

## BRIEFING DOCUMENT (FOR PUBLISHING EXECUTIVES) ON INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORIES AND MANDATED DEPOSIT POLICIES

Scholarly publishers recognize that **Institutional Repositories** (“IRs”)<sup>i</sup> serve a number of useful purposes for universities and research institutions. If properly conceived and executed, they can help disseminate knowledge and promote institutions to funding agencies and recruits. IRs can usefully highlight and capture the research output of the institution, identify and post theses, dissertations, research data, historical images and illustrations from institutional archives, and serve as vehicles for electronic course-packs<sup>ii</sup>.

Scholarly publishers are willing to work with institutions on opportunities to showcase research supported by the institution as long as publishers’ investments in the primary tasks of supporting scholarly communications<sup>iii</sup> can be maintained. Most scholarly publishers support and enable the posting of some form of “early” versions of scholarly papers for use within the institution, and other publishers support and enable the posting of such versions for open public use<sup>iv</sup>. Still others support a mechanism of linking to an open posting on a publisher web site or publisher-supported web site such as HighWire Press. Issues that drive these policies center around assessments of their impact on the integrity of the scientific record and their potential to undermine the funding that drives scholarly communication today. These assessments are especially crucial when public posting of final and authoritative versions of scholarly articles on IRs are concerned.

IRs require significant investment and organization to be effective, and a clear and focused strategy is critical to their success. Publishers become concerned when IRs involve themselves in publishing and distribution activities currently being done efficiently and effectively by the scholarly publishing community. When this happens, a parallel publishing system is created that lacks the quality controls and value-added processes publishers already employ. If IRs become primary publishing outlets, many are concerned that key elements of today’s scholarly communication system such as quality controls, preservation standards, and the discoverability of research, will suffer.

Publishers rely on copyright transfers or publishing licenses<sup>v</sup> from authors for the rights they need to ensure that the funding sources for the scholarly communications process-- which have enabled them to make more information available to more people in more ways than at any time in human history-- are not undermined by the availability of alternative versions. In return, authors’ manuscripts are improved, enriched, promoted, and branded as part of a web-based peer-reviewed journal publishing system developed and maintained by publishers. This longstanding value-given-for-value-received partnership is vitally important to publishers. Grants of broad and ill-defined rights by authors to IRs risk undermining the ability of both sides to continue this successful relationship. Many are concerned that authors are not adequately briefed on the

unintended consequences of such actions. Where these conflicts exist today, many publishers and authors face dilemmas as to how they can effectively proceed with publication decisions – to the detriment of scholarly communication.

Publishers are not alone in expressing concern about the potential misuse and dangers of IRs. Most recently, Dorothea Salo of the University of Wisconsin library has raised issues about the expense and utility of IRs in an article entitled “Innkeeper at the Roach Motel”.

As an executive in the publishing industry, you may be asked to comment on news and developments in the academic community about these IR policies, which are sometimes also less accurately described as “authors’ rights” or “open access” policies. The purpose of this document is to provide a summary of the situation as it currently exists; to enable you to review and monitor your own policies and approaches; and to respond to members of the media if desired.

Key points for internal review:

- What publishing rights are necessary to support our business model(s)? E.g. subscription models will generally need at least exclusive publishing rights while author-pays models may not
- In our journal publishing agreement(s), do we offer rights to authors for IR postings? If not, under what terms and conditions might we?
- What distinctions do we draw between pre-print servers, voluntary IRs, and mandated IRs in terms of copyright policies and business model(s)?
- Where do our business strategies and copyright policies fall in the policy categories below? (Note that the categories are not mutually exclusive and that different policies may fall into different categories):
  - Intramural Policies: We allow posting of *final or near-final versions* of articles on an *Intranet* site with *no public access permitted*;
  - Extramural Policies: We allow posting of *early versions* of articles<sup>vi</sup> on an *Internet* site with *public access permitted and journal-specific embargo periods*;
  - Linking Policies: We allow posting of *final versions* of articles on a *publisher web site with links from institutional sites*
  - Sponsorship Policies: We allow posting of *final versions* of articles on an *institutional site and/or our own site and/or other repository site with direct financial support of agency, institution, author or sponsor*

Key points to consider in possible interactions with the media:

- More scholarly journal literature is more visible and more accessible to more individuals now than at any time in history, principally because of the efforts and investments of publishers
- Today's system of web-based peer-reviewed journals is a vital component of the scholarly communication process and is used by funding agencies and the institutions alike to make critically important personal and professional decisions
- Posting on an institutional repository is not the same as publishing in a journal—journals have established editorial policies and perspectives, peer review systems, editing, tagging, and reference-linking services<sup>vii</sup>
- If not carefully conceived and managed, IRs can become nothing more than alternative, free-access parallel (but inferior) publishing and distribution systems which risk undermining the incentives and ability of publishers to invest in managing the peer-review of research and to provide and maintain the well-organized infrastructure necessary to publish, disseminate and archive journal articles
- IRs require investment and management. They should be undertaken only if they have a clear mission and purpose other than merely offering an alternative parallel publishing and distribution system
- Researchers should be fully briefed about possible adverse and long-term effects on scholarly communication before granting broad and ill-defined rights to IRs
- Faculty authors should retain the freedom to choose how and where to publish
- Universities proposing to obtain rights from their faculty should also work with publishers to avoid adverse effects on the system of web-based peer-reviewed journals which currently underpins today's unprecedented rate of scientific advancement

---

<sup>i</sup> Defined broadly as repositories set up and maintained by universities and research institutions to post, for public access, information and data about research projects coordinated by their faculty and employees, which sometimes include versions of scholarly papers

<sup>ii</sup> It should be noted that most publishers already authorize institutions, directly or through copyright clearance/rights organizations like the CCC or the CLA, to post online course-packs.

<sup>iii</sup> E.g. ensuring quality, branding excellence, enabling discovery, etc.

<sup>iv</sup> Typically publishers implement these policies through special clauses in their journal publishing agreements. See the following statements which emphasize the nuanced and principled approaches taken by publishers in dealing with legitimate scholarly needs from the author and researcher communities March 2008 "Statement on journal publishing agreements and copyright agreement "addenda", <http://www.stm-assoc.org/documents-statements-public-co/2008-03%20STM-PSP->

---

[ALPSP%20Statement%20Publishing%20Agreements%2020080310.pdf](#) , May 2007 collective statement  
“Author and Publisher Rights for Academic Use: An Appropriate Balance”, [http://www.stm-  
assoc.org/documents-statements-public-co/2003-2007-documents-statements-public-correspondence/2007-  
documents-statements-public-correspondence/2007%20-  
%2005%20Author%20Publisher%20Rights%20for%20Academic%20Uses--  
%20an%20Appropriate%20Balance.pdf](http://www.stm-<br/>assoc.org/documents-statements-public-co/2003-2007-documents-statements-public-correspondence/2007-<br/>documents-statements-public-correspondence/2007%20-<br/>%2005%20Author%20Publisher%20Rights%20for%20Academic%20Uses--<br/>%20an%20Appropriate%20Balance.pdf)

<sup>v</sup> i.e. typically exclusive licenses

<sup>vi</sup> e.g. pre-prints, revised author manuscripts prior to copy-editing and formatting

<sup>vii</sup> See <http://www.crossref.org/>