questions & Answers Session II

### **Frederick Friend**

Pieter, if we can imagine a scenario where large corpus of pre-prints become available on OA. What added value would the printed version offer over the OA?

### **Pieter Bolman**

Apart from the fact that the journal publishes the official version, it also ensures archiving. In contrast, pre-prints need not be final versions.

### **Stevan Harnad**

I agree with most of what Pieter presented. Indeed, our research culture has not opened our mind to the opportunities of OA. In relation to BOAI, you mentioned two strategies. However, you mentioned the same strategy twice. BOAI 2 also consists of founding new OA journals and converting existing journals to OA. Moreover, you forgot to mention the cultural issue, which is BOAI 1 and is available to every researcher now. This consists of posting peer reviewed articles on the web.

It is not clear that it is not a win–win situation. For example, if researchers archive all their articles and their institutions continue to pay for journal subscriptions, everyone is happy: researchers enjoy access to all material and journals do not have to change their economic model. Alternatively, we could witness competition between the OA version and the value-added version that you described. If users prefer the old model, it will stay in place. Otherwise, the model will have to adapt.

### **Pieter Bolman**

I agree and there is nothing wrong with it as long as a pre-print to a journal does not hurt journal subscriptions. As soon as it starts to hurt the journal, the publisher will have to decide.

### **Stevan Harnad**

We should acknowledge that Elsevier operates the most enlightened self-archiving policies, where, according to your Chief Executive, authors can self-archive refereed postprints, not only preprints. Is this a mistake?

### **Pieter Bolman**

That is correct.

### **Stevan Harnad**

Concerning the charge for peer review, when I say that the cost per article is estimated to be USD 500 I do not say that a 95% rejection rate journal is going to pay USD 10 000 in peer review. USD 500 is the cost if you add the rejection costs to those of the accepted articles.

### **Pieter Bolman**

A mathematician always goes to the extreme values to see how the function behaves.

**Giuseppe Vitiello, European Institute for Security Studies**

First: What is the relation between the DSpace software and Eprints.org software? Second: I do not find Pieter's argument convincing. Global operators, like Elsevier, have done a lot of work in globalisation, but not enough in localisation.

**Andy Powell**

I understand that the Eprints.org software started out with a focus on the development of e-print archives within institutions. DSpace had a wider remit. MIT wanted software to manage all intellectual output from institutions. It is fair to say that the Eprints.org software could be used to support the management of all intellectual output from an institution. Therefore, they are very complementary in overall aims.

**Pieter Bolman**

I will consider this statement.

**Stefan Gradmann**

In Germany, a few years ago, we witnessed a heated discussion on the survival of journals. Provided that we find an efficient alternative means for impact assessment of scientific work, why should we keep journals?

**Sally Morris**

As I mentioned in my presentation, a journal provides a useful subset of information. In a world where one cannot possibly read all material, a subset that is based on quality and criteria represents enormous value. This is what the journal can offer and, in fact, we may need it more, not less.

**From the floor**

Publications are becoming more and more expensive. We have heard that in the last years there was an average price increase of 5 to 8% per year. What are the origins of these price increases?

**Pieter Bolman**

Funding for science research increased by a factor of two compared to library funding which did not keep pace. Consequently, the publishers factored in cancellations into a price increase for the following year. Added to 4% inflation, 4% for expansion and 4% for erosion of subscriptions, prices increased by around 12%. In particular, not for profit publishers felt under pressure to avoid losses.

**Sally Morris**

I would like to add a comment on the expansion element, which is often overlooked. I appreciate that libraries do not want to buy more content. However, more articles are seeking publication. The publisher can either sell bigger volumes or create new journals. Regardless, costs will increase.

**Jean-Claude Guedon**

Pieter Bolman claimed that the transfer of copyright to the journal was absolutely necessary to ensure secure archiving. However, I think that there is some confusion between BOAI 1 and BOAI 2. In the BioMed Central system, authors keep the copyright and the right to post articles that they publish. There is a distinction between the transfer of copyright and the irrevocable right to post online scientific information.

**Pieter Bolman**

I agree with copyright question, which is sometimes overdone, where scientific practice is anchored in legal terms. One could argue that publishers give a lot of rights to the author. For example, without the copyright, we could not have digitised our articles. As some of our authors were dead, it would have posed enormous legal and logistic problems. Therefore, for sheer convenience, it is preferable that the publisher keeps the rights. One could let authors retain copyright and allow the publisher to use the articles as he wishes. Overall, it is easier to give the rights to the publisher.

**Sally Morris**

In the Netherlands, a recent conference on universities and copyright discussed this issue. It concluded that all players have to act responsibly.

**Hans Karow, European Science Foundation**

What drives scientists to publish metadata sets for multiple use? Andy Powell claimed that the technical issues were easily solved. However, the European Space Agency had problems convincing researchers to convert their metadata information into a format usable by others. This task takes time and money. If the author does not benefit, having just the perspective that it might be useful and quality-controlled in a few years, why should he do it?

**Andy Powell**

I agree that significant costs could be incurred in making legacy metadata available in the context of the OAI protocol. However, my statements regarding technology addressed the institutional installation of an e-print archive. After setting up the software, a lot of relatively tricky metadata issues occur. Therefore, scientists will not create metadata unless perceived benefit exists. We have to convince researchers of the benefit of working in this new world.

**Gilbert Rodriguez, Nanterre University**

In my view archiving is not a technical problem that can be solved by protocol management. As we saw this morning, a strong movement exists in favour of private property and the reduction of the public domain. In fact, the whole legal framework is aimed at reducing the extent of the public domain. Moreover, the major trends in OAI encourage a reduced role for librarians in archiving. Clearly, public service control represents the only way to guarantee the preservation of knowledge in the public domain. As Dominique Wolton stated this morning, there is a need for deep political thinking on the construction of the information society.

**Andy Powell**

I agree with your sentiments. When I referred to the unclear role of libraries, I was specifically referring to institutional libraries. In my opinion, national libraries are suitable to carry out a long-term preservation role.

**Hervé Le Crosnier, Caen University**

When I hear the presentations of this morning and afternoon, I fear that we are forgetting the objectives of science. We live in a world where hope for life is diminishing, and energy is lacking. Consequently, we need to study new materials. Since the huge amount of funding for biological research mostly originates in public money, all scientific results should benefit the public. If we use public money to seek private profit, we are taking the wrong option. In this regard, scientific output includes articles and raw data.

Under an alternative system, the role of the publisher includes less filtering and more percolating of all public information before selling it to those who can afford it. If we consider scientific output as raw data locked up in private databases, we have to fear outcome.

**Pieter Bolman**

This comment refers to the role of public funds. In the United States and the United Kingdom, about 50% of research is privately funded. It is more a matter of one's outlook on life. If one believes that research is so exalted and can function without profit, then one could also claim that scientists should build their own research equipment. Whether one likes it or not, the world does not work in this manner. Although I understand your feelings, this is not my approach. Increasingly, private enterprise is entering the public domain.

**Sally Morris**

In a sense, the pre-print represents the raw research output. If publishers add value to this information, they should recover some profit. Secondly, the taxes contributing to public research also come from companies, including publishing companies.