

Public Access Debate

Bridging the Divide

2010 APE Conference
Berlin, Germany
January 19 – 20, 2010

H. Frederick Dylla
Executive Director and CEO
American Institute of Physics



Zaporozhian Cossacks of Ukraine Writing a Letter to the Turkish Sultan. Oil painting by Elias Repin, 1878-91. 6'8" x 11'9".

Public access debate: pro voices

- Taxpayer pays [*for research*], taxpayer should have access [*to results*]
- Furthers innovation, science, public health, and economic development
- Ensures accountability and transparency
- Plays into the goals of researchers to be known--read and cited

Public access debate: cautionary voices

- Possible negative effect on health and sustainability of scholarly publications
- Peer review, quality, stability of the current system—potential casualties
- Academic freedom to publish curtailed
- Government intervention and unfunded mandates

Voices of reason

The publishing industry, academic community and libraries have been traditional allies ensuring value of scholarly publications.

- IFLA /IPA joint statement on open access
- “Chicago Collaborative,” between medical publishers and libraries
- EU-funded PEER Project
- US House Science and Technology Committee Roundtable on public access

Common ground?

- Economic pressures apply to all.
- Scholarly publications essential to science and scholarship.
- Disruptive and unsustainable transitions in the business models could disrupt scholarship.
- The polarization prevents solutions.
- Government could be a valuable partner.

Scholarly Publishing Roundtable

Convened by the Committee on Science and Technology of the United States House of Representatives, in coordination with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)

Issued report on January 12, 2010

<http://science.house.gov/press/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=2710>

Charge

“to explore and develop an appropriate consensus regarding access to and preservation of federally funded research information that addresses the needs of all interested parties.”

Composition

- Academic administration (three provosts and an association executive)
- Academic libraries (three librarians)
- Publishers of scientific journals (two from learned societies, one from an established commercial publisher with diverse business models, and one from an innovative and successful open access start-up)
- Researchers in the domains of library and information science (three)

Participants

Academia	Libraries	Publishers
John Vaughn (AAU, Chair)	Ann Okerson (Yale)	Y.S. Chi (Elsevier)
Richard McCarty (Vanderbilt)	Scott Plutchak (Alabama)	M. Patterson (PLoS)
David Campbell (Boston)	Paul Courant (Michigan)	Fred Dylla (AIP)
Jim O'Donnell (Georgetown)		Crispin Taylor (ASPB)

Researchers: Phil Davis (Cornell), Carol Tenopir (Tennessee) and Don King (UNC)

Rules [Chatham House]

- Participate as knowledgeable individuals, not as official representatives of organizations
- Refrain from public disclosure of deliberations

Shared principles

- **Peer review** must continue its critical role in maintaining high quality and editorial integrity.
- **Adaptable business models** will be necessary to sustain the enterprise in an evolving landscape.
- **Scholarly and scientific publications can and should be more broadly accessible** with improved functionality to a wider public and the research community.

Shared principles, cont'd

- Sustained **archiving and preservation** are essential complements to reliable publishing methods.
- The results of research need to be published and maintained in ways that maximize the possibilities for **creative reuse** and **interoperation** among sites that host them.

Core recommendation

Each federal research funding agency should expeditiously but carefully develop and implement an explicit public access policy that brings about free public access to the results of the research that it funds as soon as possible after those results have been published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Specific recommendations

1. Agencies should work in full and open consultation with all stakeholders, as well as with OSTP, to develop their public access policies.
2. Agencies should establish specific embargo periods between publication and public access. (agency-by-agency, field-specific)
3. Policies should be guided by the need to foster interoperability.
4. Every effort should be made to have the Version of Record (VoR) as the version to which free access is provided. (if VoR not in public access database, links to publisher's site)

Specific recommendations, cont'd

5. Government agencies should extend the reach of their public access policies through voluntary collaborations with non-governmental stakeholders.
6. Policies should foster innovation in the research and educational use of scholarly publications.
7. Government public access policies should address the need to resolve the challenges of long-term digital preservation.
8. OSTP should establish a public access advisory committee.

Achieving balance

- Validating the need for and potential of increased access to scholarly articles
- Preserving the essential functions of scholarly publishing
- Recognizing and considering interests of all stakeholders
- Urging collaboration among all involved
- Validating government's role as a partner

Path forward

- Among stakeholders:
 - present and discuss Roundtable's recommendations
- US Government:
 - engagement with HSTC and OSTP on review, and engagement with similar advisory panel for development, implementation and monitoring of policies



Building the bridge: more work to be done

Acknowledgments

- Roundtable members
- Representative Bart Gordon, Chair, US House Science and Technology Committee (HSTC)
- Dahlia Sokolov (HSTC)
- Diane DiEuliis (OSTP)
- Financial support of Roundtable by AAU and PSP-AAP