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Why is PEER needed?

There is agreement between publishing and research communities about the importance of access to results of European funded research

But

– there is no consensus on the need for mandated deposits or appropriate embargo periods

– or the impact this may have on journals

PEER has been set up to monitor the effects of systematic archiving over time
Stakeholders in scholarly communication

- Publishers
- Researchers – authors and users
- Libraries and repositories
- Funding agencies

All of the above stakeholder groups are represented within PEER, both within the consortium & an advisory board.
The three key stages of publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Investment</th>
<th>Publisher Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage One (NISO Author’s original)</td>
<td>Stage Two (NISO Accepted Manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Outputs of Research: • raw data • Draft for submission to a journal</td>
<td>Author’s manuscript incorporating peer review enhancements &amp; as accepted for publication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Situation and Key Problems & Issues

Current Situation:

- Rapid growth of institutional repositories
- Individual funding agency mandates
- Publisher experimentation
- Lack of agreement on evidence to date

Key Problems and Issues:

- Impact of systematically archiving stage-two outputs (accepted manuscripts) is not clear
  - on journals and business models
  - on wider ecology of scientific research
- Varying policies are confusing for authors and readers
- Lack of understanding and trust between publishers and research community
Purpose of PEER

PEER will look at the effects of the systematic archiving of ‘stage two’ outputs: the version of the author’s manuscript accepted for publication (NISO/ALPSP-Accepted Manuscript)

• Publishers and research community collaborate

• Develop an “observatory” to monitor the impact of systematically depositing stage-two outputs on a large scale

• Gather hard evidence to inform future policies
Objectives

• Determine how large-scale deposit of stage-two outputs will affect journal viability

• Determine whether it increases access

• Determine whether it affects the broader ecology of European research

• Determine the factors affecting readiness to deposit and associated costs

• Develop model(s) to show how traditional publishing can coexist with self-archiving
Project Organisation
## Project Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>Plan &amp; manage Key decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board (20-30 experts)</td>
<td>All stakeholders (broad perspective)</td>
<td>Advise Evaluate research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert groups: publishers, repositories, authors, ROG</td>
<td>Key stakeholders (detailed perspective)</td>
<td>Discussion and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research oversight group (ROG)</td>
<td>Experts on scholarly publishing research</td>
<td>Oversee research Validate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package leaders &amp; teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent research teams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEER Consortium

The PEER consortium (5 Executive members):

- International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers (STM) - Co-ordinator
- European Science Foundation (ESF)
- Göttingen State and University Library (UGOE)
- Max Planck Gesellschaft (MPG)
- Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique (INRIA)

Plus technical partners: SURF & Universität Bielefeld
Participating Publishers at May 2009

- BMJ Publishing Group
- Cambridge University Press
- Elsevier
- IOP Publishing
- Nature Publishing Group
- Oxford University Press
- Portland Press
- Sage Publications
- Springer
- Taylor & Francis Group
- Wiley-Blackwell
Participating Repositories at May 2009

- Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V. (MPG)
- HAL, Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique (INRIA)
- Göttingen State and University Library (UGOE)
- BiPrints, Universität Bielefeld (UNIBI)
- Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
- University Library of Debrecen, Hungary

Plus Koninklijke Bibliotheek (preservation)
Research Oversight Group (ROG)

Justus Haucap, University of Erlangen
Chair: German Monopolies Commission

Henk Moed, Leiden University
Recipient: Derek de Solla Price Award

Carol Tenopir, University of Tennessee
Recipient: International Information Industry Lifetime Achievement Award
Advisory Board – partial list

**Funders:**
- Donald J Waters, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- Robert Kiley, Wellcome Trust

**Librarians:**
- Dr Elisabeth Nigemann, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
- Paul Ayris, UCL

**Researchers:**
- Norbert Kroo, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
- Jane Grimson, Trinity College Dublin

**Publishers:**
- Herman Spruijt, International Publishers Association
- John Ochs, American Chemical Society
Overall Approach - Observatory

- Publishers contribute up to 300 journals (and a control group)

- Maximise deposit and access within participating EU repositories
  - 50% publisher-assisted deposit
  - 50% author self-archiving

- Collaborate with DRIVER to involve repositories

- Commission research from independent research teams to assess impact – behavioural, access/usage and economic
PEER Observatory: Content

- Participating publishers collectively volunteer up to 300 journals (Life Sciences, Medicine, Physical Sciences, Social Sciences & Humanities)

- Selection criteria
  - European content: 20% or greater
  - Quality: good quality, but reflecting a range by impact factor
  - Subject: wide range

- Publishers set embargo periods appropriate for journal

- >20,000 EU articles / year

- Selection process reviewed and approved by research teams
Content submission - publishers

Publishers

Select

Eligible Journals / Articles

100% Meta Data
50% Manuscripts
50% Manuscripts

Publishers Transfer
Publishers Deposit
Publishers Inform

PEER Depot (Dark Archive)
Authors
Content submission – to repositories

- Authors
- PEER Depot (Dark Archive)
- Transfer
- Deposit
- Publicly Available PEER Repositories:
  - UGOE
  - MPG
  - UNIBI
  - KTU
  - INRIA
  - ULD
- Dark Archive for Long Term Storage:
  - E-Depot (KB)
Technical outcomes & challenges - examples

• Draft report on the provision of usage data and manuscript deposit procedures for publishers and repository managers (Spring 2009)

• Full text format PDFA-1/ PDF

• Mandatory metadata fields (from DRIVER) - XML

• SWORD protocol for ingest by repositories

Additional challenges:
• Embargo management for author deposits
• Inclusion of ‘retained’ stage-2 content from publishers
• Any issues arising from trial
PEER Observatory: Research (overseen / validated by ROG)

• Behavioural – authors and readers
  – Baseline study due Autumn 2009
  – Final report June 2011

• Usage – raw logfile analysis
  – Report on observatory framework Autumn 2009 (internal to project)
  – Final report June 2011

• Economic – Request for proposals Sept 2009

• Model Development – July 2011
Next steps: 2009

• Publisher deposit to PEER Depot test starts 1 June
• Guidelines for publishers and repository managers on deposit, assisted deposit and self-archiving w/c 1 June
• Publication of participating journal list- June
• Announcement of research teams for Behavioural and Usage Research – initial research / testing underway
• Call for tender: Economic Research, September 2009
• Complete behavioural research baseline study, September 2009
• Final report on the provision of usage data and manuscript deposit procedures for publishers and repository managers September 2009
• Annual report September 2009
Next steps: 2010 - 2011

- **April 2010**: Report on economic research
- **Sept 2010**: Year 2 annual report
- **June 2011**: Report on behavioural research follow-up study
- **June 2011**: Report on usage research
- **July 2011**: Develop final model on traditional publishing and archiving
- **Aug 2011**: Project completion conference
- **Presentation and Final report at project end (Sept 2011)**
PEER - Measuring Success

• Critical success factors
  – Observatory collects sufficient reliable data to draw conclusions
  – Stakeholders use the evidence gathered

• Success indicators therefore focus on
  – Underlying data provided to the observatory
  – Success at communicating results
  – Not what the observatory measures, e.g. user uptake
PEER- Expected Results

- Greater understanding of the effects of large-scale deposit in OA repositories
- Evidence to inform future policies
- Model(s) illustrating how to maximise the benefits of traditional publishing and archiving
- Trust and mutual understanding between publisher and research communities
Questions?

peer@stm-assoc.org

Visit the PEER website:

www.peerproject.eu

(RSS news feed available)