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Si è tenuto dal 28 al 30 ottobre, a Barcellona il sesto convegno annuale dell’ICOLC (International Coalition Of Library Consortia), organizzato quest’anno dal CBUC (Consorci de Biblioteques Universitàries de Catalunya), e il CILEA ha partecipato con due rappresentanti.

Dai tre giorni di incontri è emersa con chiarezza la situazione europea dei consorzi nati per fornire risorse elettroniche alle università dei loro Paesi di appartenenza. Ci sono stati anche interventi da parte di rappresentanti provenienti da Giappone, USA, e Sud del mondo (Brasile, Messico, Sud Africa), che hanno offerto un proficuo scambio di prospettive su quale possa essere il modello ideale di consorzio. La tematica dominante del convegno è stata infatti l’esigenza di identificare quale sia il valore aggiunto che i consorzi possano offrire alla propria utenza.


Riteniamo che tutti gli argomenti trattati siano stati di estremo interesse per il lavoro del gruppo CDL, ma di particolare rilevanza è stato il confrontarsi con esperienze di collaborazione fra consorzi, come emerso nella seconda sessione. In Italia abbiamo infatti già esperienza di alcuni contratti interconsortili (Nature e Kluwer per esempio), che hanno dimostrato come la collaborazione porti maggiori risultati e ottimizzazione del tempo e delle risorse rispetto alla competizione. Le analisi dei pro e dei contro offerte dalle esperienze di consorzi dagli Stati Uniti, dalla Gran Bretagna e dal Canada sono state utili per capire quale sia la strada migliore da intraprendere per raggiungere un modello di collaborazione fruttuoso.

Dal confronto con gli altri consorzi presenti all’incontro è emerso, inoltre, come una delle ricchezze maggiori della realtà dei consorzi italiani sia la disponibilità di spazi, competenze e tecnologie per la conservazione dei dati in modo autonomo rispetto alle politiche editoriali presenti e future.

A conclusione dell’evento è stato annunciato che l’ICOLC 2005 si terrà a Poznan, in Polonia.
si prospetta una maggiore attenzione alla tematica della conservazione e archiviazione dei dati, in quanto l’esigenza da parte degli enti è sempre più forte in questa direzione.

Di seguito proponiamo la relazione riassuntiva resa disponibile dal gruppo organizzatore del convegno 2004 (CBUC).

**ICOLC Fall’04 – Barcelona**

Lluis Anglada, CBUC welcomed all participants.

Gabriel Planella did the opening speech. This year more than 30 countries participate in this meeting in Barcelona. E-resources have a high value and are necessary for all researchers. The change from paper to electronic information has started and is already well organised. Gabriel Planella told about the change in structure that will be done for all libraries in Catalonia during the period 2004-2007.

During a tender it was decided to buy Metalib and SFX. As many resources as possible have to be available (the objective is 70%). From FinELib the libraries get information about setting up resources.

It has been very important with close corporation between Licensing team and the Portal team. Nelli – The national electronic library interface is a national service. Nearly all FinELib libraries participate.

Ari Rouvari told about the Nelli-portal. FinELib need a user interface, and they want more use of the resources. With the portal they expect to get more usage and increase the knowledge of the resources. The visions are a one-stop shopping, a single-sign-on, one search in all resources, and easy to use. One server is used for the whole consortia, but they will have local user interface and local services. In the future it will be integrated with e-learning resources.

It is necessary to focus on the needs of the customers, the usability, and the open access. This is needed in order to get results.

**Collaborative storage and delivery service for valuable but low-use research materials held in Scottish university libraries / Scottish Open Access Declaration by Neil Dumbleton and Tony Kidd, SCURL.**

Scotland is different – this was the opening from Neil Dumbleton. Why a collaborative store? – The only answer is Space. The material there have to be stored are materials with low usage.

CASS – Collaborative Academic Store for Scotland is a pilot project. 7 libraries work together and are on their way to store materials in one place. The libraries keep the ownership. Document delivery is possible and there is access to the materials.

In the future (from now to 5 years) the key issues are joint ownership, remove duplicates and to establish a business plan.

The future (5-10 years) focus will be to find a permanent site, high-density storage and mass stock disposal.

Tody Kidd told about the Scottish Declaration on Open access. “We believe that the interests of Scotland will be best served by the rapid adoption of open access to scientific and research literature”.

Both institutions and researchers can participate. The action plan says institutional repositories to be set up, and to deposit copies of
It is important that the universities now are signing up, and will take care of the depository.

Kristiina Hormia told that a collaborative store is established in Finland, and get the budget directly from the Ministry. It is working very well and there are links between the material and the licenses.

**Digital Media Center (DMC) by David Kohl, OhioLINK.**

The Digital Ressource Commons (DRC) is a mechanism for integrating library e-resources and services into the local campus technology, it is a repository for scholarly publications and it is also a data site supporting the full range of educational e-resources. It is a central service, but with local control. The local institutions set their own policies governing the content in its repositories. The local institutions can also brand itself.

There are multi-level access, but again local-controlled which means that multi-tiered security levels will allow content to be shared only to the extent desired. The commons is eg. a shared statewide service environment for institutions offers best services, lowest statewide cost with maximum use. There are established a forum to implement the next new “things” in instructional technologies, information resources and research.

**CBUC training and translation programs by Nuria Comellas, CBUC.**

Consortia are more than licensing. Working together means that the members must share language, reality, objectives and visions. Training and translation is two important topics. The objectives of training are to learn from well-known international professionals about specialised topics and trends in academic libraries. In CBUC they use teachers from foreign countries. Translation makes it easier for CBUC libraries staff to read key and current professional articles. ICOLC documents will be translated into Catalan. A CBUC librarian will translate after permission from the author.

**Pannel 2: Consortia collaborations: a view from three countries.**

The whole is stronger that the sum of its parts. This can be true for consortia as it is for our member libraries. Consortia that work together face an array of challenges yet may also reap significant rewards. What are the pros, cons, advantages, and pitfalls, when consortia collaborate? The members of this panel will explore models for consortial co-operation and offer perspectives drawn from their varied experiences in Canada, the UK and US.

**Consortial collaboration. A perspective from the U.S. by John F. Helmer.**

The positive impact of overlap ns membership and mission is that specialised consortia are tailored to meet the unique needs of their membership.

The negative impact of overlap is duplicated effort, reduced buying power, diffused of human resources etc.

Obstacles to collaboration are many, some of them are:
- Culture and context
- Mission creep
- Lack of planning and clarity
- Loyalty to organisations that have outlived their mission or not progressed
- Consortium staff that look for new ways to justify their position
- Funding streams that are locked in by legislation

The Orbis and Cascade merge was possible because of history of informal collaboration. The similar membership and mission and that both wanted to fund more central staff and had a willingness to take a risk.

The impact of the merge are that the membership fees has decreased by 13%, the staff has been added with 2 positions, the electronic resources has got more participants and got a better pricing.

Some of the best practices are:
- Communication: Stay in touch with other consortia
- Shared responsibility: Seek out economies of scale
- Organisation: Maintain a narrow focus on what your organisation does well, and work with consortia.
- Finance: Determine who has the funding and who is most able to do the work – these are not necessarily the same organisation.
UK JICS collections strategy review by Lorraine Estelle, JISC

Lorraine Estelle want to focus on the JISC collaboration with the National Health Service (NHS).

The JISC collection Team remit: To negotiate for, and, where appropriate, to license, quality assured electronic materials that will provide the JISC community with a range of resources to support education and research.

The JISC community is higher education, further education and specialist colleges. The colleagues in the National Health Services have access to electronic resources, but not necessarily the same ones, and not necessarily under the same terms and conditions. The problem is that while working in the hospital they will have access to a set of online resources, but later the same day when they are teaching, they will have access to a different set of electronic resources, and under different terms and conditions.

The solution is to provide a consistent set of online resources to NHS.

Overcoming the barriers to joint procurement:

- Finding the right contacts
- Forming a joint working group
- Identifying the first deal
- Setting the publishers expectation – joint procurement means to get a better deal.

Current situation of National licenses in Canada by Deb deBruijn, CRKN/RCDR.

Deb deBruijn told about the consortia collaboration in Canada. It is a development of local, provincial, regional and multi-regional consortia groups. The focus is on electronic resources.

CRKN is a part of the National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP). The mission of the project is to expand the universe of digital research information available to Canada's academic research community, through the co-ordinated services and expertise of academic libraries. CRKN's objectives are to expand the research content available to researchers nation-wide. To speed the transition to digital materials and value-added forms of content, and maximise its value through networked access. And to leverage the buying powers and influence of Canadian universities.

Creating the new organisation mean that they share vision, they share a voice within the national agenda, they share expertise and they share power.

The use of digital resources by researchers has changed. In 2001 70% used paper versions, and 30% the digital versions. But in 2003 35% use the paper version and 65% the digital versions. During the period they have learned that "negotiations" with consortia members and partners can be more complex than negotiations with vendors, there can never be enough communication and that the strengths are the weaknesses in CRKN.

The strategies for success in CRKN are:

- Move from “problem-driven” to “vision-driven"
- Focus on collaboration, not merely cooperation
- Build consensus
- Pay attention to accountability
- Risk reduction is good for all parties
- Be aware of unintended consequences
- Small can be beautiful.

Vendors grill 1.
Arie Jongejan, Elsevier

In the print world every thing was simple. It was journal – by – journal, the price was a catalogue price, the agents had a role, there were some pricing parameters on behalf of volume, inflation, circulation, etc. and the archive was the print journals.

Of course there were problems – funding crisis, price increases, drawbacks etc.

In the hybrid world there are 4 successive waves:

- $P + E = P + \text{surcharge for } E$
- $P + E \Rightarrow E + P = E + \text{“surcharge” for } P$ (DDP)
- Access to (previously) non-subscribed content (fee based on % of current spend)
- Access to non-subscribed (fee based on % of value of non-subscribed)

It leaves Elsevier with:

- Close to 10 million users
- Currently 250 million downloads
- Simple searching, linking through CrossRef, WebSearch through Scirus
- Backfiles available from Vol. 1 no. 1 (6.2million articles)
- On pricing and prices: The LISU Study shows that the price increase of Elsevier is 36% during the period 2000 – 2004. Lower than many other publishers.
Elsevier want to know – what is being used, how often it is being used and how it is being used.

A new business model has to include content, usage and customer-user dimensions.

Content includes: Breadth, depth, quality, recency and functionality

Usage includes: Item, duration, frequency

Customer-user dimensions include concurrent users, population, FTE, sites and type of account

The conclusion is that the most traditional publishers remain close to content based pricing.

Elsevier want to offer modularity, offer choice, offer differentiation, redefine “loyalty”, and go back to simplicity.

Elsevier is also working on archival rights – it is a work in progress.

Q – The value dimension (archival rights) will it change?
A – Consortia will have to choose the journals according to the value
Q – How to choose between the 4 model?
A – Options, not one single solution.

Conclusion – As long as both print and electronic have to be produced – it will be difficult to find completely fair solutions.

**Nancy Buckley and Sue Corbett, Blackwell**

**Publishing**

Company news:

- Titles has grown from 531 (2001) to 729 (2005)
- 157 in the ISI top ten
- Market leading position in many subjects
- 1800 libraries take “collection”
- 3 pricing models for consortia:
  - Choice, collection, and online only Flip model.

In the choice it is possible to choose Premium Online and pay 95%, Standard (limited online access) and pay 100% or premium print and online and pay 110%.

Collection – it is possible to choose between the full collection, the HSS or the STM collection. This is a annually renewable deal.

The online only Flip model – it is a trial. It is an e-only model with optional discounted print, fixed prices over 3 years, and with one single line invoice.

The archiving is solved with an agreement with KB, and by participation in the LOCKSS.

Q – Price cap in the flip model?
A – Subscription part and consortia part – price cap decided deal by deal – e.g. 8%.

Q – How many titles are lost this year?
A – 3
Q – LISU survey – Blackwell is in the top.
A – Wrong information, Blackwell is waiting for an answer.
Q – Blackwell has had big price increases?
A – It is because of more content, editorial expenses, production expenses.
Q – Perpetual access to moved / sold journals?
A – The best is if the backfiles stay at the old owner.
Q – FTE based model was missing in the presentation?
A – Yes – it is a top on – based on FTE numbers.
Q – Archival rights only on electronic subscriptions – why not on paper subscriptions.
A – Print is print – it is two different media. Electronic archival rights to the years you have paid.
Q – Archival rights in the premium model?
A – Many subscriptions are free after 2 years. We will have a look at it.

**Pannel 3: Usage statistics: experiences**

**Emetrics by Dennis Brunning. Arizona State University Libraries, USA.**

The ASU experience. The ASU libraries subscribe to 300 commercial databases, 15,000 online journals and 6 major full text aggregators. The statistics is a hell of excel spreadsheets. The elements in the spreadsheets are sessions, searches, records (downloaded), connect time, turnaways and articles (downloaded).

The observations until now are big indexes receive big use, and high use of aggregated databases. The e-books have very low usage until they were catalogued. The usage increased with 100% after they were catalogued.

The usage report is used to do decisions. Re-deal, clues, non-subscriptions versus subscriptions, subscriptions versus pay-per-view.

In ASU the cost per article has changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anno 2002</th>
<th>Anno 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science Direct - $ 3,11</td>
<td>Science Direct - $ 1,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebsco EJS - $ 9,37</td>
<td>Ebsco EJS - $ 8,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy - $ 9,59</td>
<td>Synergy - $ 8,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley - $ 14,08</td>
<td>Wiley - $ 9,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluwer - $ 17,40</td>
<td>Kluwer - $ 14,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald - $ 19,36</td>
<td>Emerald - $ 16,72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To day they know that online journals are popular, there are a steady increases and the overall cost per use improves.

Usage of e-journals at CBUC libraries by Cristobal Urbano, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain

This work was undertaken because of the interest in the field of indirect user studies and the analysis of value of information. Also because the spirit of research that seeks to overcome the gap between practitioners and academics, because the offer on the part of CBUC for a joint study, in exchange for data that would be useful for their internal management and finally because the need for practical experience in gathering and analysing e-journals metrics to increase professors know-how.

The usage has increased. The usage of titles – previously non-subscribed are the same or higher than the use of subscribed titles.

Many questions need to be studied further:
• Types of users and usage habits: who, when, where and how?
• Methods for calibrating types of use
• Transactional log analysis
• Analysis of unsatisfied demand (turnaways and searches on freely available articles).

The statistical data obtained must be studies in context in order to attain full benefits: indicators according to demographics, budget, research funding, and subscription costs, bibliometrics of user published output. The next question is now when we have usage data … but what model do we have for assigning costs?

COUNTER test library sites and the practicalities of dealing with COUNTER stats by Simon Bevan, Cranfield University Library, UK and Louise Jones, University of Leicester Library, UK.

The goal of the project is credible, compatible, consistent publisher/vendor-generated statistics for the global information community. Both libraries, consortia and publishers need statistics. There are already a lot of COUNTER reports, both related to journals and databases.

The role of the pilot sites is about definitions and usage reports. Are the definitions clear, what about the format, the delivery, the frequency and are they alerted when statistics is available.

The test has told that there are some differences between compliant submitted reports and actual ones. There are difficulties locating and identifying COUNTER reports amongst others, there are a lack of historical data and a problem knowing when compliant data starts.

The COUNTER statistics have to be used in selection of new journals, in the decision of continuing big deals and to calculate the cost per use of packages.

COUNTER has published release 2 in draft for comments. The final version is expected January 2005, and have to be valid from 2006.

The current and future priorities for COUNTER are:
• Publish draft of Release 2
• Solicit feedback on Release 2 draft
• Implement auditing
• Publish e-Books draft
• Encourage and assist growth in compliance
• Reach target of 150 members.

Q – ASU. Is print usage and price included?
A – No print – so it is the real value.

Comment. The number of downloads not necessary in top on journals with high impact factor.

Q – When will max use be reached?
A – In the future, but not now.

Q – How is double-click counted?
A – Please use the description on the web-page.

Comment. Do not use too much time on usage. But the knowledge about how data is used and the value of the data are also important data.

Fig. 2 - I mal di testa consortili
Pannel 4: Consortial headaches

How game theory can help to establish cost division in library consortia by Josep Ma. Izquierdo, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain.

The cost-sharing rules have to be easy to understand, easy to implement, fair and consistent under re-negotiation.

The game theory model gives tools and defines solutions to allocate the total cost of serving the members of a group demanding a common service, and it takes into account the cost of serving a subgroup of members.

3 solutions were showed:

The constrained equal cost (CEC) – share equally the cost under the condition that nobody is charged more than his stand-alone cost.

The Constrained equal savings (CES) – get equal savings and with a positive cost-share.

The talmudic Rule (TL) – apply the CEC Rule to half of the total cost and the CES Rule to the other half.

Archival access lost – archival rights challenged by Bernd-Christoph Kaemper, GASCO, Germany.

To lose the archival access is a big problem for the libraries. The access can disappear when the publishers change server, when the publishers sell titles and when early e-journal experiments didn’t live up to the expectations. It is discovered when the URL do not work. No publisher tells about the missing access.

An example of missing rights:

"The rights granted in this subclause will terminate immediately in respect to any material that the licensor ceases to have the right to publish."

GASCO have done a survey.

• Products and contract partners (23 consortial packages)
• Characteristics and size of data sets
• Access during the term of the agreement
• Type & conditions of permanent access provision after termination of contract
• Need for a local full text storage option
• Willingness to host products of certain publishers or vendors
• Technical constraints for local hosting, framework of conditions for a shared usage by different regional consortia.

GASCO have some requirements for license agreements with respect to local hosting and archiving.

Local hosting should be possible also during the current term of the agreement. The access rights should be modeled in analogy to present licensing conditions, and the Licensing of retrieval software (from publisher, 3rd parties) under an acceptable cost model.

The suggestion for the future is:

• Work together with and encourage societies and publishers to further develop the ALPSP guidelines and make them a Code of practice that is actually signed by societies and publishers
• Clearly state which practices are unacceptable (for example charging per article downloaded as a means to provide access to paid-for materials)
• Encourage development of good practices also outside consortial settings (> standard license agreements).

Administrativa: Library consortia administrative tools by Kathy Perry, VIVA, USA.

The Administrative tools is the communication with members, Managing contacts, technical issues, product renewals and internal management systems.

“The British Columbia Electronic Library Network uses PHP and MySQL for database driven web site modules both to communicate with consortium participants and to track administrative data.

Our web site is both a vehicle for communication and an administrative tool. Combining these functions allows us to centralize our data management and provides built-in cross checks ensuring that the information presented on the web site is accurate and up to date. Centralized data management makes it a lot easier to ensure that, for example, changes to a member site's address are reflected on our web site, our mailing labels, and our invoices."

No consortia are alike. All are working differently and every have their own needs.

A lot of books could not help with these administrative tools. In the old system you use word, excel, html etc. In the new system you are able to run appropriated reports with 1 data entry task. Is it possible?

Kathy Perry won the loud applause for the Impossible Dream.
ICOLC Internal business issues
The power of One: Bridging the information gap in Africa by Susan Veldsman. SASLI, South Africa

The program Library consortium building is a program according to country needs in consultation with organisers.

The library Consortium program content:
- Principles of licensing
- Model license and case studies
- Selection and evaluation of e-resources
- Model and case studies
- Marketing and advocacy (including links with other consortia, e.g. ICOLC)
- Sustainability
- Open access
- Overview, principles and examples
- National digital strategy
- Country strategy and business plan

The vision of the SA consortia is:
Enhance access to information and the sharing of resources to benefit the clients of library consortia in South Africa through national cooperation.

The benefits in the consortia is:
Resource sharing, Obtaining funding, Benefits to and development of weaker partners and cost savings.

The future in the consortia is:
Add value, open access, interlibrary alliances.

The conclusion is that consortia have changed lives. Consortia is here to stay and it is a strategic partnership and relationship.

How does ICOLC promote, prepare, discuss and approve a statement by Arnold Hirshon, NELINET, USA.

Next ICOLC meeting will be in Boston, Massachusetts 10th – 13th April 2005.

The process for development:
- Subsequent guidelines, statements and endorsements
- Identification of an issue during ICOLC business meeting
- Volunteers to work on statement (international)
- One or more people take lead to draft (or re-draft) a statement
- Issuance on Consort listserv for comment
- Solicitation of endorsers
- Issuance of statement

2004 e-info guidelines:
- Retain copyright “exceptions” for research
- Ensure permanent access and archiving
- Require original publishers to provide access when e-journals transfer to another publisher
- Ensure pricing models reduce unit cost of information
- Ensure publishers provide effective statistical usage data, e.g., through Counter
- Support affordable access for countries-in-transition
- Support new access models, e.g., Open Access.

What does endorsement imply:
"This statement was adopted in principle by member representatives of the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC), whose organizations are listed below. This statement does not necessarily represent the official views of each consortium listed."

Vendor grill 2.
Derk Haank, Springer.

Springer is one of the world’s leading publishers for scientific and specialist information.
The consolidated sale is 833 million euro and there is more than 5,000 employees worldwide.
The merger between Springer Verlag and Kluwer Academic Publishers means 1,150 STM journals in 12 (Online) Libraries on Springer Link and 3,500 new book titles per year.
The electronic Publishing 1996 – 2004 means:
- Technology matured
- Penetration increased
- Product line expanded
- Usage exploded
- Customer Interaction

The general benefits of the developments in the business models are lower costs for libraries, no storage, no cataloging, the possibility of ILL and photocopying. Some services are moved to the publishers – it is the electronic storage, the full fillment and the search tools.

Open Access is now possible because of the cost structure of electronic publishing: High (fixed) Infrastructure costs and low marginal distribution costs.

Over 90% of surveyed libraries are familiar with Open Access. 90% of those who are familiar support Open Access as a medium for content in the future, and there is a large discrepancy in support of Open Access between librarians (90%) and authors (25%).
A new Business is Springer Open Choice is a new service that enables authors to make their articles freely available through all Springer journals.

The price for Springer Open Choice is $3,000 per accepted article. It covers paper and electronic subscription. The subscription income has to continue to pay for non-open choice articles. The Journal prices have to be adjusted annually for percentage of articles paid for by authors.

The conclusions:
• No right or wrong
• No good or bad
• No moral issue or value judgment
• It is a debate about business models and feasibility
• Let the customer decide
• Springer allows experimentation

Springer Link and Kluwer Online will be integrated on MetaPress Unified Platform
– Goal: December 2004

License Agreement integration. All existing contracts will be honored to expiration date. After that the Renewal will be into 1 new Springer contract.

Usage Stimulation Programs, and an investments in Marketing and After Sales Support.

Q – Pricing on behalf of AO-articles or on behalf of articles published in the normal way?
A – deduct the income from authors in the price. E-only price increase is expected to be 3%, paper increase expected to be 5-7%.

Q – What does perpetual access mean?
A – Archive: One off fee, and unlimited access. If cancellation – the data will be delivered in the preferred format.

Q – Statistics?
A – will be COUNTER compliant. Working with Metapress to be COUNTER compliant. January 2005 is expected as phase 1.

Q – Difference in author pricing?
A – Do not want a complicated price. Because of this – only 1 price for OA-publishing.

Richard Gedye, Oxford University Press.

OUP is the world’s largest and most International University Press, and has been journal publisher for over 100 years. Over 50% of the journals are published on behalf of academic societies.

With a site license the institutions are entitled to IP-access, full text access incl. backfiles, statistics (COUNTER), remote access, walk-in use, Document delivery and perpetual access to the paid-for content.

From 2005 all titles will be hosted at HighWire. This move is because the common features and functionality across the whole list.

As OUP is a member of Crossref, and beside there are also some bilateral agreements.

OUP is planning to launch a digitised archive in 2005.

Different pricing models
• Consortial premium model
• Base price model
• Multi-site pricing model
• Fixed price model
• Young journal pricing

OUP is experimenting with Open Access Publication

The definition of OA is:
Free access, free distribution.

The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

Deposited in a long-term repository

A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (for the biomedical sciences, PubMed Central is such a repository).

OUP work with different OA solutions:
• Partial Open Access (Journal of Experimental Botany)
• Full Open Access (Nucleic Acids Research)
• Sponsored Open Access (Evidence-based complementary & Alternative Medicine)

The Full Open Access are paid by the charges for commercial users, from the charge from the authors and by institutional memberships.

OUP considers Open Access to be a model, which may help it achieve its mission more effectively than existing models. The experiments are designed to discover whether
the Open Access model can do this and achieve financial viability and have been structured with the aim of maximising Open Access’s chances of success.

Oxford University Library Services Open Archives Initiative with partnership with OULS (Oxford University Library Services). It means online access for OULS to articles by Oxford University-based authors published in many of the Oxford Journals from 2002 and the articles will then be searchable via the OULS pilot institutional repository and available free of charge to researchers across the globe.

Q – Is PDF or HTML most used?
A – Depends on journal and the usage?

Q – Archival rights?
A - The OUP owned titles – perpetual access is allowed. Else it depends on the society. Else articles can be supplied by a 3-party e.g. UKB.

Q – What about image heavy journals?
A – Not possible to be e-only in 2005.

Monographic session 1: Digital learning environments, open access and institutional repositories.

SHERPA Initiatives by Paul Ayris. University College of London.

SHERPA is a UK repository with 7 development and 6 associate partners. It is centered on research-intensive universities, and uses the OAI_PMH protocol as a data provider.

SHERPA is funded by JISC and CURL and perceived as a European exemple in Open Archiving alongside DARE.

UCL has Copyright policy for staff and students.

The authors need to be encouraged not to sign copyright away as a condition of being published.

The commercial publishers will allow deposit of a pre-print or a post-print in an open archive repository.

SHERPA DP is funded by JISC and will develop a persistent preservation environment based on the OAIS reference model, including a set of protocols and tools, and create a Digital Preservation user guide.

Co-ordination to improve access in the UK: The response of the JISC to the parliamentary report by Fred Friend.

JISC is the Joint Information Systems Committee of the four Higher Education Funding Councils in the UK and also has a responsibility for networked services to the Further Education Colleges.

JISC Strategy includes “improving the effectiveness of scholarly communication”. This involves implementing cost-effective improvements in access to academic content for learners and researchers in colleges and universities. One route to cost-effective improvements in access through negotiation of big deals. This route partially effective but many difficulties – e.g. long negotiations, small publishers not included, many universities and colleges unable to buy in. Push for Open Access coming from both JISC Journals Working Group and JISC Scholarly Communication Group.

Benefits to UK academic community from support for open access. For research funding agencies it is greater use and exploitation of research results resulting from a higher number of readers, facilitating further research. For the author, increased readership and more citations, as academic content on open web-sites is read more widely than content on closed web-sites. For universities and colleges, more publicity for the research conducted at the institution and higher citation of research reports. For readers of research papers, access to research publications without barriers imposed by subscription or access-prevention technology, and for the UK Government, greater returns from investment in the funding of research as research publications are used more widely. This can contribute to the public’s understanding of science. For librarians, new opportunities to improve the service they provide.

The future development in the UK:

• More universities will establish repositories, because the cost is low and the benefits to both research and teaching are huge
• Funding agencies and universities will expect their researchers to deposit pre-prints or post-prints of journal articles in repositories
• The use of the deposited journal articles will grow
• Repositories will also be used for other purposes – e.g. electronic teaching packages and administrative functions
• More open access journals will become available in most subject areas, although subscription journals will continue in humanities
• Learned societies will continue to have an important role, especially if they transition to open access for their journals
• JISC will continue to support universities and colleges in all these developments.


The museum Ptolemy established in Alexandria was in effect the first university in the world.

It was dedicated to the service of the Muses.

It was a religious body only in form, in order to meet the legal difficulties of endowment in a world that had never foreseen such a thing a secular intellectual process.

It was essentially a college of learned men engaged chiefly in research and record, but also to a certain extent teaching.

In order to improve the health of people in the developing world, it is important that researchers there have access to the peer-reviewed medical literature originating in the developed world, as well as to the journals and texts originating all over the developing world.

Comparison with Hinari: The Health InterNetwork Access to Research Initiative (HINARI) provides free or very low cost online access to the major journals in biomedical and related social sciences to local, non-profit institutions in developing countries.

One of the participants said that up until he joined the Ptolemy project, he was only using abstracts for his work. This made life difficult, and his publication record to date is not good. The last good paper he published was in 2000, when he finished his PhD. He certainly regretted going back home to Africa as he thought his academic career was over. He now knows that he will be up to date, and he will certainly come up with innovative research proposals.

Monographic session 2: Round table: open access pros / cons.

How OSI is helping to make open access happen by Fred Friend. JISC Consultant and OSI Open Access Advocate, UK.

For OSI, the BOAI provided the vision and the overall strategy to work towards open access. The Soros Foundation fund of $3 million has helped to make the vision a partial reality. The value of open access to consortia is the availability of a large corpus of open access content that will add more content to the subscription content consortia offer to their users. It is the success of the open access model that will reduce subscription costs in due course. It is the working with an open access model offers consortial staff the opportunity to develop new services – e.g. managing the local repository, providing navigational tools to assist readers to find the content they really need.

But much more work remains to be done. It is necessary to work on open access economic models, e.g. the way in which funds can be redistributed within institutions to support open access. To work with learned societies to provide them with opportunities for a good future under open access, and the advocacy work – as many academic authors still are unaware of open access.

One of the conclusions is: Open Access is here – but Open Access in not free.

Evaluation and next ICOLC issues by Lluis Anglada.

Next meeting in Europe will be in Poznan, Polan.

Next ICOLC meeting will be in Boston March 2005.