



■ The 5th SPARC Japan Seminar 2013

“Winds of Change: The Past, Present, and Future of Open Access in Asia”

Friday, February 7, 2014: National Institute of Informatics 12th floor conference room

(Attendees: 77)

Discussions concerning open access have a tendency to center on the West. In SPARC seminars up to now, although Japan has been discussed, the only time the rest of Asia has been taken up as a main topic was, in fact, the July 2008 meeting on the South Korean Consortium. Since 2009, there has never been a speaker based in Asia outside Japan.

In Japan there are already initiatives such as information sharing with other regions, and disseminating information overseas. It would seem necessary going forward to promote information sharing with the rest of Asia and to look into possibilities for cooperation. From such a standpoint, this was the first SPARC Japan seminar to invite multiple speakers from Asian countries outside Japan, for sharing information on open access progress in Asia and aiming to deepen the potential for further cooperation.

At this seminar, information was exchanged on the individual situations of South Korea, China, and Southeast Asian countries, as well as on the overall situation and outlook for Asia as a whole. One of the important lessons we took home from this seminar was the need first of all to meet face-to-face and find out each other's situations, before following up with information sharing and collaboration.

A summary of the seminar is given below. See the SPARC Japan website for the handouts, documents, and other details. (<http://www.nii.ac.jp/sparc/event/2013/20140207.html>)

Presentations

Our Experience These Past Ten Years with Institutional Self-Archiving

Shigeki Sugita

(Chiba University Libraries/DRF)

Ten years ago, I remember introducing OA to a university faculty member and being asked, “Do electronic journals cost money?” Over the ten years since that time, I have kept up a dialog with researchers in order to gain their understanding of OA and its background, and have endeavored to promote self-archiving. Currently there are institutional repositories in around 400 Japanese universities, archiving approximately 1.26 million documents. While sharing various information with other universities, we have learned together. There is still much to be done, however, as by no means are all the papers produced by researchers each day being archived. I would like to find out the situation in other Asian countries and put the knowledge to good use in our future activities.

OA Activities in Korea

Choi Honam

(Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information*)

Gold OA in South Korea

In South Korea, the medical field is leading the way in OA, with services like KoreaMed and

Synapse being provided. OA is advancing also in the natural sciences fields, where K'PubS (Korean Journal Publishing Service) is a platform that integrates the entire publishing cycle and can publish globally. In the humanities and social sciences, on the other hand, understanding of and interest in OA are relatively low in the field, although awareness at NRF**, the research funding agency, is rising.

There is growing discontent in South Korea over the need to pay subscription fees in order to read the results of research supported by public funds. There were moves to legally mandate free access to such research results, but this failed to come about owing to the less than enthusiastic attitude of the powers that be. The Ministry of Health, Welfare and Family Affairs does require, however, that papers supported by KNIH*** grants be made available as open access.



* Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information: KISTI

** National Research Foundation of Korea: NRF

*** Korea National Institute of Health: KNIH

Green OA in South Korea

Nearly all institutional repositories receive funding from the national government, with the support divided among KISTI, KERIS**** and others. While the repository directly set up by KERIS is compliant with OAI-PMH (a protocol for exchanging metadata by automatic data collection), most others are not.

In addition to institutional repositories, there are field-specific repositories funded by the NRF as well as a scientific data repository, P-cube, built by KISTI and with participation by five institutions.

International and domestic collaboration

Internationally, we take part in such initiatives as SCOAP3* and WPRIM,** while domestically we are carrying out cooperation with government ministries including the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism as well as with research funding agencies.

Conclusion

The issue for Gold OA is the low understanding of OA overall. While libraries understand, they cannot act due to a lack of funding and lack of understanding by top management. It is also a structural problem with stakeholders being at odds with each other.

As for Green OA, the main issues are that OA is almost never mandatory, and that most repositories are not compliant with OAI-PMH. The issue for open government data is that no clear decision has been made regarding copyrights and intellectual property rights.

The drivers of OA in South Korea going forward are likely to be KISTI and other national government-level centers, and the medical field. I would like to promote further communication and collaboration.

OA & IR in 2012: The University of Hong Kong & Greater China

David Palmer
(The University of Hong Kong Libraries)

The Knowledge Exchange Initiative

The University of Hong Kong established the HKU Scholars Hub as an institutional repository in 2005, then in 2009 a new initiative called Knowledge Exchange started up, as the budget for and interest in institutional repositories have grown considerably. The objective of Knowledge Exchange is “reciprocity” between the university and community.

The Knowledge Transfer concept promoted by eight Hong Kong universities was a forerunner. Along with education and research, universities are

called upon to transfer knowledge. The University of Hong Kong changed the name to Knowledge Exchange, and on that basis began promoting open access.

Activities of the University of Hong Kong Office of Knowledge Exchange

The University of Hong Kong Library uses the name Current Research Information System (CRIS) rather than Institutional Repository, positioning it in the university’s strategic planning and using it to collect all kinds of research information and effectively manage research performance, while drawing on this information in deciding budget allocation.

The Office of Knowledge Exchange also supports OA publishing, ORCID*** and other such projects.

In 2000 the University of Hong Kong made it mandatory for dissertations to be archived in a repository. The Library issued an OA policy in 2010 and policy concerning intellectual property in 2011, but these have been ignored by the faculty. The next plan therefore adopts the approach of positively assessing the act itself of archiving OA papers in a repository. The University President has also been replaced, as expectations are rising for improvement.

Situation in China as a whole

All eight universities in Hong Kong have established institutional repositories, which can be accessed by means of the HKIR**** portal site. Institutional repositories are common in Taiwan, which already has 131 of them. It does not make archiving mandatory. In mainland China, the National Science Library of the Chinese Academy of Science and the China Academic Institutional Repository (CAIR), a joint project led by the Peking University Library, are promoting institutional repositories.

During OA Week in September 2013, a China IR Conference was held in Yunnan Province.



****Korea Education and Research Information Service: KERIS
*An international collaboration project aimed at realizing open access to peer reviewed journal articles in the field of high-energy physics.

**Western Pacific Region Index Medicus: WPRIM

***Open Researcher and Contributor ID: ORCID (an international organization that aims to assign unique identifiers to researchers around the world)

****Hong Kong Institutional Repositories: HKIR

Open Access in Southeast Asia: Unresolved Issues and New Opportunities

Paul Kratoska

(NUS Press, National University of Singapore)

I start from the premise that OA has not become established in Southeast Asia, but why is interest in OA so low? What would happen if OA took off in Southeast Asia?

Basic information

Southeast Asia has from around 900 to 1,000 universities, of which some 40 are considered to be research universities. Most research in Southeast Asia receives central government funding, and the results must be presented clearly. In Southeast Asia, research appearing in highly rated journals is seen as having high value, making it important to be published in those journals. We need to think about what kinds of merits there are for Southeast Asia in open access.

Unresolved issues

- Article Processing Charge (APC) issues: Can it be made possible to use research grants to pay APC? From the grant-giver's standpoint, for which journals would this be allowable? Setting criteria is difficult since the decision-makers are not experts in the field. Then there is the problem of "predatory journals" that exist only to receive APC.

- Issue of research ownership: The results of research conducted in a company belong to that company, but in Southeast Asia many universities are adopting a similar policy. Archiving in a repository becomes difficult if the rights holder is not clear.

- Issues concerning mandating of OA in the humanities and social sciences: OA is difficult in the humanities and social sciences because of the tendency to publish collections of the results of multiple projects and for papers to be lengthy. There are concerns that costs cannot be covered given current APC prices.

Many researchers in Southeast Asia are not used to publishing in English, and there are many fields where research activities themselves are not carried out actively, so that the merits of OA may not necessarily be enjoyed. There may be merits for universities, however.

SWOT analysis of OA and academic publishing in Southeast Asia

Let us attempt a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis, particularly of the opportunities. What are the advantages to research if more people have access to the results? Will Asian OA publishing be able to develop a

non-Western pattern? In Southeast Asian universities, there are grants supporting journal publishing. Shouldn't this make possible OA publishing without asking for APC?

I believe cooperation is needed in the Asian region. NUS Press has individual cooperative relationships with university publishing circles in each country, but how can greater cooperation within the Southeast Asia region be pursued?



Future of OA in "Asia"

Shun Tsuchiya

(National Institute for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation)

Let me state the following three points as premises.

1. OA is a good thing.
2. There have been discussions about the OA business model, but somehow things will work out.
3. More than a decade having passed since the emergence of OA, we now know it does not affect the price of journals.

As Asia's science and technology production output has grown, the publication of academic papers has also increased. It is unlikely that university library budgets will grow significantly. As the number of papers has increased, the issue is who will be responsible for their publication.

Therefore, the conclusion is that OA is the only way to go. There is no longer enough money to cover subscription fees. If the money is not there, there is no way to pay. We can't pay for it, but we want to publish. OK, pay for it yourself. Will no other conclusion emerge than this one?

There is data suggesting that the R&D budgets in eight major Asian countries exceed that of the United States. The number of papers is increasing as a result. So what is to be done with this increased amount? That is an issue for researchers and universities to think about. Today the question is shifting to one of how to create a model enabling OA in the Asian region. One approach is simply to keep submitting as many papers as possible to OA journals, not worrying about whether they are predatory or whatever. Another possibility would be to have people in Asia make use of Japan's J-STAGE platform. The only thing libraries can do is to redefine institutional repositories as a publishing platform. After they have been thus redefined, they can be let go of as the job of



libraries, or not let go; but in any case each university and each university library will need to start over from zero in deciding

how and by whom they are to be operated.

Panel Discussion

Moderator: Shinya Kato

(University of Tsukuba Library)

Panel members: Choi Honam / David Palmer / Paul Kratoska / Shun Tsuchiya / Koichi Ojima

Koichi Ojima gave a presentation to start the session off, followed by a discussion.

Institutional Repositories in Japan: Thinking about the Next Ten Years

Koichi Ojima (National Institute of Informatics)

Including those that are scheduled for release, the number of institutional repositories in Japan is 487. This is the most in the world, exceeding even the USA.

There are a number of regrets, however, one being that during this time, they have not expanded beyond library repositories. Others are that Green OA has not progressed; that policies are weak; that the repositories are still mostly limited to university bulletin papers; and that the results of CSI-commissioned projects have not evolved and spread further.

Here I would like to confirm once again the definition and significance of institutional repositories. The traditional definition is that "An institutional repository is a set of services provided by an academic institution to its community for the purpose of acquiring, organizing, preserving, and disseminating scholarly resources in digital form created by the institution and its members" (Clifford Lynch, 2003). Previously information could be accessed through libraries; but when information became digitalized, a model was established that enabled access without going through libraries. A flow was born that was the opposite of the previous one, in which education and research results emerging in a school were assembled, organized, made part of a collection, and published.

In October 2013 an Institutional Repository Promotion Committee was started up within the framework for collaboration between university

libraries and the NII. The committee is taking up the four areas of policy, system infrastructure, content, and people, as key strategic issues "toward creation of a system for disseminating university knowledge" (the "Takebashi Declaration").

It is necessary to make institutional repositories more familiar to faculty members, creating a system positioned on the workflow of education and research that is more on the line of flow of researchers. This should bring repositories closer to the definition of Clifford Lynch.

As for cooperation with Asian countries, Japan can be seen as having an obligation to spread its experience and knowledge up to now to the rest of Asia. Recently, for example, a project to build a system using WEKO was started up in Malaysia at Wawasan Open University. By carrying out many more such activities, I believe open access can be spread through institutional repositories.

Discussion



Language issues

Paul Kratoska raised the issue of how to bridge the gap caused by language differences in the process of moving to open access. David Palmer suggested that this could be handled by using Google Translate or other machine translation service, and noted that people in each country are encouraged to publish in English. Mr. Kratoska said that forcing people to publish in English comes with the risk of increasing stratification, since publishing papers in English is easy for Southeast Asia countries where education is conducted in English but difficult in other countries. Choi Honam then introduced a translation project where documents uploaded to a database are translated on demand.

APC issues

On the issue of whether OA would or would not reduce the amount of money paid by libraries, Mr. Kratoska introduced a Duke University study showing that in fact OA was more expensive than journal subscription fees, pointing to the possibility that the university as a whole might end up paying more than before.

Repository experiences of seminar participants

People attending the seminar were asked, “How many people here have read a paper in an institutional repository?” and “How many of you have registered a paper in an institutional repository?” It was learned that nearly all the people in attendance had read papers in institutional repositories, and that of those with experience writing papers, nearly all had registered a paper with a repository.

The forces driving OA

Mr. Palmer noted the NIH* PubMed Central as a success story. He explained that the archiving rate of more than 80 percent is achieved by the system of denying grant money if a paper is not registered with the service. Shun Tsuchiya commented in response that it was not the researchers themselves but the publishers that were uploading the articles, and that it was a “myth” that this system was the reason for the success.

Mr. Kratoska pointed out that it would be better to assume the impossibility of persuading researchers, and that the only choice is for university administrators and research funding agencies to make self-archiving a requirement. Mr. Tsuchiya said that as a researcher he was opposed to such a condition, and that working under such a requirement was not his idea of pursuing sound research.

Mr. Choi offered the view that success depended on top officials having the will to promote institutional repositories, citing the example in South Korea of KAIST** linking institutional repositories and a performance management system.

Mr. Kratoska quoted a Nobel Prize-winning scientist as saying if he were a young researcher today, he would probably not have produced such results, the reason being that young scientists today are always under pressure to publish and do not have the time to complete research that takes a lifetime.

Moderator Shinya Kato observed that the two opposing claims, one that top-down policy is best and the other that research is not like that, are like the claims in the Aesop fable The North Wind and the Sun.

Future of cooperation in Asia

Mr. Choi commented that first of all a consensus is needed regarding open access, and then a strong desire to carry out the policy, and that a strong push by government to create the legal and institutional framework for OA was needed before activities would reach critical mass.

Mr. Kratoska said that when proposing cooperation between a university publishing office and a commercial publisher, the first step is to visit the publisher many times, getting to know each other well; then you can finally get around to asking about the possibility of doing something together. When it comes to doing something as a region, first you need to get to know each other; and more important than an overarching policy is to accumulate a series of small cooperative efforts. One such step was this session today, and he expressed his appreciation for this seminar.

And with that, the panel discussion was concluded.

-----From attendees-----

(people affiliated with universities/libraries)

-Learning about the situation and policy in each country was helpful. Asia is a diverse place, after all. It was interesting to hear about the points in common and the differences. The sheer scale of mainland China is something to think about.

-It was good to find out about the current state of repositories and open access in Asia. I would hope that as Asian economies grow, OA will spread through joint research projects and research by exchange students. I believe the important thing first of all is to fulfil your own role.

-It would have been better to narrow the focus, but I felt each of the things learned today was useful.

(person affiliated with university/library, educator, researcher)

-I agree with Mr. Kratoska’s last comment, about the importance of creating opportunities for getting to know each other better in order to build cooperative arrangements in Asia.

(person in a corporation, involved in academic journal editing)

-I thought the seminar as a whole lacked clear concepts and objectives. The relationship between institutional repositories and open access was not clear. Perhaps this is just because the relationship itself is not yet a clear one. I think the overall organization of the seminar could have been better. In the panel discussion, too, it was hard to see what was supposed to be discussed.

(person affiliated with university, researcher)

-As Mr. Ojiro said at the end, we should invite people from other Asian countries once again, and maybe next time narrow down the topics a bit more.

*National Institutes of Health: NIH

**Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology: KAIST

-----Afterword-----

😊 For this seminar we invited to the podium speakers from the three countries of South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore, in their different standpoints as researcher in a government institution, university librarian, and university publishing representative. It was a very full program in which they discussed the present situation in their countries from their respective standpoints. Hong Kong and Singapore being hubs for disseminating scholarly information about Asia in English, they are likely to become important places when thinking about cooperation extending beyond Japan and beyond East Asia. Those of us responsible for putting on this seminar will be happy if the attendees found the diversity of Asia to be interesting.

Yumi Kitamura
(MC; Research and Development Laboratory,
Kyoto University Library)

😊 Planning an event on the theme of open access in Asia is by no means easy. For one thing, open access itself is diverse; besides, Asia includes many countries. All of these do not fit comfortably under a single rubric. We asked speakers to talk about the situations in each of the selected countries, and their presentations very much reflected this diversity.

Trying to force a single focus would have caused them to deviate from the objective situation. In that sense, I would like to think that if we conveyed that these are the realities in (a few countries of) Asia, we mostly achieved the goals. If the opportunity arises, next time we would like to limit the theme further and share information with Asian libraries and information specialists.

Hideki Uchijima
(University of Tsukuba Library)

😊 Looking back at the seminar in the course of putting together this newsletter, I felt that it was quite an interesting seminar, introducing a wealth of case studies from different standpoints and covering the university and research circumstances in each country. Mr. Kratoska's comment about first getting to know each other and then accumulating a series of cooperative efforts through small steps was one that left an impression.

Megumi Matsubara
(Division for Information and Communication
Systems, The University of Tokyo)



From the SPARC Japan Secretariat

From this fiscal year we enter the fourth term of the SPARC Japan project. With the basic goals being to promote open access in international cooperation, to increase the distribution of scholarly information, and to strengthen information dissemination, we are engaged in investigative projects and seminar programs aimed at promoting cooperation between university libraries and researchers and dealing with the various issues of open access. We will continue to use this Newsletter to inform you about survey results and the latest overseas trends. We are also planning to hold the Open Access Summit 2014 during OA Week, on October 21 to 22. (Nanako Takahashi, SPARC Japan Secretariat)