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**Abstract**  
The widespread deployment of repository systems in higher education and research institutions provides the foundation for a distributed, globally networked infrastructure for scholarly communication. However, repository platforms are still using technologies and protocols designed almost twenty years ago, before the boom of the Web and the dominance of Google, social networking, semantic web and ubiquitous mobile devices. This is, in large part, why repositories have not fully realized their potential and function mainly as passive recipients of the final versions of their users’ conventionally published research outputs. In order to leverage the value of the repository network, we need to equip it with a wider array of roles and functionalities, which can be enabled through new levels of web-centric interoperability.

In November 2017, COAR published the recommendations for the next generation of repositories. The vision for this work is “to position repositories as the foundation for a distributed, globally networked infrastructure for scholarly communication, on top of which layers of value added services will be deployed, thereby transforming the system, making it more research-centric, open to and supportive of innovation, while also collectively managed by the scholarly community.”

In this presentation, Kathleen Shearer will present the current international context for scholarly communication, outline her vision for a more sustainable and equitable system for scholarly communication, present the recommendations of the COAR Next Generation Repositories Report, and discuss the key issues and challenges involved with moving forward.

**Location**  
KIPJ Theatre

**Comments**  
**Kathleen Shearer** is the Executive Director of COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories), an international association of repository initiatives with a membership of over 120 institutions worldwide from 36 countries on 6 continents. COAR’s aim is to enhance the visibility and application of research outputs through a global network of open access repositories based on international collaboration and interoperability. Shearer has been working in the area of open access, open science, scholarly communications, and research data management for over 15 years. She has been the Executive Director of COAR since 2015, and participates in numerous other organizations in Canada and internationally. She has been an active member of the Research Data Alliance (RDA) and has acted as co-chair of two RDA Interest Groups, “Libraries for Research Data” and “Long Tail of Research Data”. Shearer was instrumental in launching the Portage Initiative in Canada, a library-based research data management network. She is a research associate with the Canadian
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Association of Research Libraries (CARL) and a strategic consultant with the US-based Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Shearer also sits on the CASRAI Executive Board.
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Open is not enough!
Sustainability, equality, and innovation in scholarly communication
Working for a sustainable, global knowledge commons based on a network of open access digital repositories

Who is COAR?
- Over 100 members and partners from 35 countries in 5 continents
- Universities, libraries, government agencies, open access organizations, not-for-profit organizations, and platform developers
- Diverse perspectives that share a common vision

Major Activities
- International voice
  - Raising the visibility of repository networks as key infrastructure for open science
- Alignment and interoperability
  - Building a global knowledge commons through harmonization of standards and practices
- Cultivating relationships
  - Supporting an international community of practice for repositories and open access
- Building capacity
  - Advancing skills and competencies for repository and research data management
- Adopting value-added services
  - Promoting the use of web-friendly technologies and new functionalities for repositories

Contacts Us
http://www.coar-repositories.org
Email: office@coar-repositories.org
Phone: +49 551 39 22215
Fax: +49 551 39 5222
Facebook: COAReV
Twitter: @COAR_eV

How to participate?
- Organizations can join COAR for €500 Euros per year (about $600 US)
- Join as a single, consortial, or special member or partner
- Download the membership application (https://www.coar-repositories.org/about/join/become-a-member)
Education, research, and knowledge are critical for sustainable development.

But our system for sharing and disseminating knowledge must also be sustainable.
(1) Sustainability

“Implies a holistic approach to addressing problems that takes into account multiple dimensions including ecology, society and economics, recognizing that all of these dimensions must be considered together to find lasting prosperity.”
The ridiculous $$$$$ for scholarly journals
# Table 1: Average 2017 Price for Scientific Disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Average Price per Title</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Average Price per Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$4,773</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>$2,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>Math &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>1,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LJ Periodicals Price Survey 2017
## Global results of the analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used journals</td>
<td>16,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cited journals</td>
<td>9,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals mentioned by our community in the survey</td>
<td>8,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,843 unique titles used/cited/mentioned</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>«essential titles» (80%)</td>
<td>4,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional titles (from validation by departments)</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,893 unique essential titles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,940 titles with quantitative approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,953 titles from community consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Costs of Article Processing Charges

Jisc 2016: Average APC cost was about £1745 (~$2400 US)
about DEAL

Elsevier

Renowned scientists resign from editorial activities for Elsevier and support the aims of project DEAL. Further information can be found in the HRK press release and here.

A current list of institutions that have cancelled their contracts with Elsevier can be found here.

Project aim

The goal of Project DEAL is to conclude nationwide licensing agreements for the entire portfolio of electronic journals (E-journals) from major academic publishers from the 2017 licence year. The intention is also to bring about significant change to the status quo in relation to negotiations, content and pricing in the process. The effects of a consortium agreement at the national level should relieve the financial burden on individual institutions and bring wide-scale, lasting improvements in access to scholarly literature for academics. An open access component is also planned.
Joint COAR-UNESCO Statement on Open Access

Open access is a global trend, with policies and practices rapidly being adopted around the world. As the world enters a new era of sustainable development, openness and inclusiveness in scientific research will become increasingly critical. While most governments agree on the underlying principles of open access, there is significant diversity in the way countries have approached its implementation. These differences reflect a range of perspectives, values, and priorities of the different regions. Clearly, there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution to implementing open access.
(2) Equality

What is equality?

“Equality is ensuring individuals or groups of individuals are not treated differently or less favourably, on the basis of their specific protected characteristic, including areas of race, gender, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation and age.” (University of Edinburgh)
Ten years of Chagas disease research: Looking back to achievements, looking ahead to challenges

Eric Dumonteil, Claudia Herrera

Published: April 20, 2017 * https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005422
Example: Nepal

Nepalese research outputs - with Major Clusters

Number of publications: 3,011
Years: 2004-2013

Image produced by Pitambar Gautam, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan
Word maps created using VosViewer, a free software (Leiden University), Vaby Eck & Waltman (2010)
This assumption also denies the lack of diversity in international research. When researchers gain access to the international scientific journals, they are not gaining access to a repository of knowledge that is representative of the plurality and diversity of knowledge and science produced around the world. Rather, they are dealt with articles that do not include Global South perspectives, giving more visibility and thus legitimacy to knowledge from the Global North. This again reaffirms the idea that the Western-centric mode of producing science is the model local research needs to follow in order to reach its potential, a rationale that has strong cultural and social implications for what researchers and the general public understand as valid and legitimate knowledge.
Canadian Journal Of Native Studies

The Canadian Journal of Native Studies is a highly recognized journal in the field of Native Studies. It began as a publication of the Society for the Advancement of Native Studies which is no longer in operation and whose founder; Sam Corrigan; was the Chief Editor from 1981-2008. It comes out on a bi-annual basis, and publishes original research which is refereed by peer review.

As a general focus, the journal publishes anthropological, historical, sociological, political, legal, education and cultural issues affecting First Nations people. Although the majority of articles deal with Indigenous peoples in Canada, it also publishes articles dealing with Indigenous peoples world-wide.
“Openness is not simply about gaining access to knowledge, but about the right to participate in the knowledge production process, driven by issues that are of local relevance, rather than research agendas set elsewhere or from the top down”

Leslie Chan
(3) Innovation

The application of better solutions that meet new requirements, unarticulated needs, or existing market needs
350 years of the academic journal!
350 years of the journal, despite...

**Impact Factors: A Broken System**

If you are a researcher, you are very familiar with the concept of a journal’s Impact Factor (IF). Basically, it’s a way to grade journal quality. (Photo credit: Fotolia.

The impact factor (IF) of an academic journal is a measure reflecting the average number of citations to recent articles published in the journal. It is frequently used as a proxy for the relative importance of a journal within its field, and is given to journals within a subject category.

**Publication and reporting biases and how they impact publication of research**

By Velancy Rodrigues | October 29, 2013

Add a comment

I agree | I disagree

Publication and reporting biases and how they impact publication of research

Young scientists often produce negative results. All experiments were done correctly — but there was no difference between test and control. They get conflicting advice from supervisors and ethicists. Some say that publishing negative results is a waste of resources and ruins their careers. Others say that ‘not publishing negative results is unethical’ and promotes the reproducibility crisis. What should young scientists do in such a situation?

**Retraction Watch**

**Can journals get hijacked? Apparently, yes**

Did you recently log onto your favorite journal’s website and see this? (For anyone who doesn’t want to bother clicking, it’s the video from Rick Astley’s “Never Gonna Give You Up.”) If so, your favorite journal was hijacked.

In today’s issue of Science, John Bohannon (who recently published a bogus study about the benefits of chocolate) explains how easy it is to take over a journal’s website — so easy, in fact, that he did it himself. And he’s not the only one, he reports. Read the rest of this entry.

Share this:

Written by Alison McCook

Posted in AAAS computer science science science journal
10 simple strategies to increase the impact factor of your publication

by sven | Mar 5, 2015 | |

Impact factors are heavily criticized as measures of scientific quality. However, they still dominate every discussion about scientific excellence. They are still used to select candidates for positions as PhD student, postdoc and academic staff, to promote professors and to select grant proposals for funding. As a consequence, researchers tend to adapt their publication strategy to avoid negative impact on their careers. Until alternative methods to measure excellence are established, young researchers have to learn the "rules of the game".
“The pressure to publish in "luxury" journals encourages researchers to cut corners and pursue trendy fields of science instead of doing more important work.”

(Randy Schekman, University of California, Berkeley)
The way we assess research contributions is too heavily dependent on publishing in the international journals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>Alumni of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>Staff of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly cited researchers in 21 broad subject categories</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Output</td>
<td>Papers published in Nature and Science (not for institutions specialized in humanities and social sciences)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papers indexed in Science Citation Index-expanded and Social Science Citation Index</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Performance</td>
<td>Per capita academic performance of an institution</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The case of Chilé

• Researchers that publish in a Scielo journal, get **6 points** towards promotion and tenure

• Researchers that publish in an “international journal” get **10 points** towards promotion and tenure
The top five most prolific publishers account for more than 50% of all papers published in 2013.
Increasing **horizontal** and **vertical** integration
"Just when I thought we might become competitive they launch this vertical integration strategy."
Increasing publisher integration of the research lifecycle

By Jeroen Bosman and Bianca Kramer - [101 Innovations in Scholarly Communication](https://101innovations.wordpress.com/workflows/)
Example: Elsevier’s services

Publishers are increasingly in control of scholarly infrastructure and why we should care
Case Study of Elsevier Written by: Alejandro Posada and George Chen, University of Toronto Scarborough
Elsevier’s profits swell to more than £900 million

But ‘risks’ of open access and a shift away from subscription model could halt growth, publisher’s financial results reveal

February 20, 2018

By David Matthews

Twitter: @DavidMjourno

Hand holding £20 notes

Source: iStock
Scholarly communications
Strengthen and expand the institutional role in managing scholarly output
An idea that is not new, but who’s time has come

Lorcan Dempsey (OCLC) 2012. Our environment has now changed. We live in an age of information abundance and transaction costs are reduced on the web. This makes the locally assembled collection less central. At the same time, institutions are generating new forms of data—research data, learning materials, preprints, videos, expertise profiles, etc.—which they wish to share with others.


Libraries as an Open Global Platform

“... The MIT Libraries must operate as an open, trusted, durable, interdisciplinary, interoperable content platform that provides a foundation for the entire life cycle of information for collaborative global research and education.”
But... repository systems are using old technologies developed over 15 years ago that do not support the functionalities we need.
In their current form, repositories only perpetuate the flawed system

“What if we don’t change at all ... and something magical just happens?”
Next Generation Repositories Working Group
(launched in April 2016)

Eloy Rodrigues, chair (COAR, Portugal)
Andrea Bollini (4Science, Italy)
Alberto Cabezas (LA Referencia, Chile)
Donatella Castelli (OpenAIRE/CNR, Italy)
Les Carr (Southampton University, UK)
Leslie Chan (University of Toronto at Scarborough, Canada)
Chuck Humphrey (Portage, Canada)
Rick Johnson (SHARE/University of Notre Dame, US)
Petr Knoth (Open University, UK)
Paolo Manghi (CNR, Italy)
Lazarus Matizirofa (NRF, South Africa)
Pandelis Perakakis (Open Scholar, Spain)
Jochen Schirrwagen (University of Bielefeld, Germany)
Daisy Selematsela (NRF, South Africa)
Kathleen Shearer (COAR, Canada)
Tim Smith (CERN, Switzerland)
Herbert Van de Sompel (Los Alamos National Laboratory, US)
Paul Walk (EDINA, UK)
David Wilcox (Duraspace/Fedora, Canada)
Kazu Yamaji (National Institute of Informatics, Japan)
Vision

“to position repositories as the foundation for a distributed, globally networked infrastructure for scholarly communication, on top of which layers of value added services will be deployed, thereby transforming the system, making it more research-centric, open to and supportive of innovation, while also collectively managed by the scholarly community.”

http://ngr.coar-repositories.org/
Guiding principles

- Distribution of control
- Inclusiveness and diversity
- Public good
- Intelligent openness and accessibility
- Sustainability
- Interoperability

http://ngr.coar-repositories.org/
Very early conceptual model
By Rick Johnson,
Notre Dame University
2 critical aspects to this vision

1. Common behaviors of repositories (interoperability)

1. Value added services on top of the resources in repositories
Current repositories

Services we can develop with repositories today

Next generation repositories

Services we can develop with the next generation of repositories

Conceptual layer
- Usage interactions and metrics
- Comments
- Peer-reviews
- Messages

Global sign-on
- Metadata
- Content
- Links between resources
- Notifications

Persistence layer

Interoperability

By Petr Knoth, Open University, UK
Key functionalities of a global repository-based network

• Preserves and provides access to a wide variety of research outputs
• Enables better discovery including batch, navigation and notification
• Supports research assessment including open peer review and standard usage metrics
• Provides the foundation for a transparent social network including annotation, notification feeds, and recommender systems
Beyond the journal: All valuable research contributions should be available and recognized
COAR publishes recommendations for next generation repositories

http://ngr.coar-repositories.org/
11 Behaviors

1. Exposing Identifiers
2. Declaring Licenses at the Resource Level
3. Discovery Through Navigation
4. Interacting with Resources (Annotation, Commentary, and Review)
5. Resource Transfer
6. Batch Discovery
7. Collecting and Exposing Activities
8. Identification of Users
9. Authentication of Users
10. Exposing Standardized Usage Metrics
11. Preserving Resources
19 Technologies, Standards, and Protocols

1. Activity Streams 2.0
2. COUNTER
3. Creative Commons Licenses
4. ETag
5. HTTP Signatures
6. IPFS International Image Interoperability Framework
7. Linked Data Notifications
8. ORCID and other author IDs
9. OpenID Connect
10. ResourceSync
11. SUSHI
12. SWORD
13. Signposting
14. Sitemaps
15. Social Network Identities
16. Web Annotation Model and Protocol
17. WebID and WebID/TLS
18. WebSub
19. Webmention
Research is global: we need interoperable hubs to support information exchange across repositories
Implementation – 3 major areas of effort

1. New technologies in repositories
   - Already ongoing!!!
   - OpenAIRE – Europe
   - National Institute of Informatics (NII) - Japan
   - US Next Generation Repositories Implementers Group
   - CARL Open Repositories Working Group - Canada
   - Meeting of open source platforms at open source repository platforms at Open Repository 2018
2. Next generation repository networks or hubs

20 repository networks meeting in Hamburg – May 14 & 15
Implementation – 3 major areas of effort

3. Monitoring of new technologies, standards and protocols

COAR Next Generation Repositories Editorial Group

Andrea Bollini  Kathleen Shearer
Rick Johnson    Herbert Van de Sompel
Paolo Manghi    Paul Walk
Eloy Rodrigues  Kazu Yamaji
Five prerequisites for a sustainable knowledge commons

1. Strengthen local institution-based services that preserve and provide access to diverse and valuable research products
2. Connect local services to national, regional and global networks through the adoption of interoperable standards and practices
3. Begin to redistribute funds towards services that add value to the networks, such as peer review
4. Improve the processes used to evaluate research contributions to include a wider range of qualitative and quantitative metrics and indicators
5. Adopt the principles and governance that will ensure the commons reflects the needs of the global research community
Collaboration AT SCALE is necessary to change the system!
It’s time to act!

Oh, crap! Was that TODAY?
Kathleen Shearer, Executive Director, COAR
kathleen.shearer@coar-repositories.org
twitter: @KathleeShearer