



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate L – Science, economy and society

Governance and ethics

Brussels, 6 October 2006

**SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSES TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE
"STUDY ON THE ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL EVOLUTION OF THE SCIENTIFIC
PUBLICATION MARKETS IN EUROPE"**

COMMISSIONED BY THE RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
2.	ABOUT THE RESPONSES AND THE RESPONDENTS	3
2.1.	The scope of this document	3
2.2.	Characteristics of the respondents and their responses	3
	Table 1: Nature of respondents	4
	Table 2: Regional location of respondents	5
3.	KEY ISSUES IN THE RESPONSES	5
3.1.	Access issues	5
3.2.	Quality issues	8
3.3.	Preservation issues	9
3.4.	The role of public bodies and funding	10
4.	RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON THE WAY FORWARD	11
4.1.	A cooperative approach between DG INFSO and DG RTD	11
4.2.	Further investigation	12
4.3.	A new advisory committee?	13
5.	ANNEX: RESPONDENTS	14

1. INTRODUCTION

This document aims to provide a synthesis of the responses¹ received by DG Research in the context of a public consultation on the *Study on the economic and technical evolution of the scientific publication markets in Europe*² (hereafter "the Study"). The consultation was carried out from 31 March to 15 June 2006.

The European Commission's Research Directorate-General is grateful to the respondents to the consultation on the Study for their thoughtful and high quality responses. It also owes special thanks to Frederick J. Friend, Joint Information Systems Committee Scholarly Communication Consultant and Honorary Director of Scholarly Communication at University College London, who assisted the Commission services in preparing this document in a professional and resourceful manner.

The Study generated considerable interest from all concerned stakeholder groups. Its recommendations received a wide measure of support from some actors and were criticised by others. Many of the respondents are looking towards further developments in policy and research and wish the Study to be a spring-board for action and future discussion. A strong sense of opportunity comes through the words used by many respondents who believe that changes in the way research results are disseminated can bring benefits to science and society. Key features of the responses are the following:

- *The consultation on the Study resulted in many responses underlining the importance of the future well-being of research dissemination.*
- *Most respondents welcome the Study and its conclusions and recommendations while publishers responding to the Study are generally critical.*
- *There is significant support for the recommendation that public access to the results of publicly-funded scientific research should be guaranteed. However, a number of publishers express concerns.*

¹ A list of respondents is annexed to this document and individual responses are available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/page_en.cfm?id=3186. Respondents were asked to notify the Commission services if they did not want their contributions to be made public. Two respondents did not wish for their contributions to be made public, and one respondent asked to remain anonymous. Further information on the consultation and DG Research's activities in the field of scientific publication can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/page_en.cfm?id=3184.

² The full text of the Study can be read and downloaded at http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/pdf/scientific-publication-study_en.pdf.

- *The importance of long-term preservation features strongly in the responses and is linked to the issue of access to content.*
- *Several respondents stress the strong connection between scientific publication issues and the European Digital Library initiative of the Information Society Directorate-General³.*
- *Quality issues are frequently addressed in the responses, including quality standards used in evaluations and peer review.*
- *Respondents express some concern about the visibility of European research, particularly in languages other than English.*
- *The need for further research, particularly on interoperability, is underlined.*

2. ABOUT THE RESPONSES AND THE RESPONDENTS

2.1. The scope of this document

Every response has been read and analysed in terms of the characteristics of the respondent, the support or lack of support for particular recommendations of the Study, and the identification of topics of importance to the respondent. For the purposes of this summary, 170 responses are included. A total of 174 responses were received from individuals and organizations across the world, but 2 responses were received from the same individual, and 3 responses were "holding" responses making no comment on the Study. Key features of the responses are described in the text, together with factual data and illustrative quotations from the respondents. When a respondent has expressed agreement with the recommendations in the Study without exception, the response has been interpreted as supporting particular recommendations.

2.2. Characteristics of the respondents and their responses

The respondents are a mix of individuals and organizations. The largest category of respondents is composed of individual researchers working in academic institutions, contributing 60 out of 170 of the responses received. A further 35 responses come from academic organizations. Included in this category are responses in which individual respondents indicate that they are writing on behalf of an organization. Likewise, the responses from libraries, library associations, and other information organizations

³ A description of the Digital Libraries Initiative can be read at http://europa.eu.int/information_society/activities/digital_libraries/index_en.htm

include those by individuals writing on behalf of organizations (58 of the responses). The publisher responses (17 of the total responses) come from companies or publishers' organizations. Most major scientific publishers are represented in the responses.

The individual responses are mainly from researchers working for public institutions in scientific or medical areas. Researchers working in the commercial sector have not responded, although a few respondents do mention the interest of the commercial sector in the output of publicly-funded research. A few responses have been received from researchers in the humanities and social sciences, and – although some disciplinary differences are identified below – these responses do not indicate major disagreements on key issues from the views expressed by their scientific and medical colleagues. Table 1 summarises the nature of respondents to the Study.

Table 1: Nature of respondents

Nature of respondents	Number
Individual researchers	60
Academic organizations or individuals on behalf of academic organizations	35
Libraries, library associations, and other information organizations, or individuals on behalf of information organization	58
Publisher, publisher organization, company or group	17
Total number of respondents	170

The issues described in the Study are under discussion in many different countries across the world. The majority of responses – 136 out of 170 – come from individuals and organizations within the geographical region of Europe. A wide spread of European countries is represented in the responses.⁴ There is no noticeable difference in the nature of responses received from within Europe by comparison with those from other parts of the world. Table 2 shows the breakdown of respondents by location.

⁴23 of the total of 136 European responses are from organizations with members in more than one European country.

Table 2: Regional location of respondents

Regional location of respondents	Number
Europe	136
<i>EU Member States</i>	<i>130</i>
<i>EU candidate countries</i>	2
<i>Other European countries</i>	4
North America	21
South America	2
Africa	2
Asia	8
Australia	1
Total number of respondents	170

The responses vary considerably in length, from brief e-mails from individual researchers to a 44-page document from a publishers' organization. Many responses are in the range of 3 to 6 pages. Academic and libraries/information organizations are generally supportive and publisher organizations critical of the analysis, conclusions and recommendations in the Study. The specific issues identified by the different stakeholders will be analysed in later sections of this document.

Many of the organizational respondents cover a wide range of academic disciplines, but only 6 respondents raise issues relating to humanities or social science disciplines. This lack of comment may be due to different understandings of the word "science" in the title of the Study, as in English the word is often understood to refer primarily to the scientific, technical & medical (STM) area. Of the 6 respondents who do mention humanities/social science issues, 4 are academic organizations, 1 is a publisher, and 1 is an individual researcher. The issues raised are small market area, multilingualism, differences in publishing structure, and differences in quality identifiers. 2 humanities academic organizations refer to the importance of monographs in their disciplines.

3. KEY ISSUES IN THE RESPONSES

3.1. Access issues

The issue receiving the most comments is that of access to the results of publicly-funded research. Two of the Study's recommendations relate directly to this topic: recommendation A1 ("Guarantee public access to publicly-funded research results

shortly after publication") and recommendation A2 ("Aim at a 'level-playing field' in terms of business models in publishing").

Many of the responses received equate public access as mentioned in recommendation A1 with the principle of "open access", defined by the 2000 Budapest Open Access Initiative as "free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself".

Out of the 170 responses received, 134 support recommendation A1. Within this group, 24 respondents mention the importance of open access to science and scientists in improving the process and the impact of scientific research, while 13 mention the role of open access for the public good in achieving economic and social benefits. Amongst respondents who support open access, the concept also carries a notion of moving forward. As Nobel Prize-winner Richard J. Roberts writes in his contribution, "open access is the only model of the future and the debate should be how we can get there as quickly as possible". In their responses, several research organizations describe ways in which they are already supporting access to the research they fund. The Wellcome Trust writes of the development of the online digital archive UK PubMed Central, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) has already established a policy on free access to research results, and the nuclear research organization CERN implemented a policy on deposit in 2003, a decision which has resulted in a large database of reports on research in high energy physics. Franck Laloë of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) in his response points to the value of a European approach to such initiatives: "A European effort in the direction of large open archives could have a tremendous impact".

Of the various possible forms of public access, the strongest support is for the deposit of journal articles in repositories. For example, CERN supports "ensuring immediate deposit in repositories and encouraging interoperability", believing that "digital repositories for scientific information will constitute the corner-stones in the future eScience framework". Most respondents do not distinguish between pre-print and post-print in supporting or opposing deposit of journal articles in a repository. The version recommended for deposit by information organizations such as SURF (Dutch higher education and research partnership organisation for network services and information and communications technology) or eIFL.net (Electronic Information For Libraries) is the final manuscript accepted for publication, whereas publisher organizations such as the UK Publishers Association and the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) prefer users to access the version on the publisher's web-site either through a subscription or through delayed open access. A number of respondents do make a distinction between the deposit of metadata and full-text data, especially when a publisher's embargo is in place. For example, the researchers in the Euroscience group "distinguish between (a) depositing the full text of a journal article and the corresponding

metadata into an Open Access Repository and (b) making the deposited full text either Open Access or Closed Access (allowing Open Access only to its bibliographic metadata)".

The responses display a variety of views on placing a time embargo on public access to research results, some making a case for a delay, others pressing for immediate access. A total of 39 respondents mention the issue of embargo, 15 urging immediate access, 8 regarding an embargo of up to six months as being acceptable, 3 pressing for a period of one or two years, and 13 accepting the need for an unspecified embargo period. Research and library organizations are those preferring no embargo or a short period, while publishers argue for a longer period to allow for the recovery of their costs while there is no copy in a repository.

The implementation of open access principles by public bodies is implicitly or explicitly opposed by 4 respondents (Thieme Publishing, the Biochemical Society, Reed Elsevier, and the Association of American Publishers) and 13 respondents react to open access with caution. Objections to recommendation A1 are mainly in the form of notes of caution against too precipitous action based on a Study which critics view as being flawed. This caution is based on the view that open access puts the existing dissemination of scientific research through subscription journals at risk.

Publishers and publishers' organizations generally argue that their policies improve access and that therefore it is not necessary to follow recommendation A1. The publishing house Elsevier states that there has been a three-fold increase in the number of journal titles accessible in large EU libraries in six years, and other publishers make similar points. Moreover, critical and cautious respondents emphasize that there is no active demand for a public access model, that repository use will undermine the contribution of learned societies to science, and that it will lead to additional public expenditure. They further underline that change to a system that functions well is unnecessary and that rapid change may have a negative impact on the current research dissemination system.

One particular area of concern to some respondents who express caution on access issues is the question of damage to the profitability of journals from small publishing houses. Another aspect raised is the use of surpluses from society journals for grants, bursaries, and other educational work. The UK Biochemical Society estimates the annual value of this "science dividend" from its journals and investments at GB£1 million. Responses from publishers and learned societies in some countries do not mention a use of surpluses, but do express concern about the effect of open access upon the survival of their journals. The Belgian publishing group Association des Éditeurs Belges (ADEB) points to the risk to publications from smaller countries and linguistic centres. The Faculty of Arts and Humanities at University College London supports the Study's recommendations because of the damage caused to "niche publishers" in the current situation of high expenditure upon STM journals.

With regard to the search for alternative business models and for a level-playing field recommended by the Study, many publishers would agree with the STM organization's position that they are "agnostic as regards chosen business models", while a small number of respondents move from caution to strong criticism. A number of publishers state that they are neutral regarding the choice of a business model, provided that they receive enough income to maintain their publishing services. Indeed, several major publishers refer to the trials they are currently undertaking based upon an "author-choice" business model combining articles funded by publication charges with articles funded by subscriptions. According to some respondents from library and information organizations, the Commission could support recommendation A2 in discussions with Member States, encouraging national research funding agencies to identify funds for the payment of open access publication charges. The clear identification of funds for this purpose could ease publisher concerns about the future viability of their business and help to create the "level-playing field".

3.2. Quality issues

After access issues, the next topic to be addressed in the responses is the maintenance of scientific publication quality (42 responses out of 170). There is common agreement amongst all respondents that quality control in scientific publication is crucial. This refers both to the quality of evaluation mechanisms, e.g. through funding bodies, and to the quality of published research, as traditionally ensured through peer review. Comments on quality issues are raised by some respondents in the context of recommendation A3 ("Extended quality' rankings of scientific journals") and by others as a factor in considering recommendations A1 and A2 (mentioned above). Some respondents view quality issues as part of future developments in scholarly communication. Whatever position respondents take on different publication models, it is in the name of quality assurance, but they differ on the means by which quality control is measured, expressed and ensured.

Recommendation A3 is supported by 15 respondents, while 10 are supportive of change in general in quality assurance and measurement. 6 respondents express opposition to recommendation A3, and 11 are cautious about change in quality assurance and measurement. Those respondents who support the present publishing system stress the importance given to quality assurance in the present system and point to the risk to quality in moving to new publishing models. The Association of American Publishers question "why alternate means of assessing journal quality are here proposed, given the well-established market indicators and the relative ease and transparency of journal reputations to both librarians and researchers". For those who caution against change, most attention is directed towards the value added by publishers in the certification process. As the UK Publishers Association points out, "a reputation for quality and prestige in a journal takes years, even decades to establish".

Conversely, those respondents who support change in the present publishing system are also those who support changes in the ways in which research quality is certified, while still supporting the importance of procedures to ensure quality. Dr Ulrich Pöschl of the European Geosciences Union states that "the traditional forms of closed peer review and publication are insufficient for quality assurance in today's highly diverse and rapidly evolving world of science". For those who advocate change in scientific publishing the concern is about the over-use of measures such as the impact factor of a journal as a surrogate for quality. The Finnish Open Access Working Group believes that "the increasing emphasis of funding agencies and university administrations of using the inclusion of [Thomson] ISI [citation data] as a proxy for quality is currently the strongest factor stifling innovation in this sector".

3.3. Preservation issues

Preservation issues are addressed in the Study's recommendations A4 ("Guarantee perennial access to scholarly journal digital archives") and to some extent in recommendation A5 ("Foster interoperable tools to improve knowledge visibility, accessibility and dissemination"). The long-term preservation of electronic content is discussed in 44 responses, and all stakeholders agree that it is an important issue. The 2 dominant messages in the responses are that preservation should be linked to free access and that collaboration between stakeholders is essential.

While all 44 respondents who discuss preservation issues agree that effective long-term arrangements are vital, the priorities of different stakeholder groups regarding long-term access and conditions differ radically. For publishers, access to preserved content is a business issue related to the return upon investment in publishing the digital content. For many respondents from the academic and information communities, the value of preservation lies in the ability to access preserved content without barriers of price or licensing restrictions. In its response SPARC Europe points to the preservation risk inherent in the licensing model: "Responsibility for the long-term preservation of this content is ill-defined, with some publishers taking on the task (but perhaps only for as long as there is commercial justification to do so)".

Accordingly, respondents differ on the way in which this recommendation should be taken forward. A small number of respondents treat the recommendation in structural terms, pointing to the role of national libraries or alternatively local repositories in organizing long-term preservation, or to the role of co-operative systems such as LOCKSS ("Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe"). Most respondents from each individual stakeholder group see long-term preservation as an access issue with respect to the terms and conditions under which preserved content is to be made available. Many respondents stress the enormous task ahead and the cost of implementing electronic preservation.

Arising from different perspectives on preservation are distinct views of specific preservation models. Twelve respondents comment on the J-STOR model, some supporting its use in the context of digital preservation and others pointing to its subscription-basis. ALPSP writes that the scholarly journal archive "J-STOR is not a preservation initiative but rather a digitisation and access service which recovers its costs by selling access to libraries". Academic and library respondents see the J-STOR model as suitable for the preservation of European not-for-profit journals, but with public funding to ensure barrier-free access. CIBER (Coordinamento Interuniversitario Basi dati & Editoria in Rete), a group of Italian universities, expresses the viewpoint that "the technologies and means of how to best preserve the European cultural and scientific heritage cannot be left merely to the market but must be the concern of supra-national organizations".

3.4. The role of public bodies and funding

Underlying issues of access, quality, and preservation assurance are differing views of the role of public bodies. All respondents accept that public funding is vital to scientific publication, but views on the purpose of public funding are polarised. The American Chemical Society's view is that the Study's "goal seems to be to squarely position the state as the primary gatekeeper of scientific information", and that "state control of scientific information is a prospect that many view with alarm". A different view of the role of a state comes from the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions: "we believe that each country has a responsibility for making research output widely available". Several respondents see this responsibility in a European context. The Italian universities represented in CIBER call for "a clear statement on the public, and therefore [EU] Commission, concern and responsibility for production, dissemination and preservation of culture and science", a call which resonates with the Netherlands organization SURF's suggestion of a "European Charter on open access to publicly funded knowledge", complementing the Bologna charter on higher education.

Respondents put forward various proposals on the purpose of public funding. The DFG recommends that "research funding organizations should – as the DFG already does – recognise publications as a major component of research costs and should provide scientists with funds for open access publications under the 'author-pays' model". The UK Biosciences Federation notes "that the funds available for research have hugely outstripped the funds made available (usually via libraries) to purchase the results of that research" and recommends discussion on how that gap can be covered. Many respondents from all stakeholder groups support public funding of preservation activities, although publishers see preservation as public-private collaboration.

Recommendation B3 to "eliminate the unfavourable tax treatment of electronic publications" receives support from 35 respondents. They agree with the authors of the

Study that the unfavourable tax treatment of electronic publications is hindering the take-up and therefore the benefits of the electronic format in scientific research. The cross-stakeholder Frankfurt Group makes this recommendation and the issue of value added tax the sole topic of their response to the Study. Recommendation B3 also covers the need to investigate the difficult funding situation faced by social science and humanities journals, and a number of respondents point to such situations, particularly for journals published in languages other than English. The commissioning of such an investigation would be welcomed by those respondents.

Respondents' comments on recommendation B1 ("Promote pro-competitive pricing strategies") are mixed. Publishers argue against any intervention by public authorities in the market. Academic and library organizations tend to underline the harmful effects of current pricing models upon their activities, but do not point to specific measures the Commission might take to improve market conditions. As for recommendation B2 ("Scrutinize future significant mergers"), no objection is raised and no support expressed. Publishers point out that current large-scale mergers would already be considered by regulatory authorities if likely to lead to an anti-competitive situation.

4. RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON THE WAY FORWARD

4.1. A cooperative approach between DG INFSO and DG RTD

In connection with the issues discussed above and in particular with the question of preservation, several respondents underline the opportunity and need for a common and coherent approach by DG Research and DG Information Society. Indeed, in respondents' comments on various topics, the relationship between the Study and the i2010 Digital Libraries Initiative becomes apparent.

Several respondents specifically make the connection in relation to interoperability, urging common development of technical measures which will benefit the future of both scientific publication and digital libraries. Professor Ian Butterworth of Imperial College London expresses the potential in the following sentence: "The important recommendations A4 [perennial access] and A5 [interoperable tools] also have major technical contents where DG-Research and DG-Information Society working together can speed development". The UK library organizations CURL (Consortium of Research Libraries in the British Isles) and SCONUL (Society of College, National and University Libraries) also express the hope that recommendation A5 will "[feed] into the development of that programme", i.e. the Digital Libraries Initiative. As well as collaboration within Europe, a number of respondents also stress the need for standards to be developed with partners from other parts of the world.

4.2. Further investigation

Three areas for further investigation are identified in recommendation C2: the evolution of copyright provisions, economic analysis of alternative forms of dissemination, and technological developments. Fifteen respondents comment specifically on this recommendation.

Of the 3 areas suggested, further work on copyright issues receives the strongest support. The nature of the further work proposed on copyright is not always clear, although the Finnish Open Access Working Group make two specific suggestions, a study on the growing use of Creative Commons licences and another study on the "licence to publish" model.

From the viewpoint of respondents who criticise the Study, further investigation on economic aspects is necessary to place the Study on a sound factual basis. For example, ALPSP calls for work on both the open access publishing model and on repository costs. Further economic analysis on the "long term sustainability of open repositories" is also welcomed by the consortium eIFL.net. The UK Publishers Association expresses interest "in the results of any experiment to test unbundling of certification and dissemination". A number of respondents cite studies already available, which they suggest may lead to different conclusions from those in the Study. However, these are not always made available. For those respondents who accept the conclusions and recommendations of the Study, further investigation is only necessary in specific areas and as a basis for implementing the recommendations.

The need for technological investigation is largely linked by respondents to future interoperability, as proposed in recommendation A5 "Foster interoperable tools to improve knowledge visibility and dissemination", which is supported by 25 respondents. Publishers tend to point to existing services such as CrossRef, while libraries, library associations and other information organizations support the early implementation of standards developed by public and private organizations. For example, the UCL Faculty of the Built Environment calls for EU funding of "the development of pan-European search services for search and retrieval from open access sources". Respondents cite various technical developments which they see as contributing to interoperability, such as OAI-PMH (Open Archives Initiative's Protocol for Metadata Harvesting), the OpenURL standard, or persistent identifiers. They urge the Commission both to fund further research and to support the implementation of these standards by all stakeholder organizations. Key Perspectives Ltd point to the opportunities provided by new tools for text-mining and data-mining, when these tools are used on a critical mass of open access content, "to create new, meaningful scientific information from existing, dispersed information using computer technologies".

In addition to this topic of interoperability, many respondents support the need for further investigation of various topics, particularly in collaboration with work already underway in various countries. According to the responses received, each of the 3 areas identified in recommendation C2 – copyright, economic analysis and technological development – is already under investigation by bodies in a number of Member States, and one way forward would be for the Commission to make contact with relevant national organizations to understand where the gaps are in current research on these topics. Spreading awareness of work already underway could help those Member States not involved in current investigations, and funding by the Commission of further work could fill some of the gaps in national investigations. The responses also make clear the need for further investigation of a wider range of topics than those identified in recommendation C2, particularly in relation to achieving interoperability for users of Europe's valuable research publications.

4.3. A new advisory committee?

26 respondents specifically support recommendation C1 ("Setting-up an advisory committee"). 18 of these are library/information organizations, 5 are publisher/publishing organizations, and 3 are academic/research organizations. All respondents who comment on the committee proposal see it as a collaborative body, involving all stakeholders. However, views of respondents vary considerably on the role of the committee. Those respondents who are looking for the Commission to take forward the recommendations in the Study see the committee as an action-based group, whereas those respondents who are critical of the Study are looking to the advisory committee as a forum for further discussion. Some respondents see the role of this committee as advising the Commission on policy in this area while others reject any suggestion of regulatory activity. While supporting the recommendation for an advisory committee, several respondents point to the need to avoid duplication with existing cross-stakeholder bodies at national level. Most respondents who support the creation of a new committee also indicate willingness to nominate a representative.

5. ANNEX: RESPONDENTS

A

Abulkadir Mustapha, Kamal

Albarede, Francis (Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon)

Allen, Colin (Indiana University)

American Chemical Society

Argast, Thomas

Arunachalam, Subbiah (M S Swaminathan Research Foundation) - 1

Arunachalam, Subbiah (M S Swaminathan Research Foundation) - 2

Association des Editeurs belges

Association of all European Academies (ALLEA)

Association of American Publishers

Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP)

Association of Swedish Higher Education

Associazione italiana biblioteche

Atta-ur-Rahman (Coordinator General COMSTECH/Federal Minister/Chairman Higher Education Commission)

B

Bäcklund, Ann-Katrin (Lund University)

Banks, Marcus (New York University)

Bassi, Maria Cristina (Università di Verona)

Benatar, Solomon (University of Cape Town)

Bibliothèque Cantonale et Universitaire Lausanne

Biochemical Society

BioMed Central

Biosciences Federation

Blackwell Publishing

Bobrow, Martin (Wellcome Trust, Cambridge University)

Bonato, Paolo (Harvard Medical School)

Boventer, David (European Shareware Conference, ESWC)

Bretscher, Mark (Medical Research Council)

British Library

Butterworth, Ian (Imperial College)

C

Caie, Graham (University of Glasgow)

CAIRN

Carr, Leslie (University of Southampton)

Centre for Digital Library Research, Strathclyde University

Cépaduès

CERN (European Organization for Nuclear Research)

Chandna, Jeetender (Esha News Monitoring Services Pvt Ltd)

Chandra, Smita (Indian Institute of Geomagnetism)

Chantavaridou, Elisavet (University of Macedonia Library & Information Centre)

CILEA Digital Library

Coleman, Michael (Babraham Institute)

Comba, Valentina (Università di Bologna)

Conferenza dei Rettori delle Università Italiane

Consortium of Research Libraries in the British Isles (CURL) and Society of College, National & University Libraries (SCONUL)

Coordinamento Interuniversitario Basi dati & Editoria in Rete (CIBER)

D

Dandekar, Thomas (Universität Würzburg)

Dermitzakis, Emmanouil (Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute)

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (English)

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German)

Deutscher Bibliotheksverband

Dorch, Bertil (Copenhagen University Library)

E

Electronic Information for Libraries (eIFL.net)

Elsevier

European Bureau of Library, Information and Documentation Associations (EBLIDA)

European Economic Association

European physicists and astrophysicists

European University Association (EUA)

Euroscience

F

Farace, Dominic (GreyNet Grey Literature Network Service)
Federation of European Publishers
Federation of Finnish Learned Societies
Fenoulhet, Jane (University College London)
Finnish Open Access Working Group
Forty, Adrian (University College London)
Frankfurt Group (letter)
Frankfurt Group (report)
Franssila, Sami (Helsinki University of Technology)
Frantzi, Maria (University of Patras)
Fuller, David (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

G

Gelfand, Mikhail (Inst. for Information Transmission Problems of the Russian Acad. of Sciences)
Grandjean, Philippe (University of Southern Denmark)

H

Harnad, Stevan (University of Southampton)
Hebenstreit, Michael
Heffernan, Tricia (Open University)
Hilf, Eberhard / Roosendaal, Hans (University of Twente, Institute for Science Networking)
Hogan, Brigid (EMBO)
Holzleitner, Ludwig (Joint Research Centre Ispra)

I

Indian Academy of Sciences
Information Access Alliance (IAA)
Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy (IECS)
Institute of Physics Publishing (IoP)
International Association for the Promotion of Co-operation with Scientists from NIS (INTAS)
International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers (STM) - contribution
International Association of Scientific, Technical & Medical Publishers (STM) - economics paper
International Council for Scientific and Technical Information, ICSTI
Irish Universities' Association
Istituto Superiore di Sanità, Rome

Italian National Forum on Electronic Information Resources, INFER

J

Jeon, Doh-Shin / Rochet, Jean-Charles (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Université de Toulouse)

Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC)

K

Kansa, Eric (Alexandria Archive Institute)

Key Perspectives Ltd

King, Donald / Tenopir, Carol (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of Tennessee at Knoxville)

Kirsop, Barbara / Chan, Leslie / Arunachalam, Subbiah

Klugkist, Alex (University of Groningen)

Koninklijke Bibliotheek

Kosanovic, Biljana (National Library of Serbia/KoBSON consortium)

Krobath, Gernot (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)

L

Laing, Stuart (University of Brighton)

Laloë, Franck (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, CNRS)

Lancaster, John (University of Huddersfield)

Legrand-Blain, Marie (Institut EGID, Université de Bordeaux 3)

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Leonhardt, Heinrich (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)

Ligue des Bibliothèques Européennes de Recherche (LIBER)

Lipsitch, Marc (Harvard School of Public Health)

M

MacColl, John (Edinburgh University Library)

Matcher, Steve (University of Exeter)

McGregor, Graham (University of Otago)

McGuirk, John (St George's University, Grenada)

McIntyre, Michael (Cambridge University)

Medeiros, Norm (Haverford College)

Mitchel, Daniel (California State Library)

Morrison, Heather (BC Electronic Library Network)

N

National and University Library Zagreb
National Library of Sweden
North American library organizations
Norwegian Association of Higher Education

O

Oppenheim, Charles (Loughborough University)
Overy, Patrick (University of Exeter)

P

Pelham, Hugh (MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology)
Pfeiffenberger, Hans (Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research)
Philips, Sean (University College Dublin)
Poeschl, Ulrich (Max Planck Institute for Chemistry) (contribution 1)
Poeschl, Ulrich (Max Planck Institute for Chemistry) (contribution 2)
Poeschl, Ulrich (Max Planck Institute for Chemistry) (e-mail)
Polish Librarian Association
Procurement for Libraries
Public Library of Science (PLOS)
Publishers Association

R

Rabow, Ingegerd (Lund University)
Raju, Vasantha (University of Mysore, Karnataka)
Rice, Robin (EDINA and University Data Library)
Roberts, Richard (New England Biolabs)
Roukens, Jan
Royal Astronomical Society
Royan, Bruce
Rudrabhatla, Varalakshmi (Andhra University)

S

Salzwedel, Horst (Technische Universität Ilmenau)
Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) Europe

Sim, Ida (World Health Organization)
Sonenshein, Abraham (Tufts University School of Medicine)
Southern European Libraries Link (SELL)
Spiesberger, Manfred (Innovation/Valorisation & e-library)
Stephens, Len (Babraham Institute)
Stockholm University
Strakantouna, Vasiliki
Suber, Peter (Public Knowledge)
SURF Foundation
Swedish Association for Information Specialists
Swedish Library Association
Syndicat national de l'Édition (SNE)
Szczeplanski, Jan (Goteborgs universitetsbibliotek)

T

Täljedal, Inge-Bert (Umeå University)
Technological Educational Institute (TEI) of Epirus Library
Thieme
Till, James (University of Toronto)
Turner, Erick H. (Oregon Health & Science University, Portland VA Medical Center)
Tyler-Smith, Chris (Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute)

U

UKB (Dutch library association)
Università di Napoli Parthenope, Biblioteca centrale
Universities from the capitals of Europe (UNICA)
Universities UK
University of Glasgow

V

Valdivia, Raphael (Duke University Medical Center)

Vestdijk, Dick (Hogeschool Utrecht)

Vežina, Kumiko (Concordia University Libraries)

Vincent, Jean-Louis (Free University of Brussels)

Vrije Universiteit Brussel

W

Wellcome Trust

Wiley

World Summit On the Information Society Working Group on Scientific Information (WSIS-SI)

Worton, Michael (University College London)

Y

Yemisi, Ajayi (Nigeria Institute of Medical Research)