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Foreword

This report summarises the main findings from the OAPEN-UK research project, a five-year study into open access monograph publishing in the humanities and social sciences.

OAPEN-UK was designed to work collaboratively and in an agile manner, supporting and responding to developments in the wider monograph publishing environment. Detailed research findings have been published throughout the project, and are available on the project website: http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org

This report provides an overview of those findings, summarising the key messages and recommendations from the project and its many sub-reports.

We would like to thank Jisc and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), members of our steering group, Ben Johnson at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the editors of our guides – James Baker, Martin Eve and Ernesto Priego – Graham Stone, and everyone that participated in this project, including the researchers without whom this study could not have been undertaken.
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About OAPEN-UK

OAPEN-UK was a five year study into open access monograph publishing. When the project was established in 2010, open access policy and debates focused mainly on journals, especially those in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects.

Jisc and the AHRC funded OAPEN-UK to look at open access for monographs – at that time a relatively novel idea – because books are such an important way for researchers in the humanities and social sciences to communicate their findings. The project has worked collaboratively with other initiatives over the last five years as interest in open access monographs has grown.

OAPEN-UK’s core principles were to:

» Be a consultative and collaborative project, working with all stakeholders in the monograph publishing process. A steering group, made up of publishers, librarians, funders and researchers, has guided the research to keep it relevant and informed.

» Provide an evidence base to underpin other organisations’ policies, projects and plans for open access monographs, beginning from a neutral standpoint about the value of open access for monographs.

» Respond agilely to developments in the wider scholarly communications environment, producing findings that continued to be relevant to all stakeholders.


In turn, these projects have all informed the development of OAPEN-UK, which has responded to the rapidly changing environment for open access monographs. Each year, we reshaped our research programme to ensure our research and findings remained relevant for existing and emerging stakeholders. Throughout the project we have aimed to provide funders, policy makers, publishers, institutions, learned societies and researchers themselves with the knowledge they need to make informed decisions about open access monographs.
**About OAPEN-UK**

**OAPEN-UK steering group**

- Mark Llewellyn, director of research, AHRC
- Ian Lyne, associate director of programmes, AHRC
- Neil Jacobs, head of scholarly communications support, Jisc
- Jonathan Connor, digital communications team manager, Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)
- Steven Hill, head of policy research, HEFCE
- Simon Bell, head of strategic partnerships and licensing, British Library
- Gabriel Egan, professor of Shakespeare studies, De Montfort University
- Malcolm Heath, professor of Greek language and literature, University of Leeds
- Martin Eve, senior lecturer in literature, technology and publishing, Birkbeck, University of London
- Fytton Rowland, formerly of the department of information science, Loughborough University
- Jill Russell, digital assets programme manager, University of Birmingham
- Graham Stone, information resources manager, University of Huddersfield
- Iain Hrynaszkiewicz, head of data and HSS publishing, Nature Publishing Group
- Mark Majurey, commercial director, digital publishing, Taylor & Francis Group
- Anthony Cond, managing director, Liverpool University Press
- David Barker, publishing director, Bloomsbury Publishing
- Sarah Lewis, head of commissioning, University Wales Press
- Alison Jones, managing editor, open access, Oxford University Press
- Eelco Ferwerda, director, OAPEN Foundation
- Caren Milloy, deputy director, Jisc Collections (project manager)
- Ellen Collins, research consultant, Research Information Network (research officer)

**Former members**

- David House, former deputy vice chancellor, University of Brighton (chair)
- Lorraine Estelle, COUNTER project director, COUNTER (chair)
- Shearer West, deputy vice chancellor, University of Sheffield
- Philip Pothen, head of communications, AHRC
- Gary Grubb, associate director of programmes, AHRC
- Hazel Newton, head of author services, Nature Publishing Group
- Geraldine Billingham, editorial director, journals and major reference works, Bloomsbury Academic
- Helen Toone, digital development programme manager, Oxford University Press
This section briefly sets some of the context for the OAPEN-UK project: more detailed information can be found via the ‘further reading’ section at the end of the report.

Long-form communication remains an essential part of the scholarly landscape in the humanities and social sciences (HSS). Researchers use monographs to explore ideas in depth, gather together a corpus of work that may have been completed over years or decades, and to set forth arguments that could not be contained within a journal article. They also remain important career markers for academics seeking work. Researchers, publishers, librarians, institutional managers and learned societies all remain committed to monograph publishing (Crossick, 2014 - http://bit.ly/1wpzNru).

But the way that books are produced and used is slowly changing. The development of e-books, some of which are increasingly sophisticated in their functionality, offers new opportunities for authors, readers and publishers. Some researchers envisage a future where software and services overlaid on e-books make new types of research possible (Eve, 2014 - http://bit.ly/1ltEkPU). Most humanities and social science researchers are making slower moves towards e-books; happy to use them where the functionality makes research easier but still retaining a strong attachment to print (Housewright et al, 2012 - http://bit.ly/1PBOiXY). Peer review remains paramount for researchers when thinking about e-books or about new types of long-form communication.

Open access had not made major inroads into the UK humanities and social sciences journals market when OAPEN-UK began work. That may be because the problem that open access models seek to solve – researchers’ need for immediate access to the newest discoveries, unfettered by high subscription costs and restrictive licences – is less widespread in HSS than in STEM. As UK policy on open access became more defined, many HSS researchers were concerned that their disciplinary cultures and challenges were not being acknowledged, and had severe reservations about the relevance of open access publishing for their work. Open access for monographs has begun from a more consultative position and so there is less hostility to the principle, though still concerns about the practicalities (Crossick, 2014 - http://bit.ly/1wpzNru).

Figure 1 shows the progress of policies, projects, publishing models and research that affected open access monographs over the course of OAPEN-UK. It is not exhaustive, but provides a sense of the growth and change over time. For a detailed view of the progress, see the Appendix.
Figure 1 - The development of the open access monograph landscape, 2008 - 2016
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OAPEN-UK project activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OAPEN project launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open Book Publishers founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Humanities Press launch OA book series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bloomsbury Academic start publishing OA books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OAPEN report on user needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Huddersfield Press starts offering OA monograph publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OAPEN report on best practices and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OAPEN report on OA business models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OAPEN-NL project launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>First OAPEN-UK steering group meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OAPEN Library launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK invites publishers to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OAPEN final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>OAPEN foundation launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK publisher contracts signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK year 1 begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK research plan agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK qualitative research begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK institution focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK publisher focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK researcher focus group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External activity in monographs

OAPEN-UK project activity

22  SpringerOpen Books launched
23  OAPEN-UK research manager focus group
24  OAPEN-UK aggregator focus group
25  OAPEN-UK learned society focus group
26  OAPEN-UK funder focus group
27  Soft launch of Directory of Open Access books (DOAB)
28  OAPEN-UK 2012 researcher survey
29  Finch report launched
30  Government response to Finch report
31  RCUK OA policy announced
32  OAPEN-UK end of year 1
33  OAPEN-UK start of year 2
34  OAPEN-UK RHS case study
35  OAPEN-UK 2012 benchmarking survey
36  OAPEN-UK infographic workshops
37  Palgrave Open includes monographs
38  RCUK OA policy comes into effect
39  OAPEN-UK RSA case study
40  OpenEdition Books launches
41  OAPEN-UK publisher interviews
42  Ubiquity Press launches publishing OA monographs
43  Wellcome Trust OA policy includes books
44  Open Book Publishers wins IFLA/Brill OA award
45  OAPEN-UK institution case studies
46  British Academy publishes Debating Open Access
47  OA Monographs Conference at the British Library
48  Guide to Creative Commons launched
49  Official DOAB launch
50  HEFCE OA consultation
51  OAPEN-UK end of year 2
52  OAPEN-UK start of year 3
53  Routledge Books OA launches
54  Knowledge Unlatched commences
55  OAPEN-NL final report released
56  OA Monographs Conference report released
57  OpenEdition Books freemium model launched
58  Horizon2020 OA policy announced
External activity in monographs

OAPEN-UK project activity

59 Knowledge Unlatched Round One Pilot report
60 HEFCE OA policy announced
61 Knowledge Unlatched wins the IFLA/Brill Open Access Award
62 OAPEN-UK 2014 researcher survey
63 Jisc National Monograph Strategy Roadmap published
64 OAPEN-UK librarian survey
65 OAPEN-UK end of year 3 and pilot
66 OAPEN-UK start of year 4
67 HEFCE Monographs and Open Access project established
68 OAPEN-UK funder interviews
69 Crossick report to HEFCE released
70 OpenAIRE pilot launched
71 OAPEN-UK SWOT workshops
72 Cambridge University Press launches open access monograph service
73 OAPEN-UK author interviews
74 UCL Press launches
75 Radical OA conference
76 DOAB wins IFLA/Brill OA Award
77 OAPEN-UK 2015 benchmarking service
78 HEFCE OA policy revised
79 Investigating OA Monograph Services project launched
80 Wellcome Trust Publisher Guide for OA Monographs launched
81 OAPEN-UK finishes
82 Guide to OA Monograph Publishing for researchers released
83 Knowledge Unlatched round two commences
84 OAPEN-UK final report released
Method

OAPEN-UK had two main strands of activity. The quantitative pilot project attempted to understand - broadly speaking - what happens when you make a monograph available in open access.

This covers the effect on sales and usage of the book, but also how publishers and their supply chains are affected when trying to make an open access monograph available.

The second strand of activity was a suite of qualitative projects designed to understand the practices, policies, processes and behaviours which would need to change if open access for monographs were to become more widespread. We worked with the main groups involved in publishing and promoting an academic book, including researchers, institutions, librarians, publishers, aggregators, learned societies and research funders.

Methodological details are available in the write-ups of the individual work packages.

The overall project was designed to be agile, iterative and responsive. Over our five years of work, the research programme and objectives developed in line with changes within and outside the project. We designed new work packages to address growing areas of interest, and adapted existing ones to reflect changing circumstances. Figure 2 shows the progress of the project over time.

For more information on the research and its objectives, see our project website: [http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/overview](http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/overview)
Figure 2 - OAPEN-UK project methodology

- Y1 data collection
- Review of data collection, negotiation with Amazon and Google
- Y2 data collection
- Review of data collection
- Y3 data collection
- Review of Y3 research plan
- Consultation with external projects on Y3 research plan
- 2014 researcher survey (with HEFCE)
- Librarian survey
- SWOT workshops
- 2012 researcher survey
- Need for Creative Commons guide identified
- Guide to Creative Commons for researchers
- Institutional case studies
- Learned society case studies
- Decision to include learned societies
- Initial stakeholder focus groups
- Author/publisher workshops
- Publishing infographic
- Publisher best practice guide
- Publisher interviews
Throughout this report we refer to findings from the work packages; you can read the full write-ups on the OAPEN-UK website.

- Initial stakeholder focus groups (http://bit.ly/1NFu9KB) - six workshops for researchers, institutional staff, publishers, funders, aggregators and learned societies to identify the most important areas for the project to focus upon

- 2012 researcher survey (http://bit.ly/1lwwf9g) - survey of UK HSS researchers covering issues including attitudes to open access publishing and Creative Commons licensing, preferences and priorities as both authors and readers, and views of the overall aims of scholarly communications

- Learned society case studies (http://bit.ly/1HZiWrF) - in-depth studies of two learned societies, exploring the relationship between their publishing work and their disciplinary support activities

- Publishing infographic (http://bit.ly/1MVwXa8) - built upon workshops with researchers and publishers, outlining the monograph publishing process from start to finish

- Institution case studies (http://bit.ly/1Ow82MX) - in-depth studies of three UK universities examining the possible effects of open access monographs on systems, policies, processes and attitudes across an entire institution

- 2014 researcher survey (http://bit.ly/1NdUy81) - survey of UK HSS researchers exploring the role of the monograph, the relationship between authors and their publishers and attitudes towards open access publishing

- Librarian survey (http://bit.ly/1HaTLSR) - survey of UK university librarians exploring their monograph acquisition strategies, attitudes to open access publishing and the potential impact of growth in open access monographs on libraries

- Publisher interviews (http://bit.ly/1OgYG4q) - in-depth interviews with representatives of eight UK monograph publishers, probing attitudes towards open access monograph publishing and exploring how systems, policies and processes would need to adapt to support open access

- Research funder interviews (http://bit.ly/1MDX7uq) - interviews with major funders of HSS research in the UK, exploring general perceptions of open access as well as their chief priorities and concerns

- SWOT workshops (http://bit.ly/1rH01Pt) - three workshops for publishers, librarians and researchers exploring perceived strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of various business models for open access monographs

- Matched pairs experiment (http://bit.ly/1l7mayV) - the final report from the matched pairs experiment

- Creative Commons guide for researchers (http://bit.ly/1cxDoF7) - answers to common questions and concerns expressed by researchers about Creative Commons licences

- Guide to open access monograph publishing (http://bit.ly/1TNqGIU) - information about the current state of open access monograph publishing in the UK and their options as authors and readers
Reporting the findings

Our research suggests that, if we want to move towards open access for monographs, change will need to happen in three important areas:

» Attitudes and perceptions
» Systems, policies and processes
» Business models

We are therefore presenting our findings under these three areas. Recommendations and lessons that we have learned while undertaking the project follow in a separate chapter.

Attitudes and perceptions
This section explores the perspectives of five main groups that will play an important role in any moves towards open access monograph publishing. Researchers, institutions, publishers, learned societies and funders all have views about existing models for publishing monographs and about the principles and practicalities of open access. These findings should shape the way that all stakeholders think and talk about possible moves towards open access for monographs. Constructive change has to be based upon an understanding of existing priorities for those with an interest in publishing monographs.

Systems, policies and processes
Getting a book from the author’s first idea to a reader’s eyes is a long and complicated undertaking. It involves numerous stakeholders, each with their own systems, policies and processes. Open access could potentially involve even more. This section examines the technical and organisational elements of producing a monograph and considers changes that are needed if open access books are to become a mainstream part of scholarly communications in the humanities and social sciences.

Business models
Open access for monographs is relatively new, and the landscape is rich in experimentation. We believe diversity will be crucial to the future sustainability of open access for monographs. So, rather than focusing on the pros and cons of specific business models, we have drawn out some important characteristics that we think a successful business model will show.
In this section we consider the attitudes and perceptions of five important groups that will need to play a role in any moves towards open access monograph publishing. Findings are drawn from across our work packages.

We stress throughout this report that books are not journals and that open access models for monographs cannot simply replicate those developed for serials. But when considering open access for monographs, interviewees and survey respondents could not help but be influenced by their experience and perceptions of open access for journal publishing. Any moves towards open access monograph publishing will need to consider how best to deal with these perceptions and attitudes, even where they are not yet backed up by evidence or, indeed, are unfounded in the monograph environment.
Researchers care greatly about books
This message resonates through almost every OAPEN-UK research finding. While there are of course differences depending on discipline and career stage, researchers who publish and use books care very deeply about them. For most researchers, including those in disciplines which are not typically book-heavy, a book is a career marker; a place to draw together and expand upon a body of work. Importantly, it is something that authors hope will have a lasting impact.

It follows that researchers put a lot of effort into placing their book with the publisher they think is best able to support and promote it. They consult with their peers, think about the publications they consider to be high quality within their discipline, and work with learned societies, PhD supervisors and others who might make suggestions or an introduction to editors. Of course, in some cases the book simply ends up with the first publisher to express an interest, or is commissioned (formally or informally) by a specific publisher, but there are usually other factors that lead authors to sign their contract. Placing a book is not a decision that most authors take lightly. Their priorities when selecting a publisher relate to quality assurance, dissemination and standing in the field.

Figure 3: Researchers who consider it important/very important to publish and access monographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publish</td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 researcher survey

Figure 4: Reasons for selecting publisher of last monograph published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Social sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can disseminate to audience I want to reach</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted quality assurance processes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best in my academic field</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First ones interested in my book</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned by publisher/editor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published with them before</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing relationship as peer reviewer</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good licensing/copyright arrangements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned society partnership</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open access publishers</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 researcher survey
Researchers expect publishers to share their concern for their book. They have high expectations of their publisher and these expectations are usually met. Often researchers feel their books are improved by going through the publishing process. But there are also areas of disappointment, especially around marketing and promotion of books. Researchers like to know that their books are reaching important audiences, including reviewers, and sometimes believe that publishers underperform here. This is important, as most authors do not want to take on marketing and promotion themselves. They are also keen to understand the performance of their books, and see better usage information as a possible advantage of open access. Across the board, researchers want to see core publisher functions protected in an open access world; they are often sympathetic to publishers who are seeking to maintain excellent service in the face of reducing profitability of books, especially where they participate in publishing as reviewers or editors.

Figure 5: Publisher services and author satisfaction levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Complete Satisfaction</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final print copy</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and layout</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and sales</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and promotion</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of peer review</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on early drafts</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 researcher survey
In most of our initial focus groups and throughout the project royalties appear as an important issue, but attitudes are not clear cut. Our survey work suggests that most authors do not prioritise royalties but the author interviews, although small in number, present a more nuanced view. Many researchers have a realistic understanding of the likely performance of their book. Royalties will not be important for a niche monograph but for a work with potential to become a core reading list text or to cross over into the trade market they are a bigger issue. Researchers seem happy to give up their royalties in the pursuit of open access as long as publishers will do the same with their profits – this probably aligns with the view, expressed by the majority of respondents to our 2012 survey, that publisher profits should go back into supporting their disciplines. Publishers and authors recognise that open access may not be appropriate for every monograph publication.

Figure 6: Publisher services that are important / very important to researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and sales</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and promotion</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of peer review</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy editing</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and layout</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print copy of the final book</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and guidance on early drafts of the manuscript</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival access to content</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage information/data</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation analysis</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales information/data</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 researcher survey
Our surveys suggest that humanities and social science researchers see bigger problems with publishing monographs than with accessing the books they need to read. But more detailed interviews highlight problems with limited download periods for e-books or an inability to get content quickly through the university library. Researchers remain attached to reading in print, particularly for books they will read all the way through or use more than once.

**Figure 7: Researchers who consider it both important and difficult to publish or access monographs**

![Bar chart showing 50% for publishing and 10% for accessing monographs.]

Source: 2014 researcher survey

“**There’s still a huge emotional attachment to printed books in some subjects, which library staff understand and wish to support.**”

Institutional case study

“**It’s clear that researchers in the arts and humanities still feel a real attachment to the printed book as an object with emotional resonance, in addition to the practical considerations.**”

Institutional case study

“**75% of authors considered it important or very important to receive a print copy of their book.**”

2012 researcher survey
Humanities and social science researchers have diverse ideas about open access

Our researcher surveys in both 2012 and 2014 show a strong level of support for open access. The author interviews confirm that authors see open access publishing as a way to increase their readership and many support it as a point of principle. But beyond this high-level agreement attitudes towards open access vary considerably. Authors have different views on precisely who would benefit from increased access to the books, on the ways in which open access should be implemented and on the benefits and costs to other players within the scholarly communication and higher education spheres. Many also feel that the principle is good, but implementation will be extremely difficult.

This probably reflects the huge diversity in how, why and where books are published within the humanities and social sciences. Each discipline, each press, even each institution, has its own ideas about how and why books are published and open access will affect a specialised history monograph in a very different way from a core legal text which appears on several student reading lists. Researcher attitudes also seem to be shaped by their career stage and their own previous experiences of publishing and contact with publishers. It follows that it will be difficult to create policies, processes and advocacy materials that will feel convincing and relevant to all humanities and social science researchers.

Publisher case studies

“Publishers strive to create a distinctive identity, specialising in particular fields or disciplines or publication types and recognise that they may be more attractive to authors at certain career stages.”

Publisher case studies

**Figure 8: Researcher attitudes towards the principle and implementation of open access models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA principle positive/very positive</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA implementation easy/very easy</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 researcher survey
Even a more personalised and practical approach may struggle to have a lasting impact. Authors whose books were part of the OAPEN-UK matched pairs experiment broadly felt that the experience had not improved their understanding of open access, though most expressed a positive feeling about the project. This lack of change may be because they do not recall receiving information about the project or because they received information but did not have time to read it. Institutional staff believe that humanities and social science researchers are primed by their disciplinary practices to interrogate policy changes, including those around open access, and they need support from funders and publishers to make a convincing case to researchers for open access.

Researchers are becoming more aware of the green route to open access. Institutions use their repository to manage and promote the university’s research outputs and academics are increasingly required to submit records of their publications, and often the full text. Experience with journal articles shows that this can be challenging in the humanities and social sciences: many disciplines do not have a culture of repository use and, in the few disciplines where researchers are used to depositing in a subject repository, the institutional repository can feel like unnecessary additional paperwork. Some academics also have concerns about the version submitted, for example many are not comfortable sharing or using author accepted manuscripts.

“They [researchers] are primed to ask lots of questions and it’s hard for us to go to them with new pronouncements unless they are properly thought through… if you can send a clear… message, then it makes it sit easier, even if you don’t like it, it still makes it an easier pill to swallow.”

Institutional case study

“Using pre-publication versions causes difficulties because repository staff have to add page and issue numbers before the content is in any way acceptable to researchers in HSS subjects.”

Institutional case study
Researchers’ strongest attachment is to their discipline, not their institution

When seeking support or advice about their research and career, most researchers turn first to their peers. Learned societies, which are numerous and often very specialised in the humanities and social sciences, are a more formal way of channeling information and support throughout a discipline but researchers may also seek informal advice from a network of colleagues. Institutional managers recognise that this peer support is really important, but also stress that it can cause problems for the university if peers or societies lack information or misunderstand the details of open access policies and processes. That said, it remains important that researchers receive information from sources outside the institution as this often gives alternative perspectives and raises issues that are important but may otherwise go unrecognised.

“The learned society acts] ‘almost like a trade union’ in the words of one interviewee. In recent years, the society has become much more active in this area, and is a first port of call when researchers are concerned about policy changes. These can be large-scale governmental reviews on issues such as research funding or school education, or they can be very local issues, such as the closure of a library.”

Learned society case study

“Another interviewee thought that this approach meant that researchers – and especially, less experienced ones – were often left working in the dark. He said he found the lack of support and mentoring available from more established academics for their younger peers was ‘quite shocking, actually’.”

Institutional case study

“Personal relationships can be at least as important as administrative systems in determining where researchers turn when they need help. Frequently, researchers naturally turn to colleagues within their own school for help, but that may well not always be the best option. It’s a frustration that the detailed expertise available within the research and enterprise function is not made better use of.”

Institutional case study
This reflects another challenge, one acknowledged by institutional managers. Researchers are often suspicious of initiatives from the university’s central management and can be unwilling to engage with new ways of doing things, especially where they believe them to be a distraction from their core business of doing and communicating research. Particularly evident in, for example, the slow uptake of the research management systems that all three case study institutions were implementing, it has clear implications for the introduction of open access mandates. Mandates from external funders may mean that open access is taken more seriously but, again, unless it affects the researcher directly this is not guaranteed. Another area of tension is around perceptions of the importance of books – researchers in some institutions feel books are valued differently by their discipline and their employer.

Researchers expect, and are expected, to undertake work outside the university in support of their discipline – for example, chairing conferences or editing journals and book series. This work can place significant demands upon their time but it is important for their career development. Most do not have time for complex policies and extra administration. Universities, publishers and funders recognise this and know they must keep systems simple.

There are also large numbers of researchers – especially early career and retired academics – who do extremely valuable research which deserves publication but who work outside academic institutions. Learned societies in particular, perhaps because of their perspective across their discipline, stress that such researchers must be considered in moves towards open access for monographs. Changing publishing culture in a way that affected these researchers negatively would damage the overall discipline.

“The university’s emphasis on monograph publishing did not tally with the disciplinary cultures of all interviewees, for whom publishing books may be less important.”

Institutional case study
Contracts and rights management are not a priority for most researchers

Publishers, institutional managers, librarians and even researchers themselves acknowledge that many authors do not pay enough attention to contractual agreements. Authors are often unable to recall the terms of their publisher’s contracts and very few survey respondents highlighted the publisher’s contractual arrangements as an important reason for choosing them. Tensions can arise when the author’s employment contract requires them to assign outputs to the university and they subsequently make conflicting arrangements with their publisher in a book contract. Publishers stress authors’ difficulties in securing the correct permissions for third party rights, though it is important to note that many authors wish publishers would do more in this area. Improving authors’ understanding of contracts and rights management is important for all kinds of publishing, but particularly for open access monographs.

The issue of Creative Commons (CC) licensing is also challenging. Authors seem to prefer the most restrictive CC BY-NC-ND licence but would prioritise limiting derivative works over prohibiting commercial exploitation. Despite researcher concerns about the consequences of applying a Creative Commons licence to their work, most of our author interviewees were comfortable with doing so when joining the OAPEN-UK project. The Creative Commons guide for researchers, published as a standalone output from the OAPEN-UK project, has been generally well received as a tool to try to help overcome the misconceptions about Creative Commons licensing, which were evident throughout our research.

“Researchers were noticeably vague on aspects of the copyright arrangements they had signed themselves up to, often not knowing who held copyright in their work, or for how long.”

Institutional case study

“Institutional case study

“Since June 25, 2013 the OAPEN-UK Creative Commons guide for researchers has been displayed to users around 12,000 times. It has been used across the world, and nearly 1,000 print copies have been distributed.”
The importance of identity

Universities have a clear sense of who they are and what they stand for. While institutions in our case studies have similar priorities – supporting researchers, engaging students, performing well in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) and building their national and international reputation – they talk about these priorities in subtly different ways. This sense of “self” permeates the institution and influences the nature and mechanisms of services offered by the central functions. A focus on a growing research base, or a strong collaborative ethos, or working to promote an institution’s distinctiveness and leadership within the sector, are all mentioned by librarians, research managers, senior staff and even the finance teams. When discussing open access, institutional staff often refer back to their institution’s core identity.

Other developments in research policy and management show that changes need to work alongside institutional priorities and ethos in order to stick. It follows that good practice in one institution may not translate easily to the rather different context of another one; the “good” element of the practice will certainly depend – at least in part – on how well the change fits with existing notions of what the institution should do and how it should behave.

This also applies on a more practical level. Research management is organised in quite different ways at the three institutions we studied. At one university a single team is responsible for everything to do with research management; at another, separate teams manage pre-award, post-award and finance for research projects. What works well for implementing open access monographs in one context will not necessarily be effective in another.
The centre and the departments: meeting researchers’ needs

The institutional case studies reveal a tension between researchers and central departments. It coalesces around areas where researchers are expected to change or add to their administrative practices in order to support the efficient operation of the university. Those with interdisciplinary experience feel that this tension is particularly evident in the humanities and social sciences.

Central departments within institutions stress the importance of supporting their researchers and demonstrate this in their practice and policies. But, at the same time, they are responsible for running a tight ship, financially and legally, and must meet their obligations to funders. So although they may have a light touch approach to introducing new systems for research and financial management, they cannot just drop them, as many of the researchers we interviewed wish they would. Sometimes the problem can arise when a central department of the institution needs engagement to do its work – for example, when the library seeks input from researchers into its collection development but struggles to secure any engagement.

These tensions can become problematic when implementing open access policies, especially when researcher input is unsuccessfully sought during policy formulation. Research administrators and researchers themselves are equally uncomfortable with the idea that decisions about which books to fund for open access publication might be taken centrally without input from academics; they are aware that in the current financial climate such decisions cannot be avoided, should a funder-pays open access model come to dominate.

“Non-academic interviewees recognised that anything which increases administration will be unwelcome.”
Institutional case study

“Academics can be involved in collection management, but their level of engagement varies between departments. One interviewee described how staff in the English department, twice a year, amalgamate their requests and send them to the library for the subject librarian to prioritise; but, she went on to say, other departments are less well-co-ordinated. Academic involvement in removing books is, again, limited.”
Institutional case study

“How funding decisions can ever be truly equitable is the subject of much debate. Researchers worry that research in niche areas may lose out if decisions are made centrally, and that even if decisions are made within schools, it may be hard to make objective judgements about what has most merit. Research managers are aware of this concern, and are not yet entirely sure how best to deal with it.”
Institutional case study
The wider environment for universities

The wider environment and external forces necessarily affect when and how universities feel they are able to implement open access for monographs. Financial pressures are a particular concern: university managers are unwilling to divert scarce funds to open access book publication charges when they could be used to support students or researchers. Librarians see similar pressures in their collections budgets: books purchasing is already squeezed at many institutions. Librarians, research managers, finance managers and senior staff agree that publishers must be transparent about the costs of open access publishing and how these relate to book publication charges. The increasing competitiveness of universities sits uneasily with their traditionally collaborative working practices, which will affect possible joint ventures such as university presses and centralised or subject repositories. Universities also want to use distinctive elements, like their monograph collections, to differentiate themselves from the competition when recruiting students and academic staff.

Universities also consider the national and international context for open access. Institutions may be keen to show leadership on open access, but do not want to risk getting too far ahead of the curve. Some managers believe that overly stringent open access policies might affect an institution’s ability to attract top international researchers, while committing finances to open access funding when the rest of the sector does not, can create problems as money becomes tighter. Leadership from funders and policy makers provides reassurance that universities are striking the right balance. At the same time, universities must be careful about how they translate high level policy into practice; academics’ hostility to what may seem like administrative initiatives from the university could colour their attitude to open access.

“One interviewee said researchers may find it difficult to make the choice between an open access article and extending a PhD student’s post by a month or two.” 
Institutional case study

“Generally [institution] has been a leader in this area and actually this is a kind of volte face …. we can’t do [it all] on our own and if we’re kind of leading but no one else is following then perhaps we need to reconsider.”
Institutional case study

“Interviewees felt that if open access monographs were important for REF, money would be found to support them.” 
Institutional case study

“[Institution]’s decision to use the repository as a single record of its research outputs has driven a change in perceptions of it, although not necessarily in a positive way: required to deposit at least metadata records in the repository to support the REF, some researchers associate the repository with time consuming, frustrating administrative tasks, especially as the process is not always glitch-free.”
Institutional case study
The changing balance of university funding and the growing importance of tuition fees and other teaching income is important. Institutions are eager to improve their student experience and many services are geared towards this, including book acquisitions. Open access monographs have real potential to support this ambition, particularly given the restrictions often placed upon book use under existing business models. But, at present, there is little evidence around this issue. Business models for open access must ensure that universities do not need to move money from teaching and learning budgets in order to support monograph publishing.

“If funders want outputs published in open access, they should pay for it. In full. Not 80%. I think it is not an overhead, it is a cost on the contract… otherwise the institution is forever subsiding research, and that is coming out of the £9,000 the students pay to come here.”

Institutional case study

“The books bought as part of the PDA programme are being well used by both students and researchers, suggesting that there isn’t too much difference in the way that the two find and use books after all.”

Institutional case study

Figure 10: Librarian book purchasing behaviour

- The first priority for our book budget is to ensure we have the right materials for students
  - Strongly agree/agree: 87%
  - Neutral: 11%
  - Strongly disagree/disagree: 7%

- Our budget for textbooks is separate from our budget for monographs and other book-based materials
  - Strongly agree/agree: 83%
  - Neutral: 7%
  - Strongly disagree/disagree: 11%

- We usually have enough money to buy all the monographs we need each year
  - Strongly agree/agree: 46%
  - Neutral: 12%
  - Strongly disagree/disagree: 42%

Source: 2014 librarian survey
Figure 11: Usage restrictions on e-books in libraries

- **Limited download periods**
  - Most of our e-books: 31%
  - Some of our e-books: 51%
  - Few/none of our e-books: 18%

- **Limited number of users accessing simultaneously**
  - Most of our e-books: 62%
  - Some of our e-books: 27%
  - Few/none of our e-books: 11%

- **Limited number of accesses before further payment**
  - Most of our e-books: 25%
  - Some of our e-books: 51%
  - Few/none of our e-books: 24%

- **No download to local devices**
  - Most of our e-books: 56%
  - Some of our e-books: 23%
  - Few/none of our e-books: 21%

Source: 2014 librarian survey
Universities as suppliers of content

Attitudes to new university-run presses can broadly be characterised as interested but noncommittal. Presses would generally need to be self-sustaining and universities recognise that significant investment would be needed to ensure staff have the skills and ability to run a publishing service effectively. The tension between competitiveness and collaboration also emerges here – efficiencies flow from working together and from sharing the risk of a new publishing venture, but universities must also consider their reputations and ability to attract students and staff with a distinctive offer.

The same issues arise in relation to institutional repositories and their role in supplying open access content. At the time of our case studies, all three institutions were moving towards using the repository to manage and display the university’s research outputs. This seems likely to become even more common now that HEFCE has mandated that research articles that will be submitted for REF must be deposited within an institutional or subject repository. Administrators are happy to see open access monographs included. But those with responsibility for the repository recognise that significant investment will be needed to support long-term availability and access to research outputs. In our survey, librarians express an appetite for a national service to preserve content as well as drive improvements in metadata standards so that institutions do not have to co-ordinate this work on their own.

“There’s a serious question over whether the library has the skillsets required to set up a press. Similarly, they felt that there’s a naivety about how much work is involved in running a press, driven by academics who question what publishers do for their money.”

Institutional case study

Figure 12: I would support the development of a central repository for open access books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree/agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 librarian survey
Attitudes to implementing open access vary across the institution

University staff are almost universally positive about the principle of open access, but less unified on how easy it will be to implement open access for monographs. Perspectives are, unsurprisingly and understandably, shaped by specific activities and experiences. At one university, the research office is positive about implementing open access, feeling that it simply requires an extension of existing policies and processes (though sounding a note of caution about the costs). The repository manager, however, sees new challenges in trying to understand publisher permissions and licences for putting content into the repository, particularly difficult as book publishers don’t often publish their policies on this (if, indeed, they even have them).

There are reservations about other practical challenges, especially the costs. At one institution, a senior interviewee feels that money will be found if the REF requires open access for monographs while, at another, a similarly senior person is unwilling to fund open access publishing costs for monographs in an environment of rising student fees. Despite their strong support for the principle of open access, librarians express big reservations about how easy it would be to implement.

“...The numbers can add up very quickly: ...a million or more a year you think, whoa! Hang on, am I better off going to open access? Or am I better off investing in my undergraduates? Am I better off putting new facilities in?”

Institutional case study

---

**Figure 13: Librarian attitudes to open access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OA principle positive/very positive</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold OA implementation easy/very easy</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green OA implementation easy/very easy</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA principle positive/very positive</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold OA implementation easy/very easy</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green OA implementation easy/very easy</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 librarian survey
What is open access and how does it fit for publishers?

Publishers express support for the principle of open access but not all are certain, yet, how it will fit into their existing businesses. This issue will need to be considered by each publisher, the challenges for a born-OA press which only publishes open access books are very different from those faced by a traditional publisher with a large monograph business, and these are different again from a publisher with textbook, trade, journal and other imprints alongside their academic books.

Publishers who think about open access for monographs often do so with reference to what has been happening in the journals world. Although they stress that books and journals operate in different ways and meet different needs, ideas about business models often begin from the assumption that some kind of upfront payment, similar to a journal article processing charge (APC), will be needed.

Leadership within the publishing house, external agencies and institutions is a crucial precursor to action on open access for monographs. Where change happens, it is usually down to the determined leadership of a senior member of staff, or a more junior member with backing from their managers, often, they work by galvanising interest from elsewhere within the organisation and securing engagement that leads to a wider consensus for change. Similarly, strong indications from external bodies such as funders or universities that they are serious about open access for monographs will help publishers feel that significant investment in their systems and business models is worthwhile.

Even when publishers make a decision to pursue open access for monographs, it takes time for it to permeate the organisation. Staff may receive training on open access (often in the wake of changes to journal publishing) but they rarely put it into practice because it is not part of their day-to-day work and its long-term effect is therefore limited. A concerted effort is needed to ensure open access monographs are considered as part of everything that the business does.
Identity matters

Like institutions, publishers have a strong sense of their identity. Their mission and values inform the way they think and talk about open access, and any plans for introducing open access monographs will need to sit well with the publisher’s sense of itself. On a more practical level, a publisher’s other areas of business also affect the way it approaches open access for its monograph lists. For example, a publisher with a large journal business uses lessons from that market to inform its approach to open access books, while a textbook publisher places a particular importance on the continued availability of author royalties.

Publishers work hard to build their specialism and expertise in certain areas, and this also feeds into their sense of identity. Often they recognise that a book might not be right for their lists but could find a good home with another publisher. Editors will do their best to make this happen. Publishers recognise that diversity is important for a healthy monograph publishing environment. The expertise of an individual publisher builds into its brand identity and this, too, is important. Publishers and authors have a symbiotic relationship in terms of prestige, but publishers can provide an important marker of quality for a book.
Publishers care about their books and disciplines
Publishers spend significant resources on staying networked within their disciplines. Evidence from author interviews suggests that this is important in attracting outstanding proposals for new books. Attending conferences, recruiting potential authors and series editors, and developing lists in new disciplinary areas are all important tasks for editors. But this is not just about profitability - publishers, especially editors, see publishing as an essential part of disciplinary ecosystems and recognise the role that they can play in helping to support subject development. Editors do have the leeway to publish books that they think are important, even where they may not be as profitable as the business managers would like.

Change is happening anyway
Supporting effective open access monograph publishing requires significant change - but usually in areas where change is happening anyway. Open access needs better metadata for discoverability and usage, but metadata is already a known challenge for e-books. Discussions about open access often consider the future of the book; this, too, has been on publisher agendas (and on those of other organisations such as funders and universities) for some time. Issues of rights and licensing, and how this works throughout the supply chain, need to be sorted for monographs published under traditional and open access business models. The same conversations are happening in institutions among librarians and repository managers and they have the same recognition that solutions must work with existing developments.

“Publishers care about their books and disciplines
In many houses editors had considerable autonomy over what they chose to publish, and would fight for books that they felt were important, even if they were not likely to make much (or any) money.”
Publisher interviews

“One interviewee explicitly linked quality to cost-recovery, believing that a high-quality book would always cover costs. Others felt that occasional important books may not be profitable (and may even make a loss) but should be published anyway as an investment in the press’s brand.”
Publisher interviews

“At this stage, it seems that the wider business shapes open access opportunities, rather than the business adapting itself significantly in order to deliver open access.”
Publisher interviews
Learned societies play important and varied roles in their disciplines

Learned society membership is high among researchers, and most are members of several different societies. They might join and leave more specialised societies as their research interests change but many will retain membership in overarching discipline-wide organisations throughout their career.

Learned societies see themselves as a conduit between their research communities and other stakeholders in the academic world – publishers, funders and policy makers, for example. They play an important role in disciplinary development – for example, establishing conferences, networks and journals to communicate around novel or specialised areas and supporting early career researchers through targeted funding, events, training and support. They are a place for academics to come together, feel connected to each other and the discipline, to share their concerns. Learned societies use all this to advocate for the discipline and its researchers.

“[Early career] researchers are seen as crucial to the future of the discipline, and part of the [society]’s role is to create a supportive environment where they can ‘learn to be an academic’, as one interviewee put it.”

Learned society case study

Source: 2012 researcher survey
Learned societies and publishers have a symbiotic relationship

Many, although not all, learned societies publish journals, books, or both; this work is almost always outsourced to professional academic publishers. Most learned societies depend upon volunteers from the discipline to manage their activities but these volunteers rarely have the skills to undertake all the tasks involved in academic publishing. This is particularly true as new digital techniques become more prevalent within the sector: learned societies rely on publishers to manage and produce high quality books that comply with all relevant standards.

At the same time, publishers benefit from working with societies. The societies give them access to highly respected academics to undertake peer review, and support the development of book series and journals that will attract prestigious authors. Publishers may even use society journals or imprints to test new ways of working, something which is seen to benefit the society and the publisher in equal measure.

Learned societies expect their publishers to perform and regularly review their contracts with publishing partners, but they value long-term and trusted relationships.
Publishing is not just about income

While journal publishing can sometimes generate significant revenue for learned societies, book publishing is not usually a particularly profitable activity; in some cases it can be loss-making. Nonetheless, it can be an important part of societies’ activities. It connects them to their discipline, and gives them credibility within their research communities. Many publish monographs in order to meet a need – to provide a platform for important research that could not, perhaps, find a home with more commercially-minded publishers, they see it as part of their role of providing support for the discipline.

“The core lobbying and advocacy role is underwritten more by gratis time and effort from council members and officers than by publication income.”

Learned society case study

“The high quality of [society] publications – the eminent authors who publish in its journal and the unusually high editorial standards of the other publishing activities – show that [society] remains connected to excellence in academia – it is not simply a lobbying body or a way to redistribute funds to early career researchers.”

Learned society case study

“The book series does not make money... and is almost exclusively about supporting disciplinary development.”

Learned society case study
Context is important
Funders’ attitudes to open access for monographs are strongly shaped by their own context and priorities. While funders agree that open access is desirable, their approach to open access for monographs is influenced by their work in other areas. This is important because it means that, while their approaches to open access are currently fairly similar, they may diverge in future in response to other factors.

Money is a particular issue. Funders with large budgets can readily tolerate the cost of paying for open access monographs in funder-pays models. Those with smaller budgets are more concerned; funding spent on publishing an open access book is no longer available for research (the view that publication charges are part of research costs is not universally held). All funders agree, though, that publishers must be more transparent about their costs so that funders can evaluate the value for money offered by each model.

Discipline is also important. The funders making the fastest moves towards open access for monographs are those working in, or with, several different disciplines. Attitudes from the sciences, where open access is more common and where researchers are more receptive to it, are evident in approaches to open access for HSS monographs.

Drivers behind moves towards open access often seem similar across funders but, upon investigation, they are subtly and importantly different. For example, several funders talk about the societal obligation to promote open access. For one, this means driving forward research to solve problems more quickly, while for another it means giving the general public access to research outputs. For a third, it means giving businesses access to research findings in order to grow the economy. Although most funders expressed all of these views in different measure, their priorities were not necessarily the same. If funders want to work together in a joined-up way to promote open access, they will need to recognise the differences in their motivations and consider whether the same models and systems are likely to achieve all their objectives.

“The funders interviewed differed dramatically in their perceptions of OA costs. A clear correlation could be detected between the amount of revenue a funder has at its disposal and its proclivity to cover the costs of OA publishing.”
Funder interviews

“Without really knowing what the real costs are of the current system or an open access one, participants felt that costs borne by funders would be controlled by those that do know the costs – the publishers.”
Funder initial focus group

“Funders’ willingness to be proactive in the field of OA was very strongly correlated with their size and prominence, as well as with their involvement with the STEM disciplines.”
Funder interviews
Funders recognise the challenges

Apart from the obvious issue of finances, funders recognise other challenges in moving towards open access for monographs. Researchers’ attitudes are one such challenge. Funders believe that they themselves must be part of the solution, helping to persuade researchers of the value of publishing their books in open access. But efforts to do so must recognise the differences between disciplines, and in particular the publishing behaviours that are typical in those disciplines. They must also appeal to what really interests researchers – the performance and reach of their book and the way it is perceived by peers – and not focus solely on compliance with funder policies. Funders say that policies and business models must also allow for researchers’ continuing attachment to the physical book.

Rights are another important challenge. Funders recognise some new rights regimes make researchers feel that they lose control of their own work, and they are not always comfortable with licences that permit unrestricted reuse. They also recognise the challenges of working with third party content for an open access publication; rights holders can be even more nervous about unfamiliar licensing regimes and can set prices for use that researchers simply cannot afford, or refuse permission altogether. Funders realise that these issues are not unique to open access monograph publication – they are known challenges for existing e-book business models. The issues of third party rights need to be solved for both traditional and open access business models, and need to be solved collaboratively.

Change needs to happen slowly

Given these various challenges, it is unsurprising that funders agree change needs to happen slowly. They are keen to see diversity and experimentation in the open access monograph environment and feel that it is not yet time to implement strict policies or mandates. They want to encourage open access for monographs but their ability to do so depends upon the context described above. It will be important to ensure that experimentation happens in a joined-up way, and is thoroughly evaluated to ensure that the existing strengths of monograph publishing are protected.

“For OA to work for researchers, [funder]’s representative believes that researchers need to see other researchers gaining credibility for what they have published through OA first.”
Funder interviews

“They also recognise that there are big differences between the fields in the HSS, so what works for economists, for example, will not necessarily work for archaeologists.”
Funder interviews

“Licensing and the question of third party rights were frequently acknowledged by the funders interviewed as additional problems that need solving in parallel to the OA debate.”
Funder interviews

“Every funder interviewed is busy watching the activities of other funders with interest to see what they are doing in this area, both nationally and internationally.”
Funder interviews
In this section, we consider the policies, systems and processes of organisations involved in the production, dissemination and use of academic monographs and how these might need to change to support open access monographs. Findings are again drawn from across our work packages and are organised by the different stages of writing and publishing a book.

Many of our interviewees assumed that the business models which underpinned open access monograph publishing would by default require payment of something like a journal article processing charge (APC). Some of the changes they believe to be necessary reflect this assumption; we are sharing them here but stress that other business models may present different challenges. We also stress that many of the challenges for open access monographs are in fact issues for e-book publishing more widely. Electronic publication is a necessary precondition for open access monographs, and e-books have their own challenges, which in some cases are exacerbated by open access.
Undertake research and write the book

OAPEN-UK did not focus on the process of research and writing, but throughout our work with academics, universities, publishers and learned societies we heard again and again what a complex, intensive and varied experience this can be. Sometimes books are based directly upon a single research project – a PhD for example – and written in a relatively short space of time. More often, they evolve slowly from one or many pieces of research, or represent an author’s considered reflection on a body of work within their career. They can take years, sometimes even decades, to move from first ideas to final text. Researchers and publishers, in particular, were very keen to stress the complexity involved in writing and editing a book and the importance of flexible timescales when writing. Neither group would want to publish what they see as a sub-standard book in order to comply with timing requirements from funders, universities or projects, driven by a need to sign off budgets.

This presents some challenges for open access. Where books are based on research from multiple projects they may have multiple funders. Researchers and institutions were concerned about the possibility of conflicting mandates, or the idea that drawing on a particular project for a small element of their book might bring an open access requirement into force. Sometimes links between a research project and the finished book can be loose and researchers queried how strictly funders would enforce their mandates in such cases. Lack of clarity is a concern, especially as there is still some uncertainty about how policies should be applied for journal articles, where open access mandates are already in place.

“For most presses [in our study] it takes around twelve to eighteen months from proposal to final draft.” Publisher interviews

“The relationship between industry, university and research council funding is not always entirely clear in collaborations, and the rules around [journal] open access mandates for research council funding secured through such collaborations remain unclear.” Institutional case study
The fluid and extended research and writing process also raises questions about funding for open access. In a model where costs are underwritten by project-based funding through, for example, Research Councils or charities, challenges arise. If funding is provided directly as part of a research grant, the lengthy period from research to publication could be problematic. Universities and funders told us that they prefer to close grants when the research finishes, at which point many books will not have been conceived, let alone written and accepted for publication. Furthermore, a researcher’s ideas about how and when they want to publish could change significantly over the period of the project, making it difficult to build publication costs into their budgets.

For books that are based upon a number of research projects, or projects which the researcher has undertaken as part of their employment contract with the university, funding may not be available at all. They may have started researching or writing while employed by a university, or after they left, and they may or may not be employed by a university when the book comes to be published. Authors in these circumstances would need clarity about what is expected of them, even where they are not subject to policies they may still want to publish in open access.

“There is no way for researchers to know at the beginning of a project what, and how, they will want to disseminate at the end. This makes it very difficult to calculate a reasonable indirect cost to underwrite publishing.”

Initial funder focus group
Authors and publishers are clear that every monograph has an appropriate “home”, even where authors have had a good experience with their publisher they may choose to place a subsequent book with another imprint because it provides a better fit for that title or because they believe it will have a positive effect on their career. Funders and institutions stress that authors must remain free to place their work wherever they think it will do best; open access must not affect this fundamental principle.

Figure 15: Reasons researchers changed publisher

- 65% New book was on a different subject
- 34% New book accepted by more prestigious publisher
- 26% Important to career to publish with different publishers
- 20% More services at new publisher
- 20% New publisher highly recommended to me
- 14% Previous publisher not interested in new book
- 14% Better royalty/contractual arrangements at new publisher
- 13% Poor experience with previous publisher
- 9% Co-author preference

Source: 2014 researcher survey
In an environment of limited funding and growing numbers of publications this presents a challenge. If open access monographs were to follow the same route as journals, and centralised pots of funding were made available – either held by the funders themselves, or passed on to universities as a block grant – somebody would need to decide how to distribute the limited money. Nobody believes that enough money would be available to underwrite all the books published by UK researchers. It would not be a question of deciding which books should be published: this responsibility would remain with publishers through well-established mechanisms. But funders, like research managers in universities, are reluctant to make decisions about who is able to publish in open access and who is not. They believe that might violate their core principle of not telling researchers where to publish. Even the appearance of this is a cause for concern. Researchers themselves do not particularly want to take on this role either, so it is unclear how funding could best be distributed. Librarians may step into the breach, but they would need to consider whether (and how) this differs from their existing role in making book acquisition decisions.

“If deans and so on start making decisions about whose stuff gets funded and whose stuff doesn’t, this raises all sorts of serious questions about academic freedom, justice... it is an unwelcome spectre, to say the least.”
Institutional case study

“There’s a widespread feeling that there will be winners and losers however open access is implemented, but it’s the uncertainty over who those will be that is causing unease.”
Institutional case study
Librarians and research managers, in particular, feel that the present set-up for monograph publishing detaches researchers from the costs. Academics buy books and know that they are expensive, but very few understand how much the library spends on its collections, how little money it sometimes has for books, or indeed if the book budget is under significant threat. Researchers, especially PhD students, are heavily reliant on the library for access to monographs and in general do not feel that they regularly encounter any issues in accessing the books that they need. So they may not see any need for open access when it is presented as solving a problem for readers; they have a variety of ways to get hold of books that they need and, for them, the system usually works.

Figure 16: How researchers acquired the last book they read, by career stage

Source: 2014 researcher survey
But if you reconnect researchers with the costs of communicating their research findings, through an understanding of acquisition costs and how budget pressures can affect the collections they enjoy, open access may well climb higher up their agendas. There are certainly academics working with colleagues around the world who clearly recognise how important open access is in countries where researchers do not enjoy the same access to comprehensive library collections. Presenting open access as a way for authors to increase the reach, visibility and impact of their monographs may have resonance for researchers, who are very conscious that readership of their own publications is limited by the high cost of academic books. Publishers, funders, institutional managers and researchers themselves agree that, in a fee-based open access model, authors who understand the costs of publishing a book might consider whether the services their publisher provides really represent value for money. That said, stakeholders also recognise that a publisher’s brand is a key service and an important consideration for potential authors - this will be very difficult to quantify in a way that permits comparison. Publishers’ reputations may be strong in some disciplines or even sub-disciplines and weaker in others, and brands are built at least in part on the prestige of previously-published authors rather than on the specific services offered. It might be difficult to find an objective measure of “value for money” when comparing the author fees charged by publishers.

“Within most (but not all) institutions, researchers are divorced from their library acquisition budgets and often buy the books they need via Amazon: this leaves them with little understanding of the real costs of providing monograph content to users (both in print and electronic formats) and therefore little incentive to save money by pushing for open access monographs.”

Researcher initial focus group

“Interviewees recognised the delicate and symbiotic relationship between their brand and the authors they publish: they confer prestige on their authors, but that prestige stems from the reputation of authors they have previously published.”

Publisher interviews

“All authors believed that open access would increase the readership of their books, and several explicitly mentioned the high price which meant their main customers would be academic libraries.”

Author interviews
Authors stress that editorial support is a very important factor in their publishing decisions. The publishers we spoke to understand this and agree that the business model by which a book is published – open access or traditional – must not affect the editorial work. Overall, this is the area of publishing where interviewees from all sectors feel there should be little or no change in a move to open access. Indeed, most stress that it is essential for policies and processes related to editorial conduct to remain exactly the same if open access is to be credible. In particular, decisions about whether to publish a book must be taken without any reference to an author’s ability to pay for open access. In other words, the open access option should not be discussed until after a book has been accepted for publication based upon peer review in the traditional way.

New publishers find themselves in a slightly different situation. Without established processes for peer review, they need to show their authors and the wider academic community that their quality assurance is rigorous. Since peer review processes for monographs are far from standard, varying between and even within presses, they will have to give careful thought about how to demonstrate their academic credibility.

“For publishers offering open access titles as part or all of their lists, it was very important to stress that the quality assurance process was the same for open access books as it would be for those published under any other business model.”

Publisher interviews
Marketing, sales and promotion

This is the area that researchers are least willing to take on themselves and one of the areas where they have the greatest expectations from their publishers. It will be extremely important to maintain this activity in an open access world. But publishers feel that marketing and promotion of open access content will need a different approach. Monograph marketing currently tends to focus on librarians as the main purchasers of content and the most common route to readers, even though this may not in fact be the case. Many publishers sell monographs in packages or subject collections. Libraries will want to know in advance if any of the titles are open access and in what formats so that they can decide whether to purchase the package or to negotiate a discount. Where open access business models involve purchasing of alternative formats or premium versions, librarians will remain an important audience but the way that they are approached will need to change. Open access also creates an opportunity to go directly to researchers; publishers welcome this but also recognise that it will mean significant changes for staff, systems and processes. This can be a particular challenge for new publishers, they may not have existing sales and marketing strategies that need to change but they can struggle to make librarians aware of the paid-for versions of their books, which jeopardises their business model. Unfamiliarity with industry systems and standards can be a real problem for newer presses.

Figure 18: Importance of sales and marketing services to authors

Source: 2012 researcher survey

Figure 19: Authors who would not be willing to take on sales and marketing

Source: 2012 researcher survey
Open access may also present an opportunity for authors to do more promotion within their communities. Some researchers feel they already do a lot of this; sometimes perhaps more than they should have to. But interviews with authors whose titles were made open access through the OAPEN-UK project suggest that many remain uncomfortable with what they see as “self-promotion” on social media. That said, those who do undertake promotion sometimes find that it has a noticeable impact on usage. So researchers may require support to help them find a satisfactory way to share information about their open access publications with their wider communities.

As we have said, all stakeholders are keen to maintain the integrity of existing peer review processes and prefer not to discuss open access before the decision to publish a book is taken. But marketing and sales teams need to know as soon as possible if a book is to be made open access in order to promote it appropriately during the pre-publication period, to decide how (and if) it should be sold and to release the right metadata into the supply chain. Add into this the different timescales of funding bodies or universities who may need to confirm their support for publication costs and the issue becomes complex.

“She said she would be ‘horrified at the thought of being seen to be peddling it on Twitter or such like.’”

Author interviews

“Funding for open access, if based on an author pays models, would need to be available when the contract is signed, and remain available when the book is finally published which could be several years later. Even if money could be guaranteed, this kind of timescale would present an accounting problem which publishers do not currently have to face.”

Publisher interviews
Setting the price of an open access book is another novel challenge for publishers. Under traditional business models, individual titles are generally expected to cover their costs but the amount of profit made on a book can vary enormously - it is not always predictable when the title is accepted for publication. Many open access business models look to a funder to cover the book’s costs with sales playing a much less important role within the overall financial profile. Publishers gain the security of knowing the book will not be published at a loss but may (depending on the business model) lose the opportunity to make a large profit on an unexpectedly well-selling title. This can make it difficult to set an appropriate charge for open access monographs. It also makes it difficult to set an appropriate price for non-open access versions of the title - print or e-books, if the publisher is continuing to sell these - as data about similar books’ performance, which publishers usually rely on to set prices, is not yet available. OAPEN-UK’s findings suggest that open access does not have a significant impact upon sales; publishers may nonetheless feel uncertain about basing business models on such a small and noisy dataset.

“In all cases, publishers calculated revenue expectations independently for each title rather than having a blanket expectation for all books. Interviewees stressed that this made it very difficult to estimate an appropriate open access fee for books, and felt that it might not be appropriate to apply the same fee to all titles.”

Publisher interviews

Figure 20: Total print sales for experiment and control group titles, by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year one</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year two</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year three</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Matched pairs experiment
Content management and preservation

At present, open access adds another layer of complexity to the already complicated publishing supply chain. Our research shows that existing systems do not always function efficiently and that metadata and standards are a known challenge for publishers, librarians and third party suppliers. This is particularly true for publishers who run different versions of their content management systems in the various territories where they operate – many publishers are already trying to rationalise these systems internally. Open access requirements could, therefore, be rolled into existing conversations about improving systems and standards but all parties will need to make a concerted effort to ensure open access monographs are put onto the agenda. As a niche area of business for most publishers, they will not be there automatically. And such conversations need to include all stakeholders, not just those who are already engaged with open access for monographs, otherwise the solution may end up meeting only their particular needs.

“Interviewees stressed that these conversations need to happen across the entire publishing industry; third parties need to see that changes are necessary to all of their clients, and changes need to be structured to meet the needs of all publishers, not just those who are sufficiently engaged with open access to lead a conversation with third parties.”
Publisher interviews

“Larger publishers often had several iterations of the same system running to allow for differences between territories. Interviewees considered this suboptimal and many spoke of work their companies were doing to rationalise their internal systems – however, this was usually proving more difficult than they had anticipated.”
Publisher interviews

“Participants were clear that publishers would need to supply metadata for open access content to be licensed on aggregator platforms rather than the role of metadata creation sitting with the aggregator. Aggregators would still need to enhance the metadata to work with their individual platforms and to support discovery by users, in order to ensure that their service is good.”
Aggregator initial focus group
Researchers and librarians in particular are concerned about whether, and how, publishers will support the long-term availability of open access monographs. They question whether publishers will invest in preservation of open access books, given that they may be unlikely to make a financial return on such investment. Publishers definitely do expect to preserve open access content in exactly the same way as work published under traditional business models but they acknowledge that it is difficult to estimate the costs that this will entail. New formats and technologies raise similar issues. Librarians are, on the whole, happy for their institutional repository to be the main long-term source of open access monographs produced by their own researchers, but they also support a joint central repository for open access books. The role of copyright libraries also needs to be clarified.

“The long-term availability and preservation of open access monographs was a particular concern. Participants recognised that these problems exist for paid for e-books but become even more critical for OA monographs as there is no direct contract between the library and the publisher and it would not be clear who is responsible for maintaining access and preserving OA monographs.”

Institutions initial focus group

“Some interviewees also mentioned the long-term costs of supporting electronic content – preservation, for example - which are hard to estimate and therefore difficult to include in an open access fee.”

Publisher interviews

Figure 21: Librarian attitudes to preservation issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Strongly agree/agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree/strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring long-term access to electronic books that we acquire is a major priority for my library</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have confidence in the arrangements that publishers have made for the long-term access to the electronic books in my library collection</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be happy for the institutional repository to be the main long-term source of open access version of monographs produced by researchers at my institution</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support the development of a central repository for open access books, to provide long term access to open access versions of monographs and ensure these are available within library discovery systems</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 librarian survey
Production

Researchers are clear, and publishers understand, that open access should not affect the production quality of a monograph. This is important for authors (who still like to receive a print copy of their work) and also for the credibility of open access books as they begin to move towards the publishing mainstream. Some researchers in the humanities and social sciences remain suspicious of books that are only published electronically.

Changes in the wider publishing production process may provide an opportunity for open access books. For example, publishers who move to XML-first systems will find it easier to produce different versions of a book to support business models which sell some formats but not others. Print on demand may offer opportunities for streamlining the costs of print copies of open access monographs.

Production staff will need to be closely involved in conversations about content management. They may need to lead these conversations with the third parties who build their production systems.

“One publisher] was keen to ensure end customers accessed content directly from them rather than through third parties such as Amazon: building a platform for this provided an opportunity to review how they provide open access monographs.”

Publisher interviews

“Interviewees also mentioned the problems that can arise when systems are redesigned without considering open access – which often happens, because it remains a niche area for most publishers; company-wide rationalisations of more than one publisher’s systems can remove a feature which is essential for delivering open access content.”

Publisher interviews
Discovery and availability

A central aim of open access is to support increased and more flexible dissemination and usage. But this can happen only when readers are able to find the open access copy. This is a particular challenge for monographs. The majority of sales and usage comes from third party sites - library vendors, e-book aggregators, retailers such as Amazon, and Google. The metadata challenges, described in the section on content management and preservation, are part of the problem. In addition, many third party suppliers simply are not set up to deal with open access content. Some are not able to offer a zero price to end users. Others operate blanket digital rights management (DRM) across their platforms, which means that usage restrictions are applied even where licences do not require them. Publishers, too, can struggle to promote an open access copy of books on websites that are built to sell.

Libraries also play a crucial role in discovery of open access monographs. Most libraries work with electronic vendors to supply e-books to their users so will be affected by the issues described above. An alternative route lies with services such as the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB) and the OAPEN Library, which aggregate open access books and integrate them into library discovery systems. This development solves a problem for newer publishers who are not always engaged with library aggregators and therefore struggle to get their content to end users via university libraries. Many libraries will therefore be providing links to the open access copies of monographs through their discovery systems, but librarians are not always aware of this. A minority are also reluctant to include open access content within their catalogues.

“One publisher described a Kafka-esque situation with Amazon, which charges publishers for each download of the e-book. Because the publisher had made the e-book available for free through their open access programme, they were effectively paying Amazon so people could read their book. The publisher got around this by agreeing to give Amazon a revenue share instead of a flat fee for downloads, setting a relatively low book price and then getting customers to write to Amazon pointing out that the book was available for free elsewhere – this forced Amazon to match the zero price.”
Publisher interviews

“Consistency is important and there is an end user agreement between libraries / end users and aggregators. If OA monographs were to be available on a platform, the participants suggested that they would fall under the end user licence and be subject to the platform DRM – having different types of Creative Commons licences would be inconsistent and perhaps cause user to presume OA titles were of lower quality if they were not subject to the same control.”
Aggregator initial focus group

“30% of respondents currently identify open access monographs for inclusion within their library collections - 49% do not, while 21% were unsure.”
Librarian survey
Institutional and subject repositories are another route for discovery and availability of open access monographs. Books published under the more usual open access licences – Creative Commons, for example – can be freely shared and therefore posted within repositories. But where publishers have developed their own open licences, the issue becomes more complicated. Lack of clarity about how universities should deal with a non-commercial clause may also lead to problems. Repository managers already face these issues for journal articles and there is a very long tail of book publishers who have not published their policies, finding out what is and is not permissible could be challenging.

The issue becomes even more complex for open access achieved through self-archiving. Most publishers do not have a published policy on self-archiving and many, especially the smaller publishers who have thus far had little contact with the open access agenda, may not have given the question any thought. This creates a very difficult situation for repository managers.

“Problems could arise if the repository was dealing with long embargo periods and restrictive licences, which he thought was quite likely [for monographs]. They would need to ensure that ‘we didn’t lead the user up the garden path’ in terms of what is available to them, and when, and how; this is difficult to manage within the current set-up of ePrints.”

Institutional case study

“*If new entities emerged in a publishing role – university libraries, or learned societies, for example – aggregators would need to consider taking on their content, to ensure complete collections. But if these entities became a threat to established publishers, the aggregators would need to manage relationships with their existing suppliers to ensure that these were not compromised.*”

Aggregators initial focus group

---

Figure 22: Types of monographs librarians expect to be in their catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of monograph</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open access and non-open access</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-open access only</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 librarian survey
Researchers are interested in how their books perform. Providing them with data about this is a challenge for all monographs, open access or not. Print sales are not necessarily a reliable proxy for usage and electronic use often takes place on platforms that are not within a publisher’s control – library aggregators or third parties such as Google or Amazon. But with open access there is an additional layer of complexity: most licences permit readers to share their own copy of the book online. So publishers may not know where it is being made available, let alone have any ability to secure data about usage from these sources, although in reality usage on such sites is likely to represent only a small amount of the total. Even for sites where usage can be captured, standardised measures such as COUNTER are not universally applied.

In an open access world, we expect online usage to grow as a proportion of the overall figure. So information about how and where the e-book is used becomes increasingly important to help authors – and just as importantly, publishers – understand how a book has performed. Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) may offer one way for publishers to track where and how a book has been shared, although the long tail of smaller monograph publishers might need help to implement these for their titles. But publishers, vendors, librarians and third parties who provide open access books will need to work together to develop an effective way of sharing data about usage. They will also need to engage with any emerging industry-wide metrics and standards for understanding book performance.

Figure 23: Average Google book views with pages viewed and PDF downloads from OAPEN library

Source: matched pairs experiment
Organisations and individuals have open access on their radar and, increasingly, are considering how this might apply to monographs as well as journals. Working groups, steering groups and other committees are common ways of trying to implement change but often they struggle to get sustained engagement from other staff within the organisation. Part of the problem is that, until new ways of working become routine, training and policies are subsumed within busy working lives and do not generally have a lasting effect.

Where change is happening, it is often driven by highly motivated individuals. They need the organisation’s explicit backing but may themselves be relatively junior (though not always). Their enthusiasm keeps things moving and ensures the organisation is linked into external initiatives; on the other hand, change can slow or even halt if they leave the organisation. Projects are another important way to drive change – often they work in concert with these individuals. A relatively small amount of funding can provide motivation for a disparate group of individuals to coalesce around a particular agenda, and a contained project allows safe experimentation. Projects are particularly effective when they link individuals from different organisations and where they are evaluated to understand how they worked and what changed. Neutral evaluation is important to pick up negative effects of change as well as positive ones.

“Projects were also very important to the way that [institution] has developed its services and systems. A library interviewee mentioned [institution]’s success with Jisc-funded projects, and felt that each one ‘functioned as an opportunity to move the university’s thinking and ideas forward.”

Institutional case study

“Many of the funders interviewed pointed to individuals within their organisation that could be seen as responsible for driving forward engagement with the question of OA publishing.”

Funder interviews

“People move on in their careers and several of [institution]’s early OA pioneers have moved to new positions or new institutions, resulting in what one or two interviewees called ‘a policy vacuum.’”

Institutional case study

“Even within a broadly supportive company, or one that is agnostic towards open access, somebody needed to take the lead and push for discussion and policy changes. If that person is not senior, they need the support of senior colleagues to provide legitimacy for proposed changes or pilots. This role was usually recognised – either a new position was created, or existing job descriptions were changed to acknowledge the work an employee was doing to implement open access.”

Publisher interviews
National and international policy and strategy are important drivers for change. Institutions and publishers, aware that a move towards open access for monographs will require significant investment of time and money, are unwilling to make major changes without indications that such changes are necessary. But funders are – rightly – unwilling to back a single route until the environment is more mature. This creates something of an impasse, one which could potentially be solved with projects that provide targeted support to experiment with change in a managed fashion.

In all this, it is important to think about the speed of change. Moving too fast may risk losing some of the existing strengths of monograph publishing and of asking organisations to perform roles that they have not yet considered, let alone prepared for. We also need to consider the international environment. Academic research, employment, publishing and funding are elements in a global enterprise and it will be important not to get too far ahead – or too far behind – developments in other countries.

“Now is the time for funders to be experimenting with new OA business models, not trying to pin down which is ‘the one’ for monographs just yet, as it is far too early for that. Every funder interviewed is busy watching the activities of other funders with interest to see what they are doing in this area, both nationally and internationally.”

Funder interviews

“There was a general feeling that, at the time of the interviews, the UK was some distance ahead of other territories in its approach to open access and interviewees were concerned that attitudes in other countries – in particular the US, which is a very important market for monographs – might impede successful promotion of open access books.”

Publisher interviews

“The overall sense from a number of interviewees was that they are waiting to see how funders continue to develop their requirements, and what the timescales are likely to be, before taking any major steps of their own.”

Institutional case study

“There’s a strong sense that whatever [institution] decides to do has to make sense in a global context, not just in Britain.”

Institutional case study
Publishers and universities in particular work with a number of external systems to manage their workflows and monitor their outputs. Third party suppliers are important; they are often economical and able to rationalise activity across the sector. But without complete control of their systems, organisations can find it difficult to implement changes that are needed for open access monographs. Publishers’ project management tools, production systems and sales platforms as well as university research management systems, repository infrastructures and library vendors, all experience these problems - they need to be tweaked for open access books, but such changes are low on the priority list of systems suppliers. Moreover, changes need to be co-ordinated across suppliers: most librarians and publishers work with a number of intermediaries and will need open access to function in a similar way on each system to make their workflows as efficient as possible.

“Institutional case study

“The library makes extensive use of third party systems, and these are not always configured in the best possible way to support open access. One interviewee described their commercial discovery tool as being particularly slow to index open or public data sources such as the Harvard Open Bibliographic Dataset. This system is also unable to distinguish between full text and metadata-only content in open access repositories and by treating all results as full-text it causes considerable frustration for users: ‘I don’t think it does the cause of open access any good’.”

Source: 2014 Librarian survey

Figure 24: Number of library vendors worked with as main or supplementary way of acquiring books

Source: 2014 Librarian survey
Many organisations create manual workarounds. Publishers in particular have to do this for open access monographs, leading to problems when global changes to the system (from within or outside the publisher) override the changes that support open access books. Universities may create or commission programmes or bits of code to help non-interoperable systems work together; this can work quite well but is not scalable and such work needs to be repeated every time the external system is updated.

“OA could generally only be achieved with workarounds and tweaks to systems that are not designed to give content away for free. Often such workarounds are manual; this is sustainable at the current level of OA, but may prove problematic if the volume of OA books grows.”

Publisher interviews

“Even these two products from the same vendor don’t interact with one another readily. The university has developed its own interface to make that happen, because lack of interaction between systems is not only unpopular with people who have to repeat workflows – it also limits the quality of management information and makes it hard to associate inputs with outputs.”

Institutional case study
Business models for OA monographs

One of OAPEN-UK’s key original aims was to inform the development of a sustainable business model for open access monographs. As the project progressed it became clear that we should be thinking instead about business models.

Over the last five years we have seen institutions, academics, publishers and others increasing their experimentation with different ways of funding open access monographs, with many of these experiments showing the potential to evolve into sustainable long-term businesses. This experimentation will – and should – continue.

In view of this, we have decided not to examine each existing business model in the light of our findings. Instead, we have drawn out what we believe will be characteristics of successful business models, both individually and as contributors to a wider ecosystem of open access monograph publishing. Organisations offering or developing open access offers for monographs may want to consider evaluating their plans against this list. Many may seem obvious, but they are not always explicitly considered.

We talk about “publishers” and “publishing organisations” interchangeably because we recognise that new market entrants may join traditional and existing open access publishers in seeking to create and promote open access monographs.
A strong business model for open access monographs...

**Fits with the publishing organisation’s missions, values and drivers**
Publishers have a clear vision of who they are and why they operate; some values are explicitly expressed through company strategy and documentation, while others may be felt more through the ethos and behaviour of staff. New, open access business models are likely to be more readily accepted within the business if they can show how they align with these values. Organisations such as universities who may be considering a changed role within the publishing process also have missions, values and drivers: buy-in for widening an institution’s scope to include publishing activity is more likely if plans are designed in line with existing priorities.

**Uses existing expertise and builds capacity within the publishing organisation**
Publishing is a skilled and complex process, which requires considerable expertise. Although open access monographs represent an opportunity to do things in a new way, core publishing skills and knowledge remain essential. Organisations that are considering moving into publishing need to recognise the complexity and identify areas where they will need to develop skills; traditional publishers need to examine and rectify gaps in their own knowledge when it comes to open access systems, services and policies and consider how best to implement staff training and knowledge transfer protocols. (See figure 25 on the next page).

**Protects the core elements of publishing that are important to academics**
As authors, academics have clear ideas about how and why they publish; they also have expectations as readers. Quality is paramount and both peer review and production values must remain equally high for books published under open access and traditional business models. Authors also value the sales and marketing activity undertaken by publishers, so publishers need to consider how to promote open access books within a system that is designed to sell. But publishers could consider charging for services that authors do not currently consider essential; alternative formats, for example, or detailed information about usage.

**Takes account of existing platforms, systems and services for publishing and accessing monographs**
As long as open access business models remain a marginal publishing activity, production and dissemination workflows need to integrate with those used for traditional business models. It is unrealistic to expect the third parties who supply many of these systems to invest heavily in developing their offer to benefit a small proportion of their overall business. Furthermore, authors and readers of open access monographs want them to be accessible in the same place as those published under traditional business models. That said, publishing organisations should also make sure they work with services developed specifically for open access books – such as DOAB or OAPEN Library - to ensure the open access versions of titles are available as widely as possible.

**Recognises the international nature of research and publishing**
Large publishers with international offices may find that moves towards open access happen at different speeds in different territories; models must recognise that something that European staff see the need for and are ready to adopt may not have the same resonance in the US, for example. If those other territories are driving developments in systems and services they may not consider the open access business model when doing so; it is important to maintain awareness right across the business. Even smaller publishers need to consider the global aspects of monographs; for example translation rights can be an important source of revenue which must be considered in open access business models.
Investigate existing collaborative initiatives by OAPEN, ONIX and other publishers to create systems and standards for open access monographs in the publishing supply chain.

Maximise social media activity and help your authors promote their open access monograph. Some authors can be a bit shy.

Monitor downloads and page views across all platforms within your control, as authors like to know about book performance and sales data will not provide the whole picture.

Wait until the book proposal has been through standard peer review and has been accepted before discussing open access with the author. This avoids any appearance that financial considerations are influencing editorial decisions.

For now, don’t change anything. Authors, publishers, funders and institutions all agree that open access monographs should retain the same high quality editorial and production process. And authors still want a print version of their book.
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A strong business model for open access monographs...
Seeks to understand usage across all platforms
Usage information will be important to funders and institutions that pay for a book to be published via open access, and is already important to authors. It is also essential for publishers who want to evaluate and refine their business models. Open access publication means usage may happen on new platforms – many outside the publisher’s immediate control – and patterns of where use occurs may change as well. Publishers of open access titles need to explore new ways to collect data and develop new partnerships to provide a reliable picture of their use.

Engages with third party systems and suppliers to improve services for open access monographs
Third party systems play a role at almost every stage of the monograph publishing and distribution supply chain. Changes to metadata, licensing and rights management and even business models might be necessary to create and supply open access monographs on a level playing field with those published under a traditional business model. As we have said, suppliers are unlikely to invest significantly in change where they cannot see a clear return to their business. But there may be less costly but still-important changes that can be made, particularly in partnership with standards agencies, to promote a direction of travel which supports open access for monographs. Publishers should ensure they engage with such efforts, in collaboration with other publishers, universities, librarians, funders and other stakeholders.

Works collaboratively with other stakeholders, recognising that it is part of a wider ecosystem for open access monographs
No single model or organisation is likely to dominate open access monograph publishing, and it is not desirable that it should. Publishers will have to consider how their business model fits with those offered by other stakeholders and whether they need to engage with those business models to provide the best and most flexible service to their authors. Funders, universities and learned societies also have their own agendas for open access monographs and publishers must recognise and engage with these when developing their business models, even where drivers might be very different from their own.

Evaluates its effects, but recognises that consequences might change as open access for monographs becomes more widespread
Data from OAPEN-UK’s pilot experiment suggests that open access has no obvious impact on monograph sales. But there are a lot of caveats. We have a very small and noisy dataset, with considerable inherent variation as monograph sales are unpredictable and very sensitive to unpredictable events – for example, titles being placed on a reading list. Because the number of open access titles currently available is so small it is quite plausible that many users, especially those in libraries who purchase hundreds of books at a time (often through third parties) did not notice the open access version. Business models that are built on the assumption that sales will remain steady will need to review their viability if and when open access for monographs moves from the marginal to the mainstream.
Offers flexible licensing and plenty of support to authors dealing with issues around third party rights

Funder policies about what kind of licensing regime constitutes “open access” for monographs are varied, and many have not committed to a single licence. Authors, too, have strong preferences about how they licence their monographs. Third party content is important for monographs in many disciplines and rights holders may stipulate licence conditions if their content is to be included in open access monographs, or even refuse permission. Though authors deal with most rights issues in current models, publishers provide support and final checks. This is likely to be even more important in open access models.

Is transparent and realistic about costs and how it recovers them, to build confidence among its stakeholders

Publishers asking a funder or institution to support the costs of open access monograph publishing (either through an upfront charge or by continuing to pay for alternative formats of the book, or both) must recognise that those funders or institutions will have an interest in understanding whether they are getting value for money. We recognise that publishers need to protect their commercial interests so they may not always be able to disclose as much as their customers might like. Nonetheless, to build trust and ensure widespread support, business models must begin from and embody a principle of transparency.

Until open access monograph publishing becomes widespread, publishing organisations will need to provide clear and consistent information about their business models to help authors (in particular) make informed choices. We have listed on the following pages the key areas that need to be communicated.
Communication to stakeholders about a business model for open access monographs will...

**Explain what is meant by open access**
The diverse opinions of authors about what open access is (and is not) and what it can (and can’t) do demonstrates the need to be very precise. As policies or mandates increase in the area of open access monographs there has to be a reassurance that the “open” in the model complies with requirements.

**Explain what is meant by peer review**
Researchers prioritise peer review, and will want assurance that peer review is undertaken in the same way for open books as for non-open books. This is an issue for monograph publishing more generally as there is not currently a standard vocabulary for describing peer review processes.

**Articulate how the business model works and how the costs are covered/recovered**
Since different models will suit different publishers depending on their mission, focus and revenue streams, it is important to explain the motivation behind the business model, why it was selected and how it works.

**Clarify how the costs associated with this business model are arrived at**
Funders, institutions and researchers care about how fees are calculated and used. Transparency about costs or charges, including data where possible, will help promote understanding of the whole publishing process. If there is a charge to the author it needs to be clear what that charge is, when it is expected to be paid and if there are any waivers.

**Make clear what services are included and what is excluded**
As highlighted on previous pages, being clear about what is and is not included as part of the business model will help to manage expectations. Does the publisher offer third party licensing support, what marketing will take place to support the open access version, what formats will the titles be available in and on what platforms will the title be distributed? Will the author be expected to self-deposit the title or will it be placed in appropriate repositories? One key question that should always be answered is whether the service includes print/print-on-demand, as this remains critical to researchers.

**Give details of licensing policy and options**
Authors do not always pay attention to their licences and contracts and, although awareness of Creative Commons has increased, there is still a lot of confusion and uncertainty about what the licences mean and the impact they will have on authors’ work, rights and revenue generation. Giving details of the licensing policy, what it means for an author, how it complies with funder requirements (such as those of the Wellcome Trust) and if there is flexibility in applying a different licence, will all help authors to make an informed decision.
Describe the standard royalty arrangement
While royalties are often not a significant consideration for most researchers, they may be important for some. Providing information about how the business model that is applied will interact with royalty arrangements, or being clear about differences from the standard model, will be useful to authors. Publishers may also like to consider opportunities for authors to contribute royalties back into open access publishing or to support early career academics.

Explain how long term access and preservation is dealt with
Although this is often a standard part of a publisher’s service, all stakeholders are concerned about who should be responsible for maintaining access to the open access monograph and for its ongoing preservation. There remains a fear that open access monographs, or their publishers, will disappear into the ether. A long term access and preservation policy with practical arrangements that inspire confidence is a necessary part of any business model.

Finally, we wish to reiterate the need for all publishing organisations to develop, experiment with and implement a range of business models. The Crossick report and the findings from our workshops with researchers, publishers and librarians on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of open access monograph business models, confirm that no single business model will meet the various and changing requirements of researchers, institutions and publishers. Variety is vital to meet the diverse nature of arts, humanities and social science research.
Lessons learned

Over the five years of the project we have learned some important lessons about working in the rapidly-changing open access monograph environment. Over the following pages we present a few of our most important insights; we believe that anyone running projects or activity in this area will benefit from thinking about them.
Lessons learned

1. The environment for open access monographs moves fast and in unexpected directions. When we started the project, we simply could not have anticipated many of the challenges we eventually encountered.

2. Be flexible with your objectives and keep reviewing what you can realistically expect to achieve. Our focus changed as we began to collect data and realize that it could not answer some of our original questions, but that it could tell us quite interesting things that we had not anticipated (for example, the relative levels of usage on different platforms).

3. Address challenges as they arise, collaborate to find the best available workarounds rather than seeking a perfect solution. When it became clear that Amazon was not signposting the free open access versions of our titles, our participating publishers worked together to create and implement additional metadata information to point users to the OAPEN Library where they could download the title for free. Not the most elegant solution, but more effective for a time-limited project than trying to get Amazon to change the way it provides and displays books (which remains important in the long term).

4. Accept that you cannot control what third parties such as aggregators and book vendor platforms will do, even though they will almost certainly make changes that affect your activities. Keep an eye on developments and be prepared to create quick adaptations to protect your aims and objectives.

5. Make somebody responsible for open access monographs and set aside some of their time so they can work on it. The publishers who got the most out of our project were the ones who engaged consistently and with the same people.

6. Be aware that changes inside your own organisation may affect open access monographs and you need to be prepared to recognise them because people will not necessarily think to tell you. Again, you need to be agile to create workarounds.

7. Wide and open-minded collaboration can enhance the effectiveness of your work. Bringing the publishers onto the steering group for OAPEN-UK gave us access to their insight and expertise, which we needed to make sense of the data.
8. The real world is the real world, and you have to work within it. Data are messy, measures are frustratingly unstandardised and things change all the time. If you are trying to build something perfect you will fail; it is best to accept and be honest about the limitations and focus on what is possible within the context you find yourself in.

9. It is impossible to see the whole picture at the beginning of the project and only by getting started will you uncover challenges. Even experts cannot anticipate all the issues you might encounter. For example, we conducted interviews with all our publishers at the start of the project to decide what data we could and should collect but we still did not identify the problems we eventually had with getting usage data from Google, Amazon and e-book aggregators.

10. Individual, face-to-face conversations remain very important. Collaboration is crucial but there are always things that people will not want to share in public; make space for them to talk directly and regularly to you.

11. Think carefully about timescales. Our project sought to identify trends and longer-term changes resulting from open access for monographs but this left us susceptible to drastic changes by third parties which actually made it hard to compare data over time. A balance needs to be struck.

12. Individual books have their own sales patterns which can be quite unpredictable, so it is difficult to draw conclusions based on small samples. Our matched-pairs model revealed how different books can be, even when matched as closely as possible by publishers.

13. We are in an environment where open access monographs are uncommon and any findings from projects or experiments will reflect that. It is almost impossible to simulate a real world where open access monographs are more mainstream but if we move to an environment where they are more common and systems have adapted to accommodate them, you may see very different results to those arising from experiments and projects conducted now.
Publisher lessons learned and recommendations

At the end of the project, publishers who participated in OAPEN-UK shared some of their experiences and advice that they think would benefit other publishers considering a move into open access for monographs. We present some of these thoughts below.

“The sales and usage data required for the project had to be sourced from a number of places and involved a number of colleagues/departments to collate. Combined with some issues with the Google Books data, this was a more challenging aspect of the project than expected.”

“We would recommend that other publishers take time to consider the end-to-end processes and how they impact on sites and systems. It is worth thinking issues through beforehand rather than implementing fixes later on. We also recommend keeping authors well informed on aspects of a “Gold” open access model, particularly around Creative Commons licensing and exactly what this means for their research so that they can make informed choices, with the support of their editor. Rely on the skills and wealth of knowledge of your commissioning editors, production and digital teams to work through the practical issues, and make sure you have adequate data reporting in place so you can build that evidence and knowledge base.”

“For established publishers the biggest challenge is adapting systems and processes – which have historically been designed and built to deliver paid-for and printed content – so that they can deliver open access content. A major part of the work involves identifying each aspect of the book publishing process that will be affected by OA – from commissioning, third party rights and contracting, to production, distribution, marketing and sales – and adjusting systems and processes accordingly. Metadata must also be updated for each platform on which monographs are available.”

“A major challenge was increasing author awareness of the implications of publishing third party materials in open access works published under Creative Commons licences and the difficulty of obtaining the necessary permissions to do so.”
“For larger publishers, there is a need to consider staff training so that representatives from all relevant departments are aware of process differences for OA monographs, which are likely to be a small proportion of content overall for the foreseeable future.”

“We would recommend that you inform yourself as widely as possible of the implications and issues from the perspective of the publisher/author/institution to inform judgments and choices, and what is realistic from a business model perspective.”

“On a practical level we would advise other stakeholders to take time to discover and communicate specific requirements for open access publishing: funders and institutions can support authors by making their requirements clear and upfront. For authors, we would hope there is sufficient information out there to understand options and requirements for publishing your research, particularly on issues of licensing, copyright and the implications of these for reuse and sharing. Any remaining questions on open access should be raised with the editor early on – certainly before you sign any contract to publish. As publishers, we will endeavour to offer as much support as we can to authors, but there is very much a role for more local provision from dedicated OA advisors at institutions, particularly around issues of contracting. There is certainly a need for all stakeholders to communicate well and collaborate on the issues of OA monographs to find sustainable long-term solutions.”

“Consider OA as a viable alternative that can work alongside traditional monograph publishing models, but remain flexible when considering policies and processes.”

“The digital supply chain was shown not to cater adequately for OA books. Many vendors (including library aggregators) are technically unable to host books at zero price and there was a lack of appetite for OA books on those platforms in general. If wider dissemination is one (of many) desired outcomes of OA publishing, the wider digital supply chain needs to be engaged more effectively in future.”
We have identified which section of the report each recommendation has developed from. We have also indicated to whom each recommendation primarily applies, although many are relevant to more than one stakeholder group. We also suggest how quickly we think each recommendation could be achieved, distinguishing between quick wins and longer term goals.

In line with the objectives and ethos of OAPEN-UK, the recommendations fall into three categories:

1. Supporting informed decision-making – by all stakeholders in the scholarly communications process, but especially by researchers who may consider publishing an open access monograph
2. Taking collaborative action – multiple stakeholders working together to overcome challenges or develop new standards
3. Enabling projects, research and experimentation – initiatives to support innovation or deepen understanding

Underlying this is a set of guiding principles that will underpin any successful activity around open access for monographs.

Over the five years of OAPEN-UK, other projects and initiatives have undertaken important work on open access monographs. Some of our recommendations support those of projects that have already reported and some activities that we suggest may already be in progress thanks to initiatives that began while OAPEN-UK was underway. We have indicated where this is the case.

The recommendations presented below have been developed from the findings presented in the previous four sections of this report.
Guiding principles

» Reframe the discussions around open access for scholarly monographs by acknowledging that monographs are different from journals. The issues, concerns and opportunities are not necessarily the same as in the journals market and are sometimes more complex or compounded by issues in the wider e-book environment.

The HEFCE Open Access Monographs project and the Crossick report (http://bit.ly/1wpzNru) have made inroads into this work, making clear the need to recognise the distinctiveness of monographs.

» At the same time, recognise what has worked for journals as open access publishing has become more mainstream. Open access monographs can learn from aspects of their experience and initiatives such as ORCID, PubMed Central, the practice of implementing Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs), and other developments in journal publishing may all be useful in developing open access for monographs.

» A one-size-fits-all approach will not work for open access monographs. Policies, services and business models need to be flexible so that they can fit with the existing diverse monograph publishing environment. Models will work more or less efficiently depending on the type of book, the author’s access to funding and the likely profitability of the text; it will be important to maintain a mix of models in the long term which will require flexibility from all stakeholders – this may be a challenge.

This recommendation is supported by the Crossick report (http://bit.ly/1wpzNru).

» Goodwill and tolerance of other stakeholders’ points of view are prerequisites to success for open access monographs. Lasting change will be achieved through collaboration and the various parties need to recognise that they may have very different perspectives, even where they share a common goal. Effective and open communication will be important, as will flexibility and compromise.

» Change must happen slowly, be carefully evaluated and ensure it does not undermine the existing strengths of monograph publishing. Books play an important and complex role in scholarly communications in the humanities and social sciences, and within the various economies of prestige that underpin academic careers, institutions, publishers and societies. Any change to these roles must be the result of careful deliberation, not an unintended consequence.

This recommendation is supported by the Finch report (researchinfonet.org/publish/finch), in relation to journals.
## 1. Supporting informed decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Learned society</th>
<th>Third party systems/suppliers</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The open access monograph environment will continue to be characterised by</strong></td>
<td>blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>diversity, innovation and change.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure information for researchers about open access monographs is readily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparable and consistent so they can understand the characteristics of each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option. The section on business models in this report suggests some key areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where information should be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing projects and initiatives in this area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The OAPEN and Jisc project, Investigating open access monograph services, has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a work package dedicated to setting out best practice for the information that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishers should provide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wellcome Trust has created a guide for publishers, suggesting information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that they should provide when sharing their open access options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of learned societies is widespread, and many researchers identify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more strongly with their discipline than their institution. Institutions may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not always be the most effective way of communicating policy changes, as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researchers sometimes regard these as administrative burdens and out of step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with their own disciplinary norms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make use of the networks and reach of learned societies to understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researcher priorities and to consult on and communicate new policies and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes around open access for monographs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation**
Researchers are not always clear about their options for publishing and their responsibilities and rights when it comes to licensing and contracts. This is true for traditional models, and even more so for new open access models.

*Provide targeted funding for institutions and learned societies to run joint training events on traditional and open access monograph publishing, in particular the legal aspects, including third party issues, and the variety of business models. Institutions may wish to explore the viability of implementing a scheme similar to the Harvard License to enable them to maximise their researchers’ outputs and comply with possible future mandates.*

**Recommendation**
When considering their publishing options, researchers draw on expertise from a wide range of people, including their colleagues, peers, publishers and university management.

*Ensure that all staff in a researcher-facing role (including publishing staff) are appropriately trained or provided with adequate information so that they can either answer questions or know who to contact with questions about open access policies, models, opportunities and requirements.*

**Recommendation**
Experimentation and change will be a feature of the open access monographs environment for some time. It is important that stakeholders understand how their innovations play out in practice, to inform future development.

*When introducing new policies or business models, consider what “success” would look like and how – within current constraints – data could be gathered to evaluate whether it has been achieved. Share these evaluations as widely as possible.*
1. Supporting informed decision making

**Recommendation**

While it is widely accepted that monograph publishing is not particularly lucrative, librarians and institutions want more information on the costs of publishing books so they can make informed decisions about business models. Researchers, too, are relatively detached from the costs of maintaining an effective research library.

Work towards greater transparency in costs throughout the publishing supply chain so that all participants can make informed decisions and judgements about value for money. Publishers or aggregators that sell collections or bundles of e-books will need to consider how to offset the costs of any titles that are also available in open access.

**Recommendation**

Authors are keen to understand the performance of their books and test their assumptions about whether open access will increase usage.

Make use of existing and emerging systems to track book sales and usage and report information back to authors. While this can only supply part of the picture, authors want to have this information available to them.
2. Taking collaborative action

Recommendation
At present, stakeholders all have their own ways of thinking and talking about open access for monographs. Each sees how the present publishing setup challenges their own group, but does not always recognise challenges to other groups (although often they do). The similarities between groups and the issues they face is not always recognised either. Effective change will depend upon a common understanding of the issues to be addressed.

Set up a cross-sector working group to establish:

- a common vocabulary for talking about open access monographs
- best practice guidelines / work arounds to support the immediate future
- the requirements for and development of new standards to support open access monographs
- where (new) services could be developed to support efficiency within the workflow

It will be important to ensure that standards or requirements are developed and implemented in a way that does not deter new market entrants.

Existing projects and initiatives in this area
The OAPEN and Jisc project, Investigating open access monograph services, has work packages dedicated to setting out best practice for metadata and aggregation.
**Recommendation**

Open access will result in sales and usage on a wide range of platforms controlled by different groups of stakeholders. To understand impact and build sustainable business models, data must be collected and comparable.

Collaborate to ensure usage and sales information can be reliably tracked across platforms to provide accurate data for authors, and for publishers as they seek to develop their business models.

**Existing projects and initiatives in this area**

Crossref DOI Event Tracker working group is exploring this.

**Recommendation**

Most users – individual academics and libraries seeking to ingest content – discover books through third party systems such as Amazon, Google or library vendors. At present these companies have limited motivation to support the discoverability of the open access version of content within their services.

Tackle the supply chain challenges with large companies, such as Amazon and Google, as a scholarly community rather than as individuals. This is necessary in order to motivate these companies to invest in change to support the visibility and discoverability of open access monographs.
Recommendation
Researchers expressed concerns about an open access version of their work differing from the version of record. They wanted to ensure that updates or different licence conditions on the open access version were clearly identified.

*Develop a framework for ensuring licence terms, permissions and version information travel through the supply chain with the monograph.*

**Existing projects and initiatives in this area**
The OAPEN and Jisc Investigating Open Access Monographs Services project is exploring the possibility of applying a CrossMark to OA Monographs.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Access for Monographs is not yet mainstream among publishers, institutions, funders and other stakeholders and services are not necessarily designed to meet the needs of open access. Aggregating efforts across organisations and sectors will raise the profile of open access books and create efficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Work with existing supply chain services such as ONIX and library discovery systems to identify developments and, where necessary, support the development of new centralised services that will bring efficiency into the market place, increase visibility and improve scholarly research.*

**Existing projects and initiatives in this area**
The OAPEN and Jisc Investigating Open Access Monograph Services project is currently exploring the opportunities associated with aggregation and automated deposit.
Recommendation
Everybody involved in academic publishing cares about prestige and monographs are an important way for researchers, publishers, institutions, learned societies and others to signal their credibility. It is important that open access versions of monographs are recognised, used, and become a normal and accepted part of scholarly discourse.

Identify and develop ways of showing use of open access books: for example, a way of signalling that a book is available in open access within referencing styles. Develop a common language to talk about peer review for all types of monograph.

Recommendation
Evidence about the impact of open access on monograph use is anecdotal and usually specific to certain titles. But this evidence would be much more powerful, informative and valuable if it were collected and collated in a systematic way.

Develop a way of capturing the wider, non-metric based impacts to show if and how open access monographs increase reach – this would help cement positivity towards OA business models – and encourage more policies and adoption.
3. Enabling further research, projects and experimentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Librarian</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Learned society</th>
<th>Third party systems/suppliers</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most organisations – publishers, universities, funders, learned societies and others – have a culture and values which inform how they approach their work. Open access initiatives will be most successful where they fit with this culture.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop open access working groups (or sub-groups) within organisations dedicated to considering the organisation’s core values, mission or founding principles and thinking about how open access monograph publishing fits with these in order to create policies, projects and messaging that will resonate and stick with staff.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many important developments in systems, policies and processes within an organisation have occurred as a result of projects which bring together disparate groups of people around a common aim. Understanding the impact of these projects also helps to develop effective next steps.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and fund time-limited, cross-departmental projects which are designed to meet organisational aims and evaluate them carefully to inform the next stage of development for open access monographs.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funders can strongly influence publisher and institutional appetites to experiment. Different groups will need different kinds of support, but all can learn from the experiences of their peers.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund a range of “testbeds” for new open access models and services to be explored and evaluated against a set of agreed criteria. Testbeds should support innovation, collaboration and best practice.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individuals play a very important role in driving change within organisations. A shared interest in open access monographs could overcome existing differences between stakeholder groups and certainly change will be more effective when it is co-ordinated across groups.

Establish a cross-sector working group for individuals at all levels in publishers, institutions, learned societies, funders, aggregators and other third parties to share their enthusiasm for open access monographs: use this working group to help stimulate change and improve understanding more widely throughout the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researchers can, individually, be extremely supportive of and interested in open access for monographs but may not find many like-minded peers in their own institution. This limits the possibility of researcher-led innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a support network for researchers who are keen to experiment with open access monographs, giving them a space to discuss their experiences and using them to influence more widely within the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned societies often have a particular focus on supporting early career researchers, and may see their monograph series as part of that ambition. Most are operating on very tight budgets with limited scope for experimentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund further work to explore if and how learned societies can better support their members, especially early career researchers, in transitioning to open access monographs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation
The value of the library collection of monographs to researchers, particularly at PhD level, is high. Libraries need to maintain access to print and e-book collections of monographs but are also being asked to support new models that work via the library. Institutions need to support libraries in experimenting with new open access models and publisher business models need to recognise the ongoing cost of maintaining access to subscribed content and supporting open access content.

Recommendation
Arguments about open access for monographs often focus upon potential benefits to research. Funders, institutions, librarians and academics are also interested in student experience, which is becoming increasingly important in the current funding climate. There is little evidence about how – if at all – open access monographs might benefit students. Investigate the value of open access monographs as a tool for teaching and learning and providing free access to important texts for students, exploring also whether this could free up funding within university libraries.

Recommendation
Funders play a crucial role in stimulating change; institutions, publishers and researchers will be encouraged to experiment with new models if funders have shown enthusiasm for open access monographs. At the same time, policies must be flexible so that they support rather than stifle innovation. Funders should develop lightweight, flexible polices that will account for the long process of book publishing and support early career researchers. Policies should develop in direct consultation with stakeholders.
### Recommendation

Institutions currently integrate open access content into their catalogues and repositories in very different ways. This means that end users may be more or less likely to find open access monographs depending on choices made by their own institution – visibility will not be equal across all organisations.

*Fund a project to establish best practice for inclusion of open access monographs within existing library discovery systems (catalogues, discovery services, web pages etc) and institutional repositories to support the visibility of open access monographs within the institution.*

### Recommendation

The potential legal and business impacts of implementing a non-commercial or non-derivative Creative Commons licence within the e-book supply chain and are not yet fully understood by publishers, e-book aggregators or institutions. The challenges of integrating third party content into open access monographs also need further exploration.

*Fund a piece of work to gather more insight into potential legal issues, challenges and possible solutions, both here in the UK and internationally.*

### Recommendation

Relatively little experimentation is happening with delayed open access for monographs, but institutions in particular see this as a potentially important route.

*Fund a scoping study on how delayed open access might work for monographs, with a view to developing a pilot project for further experimentation.*
Further reading


» The academic book of the future. AHRC http://academicbookfuture.org

### Progress of policies, projects, publishing models and research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>External initiatives</th>
<th>OAPEN-UK activities</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/09/08</td>
<td>The OAPEN (Open Access Publishing in European Networks) project launches. The goal of the project was to achieve a sustainable publication model for academic books in humanities and social sciences (HSS) and to improve the visibility and usability of high quality academic research in Europe</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1OSkeYf">http://bit.ly/1OSkeYf</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>01/08/09</td>
<td>Open Humanities Press partners with the University of Michigan Library’s Scholarly Publishing Office to launch five new OA book series</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1lwvGfn">http://bit.ly/1lwvGfn</a></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*2009</td>
<td>Bloomsbury Academic publishes its first open access book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*2010</td>
<td>University of Huddersfield Press offers open access monograph publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1TOJs54">http://bit.ly/1TOJs54</a></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>01/10/10</td>
<td>Launch of the OAPEN-NL two year project to test a publication model for open access books and to create transparency into the costs and procedures involved</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MWTsqO">http://bit.ly/1MWTsqO</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>01/10/10</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK steering group is formed and holds first meeting to agree the project</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1S6gD6y">http://bit.ly/1S6gD6y</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>06/10/10</td>
<td>The OAPEN Library was launched containing 17 content providers and over 650 open access academic books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22/10/10</td>
<td>The OAPEN-UK project invites publishers to participate in a research project and pilot to make books available in open access</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1SHpETJ">http://bit.ly/1SHpETJ</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>01/03/11</td>
<td>The OAPEN project released its final report</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1OgWx8G">http://bit.ly/1OgWx8G</a></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>01/04/11</td>
<td>Launch of the OAPEN Foundation, the OAPEN Library and first steps towards the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB)</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1OSkeYf">http://bit.ly/1OSkeYf</a></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>External initiatives</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK activities</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12/07/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK contracts are signed with Palgrave, Berg, Liverpool University Press, University of Wales Press, Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1l7mayV">http://bit.ly/1l7mayV</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>01/09/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>The OAPEN-UK pilot to explore the impact of open access on sales and usage commenced</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1S6gD6y">http://bit.ly/1S6gD6y</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14/09/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK full steering group including participating publishers meet and agree the full research plan</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MWU6Vg">http://bit.ly/1MWU6Vg</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>01/10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK qualitative side of the research plan starts</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/105IB4m">http://bit.ly/105IB4m</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21/11/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with institutional representatives</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1lww91n">http://bit.ly/1lww91n</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28/11/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with publishers</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1O5lB4m">http://bit.ly/1O5lB4m</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29/11/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with researchers as both authors and readers</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/3150Lao">http://bit.ly/3150Lao</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20/01/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with research managers and administrators</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1TOKgal">http://bit.ly/1TOKgal</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>13/02/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with e-book aggregators</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1l7mmhv">http://bit.ly/1l7mmhv</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15/02/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with learned societies</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1TOKIL0">http://bit.ly/1TOKIL0</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17/02/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK focus group with HSS research funders</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1l7m5Bb">http://bit.ly/1l7m5Bb</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29/02/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN soft launches DOAB: A new service for open access monographs</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1NdGNq4">http://bit.ly/1NdGNq4</a></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18/06/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Finch report: Accessibility, sustainability, excellence: how to expand access to research publications, is released. The report recommended a clear policy direction in the UK towards support for 'Gold' open access publishing, the extension of existing licensing and improvements to infrastructure</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1CJmJXu">http://bit.ly/1CJmJXu</a></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>External initiatives</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK activities</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>16/07/12</td>
<td>The government response to the report accepts all the report’s recommendations and looks to the funding councils and research councils to implement them in consultation with universities, research institutions, researchers and publishers</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1SHr68w">http://bit.ly/1SHr68w</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>16/07/12</td>
<td>Research Councils UK (RCUK) announces a new open access policy for articles with preference for immediate open access</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1DlE06v">http://bit.ly/1DlE06v</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31/08/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK end of year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>01/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK start of year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>01/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK Royal Historical Society case study</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1HZiWrF">http://bit.ly/1HZiWrF</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nov 12 - Feb 13</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK benchmarking survey with participating authors and steering group 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1QPrGma">http://bit.ly/1QPrGma</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK infographic workshops on monograph publishing</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MVwXa8">http://bit.ly/1MVwXa8</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>Palgrave Macmillan extends Palgrave Open to include monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1Lo86Gl">http://bit.ly/1Lo86Gl</a></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>04/01/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>RCUK open access policy comes into effect</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1DlE06v">http://bit.ly/1DlE06v</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>25/01/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK Regional Studies Association case study</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1HZiWrF">http://bit.ly/1HZiWrF</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20/02/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>OpenEdition Books launches with 2500 open access books</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>May - Jun 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK publisher in depth interviews</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1OgYG4q">http://bit.ly/1OgYG4q</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>30/05/13</td>
<td>Wellcome Trust announces extension of OA policy to include monographs and book chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1lwxqa">http://bit.ly/1lwxqa</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>31/05/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Book Publishers wins the IFLA/Brill Open Access Award</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1j9kmEg">http://bit.ly/1j9kmEg</a></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Jun - Jul 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK institutional case studies with Sussex, Lincoln and Nottingham</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1Qw82MX">http://bit.ly/1Qw82MX</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>01/07/13</td>
<td>British Academy releases Debating Open Access: A collection of eight articles by leading academics and publishers, reflecting on the challenges of open access publication for humanities and social sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1LFdpu1">http://bit.ly/1LFdpu1</a></td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>External initiatives</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK activities</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>02/07/13</td>
<td>Jisc and OAPEN Conference on Open Access Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences takes place at the British Library. The first ever conference dedicated to OA monographs</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MoWrLK">http://bit.ly/1MoWrLK</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>02/07/13</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK Guide to Creative Commons for HSS researchers is released</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/TcxoOf7">http://bit.ly/TcxoOf7</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>31/08/13</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK end of year two</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>01/09/13</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK start of year three</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>08/10/13</td>
<td>Knowledge Unlatched commences round one of its pilot to explore the viability of a global library consortium collaborating to make monographs open access</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/OnJIPV">http://bit.ly/OnJIPV</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>23/10/13</td>
<td>OAPEN-NL final report released with key findings that open access publishing has no negative effect on book sales, and increases online usage and discovery considerably</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/TMoWRIuM">http://bit.ly/TMoWRIuM</a></td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>25/10/13</td>
<td>Jisc and OAPEN Conference on Open Access Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences conference report is released</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/TSHMmuN">http://bit.ly/TSHMmuN</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>12/11/13</td>
<td>Horizon2020 OA requires beneficiaries to make research open access and encourages this to include monographs</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/T9regtt">http://bit.ly/T9regtt</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>01/03/14</td>
<td>HEFCE policy for open access in the post-2014 REF: (updated July 2015) sets out the details of a requirement that certain research outputs should be made open access to be eligible for submission to the next REF. Monographs are excluded following feedback from the consultation</td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/Tq9p9T1">http://bit.ly/Tq9p9T1</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
<td>Knowledge Unlatched wins the IFLA/Brill Open Access Award</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1PPDeVO">http://bit.ly/1PPDeVO</a></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>10/07/14</td>
<td>Jisc’s national monograph strategy roadmap is published</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1O5cZuo">http://bit.ly/1O5cZuo</a></td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Jul - Sep 14</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK librarian survey</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1HaTLSR">http://bit.ly/1HaTLSR</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>31/08/14</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK end of year three and end of the pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>01/09/14</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK start of year four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>04/11/14</td>
<td>The HEFCE Monographs and Open Access Project was set up to consider the place of monographs in the arts, humanities and social science disciplines, and how they fit into the developing world of open access to research. The project was led by Geoffrey Crossick, distinguished Professor of humanities at the school of advanced study, University of London, and was commissioned by HEFCE in partnership with the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1X0OGUOh">http://bit.ly/1X0OGUOh</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>*Jan 15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK research funder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MDX7uq">http://bit.ly/1MDX7uq</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>23/02/15</td>
<td>OpenAIRE pilot launched funding open access for post-grant FP7 publications to include monographs</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1QLludvP">http://bit.ly/1QLludvP</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>16/03/15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK business models SWOT workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1SHoJPt">http://bit.ly/1SHoJPt</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>May - Jul 15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK author interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1MXOqw1">http://bit.ly/1MXOqw1</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>05/06/15</td>
<td>University College London Press launches</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1LogTID">http://bit.ly/1LogTID</a></td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>15/06/15</td>
<td>The Radical Open Access conference takes place</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1X0OUu">http://bit.ly/1X0OUu</a></td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>17/06/15</td>
<td>DOAB wins the IFLA/Brill Open Access Award</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1lwErpX">http://bit.ly/1lwErpX</a></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>External initiatives</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK activities</td>
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<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Jun 15 - Aug 15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK benchmarking survey with participating authors and steering group 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1QPrGma">http://bit.ly/1QPrGma</a></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>01/07/15</td>
<td>Revisions to the HEFCE policy for open access in the post-2014 REF</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1q9p9T1">http://bit.ly/1q9p9T1</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>01/07/15</td>
<td>Jisc and OAPEN Foundation commence investigating OA monograph services: a project to explore potential future services to support OA monograph publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1LogYMm">http://bit.ly/1LogYMm</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>22/07/15</td>
<td>Wellcome Trust launches guide for publishing open access monographs and book chapters</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/TgClajB">http://bit.ly/TgClajB</a></td>
<td>Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>31/08/15</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK end of year four and end of the OAPEN-UK project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>06/10/15</td>
<td>Knowledge Unlatched round two commences</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://bit.ly/1OSCM9">http://bit.ly/1OSCM9</a></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>OAPEN-UK final report released</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OAPEN-UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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