DAY ONE: Tuesday, 17 January 2017

Greetings:
Prof. Dr. Andreas Degkwitz, Director of the University Library, Humboldt University zu Berlin
with a Personal Message from Prof. Dr. Johanna Wanka, Federal Minister of Education and Research, Berlin

Welcome and Opening: Dr. Michiel Kolman, President, International Publishers Association (IPA), Geneva and SVP Elsevier, Amsterdam

Moderation: Arnoud de Kemp, Chairman, APE 2017

Keynotes:

• Peer Review: Openness, Experimentation and Integrity

It is often said that much like Churchill’s famous quote on democracy, peer review is the worst system possible... “except all other forms that have been tried from time to time”.
It is widely acknowledged that peer review has its limitations, but we have as yet to invent a better method for quality control in scholarly publishing. The importance of maintaining the integrity of published research as output continues to increase means that the demands made on reviewers are greater than ever. Efforts to reinvent peer review: portable, open, post-publication, have all had limited uptake to date. Publishers are continuously making incremental improvements to systems and processes, but which developments could lead to a complete overhaul of the process in the future? Will artificial intelligence and automation play a key role in the peer review of the future?
Rachel has responsibility for BioMed Central and SpringerOpen’s editorial and commercial activity. The group publishes 575 open access journals and across all research disciplines. She joined Springer Nature in February 2016. Previously she was Vice President and Director of Open Access at Wiley, where she led the strategic planning and development of Wiley’s open access initiatives. Prior to that, she spent seven years at Nature Research, where she developed several new journals including Nature Methods and Nature Protocols.
• Safeguarding the Integrity of Research
  Dr. IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg, SVP Research Integrity, Elsevier, Amsterdam

The ultimate responsibility for the integrity of research and its associated publications lies with the individual researcher. The ultimate beneficiary of the integrity of research is the society at large. And in between those ends there are many contributors that play a role. Institutions, funders, and journals provide a combination of support for and validation of best-practice research processes – each in its own way and with its own challenges. At the end however, it is imperative that all collaborate to reach that goal of safeguarding the integrity of research.

Dr. IJsbrand Jan Aalbersberg is Senior Vice President of Research Integrity for Elsevier. He joined the company in 1997, and from 2002 till 2005 he was responsible for the technical development of Scopus. In 2009, he changed his focus to the enrichment of the scientific article, leading Elsevier’s Article of the Future and research data initiatives. His current position, which he holds since 2015, focuses on the integrity of both the content and the content products that Elsevier offers to the researcher. Dr. Aalbersberg holds a PhD in theoretical computer science from Leiden University.

• Demands for Transparency: Helping Readers assess the Quality of Peer review
  Will Schweitzer, Director, Product, AAAS/Science, Washington, DC

Transparency yields trust and journal authors, editors, readers, and reviewers want more. How can publishers help readers decide if an article is reliable and address widespread concerns over the variability of peer review quality? This session will summarize recent studies of peer review perceptions and suggest practical steps that publishers can take to meet increase demands for transparency and overhauling peer review.

Will Schweitzer is the Director, Product for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is responsible for managing the Science family of journals, Science’s custom publishing operations, and PRE (Peer Review Evaluation). He also guides the organization’s product development efforts. Will previously worked for SAGE Publications, the American Psychological Association, and what is now Wolters Kluwer Health.

• How far have we come in facing Challenges in Publication Ethics
  Dr. Mirjam Curno, Council Member and Trustee of COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) +
  Editorial Director, Frontiers, Lausanne

To look forward to the challenges ahead sometimes it is good to remember the long way we have come in dealing with issues related to publication ethics. In 1997 the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) is turning 20. In two decades we have discussed over 550 ethics cases in our forum and released 18 flowcharts guiding editors through common scenarios. Our mission to educate and support editors remains as relevant today as it did in 1997. We have seen cases become more complex, new topics such as peer review fraud arise and our membership increase to over 10’000 worldwide across all academic disciplines. These are challenging times, but editors and publishers have more experience, more guidance and more tools than ever before. Looking forward to the next 20 years our common goal has to be facing the root causes of publication ethics: the culture of how research is conducted and evaluated. Without changes in the incentive structure for researchers we will continue, albeit better, to deal only with the symptoms. In the meantime we will be busy with new challenges such as data sharing, multimedia content, different journal formats and others yet to surface, that will require finding novel approaches.

Mirjam Curno is a council member and trustee of the Committee on Publication Ethics since her election in 2012. She completed a PhD in molecular oncology at the University of Dundee in Scotland in 2006, and then moved to the University of Lausanne, Switzerland as a postdoctoral fellow to work on viral immunity. From 2010 to 2013, Mirjam was the Managing Editor of the Journal of the International AIDS Society, where she also organised workshops on scientific writing and supervised by the Conference Abstract Mentor Programme run by the society. Since 2014 she works for Frontiers, an open access publisher based in Switzerland, and as Editorial Director she oversees the operations of the editorial office.

Session 1: OA 2020 - An achievable Reality?
Chair: Liz Ferguson, Publishing Director, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford

Pressure is increasing to accelerate a transition to OA across Europe. In 2015, a Max Planck Digital Library white paper concluded that there is sufficient resource to support a large scale transformation to OA while maintaining the function of journals. Subsequently, the Berlin12 meeting announced OA2020 - an initiative to transform subscription-based scholarly publishing to open access now supported by more than 70 signatories. In 2016, the Amsterdam Call for Action on Open Science called for full open access for all publicly funded scientific publications by 2020. This session will outline progress made towards those goals, recent developments in policy and implementation, and explore impacts and outcomes for multiple stakeholders.
• **OA2020: Building Capacity for the Transformation**
  
  **Dr. Ralf Schimmer, Deputy Head, Max Planck Digital Library, Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Munich**

When the international OA community will be meeting for the Berlin 13 Conference on 21-22 March 2017, OA2020 will mark the first year after its public launch. Starting with the White Paper in 2015, the idea of transforming the subscription system has proven to be quite powerful in the international discourse. New ways of looking at the interaction in scholarly communication have emerged; new licensing models are being tested in several countries trying to combine elements of the traditional subscription system with entitlements according to OA logic. While there is still a way to go until 2020, it is becoming more and more evident that the capacity for transforming the system is building up very consistently on all sides of the industry.

As Deputy Director and Department Head at the Max Planck Digital Library, Ralf Schimmer is responsible for the electronic resources licensing program for the entire Max Planck Society and for a broad range of Open Access and other information services. He is a frequent co-organiser of the Berlin conferences on Open Access since 2003 and manages the Open Access publication charge agreements of the Max Planck Society. Among many other roles, he is currently the chair of the Governing Council of SCOPA³, the Sponsoring Consortium for Open Access Publishing in Particle Physics, serves on the Knowledge Unlatched Board of Directors, and acts as project manager of ‘OA2020’, the large-scale Open Access transformation initiative proposed by the Max Planck Society.

• **Supporting the Transition towards Open Access: Putting the Researcher at the Centre**
  
  **Dr. Dagmar Meyer, Policy Advisor, European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA), Brussels**

The European Research Council (ERC) supports the principle of open access to research results as a fundamental part of its mission. It strongly endorses the policy that informs the OA2020 initiative for the large-scale transition to open access. As an organization that is governed by scientists, the ERC considers it crucial that this transition take into account the important role of researchers in this context, be it as producers of knowledge, as actors in the review and publication process (within the established system or otherwise), or as users of other researchers’ output. The vast diversity of situations across different research communities makes this a complex and challenging task.

With this backdrop, we will first outline the ERC’s approach towards open access, highlighting some of the bottlenecks in the implementation. We will then discuss a number of initiatives that the ERC has engaged in to support the researchers it funds in opening up their results, and provide a glimpse of some ideas for the future.

Dagmar Meyer is a Policy Adviser at the European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA) in Brussels. Her work focuses on the policy and strategy related aspects of open access, research data management and sharing, and open science more generally. She closely interacts with her counterparts at the European Commission and is in regular contact with research funders, publishers and other stakeholders across Europe. Before joining the ERCEA in 2012, Dagmar worked for three years as Policy Officer for the European Commission’s DG Research and Innovation on issues related to researcher mobility and careers. She holds a PhD in mathematics from the University of Heidelberg.

• **Open Access Policies and Science Europe Member Organisations: State of Play**
  
  **Amanda Crowfoot, Director, Science Europe, Brussels**

As early as 2013, Science Europe adopted common principles on Open Access policies that share many features of the OA2020 initiative, as well as the ultimate goal of moving to a new and sustainable system of scholarly communication of Open Access by replacing the present subscription system with other publication models whilst redirecting and reorganising the current resources accordingly. Science Europe - a policy-oriented association - has pursued this goal by providing major public research funding and research performing organisations in Europe with a platform to discuss, compare and coordinate their Open Access policies. The result has been an increasingly robust and aligned ecosystem of public Open Access policies around Europe, which provide fertile ground for further collective action to fully achieve the transformation of the scholarly communications system, of which OA2020 is a key example. The presentation will focus on some key areas of policy convergence as identified using data from recent Science Europe surveys and will conclude that with institutional OA policies in place at national and EU level (including the Horizon 2020 OA mandate and recent Conclusion by the Council of the EU), the policy conditions for achieving the goals of OA2020 in Europe are in place to a large degree.

Amanda Crowfoot has been Director of Science Europe since 2012. Science Europe is an association of major national research funding and research performing organisations from 27 European countries, founded in 2011 with the aim of promoting the collective research policy interests of its members and facilitating collaboration between them (see www.scienceeurope.org). From 2001 to 2012 Amanda worked at the UK Research Office (UKRO) - the Brussels Office of the seven UK research councils - first as a European Advisor, and then, from 2005, as Director of the Office. UKRO's mission is to maximise UK engagement in EU-funded research, innovation and higher education activities. With a background in linguistics, prior to joining UKRO Amanda taught and researched at several UK universities, and was Projects Manager at the Centre for Research and Policy in Disability at Coventry University (UK), where she established and managed European projects.
• **Open Access Publishing in Chemistry: Opportunities and Challenges**  
  Dr. Emma Wilson, Director of Publishing, Royal Society of Chemistry, London

This talk will present data on Open Access publishing within the chemical science community, with a focus on geographical differences, what is driving this change and what the future might hold.

Within the chemical sciences research community Open Access publishing is gaining traction and growing. Both funding mandates and an increased number of Open Access journals has led to a change in researchers attitudes and an evolution of their publication behaviours. However the complex and varied drivers within Open Access, particularly when examined from an international perspective, makes the path ahead uncertain and challenging but also exciting - as new opportunities arise.

Dr. Emma Wilson is the Director of Publishing at the Royal Society of Chemistry. She has over 15 years’ experience working in the scholarly publishing sector, and has worked for both commercial and not for profit publishers in a variety of editorial, business development and management roles, joining the Royal Society of Chemistry in 2006. In her current role she has responsibility for editorial, product and policy development across the Royal Society of Chemistry’s portfolio of journals, books, databases and magazines. This includes engaging with the chemistry community and other stakeholders to ensure that the Royal Society of Chemistry’s publishing portfolio delivers against the Society's mission to advance excellence in the chemical sciences.

**Session 2: Room at the Top - It’s Good for Business**  
Chair: Dr. Liz Marchant, Editorial Director, Taylor and Francis, Oxford

An Introduction and Structured Debate

It is known that more diverse companies and institutions are achieving better performance. We need the very best people to lead our industry, now and in the future, and currently the gender balance in the publishing industry is not reflected in the boardroom. This session explores the reasons why we have a the glass ceiling and, crucially, debates practical ways we can work as an industry, as organizations and as individuals to ensure the broadest, best talent flourishes and finds its way to the boardroom of the future.

• **Why is there Room at the Top?**  
  Dr. Patricia Gabaldon, Associate Professor, IE Business School, Madrid

• **Women in Scholarly Publishing: Some Context**  
  Alice Meadows, Director, Community Engagement and Support, ORCID, Bethesda, MD

Joining us for the Debate:

• **Tasha Mellins-Cohen**, Director of Product Development, HighWire Press, Brighton  
• **Dr. Gerlind Wallon**, Dep. Director, EMBO, Heidelberg

-----------------------------16:00 – 16:30 Coffee, Tea & Networking ----------------------------------------------------------

**Session 3: How big is the Iceberg under the Sea?**  
Chair: Jan Velterop, Independent OA Accelerator and Blogger, Guildford, Surrey

• **Preprints as a Complement to our Journal System**  
  Dr. Jessica Polka, Director, ASAPbio, Cambridge, MA

Preprints are a rapidly growing form of communication in several disciplines, raising questions about how journals and preprint servers can productively coexist. ASAPbio is a researcher-driven project to promote the productive use of preprints in the life sciences; we hold the view that journals and preprint servers play complementary roles. I will discuss examples of journals piloting innovative policies and experiments to establish symbiotic relationships.

• **A new Model for faster Communication of Research**  
  Dr. Kaveh Bazargan, Director, River Valley Technologies, London

The method of communicating research has traditionally been the “research paper”, published in a journal. This will remain the case in the foreseeable future, but it is time to re-examine this model and ask whether we can use an alternative method of communicating research, in order to take advantage of the internet age. I propose an online system of communication that addresses some of the problems perceived in the traditional system, including: low speed of communication; non-publication of negative results; plagiarism; and gender bias.
The proposed system allows each stakeholder to do what they are good at or what interests them, in a collaborative way. In addition it has the following advantages: direct and granular assessment of research by peers; recognition of any type of contribution, say data visualisation or reference gathering; and full version control showing the history and the source of each contribution. An important role remains for the publisher, namely to “report” the research as clear and lucid narrative.

- **How do we Measure the Iceberg? Analysing Online Activity beyond the Article**  
  *Euan Adie, CEO, Altmetric, London*

Publishers are increasingly turning to metrics to help them make data-driven decisions and inform future strategy. Scholarly and non-scholarly metrics for journal articles have now become the norm, with editorial teams using these insights to track trends, analyse reach and determine scope. But what happens when you look beyond the article, to books, multimedia and other research outputs? How can you ensure your teams get the feedback they need and that your contributors are encouraged to engage and can demonstrate the value of their work? In this session we’ll explore how non-traditional metrics and the underlying activity they represent can be utilized to track the online engagement and interactions relating to these varied outputs. We will also demonstrate how publishers of all sizes and disciplines can interpret and incorporate the data into existing workflows to increase author satisfaction, attract new talent, refine strategy, and drive sales.

**The APE Lecture**

Introduction: Dr. *Bernd Pulverer*, Chief Editor, The EMBO Journal, Head of Scientific Publications, EMBO Press, Heidelberg

- **The moral Vacuum of modern medical and scientific Publishing: is there a Solution?**  
  *Dr. Richard Horton, Editor-in-Chief, The Lancet, London*

---

**Conference Dinner** at Restaurant ‘Refugium’ under the French Dome at Gendarmenmarkt

Please note: Separate Registration or on Invitation (limited seating)

**DAY TWO: Wednesday, 18 January 2017**

---

**Wake-up Session (Start 08:30!)**

*Why are Publishers still Obsessed with Print?*


In academic publishing we take pride in the long and storied history of the industry, often congratulating ourselves for a core model that appears to resist many of the seismic changes afforded by Internet technologies. Although many podium hours have been spent on talk of ‘disruption’, we are still encouraged to think of the four functions of scholarly journals as though they were inviolable laws of physics; some here may recall that in the past this conference has been told that we have now ‘solved’ the challenges of online journal publishing. However comfortable these views may be, they are based on a number of premises which are flawed and anachronistic, persisting only because of inertia within the academic community we serve. In effect we are sitting on a local maximum which will inevitably diminish as academic tastes and fashions modernise. Our notions of appropriate size, speed, quality, brand and service levels are all based on a technology - paper - that is now nearly fully obsolete.

This panel discussion will take a provocative look at what we may gain, and have to give up, in a future where our underlying conceptions are no longer rooted in the pulp of dead trees.

**Session 4: Innovation & new Dotcoms to watch! (Start 09:30!)**

Chair: *Drs. Eefke Smit*, Director, Standards and Technology, STM, The Hague
• Are we Worshiping false Gods? The Journey from Excellence to Innovation.
  Melinda Kenneway, Executive Director, Kudos, Oxford

The concept of ‘excellence’ sits at the heart of academia. Funders require it, universities promote it, researchers strive for it, and publishers champion it. But what exactly is excellence, and is it helping move the world forwards, or is it simply an old-fashioned idea based on an old fashioned ideal? In the words of Jack Stilgoe, writing in The Guardian: “excellence tells us nothing about how important science is and everything about who decides.”

As research becomes more open and transparent, and as the costs of dissemination via online channels continue to reduce, should ‘excellence’ remain the target for the research community? At point when the cost of the pursuit of excellence outweighs its value? Then there’s the mystique of what actually constitutes excellence - usually judged by small groups of peers, and certainly not subject to public scrutiny. But to discuss this in academic circles can feel like heresy.

Scarcity of resources generally drives focus on the principle of 80:20. Something very familiar to anyone working in a start-up. Getting to grips (or not) with this early on is one of the factors that tips a young company towards either success or failure. Excellence in this environment is certainly a lot less important than innovation. But this principle applies more broadly in the world too. According to the OECD: “there is growing awareness amongst policy makers that innovative activity is the main driver of economic progress and well-being.”

The research world is heading towards a time of scarcity. Competition for funds is on the rise, worldwide. Governments are recognizing that the capability to innovate is a crucial determinant in global competitiveness. Put these two things together and perhaps, very soon, we’re going to see the research community thinking and acting more like a start-up, with reducing emphasis on the ideal of excellence. A ‘new god of innovation’ would require a different form of worship, changing how we fund, conduct and publish research.

• • • • • • • • new Dotcoms to watch

This part of the session is getting more and more popular every year. Come and listen to snapshot presentations of new smart apps and clever solutions that have just been launched. Presented by their founders or creators who have the ambition to improve scholarly communication through first class new technology and an unorthodox approach. An exciting line up of selected new initiatives is waiting for your attention

Confirmed:

• Peerwith.com -- by Co-Founder Joris van Rossum
• TrendMD -- by Dr. Matt Cockerill, Director
• PaperHive - by Founder Dr. André Gaul
• Trellisscience.com - by Jim Gilden, Business Development Manager PRE, AAAS
• Kolabtree.com - by Co-Founder Ashmita Das

----------------------------------11:30 - 12:00 Coffee, Tea & Networking----------------------------------

Session 5: Frontiers of Peer Review
Chair: Alice Meadows, Director of Community Engagement & Support, ORCID, Bethesda, MD

Introduction and Report from ‘Peer Review Week 2016’ including an overview of the scope, activities, and participants, as well as a look ahead to Peer Review Week 2017 and beyond

Peer review is a cornerstone of science. Its quality and efficiency depends on a complex, large-scale collaboration process, which is sensitive to motivations, incentives and institutional contexts. The PEERE Cost Action (http://www.peere.org) aims to improve efficiency, transparency and accountability of peer review through a trans-disciplinary, cross-sector collaboration that analyzes peer review in different scientific areas. It is also exploring the implications of different models of peer review and defining a joint research agenda that points to an evidence-based reform of peer review. Key factors in this process are the promotion of initiatives to institutionalize data-sharing between stakeholders, the establishment of standards to promote data-sharing in peer review that take account of potentially sensitive stakeholder data, the development of testing activities, and measures to monitor and evaluate the impact of new models of peer review.

This session presents a selection of talks by PEERE chairs and stakeholders dealing with the following topic

• Data Sharing on Peer Review in the PEERE COST Action
  Prof. Dr. Flaminio Squazzoni, University Brescia and Prof. Dr. Francisco Grimaldo, University Valencia

• Increasing the Transparency of Peer Review in Conferences in Springer Nature
  Dr. Aliaksandr Birukou, Senior Editor Computer Science, Springer, Heidelberg
• Benefits of Data Sharing for Stakeholders in Improving Peer Review Process and Recognizing Reviewers  
  Dr. Bahar Mehmami, Reviewer Experience Lead, Elsevier, Amsterdam

• Benefits of Data Sharing for Stakeholders in Maintaining Ethical Standards in Peer Review  
  Michael Willis, Senior Manager Peer Review, John Wiley & Sons, Oxford

--------------------------------------------- 13:00 - 14:00  Lunch & Networking  ---------------------------------------------------

Session 6: Is our Industry in Good Shape?  
Chair: Robert C. Campbell, Program Committee APE 2017, Oxford

• Is our Industry in good Shape?  
  Michael Mabe, CEO STM, The Hague/Oxford

This paper looks at the status of STM publishing world at a high level overviewing the current trends and challenges in the scientific and scholarly domain. It examines the positive and negative outcomes of the digital revolution and what will remain and what will change as we move forward.

• The Scientific, Technical and Medical Information Sector, 2016  
  Jo McShea, VP & Lead Analyst, Outsell, London

The Scientific, Technical & Medical space continues to feel the impact of new business models, the growth of open access, and an ongoing call to focus on individual researchers and professionals and their needs. As technology develops, the infrastructure needed to support innovation across the space continues to develop and disrupt, leading to further market expansion. This presentation looks at the Scientific, Technical and Medical Information & Solutions markets and provides an update to Outsell’s traditional segmentation of this sector. It includes analysis of market trends and our forecast for segment growth and performance to 2019, providing an overview of the industry, its competitive landscape, disruptive forces and companies, as well as Outsell’s industry forecast.

• Publishing in the Doghouse: Protecting Copyright, Enabling Access, or Both?  
  Philip Carpenter, Senior Adviser, Research, Wiley, Oxford

Research publishing is an industry with a reputation problem. Despite the massive expansion of access achieved over the last decade, the comprehensive migration to digital and the development of numerous new business models, our industry is perceived by many to be an inhibitor of scientific communication and by some governments as a resistor of digital transformation. At core, we are an industry caught between needing to protect intellectual property rights and wanting to enable access. I will argue that we need both to say more about what we do to facilitate access to knowledge and to do more to support research and discovery.

Philip Carpenter was until recently Executive Vice-President, Research at Wiley, responsible for Wiley’s global program of journals and other products and services for the research community. He now serves as Senior Adviser to the Research business and is co-Geschäftsführer of Wiley’s businesses in Germany. He is a member of the Board of the STM Association.

Closing Panel:  
‘The Scholarly Kitchen’ live in Berlin  
What’s Hot and What’s Cooking in Scholarly Publishing?

Chef Cook: David Crotty  
Editorial Director, Journals Policy, Oxford University Press, New York

Other Kitchen Chefs who are confirmed:  
• Kent Anderson, CEO, RedLink, Westborough, MA  
• Alice Meadows, Director of Community Engagement & Support, ORCID, Bethesda, MD  
• Ann Michael, President and Founder, Delta Think, Flourtown, PA

--------------------------------------------- 16:30  End of Conference  ---------------------------------------------------
Sponsors of APE 2017:

---

Supporting: Members enjoy a discount of 25%: