



PALOMERA Interview

Date: 22.08.2023

General information

Gender: female

Stakeholder type (multiple choice, delete irrelevant):

- research performing organisations

Country the interview is focused on: Serbia

Language of the interview conducted: English

INTERVIEWER:

Okay, wonderful. Good. So first of all, thank you very much for agreeing to be here today with me and to this interview. I know that we know each other, but for the sake of this being a formal interview, I have to ask you to shortly present yourself, and if you could tell me what your role is, what your current position is, and how in your professional life, how this relates to Open Access Books

INTERVIEWEE:

Okay, so I guess that you didn't manage to get anyone from the ministry. I know there were some problems, so that's why I'm here. Basically, I work as a librarian at a research institute and this is my main job, but it's not really related to Open Access Books, except for the advocacy of Open Access in general, for training, for researchers, etc. But basically since 2014, I've been working for [ORGANIZATION 1] as the country coordinator in the Open Access program. That's where I'm actually involved quite a lot with Open Access, mostly with journals. I've been working a lot with journals. We had a lot of projects for journals. We have regular consultancy for anyone who is interested, etc. Not so much about books, not because I didn't want, but because there was no interest on the part of the publishers. I'll explain this later. Also, there is another connection with Open Access books and Open Access in general. In Serbia, we have an open science policy, then a national open science policy. It was adopted in 2018. There was an informal group since 2012 working on this. I joined this group in 2015.

In 2017, it was formalized and it was connected with two projects. One was an Erasmus project, BE OPEN, which was about Open Access. It covered all public universities in Serbia. One of the aims of the project was to establish institutional policies and also a national policy. The other is OpenAIRE, and we have an OpenAIR NOAD (National Open Access Desk) at the University of Belgrade, who was actually the initiator of all these groups. So in 2017, we had a final draft of this policy, and had to wait for about one year before it was adopted. I was one of the authors of this policy. And [this policy](#) covers books. It says that books published by institutions that are publicly funded through any of the public programs of the Ministry responsible for science should be made open access, but it's not really monitored. And so we don't really track whether

they are really open access, etc. When we were working on this policy, the group also initiated a change in the documents related to subsidies for publishing, because we have subsidies programs for subsidizing journals, books, conferences, et cetera.

But there is no requirement in these documents, in these criteria for subsidies, that these publications that are subsidized should be open access. We drafted new criteria for subsidies: we took the existing documents, and we made changes. These were very slight changes, but they were meant to make open access mandatory. Unfortunately, the ministry promised to adopt the new criteria, on multiple occasions, this has never been adopted. In 2020, there was another [working group established with the ministry](#). So the 2018 open science platform mostly covers publications. It's about open access. It doesn't really cover other open science practices that we recommended. In 2020, we established a new working group, and this was related to the activities under the [NI4OS Europe project](#), which was connected to EOSC. This was really quite a big group, about 30 people, various stakeholders, researchers involved, etc. The group had several meetings, but there were changes in the Ministry of Education Science and Technological Development. Since 2022, a different ministry is responsible for science - the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation. So, after the initial activities, this group has been inactive for most of the time. One of the lines, subgroups (there were many lines/subgroups) within this working group even drafted, in 2022, in February, a new version of the open science policy.

INTERVIEWER:

Oh, okay.

INTERVIEWEE:

Yes, and the draft has never been discussed with the ministry. Apart from other stuff related to open science, open research data, open infrastructure, the draft even covers the POSI principles implicitly. It makes it explicit that the subsidized publications must be open access and even diamond open access. But this policy has never been even discussed because at the moment when we contacted the ministry, there were some changes. They were preparing for the elections. Somebody had COVID, so everything was postponed. And now after that, we have a new ministry (Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation). These are my connections with open access book publishing. I've been involved in this as somebody who is there, who is doing this. It's mostly volunteer work. I'm involved in these stories as someone who knows the landscape from direct contacts with people. That's basically my role. I'm not an official expert. I've been an official member of these groups, but my role, my main role (as a librarian) is not officially connected, and my volunteer work is not endorsed by the ministry officially.

INTERVIEWER:

My goodness, what an odyssey.

INTERVIEWEE:

Everything is there, but you just need a paper and a signature on it.

INTERVIEWER:

Okay, wow. Yeah. Also, you pretty much answered half of my questions. Yeah, I know. That's great. But one thing I have to ask before we dive deeper into some nuances there, because the Palomera Projects defines academic books as scholarly, peer-reviewed books, including monographs, edited collections, critical editions, and other, we say, long-form, scholarly works. Is this also how it is..?

INTERVIEWEE:

In order to get subsidies, in order to get something accounted for in research evaluation, it has to be peer-reviewed. In Serbia, all the scholarly works are peer reviewed. Even conferences, for

example, conference proceedings, have some sort of peer review, but books of abstracts are not really subject to peer review. Some are, but not always. But monographs, critical editions, etc, everything that is counted in research, evaluation is peer-reviewed. Previously, two peer reviewers were required for books. Now, there must be three. One of them is not from the institution from which the author is. At least one should be external, and their names are listed in the imprint section of the book. Their names are publicly available. And also in order to get subsidies through this program by the ministry - and it's the same with the Ministry of Culture, I guess - one has to submit the peer reviews. So they must be submitted with the application form in order to get funding.

INTERVIEWER:

All right, okay. Since we touched on funding, because this is the next part of this interview, so the economic factors. You mentioned subsidies. Can you explain a little bit more in terms of what resources, sources of funding are available for Open Access books, if any, and how it works?

INTERVIEWEE:

There are two ministries providing funding through regular annual calls. Sometimes there are two calls per year, but usually these are annual calls for subsidies, for journals and for books. And the Ministry of Culture also provides funding for exhibitions and other programs. So there are calls, they're usually in February or sometimes at the end of the year, and they are regulated. There is documentation. There is an application form, there are requirements, official requirements, and they're quite transparent. It's only that there is no open access requirement in these calls. The subsidies are usually intended for print books. The books are not even required to be available online. So that's what we try to insert in these documents (application forms and requirements) just a few sentences about open access. Everything else is okay. In order to qualify for funding, there must be an institution, a scholarly institution involved. Sometimes researchers who are authors, hire a private company, a private printing office, or a private publisher. These are mostly small, local publishers. They have a small publisher involved as the main publisher because it's easier to handle the publishing process, because the institutional procedures may be quite complicated. But then these private publishers have to have an agreement with the scholarly institution in order to qualify for funding. So that's one of the main requirements. The applicants get a relatively small amount of money. They have to submit a budget, but usually they get about half of what they require. And these amounts range between 1,000 euros and several thousand euros. This usually covers the printing of 100 or 300 copies. In most cases there is no copyright transfer. The copyright remains with the authors. IPR awareness in Serbia is low, authors are sometimes not aware of their rights, but basically, they don't sign any agreements, so copyright remains with them. We have a clause in the national copyright law about "work for hire". If authors work for an institution and this is part of their job to produce some publications, then for five years the institution has the right to exploit these outputs. Basically, the applicants for subsidies are authors and institutions, and then institutions, if they have repositories, they make the subsidized publications available in a repository. This is a common practice, and that's why, for example, in Humanities, most of these publications end up in open access in a repository, not necessarily under a free license. Sometimes it's CC non-derivatives, non-commercial, but basically the books end up in repositories. For the publishers subsidies are sometimes the only source of funding... though according to the rules, this shouldn't be the only source... Publishers should prove that there are other sources of funding, for example, that the institution will fund something. So then the institution, for example, can contribute in kind, and this has to be shown in the budget breakdown. However, the greatest amount of money comes from public sources, from these subsidies programs. Sometimes if it's a major edition and a more expensive one, more luxurious one, publishers combine funding from the Ministry of Science and the Ministry of Culture. Also, for example, the local authorities in Belgrade and in other cities have their subsidies programs. They are mostly for print books. It's not that they wouldn't fund online

books, but it's just that it occurred to no one that it could be used for this purpose as well. Subsidized books are mostly modest publications, but basically the important thing is that there is no financial interest in selling them. Some institutions can't sell them because the rules are vague. If you are a public institution, it's not very clear whether you can sell publicly funded publications or not. You can distribute them to libraries. And when you run out of these 100 or 300 copies, then it's in your interest to make it available online somewhere so that people can read. There are some cases when the institutions make a partnership with major local commercial publishers. For example, we have one major publisher, Službeni glasnik. They publish the Official gazette and similar publications. So they are a major publisher. If an author or institution has partnered with such a publisher to publish a publicly subsidized book, such a book will be sold by the commercial publisher. These books are not really expensive, but despite this, publishers sometimes don't manage to sell these 100 or 300 copies. At the same time, collaboration with such publishers involves limitations. In these cases, it's more difficult to make subsidized books available online because there is a copyright transfer involved. In these cases, it's more difficult. On the other hand, when authors partner with minor publishers that are actually small printing offices that are also registered as publishers, the rights remain with the authors and institutions.

INTERVIEWER:

Okay, an additional question, because this is all... If the author or if we were talking about local publishers in Serbia and we're talking about publications in Serbian outputs, right? But what happens if there is a hypothetical situation? There is a researcher from Serbia and he or she wants to publish an open access book with, I don't know, Springer Nature and the bill is €10,000. So what happens then?

INTERVIEWEE:

Serbian authors don't really publish with publishers who charge 10,000 euros for books, but sometimes they do pay book processing charges, and they pay smaller amounts, not really this figure. There are such cases. Not so much in the humanities, but in science and for example, geography and engineering, this is not uncommon... When publishing with international publishers, there is the issue of copyright transfer because authors usually can't pay BPCs, so these books are usually not in open access. According to a [study conducted at the University of Belgrade](#), about 30-40% of authors pay publication charges from their own money. Institutions don't really have this money. In our national open science policy, there is a clause saying that APCs and BPCs can be considered as eligible costs if they are included in the project's budget - only if there is a project and if they're included in the project budget. One can't, for example, publish a book, pay a BPC and then ask for reimbursement. But if it's planned, it's okay. Several years ago, the funding system in science changed. Now we have a National Fund for Science and they have projects where researchers can include APCs or BPCs in the budget. Researchers usually include APCs, but theoretically they can also include a BPC. In most cases, authors pay these cost from their private money. Sometimes, for example, when a book chapter is to be published with an international publisher - these are rarely monographs, it's too expensive - the real authors include more people in the author list than there actually were in order to share this cost with more people. There are some not really good practices involved in this. It's usually just like everywhere else. Paradoxically, the good thing is that we are quite poor and not many authors can publish with international publishers. We have this small-scale publishing that eventually can be made open access. As for the outputs published with international commercial publishers, in most cases books and book chapters are not open access. This is a problem in terms of the compliance with the national open science policy because these book publishers don't really have self-archiving policies. They're either not fair or not defined, and in most cases, one can't make a manuscript available in a repository.

INTERVIEWER:

Okay, all right. Let me gather my thoughts here. Yes, okay. Because I also wanted to ask if there was any funding, especially for alternative business models, so for Diamond OA, for example.

INTERVIEWEE:

No, no, because there is no awareness among the public decision-makers of open access. In this part of the world, the so-called Eastern Europe, Eastern Bloc, the awareness about copyright is poor. For example, we had to invest a lot of effort in training publishers to introduce policies defining copyright because they would say, Well, my journal is online, so anybody can use it. I don't restrict anything. We said, Okay, but you have to say this because if you don't say anything, it's restricted. All rights reserved are implied. It's still very difficult to explain this to them. Our authors make their books available on Academia.edu and on institutional websites. Research librarians had a project at the time when we didn't have repositories [2013] to encourage authors to make their books available on Google Books, because at that time, Google Books used Creative Commons licenses. For us, this was a first step towards making books OA. So we made about a thousand, and more than a thousand books available on Google Books. The idea of business models is quite, quite vague in Serbia. However, the new draft of the open science policy, the one that has never been discussed, has a clause explicitly requiring support for diamond OA publishing.

INTERVIEWER:

Oh, okay, wow.

INTERVIEWEE:

In Serbia, books, journals that are not open access and journals that charge APCscan still qualify for public funding, which is not okay. We tried to change this in the new OS policy draft, which has never been discussed. If the draft were adopted, one of the requirements would be that a book must be open access and that no APCs, BPCs are involved. [As for books, BCS are currently not charged by local institutional publishers. Also, as far as I know, the subsidies do not apply for publishing with international publishers.]

INTERVIEWER:

I see. Okay. All right, I have a clear picture. Now we can move to the social part of this adventure. I wanted to ask a little bit about the perception of open access books in Serbia, if there is any at all. What is the role of academic books in general in national institutional research assessment systems? And are all the books taken into consideration? Is there anything specific about that in your research assessment system? How does this work?

INTERVIEWEE:

Yeah, it's quite defined. I don't say it's okay, but it's very clearly defined. So we have an official ranking of books, journals, etc. at the national level. So, for example, journals: researchers who publish in journals that are listed in the Web of Science and have an impact factor, they score more points than those who publish in journals without the impact factor. Books are also included and conference proceedings are also included in research evaluation. So basically you score some points for all of these. For example, for an abstract, in an abstract book, you score 0.5 points. So if it's a paper and conference proceedings, then it's one point. There are several ranking categories that are related to books. We have international books and there are two ranks. One is, for example, for the books published by those major publishers. It's Springer, it's Elsevier, but that's not always clear. For example, Nova Science publishers can be a prominent publisher in chemistry, but it's not in physics. But Elsevier is in all the lists. Also for book chapters, you score some points for international books. And you have also national books, two categories, two ranks, and also book chapters. However, there are lists adopted for each discipline where regulating bodies responsible for individual disciplines define the ranking. It's

way too complicated, but basically books are included in research evaluation... Also books are more important in the humanities, in social sciences, too, but in humanities especially. So for example, researchers in the humanities usually have more book chapters than journal articles in their bibliographies. That's why it's important for them to publish monographs and to keep book publishing local. It's good for them to be able to publish with their own institution. Institutions care about this and institutions provide support to them when they are applying for funding.

INTERVIEWER:

Okay, all clear. What about the perception of open access? Because it still lingers, especially I know that in Poland, for example, that's still the case, that open access is perceived as of somewhat lower quality. Who knows why? But sometimes this perception is still there. Is it like this in Serbia or what is the attitude?

INTERVIEWEE:

It depends on the discipline. For example, I work with chemists. My colleagues here at the institute, they're mostly doing chemistry and chemical engineering and engineering in general. They still have prejudices about open access, and I believe that they stick to these prejudices intentionally. They have training. I've been doing a lot of advocacy here, and not only me. We have a national library consortium in Serbia. It was established 20 years ago by the then head of the Scientific Information Department of the National Library of Serbia and EIFL. EIFL actually initiated and supported this, and they've been doing a lot about the promotion of Open Access.] So all the information is available. Researchers have all the information, but some of them are just keeping the current research evaluation system alive because they can benefit from it. They care about the impact factors. I wouldn't say that open access awareness is poor. It's not really poor. It's just that some people intentionally put forward prejudices about open access. For example, it seems that medical researchers, and also those in some areas of agriculture, are prone to publishing in suspicious journals more than others. I wouldn't say that it's a matter of poor awareness, it's a matter of knowing how the system works and trying to manipulate it. But these people are not the majority. Also, there are people publishing in hijacked journals. We call them also predatory, and these people are doing this intentionally. I had more than 30 presentations about predatory journals. All the materials are available, and librarians usually have arguments during these sessions with individual researchers who are trying to explain to us that these journals are actually OK. That the hijacked Sylwan is not actually hijacked, that it's okay - something that is obvious. For the people in the humanities and in social sciences paid open access, APC and BPC-based open access, is not affordable. I wouldn't say that they have prejudices against this, but it's something they don't think about because they can't afford it. Basically, most of them are very comfortable with making their work available online. They're poorly aware of the licenses, they're not always happy to allow something that involves potential commercial reuse. In journals in these areas [SSH], they have more restrictive licenses, but they are very, very comfortable with making these materials available online. For example, my institute is associated with the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts has other institutes.[We are not officially part of the Serbian Academy, but we are related through management bodies, through founding acts, et cetera.] There are several institutes, five, dealing with humanities, and we have a shared repository. This is the largest repository in Serbia, and 95% of the content in this repository is open access. There are many monographs published by these institutions. So, generally, in Serbia, if you look at the repositories, the repositories of the institutions that deal with the humanities, they have about 85-plus percentage of open access content. And the institutions dealing with chemistry, biology, medicine, physics, et cetera, they have 35% or 40% at best. It's quite clear. This is something that is, I would say, typical of Serbia. It's not typical for other countries. This is a "semi-conscious open access". Researchers are fine with this. They don't care whether it's defined as open access or not, but they are comfortable with sharing. Sometimes they're afraid, for example, that there might be some copyright issues. But when we explain to them, they realize. Also, one of the

things that is very good, for example, in persuading them to make things open access are those repository statistics. When we show, for example, that a book that is published in a local language, in a local alphabet is visited from abroad, that it's used, for example, beyond academic centers in Serbia, that encourages them to share.

INTERVIEWER:

Sure, absolutely. How bizarre. I've never heard about something like that. Okay, great. We have to... Because I'm looking at the time and we still have different aspects to touch on. Let me move towards the technological aspect here. I think I know the answer, but I'm going to ask in any case. I wanted to ask if there is any underlying infrastructure that could support implementation of open access policy. I'm thinking about some publishing portal on a national level or something like that.

INTERVIEWEE:

We were thinking about this in 2018 in the working group who drafted the OS policy. There was an idea to suggest to the ministry to establish a kind of a repository for example, a Dspace repository because most of our repositories are DSpace. We know the technology. [When we work with open source technology, then you need people who want to do this. Our IT people, they earn a lot in the industry and they don't want to deal with open source. They know nothing about it, they don't want to know. At the university, they are trained that this is something completely not interesting.] So mentioned this option - using DSpace or, for example, PKP software. That was one of the ideas. However, we couldn't identify a stakeholder who would deal with this task. The ministry wasn't interested. It wouldn't have been expensive, but they were not interested at all and we [working group] couldn't identify an institution to run this, because in Serbia everything is very centralized. Everything is in Belgrade. Belgrade University is the largest university and it's quite an issue. For example, the National Library Consortium, they could logically do this, but they don't have human resources and they are part of the National Library and the library doesn't see its interests. They don't want to dedicate resources to this. So it's quite, too complicated. What's been happening recently is that some individual institutions or, for example, scholarly societies, make attempts. For example, when doing this survey for the Diamas, I learned that, for example, at the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade [University of Belgrade], they are using PKP's Open Monographs Press, and they're making their books available [there](#). Also, there is another scholarly society, ... They have few monographs, but they have conference proceedings, so they're using OMS for [this](#). Also, some universities - not in Belgrade, Belgrade University is huge and it's very decentralised, so it's very difficult to manage publishing - but they are locally trying to do something about infrastructure. What I see is the lack of expertise. Sometimes they're not very skilled and they don't use the software quite properly. This is generally a problem with OJS. Many journals are using OJS. Nevertheless, this is a shift forward. Compared to 2018 to 2020, this is a shift forward, so the publishers are becoming aware of the tools and infrastructure. What is interesting about this is also that in many cases, the people providing technical support are not always IT people. They're very often people from the humanities who were actually self-trained how to manage these tools. I expect some shifts forward in this direction. Previously, institutions would put books on the institutional website - just a PDF on the website. Sometimes it's not easily discoverable. And these are usually PDFs. [Except for one textbook for students, that was made by a colleague from Novi Sad who is really an open science advocate and who made an effort to make it online only, I don't know about other examples of trying to use a platform that's adjusted technologically to open access publishing] Also, the quality of these PDFs is very disputable. For example, at the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade, when we started depositing in the institutional repository books that had been made by their publishing unit, the PDFs were not readable. The quality of these PDFs is highly, highly disputable. Sometimes it's even difficult for institutions to get a PDF from the printing office who is a service provider. We [librarians] had to instruct them how to put clauses

in their institutional regulations when making contracts, agreements with these publishers, how to get this PDF and how to get it right. It's very difficult to implement this in practice.

INTERVIEWER:

Goodness. Okay, speaking of PDFs, because my next question was, what happens if a researcher would like to publish something that goes beyond a PDF? What if they want to have some video embedded or something like that? Is there any support for that? Or is it completely out of question?

INTERVIEWEE:

They don't even think about it. We started promoting this in journals. As for monographs it is premature because they can't even imagine this. We started encouraging journals to use various materials. And what we usually do when we do trainings for repositories, we usually tell them, okay, we know that you can't publish this addendum to the PDF, but if you want to provide something more, your institution, which has a repository, will support this and we, the librarians, will make sure that it is well-connected with your publication, that it's related, that it's visible, etc. So this is the only support that we can provide at this moment. The problem with this "multimedia" is that this is not recognized by the research evaluation system. That was the problem with the journals. They said, that's a great idea. We would like to do this, but it's not recognized, so this is an effort. We have to invest our money, our institutional money, our private money in this, but this is not recognized by the research evaluation system.

INTERVIEWER:

Yeah, of course. Then there is no incentive to do that, of course. All right, we have to move towards the legal part of the interview now. I wanted to ask about open licenses. In this policy, which still has not been adopted, but which is there, does it specify which open licenses should be used? Or does it just say open licenses? Or is it, for example, CC BY? It has to be CC-BY or it has to be CC BY NC ND. I don't know.

INTERVIEWEE:

The current open science policy generally recommends CC licenses. We were quite liberal about this because I was running a project for EIFL in 2016, 2017, when we were supporting journals to join DOAJ and to reapply because some of them were expelled. And we had quite many discussions and trainings, etc. And in these discussions, I realised that promoting very open licenses wouldn't work. Editors were skeptical. For example, if you tell a person in the humanities, this could be used commercially, they see Hollywood coming and reusing their book and they [authors] are getting no money at all. So they were not comfortable with this. And then we said, Okay, just use any CC license, any license you like. So now we are trying, and it's quite difficult, we are trying to persuade these journals to shift to CC BY because we say, "Okay, over the several years, nothing bad happened. You can see that it's just to indicate something to the users. Nobody is really using these materials in an inappropriate way, so you could... Now that you have this experience, you can shift towards more liberal licenses." The new OS policy draft, it also says CC licenses, preferably CC BY, basically. I think that CC BY, non-commercial is mentioned, I'm not sure. But basically it's CC licenses. I believe that for monographs, it would be quite difficult to implement CC BY for everything.

INTERVIEWER:

Absolutely. I absolutely agree.

INTERVIEWEE:

Our approach was "okay, let's then adopt just anything to have an experience of this, to be involved in this. If they stay behind, stay away from this, it would be more difficult to persuade them in five years."

INTERVIEWER:

Yeah, absolutely understandable. Okay, we are close to the big questions. I saved the big question for last. Here it goes. How do you assess the progress of the transition to open access books? And what still needs to be done to make it progress better?

INTERVIEWEE:

Basically, in Serbia, everything is there. So we basically need one or two clauses in the policy. Serbia is a centralized country. So if something is "prescribed", it's put in a document by the ministry, then it takes quite a short time for this to be accepted. For example, in 2018, we had less than 10 repositories in Serbia. Once the National Open Science Platform was adopted, and it mandated open access and depositing in repositories as self-archiving, it didn't say you need to have your institutional repository. You can use Zenodo if you wish. But now we have about 80 repositories, and it's a period of only five years. Okay. Some of these repositories are quite well maintained. Basically, if the ministry says you should do this, and we will provide the money only for diamond open access monographs, everybody will align.

INTERVIEWER:

Wow.

INTERVIEWEE:

Okay. It's not too difficult to persuade researchers. For example, a researcher comes and says, okay, but my book is still sold in bookshops. And we say, okay, but in the current open science platform, it says that an embargo of one and a half years for monographs in the humanities is allowed. So okay, if you didn't manage to sell 300 copies in one and a half years, you won't be able to sell them ever. They say, well, you're right. Basically, you're right. And it also happens that somebody reads their book in a repository and they say, okay, I would like to buy this. So it's quite easy to persuade researchers. Those researchers who would make problems, for example, those in chemistry, etc, who always have something to nag about open science, they don't really publish monographs, they publish journal articles.

INTERVIEWER:

For closing remarks, is there anything else that we should know about Serbian and Open Access books that perhaps we haven't covered in the interview? Is there something else that you would like to add to make sure that people know about it?

INTERVIEWEE:

No, not really. I'm not really aware. I think that everything is covered. Basically, I don't have any advice to give to you being aware that people from the ministry didn't respond. I don't really know how to resolve this situation. What we can do, what I see as the only... For example, providing technical advice to those trying to establish these platforms, open monographs or open conference, etc, platforms providing technical recommendations to them and involving them in training so that they can improve the quality of these platforms is a good way forward. Because researchers, they usually, if they are running some project or initiative, they usually look at their peers. Competition was actually crucial in establishing repositories. So if one institution established a repository, the other institution wanted to compete with them. So they would come to a service provider [e.g. University of Belgrade Computer Centre] and say, so we've learned that you made a repository, that you provided the technical infrastructure for their repository - we want to do the same. This is something very good. Basically, what I do as an advocate is trying to identify best practice examples and then promoting them. Okay, yeah, exactly. Then I count on this competition.

INTERVIEWER:

Yeah, that's great. I was just thinking when you said about this technical support, I was just thinking about some scholarly society you mentioned that they have their own... Well, they use the open monograph press. Yeah, just showcasing cases where it works and where apparently it's doable. Okay, wonderful. I think that I got everything I wanted out of it.