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Introduction

PEER (Publishing and the Ecology of European Research) is an important new research project supported by the European Union that will investigate the effects of the large-scale, systematic depositing of authors' final peer-reviewed manuscripts (so called Green Open Access or stage-two research output) on reader access, author visibility, and journal visibility, as well as on the broader ecology of European research. The project is a collaboration between publishers, repositories and researchers and will last from 2008 to 2011. While PEER has a European focus its findings will have worldwide implications for the publication of research outputs.

Peer-reviewed journals play a key role in scholarly communication and make an essential contribution to the progress of science. The publishing and research communities in Europe have agreed that access to the results of European funded research is important to maximise its use and impact. However, they hold different views on whether mandated deposit in open access repositories is necessary and the embargo periods that would be appropriate. No consensus has been reached on a way forward.

The key problem is that there is no clear evidence of what the impact of archiving research outputs in open access repositories will be if implemented on a broad and systematic scale. The solution that PEER brings is a collaboration involving the publishing, library and research communities that will investigate the effects of this phenomenon. The aim is to develop an "observatory" to monitor the effects of systematic archiving over time. Participating publishers will collectively contribute 300 journals to the project and supporting research studies will address issues such as:

• How large-scale archiving will affect journal viability.
• Whether it increases access.
• How it will affect the broader ecology of European research.
• Factors influencing the readiness to deposit in institutional and disciplinary repositories and the associated costs.
• Models to illustrate how traditional publishing systems can coexist with self-archiving.

The PEERage

The International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers, the European Science Foundation, Göttingen State and University Library, the Max Planck Society and INRIA will collaborate on this project, supported by the SURF Foundation and University of Bielefeld to involve the expertise of the EU-funded DRIVER project. This work should lead to a greater understanding of journal and repository use in the digital age, and, it is hoped, will foster trust and mutual understanding between the stakeholders in academic research and scholarly publishing.


The PEER Solution

PEER identifies three stages of research outputs: stage-one: the author’s draft manuscript, often called a preprint, submitted for publication; stage-two: the author’s final manuscript that has been accepted for publication by a journal and incorporates all the changes required by the peer review process; stage-three: the final published article, a complete, definitive peer-reviewed version with full editing, typesetting, and electronic indexing and linking to other articles.

Most publishers allow the deposit or use of stage-one outputs without any restriction; a few allow open access to stage-three outputs under very specific conditions which they impose, such as payment of publication charges or after embargo periods. Disagreement focuses on the conditions of deposit of stage-two research outputs.

Many publishers allow archiving of stage-two outputs on a limited scale (e.g., to comply with the specific mandates of individual funding bodies). Policies vary considerably across publishers and can vary across a given publisher’s journals. This situation can be confusing to authors. On the other hand, some publishers are broadly supportive of open access and are conducting their own experiments with new business models (e.g., funded open access or converting traditional journals to open access models).

It remains unclear what the impact of archiving the stage-two research outputs in repositories will be, if implemented on a broad and systematic scale, on journals and on the wider ecology of scientific research in Europe.

The proposed solution is for publishers and the research community to collaborate in developing an observatory that will enable them to monitor the impacts of the deposit of stage-two research outputs. The data provided by the observatory can then be used to provide an evidence-based foundation for discussions on future policy.

Collaboration is an important part of the solution. In principle, either publishers or the research community could independently gather its own evidence and propose policies to the other on this basis. PEER's philosophy is, however, that a true solution will only be achieved if both publishers and the research community collaborate to design the Observatory, gather the evidence, and reach a joint understanding on the impacts.

The PEER Observatory will act as a controlled experiment to compare an evolving scenario of large-scale and systematic archiving with the current situation of limited and sporadic archiving. It will, therefore, involve a group of journals participating in the project and a control group for comparison.

It has been observed in other projects that the response times of the scholarly communication system are slow. Effects observed today may be the outcome of quite temporally distant events. The observatory will therefore not be dedicated to looking at the irreversible impacts of change but rather the accumulating indicators that presage that change.

The PEER Objectives

The specific objectives of PEER are:

1. Determine how the large-scale deposit of stage-two research outputs in repositories will affect journal viability.

The scholarly journal supplies core functions of formal academic communication by offering readers a branded thematic focus and quality control through editorially anchored peer review. There is no desire to see it damaged, if there is a continuing user demand for these functions in an open access environment. It is essential therefore to understand the nature and scale of the impact of large-scale deposit on journal economics. In the project timescale (three years), it will be difficult to measure impact in terms of cancellations of journals subscriptions. The project will use migration of use from publisher sites to repository sites as an indicator of economic impact, supplemented by research to explain this migration and the behavioural consequences for researchers.

2. Determine whether the large-scale deposit of stage-two research outputs in repositories increases access.

Repositories can play a role in broadening access to a wide variety of digital objects; the formal peer-reviewed document landscape is unusual in having high but not universal access within the scholarly community. It is important to understand how access may actually be continued on page 87
improved. The project will seek to determine whether (and how) large scale deposit impacts on access to publications. This can be done by:

- Monitoring whether repository use is truly “new” use or migration from publisher sites.
- Comparing usage of the same articles at both repositories and publisher’s sites.

To this end, the project will collect data on usage, e.g., institution type, user type, geographical area. Usage data will be supplemented by research to explain this new use.

3. Determine whether the large-scale deposit of stage-two research outputs in repositories will affect the broader ecology of European research.

The attitudes and behaviours of the research community are probably the most important aspect of the evolution of their communication systems. Researchers are increasingly obliged to enter data about their research activities into their institution’s research databases as the basis for fund allocation. The combination of this process with the deposit of publications is currently considered by single research institutions. Either the requirement to deposit or the fact that someone else (a publisher) may have deposited content into a repository on your behalf changes the boundary conditions. It will be essential to measure and monitor these attitudes and behaviours through a qualitative and quantitative baseline study that gets iterated at various points during the project.

4. Determine the factors affecting the readiness to deposit manuscripts in institutional and disciplinary repositories and measure the associated costs.

In the debates about the use of repositories, it has been suggested that researchers rarely deposit their publications in institutional and disciplinary repositories, even when the journals in which they published their work allow this. A number of reasons have been discussed in this context: Researchers may find depositing manuscripts in repositories to be difficult and/or time consuming; the legal situation may not be entirely clear to them; they may not be aware of the relevant repositories or the value of self-archiving may not be clear to them. PEER will collect information on repository use and on the behaviour of the researchers (both by logfiles and quantitative as well as qualitative surveys) to help understand the factors which affect the decision to deposit published works in repositories. Furthermore, the project will compare the costs associated with publisher-assisted deposit with various models of author self-archiving to determine which model is most cost-effective.

5. Develop a model to illustrate how traditional publishing systems can coexist with self-archiving.

The observatory will provide an environment for studying the effects of self-archiving. In essence the model for large-scale archiving is being monitored in a controlled fashion for a subset of European research and publishing, open for extension in the course of the project. The project will seek to describe this model, the parameters, and how they interact. This could provide insights into how to optimise the parameters, e.g., method of deposit, embargo times. It will also stimulate field studies and discussion about alternative models that could benefit all stakeholders.

Overall Approach

The 300 journals contributed by participating publishers will cover a wide range of types and subjects. Publishers will set embargo times for each journal appropriate to the discipline and individual journal economics.

During the project, stage-two research outputs for European authors will be deposited in open access repositories in the EU using two methods: either (a) the author will be requested to deposit the manuscript (self-archiving), or (b) the publisher will deposit the manuscript on behalf of the author.

PEER will be managed by an Executive, chaired by Michael Mabe of STM, and will be advised by a Research Oversight Group of distinguished scholars. The research itself will be commissioned from appropriately qualified and independent research teams. There are three strands to the research: behavioural, focusing on researchers as authors and users; access and usage, focusing on logfiles from participating repositories and publishers; and economic, focusing on efficiency and cost-effectiveness of deposit processes.

Expected Results

It is anticipated that PEER will result in:

- Greater understanding by both publishers
Technology Left Behind — The Kindle Fire Still Burns

Column Editor: Cris Ferguson (Electronic Resources/Serials Librarian, James B. Duke Library, Furman University, 3300 Poinsett Highway, Greenville, SC 29613; Phone: 864-294-2713 <cris.ferguson@furman.edu>)

In the April 2008 issue of Against the Grain, this column took a look at Amazon’s Kindle and its applications within libraries. The Kindle was brand-spanking new at the time, and there was some controversy over the Terms of Use, which prohibit the lending of Kindles loaded with eBooks. (See “Throwing Kindling on the eBook Fire,” ATG v.20/2 for the full story). It is six months later, the Kindle is about to celebrate its first birthday, and I am taking a second look to see how both the Kindles and the libraries that are lending them have fared. I have also checked in with a publisher, John Wiley and Sons Inc., to see where they stand on the issue of libraries lending Kindles.

Sparta Public Library

As far as I am aware, Sparta Public Library (SPL) was perhaps the first library to start lending Kindles loaded with eBook titles. While they were not aware of the limitations placed upon lending by the Terms of Use, they have not stopped lending since they became aware of the restrictions. Diane Lapsley, Assistant Director at SPL, continues to champion the use of Kindles in libraries.

SPL has a hard time getting Kindles. Says Lapsley, “Although the demand is still high, we feel that we’re meeting the demand with the units we have, so we’re good for right now.”

Thus far, SPL’s lending policies for the Kindles have served them well. According to Lapsley, nothing has been lost, the Kindles are very rarely returned late, and they have had no recharging problems. She says, “It’s been great all around, and the patrons are still enamored of the whole thing!” I asked Lapsley the $64,000 question: Have you ever heard from Amazon? and her response was, “NOT WORD ONE... and I LIKE it that way!!!!”

Lapsley may not have heard from Amazon, but she has been contacted by several libraries that are interested in setting up Kindle lending programs of their own. This includes libraries outside of the United States, two in Sweden and one in Norway.

North Carolina State University

SPL is not the only library lending out its Kindles. North Carolina State University (NCSU) Libraries ordered six Kindles in January 2008, and began lending them out sometime in late February. Just recently, because of the long waiting list for the devices, they acquired six more, bringing their current total to 12.

Greg Raschke, Associate Director for Collections and Scholarly Communication Administration at NCSU Libraries, recently discussed the NCSU Libraries’ Kindle program with me. The Kindles are made available as part of NCSU’s device lending program (http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/learningcommons/devices.html), which acts as a technology test bed, allowing NCSU students, faculty, and staff to check out and experiment with new and emerging technologies. Says Raschke, “The students really like the device lending program quite a bit. The idea is that they can experiment with these, figure out what they like, and then, typically, go buy them.” In addition to Kindles, NCSU Libraries lend out laptops, digital cameras and camcorders, iPods and MP3 players, GPS units, graphing calculators, and digital voice recorders. The devices are lent from the Learning Commons service desk, which is separate from the Circulation Desk.

NCSU Libraries requires a current patron record to borrow a Kindle; no credit card or other information is required. Patrons may check out the Kindles for seven days. Raschke says that NCSU is letting patrons build the collection as they go. A single Amazon account can have up to six Kindles affiliated with it, which is why the NCSU Libraries has bought its Kindles in groups of six. With its Kindles, NCSU Libraries manages two Kindle accounts. At this point, they have over 70 titles between the two accounts, which, at an average price of $9.15 per book, represents approximately a $700 investment in titles for the Kindles. There is a price threshold of $50 per book, and a limit of five titles per person per checkout.

All of the titles that are purchased for the Kindles are added to the online catalog. Unlike SPL, NCSU Libraries does not allow patrons to purchase titles on their own; if a patron wants a title that is not already on the Kindle, the patron may request that it be purchased and downloaded to the Kindle prior to checking the device out. The process of downloading a new book to the Kindle usually only takes five to ten minutes, and it can be done while the patron waits.

Raschke does not feel that NCSU patrons are using the Kindles as an alternative to interlibrary loan. “Sometimes they will use it when a book is checked out, and they want an access copy,” says Raschke, but surveys indicate that the driving motivation for 90% of people checking out the Kindles is that they want to see how the device works. While the majority of users of this program have been students, a couple of professors have used the Kindles for classes. For example, a professor teaching a communications class has juxtaposed the Kindle with caveman drawings as a form of written communication.

Raschke says that initial set up of the accounts and managing multiple sets of Kindles has been the most challenging part of this program. Figuring out which books are loaded to which Kindles is a bit of a hassle for people working the Learning Commons service desk. He indicated that NCSU Libraries may acquire six more Kindles, but that they would most likely cap the number of Kindles it owns at 18. They don’t want more than three or four accounts to manage. Raschke is hopeful that Amazon will come up with a more institutionally friendly model; one that would allow books to be shared across more than six Kindles at a time. Overall, Raschke says, “The program has been successful, and students have really enjoyed it. The use per dollar spent has been pretty good already.”

A Publisher’s Perspective

John Wiley & Sons, Inc. has offered titles via the Kindle since Amazon first launched the eBook reader. According to Peter Balis, Online Sales Director, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., continued on page 89