

**Examination and specification  
in order to publish the annual AIW contributions**

-

**“American Indian Workshop Online Journal”**

**drafted version 0.9**

*with special thanks to: Renate Bartl, Henry Kammler, Sylvia Kasprzycki, Patrick Kotter,  
Franz Krause, James Mackay*

**Sonja Ross**

Email: [ross@rosske.de](mailto:ross@rosske.de)

Mobile: +49 163 162 4786

# Content

## **I. Prerequisites**

- I. Organizational framework**
- II. Workshop Contributions**

## **II. Plans and timeframe as a working hypothesis**

## **III. Description of Step one: repository with comment area, closed for the AIW**

## **IV. Description of Step Two: Options for Open Access publishing**

- I. Descriptive criteria of an Open Access approach and comparison with conventional way**
- II. AIW options to establish a publication media using the Open Access approach**

## **V. Recommendations and costs**

## **VI. Funding proposals**

## **VII. Feasibility / Prerequisites**

## **VIII. Decision table**

# Prerequisites

## I. Prerequisites

### I. Organizationally, the AIW

- I. is community curated, no legal entity
- II. has no income beside workshop fees, no fund, no membership fee. All participation is voluntary
- III. provides an information platform for associated members via mailing lists
- IV. runs a webpage for additional information purposes
- V. is linked with European Universities and Museums
- VI. arranges international workshops on an annual basis alternately organized by European Academic Institutes

### II. Contributions to the workshops

- I. are key note presentations to the appropriate focus topic, or
- II. presentations to the appropriate focus topic, or
- III. panel sessions to the appropriate focus topic
- IV. presenters provide an abstract and bibliographical information to the organizers for acceptance
- V. there is no documentation or publishing of the contributions beyond program related information

# Plans and Timeframe (working hypothesis)

## II. Plans

- I. discuss and create options to publish the workshop contributions on an annual basis by establishing an AIW curated media for publication
- II. Implementation of a two step approach, e.g.
  - I. Step one: File storage for draft / comment pieces e.g. creating a repository for PDF files and comment areas login/password protected – drafted / preliminary versions (“as-is”) for AIW closed area
  - II. Step two: Open Access publishing using an established OA platform / an OA publisher offer
- III. Establish an editorial board / team to prevent political or ethical abuse of the platform for step one
- IV. Establish an extended editorial board / team to handle editorial tasks for step two
- V. Costs/ efforts to be considered for step one and step two before starting

## III. Timeframe

- I. Publishing activities for the AIW 2021 (42<sup>nd</sup>) are already covered by the Team Cyprus, James Mackay et.al. (Transmotion)
- II. Starting point for the AIW Journal with the results / contributions of the AIW 2020 (41<sup>st</sup>) for step one implementation in 2021 retrospectively as a pilot version
- III. Proceed with details for step two in 2021 and start with step two implementation in 2022

# Description „Step One“, p.1/ – closed area for „as-is“

## IV. Description of step one: closed repository with comment area for annual “as-is” workshop contributions

- I. (r) display overall program information of the respective year
- II. (r/w) Access to contributors’ page: login / password  
<alias name for login in case of using email address>
- III. Content elements read/write (r/w) or read (r)
  - I. (r/w) Author: First Name / Surname / Title / <optional> job title
  - II. (r/w) Title of contribution
  - III. (r/w) Abstract (= < 80 words)
  - IV. (r/w) PDF file storage, ***discuss: additional media, e.g. video clips to be considered?***
  - V. (r/w) Keywords fields 1-6
  - VI. (r/w) Number/Year of the AIW
  - VII. (r/w) Institute/City that organized
  - VIII. (r/w) Topic or leading idea of the respective workshop
- IX. (r/w) Comment fields 1-n**
  - X. (r) display field discussion open / closed
  - XI. <optional> (r) list attendees of discussion

# Description „Step One“ p.2/ – closed area for „as-is“

## IV. Search function / Display function

- I. (r/w) Author: First Name / Surname - (r) display field
- II. (r/w) Keyword - (r) display field
- III. (r/w) Number/Year of the AIW - (r) display field
- IV. (r/w) Institute/City that organized - (r) display field
- V. (r) display PDF
- VI. ***discuss: download PDF possible? To mark as “AIW internal”? Disclosure note?***

## V. operational processes, main steps

- I. enter contributors page with login / password
- II. store drafted contribution (t ~ within 2 weeks after congresses end)
- III. save and inform “step-one-editorial team“ for release
- IV. “step-one-editorial teams’ ” release / switch to open for discussion (t ~ 4 weeks after release for discussion)
- V. end discussion and save
- VI. <optional> update contribution (t ~ 4 weeks after discussions’ end)
- VII. close process, close editing, save and archive
- VIII. enable search function
- IX. allow delete function to author

# Description „Step One“ p.3/- closed area for „as-is“

## VI. IT basis and implementation

### I. Description of current IT Basis (volume)

Virtual Server, current Disk Volume 40 GB  
expansion fee for 250 GB Hard Disk Volume additional 5,-- € per month

### II. Extrapolation of data volume needed

[- assumption presentation files:

35 – 45 presentations each year, each approx. 20 pages, PDF-file including maps, pictures, graphs, etc., compressing mode “high quality”

- assumption clips, movies, youtube files, etc.:  
solely a link to media]

assumption 40 x 2,600 KB/PDF ~ 104 MB per year

### III. In terms of the needed application, the usage of a Standard Package is obvious (recommendation here „dropbox business standard“, see p. 15)

In general is the usage of a standard package saving efforts and costs for implementation and maintenance, protects the AIW team from IT security issues, provides access methods and can solve archiving needs

# Description „Step Two“ p.1/ Descriptive criteria of OA

## I. Descriptive Criteria

### I. Two ways:

- OA golden way: to publish directly digital, no previous publication in a print medium
- OA green way: first publication in a print medium, check if there is a secondary publication clause.  
Aligned to that, afterwards optionally digital

### II. Licenses

- “Open Licenses”

Authors place their works under an open license. Then they allow the general public, under certain conditions, the free use of their work. A license agreement is also concluded here. However, an individual contract is not concluded with each user, but the contract comes about "automatically" through the use of the work.

- Applicable for our purposes

Creative Common licenses BY non-commercial / share-alike (forwarding under the same conditions): CC BY NC-SA

### III. Commercial Conditions

- free access for readers / scientific communities worldwide
- costing lies with the author or needs specific funding
- funding options currently are offered by public institutions such as libraries or universities

### IV. Implementation

- usage of respective open access SW like OJS in cooperation with a hosting partner
- cooperation with a publishing company, an university institute, a library...



# Description „Step Two“ p.2/ compare conventional/ OA

## I. Comparison conventional/individual approach using print media and digital/coordinated approach using Open Access

| <b>Conventional way: print media and individual search for a publisher</b>                              | <b>Digital publishing: Open Access (here: golden way*), AIW coordinated</b>   |
|---|---|
| +   | +   |
| Wide range of options, various scientific media available to choose from                                | <b>Consolidation of all AIW programs and contributions, AIW curated and self-organized</b>  |
| benefit from the publisher's marketing strategy and scientific reputation                               | Licence driven regarding copyright / quotations, multiple online register entries, free access  |
| Quality assurance additional through publishers' editorial efforts                                      | Quality assurance comparable to printed media by application of OA conventions and rules  |
| <b>Announcement of the printed publication in the AIW database, no further activity</b>                 | <b>Cost free scientific information and texts for the AIW community as well as for a broader audience using the www</b>   |
| -   | -   |
| <b>AIW contributions not consolidated, but spread over various media with different focus</b>           | Quality assurance and editorial tasks on side of the AIW (voluntary teams, scientific renommée...)  |
| Long-term project, print media are flooded by contributions   | <b>Long-term project organizationally, requires stable framework conditions</b>   |
| <b>Reader pay for access, therefore target audience is restricted and specialized, subscriber-based</b> | <b>Costs to be paid by the author (APC Article Processing Charges) respectively by appropriate funding. Effort to organize. Carefully bypass „predatory publishers“</b> |

\*OA golden way: to publish directly digital, no previous publication in a print medium

OA green way: first publication in a print medium, check if there is a secondary publication clause. Aligned to that, afterwards optionally digital

# Description „Step Two“ p.3/ Options for an AIW-OA, option A

## I. AIW options to establish a publication media using the Open Access approach

- I. Communities' collaboration with an AIW hosting University, participation in existing procedures... *to be discussed e.g. "Transmotion" (<https://journals.kent.ac.uk/index.php/transmotion>), clarification with James et. al., or LMU offering regarding Open Access Journals ([https://www.ub.uni-muenchen.de/schreiben/open-access-publizieren/kompakt/open\\_journals\\_lmum/index.html](https://www.ub.uni-muenchen.de/schreiben/open-access-publizieren/kompakt/open_journals_lmum/index.html)), clarification with Henry et. al. !!! // or any other ideas?*

### I. Descriptive Criteria, *to be discussed*

- I. Usage of existing publishers' infrastructure, procedures and experience
- II. Participation regarding entries in OA registers, archiving mechanisms for OA registers, adequate licence models
- III. Shared editorial board and responsibility for editorial tasks with the respective partner University
- IV. Common choice and set up of the appropriate editorial process
- V. Production editors to be established on AIW side (proof reading, style guide, formatting, release...)
- VI. Participation in Institutes' possibilities to get funding
- VII. Cost calculation and apportionment method to authors each year respectively funding efforts, clarification of pre-financing
- VIII. Financial responsibility usually lies with the Institute
- IX. Mixed EU and Non-EU team presumably will suffer difficulties /lack of clarity (financing options EU/Non-EU budgets, rules, laws ...)

# Description „Step Two“ p.4/ Options for an AIW-OA, option B

## II. “Lease” platform and use the OJS for OA publications – coordinated by AIW

### I. Descriptive Criteria

- I. Usage of experienced Open Source Software, development consolidated by PKP (Public Knowledge Project, <https://pkp.sfu.ca>)
- II. Participation in existing procedures regarding entries in OA registers, archiving mechanisms for OA registers...
- III. Software provides the appropriate role models for the publication of **Journals**, e.g. SysAdmin, Journal ManagerIn, Appraiser/Expert, Editor, Author, Reader...)
- IV. All roles are to be filled by the AIW (SysAdmins, Editorial board and responsibility for editorial tasks, incl. peer-review process, production editors for proof reading, style guide, formatting, typesetting, release...)
- V. Checklist for the publication of Open Access Journals available, [https://www.oana.at/fileadmin/user\\_upload/k\\_oana/publikationen/](https://www.oana.at/fileadmin/user_upload/k_oana/publikationen/)
- VI. The OJS Software is free, but there is a hosting server/partner needed (Universities, Libraries...list of possible partner organizations within DACH <https://ojs-de.net/netzwerk/ojs-standorte-im-deutschsprachigen-raum>. Partner and costs for hosting services to be clarified
- VII. Cost calculation and apportionment method to authors each year respectively funding efforts
- VIII. More information on <https://pkp.sfu.ca/ojs> or <https://ojs-de.net/start>

# Description „Step Two“ p.5/ Options for an AIW-OA, option C

## III. Find a publishing company as a cooperation partner, e.g. logos Verlag, Berlin, [www.logos-verlag.de/openaccess](http://www.logos-verlag.de/openaccess) (“enablement” partner of the BMBF, Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany)

### I. Descriptive criteria

- I. Preferred format for annual publications (like Yearbooks, Anthologies, Proceedings...) would be a “Schriftenreihe/ Series of Publication” due to publication cycle once a year. Advantages regarding editorial tasks (quality assurance, reviews by the editor, not necessarily a complex peer review process)
- II. Licences according to OA standards CC BY-NC-ND / CC BY-NC-SA (Creative Common By “Non-Derivative” / “Share-Alike”)
- III. Production of printed and digital versions
- IV. Production editing /copy editing on publisher’s side (style guide, formatting, typesetting)
- V. Support with editing tasks possible (language control, formalities, cross-checks)
- VI. Physical hosting on publisher’s systems and additional public databases (Open Research Library, Zenodo, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek...)
- VII. Participation in existing procedures regarding entries in OA registers, archiving mechanisms for OA registers, Index machines like DOAB and CrossRefs for DOI’s
- VIII. Editorial Team to be established on AIW side (proof reading, quality control, releases...in case of peer-review method even more complex)
- IX. Cost calculation and apportionment to authors each year (APC, Article Processing Charges) respectively search for funding

# Description „Step Two“ p.5/ main pluses/minuses

## I. Advantages / Disadvantages for each option

### I. Option A: Collaboration with an AIW hosting University and its existing media (e.g. „Transmotion“, Cyprus and Kent)

| +  | -  |
|--|--|
| Benefit from existing processes, methods, structures | EU / non-EU issues presumably to consider  |
| Financial responsibility lies with the institute     | Financial responsibility lies with the institute   |
| Stabilize publishing processes in a long term        | Annually switch from one organizing institute to another in terms of publishing not affordable |
| Presumably funding options through the institution   | AIW publications will slowly follow to Institutes' priorities?                                 |
| ...  | ...  |

# Description „Step Two“ p.6/ main pluses/minuses

## II. Option B: “Lease” and use a standardized platform, e.g. OJS platform for OA publications

| + | -  |
|---|--|
|   | Need to contract a hosting partner for running the platform; for the AIW as a non-corporation or non-legal person not possible from my perspective |

## II. Option C: Find a publishing company as a cooperation partner, e.g. logos Verlag (“enablement” partner of the BMBF, Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Germany)

| +   | -  |
|---|--|
| Coordinating role of the AIW as managing editor   | Financial responsibility lies with the AIW, calculation and apportionment to authors, need of structures for invoicing and payment, and a (additional?) committee member for treasurer |
| Participation in existing practises and experience, task delegation to the publisher possible, even copy editing; publisher above mentioned provides a printed and online version | Somebody is needed to contract the publisher which role would it be? Formally there has to be an editor who will be the contact person for the publisher                               |
| Benefit from standardized OA processes  | The workload in general; and: reputation must first be developed   |
| Independent AIW publication with „logo and brand“   |  |
| ...   | ...  |

# Recommendations and probable costs, p.1

## I. Step one: “as-is” repository with comment areas, closed for the AIW

- I. Standard package “Dropbox Business Standard”
  - I. Flexible license model
    - I. with core users who require a license and associated teams, “readers/commentors”, which will be invited to join the application by link (authors+organizers , *discuss: plus registered participants or all AIW members?*)
    - II. Switch from business standard version (to be paid) to cost free basic version during inactive months possible
  - II. Required core functionality available
    - I. Comment fields/columns not within the file but separately in columns assigned to the respective document
    - II. Download prevention can be set via permission (which I’d recommend)
    - III. Encryption functionality with the package
- II. License costs to be paid for core users € 12,--/month/user
- III. Suggested model:

To buy annually business standard licenses for core users (managing editors, organizers, authors) valid for a limited period of two months and invite all others by sending out the link to the directory to comment files. After the active period has ended switch to the cost free basic mode (attention: not for archiving purposes, because backup/recovery is not guaranteed with the basic version).

Assumption: 40 core users plus multiple invitees for two months/year  
€ 960,-- + VAT

timeframe e.g.:  
two weeks for uploads, 4 weeks for comments, two weeks for updates/ closure and switch to basic  
=> timeframe requires discipline and deadline accuracy

# Recommendations and probable costs, p.2

## I. Step two: publishing option with Open Access for the AIW

- I. Wait for the publication activities of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Workshop in connection with “Transmotion” and learn from the respective experiences. Invite James/Colleagues and the authors of 2021 to discuss the lessons learned
- II. Move any decision regarding publishing activities – which would be AIW coordinated - to the first quarter of 2022
- III. But down select as soon as possible an option (A/B/C) as a working hypothesis to follow up with in 2022. This down selected option needs to be matched with the 2021 experiences later on.

I. Recommended down selected option: “**C**” – cooperation of the AIW with a publishing company (description and plus/minus see p. 12,14)

II. Probable costs based on non binding statements of two publishers (orally)

€ 4.000 – 7.000 + VAT (Waxmann Verlag), requires down payment

€ 5.000 – 10.000 + VAT (logos Verlag), no down payment required

**assumption/ calculation model** (logos Verlag)

30 contributions, each 15. pages ~ € 6.000 incl. copy editing and book setting + VAT

-> € 200 / author resp. use a fixed price with buffer **€ 250 /author**

(saving option € 2.000 by exclusion of book setting/ copy editing)



# Funding proposals

- I. Funding step one “repository closed for the AIW with comment area”**  
(estimated costs based on proposal p.15, € 960 + VAT)
  - I. increase of the conference fee
  - II. annually community-wide funding call
  - III. ... any other options??
- II. Funding step two “AIW workshop contributions as Open Access Online Journals / Yearbooks**
  - I. APC (article processing funding) – apportionment to authors
  - II. In case of cooperation with institutions check the options there
  - III. “Crowd funding”, see more information under [www.crowdfunding.de](http://www.crowdfunding.de) (e.g. “GoFundMe”, “Crowdify”)
  - IV. ...any other options??

# Feasibility and Prerequisites

## I. Step one: “repository closed for the AIW with comment area”

- I. I'd recommend to start with a pilot in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2021
- II. The objective of the pilot should be the Workshop of 2020 retrospectively as a test case
- III. Select the speaker group + organizer + managing editors as the core user group
- IV. Select other registered members as an extended user (reader/commentator) group
- V. Usage of a cost free test license of Dropbox Business Standard (30 days valid)  
  
[challenge:  
- we cannot “test-the-test” unless we don't have a second computer and second email-address...  
- timeframe requires discipline and deadline accuracy]  
  
timeframe:     2 weeks preparation and upload of files  
                  3 weeks comment period  
                  1 week review and conclude
- VI. Set up of a small team of managing editors (2-3) to handle the pilot and check suitability, prepare basic conduct guidelines
- VII. Regular start of the repository after clarification of the financing and the teaming with the 2022 workshop

## II. Step two: publishing option with Open Access for the AIW

- I. Detailing questions or discussion points in the fourth quarter 2021
- II. Decision-making in the first quarter of 2022

# Decision table

tbd

# Backup

# Glossary

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| APC     | Article Processing Charge   | Apportionment to the author in order to publish an article using an open access approach   |
| CC      | Creative Commons (by attribution)<br><br>-nc<br>-nd<br>-sa<br><br>CC BY NC-SA | The most common licenses used in open access publishing<br>-Non commercial (not to use for commercial purposes)<br>-No Derivatives (the work must not be changed)<br>-Shared Alike (disclosure under the same conditions)<br><br>Attribution, non-commercial, sharing alike, see <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses">https://creativecommons.org/licenses</a> |
| DOAB    | Directory of Open Access Books  | DOAB is a community-driven discovery service that indexes and provides access to scholarly, peer-reviewed open access books and helps users to find trusted open access book publishers. All DOAB services are free of charge and all data is freely available.  |
| DOI(J)  | Directory of Open Access (Journals)   | Indexes and provides access to high quality OA, peer-reviewed journals   |
| (e)ISSN |   | international standard number for sequential collections   |
| OA      | Open Access   | Open Access is free access to academic literature and other materials on the Internet  |
| OJS     | Open Journal Systems  | Software for the administration and publication of scientific articles   |