



EGU announces 2015 awards and medals

The EGU has named the 35 recipients of next year's Union Medals and Awards, Division Medals, and Division Outstanding Young Scientists Awards. These individuals, from both European and non-European countries, are honoured for their important contributions to the Earth, planetary and space sciences. They will receive their prizes at the EGU 2015 General Assembly, which will take place in Vienna on 12–17 April. The EGU has also announced the winners of the Outstanding Student Poster (OSP) Awards corresponding to the 2014 General Assembly.

The following individuals will receive 2015 Union Medals and Awards:

- **Hubert Savenije** – Alexander von Humboldt Medal
- **Sergej Zilitinkevich** – Alfred Wegener Medal
- **Carlo Laj** – Arthur Holmes Medal
- **Jonathan I. Lunine** – Jean Dominique Cassini Medal
- **Manuele Faccenda, Katrin Schroeder, Francesca Pianosi and Jérémie Mouginot** – Arne Richter Award for Outstanding Young Scientists

The following individuals will receive 2015 Division Medals:

- **Gregory Houseman** – Augustus Love Medal
- **Göran Ekström** – Beno Gutenberg Medal
- **Kristine M. Larson** – Christiaan Huygens Medal
- **Peter Janssen** – Fridtjof Nansen Medal
- **Robert L. Lysak** – Hannes Alfvén Medal
- **Nick van de Giesen** – Henry Darcy Medal
- **Wolfgang Schlager** – Jean Baptiste Lamarck Medal
- **Diane McKnight** – John Dalton Medal
- **Sami Solanki** – Julius Bartels Medal
- **Daniel Schertzer** – Lewis Fry Richardson Medal
- **Michiel van den Broeke** – Louis Agassiz Medal
- **Toshihiko Shimamoto** – Louis Néel Medal
- **Paul Valdes** – Milutin Milankovic Medal
- **Ingrid Kögel-Knabner** – Philippe Duchaufour Medal
- **Alfredo M. Lagmay** – Plinius Medal

- **Heather Viles** – Ralph Alger Bagnold Medal
- **John C. Eichelberger** – Sergey Soloviev Medal
- **Evgueni B. Burov** – Stephan Mueller Medal
- **Geoffrey Blewitt** – Vening Meinesz Medal

The following individuals will receive 2015 Division Outstanding Young Scientist Awards:

- **Richard Davy** – Atmospheric Sciences (AS) Division
- **James Rae** – Biogeosciences (BG) Division
- **Jeremy D. Shakun** – Climate: Past, Present & Future (CL) Division
- **Krzysztof Sośnica** – Geodesy (G) Division
- **Omar Bartoli** – Geochemistry, Mineralogy, Petrology & Volcanology (GMPV) Division
- **Bertrand Bonfond** – Planetary and Solar System Sciences (PS) Division
- **Patrick Grunert** – Stratigraphy, Sedimentology and Palaeontology (SSP) Division
- **Paulo Pereira** – Soil System Sciences (SSS) Division

The EGU Awards Committee received 121 applications for the 2015 awards, with 19% of them nominating female scientists (17% of this year's awardees are female). For more information about the awards above, including application and selection criteria and how to apply, please check the [Awards & Medals](#) page on the EGU website.

In addition to the Union and Division Awards and Medals, the EGU also bestows a number of poster awards to students taking part in its annual General Assembly. These OSP Awards aim to further improve the overall quality of poster presentations and foster students' excitement to present posters at a large scientific conference. The list of recipients of the 2014 OSP Awards is now available [online on the EGU website](#). For more information about the OSP awards, including application criteria and how to apply in 2015, please check the [OSP page](#).

An earlier version of this article was [published on the EGU website](#).



A few of last year's awardees pose with the EGU President and Vice-President at the EGU 2014 Awards Ceremony. (Credit: EGU/Foto Pfluegl)

EGU 2015: call for papers open until early January

From now, up until 7 January 2015, you can submit your abstract for the upcoming EGU General Assembly (EGU 2015). In addition to established scientists, PhD students and other early career researchers are welcome to submit abstracts to present their research at the conference. The deadline for the receipt of abstracts is **07 January 2015, 13:00 CET**.

Further, the EGU encourages undergraduate and master students to submit abstracts on their dissertations or final-year projects. The EGU recognises that there are many outstanding students who would benefit from attending and presenting at the General Assembly and, therefore, provides a discounted registration rate to this group. Interested undergraduates can apply to present a poster (or



See you next year! (Credit: EGU/Stephanie McClellan)

talk) on research undertaken in a laboratory setting, on a mapping or field project they've been involved in during their degrees, or any other research project of relevance.

You can browse through the EGU 2015 sessions [on the conference website](#). Clicking on 'please select' will allow you to search for sessions by Programme Group and submit your abstract to the relevant session either as plain text, LaTeX, or a MS Word document. Further guidelines on [how to submit an abstract are available](#) on the EGU 2015 website.

An innovative presentation format – Presenting Interactive Content, better known as PICO – has been implemented at the General Assembly since 2013. PICO sessions bring together the advantages of both oral and poster sessions, allowing authors to present the essence of their work and follow it up with interactive discussion. Please note that some sessions are 'PICO only' sessions, meaning you cannot select oral/poster preference.

EGU 2015 will take place from 12 to 17 April 2015 in Vienna, Austria. For more information on the General Assembly, see the [EGU 2015 website](#) and follow us on [Twitter](#) (#EGU15 is the conference hashtag) and [Facebook](#).

An earlier version of this article was [published on the EGU blog, GeoLog](#).

Open access: access to knowledge

In a post on the EGU blog, GeoLog, Sam Illingworth, a Lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University and the EGU Young Scientist Representative on the Programme Committee, writes about the Open Access movement and how it contributes to provide a wider access to knowledge.

“Access to knowledge is a basic human right.” Yet sadly as scientists we are often forced to operate in a framework in which this is not always the case. The week of 20–26 October saw the celebration of the eighth [Open Access Week](#), and whilst there have undoubtedly been many achievements by the Open Access (OA) movement since 2009, there is still a long way to go before mankind's basic human right to knowledge is restored.

So why all the big fuss about OA in the first instance? If you are reading this as a layperson or as a scientist at the outset of their scientific career, then you may be surprised to find out that it costs (often large sums of) money to read online research articles. Even if these fees are not being charged to you personally, the chances are that it is costing your research institution or library thousands of pounds/euros/dollars that could otherwise be spent on research, resources, jobs, or infrastructure (as an example, in 2009, Clemson University in the US, an institute with less than 17,000 students,

spent an astonishing [\\$1.3 million on journal subscriptions](#) to the publishing magnate Elsevier alone).

[Over the past 30 years, journal prices have out priced inflation by over 250%](#); but it wasn't always like this. In the past journals existed for two reasons: as an affordable option for scientists to publish their work in (as opposed to the more expensive option of personally-published books), and as a place where members of the general public and the wider scientific community could find out about the advances in science that their taxes were helping to fund. Sadly, in recent times many journals seem to have lost their way on both counts, hence the need to open it up again.

The beginning of the modern OA movement can be traced back to the 4th July 1971, when Michael Hart launched [Project Gutenberg](#), a volunteer effort to digitise and archive cultural works for free. However, it wasn't until 1989 (and with the advent of the Internet) that the first digital-only, free journals were launched, amongst them [Psycoloquy](#) by Stevan Harnad and [The Public-Access Computer Systems Review](#) by Charles W. Bailey Jr.

Since then, the OA movement has grown considerably, although it is important to note that publishing articles so that they are free for

all is itself not without expense. Despite the lack of print and mailing costs, there are still large infrastructure and staffing overheads that need to be taken into consideration, and so rather than make the reader pay, alternatives have to be found.

One alternative, known as the **Gold route** to OA, is to make the author(s) of the article pay for the right to have their research accessible by all. Many journals already require an Article Processing Charge (APC) to be paid before publication, and so some journals have simply elected to add an additional charge if the author wants to make their journal open to the general public.

The other main alternative is the **Green route** to OA, which involves the author placing their journal in a central repository, which is then made available to all. The journal in which the article was originally published will usually enforce an embargo period of a number of months or years that must pass before the published articles can be placed in these repositories, although this can often be circumnavigated by uploading final, 'accepted for publication', drafts of the article. You can read more about OA subject repositories in [this article](#).

Both of these approaches to OA have their respective advantages and disadvantages, and normally research intuitions and/or funding bodies guide the route that researchers choose. The Research Councils UK (RCUK), for example, have a policy (which can be found [here](#)) that supports both the Gold and the Green routes to OA, though it has a preference for immediate access with the maximum opportunity for reuse. It is worth noting at this point that another key aim of the OA movement is that published research is free to reuse in future studies. This might seem like a fairly trivial point, but currently for any articles published in closed access journals, express permission is needed from the publishers if the results are to be used in any future studies.

The major barrier that still needs to be overcome with regards to OA is determining who pays for the right to free access. At the moment many governments have a centralised pot, which they allocate to

their different research institutes. However, issues arise when one considers the limitations that this imposes on poorer countries, institutes, research disciplines, and independent researchers. There is also the minefield of determining who gets how much and why. My own institute, Manchester Metropolitan University, has only been [allocated enough funds](#) to pay for 7 academic papers a year via the Gold route to OA. When you consider that some researchers would hope to publish that many papers themselves on a yearly basis, there is clearly a disconnect. It is for these reasons that many are pushing for OA 2.0, an initiative in which articles are, in the words of EGU's former executive secretary Arne Richter, "[Free to Read, Free to Download and Free to Publish](#)." However, such an approach will require a major change in the modus operandi of almost all publishing companies. It is worth noting that Copernicus, who are responsible for publishing the majority of EGU's affiliated journals are very strong proponents of the Open Access movement, and have been one of the leading lights in an otherwise murky world.

The sad truth of the matter is that many of the more traditional journals are now run as big-business, moneymaking machines, safe in the knowledge that they can get away with charging large fees, because scientists are still desperate to publish in places with a 'high-impact'. However, if enough scientists rise up and move away from these restrictive journals, and migrate towards those with an OA policy, then the impact factors will soon follow suit (in fact, there is already [strong evidence](#) that publishing in an OA journal will result in more citations for your research). Only then can we begin to reinstate knowledge as a basic human right available to all, rather than as an expensive luxury dolled out to the privileged few who can afford it.

Sam Illingworth

Lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University and EGU Young Scientist Representative on the Programme Committee

An earlier version of this article was [published on the EGU blog, GeoLog](#).

