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The alternative proposals:

Conventional Journals
Open Access Journals
"Self-archiving"
Article Databases

and all feasible stable combinations
Conventional Journals: Flow of Money

Public Funding Agencies → University Administrations → Libraries → Publishers → Researchers
Conventional Journals

advantages:
1. Equitable access for authors
2. Supports academic tenure & promotion practices
3. Supports scholarly publishing industry
4. Supports scholarly societies

disadvantages:
1. Not financially sustainable
2. Inequitable access for readers
Open Access Journals: Flow of Money

Public Funding Agencies

University Administrations

Libraries

Publishers

Researchers
Open Access Journals (GOLD OA)

**advantages:**
1. A little less expensive (70%-90% of present cost)
2. Does not require major change in criteria for tenure & promotion
3. Preserve existing mechanisms for peer review / quality control / preservation

**disadvantages:**
1. Requires major change in research financing
2. Requires publisher co-participation
3. Susceptible to possible inequities in funding
4. Probably slow to develop
Self-Archiving: Flow of Money

Public Funding Agencies

University Administrations

Libraries

Researchers

Publishers

"self-archives"
"Self-Archiving" (GREEN OA)

advantages:
1. Can be done by academic authors acting alone
2. Will have intrinsically equitable funding
3. Does not require change in institutional finances
4. Does not require changing existing journal system

disadvantages:
1. Slightly more expensive (journals + archives )
2. Some proposals archive potentially unrevised texts
3. Some proposals incorporate time delay (embargo)
4. Requires existing journal system for peer review / quality control / preservation
5. If widespread, may hurt the journals it depends on.
Article Databases: Flow of Money

Public Funding Agencies

University Administrations

Libraries

Researchers

Article Databases
Article Databases

advantages:
1. Much less expensive (1%-10% of present cost)
2. Can be produced by academic world acting alone
3. Do not require major change in research financing
4. Will have intrinsically equitable funding

disadvantages:
1. Require re-evaluation of criteria for tenure & promotion
2. Require additional built-in mechanism for peer review / quality control / preservation
3. Probably will destroy existing publishing system
Alternative fates:

A. OA journals initiatives not enacted

B. OA initiatives enacted:
   '05 for some fields/countries, '06 for all
   
   I. Publishers try to continue as before;
      OA Journals do not develop;
      Article Databases do not develop

   II. Publishers try to continue as before;
       OA Journals do not develop;
       Article Databases develop

   III. Publishers develop OA journals
Note:

All graphs are hypothetical examples only
A: OA MEASURES FAIL

100% OA: 2010

Tipping point: 2011

Relative number of Articles

subscription year

Conv. journals
Article Databases
OA Journals
"self-archiving"
B I: OA MEASURES PASS; NEITHER OAJ NOR ARTICLE DBs DEVELOP

100% OA: 2007

tipping point: 2009
B II: OA MEASURES PASS; ARTICLE DBs DEVELOP

Conv. journals
Article Databases
OA Journals
"self-archiving"
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B III: OA MEASURES PASS
OA JOURNALS DEVELOP

- Conv. journals
- Article Databases
- OA Journals
- "self-archiving"
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## The Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tentative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>OA Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development of new systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td>2010 +</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## or, The Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>planning or denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>OA Journals or decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td>2010 +</td>
<td>growth or extinction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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