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Scholarly Communication - what do we mean?

- Scope of the term is wider than "scholarly publishing" and covers the authoring, publishing (in a broad sense), and reading of information produced by members of the academic community for teaching or research. "Information" in this context may be in a variety of formats. (CURL/SCONUL definition)

- Stakeholders usually defined simply as
  - Authors + Publishers + Librarians + Readers

- Other stakeholders not usually included in the debate
  - This needs to change
Definition

- Scholarly Communication encompasses *everything* that researchers, teachers and learners need in order to be effective – and this makes Open Access dissemination important

- **New definition**
- The authoring, publishing, dissemination, and reading of information produced for teaching, learning or research in whatever format,

- *with the tools, measures and systems needed to provide access to and store these materials in perpetuity*

- It is an *inclusive* definition – *of both partners and processes*
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What was the significance of the meeting?

- Major statement of interest by the European Commission
- EU did not mandate deposit of all materials into Open Access sources across Europe
- Perhaps Conference was first public occasion when Open Access was accepted as a serious model for publishing and dissemination alongside commercial models
  - If true, then this may turn out to be historically significant…
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Research Information Network (UK) – Gap Survey of our understanding of journal publishing

- Analysis of data on scholarly journals publishing
  - Published under the auspices of the Research Information Network
  - [http://www.rin.ac.uk/data-scholarly-journals](http://www.rin.ac.uk/data-scholarly-journals)
  - Research undertaken by EPS Ltd
4. Citations, impact factors and their role

Are traditional (i.e., subscription-based) journals more likely to be cited than OA journals?

- Evidence scattered, uses inconsistent methods and covers different subject areas
- Consistent longitudinal data on IF trends needed
- Qualitative factors should not be ignored – range of factors can affect citation counts

Key methodological challenge: article cannot be OA + non-OA at the same time = no like-for-like comparison

Deposit of articles in OA repositories seems to be associated with a larger number of citations, and earlier citations for articles

But reasons for this not clear. The little existing evidence suggests that authors put their best work into OA format

Evidence of IF advantage for OA journals over toll-access journals less consistent – one study of a hybrid journal shows higher citation counts for OA articles than subscription-access articles – but only covers one journal = more work is needed
6. Cost/Impact of Alternative Dissemination Models

What are the costs involved in publishing OA journals? What is the impact of digital repositories on the economics of publishing?

- Some acceptance that many costs common to both OA + conventional journal publishing = can be cancelled out in the ‘equation’ (e.g. ‘first copy’ costs, server and software costs).

- Evaluation of cost impact of alternative models presupposes understanding of existing models. But no solid comparators to compare OA costs against!

- How will OA publishing models be funded? Early evidence that institutionally-based solution potentially inequitable.

- Evidence that repositories are an important new factor in the journal cancellation decision process, but no evidence yet to demonstrate any relationship between subscription cancellations and repositories.

- Paucity of evidence generally in this area

- Critical gap: study on money flow implications of new models

- Further gap: what is their impact on quality of research communications (peer review)?
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## 5 specimen counts from UK repositories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repository 1</td>
<td>821 records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository 2</td>
<td>2521 records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository 3</td>
<td>512 records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository 4</td>
<td>93 records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository 5</td>
<td>69 records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does this tell us?

- In terms of RoI (Return on Investment)
  - Well over £17 million of public money has been spent on the UK repository system at a national level
  - Is the Return on Investment terrible…
  - Has advocacy been a failure…?

- What other statistics can we use?
  - Better results come from usage
  - Particularly for institutional content
    - Research theses particularly important
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Number of downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kaipa, D. (2002) Clinical foundations and information architecture for the implementation of a federated health record service. Thesis (Doctoral, PhD), UCL (University College London).</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RIOJA

- RIOJA – funded by JISC Capital Programme (April 2006)
- Repository Interface for Overlaid Journal Archives
- Academic-led project
  - Illustrates the use of the RIOJA tool to facilitate the overlay of peer review onto repository content
- Importance is that it shows how repositories can add value?
And...

- **RIOJA**
  - Will explore social and economic aspects of building certification onto repositories in support of the creation of overlay journals
  - Carry out a survey of researchers from the field of Astrophysics and Cosmology
  - Aim to deliver a continuation plan for the demonstrator journal, founded on a cost-recovery business model tested on the Astrophysics and Cosmology community

- **RIOJA futures?**
  - Project is talking to Arts and Humanities community about another exemplar
  - Economics of publishing is especially important in these areas
  - RIOJA may be a cost-effective model here
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LIFE project is a collaboration between UCL Library Services and the British Library, funded by the JISC.

LIFE 1 has developed a Generic Preservation Model for costing digital curation at an item level.

Preservation = Technology watch + Preservation frequency * Overall preservation action

Fits into formula for identifying whole lifecycle costs over time at http://eprints.ucl.ac.uk/archive/00001854/01/LifeProjMaster.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifecycle Element</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Ingest</th>
<th>Metadata</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Element 1</td>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Characterisation</td>
<td>Reference Linking</td>
<td>Bit-stream Storage Costs</td>
<td>Technology Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq1)</td>
<td>(Aq1)</td>
<td>(M1)</td>
<td>(M1)</td>
<td>(Ac1)</td>
<td>(P1)</td>
<td>(P1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 2</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>User Support</td>
<td>Preservation Tool Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq2)</td>
<td>(I2)</td>
<td>(M2)</td>
<td>(M2)</td>
<td>(Ac2)</td>
<td>(P2)</td>
<td>(P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 3</td>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>Holdings Update</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Access Mechanism</td>
<td>Preservation Metadata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq3)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td>(M3)</td>
<td>(M3)</td>
<td>(Ac3)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 4</td>
<td>Ordering &amp; Invoicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq4)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 5</td>
<td>Obtaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element 6</td>
<td>Check-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aq6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggested actual costs – Web Archiving Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage of overall cost (10 year average)</th>
<th>Average cost per instance archived</th>
<th>Average cost per new title</th>
<th>Cost per title after 1 year</th>
<th>Cost per title after 5 years</th>
<th>Cost per title after 10 years</th>
<th>Cost per title after 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aq</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£108</td>
<td>£475</td>
<td>£934</td>
<td>£1,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>£21</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£111</td>
<td>£557</td>
<td>£1,114</td>
<td>£2,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£54</td>
<td>£270</td>
<td>£539</td>
<td>£1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>£81</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£426</td>
<td>£2,127</td>
<td>£4,256</td>
<td>£8,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£130</td>
<td>£21</td>
<td>£707</td>
<td>£3,449</td>
<td>£6,876</td>
<td>£13,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The per title costs for 1, 5, 10 and 20 years are based on the average cost per title, combined with the cost of gathering a number of instances of that title. On average the Web Archiving team aims to gather just over 5 instances of each title per year. In reality titles are gathered at different frequencies depending on the nature of the title in question. These figures do not include numbers for web sites which close or remain unchanged.
LIFE Phase 2

- LIFE 2 has been funded by the JISC
  - Firming up the economic modelling in partnership with Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration
  - Will work up more Case Studies to test the models
  - Including Open Access repositories
- Result will establish benchmarks for local digital curation services in a University or National Library
  - Creation of a local digital curation service an objective of UCL’s Library Strategy at [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/Library/libstrat.shtml](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/Library/libstrat.shtml)
  - It is irresponsible to create or store digital objects and not to curate them digitally
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Conclusion

- Many facets of the Open Access debate have been discussed at OAI5
- Advocacy may prosper if we concentrate on impact and visibility
- There are gaps in the knowledge base which hamper our ability to assess the impact and importance of new dissemination models
- Are value-added services the key to securing academic support?
- Digital Curation will ensure the long-term preservation of digital assets in repositories, and the costs are becoming clearer
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And for the generosity of OAI5 sponsors
And finally…

- Evaluation Form will be available on the website after the Workshop
- It is *your* Workshop, so tell us what you think
- Future Workshops will be planned around your comments