



Knowledge Exchange: a case of international co-operation

Wilma Mossink SURFfoundation/
Nol Verhagen University of Amsterdam
ALPSP seminar April 2011



The story in more detail

- Introduction to the Knowledge Exchange & consortia partners
- International co-operation
 - background information
- Tender procedure
- Results of the tender
- Achievements of our co-operation
- Some evaluative comments
 - tender
 - co-operation
- Conclusions

Knowledge Exchange

- Umbrella organisation with 4 sponsoring partners
 - Denmark's Electronic Research Library (DEFF)
 - German Research Foundation (DFG)
 - Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC)
 - SURFfoundation (SURF)
- Intention to make a layer of scholarly and scientific content openly available on the internet
- Mainly Open Access focused
- Realising that licensing of resources can contribute to overall mission

Consortium partner: Denmark/DEFF

- Funded by Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation
- Co-operation organisation for Danish research libraries
- The overall objective is to ensure an optimal exploitation of the institution's research-based information resources
- Funding M€2,7 yearly which covers mainly activities Licence Secretariat
- Main target group
 - researchers, lecturers & students of higher & further education institutions within the public sector
- Growth in number of institutions & agreements
- Turnover DKK M135/ M€18

Consortium partner: Germany/DFG

- Mainly funded at institutional level with some central funding available in some of the German states (Länder)
- Mainly organised along the lines of political borders in the federal system or existing regional library networks
 - six major regional consortia
 - consortia of research organisations, e.g. Max-Planck Digital Library
- Variety of different organisational models
- DFG has taken role of umbrella, covering the whole federal system
 - national licences for completed collections (ends 2010)
 - national consortia for current e-journal content
- Priority Initiative Digital Information of the Alliance of German Science Organisations

DFG perspectives for licensing

- Infrastructure
 - regional consortia will continue to exist alongside national licensing initiative, but probably more licensing at nationwide level
 - opt-in models via the Alliance Initiative
 - more co-operation and clearer division of labour between existing structures in the future
- Funding
 - local and regional funds will remain the basis of literature supply
 - DFG funding can only support, but not replace this structure

Consortium partner: UK/JISC Collections

- Membership organisation established & funded by the UK Higher & Further Education funding councils,
- Shared service, providing members within the scholarly communications sector with:
- selection & negotiation
 - expertise in negotiating & procurement,
 - strategic negotiations for core content including unique scholarly journal content
- research & knowledge sharing
 - examine the needs & behaviours of modern students & researchers to inform resource development & licensing
 - explore how innovative tools & technology can support efficient procurement
 - develops effective & sustainable business models for e-resources

Consortium partner: Netherlands/SURF

- Membership organisation for institutions of HE
 - 2 consortia: universities (UKB) & universities of applied sciences
 - public libraries, museums & Belgian institutions for higher education can use some services of SURF
- Funded by institutions through combination of fixed fees & top up fees on purchase of content
- No involvement central government
- Overall objective is to support negotiations and purchases of software & content for research & teaching
- Procurement & single invoice.
- Costs Licence Agency about M€1 yearly; turnover about M€30

Background tender initiative

- Initial meeting in Bonn July 2006 to create framework (Bonn Accord), starting from the notion that
 - publishers will continue to play essential role in evaluating & distributing secondary literature
 - partner organisations currently use different models & strategies for the procurement of digital content on a national level

Reasons for a new approach

- Engagement for a **joint tender** to procure digital content because of
 - lack of innovation among publishers
 - in creating new business models for electronic resources
 - In creating new access strategies for content
 - need for transparency for benchmarking national licences & framework agreements
 - need for a route to market for content often left out of deals on a national or regional level

Tender: EU Competitive Dialogue

- Request for Information
 - contracting authority makes known its 'needs & requirements' in contract notice & defines them in Descriptive document
- Dialogue with bidders
 - aimed at identifying & defining means best suited to satisfy needs contracting authority
- Descriptive document
 - detailed award criteria specified on the basis of which bidders have formulate their proposals
- Award of contract
 - assessment on basis of award criteria & most economically advantageous tenders

Tender: Our offer to the vendors

- No allocated money but:
 - provisions for a route to market to hundreds of research universities & large teaching universities
 - endorsement and promotion of the bids to the libraries
 - provisions for a single point for contact resulting in better efficiency
 - reduction in administration costs for the publisher
- 2 types of lists for differentiating institutions
 - basic list representing research universities
 - extended list defining other affiliated institutions

Tender: Our question?

- Bids must contain:
 - final prices (no negotiation on fees)
 - single fee for all institutions on basic & extended list for each country
 - opt in framework which should show an innovative character:
 - discount structure based on participation through subscriptions in basic list
 - requirement to offer discount level to subscribing institutions in both lists
 - tiered pricing differentiating institutions in basic & extended list

Achievements: licensing structure

- Overarching agreement between 4 partners of Knowledge Exchange & publisher
 - establishes rights & obligations between publisher & Knowledge Exchange partners
- Agreement with 4 annexes
 - Schedule A: Basic and Extended list of participating institutions
 - Schedule B: Licensed material, types of licences & fees
 - Schedule C: Licence agreement
 - Schedule D: Support
- Licence agreement
 - agreement regarding User Rights in respect of the Licensed Material between publisher & institution via Knowledge Exchange as intermediary

Achievements: business model

- Basic list
 - list representing research universities and largest teaching universities (mainly in UK)
- Extended list
 - list representing other HE institutions and (some) publicly funded research institutions
- Innovative business model with
 - price for national (multi) national licences for basic & extended list for each country
 - several possibilities for discounts
 - discount structure based on amount of participation through subscriptions in basic list
 - discount level to subscribing institutions in both lists
 - tiered pricing differentiating between institutions in basic & extended list.

Achievements: criteria to award offers

- 4 overarching criteria:
 - innovative character
 - value for money offered by the proposal publisher (40 %)
 - compliance with the access strategy set out by Knowledge Exchange (10 %)
 - fit of content to the academic strategy of the country (50 %)

The destination: agreements with publishers

- April 2008 agreements with 5 publishers:
 - [TheScientificWorldJournal](#): a hybrid open-access / fee-based online journal in the life sciences
 - [MultiScience Journal](#): an aggregator of 34 engineering journals;
 - [BioOne](#): an aggregation of bioscience research journals run by a non-profit consortium
 - [SWETS/ALPSP](#): a collection of 543 journals from 36 diverse publishers, in a single collection with a single umbrella license, pricing model and delivery platform
 - [Wiley InterScience OnlineBooks](#): a package of e-book offers from Wiley/Blackwell

The ride: the take up

- Libraries had to be convinced of taking up the offers
- ALPSP interesting example
 - not a very relevant offer for the institutions on basic list
 - too expensive for institutions on extended list
- Wiley
 - opt-in model not very different from usual model apart from slightly better conditions in terms of discounts beyond certain threshold
- TheScientificWorldJournal/MultiScience/BioOne
 - sponsorship funding bodies enabled national licences in some or even all partner countries

Tender: disadvantages

- Time consuming process
 - time frame of tender procedure itself
 - writing the several documents with severe deadlines
 - evaluating the bids by markers
- Process rather inflexible:
 - careful structuring of bids needed
 - no further negotiations on prices/licences possible
 - bid is final bid but considerations could possibly influence bid
- Takes up time & money of the organisations involved
 - strong commitment of the organisations needed
- Still difficulties to estimate whether prices are fair
- Libraries are offered content they have not asked for

Disadvantages process working together

- Need to find formula that fits all 4 partners, bridging differences in organisation, funding & structures of HE
- Need to organise a route to market for each publisher in each country, giving the partner organisations a new role towards their 'patrons'
- Need to find or develop new funding arrangements for licences
- Need to 'sell' the agreements to libraries that hadn't asked for these contents

Advantages process working together

- Ability to benchmark the prices
- Higher degree of transparency
- Reaching a group of interesting/unknown publishers which normally are not on the short- or longlist of consortia
- Some innovative business models & access strategies
- Worthwhile discounts especially on multinational level
- Concept of national licences comes into view because of economies of scale
- Created framework useful for future licences
- Model licence with most favourable provisions of the 4 countries
- Test system for multinational negotiation and national implementation

Conclusion

- 4 organisations focussing on digital supply of information in HE
- Substantial differences in funding arrangements for these organisations
- Fundamental differences in relations between ‘agencies’ & ‘members’
- Functional differences in services delivered by ‘agencies’
- Tendering is not the most suitable way to purchase or procure scholarly content

Thank you for your attention!

Knowledge Exchange Licensing Working Group:

- Anette Schneider (Technical Information Center)
- Lone Madsen (Universtiy Library of Southern Denmark)
- Hildegard Schäffler (Bavarian State Library)
- Markus Brammer (German National Library on Science & Technology)
- Lorraine Estelle (JISC Collections)
- Nol Verhagen (University of Amsterdam/SURFdiensten)
- Wilma Mossink (SURFfoundation/SURFdiensten)