aap
Association of American Publishers
www.pspcentral.org
71 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003 212-255-0200 www.publishers.org

PSP

Members of the Professional and Scholarly Publishing Division of AAP publish books, journals, looseleaf, and electronic products in technology, science, medicine, business, law, humanities, the behavioral sciences and scholarly reference.

Professional/ Scholarly Publishing Bulletin

Volume 11, No. 1, Winter 2012

2012 PSP Annual Conference

by **Myer Kutz**, *PSP Bulletin Editor*

The more than 200 attendees at this year's PSP annual conference (**Prospering with Digital: Making Investments Pay**, Renaissance Mayflower Hotel, Washington, DC, February 1-3) could not, it seems to me, have questioned whether the members of the program committee were being insular in selecting panelists and speakers. To be sure, six of the ten conference sessions were moderated by representatives of traditional PSP houses. And three of the other four moderators came from organizations that have operated in the PSP space for some time – SilverChair, Atypon, HighWire Press – and the tenth was from the AAP/PSP division. But the keynote speaker, Latanya Sweeney, came from Harvard, where she is Director and Founder of the Data Privacy Lab, and the four adversaries in the Oxford style debate that kicked off the conference - David Brin of Futures Unlimited, Oliver Goodenough of the Vermont Law School, David Jacobs of the Electronic Privacy Information Center, and Mike Zaneis of the Interactive Advertising Bureau - were all from outside the PSP space.

(Continued on page 2)

From the Executive Director's Desk

by **John Tagler**, *AAP/PSP Director*

A Mob Mentality

SOPA…PIPA…RWA…FRPAA…ACTA…OPEN. The legislative field is awash with a veritable alphabet soup of acronyms. Some, like PIPA and SOPA, rise like a Phoenix, and then quickly disappear. Others linger. FRPAA has been on the horizon three times (in 2008, 2009 and again in 2012) while RWA has had two incarnations (in 2009 and late 2011). Some are U.S. legislative issues, others not. But with anything involving the Internet and any perception of restricting the free flow of information, national boundaries quickly break down. So, too, do rational boundaries.

What has amazed me in the past few months about the rhetoric surrounding these legislative measures – first with SOPA and PIPA, followed by RWA and FRPAA – is the distortion of facts and truth in much of the online discourse. Instead, it has been emotionally driven and there has been a decided shift in the dialogue away from seeking collaboration among the stakeholders to develop solutions for improving access toward a demand for

(Continued on page 2)

In this issue:

2012 PSP Annual Conference

(Continued from page 1)

As for the roster of session speakers, just under a third came from traditional PSP publishers, while about a quarter came from organizations long associated with PSP, including the International Intellectual Property Alliance, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Scientific and Technical Information of the US Department of Energy, Rittenhouse Book Distributors, CrossRef, and the British Library. Nearly half of the speakers, however, came either from university offices (Maryland's Human-Computer Interaction Lab and Harvard Medical School's Information Technology), relatively new enterprises operating in and around the PSP space, and publishers and other businesses serving non-PSP markets.

It seemed to me that in bringing in so many non-PSP speakers the conference planning committee was right on the mark. To my way of thinking, it is entirely a good thing to bring outside expertise into discussions about improving PSP publishing and for PSP publishers to learn how new organizations can infuse PSP with new blood that enriches content and delivers it more swiftly and easily to the people who need to use it in their daily work. One symposium, **Thriving on Disruption: Lessons for Scholarly Publishing from Consumer Content**, moderated by Tom Easley, New England Journal of Medicine, was designed to take advantage of the know-how of Kevin McKean, Consumer Reports, M. Scott Havens, the Atlantic Media Company, and Michael Gold, West Gold Editorial Consulting. Among their recommendations from the consumer media (mainly magazine) world: redesign content so it is suited to each individual channel, instead of simply repurposing the same content for all channels; ride the news; take advantage of social media; explore new business models; see what brings in more traffic; optimize sites based on user feedback; and use deals, how-to videos, games, rating services, and product reviews to attract site visitors. Some of this advice may not sound new, of course, and some of it might be useful and some not, but the takeaway from the session was that such advice is at least worth thinking about and possibly adapting to PSP publishing.

Four representatives from companies with potential for enhancing PSP publishing performance were featured in the symposium, **The Game Changers? Four Organizations that Could Revolutionize Scholarly Publishing**, moderated by Audrey Melkin, Atypon, and William Deluise, Wiley-Blackwell, which billed itself as a "fast-paced, interactive session," and lived up to the billing. After hearing brief presentations, the audience split into

(Continued on page 3)

From the Executive Director's Desk

(Continued from page 1)

unilateral free access. This was particularly noticeable in the rhetoric demanding free public access which followed the introduction of RWA and was rekindled with the reintroduction of FRPAA. The term 'open access' was bandied about but in most instances was not used to describe what has in recent years evolved as an alternative economic publishing model where, rather than subscriptions, an author or funding agency subsidizes the cost of publication (e.g., 'gold' open access) to make an article free upon publication to all users. In fact, there is considerable confusion about such terms as "access," "self-archiving" and many others that publishers try to use consistently and correctly for the communities we serve as well as for the broader public.

There is the perception that publishers are opposed to open access. This is not true. What publishers seek is the development of economic models that can sustain a reliable scholarly record of vetted, peer-reviewed literature; see *Publishers Support Sustainable Open Access*.

This distinction is rarely found amidst distortions and self-serving versions of the truth, such as Michael Eisen's *New York Times* article on January 10, 2012, entitled, "*Research Bought, Then Paid For*." He asserts that "researchers should cut off commercial journals' supply of papers by publishing exclusively in one of the many "open-access" journals that are perfectly capable of managing peer review (like those published by the Public Library of Science, which I co-founded.)" What Eisen fails to acknowledge, however, is that the PLoS flagship journals in biology and medicine carry a publication fee of $2900, several other PLoS journals carry $2250 publication fees and even *PLoS ONE*, which some may regard as a slightly elevated version of vanity publishing, carries a publication fee of $1350. Eisen is not committed to fair disclosure

(Continued on page 4)

2012 PSP Annual Conference

(Continued from page 2)

four groups, and the four company representatives spent ten minutes on questions and answers with each group – sort of like speed dating was how the moderators described these forty minutes. I heard considerable back and forth between the audience groups and the representatives from Pubget (Mike Anderson), which makes it easier to find and read content; TEMIS (Guillaume Mazieres), which delivers automated content management; DeepDyve (William Park), which provides limited article access to unaffiliated users with limited budgets; and Mendeley (Jan Reichelt), which, among other things, helps people organize their work and get insights into how content is being used. This session was content rich, and the give-and-take format worked very well.

Another symposium, **To Be or not To Be Discovered? An Important Question in Today's Digital World**, moderated by Mark Johnson, HighWire Press, had one speaker from a traditional PSP house (Lettie Conrad, SAGE), another from an organization long active in the PSP space (Pam Harley, SilverChair), and a third from outside the space (Connie Chen, Transparensee Systems). The three panelists were women, so the running gag here was that they were Mark's Angels. This session, also rich in content, might have benefitted from the speed-dating format in the Melkin-Deluise session, instead of the standard rapid-fire-PowerPoint format it employed. Even though this session was one of the two in the conference's last time slot, audience members might have enjoyed active discussion with the presenters, who could have spent more time on such non-trivial topics as making content more discoverable by major search engines; search engines may get people to websites, but discovery tools are needed within the sites; discoverability rules keep changing; qualitative research on discoverability and searching; how to get people to spend more time on your site once they land there - by using related content linking, incorporating content that changes frequently, and converting books into a journal model; and fuzzy matching, which can come into play when someone gets to a site but can't find exactly what he or she wants. There was an example of using fuzzy matching to improve discoverability and findability of the movies you might like to see. This would cut out Netflix, Connie Chen, Transparensee, said gleefully. This depressed me. I love Netflix as a terrific way to find and see older movies, especially foreign-language ones, that Turner Classic Movies doesn't get around to, and there's no guarantee that another system will be any better, as far as I'm concerned. The moral of this story? It's best not to get too attached to anything in today's digital world.

Dan Duncan, McGraw-Hill, again eschewed the standard PowerPoint presentation for his panelists in his plenary, **Copyright Policies: The Nexus Between U.S. and Foreign Laws**. As he did last year, he arranged his three lawyer panelists – Barbara Gratch Cohen, Oxford, Allan R. Adler, AAP, and Steve Metalitz, counsel to the International Intellectual Property Alliance – around a low table, and he teed up topics for them to discuss. I thought the atmosphere around the table was more spirited this year, as opposed to last, perhaps because, as Dan Duncan mentioned in his opening remarks, in the last year or two the assault against copyright, including the amount of money spent, has been greater than ever and the government is asserting that more and more information is critical and, therefore, can't be held for very long by publishers under copyright protections. There was discussion about the job other countries do in combating intellectual property theft; how copyright is an engine of free speech, not an impediment to it, and that no other country has a free speech doctrine like ours; and that copyright proponents are shell-shocked from the misinformation approach that the Internet magnifies. The highlight of the session was Allan Adler's forceful affirmation of the recently failed copyright legislation (SOPA in the House and PIPA in the Senate). If he mentioned any flaws in the legislation, I missed them, but you couldn't miss his condemnation of an unnamed Internet Goliath who, he indicated, opposed the legislation because its financial interests were threatened. Barbara Cohen demurred, but there was no time, or inclination, for a more balanced discussion, like the one that Bill Keller provided in his New York Times column a few days after the conference. He defended copyright unequivocally, but called the failed legislation "vague and ham-handed, a case of overreach by the once-mighty entertainment industries."

Another plenary, **E-books and the Resizing of the STM Book Industry**, moderated by Scott Grillo, McGraw-Hill, also featured a departure from the standard format. The panel had a "featured speaker," Ned May, Outsell, who delivered a PowerPoint presentation that focused on where STM stands digitally today and where it might look for answers about enhancing its position in the ebook market (not the consumer book market, but newspapers, music, and consumer electronics) and three "speakers" from the traditional PSP space – Roger

(Continued on page 4)

2012 PSP Annual Conference

(Continued from page 3)

Kasunic, McGraw-Hill; Clark Morrell, Rittenhouse Book Distributors; and Lisa Nachtigall, Wiley – who responded to questions from the moderator. The idea behind the session was a good one, but I didn't think the discussion provided great insights, not because of the speakers, but perhaps because the STM book industry is still feeling its way into the digital distribution channel and library budgets and publishers' prices are going in opposite directions, as Ned May pointed out.

The PROSE Awards luncheon, presided over by Awards chair John Jenkins, CQ Press, who was born to the role of master of ceremonies (I say that every year, but it's no less true), featured two films – Mapping the Slave Trade, based on Atlas of the Transatlantic Slave Trade from Yale University Press, last year's R.R. Hawkins winner, and What is a Book?, which John Jenkins narrated. The luncheon highlight, as usual, was the awarding of this year's Hawkins, which was McGraw-Hill Professional, for ***The Diffusion Handbook: Applied Solutions for Engineers*** by R.K. Michael (Mike) Thambynayagam. This was the first time McGraw-Hill had ever won the Hawkins, and, to my knowledge, the first for an engineering book, as well. This book is likely to be a valuable reference for a very long time. It contains more than a thousand practical solutions to the diffusion equation across a multiplicity of engineering disciplines. The 125-page table of contents uses illustrations to organize the solutions. Mike Thambynayagam, a chemical engineer by training, who works at Schlumberger, developed the outline for his book eighteen years ago. At the luncheon, he was assisted onto the stage by his striking daughter, who is a New York City performance artist (his son is a professional poker player). He gave a brief, moving tribute to family and colleagues, and then his editor, Michael Penn, delivered a graceful speech in which he mentioned Mike's father's admonition to the effect that we live on through what we leave behind.

The conference began with an Oxford style debate and a keynote that were both on privacy. The debate proposition was **Privacy is Obsolete in the Digital World**. The audience gets to vote on the proposition before and after the debate via mobile texting. The "before" vote had 50% agreeing with the proposition and 39% against (the rest were undecided). After the debate, the tide had turned, and only 21% agreed and 70% disagreed, with a few still undecided. The four debaters all seemed to end up on the "disagreed" side, as well, and moderator Thane Kerner, SilverChair, mused that he, too, disagreed with the proposition, which he wished he could have found a way to rehearse. Still, the debate was useful and enjoyable.

Keynoter Latanya Sweeney, who works on privacy in the medical data collection arena, was also optimistic about individuals' retaining their privacy in the digital age. "Technology got us into this mess," she said, "and technology can get us out." The task is daunting, however. De-identification doesn't work, nor does informed consent or aggregation. She pointed out that with just three pieces of information – sex, zip code, and date of birth – 87% of individuals participating in a supposedly blind study could be identified. She talked about the need for a "privacy rethink". There was no need, it seemed to me, for mobile texting to see whether anyone disagreed with *that* proposition.

From the Executive Director's Desk

(Continued from page 2)

when writing in a newspaper where the majority of readers aren't familiar with the nuances of peer review or the indiscriminate use of the term "open access." That nagging little fact of $2900 fees, often paid by the taxpayer, would weaken his pitch for PLoS, and the fact that PLoS has staff and a well-paid chief executive could alienate Eisen's acolytes. Another point of disclosure was of concern to me: Eisen concedes that he was a co-founder of PLoS but the article failed to acknowledge that he is still a member of its Board of Directors.

Many detractors maintain that scholarly publishers' contributions in producing research articles are minimal and that all the work is done and paid for by researchers, so publishers needn't be compensated. But this view doesn't take into account the fact that even with the time that publisher-sponsored peer review takes, publishers often provide research results in a more timely manner than some federal funding agencies, most of which require grant recipients to file research reports on their findings. In many cases the agencies provide public access to these

(Continued on page 5)

From the Executive Director's Desk

(Continued from page 4)

reports (e.g., DOE, DOD, NSF, EPA and NASA); see "*My Argument for Public Access to Research Reports*." It is interesting to note that the NIH, the agency held up as an exemplar in making research findings publicly available, does not make its research reports readily available or discoverable, despite these reports being under its complete control. Isn't there a disconnect here? If the information is so critical and time sensitive, why doesn't the agency make these reports accessible upon delivery from grant recipients? These reports could be available far earlier than the peer-reviewed articles that appear in published journals. Yet while the NIH minimizes publishers' contributions to the published literature, the agency is also deferring building and maintaining the research record to publishers. Why should the NIH bother when it can claim publishers' work by eminent domain and get a better quality product in the process? But perhaps the NIH's commitment to enabling access is less ardent than it claims. A recent article in *The Scholarly Kitchen* cites a study and companion article in the British Medical Journal that notes, "Fewer than half of NIH funded clinical trials are published within 30 months of trial completion…and nearly four out of five studies fail to adhere to mandatory public data reporting." Can it be that the NIH prefers to champion free public access to information when someone else does the work?

It is increasingly argued that while publishers were necessary in the print world, the digital revolution has rendered them obsolete, especially in scholarly publishing. Many people call for open peer review systems in the belief that each scholarly community can self- evaluate and regulate its output. This is the PLoS ONE mantra, which states that the journal, "will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound. Judgments about the importance of any particular paper are then made after publication by the readership (who are the most qualified to determine what is of interest to them)."

This sounds like a good idea but if a mob mentality prevails in evaluating scholarly output, what do we really have? Only the loudest, most persistent and often most tiresome voices will be heard. Not surprisingly, those with the loudest voices may have personal agendas to push, or may be self-proclaimed experts with the tenacity to advance their own interests. Unlike the traditional peer review system, where reviewers are selected based on reputation, expertise and specialized knowledge, balanced, considered and weighed judgment will not prevail but sheer volume and persistent self-interest will. After all, many of those most energetically engaged in the public debate about FRPAA, SOPA and PIPA were academics and scholars, although much of the discourse could hardly be characterized as balanced and unbiased – or based in economic reality or sustainability.

Another important aspect of peer review is the educational process. Many published papers are strengthened by referees who suggest improvements – other research or papers to cite, references to check, repetitive content to cut, conclusions that can be challenged, etc. A lot of this is lost in an environment of mass self-regulation. Whose voice(s) should be followed? Are all voices equal? At what point does an article achieve authority and reliability? What does a reader, researcher or even the author make of all of this?

It is often said that specialized scholarly communities can self-regulate because the researchers all know each other and recognize their peers' standing. With the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of research, however, this posture loses its allure because there are so many people from other fields conducting research in new or unfamiliar disciplines.

This equates to a Wikipedia mentality for scholarship. I confess that I use Wikipedia – mostly for quick reference or to get context – although I'm keenly aware of its potential for inaccuracies, distortions or omissions. But it's 'good enough' for certain purposes. However, would you want a doctor to administer a medication dosage solely derived from a Wikipedia–like resource that's been endorsed by a mob mentality? Or perhaps ride in an airplane made of composite materials derived from papers published in Wikipedia format? Or how about crossing bridges built according to specifications based on a similarly authoritative source? Is "good enough" really good enough? Not on your life.

PSP 2012 ANNUAL MEETING PRE-CONFERENCE SESSION: Smart Content, Smart Delivery, Smart Business

by **Hill Slowinski**

This year's pre-conference session, organized again by the PSP Electronic Information Committee, co-chaired by **Darrell Gunter** (Gunter Media Group) and **John Purcell** (Full Potential Associates), was moderated by **Kevin McKean** (Consumer Reports), and focused on developing content that can be delivered in a user-driven, device agnostic, interactive environment anytime and anywhere. The session provided examples of efforts to adapt to rapid alterations in the technological/user landscape. McKean introduced the session by saying this is "a woeful time to be in the content business," with its stress points involving company finances and demands that content be free.

There were times when the pace of the session struggled and felt difficult, as the flow was uneven and talks were disconnected. The transitions from one presentation to the next took work to make the connection. While it did not have the Wow! factor last year's pre-conference session delivered, the presentations were informative. Whether some topics were too deep or not deep enough, advances and developments in some other areas of publishing and product evolution and capabilities seem more intuitive and useful in a different way. The program was to explore issues of "how user-centric preferences drive new delivery and business models, as well as shaping content to this new environment."

Smart Content

Bradley Allen (Elsevier Labs) described how smart content is created and provided and its context within the STM market. What makes content 'smart' is creating it with a structure that enables it to be found when it is needed, to be better understood, and integrated, it into solutions, applications and systems.

Content is made smart, Allen said, by adding structure with asset metadata, concepts, assertions (relating facts to the associations), citations of other work, usage, and provenance and trust. Two methods for adding structure to content are manual and automated. The manual process is very mature and hard to scale. If crowd sourcing is attempted, quality control is difficult. The automated process is in varying degrees of maturity but there have been huge strides through machine learning research.

Allen suggested that an approach embrace linked data principles and leverage workflow and infrastructure. Challenges include URL and name space management and governance, globalization/localization of knowledge organization systems, and registries for resolving identity of named entities and accreditation and provenance.

For perspective of where we are today, Allen described pre-1980s as the print era, 1980-2010s as the digital library era, and 2010s and beyond as a platform-as-a-service era. Smart content allows publishers to create new products and services through structuring content for better discovery, insight, and utility. The value is in the structure, not the content. New consumer Internet businesses are using open source software and the cloud to add structure to content today. The result: Content publishing is becoming business intelligence.

Business Models/Initiatives

Heidi McGregor (ITHAKA) described as a case study the business model of JSTOR, a platform for preservation and access with 7000 participating institutions in 150+ countries, and 75 million downloads and 1.1 million profiles. But finances are decreasing and expectations are increasing. Everyone is your market, so the challenge is: Who matters?

People have expectations. There are 100,000,000 attempted JSTOR accesses annually by people who try to get access to free content. JSTOR is testing new approaches through providing access to 1) big data, 2) focused teams, and 3) experimental models.

JSTOR's current test is called "Front Door," which provides Early Journal Content in JSTOR free. So far, there have been 2.35 million accesses in 4 months, and of those, 50% have been from unknown users.

JSTOR is planning to start its new 'Register & Read' program, which will provide read-only access to its archive of journal articles without subscription. Users will have to sign up for a free JSTOR account. They will be limited to three articles at a time, viewing will be limited to 14 days, and they will not be able to download articles. There are lots of moving parts to this test, and JSTOR is leaving its options open about future business models.

(Continued on page 8)

Spotlight On…

Draft Release 1 of the Code of Practice for Usage Factors

Draft Release 1 of the Code of Practice for Usage Factors is now available for comment and may be accessed on the Usage Factor page of the COUNTER website at: *http://www.projectcounter.org/usage_factor.html*.

Draft Release 1 is one of the most significant outcomes to-date of the Usage Factor project, and is an important part of the project's final Stage, which will take Usage Factor towards full implementation. Draft Release 1 is based on well-established COUNTER standards, procedures and protocols; it is designed to enable recording and reporting by publishers of credible, consistent and compatible global Usage Factors for their self-hosted online publications (and incorporating usage of these publications on other platforms capable of delivering COUNTER-compliant usage statistics). While Release 1 of this Code of Practice focuses on Usage Factors for journals, it is envisaged that its scope will be extended in subsequent Releases to cover other online publications, such as books and reference works.

The development of the Code of Practice for Usage Factors is designed to be an open, transparent process, and input from individual researchers and practitioners, as well as from librarians, publishers and other information professionals, is actively encouraged. The purpose in publishing this Draft Release 1 now is threefold: first, set out a formal, detailed standard for the recording, reporting and maintenance of Usage Factors, solidly based on the outcomes of Stages 1 and 2 of the Usage Factor project; second, provide a document for interested parties' review and comment; third, provide a framework for selected publishers and other organizations to do more extensive testing of the proposed processes for calculating and reporting Usage Factors.

Draft Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice for Usage Factors will be available for comment on the COUNTER website at: *http://www.projectcounter.org/usage_factor.html* until **30 September 2012**. Comments should be sent to Peter Shepherd, COUNTER Director, at: *pshepherd@projectCounter.org*. Feedback will be reviewed by the Usage Factor International Advisory Board and taken into account in developing the definitive version of the Code of Practice for Usage Factors.

About Usage Factor

The Usage Factor project's overall aim is to explore how online usage statistics might form the basis of a new measure of impact and quality of journals and other online publications, the Usage Factor (UF). The project was launched by UKSG in 2007 and is now managed by COUNTER, with the guidance of an International Advisory Board. The main project outcome will be a COUNTER Code of Practice for Usage Factors, which will enable publishers and other organizations to calculate and report statistically robust Usage Factors in a consistent and cost-effective way.

For more information, please visit the Usage Factor page of the COUNTER website at: *http://www.projectcounter.org/usage_factor.html*

PSP 2012 ANNUAL MEETING PRE-CONFERENCE SESSION

(Continued from page 6)

Open Access

Barbara Kline Pope (NAS) recounted the National Academies Press history as a case study in Open Access. In 1994 NAP first posted PDF page images online and provided free access to them, one page at a time. In 2001 NAP experimented with providing all PDFs of books online for free, but leadership concluded that it was too expensive, so NAP started selling the PDFs. In 2003, it did start providing free PDFs to developing countries. From 2005 to 2011, 35% of titles were available as free PDF and 65% of titles were sold.

Today, PDF content is free to everyone, and while book sales have not fallen off the cliff, they continue to decline. User behavior has been a surprise: online downloads spiked in 2011 immediately after the announcement of free downloads, which Pope said probably indicated a hoarding behavior and/or a fear that access was temporary. But levels of free downloads overall have generally increased gradually, and have now doubled. There has been an interaction between free content and product quality, which has had an effect on print sales of PDF files.

Two recent experiments, involving measuring user preferences, have attracted attention to NAP and increased discovery and relevancy for users. Over time, NAP has increased the number of books available online, the number of visitors to its website, number of pages viewed or turned, and number of downloads. It has 140,000 registered users and over 300,000 on its mailing list.

In the most recent experiment in 2010, NAP measured the interaction between free content and product quality. It manipulated conditions such as no free content, free first chapters only, or whole books free. It also controlled whether there was color or no color. It experimented with products in three price points and three popularity levels. The results are not out yet. Nevertheless, Pope said, it is clear that selling printed books is not a business model for the next 10 years.

Digital Annotation and the Future of Reading

Is there a value in how readers annotate and add marginalia to content, and how can they share their notes in an online environment? **Bobby Fishkin** (ReFrameIt.com) researched the scribbles of great authors throughout history and created a tool for producing a potential social community to share ideas better. ReFrameIt is social media for individuals to exchange thoughts on scholarly works. It creates a 'neighborhood' in which to realize one's self-interest and relevance.

Fishkin says the location of annotations on a page is significant as they reach critical density. The position of readers' marginalia visually associates what idea or expression they are referring to.

ReFrameIt is an add-on – currently installed by 800,000 people -that allows annotations to lay on top of a web page. Fishkin observed that threads of comments following content cannot be seen in context and could not get to critical mass to create an urbanized text. Notes in position could be used, for example, in a peer review setting, leveraging community to add value to content.

The more people participate, the greater the value. For instance, in a scholarly setting, student access to expert commentary could be a teaching tool. In a commercial setting, such access could be valuable in product development or provide other business benefits like recruitment and retention, or improved marketing.

Smart Content Use Cases

Steve Nathan (Parity Computing) provided examples of smart content in action and how several market segments use smart content and data. He cited Mark Stefic's description of smart content as content that "organizes itself automatically depending on your context, goals, and workflow… 'smart content' is interesting in how it re-frames match-making between people and content."

Nathan described his company's Author Profiler, which shows the business value of citations to articles and positions of authors within a discipline, thereby, for example, yielding a quantified indication of an applicant's suitability for funding of a proposed research project. Nathan discussed how Individual researchers can be helped to identify opportunities to partner with others with complimentary expertise for funding awards.

He also showed how smart content can be applied by a medical equipment company as sales lead tool by identifying in an STM journal article what equipment was used and whether a competitor's equipment was cited in published research.

(Continued on page 9)

PSP 2012 ANNUAL MEETING PRE-CONFERENCE SESSION

(Continued from page 8)

In a patient setting, automating evidence-based medicine containing individual patient health data can assist in automatically matching patients with an appropriate diagnosis and subsequent treatment plans. It can advance predictive diagnostics to make for better patient outcomes. By using intelligent automation systems to survey medical literature for new data and treatment techniques, doctors can match patients to medical research to identify relevant studies.

The challenge is to think about, in semantic technologies, whether to take a platform approach or to look at market opportunities to focus on more targeted projects.

Summary

Allen's overview of smart content set up a thoughtful foundation for understanding What, When, Why, and How. The JSTOR experiments seemed to be tests of new but not so innovative business models. The NAS story, once again, really is an example of continuous exploratory testing over the long term and meeting user demands in differing markets with new revenue plans. In some cases, though, such as ReFramIt, the exercise seemed to be a solution looking for a problem. Setting aside Fishkin's excitement to be able to do work with marginalia in this way, while it was interesting, it left one thinking, So what do I do with it, and would my customers want it? The Parity use cases demonstrated capabilities as a tool for very specialized markets or clients more than as a publishing business model for new resources for users.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

WEBINAR: *DIGITAL PIRACY BRIEFING*

The Professional and Scholarly Publishing industry has been a forerunner in the transition from print to digital publication. While digital delivery provides new enhancements and services to customers, it also makes scholarly publications increasingly vulnerable to online piracy.

Join us for the ***Digital Piracy Briefing –*** a webinar designed to provide you with an overview of issues relating to piracy, both domestic and international, with a specific focus on addressing online piracy.

You will learn about:

- Types of piracy specific to the publishing industry
- Issues surrounding monitoring and digital enforcement
- Technology solutions
- Government and industry enforcement efforts
- Legislative developments

Sign up today to learn more about these issues and AAP's global efforts on behalf of the publishing industry.

Instructor: M. Luisa Simpson, Executive Director, International Copyright Enforcement & Trade Policy, Association of American Publishers.

(Continued on back page)

Association of American Publishers, Inc.
71 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003-3004

First Class
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, NY
Permit No. 5335

Route to:

- ☐ Sales & Marketing Director
- ☐ Editorial Director
- ☐ Director of Human Resources
- ☐ Director of Finance
- ☐ Director of Production & Manufacturing
- ☐ Director of New Media Development

Announcements

(Continued from page 9)

Date: May 16, 2012

Time: 11:30am – 12:30pm
(Eastern Daylight Time)

Price: AAP Members: $29.00
Non-members: $49.00

For more information and to register visit *www.publishers.org* or email Sara Pinto at *spinto@publishers.org*

PSP
Professional, Scholarly & Academic Books: The Basic Boot Camp

Friday, May 18, 2012

9:00am – 5:00pm

AAP Offices
71 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003

If you have less than three years' experience with professional, scholarly, and academic book publishing this course will provide an overview of the industry. Or, if you have spent most of your career working in one aspect of PSP publishing and want to learn about other PSP job functions, you should attend.

Topics to be Addressed Include:

- Acquisitions
- Marketing
- Sales
- Production
- Finance

Registration Fees:

$150.00 AAP Member

$199.00 Non Member

For more information and to register visit *www.publishers.org* or email Sara Pinto at *spinto@publishers.org*

The PSP *Bulletin* is published quarterly. All material in the PSP *Bulletin* is protected by copyright, but may be reproduced or quoted with proper credit. This newsletter is provided as a service. AAP does not assume any liability for errors or omissions. Please direct all communication to Sara Pinto, PSP Division, Association of American Publishers, 71 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003, Tel. 212-255-0200, Email: spinto@publishers.org.

Editorial Staff
Myer Kutz, Editor

Editorial Contributors
Kate Kolendo, Sara Pinto, John Tagler