I Hear the Train A Comin'

Greg Tananbaum
ScholarNext, greg@scholarnext.com

Kevin Guthrie
ITHAKA, Kevin.Guthrie@ithaka.org

Anne Kenney
Cornell University, ark3@cornell.edu

I Hear the Train A Comin'

Greg Tananbaum, Founder and CEO, Anianet, Owner and Operator, ScholarNext
Kevin Guthrie, President, ITHAKA
Anne Kenney, Carl A. Kroch University Librarian, Cornell University

Greg: Well, it's nice to see the Charleston Conference turning into an iteration of Meet the Press—it feels like, at this point—so hopefully we'll keep it at that level and not take it down to the Jerry Springer level. We'll see how we do here. But, no need for long introductions; I really want to dig in. My name is Greg Tananbaum and I'm really, happy to have two folks here. The idea here is to bring some thought leaders together from the scholarly communication space and discuss some of the big picture issues that our industry faces. The idea is, again, as these two will talk for a little bit, I'll ask some questions, and then we will leave some time for you to interact as well. So hopefully we'll get lots of folks involved. By way of background, I'm very pleased to be joined by and Anne Kenney and Kevin Guthrie today.

To give their bios briefly, if you don't know, Anne is the University Librarian at Cornell and she's held that post since 2008, but she has been at Cornell since 1987. She has done pioneering work in the areas of archiving and preservation, particularly in developing standards for digitizing library materials. Among other things, she is the Fellow and past President of the Society of American Archivists, served on the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Libraries and Archives of Cuba and on the ARL's Board of Directors. She does a lot of other cool stuff too, but we'll leave it at that.

Kevin is an executive. He is an entrepreneur. He has expertise in high technology and also not-for profit management. He was the founding president of JSTOR in 1995, and also of ITHAKA in 2004, and, as I'm sure you know, ITHAKA provides three relevant services, externally facing services: JSTOR, Portico, which is a digital preservation service, and ITHAKA S+R, which is a strategy and research enterprise focusing on helping scholarly communication make a successful and sustainable transition to digital and network technologies. Kevin also has, in past lives, started his own software development company and served as a research associate at the Mellon Foundation. So, those are the formalities and we will dig in. We'll start with an easy question for both of you.

Anne, we'll go with you first. I at first framed this as, what are the biggest challenges that are facing the library community over the next two to five years, but, to coin a phrase that I just invented, this moment, on the spot, with no external stimuli, what's gotta give with the library space?

Anne: Well, first, thank you very much for inviting me to participate with Kevin in this. So what's got to give? I think as we look at where our materials budgets are going, I think it sort of shows us a path forward. Since I am most familiar with the research library community and ARL data, I'll draw from that, and you know you have to take it with a grain of salt. But since 2004 to 2010, the percent of materials budgets for research libraries that is going e-content has doubled. It was about 30% in 2004. On average at 61% across all of the academic research libraries in ARL and there are 116 of them. 18 of them have less than 50% of their budgets they go to "e." And there are only two, Harvard and Yale, that are under 30% of their budgets going e-content. So this has a couple of implications, obviously, for us in research libraries. First, I think, is the issue of "Well we have been surprised by the diversity of our holdings in the past." Cornell and Columbia have about a 35% overlap; we've done some studies through our 2CUL effort. I think moving forward we will see more homogeneity as more of our resources are going to e-content. At Cornell we just went over the 50% mark for electronic resources and half of that goes to three publishers who are now producing about 42% of all of the scholarly journals that are being published in the world. That same amount is comparable to what Columbia is paying for those same three journals. So I'm a little concerned about how will become less and less dis-

tinct from one another and that it will be the big players who really continue that process. But even more troubling than that is that our organizational constructs are still very much heavily embedded in physical facilities, physical objects, physical services, and something's going to have to give to be able to address the new needs as more and more of our resources become core electronic, and as more and more of our faculty and students need support for managing that material. But it is really hard to change. It will be majorly disruptive, and I am reminded of the ARL stand on the GPO's stand around government documents, government publications, where they are resisting efforts to look at more multi-state efforts to provide digital access to government documents and that there's more of a pushback from GPO, remaining true to old models, pouring new wine into old bottles.

Greg: Kevin, what has to give from the publisher perspective, from the information provider's perspective, what's gotta give in the next two to five years?

Kevin: Well, I think one thing I would say is that this sort of notion of the libraries and the publishers in this game it is sort of pitted in an adversarial kind of role, or as two different players in the space. I think that is actually not the best way of thinking about it.

Greg: So, you're not going to thumb wrestle after this?

Kevin: No, we will we will. But I think that was touched on in the first session too. You know, at the end of the day, it is really about the author and the reader, or the researcher or student, and you have a system that got created to serve that in a certain kind of an environment and all the structures, the social structures, the organizational structures, were built in between those two points and I think what has got to give is the allegiance to those structures. I mean, that is the hard part and everybody has it whether you are a resource provider like JSTOR, which is relatively young, or you're a library like Cornell or your publisher, everybody has got to give up on those things and say, "Okay what is the next thing?" Because there's so much restructuring that has to go on. It has all

been thrown up in the air by the digital realm. JSTOR exists because of this digital realm, and there are new actors coming in all the time trying to change the way the structures work. It is very hard for the existing actors to give up on the way they do things. So when Paul talks about how there's plenty of money in the system, yes, there is, but, it is in this budget and that budget, and this place and that place, so giving up those things to allow freedom of the reinvestment I think is the biggest thing. I mean, it's a bit like the polar bear and the seal in an argument trying to figure out who's going to get what, and really the problem is the ice is melting. So if I'm a polar bear and I want brown hair and to live on land—those kinds of changes are really, really difficult to make.

Greg: Just to elaborate on that a little bit, and also harken back to the last session where they talked a little bit about the physics archives; you and I, Kevin, have talked in the past, it is an interesting example everyone believes it should be free, everyone wants it, no one actually wants to pay for it.

Anne: I don't think that's true.

Greg: You don't think that's true? In what way?

Anne: I think that actually that ArXiv is moving very much in the direction of being seen as one of these public goods that is worthy of public support. There was a prominent physicist at Yale, who when she found out I was a Cornell librarian, thanked me for taking care of her library. And, in fact, we are moving toward a model where we are looking at providing support from around the world for this. There are 119 institutions in 11 countries who have voluntarily signed on to provide support for the ArXiv.

Greg: So you don't feel as though there is a process of content commodity devaluation occurring at all, either with the ArXiv or generally?

Anne: The ArXiv is alive and well. It continues to accelerate not only in content contributed to it, but also in use of it every day.

Kevin: I mean, there is no question that, and it is not just in our sector, but, that there is downward

pressure on the pricing of content and if it is only content, if it is just flat only content, that there is great pressure on that. It becomes a commodity and then it's a question of what value you are adding on to that. And I think that's the common thing between the publishers, the libraries, everybody in the space between the writer and the reader; the challenge is to figure out what is it that you can really do that somebody else is not able to do as well as you and what the value of that is? And there are going to be a lot of different ways that that value gets converted into resources that can support it in the long run and ArXiv has a model where they're looking for voluntary contributions based on a rough assessment of the number of postings coming from different institutions. So there is an effort to say "you're getting more value from this than other people, you ought to pay" and that is a reasonable thing to do. It's taking an approach that is not exclusive, that is not saying "if you don't pay you can't get it," but it is going to depend upon, as Paul was saying earlier, the incentives of people to want to support things that they can get otherwise. The question of how much they'll be supported for the public good is something we'll just have to see through experience.

Greg: Shifting gears a little bit: you mentioned reframing it as the authors and the readers, but talking about vendors and institutions, just to harken back to that a little bit. Anne, I'll start with you, what aspect of the vendor institutional relationship do publishers, do information providers, potentially fundamentally misunderstand? What misconceptions do they have that cloud the interaction?

Anne: Well, this will be an exaggeration, but, we tend to think in libraries that publishers see us as a sales channel, and that there is less understanding of our mediation role, the importance we play in knowledge management, in providing access to materials through fair use, in looking at preservation consideration, Paul mentioned those, and that there is a much stronger relationship between the library and the reader than would be considered in that sales channel process.

Greg: Kevin, same question to you, but flipped. In terms of the vendor-institution relationship, what

aspects do libraries perhaps fundamentally misunderstand?

Kevin: Well, I think that with librarians, and in fact, the Academy, there is a self-selection process. They go into that profession precisely because they're not looking to go into business, so I think that there are some challenges with the understanding of the entrepreneurial business aspects of things. I think that the way that the network and Moore's Law and digital technologies have played out, there is this kind of a paradox where, as Fred was saying, you can publish something for free, the marginal cost of that distribution is close to free, it's not totally free, but it's close to free, but when you build scale you build huge costs, so there are big fixed costs. So, sort of understanding the economics is one part.

But, I think the more challenging part is the question of value. When you think about resources, and you think about whether you should pay for them or not pay for them, whether they are subscription-based or open access, how does the library, and how does the library as the representative of scholars on the campus, value the materials that they are getting? You can figure out the cost of them; that is straightforward, particularly if it's priced, but how do you measure the value?

I remember when I was in the very early days of JSTOR, one of the first publishers was the American Mathematical Society, and the Executive Director of the AMS was a man named John Ewing. We were talking about things, and this is before COUNTER and before usage statistics and everything, and we were working hard to try to get usage statistics available. He said, "Well, I don't want usage statistics available. I don't want that to happen at all," and I said, "Well, why? That seems like you're not contributing?" He said, "The American Mathematical Review will never be used as much as the American Economic Review. It's not going to happen. It's a completely different kind of publication; it is used in a different way. You know, you don't have Econ 101 in mathematics, and if somebody just uses usage statistics to determine the value of our publication, they're going to get it all wrong". I'm not suggesting that libraries are using only usage statistics, but libraries have a very, very

difficult job because there are so many publications that they pay for, there are only so many measures and there are only so many people, so, when you look at usage stats or you look at other measures of value, it becomes relatively easy to grab a particular metric and say, "Okay, that's it." We see that in citation impact factor and tenure review and in all parts of our world, U.S. News & World Report. We all seek out these proxies and rankings and so I think that that feels to me like a big challenge for the community is how to figure out the value of things when it's very difficult to measure.

Anne: I was just going to say another sort of arena where publishers and libraries have some difficulties is looking at defining the meets and bounds in access rights in the digital domain. We tend to want to continue to exercise the same kinds of rights we had over physical constructs. Publishers tend to say this is something very, very different. You can see it from one end on the consideration of read rights only versus use rights more broadly defined. Nowhere probably is it more evident than in the issue of the e-lending of materials. Section 109 of the copyright law has been the basis for physical lending of items and publishers might say that there's no such thing as really a digital ILL, and where…

Greg: Just to interrupt, when we talked about this previously, Kevin said in ILL, there is no loan involved in electronic ILL. There is no second L…

Anne: I will give him a minute to respond, but, I think that libraries tend to see this as something where publishers are trying to curb their traditional kinds of roles here, and the case law has been fairly split on defining those rights. But, I think there is common cause for publishers and libraries in looking at fair use of material. So, at a recent conference there was a distinguished professor from a pretty significant institution who was talking to the audience about when he can't get something that his home institution has, or he can't get it through interlibrary loan, he just calls his colleagues at other institutions and asks them to download the thing and send it off to him. Now, he and his colleagues are violating either IP rights or contractual rights in doing that, but this whole

hidden environment out there of seeking information wherever it's found and seeing both publishers and libraries as "in the way" of that scholarly process is justification enough for that. We've certainly seen it in the music realm, where the downloads from BitTorrent, which amount to about 24% of the Internet traffic in the United States, a vast majority of them are illegal downloads, and so you see performers moving back to concerts to support their livelihood. Well, there is no such parallel for authors in this domain unless you want to start reading aloud these turgid volumes and see how much money comes from that. And so, is there not the possibility that publishers and libraries, who really are profound respecters of rights and contracts, in making it easier for digital lending, to kind of keep it within the Academy going forward?

Kevin: Yeah, I think it is about trying to figure out the new models, and coming back to what we said at the beginning, you know letting go of the way it is before, because I think there's a tendency for all parties to say "Well, it's been this way and that's the way it should stay." So the concept of owning something is obviously changed. People, depending on which side of that they are on, can be frustrated about that, and sort of a full understanding of what that means, I mean, there would be friction in the system and to pick up on Paul's comments about a public library and you know, the controversy around book lending and loaning, it's not a kind of an "a", "b" you know, right or wrong answer. The reality is that publishers sold books to libraries and they were loaned and there was a friction in that and the people who didn't want to go to library bought the book at Barnes & Noble or wherever have you, and that model sort of worked. And then you get into a new space. Some people want to say "well, we should be able to do that just the way we used to do it". Well that was an evolutionary process that was built up around the interests of a variety of players and when the friction is removed and you know, things can move rapidly, that will be disruptive and I think there's a process there and it may be that, you know, obviously all the players that were in it before are not necessarily going to be in after, and there will be new entrants that come in and say "well, I don't need to protect this legacy or that legacy" and it

will change. But, I think in our system, where we're talking about scholarship and we aren't as comfortable with things dying and never being found again and where the persistence of information is important, I think this collaboration between those who are helping the authors write and those who are helping the authors distribute is really, really important.

Greg: And, just to be clear, I don't think either one of you is arguing that this is unidirectional, that the library is clinging to antiquated notions and that publishers are not. "One copy, one library," presumably, is an example heading in the other direction where we are used to doing something a certain way, and circumstances and media have changed, and it allows us an opportunity to revisit.

Anne: Yes, both of those institutions suffer from antiquated models. Our medical school is in New York City, but all of the content we are purchasing is electronic; it should not matter that there is this 200 mile difference, yet there are different licenses that support them. And another thing about that is one library, one subscription, one publisher; we're moving beyond the silos of publishers as well of the silos of libraries. Scholarship has done this forever, and particularly as it becomes much more global there needs to be a sort of very loose milieu in which all of this thrives.

But I want to get to Kevin's point about preservation. I think this is an area where publishers and libraries need to do much more work as we are moving toward licensing of content and not actually owning the material or physically possessing the material. We are at real risk here. We've been sleeping at night because publishers have promised perpetual access and if we stop having a subscription they will deliver the stuff to our door? I mean this is sort of like trading in pork bellies. You never want to have the pork bellies delivered to your door. So, you really want to have mechanisms in place that will preserve that content. Publishers' attitudes towards preservation are really great, but, they are insufficient. So, as we were looking through Cornell and Columbia at what of our e-journals were being preserved through either Portico or LOCKSS, it turned out that only about 15% of what we were looking at, what we manage, is

within either one of those third-party archives. Half of what we manage at Cornell has an ISSN or an E-ISSN, and it was only half of that body of material that was in there. So there is a big gap out there. It's the responsibility of publishers, third parties, and research institutions to ensure that that is also being preserved.

Greg: In terms of that Portico coverage, I know a guy at ITHAKA that you can talk to about that.

Anne: I know, we've been, we've been talking about that.

Kevin: There is a lot to do, and I think that there is a tremendous amount to do with e-journals but, as Paul and Fred were talking about earlier, then you also have these new formats coming, so I think that it is very important that, as a community, we are investing in those solutions to at least deal straightforward and stuff so that people can start to really work on some of these tougher challenges too.

Greg: Just to shift gears a little bit, both of you are involved in interesting court cases. One is criminal and one is civil. Kevin, I'll just give a bit of background here, ITHAKA is somewhat enmeshed in the Aaron Swartz case in which Mr. Swartz was allegedly tapped into the core of MIT's network in order to avoid JSTOR's security measures and allegedly misappropriate nearly 5,000,000 articles that are part of the JSTOR database. And Anne, I believe three major author groups filed suit against Cornell and four other institutions alleging that the HathiTrust Book Digitization Initiative constitutes copyright infringement. Without digging too deeply into the details of those pending trials, what should we take away from those cases, particularly as pertains to issues of use and compliance and security? Anne, we'll start with you.

Anne: Well, I would like to direct these questions to Paul. We need to understand the issues associated with what is appropriate in terms of digitization and digital access to materials and part of it, I think, was the making available, or planning to make available, orphan works. I think we need some court cases in this. I would've been really pleased had Cornell not been a party to this, to

watch aggressively from the sidelines as Michigan and Indiana and Wisconsin and California went forth and battled on our behalf. But, that's not the case. So, we will see what will happen with this. We need to have a better sense of this. I don't think legislation is going come to our rescue anytime soon. But, libraries are in the business of respecting agreements and contracts and rights, and if we aren't able to do that we will lose our sense of trust that publishers have in us, that authors have in us, that researchers and students have in us. That is something that we will not let go lightly.

So, we may argue about contractual relationships, and push as hard as we can, but once that's signed, I think that we really will do our darndest to obey them. That does come smack dab into the issue of privacy and use, so we wrestle with our IT organization at Cornell all the time about whether it's better to have people sign in on the public computers in the library so we can manage and track if there are any abuses. And our feeling is yeah, but then there's this big brother part of this that's coming along, and so we fight back and forth on whether security, and privacy, and freedom of access to materials will trump.

Kevin: You sure we haven't run out of time? I got a heads-up that this question was coming and so my general counsel was in my ear. You know, there's really not a lot I can say. There are some personal lessons in this for me and some broader lessons. I think one thing is that this whole adage that what you read in the newspaper or on blogs is not true. It's really amazing, actually, when you really know a lot about something that's happened, and then you read about it and see how far it is from what you know. I think we've all have had that experience, but, somehow we wake up the next morning and read the newspaper and the newspaper has truth in it. So, I think that was one part of the experience. The other thing is a lesson in the justice system. I think there's a perception out there somehow that JSTOR plays a role in pressing charges in this and that's just not the way the system works. It's a really unfortunate incident completely from our perspective. Our role is to try to disseminate the knowledge that we're putting together on behalf of the publishers as broadly and widely as possible in a sustainable way, and at the

same time protect the interests of the publishers and to be proper stewards of the content, so we're in the middle. I mean the libraries are in that same middle ground. So, to have this happen was really just an unfortunate thing and we're just letting it play out. At the end of the day, it's a grand jury that decides if this looks like it's breaking the law, and it's all about the law at some level, and the interpretation of the law by the system. So what I would say, more broadly, is that as a country, as a society, we benefit greatly from respect for the rule of law, and that's just to pick up on your point, Anne. I believe very strongly in that, and at the same time I know that there are times when we don't necessarily like the law and we agitate to change it. I think that's a great thing about the flexibility of the society. But at the core, I think that we do a great job of respecting the law. And finally, on your point about the security and such, I can speak for our experience that in this, libraries have been, not this particular case but broadly speaking, libraries have been great stewards of their responsibilities and contracts and terms and conditions and copyright and we respect that tremendously. I think that there are going to be cases and times when things happen, but libraries have been great at that and we've had great working relationships with libraries about those issues and will continue to do so, so we kind of do the best we can.

Greg: One last question that will open it up to the floor. Kevin, give me one game changer that we're going to be talking about in Charleston in 2014, 2015.

Kevin: Well, to some degree I think the big game changer that I would talk about is somewhat regressive than this and somewhat yesterday's news, because I think really that books in electronic form is the big game changer at this particular moment. Even though we've seen with HathiTrust and with the Google Books effort that books are becoming digital, there isn't broad access to them yet and so when those millions of books are genuinely accessible, however they're made accessible by fee or by whatever mechanism, everything changes. I remember before the Google Books initiative when you would talk about the notion of all content being available digitally, everybody kind of shook their

head, "Yeah, journals, but journals are only this part of our library." I remember giving talks and people just said "No, no, no." You might have a variety of different feelings about the Google Books initiative, but I think one of the things that it did was it signaled that it was possible; that there was actually enough money somewhere that somebody could go and digitize 15 million books. Before that there was the Million Books project, there were efforts to do that, but they didn't get that kind of attention and scale. I think that's kind of changed the nature of things, it's like "Wow, what if we are a library and really everything that we provide, or 95% of it, is available electronically? That really changes the way we have to operate." And I think we all see that now, and on the other side the information providers see it, but it's still not really here yet, right? Because those books are not available as much as people want them to be. So when that material is truly broadly available in some form, then we're really going to see an even more accelerating change in terms of the way the infrastructure works, in the way people interact, what libraries have to do and what information providers have to do.

Greg: And that of course harkens back to Anne's original point about staffing and physical plant and budgeting and the evolution of the library. But, Anne, I'll ask you the same question. What are we going to be talking about, besides the food and the weather, what are we going to be talking about in Charleston in 2014?

Anne: Well, you know there are a lot of different game changers that are out there. Yesterday morning's presentations certainly talked about beyond the published content, how do we manage the long continuum of scholarly communication both at the front end and at the backend? That's where a lot of our energies are going to the placed in the years to come. I think one game changer is the outcome of the Google Settlement; what is going to happen after that? But if I had to really choose one for my library, I think it is the development of the HathiTrust. It has, from three years ago, come up to where it's moving beyond adolescence now to a full-fledged thing where there are over 60 institutions and consortia who are participating in it. The fact that it has album made it 10 million volumes puts it in the very elite among the

ARL libraries. Sure we don't have access to all of the content, but over 2 million of it is in the public domain or free of copyright restrictions. There is also the ability to search across the content of all 10 million volumes, and we are looking forward to a future where we can move beyond the new forms of reading. This non-consumptive research sounds like we don't have TV or something like that, but the idea that you can start to mine that information in new ways, that it will lead to a resurgence of looking at physical books as we await opening up fuller access to material, whether it is orphan works or expanding the scope of those that are no longer covered by copyright. I also think the Constitutional Convention was a very interesting event a couple of weeks ago for a couple of things. One: taking on some of the other big, big challenges. How do we marry up print repositories with digital access through Hathi? Everybody knows we've got to handle the print stuff but somehow we've just not managed to get our acts together on that. The government documents issue and moving beyond digitized content, but, even more so is this idea of how do we, as a community, keep things lightweight and work together in this to not diminish the role of the individual institution but actually to enhance it? My concern would be for Hathi is that we not go the same route that many collaborative efforts go, which is to create another organization and spend more time on maintaining that organization then dealing with the intent that brought us together in the first place. But I think the future will be in much more of this pre-and post-collaborative activity, whether it is on the national level, or at the two-sies and three-sies such as the Cornell and Columbia participation.

Greg: And with that, we're going to turn it over to Anthony and get some questions going.

Anthony: Sandy, your question please.

Sandy Thatcher: This is a question for Anne, and it has to be with an issue that really hasn't been discussed yet: its services to graduates of universities. Right now, you have all this wonderful e-content, and you're spoiling all the undergraduate and graduate students with the vast wealth of material that they're able to access and the day after they graduate they're cut off. They can't access it at all.

I've read somewhere, maybe the Chronicle, that some universities are allowing graduates access to JSTOR for a 10% premium surcharge. I'm on seven online discussion groups hosted by the Princeton Alumni Association, and I polled two of them about this because Princeton doesn't offer this. I can tell you that there was wild enthusiasm for the idea that these people who now own businesses outside academe could access this material. And I also think of all those unemployed graduates in the Occupy Wall Street sites around the country who have all this time on their hands, they could be reading in JSTOR about the history of social movements, just think of it! At any rate, a 10% premium, that's cheap because I really feel very strongly that you're going to get alumni annual giving increasing that will make that 10% look like a drop in the bucket. There really is tremendous enthusiasm for this idea out there, so I would encourage all you librarians to go back and talk to your development offices and say "Look, this is a great opportunity to keep in touch with alumni. Show them that the university is providing them with services over their lifetime." It's a great idea.

Anne: Did Kevin pay you to say that? Well, it is obviously an issue. We have just completed a report on alumni access to materials that included alumni as well as library staff members and there are recommendations. JSTOR is on our mind, but I also have a particular interest in looking at the licenses so we can extend access to graduates in the gap years. Those first two to three, four years out of their programs, whether they're PhD's or professional degrees or undergraduate degrees, to continue to have access to material that is not competitive in the terms that they're not going to buy this stuff. I've been cautioned not to say this, but I think it's analogous to the nickel bag. If you keep people interested in it, by the time they move into their professional programs they're going to want it. They're going to continue to want it. We're looking at a pilot program right now in expanding access for vet students as they graduate.

Anthony: Have we anybody upstairs in Gold? No? Well, another question down here.

Audience Member: Yes, hello, Richard Brown, Georgetown University Press. I had a question, but now I'm flustered by the nickel bag metaphor.

Anne: I knew I shouldn't have said that!

Richard: There has been a great deal of collaboration between non-profit and university presses in the last couple of years. So much collaboration, that in 2012 we will have four new platforms of aggregated monographs and journals. This seems to me exactly what librarians didn't want to have happen. I wonder if Kevin, you or perhaps Anne, see any prospects for rapprochement, for collaboration, for mergers, among these four platforms: e-books at JSTOR, the UPCC powered by MUSE, Cambridge, and Oxford. And I suppose the same could be said for archiving and preservation services. This is a fairly small space we're all in. Or, is the market the best winnowing fork, and let things fall where they may. Thank you.

Kevin: Wow, is that an invitation? I don't know. I think we should always be talking about the possibilities and the benefits of working together. That's something we can do, we're collegial and we can do that. I also think that there are advantages to competition and those things drive people to make decisions that make things better for a marketplace. I think there is a lot of value in that. I think that both things are a good thing. Having competition, just speaking from our perspective, when we see that somebody's moved ahead and done things a certain way, we've got to keep rushing and that's a good thing overall for the environment. But, at the same time, if each of these things is too small, or if it's not able to succeed, we ought to think about ways to bring them together. It's a little too early right now to determine, I think. So I think there will be some advantage to everyone seeing what they're able to pull together and seeing how the libraries and the presses respond to that. The broader issue that we're now seeing is the presses, particularly university presses, working together which is a good thing. They're obviously, each of them, very small, and figuring out mechanisms for them to work together via

UPCC, or e-books at JSTOR, or whatever, I think that the core, really important thing is that the presses are working together. Because, to come back to our earlier theme, what's gotta give, at some level all of us have to identify what are the things that we do really well and what are the things that are too costly to continue to do. That's part of this process that we're engaged in.

Anthony: Any comments from the library end?

Anne: I agree with Kevin. Looking at the preservation side of things, I think that I would be uncomfortable if there was only one solution for digital preservation. I did want to correct one thing that Kevin said earlier. I became a librarian because I wanted to become a librarian, not because I didn't want to go into business.

Kevin: That's not totally fair is it? I'll admit that being a librarian isn't the same as choosing not to be in business, but I'll stay out of it.

Anthony: Thank you very much.