

# Update on Open/Public Access

AAU's Council on Federal Relations  
September 14, 2004



## Some Context About Scientific Publishing

- Over-arching goal of all scientific publishing is the dissemination of knowledge
  - Primarily to scientific community
  - Many publishers also want to inform the public
- Publishing is also a business
  - Costs vary widely by type(s) of journals
  - For-profit vs not-for-profit publishers

## Business models for scientific publishing

- Not just subscribers pay vs. authors pay
  - Most publishers have combined business models/plans

## Elements of business models for scientific publishing

- Subscribers pay
- Libraries pay
- Authors pay through page charges, required reprints
- Advertisers pay
- New model: authors pay to publish accepted manuscripts
  - A few now charging submission fees

## About *Science*

- Unique multi-element journal
  - News
  - Perspectives
  - Policy pieces
  - Review articles
  - Reports
- Receive 11,000 ms. per year
  - Publish about 800 reviews and reports
  - 200 perspectives and policy pieces

## *Science's* business model - revenue

- Authors don't pay
  - No page charges
    - But do charge for reprints, color
- Multi-element revenue
  - About 120,000 individual print subscribers/members
    - Plus a few hundred digital subscribers
  - About 2,500 library print subscribers
  - Advertisers (2/3 revenue)
  - Electronic site licenses introduced in late 1990's
    - Now have 1200

## *Science's* business model - expenses

- Total = \$32 million direct costs; over \$40 million total
  - Printing and distribution ~ \$10 million
  - News and editorial ~ \$10 million
  - Business/marketing/circulation management, etc. = the rest

Remember: *Science* and *Nature* are unique in diversity of content

- Other journals have different expense distributions and business models

What about access?

## Most journals now control access

- Subscribers
- Pay-per-view
- Site licenses

Many also provide free or reduced cost access to those who are unable to pay

- *Science* participates in:
  - *HINARI* – WHO organized, free access to 600 organizations in 67 countries
  - AGORA – agriculture
  - *SciDevNet* – sustainable development
  - Reduced rates for post-docs, students, teachers
  - Very cheap rates to public libraries for electronic access
  - Papers of great significance often made free access for all immediately

Many make all research papers available to everyone after six or twelve months

- *Science* is free at 12 months
- *Nature* doesn't give free access
- *PNAS* is six months
- *Molecular Biology of the Cell* is three months

Then, along came “Open Access”

## Open Access

- The Goal: Make scientific literature freely available (electronically) to everyone immediately upon publication
  - Particularly for biomedical research where public funds (NIH) support so much of research

## Open Access

- The problem: You don't need to subscribe to get instant access
  - For *Science* there has been an inverse relationship between numbers of site licenses and numbers of subscribers.
  - How would we pay the bills?

## Open Access

- Business model involves a mixture of elements
  - Core is “published author pays”
    - Some also have submission fees
  - Grants from private foundations
  - Pay for print subscriptions
  - University subscriptions can partially underwrite author costs

“Open Access” has become synonymous with “author pays” business model

- Public Library of Science – *PLoS-Biology*
  - PLoS charges \$1500 per published paper
  - We’d have to charge \$8-10k
- We don’t know detail of any open access business model
  - We’re watching the experiment

There has been a tremendous amount of polarized discussion in the scientific, policy and publishing communities

- Self-righteous “do the right thing!”
- “You’re going to kill us!”

Along came the House appropriation subcommittee draft report for NIH FY 2005 budget

- NIH should develop a policy that would require that:
  - If research supported by NIH funds, paper must be deposited in PubMedCentral for release within six months
  - If any publication costs supported by NIH, release must be immediate upon publication

## Publishers became very concerned

- Met with Zerhouni
- Met with Congressional members and staff
- Wrote strident letters
  - You'll kill us!
  - You can't do this!
  - Were some very important points

## NIH released a draft policy in Sept. 17th Federal Register

- Authors are requested to deposit final accepted manuscript into PubMedCentral, for release six months after publication
- Publishers are requested to substitute final form of paper for manuscript form later
  - .pdf can be quite different from final manuscript

This is not “*open access*”

- NIH calls it a “*public access*” policy

## Reactions

- Open access types and some publishers deem this a “reasonable compromise”
- Some zealots believe doesn't go far enough
- Some publishers remain hysterical
- Change will happen!

## There are unresolved big issues

- What's a final, accepted manuscript?
- Will the publishers deposit final real papers?
- What are the rules for PubMedCentral?
- Is this an archive or the archive?
- Will the government actually maintain the archive forever?
- What about political influence?

Enough....let's talk!