

## **Free Journal Network (FJN) Annual General Meeting 2023 Meeting Minutes**

23 May 2023 – virtual meeting (Gotomeeting)

Meeting start: 17:00 CEST / Meeting end: 18:30 CEST

Documented by: Wendy Patterson, FJN Secretary

### **Members in attendance**

Virginia Steel (VS), Patrick Trettenbrein (PT), Jamie Farquharson (JF), Mark C. Wilson (MW), Wendy Patterson (WP), Andrzej Klimczuk (AK), Simon Battebury (SB), Lou Balogh (LB), Miguel Oliveira Jr. (MO), Joline Schmallenbach (JS), Cath Jex (CJ), Thomas Guillemaud (TG), Tibor Krisztin (TK), José Luis Bravo Trinidad (JLBT), Pandelis Perakakis (PP)

Board members not in attendance: Jean-Sébastien Caux, Elyse Gustafson, Matthieu Latapy, Michaël Poss

### **Voting and voting outcome**

Nominating process:

All members were notified on April 14, 2023 that nominations were open for two Board member seats. The notification was posted in the member forum on GitLab. A reminder was sent on May 16, 2023.

Motion #1 raised (VS):

Proposal to conduct Board election vote by voice and hand raising. All hands will remain held until counting is complete. A simple majority voting will determine the outcome.

Motion #1 was seconded (LB).

14 attendees voted “yes”; no abstentions; no “no” votes against.

Motion #1 was passed.

Voting:

Motion #2 raised (VS):

Proposal to nominate the following Board candidates:

Jamie Farquharson (current Journal Representative) - Editor-in-Chief Volcanica - <https://jifarquharson.github.io/> - Proposal to nominate to FJN Secretary

Wendy Patterson (current FJN Founding Secretary) - Scientific Director Beilstein-Institut <https://www.linkedin.com/in/pattersonwendy/> - Proposal to nominate as FJN Journal Representative

Motion #2 was seconded (PT).

Votes were cast and 11 attendees were in agreement to pass the motions. 3 members abstained from the voting (President and candidates). There were no “no” votes against.

Motion #2 was passed.

## **Topics of business**

The FJN President initiated a short introductions round.

The FJN President gave a presentation based on the slides “President Report” found in the Annex of these meeting minutes.

The FJN Secretary conducted the election of officers. The results are given in the “Voting and voting outcomes” section.

The FJN President gave an overview of the financial status based on the financial report “FJN Financials” found in the Annex.

Discussion: MW proposed a new procedure to approve debits from the FJN bank account. His proposal was that any payment must be approved by any two board members in addition to the treasurer. The members were in agreement with this plan. MW will take the issue to the Board to develop and enact an official procedure.

The FJN President gave a report of the fundraising efforts over the last year (details found in the slides “President Report” in the annex).

The FJN President made announcements about and a request for members to apply for FJN Grants.

The FJN Secretary gave an overview of what would be required for FJN to commit to becoming a [Crossref Sponsor](#). If FJN were to become a Crossref Sponsor, it would be responsible for oversight to ensure members are delivering good metadata and FJN would agree to financially support the registration of DOIs of its members and would take care of the billing. FJN would also need a dedicated technical contact to support members if they have questions regarding registering DOIs and delivering metadata. WP emphasized the need for a volunteer for this technical contact. WP will post in the forum to see if other members have interest in being supported by FJN in this way and to see if anyone would be willing to volunteer to serve as the technical contact.

Discussion:

MW: what is the downside?; WP: FJN would be financially responsible and we must ensure we have funds to pay for the DOIs if we enter into this program;

MW: Who is responsible for the enforcement of metadata quality? Do we have to monitor this? What happens if journals don't meet requirements; WP: in the worst case the journal can't register the article if they don't provide enough details. The requirements are already very low and most who want to register DOIs will want to provide the basic metadata for visibility reasons.

WP: who would be potentially interested? (no immediate interest was indicated)

AK: registering DOIs with Datacite but considering other options.

JS: our journal uses datacite because of cost. (Datacite is cheaper than Crossref)

LB: our journal uses scholar sticker (?) for DOIs; DOI registration is embedded into the workflow already.

AK: iThenticate/Similarity Check is too expensive to use for the journal; it would be helpful if access to Similarity Check would be possible. Would help with the increasing issues with fraud, papermills, etc.

JF: OASPA members get Crossref membership for free plus 50 DOIs. The lowest tier is now \$75. However the OASPA selection process is time consuming and journals must be able to produce XML versions of their articles.

The FJN Secretary gave a report on the current landscape of scholar-led diamond OA initiatives. The overview included:

- [DIAMAS](#) Project - an EU project with the goal of improving the efficiency and quality of Institutional Publishing Service Providers (IPSPs - that's us).
- [CRAFT](#) OA - an EU project with the goal of strengthening Diamond OA by improving the technological bases of its platforms, software and infrastructure.
- OASPA's support for scholar-led and non-profit: [Webinar](#) on funding journals without transformative agreements; Equity in OA Workshop series (WP was on the panel for [Workshop #2](#)).
- Initiatives from Science Europe supporting diamond OA; [Diamond OA Global Summit](#) in Toluca, Mexico in October 2023.
- Rise of [Subscribe to Open](#)
- On May 4th, the EU Council published [Recommendations](#) which were immediately [supported](#) by many major European research organizations. The focus on interoperable, not-for-profit infrastructures based on open source software and open standards is inspirational and a step in a better direction for scholarly publishing. Note that such "recommendations" have huge political weight, despite the seemingly lightness of the word. In the EU, Recommendations are an important political instrument and in this case the ministries of science will need to act.
- [CoARA](#) - is making headway working to improve research assessment in Europe

Open Discussion:

LB: the projects in europe are not of interest to the US; we need collective funding solutions; the metrics are essential;

## **Actions agreed to be taken**

MW: Discuss a new method to approve payments with the Board requiring two Board members.

MW: Post details about FJN Member Grants in the online forum.

WP: Start a discussion in the Forum about the Crossref Sponsorship Program and make a formal request for a volunteer.

## **Annex**

Part 1: President Report.pdf / FJN President, Mark Wilson

Part 2: FJN Financials.pdf / FJN Treasurer, Elyse Gustafson (presented by FJN President)