The Berlin 8 open access conference was held in Beijing on October 26 and 27, and the overall tone was rather balanced. Many speakers went out of their way to recognize publishers as key partners and stakeholders in open access.

The opening ceremony generated quite an air of excitement. Some participants hoped the Chinese government would make an open access policy announcement, however no statement materialized. Colleagues from the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) demonstrated their commitment to open access (this is long-standing as they signed the Berlin Declaration in 2003), however my impression is that the majority of participants from China were gathering information in order to form their own views about open access.

Here’s a little flavor of the conference for those STM colleagues unable to attend.

**Opening Ceremony** – One recurrent theme was the importance of the public having access to publicly-funded research. The other recurrent theme was that the scholarly communications world is very different to what it was in 2003 when the Berlin Declaration was signed: now there is an array of publishers using open access models, and there are a large number of institutional repositories.

**Keynote Speeches** – CAS described its wide range of activities including a thriving digital library program, a long term digital archive for Springer and BMC titles, and 140 open access publications on the [www.oaj.cas.cn](http://www.oaj.cas.cn) platform. Max Planck Society (MPS) remains committed to playing a lead role in open access, not by forcing its scientists to publish via open access models but rather by encouraging their voluntary uptake. MPS is also very interested in facilitating the sharing and exchange of data.

**National Strategies and Policies** – The DFG in Germany is establishing a federated repository network, supports the creation of new open access journals, incentivizes publishers to enable subscription-based journals to provide delayed open access, supports research into open peer review processes, and runs open access advocacy seminars with senior leaders in German universities. DFG also works closely with funding bodies in Denmark, the Netherlands, and the UK because “a world-wide information infrastructure is needed and an international approach to open access”. Meanwhile the Australian Research Council encourages academics to consider the benefits of open access, and to manage their data to maximize public benefit. Grant applications are asked to describe how they will ensure their results are readable, durable, and re-usable. They are also encouraged not to ‘assign away’ their intellectual property rights.
Institutional Strategies and Policies – Duke University has a scholarly communications office to brief academics on author agreements, and it also has an institutional repository. A Digital Futures Task Force was created in 2009 to enable senior academics to identify how the university can facilitate broader and deeper access to research. Access is very closely linked with preservation which was described as ‘sharing into the future’. An interesting driver for Duke’s open access policies was that North Carolina state legislators could not access the scientific literature and had to regularly request ‘access favors’ from Duke University staff and students. Finally the library has built an open access publishing service and the university has recently joined COPE. At the University of Goettingen the major trigger for open access was unhappiness with publisher pricing. The activities underway mirror those at Duke, but Goettingen also has posting agreements with publishers and a range of memberships with open-access-only publishers. The university participates in any collaborative open access project that it can, including PEER. The university has 5 FTE staff members and a budget of c. 150k Euros per year for open access activities which it funds through grants. MIT again has a similar range of open access activities which were launched in 2008 following the formation of a faculty committee on open access publishing. Unlike the other universities MIT is actively trying to change the relationship between its authors and publishers by entering into central agreements and pushing for a grant of licensing rights only to publishers (with what was described as ‘some success, I would not say wide success’). In Finland, universities have a shared repository and their objective is to solve ‘the problems of access, storage and preservation in a user friendly way’.

Open Access Publishing – The speakers in this session will be mostly well known to STM readers and came from BMC, Elsevier, Medknow Publishing, and Springer. I’ll not summarise their presentations as these are likely to be very familiar to STM members! There was a clear message from all that good publishing costs money, and these costs do need to be recovered in a sustainable way.

Institutional Repositories – The OpenAIRE project will collect outputs from 437 EC-funded projects across 7 broad subject areas, and is tasked with building the support infrastructure to support deposit of manuscripts. We also had a report from the Xiamen University Institutional Repository, where university authorities were said to be very focused on citations and rather less on issues of scholarly communication, and from the CAS Library. The Digital Repository Federation in Japan consists of 121 organizations in Japan and is a network of librarians and information specialists who act as repository managers.

Supporting Infrastructure and Services for OA - SPARC offers support for a wide array of open access advocacy campaigns and a partnership program to support/promote OA journals to member libraries. It also supports an expanding student coalition, The Right to Research Coalition, with 5m+ student members. The PEER Project, of which STM is the lead partner, is an EC funded project which began in 2008 and about which there is more information on the STM website. John Houghton gave his paper on the costs and benefits of open access publishing. We also heard about the JISC-funded Repositories Support Project. Wim van der Stelt from Springer reported on the SOAP Project which runs until February 2011 and aims to understand the supply and demand dynamics for gold open access. It is coordinated by CERN, and publishers are member in the project consortium (BMC and Sage in addition to
Springer). There will be a SOAP workshop in conjunction with the APE conference in Berlin on 13 January. Alma Swan gave her perspective on the Economic aspects of OA.

**Closing Session** - The conference ended with a panel discussion by representatives from MPS, JISC, CAS, SPARC, BMC, and the European Commission. They identified the key themes of the conference as:

- We haven’t yet answered the question ‘how can we help publishers make a sustainable transition to open access?’ This may be a key theme at next year’s conference
- SCOAP 3 really needs more funding
- The Berlin OA conference is a helpful opportunity to recharge and re-energise in order to continue OA advocacy work
- We need more focus on building/outlining OA benefits for individual researchers
- We need new ways to measure and talk about the impact of OA
- No stakeholder can change the system unilaterally
- There are some who feel frustrated that change is slow; others feel that progress is ok
- How researchers perceive research evaluation is the single issue that creates the most inertia in the change to OA
- We need to shift our focus to also embrace the challenge of open data
- This is a complex issue and an objective analysis of the goals/challenges of each of the stakeholders could be helpful to policy makers
- Collaboration is a key theme
- There is a growing willingness from publishers to work with libraries
- Open data, open educational resources, open access, and open science will lead to a new intensive knowledge discovery environment

Berlin 9 in 2011 will be in the US in or around Washington DC. Berlin 10 in 2012 will be in South Africa.