Funded by the European Union

Deliverable 4.2 – The PALOMERA Recommendations for Open Access Books

—— Executive Summary ——

The PALOMERA project set out to understand the policy landscape of OA books and the challenges preventing research funders and institutions in particular from including books in their OA policies. One of the project's main goals was to support the key stakeholders in the field by providing evidence-based, aligned, and actionable recommendations that can help formulate OA book policies.

Open Access books are defined here as scholarly, peer-reviewed books including monographs, book chapters, edited collections, critical editions, and other long-form scholarly works. Textbooks and popular science books are seen as a different category, although the policy recommendations could potentially be extended to this category of books as well when they are published Open Access. Open textbooks are deliberately left out from this definition because they require a different process: policies regarding open textbooks must take into account considerations about Open Educational Resources, which are beyond the remit of the PALOMERA project.

In Deliverable 4.2, PALOMERA has developed an extensive set of actionable and aligned recommendations on Open Access (OA) books for eight stakeholders: (1) Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) and research institutes, (2) Public and private Research Funding Organisations (RFOs), (3) National policymakers, (4) Academic and national libraries, (5) Researchers, (6) Learned societies, (7) Infrastructure providers, and (8) Academic publishers. These stakeholders are uniquely positioned to drive a transition to OA books by embedding OA principles for books into their policies and strategies. Since the current landscape of OA book policies is characterised by a lack of policy alignment between various relevant stakeholders, this change requires an aligned effort based on policy recommendations for various stakeholders that are grounded in solid evidence.

The evidence for these recommendations has been provided by the Knowledge Base developed in WP2, which contains over 650 open access policy and related documents and a set of 40 stakeholder interviews, as well as on the research undertaken in WP3 which provides a unique overview of the OA books policy landscape in Europe.

For each set of recommendations, we have defined a timeline by prioritising recommendations in terms of short term (1-2 years), medium term (3 years), and long term (4-5 years) time frames.

The project has performed three validation exercises to check the validity of 1) the data collection and methodology; 2) the analytical approach, methodology, and key findings; and 3) the recommendations themselves. This approach was chosen to increase the engagement with all relevant stakeholders and to strengthen the outcomes of PALOMERA.

The recommendations integrate the valuable comments of two reviewers, as well as the constructive comments from the subgroup on scholarly communication of the European University Association's (EUA) Expert Group on Open Science and the LIBER Working Group on Open Access.

Keywords :

Open Access, Open Access books,
Open Access policies,
Research Funding Organisations,
Research Performing Organisations,
Policymakers,
Open Infrastructure providers,
Academic publishers, Scholarly societies,
Libraries, CC licences, Metadata,
Book processing charge,
Diamond Open Access,
Policy recommendations

Document identification

Workpackage	WP4

Lead Beneficiary	BE08 ESF	**Lead Author**	Johan Rooryck

Contributors	Laura Bandura- Morgan, Nataliia Bazeliuk, Andrea Davidson, Malte Dreyer Lorena Caliman Fontes, Maria Olímpia Fernandes Especiosa, Nelson Henrique Ferreira, Rupert Gatti, Françoise Gouzi, Davide Emanuele Iannace, Mikael Laakso, Delfim Leão, Frank Manista, Gabriela Manista, Maciej Maryl, Pierre Mounier, Sinziana Paltineanu, Nora Papp Le Roy, Vanessa Proudman, Ursula Rabar, Claire Redhead, Niels Stern, Graham Stone, Andrej Vrčon
Reviewers	Danny Kingsley, Marc Vanholsbeeck

Type[1]	R -Document, report	**Dissemination level[2]**	Public (P)
Status[3]	Under EC review Final	**Due date**	2024/10/31
Version	D4.2 V1.3 Final	**Submission date**	2024/10/31

Document history

Version[4]	Date	Change editors name	Changes
1.0	2024/06/18	Johan Rooryck	Drafting and collecting input
1.1	2024/09/30	Johan Rooryck	Editing the reviewer ready version
1.2	2024/10/04	Danny Kingsley, Marc Vanholsbeeck	Minor changes and some improvements suggested
1.3	2024/10/21	Johan Rooryck	Pre-final version integrating reviewers' comments

Quality control

Role	Name (Beneficiary short name)	Approval date
Project manager (Quality)	Mandy Yuju Lin	2024/10/31

---

[1] Retain as applicable.
[2] Retain as applicable.
[3] Retain as applicable.
[4] Use 2.0, 2.1, etc. if the version is updated after the EC rejection.

Table of contents

List of contributors

Name	ORCID	Affiliation	Role	Section
Laura Bandura-Morgan	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7040-5682	OAPEN Foundation	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	1–4
Nataliia Bazeliuk	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6156-1897	HANKEN School of Economics	Writing – review & editing	1–4
Andrea Davidson	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3234-2649	SPARC Europe	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.2, 4.3, 4.4
Malte Dreyer	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5971-3572	UGOE	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	2, 3, 4.1
Lorena Caliman Fontes	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9566-2397	Coimbra	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5
Maria Olímpia Fernandes Especiosa	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9519-6859	Coimbra	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5
Nelson Henrique Ferreira	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2637-3211	Coimbra	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5
Rupert Gatti	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0676-9024	Open Book Publishers	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.7, 4.8
Françoise Gouzi	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0221-5991	DARIAH-EU	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5
Davide Emanuele Iannace	https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7154-2810	Coimbra	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5

Name	ORCID	Affiliation	Role	Section
Mikael Laakso	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3951-7990	Hanken School of Economics	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	1–4
Delfim Leão	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8107-9165	Coimbra	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.5
Frank Manista	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6901-1507	Jisc	Review	4.7, 4.8
Gabriela Manista	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1012-3958	IBL PAN – Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Science	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4, 4.6
Maciej Maryl	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2639-041X	IBL PAN – Institute of Literary Research of the Polish Academy of Science	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4, 4.6
Pierre Mounier	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0691-6063	OPERAS	Review	1-4
Sinziana Paltineanu	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9398-4480	OPERAS	Writing – review & editing	
Nora Papp Le Roy	https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9232-7839	ESF cOAlition S	Review	1–4
Vanessa Proudman	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5623-9051	SPARC Europe	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	1–4
Ursula Rabar	https://orcid.org/0009-0008-7452-3732	OPERAS	Writing – review & editing	1–4
Claire Redhead	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5797-0022	OASPA	Writing – review & editing	4.8
Johan Rooryck	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7214-7405	ESF - cOAlition S	Writing - Original Draft, Writing –	1–4

			review & editing	
Niels Stern	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6466-9748	OAPEN	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	1–4
Graham Stone	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5189-373X	Jisc	Writing - Original Draft, Writing – review & editing	4.7, 4.8
Andrej Vrčon	https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6198-3279	LIBER	Writing – review & editing	4.4

Table of acronyms

Acronyms	
AAM	Author Accepted Manuscript
BPC	Book Processing Charge
CC licence	Creative Commons licence
CoNOSC	Council for National Open Science Coordination
CRIS	Current research information system
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
ERA	European Research Area
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable.
JIF	Journal Impact Factor
OA	Open Access
OIP	Open Infrastructure Providers
ORCID	Open Researcher and Contributor ID
OS	Open Science
PID	Publisher Identification Number

Acronyms	
PESTLE	Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Legal and Environmental
PRISM	Peer Review Information Service for Monographs
POSI	The Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure
RFO	Research Funding Organisation
ROR	Research Organisation Registry
RPO	Research Performing Organisation
TCS	Think Check Submit
VoR	Version of Record
AAM	Author Accepted Manuscript
BPC	Book Processing Charge
CC licence	Creative Commons licence
CoNOSC	Council for National Open Science Coordination
CRIS	Current research information system
DOI	Digital Object Identifier
ERA	European Research Area
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable.
JIF	Journal Impact Factor
OA	Open Access
OIP	Open Infrastructure Providers

Table of recommendations

Recommendation #1:
Raise awareness about OA books at all levels

Recommendation #2:
Provide flexible funding in research grants for OA book costs.

4.3. National policymakers

Recommendation #1:
Consult with all national stakeholders

Recommendation #2:
Formulate a national policy for OA books

Recommendation #3:
Establish mechanisms that fund OA books, programmes, and infrastructure

4.4. Libraries

Recommendation #1
Promote OA books in the institutional OA publication policy

Recommendation #2:
Raise awareness of the importance of OA books and their benefits

Recommendation #3:
Make OA books more visible

Recommendation #4:
Provide researchers with clear information on OA books

Recommendation #5:
Set financial and institutional incentives for OA books

Recommendation #6:
Consider playing a role in the archival and long-term preservation of OA books

4.5. Researchers

Recommendation #1:
Ask publishers for explicit information on OA policy

Recommendation #2:
Understand the publishing process

Recommendation #3:
Explore resources and support

Recommendation #4:
Share positive experiences about publishing OA books

4.6. Scholarly societies

Recommendation #1:
Develop discipline-specific publishing standards and practices for OA books

Recommendation #2:
Incentivise OA book publishing

Recommendation #3:
Advocate for disciplinary needs with respect to OA books in OA policies

4.7. Open infrastructure providers (OIP)

Recommendation #1:
Encourage collaboration between open infrastructure providers

Recommendation #2:
Ensure alignment of terminology

Recommendation #3:
Develop and adopt authority files

Recommendation #4:
Encourage and participate in national publishing platforms

Recommendation #5:
Allow metadata sharing with and reuse by national libraries, publishing platforms and institutional repositories

Recommendation #6:
Define a set of monitoring criteria in collaboration with RFOs and national policymakers

4.8. Publishers

Recommendation #1:
Provide clear information on publisher OA book policies

Recommendation #2:
Increase awareness of OA and its possibilities

Recommendation #3:
Improve the discoverability of published OA books

Recommendation #4:
Improve metadata for OA books

Recommendation #5:
Publish OA books in many formats

Conclusion

1. Introduction

Despite groundbreaking Open Access (OA) experiments and growing advocacy, the uptake of OA books has received less attention in a policy context than that of OA journal articles and research data. Although books are a specific scholarly output for many authors, they represent a publication format that is very important in various disciplines,[1] and that is often neglected in OA policies in favour of the journal article.

Open Access books are defined here as scholarly, peer-reviewed books including monographs, book chapters, edited collections, critical editions, and other long-form scholarly works. Textbooks and popular science books are seen as a different category, although the policy recommendations could potentially be extended to this category of books as well when they are published Open Access. Open textbooks are deliberately left out from this definition because they require a different process: policies regarding open textbooks must take into account considerations about Open Educational Resources, which are beyond the remit of the PALOMERA project.

Research funders, national open science policymakers, learned societies and institutions are uniquely positioned to drive change by embedding OA principles for books into their policies and strategies. This change requires an aligned effort based on policy recommendations for various stakeholders that are grounded in solid evidence. This report aims to provide such recommendations.

The PALOMERA project set out to understand the policy landscape of OA books and the challenges preventing research funders and institutions in particular from including books in their OA policies. The main expected outcome of the project is to support the key stakeholders in the field by providing evidence-based, aligned, and actionable recommendations that can help formulate OA book policies.

To base the recommendations on well-documented evidence, the project has researched the policies of 39 European Research Area (ERA) countries and structured the collected data in a [Knowledge Base](#) with over 650 policy and policy-related documents in addition to over 40

---

[1] Contrary to a commonly held perception, OA books are not only important in SSH, but also in STM disciplines: 20-25% of the OAPEN book collection is from STEM disciplines, including the SCOAP3 collection https://oapen.org/funders/10449907-scoap3-the-sponsoring-consortium-for-open-access-publishing-in-particle-physics . On the central role of OA books, see also Crossick, Geoffrey (2016) Monographs and Open Access, https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.280; Ferwerda, Eelco, Niels Stern, & Frances Pinter (2017) A Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs, https://www.ouvrirlascience.fr/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Landscape_study_on_OA_and_Monographs_Oct_2017_KE.pdf; a joint research study by Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press: Researchers' perspectives on the purpose and value of the monograph, https://openresearch.community/documents/59404-perspectives-on-the-value-and-purpose-of-the-monograph

anonymised interviews with stakeholders from across the ERA.[2] In addition, the project has reviewed 89 existing OA policy research articles and reports which are also used as evidence here. These are mostly not part of the public Knowledge Base due to copyright issues preventing them from being re-shared. This large and well-structured Knowledge Base has enabled the project to perform unprecedented policy studies across stakeholders and countries applying the PESTLE analytical framework approach. The analysed material forming the basis of recommendations is available in the PALOMERA project Knowledge Base[3].

Alignment is one of the key goals of our recommendations and approach. The current landscape of OA book policies is characterised by a lack of policy alignment between various relevant stakeholders, as was evidenced by stakeholder engagement events organised throughout the project.

To address this fragmentation, we provide actionable recommendations in a structured way that progressively moves from general recommendations to stakeholder-specific ones. First of all, we formulate *general recommendations* that are relevant for all stakeholders. Secondly, we present a set of *common recommendations for RFOs, RPOs and national and regional policymakers* (Section 3) Finally, we formulate *recommendations that specifically apply to each of the following eight stakeholders* (Section 4):

(1) Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) and research institutes,
(2) Public and private Research Funding Organisations (RFOs),
(3) National policymakers,
(4) Academic and national libraries,
(5) Researchers,
(6) Learned societies,
(7) Infrastructure providers
(8) Academic publishers.

For each set of recommendations, we have defined a timeline by prioritising recommendations in terms of short term (1-2 years), medium term (3 years), and long term (4-5 years) time frames.

The recommendations were formulated and discussed by an international group of experts who were participants in the PALOMERA project. The recommendations were prepared in eight stakeholder groups with related experts, and progress and alignment were discussed in regular plenary meetings. The various recommendations were subsequently organised into the three levels of recommendations mentioned above: general recommendations; common recommendations for RFOs, RPOs and national or regional policymakers; and stakeholder-specific recommendations. We realise that the explanations we provide for the recommendations are sometimes long, detailed, and technical, an inevitable and desirable result

---

[2] Note that this means that some of our observations and recommendations are limited to the ERA, and that a different legislation may apply in other regions of the world.
[3] Maryl, M., Manista, G., Păltineanu, S., Stone, G., Laakso, M., Dryer, M., Bandura-Morgan, L., Davidson, A., Silva Ferreira, N. H., Snijder, R., Tummes, J.-P., & Varachkina, H. (2024). PALOMERA D2.1 Report on Compiling the Knowledge Base. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10777132

of the evidence-based process we chose to follow in the project. This is why we have provided a table summarising the recommendations for ease of reference.

In addition, the project has performed three validation exercises to check the validity of 1) the data collection and methodology; 2) the analytical approach, methodology, and key findings; and 3) the recommendations themselves. This approach has been chosen to increase the engagement with all relevant stakeholders and to strengthen the outcomes of PALOMERA. We also integrated the valuable comments of our reviewers, as well as the constructive comments from the subgroup on scholarly communication of the European University Association's (EUA) Expert Group on Open Science and the LIBER Working Group on Open Access. We are very grateful to all those who contributed to our work in this way.

It is essential that the recommendations are *aligned* and complement each other across the stakeholder groups. Ideally, they should be adopted in mutual concertation between stakeholders. Alignment of policies can occur in a healthy ecosystem, where the stakeholders work together in a synergetic way. All perspectives need to be considered and addressed jointly in an actionable way based on available evidence and best practices. The recommendations are *actionable*, which means that they contain practical advice, best-practice examples, and links to contextual material to facilitate their implementation in institutional contexts. Although we understand that national, cultural, economic and social contexts may differ, we hope these recommendations will contribute to fruitful pathways towards more policies for OA books, in the interest of the public availability and dissemination of scholarly knowledge.

2. General recommendations

Here we provide overarching recommendations that should be considered by all stakeholders with an interest in developing policies for OA books.

Recommendation #1:
Address OA books specifically in OA policies

Open Access policies should encourage, recommend or require OA to a wide range of research outputs, including books. Most OA policies show a narrow focus on OA for journal articles and (FAIR) research data.[4] OA policies should explicitly address OA books, since these represent a research output type that not only has its own specificities in terms of content, evaluation modalities, readership, form, and length, but also functions as the most important output type in

---

[4] See e.g. the Zotero dataset: zotero://open-pdf/groups/4935808/items/CN85TVZ4?page=10, The National Policy of the Republic of Cyprus for Open Access to Scientific Information. (2016.) https://knowledgebase.oabooks-toolkit.org/items/a3bb475e-9eb8-4396-bb2b-03b21e9f6869, page 4, or the absence of any mention of OA books in Gurdal, G., Holt, I., & Kafali Can, G. (2019). Achieving Open Science Through OpenAIRE. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3387265

many research cultures that produce, evaluate and read them.[5] OA books should be treated on a par with OA articles and open data.

The Knowledge Base identifies 68 Open Science (OS) policy documents that make use of a general term like "scientific publication", without specifically mentioning books. The use of such a general term leaves ambiguity as to whether books are included, and weakens the policies since no further considerations are provided as to how OA to books should be advanced. Since OA books have hitherto received less attention, it is important that they are given appropriate visibility as a distinct and integral part of Open Science policies.

A policy on OA books should provide a clear definition of the type of books that are in scope of the policy (see e.g. the definition of OA books above). In the PALOMERA policy analysis of 113 OA policies that explicitly mentioned books, 26 (23%) did not provide further specifications for what types work as specifically considered to be within the policy, and many of those that did were vague leaving room for interpretation.[6] When national law makes it possible, it is advisable to mandate rather than recommend open access to all books.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Use simple language in OA book policies

It is important to keep the policy language simple, and avoid jargon that will not be understood by OA book authors. Care must be taken to distinguish between the administrative formulation of the policy on the one hand, and the communication strategy and dissemination to its target audience on the other. The latter requires more accessible and actionable resources based on the policy. We recommend that the OA policy be accompanied by implementation guidelines.[7]
The policy should include statements that cover the following elements:

1. The type of OA policy mandate and self-archiving:
   mandatory, recommended, or encouraged;
2. The types of books that are in scope of the policy;
3. The time and place of deposit;
4. The technical specifications;
5. The policy on rights retention;
6. The type of open licences allowed or required;
7. The funding mechanisms, including eligible costs and any limitations;
8. The distribution of responsibilities between involved parties;

---

[5] Source: Country Overview, Palomera WP 3 Report, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1360726
[6] Policy scope section in the policy analysis. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251
[7] For a literature review, see DeSanto, D. 2023. Carrots and Sticks: A Qualitative Study of Library Responses to the UK's Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021 Open Access Policy. College & Research Libraries, 84(3), 315–334. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.84.3.315

9. The compliance and monitoring mechanisms.[8]

For a primer on writing OA policies, see
https://open-access.network/en/information/policy-frameworks/open-access-policies

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #3:
Raise awareness about OA books at all levels

Although awareness of the advantages of OA is already widespread among the academic community, it tends to be much more directed towards the publication of articles and open data than towards OA books. There is a real need to inform and increase awareness of all the stakeholders involved in the book value production chain. From our analysis of interviews 'a lack of awareness' ranked among the top five most frequently mentioned barriers to wider adoption of OA books[9].

In Section 4, we formulate stakeholder-specific recommendations to raise awareness of OA books for Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) (Section 4.2, Recommendation #1), libraries (Section 4.4, Recommendations #2 and #3), researchers (Section 4.5, Recommendation #3), and publishers (Section 4.8, Recommendation #2). We draw specific attention to these recommendations here to ensure that they can be used to create much needed synergies.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #4:
Consider funding mechanisms for OA books that do not involve BPCs.

Publishers often charge Book Processing Charges (BPCs) to recoup costs for the publication of OA books. However, BPCs are subject to the same criticism as Article Processing Charges (APCs) for publication in journals: they often vary considerably between publishers, disciplines, and output types. They are also highly inequitable, excluding authors without access to funds.

Exploring alternatives to BPCs fosters a more equitable publishing environment, enabling authors from underfunded institutions or regions to publish OA books without facing financial barriers. Moving away from BPCs would enable the development of publishing models that are more sustainable and less reliant on inequitable author payments. It is important to encourage sustainable, inclusive and cost-effective funding models for OA books.

The most prominent barrier identified throughout for OA policy development and increased adoption of OA books in the PALOMERA interviews was the availability of funding resources,

---

[8] For a literature review, see Tsoukala, V., Angelaki, M. (2015). Open Access Policy Guidelines and Template for Funders. https://shorturl.at/Hm8E9
[9] Barriers in policy development section. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

often in the context of BPCs being too expensive to support as a model for transitioning towards OA book publishing.[10] There was also a strong signal that alternative solutions are needed, since only under a third of all analysed OA book policies by RPOs included any information about funding they provide for OA books, making compliance very difficult for authors.[11]

While it is clear that there is a cost to the publication of OA books, we invite all stakeholders to explore cost-effective alternatives to BPCs that do not involve author-facing charges. We recognise that finding viable alternatives to BPCs could be difficult, particularly for smaller publishers or in fields with less funding support, and recommend that appropriate,openly available infrastructure and tools be developed for OA book publishing. We also encourage relevant stakeholders to consider membership in different national and international collective funding models that facilitate Diamond OA book publishing.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #5:
Engage in collaboration with related stakeholders

OA policies are often developed by different stakeholders who do not necessarily coordinate their actions with respect to information management, possibilities for funding, and incentives, rewards, and recognition. This makes it hard for authors of OA books to find appropriate and consistent information about OA for books, appropriate funding to recoup the costs of publication, and clear information about how the publication of books in OA will count towards their career progression.

Analysis of the transcripts of the interviews conducted within PALOMERA identified the lack of national coordination as the third most frequent barrier, but also the most frequent enabler for successful policy development. This suggests that this component is very powerful and needs to be managed correctly.[12] We therefore recommend that all stakeholders engage in collaboration and take responsibility for bringing together stakeholders at their specific level, and for aligning with transnational OA book policies such as those of cOAlition S or the European Commission (EC). Collaboration could also take the form of collecting best practices in OA book publishing and making these available for all stakeholders. We provide specific recommendations for collaboration for each stakeholder in Section 4. RPOs should ensure that the missions of affiliated academic publishers are aligned with the OA policies of their institution (Section 4.1, Recommendation #3). RFOs should bring together national stakeholders, identify their needs, and ensure their participation (Section 4.2, Recommendation #1). Likewise, national policymakers should consult with all national stakeholders in OA book publishing (Section 4.3, Recommendation #2). Scholarly societies should engage with policymakers, funders, and members to ensure that OA policies adequately address the diverse needs of OA book

---

[10] Barriers in policy development section. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

[11] Funding section in the policy analysis. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

[12] Barriers in policy development section. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

publishing in their field (Section 4.6, Recommendation #3). Open infrastructure providers (OIP) should collaborate more strategically on high quality open book metadata to create efficiencies and establish best practices for other stakeholders (Section 4.7, Recommendation #1), and they should define a set of monitoring criteria in collaboration with RFOs and national policymakers (Section 4.7, Recommendation #7).

Time frame: Short Term

3. Common recommendations for RPOs, RFOs, and policymakers

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers have in common that they are able to influence the behaviour of authors of OA books via local, national, and international policies and mandates that incentivise and reward the publication of OA books. It therefore makes sense to group the recommendations that are specifically directed at this aspect. More specific recommendations for each of these stakeholders are provided below in Section 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

Recommendation #1:
Consider appropriate reward and recognition mechanisms for OA books

OA book policies should take into account that the mechanisms providing reputation, rewards, and recognition to the authors of books are very different from those that apply to authors who mainly publish journal articles. This is especially important in the context of the challenges and undesirable developments that have been created by the reputation systems in place for journal publication (Journal Impact Factor (JIF) and other journal prestige citation scores). In each scholarly discipline, books function quite differently as a means of scholarly communication. This entails that the current reform efforts in the rewards and recognition system will need to take this discipline-dependent specificity into account. Of the 113 OA book policies analysed in detail for PALOMERA, only 26 (23%) could be interpreted as including some kind of incentive for compliance mentioned within the policy.[13] In the interviews conducted, incentives were among the top themes we discovered among both enablers and barriers for policy development and OA book publishing adoption. This suggests that it is very important to include such incentives for compliance in OA book policies, and that they should be thoughtfully designed to work as intended.[14]

In addition, many scholars are engaged as editors of scholarly book series and reviewers of OA books. This is invisible work that is essential for a well functioning OA book ecosystem and it is rarely rewarded or recognised. Institutions should therefore encourage their staff to become

---

[13]   Incentives analysis within the policy analysis section. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

[14]   Barriers and enablers in policy development section. D.3.1. Report on analysis findings. 10.5281/zenodo.13827251

active in editorial boards of scholarly book series and volunteer for reviewing OA books, and appropriately recognise and reward these activities in a way that does not just count the number of book reviews written, but takes into account their intrinsic contribution to the scholarly debate.

OA books, as well as the editorial and reviewing work that ensures their quality, should explicitly be taken into account for appointment and promotion criteria or in performance assessment.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Provide appropriate funding mechanisms for OA books

The specificity of funding OA books
In line with a strategy for opening up OA books, RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should *provide and coordinate funding* for researchers to recoup OA book costs.[15] In many cases, the costs of publishing books are covered by incidental OA funds, individual grants, project budgets and other non-permanent resources. Reliable, consistent, and sustainable funding for OA books should be factored into regular budgets as an integral part of OA policies for OA books. Application criteria for OA book authors must be consistently defined. The costs can be included in project budgets, they can be part of a national performance-based public funding model for universities, RPOs, and other higher education institutions,[16] a national 'Transition to OA' project,[17] or a national subsidy system for OA book publication that assigns funds to libraries as is the case in Germany.[18] Other initiatives, such as those mentioned in Morka (2021), should also be considered.[19]

Funding shared services, processes, and studies
RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers can also bring more efficiency to the OA book ecosystem by funding shared services. Separate budget lines or budgets for OA books as opposed to closed books, or just printed books, should be given consideration.[20] RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers could also consider funding more innovative open digital publications that go beyond the conventional book or PDF like scientifically annotated databases, apps or wiki models.[21] They can also incentivise more OA books, more openly licensed ones, or books that are made

---

[15] See also
https://www.ouvrirlascience.fr/recommandations-pour-la-diffusion-en-acces-ouvert-des-ouvrages-de-recherche/ page 6.
[16] Country Overviews, PALOMERA interview transcript Finland 2023
https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4673
[17] Austria interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685, p. 4
[18] See https://open-access-brandenburg.de/en/publication-fund/
[19] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, p. 9.
[20] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 60.
[21] Austria interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685, p. 8

immediately OA with no embargo by funding these with higher amounts. RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers can fund particular processes or services like foreign language editing, translation, image rights, layout, distribution and preservation costs. These measures will incentivise more OA books beyond simply paying for BPCs.[22] National research funding strategies should be developed to support an equitable scholar-led Diamond OA ecosystem that includes OA books,[23] and studies of the legal and economical aspects of open book publishing[24] as well as the effects of OA books on sales should be given priority.

Preserve bibliodiversity through funding

RFOs, RPOs, and national policymakers can help preserve the bibliodiversity[25] of OA books through their funding. They should ensure that a wide variety of OA book forms are eligible for funding, with special attention to publication in national languages.[26] RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should support and stimulate alternative publication formats and forms, including monographs, edited volumes and chapters; as well as innovative, multimedia long-form publications.[27] In order to ensure equity, it is important to support infrastructures and networks for non-BPC-funded OA books to sustain diversity in authorship and publishers. Since bibliodiversity is mainly ensured by university presses, scholar-led and smaller publishers (commercial and non-profits), these should be given proper attention and perhaps even prioritised for funding under a Diamond OA book publishing model.[28]

Time frame: **Medium Term**

Recommendation #3:
Put in place mechanisms that monitor OA book policies

---

[22] Austria interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685, p. 6-7
[23] Brun, V., Pontille, D., Torny, D. (2024). D5.1 IPSP Sustainability Research Report (1.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10907086, page 78. Note that FNR sets aside €2.500 in a special fund aimed at supporting community-driven non-profit diamond open access journals and platforms. UKRI policy has also reserved special funds for diamond publishing. Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR). (2023). Consolidated FNR Policy on Open Access to Scientific Publications. https://storage.fnr.lu/index.php/s/bfSqYc8bLBAJrjz#pdfviewer; UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). (2023). UKRI open access policy. https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy/
[24] Ukraine interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4689, p. 2
[25] The term 'bibliodiversity' refers to the diversity of academic content in terms of a wide variety of epistemic and methodological approaches and traditions, its expression in many different languages (multilingualism), specific national, regional, disciplinary contexts and cultural (publishing) traditions, differences in quality assurance standards and decision making transparency, and markets. See also Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, pp. 13-14.
[26] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, pp 1-2.
[27] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Pǎltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 67.
[28] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, pp. 13-14.

Policy compliance monitoring

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should put in place mechanisms for monitoring compliance and impact of their policies for OA books. Policies should ideally include a full description of how and when monitoring of compliance and impact will proceed, explaining what incentives and sanctions will be implemented.[29] RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers need to actively check policy compliance.[30] More in general, RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers need to put more incentives in place for digital outputs in evaluation assessments.[31] These monitoring processes must assess not only OA book publications, but also the costs of the transformation at the institutional and national levels.

Monitoring can be facilitated via the mandatory use of persistent unique identifiers (PIDs) including DOIs, ORCIDs, ROR, and FunderIDs, in addition to information that can be gathered from many local and international sources (CRIS or institutional or national repositories).[32]

Cost monitoring

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should also monitor costs for OA books.[33] They should require some degree of transparency about the costs of BPCs as a condition for paying such fees to publishers. In addition, they should require transparency of costs with respect to their OA publishing operations.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #4:
Develop awareness about rights and licences

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should require researchers, and their institutions, to hold copyright over an openly licensed book, chapter or long-form publication OA by not transferring those right or (indefinite) exclusive publishing or permission rights to the publisher.[34] This

---

[29] (source: policy mapping 4/10 policies include incentives and 5/10 proposed sanctions for noncompliance, Palomera WP 3 Report, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1360726

[30] Austria interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685, p. 11

[31] Fathallah, J. (2022). Open Access Monographs: Myths, truths and implications in the wake of UKRI Open Access Policy. LIBER Quarterly: The Journal of the Association of European Research Libraries, 32(1). https://doi.org/10.53377/lq.11068; Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 61.

[32] Philipp, T., Botz, G., Kita, J.-C., Richards, P., Sänger, A., Siegert, O., Reumaux, M. (2021). Science Europe Briefing Paper on Open Access Monitoring. https://scienceeurope.org/our-resources/open-access-monitoring/ (literature review)

[33] See also https://www.ouvrirlascience.fr/recommandations-pour-la-diffusion-en-acces-ouvert-des-ouvrages-de-recherche/ page 7.

[34] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, page 27; Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA

requirement can be supported by means of an [institutional rights retention policy](#) where feasible.[35] When publishing OA, researchers and institutions should only sign non-exclusive publishing agreements. RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should design their policies as much as possible to accommodate the different contexts and jurisdictions in which institutions and researchers are working.[36]

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should use and require well-defined open licences for OA books, such as the set of Creative Commons licences. CC BY could be the default licence where feasible, although other licences requiring permission for commercial uses and/or derivative licences could be accepted in specific cases[37] (e.g. CC BY-NC, CC BY-ND), though this limits the open sharing of publicly funded research.[38] We recommend avoiding the creation of bespoke or applying publisher-specific licences.

Institutional OA policies should encourage staff to reserve the right to secondary publication when signing a publishing contract and to archive a version of their books in institutional repositories after the legally prescribed period has expired.[39]

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #5:
Contribute to improving the infrastructure for OA books

OA books require specific digital infrastructure that is different from that of journals and articles and non-OA books in at least six ways: (1) metadata schemes; (2) distribution and dissemination

---

survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 49; see also Gatti, R. (2022). Is a Rights Retention Clause needed for OA books? https://unlockingresearch-blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?p=3346

[35] The Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR) policy requires the publication to not only acknowledge FNR funding, but also to include a statement about Rights Retention. See Luxembourg National Research Fund (FNR). (2023). OPEN ACCESS FUND – FNR. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4742.

[36] Treadway, J., Labastida i Juan, I., Melinščak Zlodi, I., Proudman, V. (2023). Opening Knowledge: Retaining Rights and Open Licensing in Europe 2023. https://www.knowledgerights21.org/reports/opening-knowledge-retaining-rights-and-open-licensing-in-europe-2023/; Adema, J. (2019). Towards a Roadmap for Open Access Monographs. Knowledge Exchange. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2644997; Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, page 29

[37] The use of more restrictive licences may be warranted by the specific discipline, the content of the book, the affiliation/nationality of the author or other considerations particular to the book or the research itself.

[38] Other possible licences include the Open Government licence https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/ . Also note that several other licence types are used in the DOAB. Also see Gatti, Rupert (2022) Is a Rights Retention Clause needed for OA books? https://unlockingresearch-blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?p=3346

[39] For some examples of good practices, see University of Konstanz. (2021). Open Science Policy. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4936; Freie Universität Berlin. (2021). Open Access Policy of Freie Universität Berlin. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4933; Universität Basel. (2019). Open Access Policy der Universität Basel. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4863.

channels; (3) integration with library catalogues; (4) usage metrics and monitoring; (5) publisher workflows, and (6) business models[40].

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should consider supporting not for profit open infrastructure providers to keep the metadata of OA books open. Open Science will only be fully successful if the underlying infrastructures are open as well. They should also encourage publishers to follow technical standards around open metadata and in adopting best practices, insisting on machine-readable versions of OA books (see also the recommendations for infrastructure providers, section 4.7) These technical requirements include immediate access to platforms, open metadata, and the mandatory deposit of OA books in institutional repositories.

We recognise that support for and reliance on not-for-profit open infrastructures comes with vulnerabilities if these entities face financial or operational challenges. Ensuring long-term sustainability for Open Infrastructure Providers (OIP) is key to success.

RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should ask that publishers make it transparent on their website and catalogues that the OA books that have been published with their funds are OA and provide a link to where the free digital edition can be accessed.[41] RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers can make publishers change practice by mandating metadata quality standards such as the guidelines for publishers recommended by OAPEN and DOAB.[42] RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers are in a position to ask publishers to share open metadata and underline the need for these in future policies. They might also call for a basic metadata threshold and could set technical standards when funding book publishing programs.[43] The use of persistent unique identifiers such as ORCIDs, RORs, and FunderIDs, and DOIs for OA books should become a requirement within a delimited timeframe (see also recommendation #3 on monitoring).

In addition, RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should invest in the improvement of the technical infrastructure for OA books.[44] This extends to efforts that connect and build capacity among

---

[40] Stone, G., Gatti, R., van Gerven Oei, V. W. J., Arias, J., Steiner, T., & Ferwerda, E. (2021). WP5 Scoping Report: Building an Open Dissemination System. *Copim*. https://doi.org/10.21428/785a6451.939caeab

[41] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261 , p. 47ff

[42] See Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB). DOAB documentation for publishers. https://doabooks.org/en/publishers/documentation and specifically this spreadsheet https://doabooks.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/uploads/OAPEN_DOAB_metadata_Thema_ba6f8ad2fd.xlsx)

[43] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 53ff; Philipp, T., Botz, G., Kita, J.-C., Richards, P., Sänger, A., Siegert, O., Reumaux, M. (2021). Science Europe Briefing Paper on Open Access Monitoring. https://scienceeurope.org/our-resources/open-access-monitoring/; Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, page 16

[44] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V.,

infrastructures, including OA books in openly accessible regional, national or international portals. This will help make this ecosystem more technically and financially sustainable in the mid to long term.[45]

Finally, RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should strongly encourage or mandate the deposit of funded OA books in an institutional or subject repository.[46] Because of the social prestige associated with the Version of Record (VoR), RFOs, RPOs, and policymakers should preferably ask to deposit the VoR rather than the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) of an OA book.[47] The requirement to deposit an OA book in a repository should include a strict time frame, either immediate or preferably within 12 months.[48] The repository deposit requirement should also be linked to research evaluation and as an incentive for the next grant application:[49] a mandatory requirement of deposit that is linked to research evaluation is positively correlated with policy effectiveness.[50]

Time frame: **Medium Term**

4. Stakeholder–specific recommendations

4.1. Research Performing Organisations (RPOs)

Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) typically are the first-line employers of researchers, who often combine research and teaching functions. Many RPOs train young researchers and periodically evaluate the research outputs of their staff. This means that RPOs have a specific responsibility in guiding their staff and ensuring they reflect on the processes leading to

---

Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 36-37

[45] Brun, V., Pontille, D., Torny, D. (2024). D5.1 IPSP Sustainability Research Report (1.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10907086, page 78

[46] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 49; Swan, A. (2012). Policy Guidelines for the Development and Promotion of Open Access. Paris, France. Accessed: University of North Texas Libraries, UNT Digital Library. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc141806/m1/50/

[47] Lovett, J. A., Rathemacher, A. J., Boukari, D. & Lang, C. (2017). Institutional Repositories and Academic Social Networks: Competition or Complement? A Study of Open Access Policy Compliance vs. ResearchGate Participation. Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 5(3). https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2183 (policy mapping and literature review)

[48] cOAlition S statement on Open Access for books. (2021). https://www.coalition-s.org/coalition-s-statement-on-open-access-for-academic-books/

[49] Herrmannova, D., Pontika, N., Knoth, P. (2019). Do Authors Deposit on Time? Tracking Open Access Policy Compliance. 2019 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL), pages 206-216. https://doi.org/10.1109/JCDL.2019.00037 (literature review).

[50] Literature review: Open Access policy effectiveness: A briefing paper for research funders https://zenodo.org/records/35635#.WD2trfl97cs

high-quality research outputs, including OA books in those disciplines where books are an important scholarly means of communication.

More than other stakeholders, RPOs include a variety of staff with different roles in the transition to OA: researchers, librarians, institutional publishers, and administrators. Our data collection showed that many RPOs display a variety of practices that have often grown organically over time so they are not always complementary or well coordinated. This is why it would be advantageous for RPOs to develop a clear strategy about their OA policies, specifying the target audience of each policy and how they interact.

In these policies, specific consideration should be given to OA books. RPOs will recognise that books represent a type of research output that is very different from the publication of scholarly articles in journals and research data, not only in terms of their content, form, and length but especially in terms of the research cultures that produce them, the evaluation procedures they are subject to, and the audiences to which they are aimed. In the interest of bibliodiversity and the equity between different research cultures, publication policies and action plans, RPOs should properly and appropriately consider, measurable, and implementable actions that apply to the publication of OA books.

Recommendation #1:
Incorporate existing policies about OA books into institutional action plans that are publicly available and monitored for compliance.

Policies at the national level are often flanked by action plans[51] and guidance at the institutional level, but these action plans are often not made public nor monitored for compliance. We strongly encourage institutions to create incentives for the design of action plans or other implementation guidelines at the disciplinary level that are in line with the research culture of that discipline regarding publication in the form of OA books. Institutional policies should also be regularly updated to align with national or funders policies.[52] Such policies and action plans should include a commitment to monitoring results, checking the outcome of policies and action plans.

Time frame: Short to Medium Term

---

[51] Examples of national policies in which each measure is accompanied by a series of concrete implementation proposals and a timeframe are the Second French Plan for Open Science or the Irish Action Plan for Open Research 2022-2030. See: Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Innovation (2021), Second French Plan for Open Science: Generalizing open science in France 2021-2024. NORF. (2022). National Action Plan for Open Research. https://doi.org/10.7486/DRI.ff36jz222

[52] A recommendation that already exists with regard to national policies. For example see: Prof. Dr. Ingrid Kissling-Näf in: Bärwolff, Theresa et al. (2023). Open4DE Spotlight on the Open Access Ecosystem in Switzerland. Version 1.0. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7858271 : "change should already be taken into account as a constant factor in policy formulation" (p. 8).

Recommendation #2:
Raise institutional awareness about OA book publication.

Take into account different disciplines and publication cultures:
Universities, RPOs, and other higher education institutions host many disciplines and their staff participate in a variety of publication cultures. It is recommended that RPOs outline discipline-specific plans[53] to raise awareness amongst their faculty about the different publication formats and, in particular, the importance of the OA book publication format in various disciplines, in the humanities and social sciences and beyond. In some disciplines of the humanities, early career researchers are often expected to publish a book with a publisher that has a good reputation in the discipline to advance in their career.

Talk to early career researchers about OA book publication:
Early career researchers often do not receive adequate information about the role that book publication plays in their discipline, and what processes they should be aware of when writing and publishing a book. These are described in the Open Access Books Toolkit,[54] which may be a helpful reference for researchers. It is important to raise awareness at an early stage, and to include courses about OA to books in the teaching curriculum at every stage.[55] The attention of researchers should also be drawn to the innovative advantages of digital publishing such as embedding audiovisual material, updates of OA books, or enabling interactivity with readers. These are all aspects that are naturally associated with the concept of Open Science.

Raise awareness among staff about quality criteria for pre- and post-publication peer review of OA books:
Peer review procedures in book-based disciplines have quality assurance mechanisms that are different from those of journals.[56] Authors and reviewers are sometimes professionally

---

[53] The European Research Council already recommends using discipline-specific solutions (here for long-term archiving). "[We] strongly encourage ERC funded researchers to use domain-specific or discipline-specific repositories for their publications." See European Research Council (2021): Open Access Guidelines for research results funded by the ERC." However, the importance of discipline-specific solutions was repeatedly emphasised in our interviews with various stakeholders: See interviews with Cyprus , Germany (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4687).
(https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4668), Denmark (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4674), Bulgaria (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4658), Belgium (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4688) and many others.

[54] Open Access Books Toolkit. https://www.oabooks-toolkit.org/

[55] For an example of an OA syllabus for ECR, see Bibliothèque Universitaire Moretus Plantin of Université de Namur. (2023). L'Open Access. Formation des doctorants. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5319. We received additional impulses to involve young academics in the very early stages of their studies from our interview partner from the Netherlands (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4670). Other best practices can be found in the OpenUP Early Career Researcher (ECR) Monograph initiative, in which Bistrols University Press is involved (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5164) or – regarding to the problems for young researchers – in the position paper of the Irish Humanities Alliance. (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5196).

[56] In our discussions with RPO stakeholders, we received various indications that the review processes for quality assurance need to be adapted to the book sector and designed flexibly. For example, in interviews with our dialogue partners in Belgium (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4688), Croatia

dependent on each other, and the small size of the scholarly communities hampers the prevention of collegial bias. Universities, RPOs, and other higher education institutions should therefore consider adopting and developing minimum requirements of quality assurance for peer review at all levels of book publication. We also recommend transparency around peer review practices, for example through the use of the Peer Review Information Service for Monographs (PRISM).[57]

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #3:
Ensure that the missions of affiliated academic publishers are aligned with the OA policies of their institution.

The role of institutional publishers or publishers affiliated with RPOs should be aligned with institutional OA policies and contribute to their implementation. As part of the challenge to lower the barriers to publication, institutional publishers would ideally adopt a Diamond OA strategy, and thus expand the possibilities of institutional publishing in RPOs.[58]

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #4:
Include metadata in institutional research services and research output documentation

Metadata management is an important instrument in the transformation towards OA books. On the one hand, the collection, maintenance and provision of interoperable metadata is an important quality criterion for OA books and helps to enhance their reputation in the medium term. In addition, they increase the visibility of OA books.

Universities, RPOs, and other higher education institutions have a special role to play here because they are at the beginning of the "metadata value chain".[59] Their institutional services

---

(https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4681), Romania (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4680), Ireland (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4669), Luxembourg (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4683), the Netherlands (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4670), among others.

[57] https://doabooks.org/en/publishers/prism

[58] Since 2019, Cardiff University Press provides Diamond open access for outputs – including monographs – by university employees. See Cardiff University. (2014). Open Access Publications Policy. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5155; In Berlin, an institutional DIAMOND Publisher (Berlin UP) is the result of a joint venture between various RPOs in Berlin and offers comprehensive services for the publication of books without BPCs for academics. See: https://www.berlin-universities-publishing.de/en/ueber-uns/policies/open-access-grundsaetze/index.html

[59] This also reflects the opinion of the RPO members surveyed in our PALOMERA survey. When we asked which policy measures they consider to be most the important they answered openly available book metadata, a record in scientific and scholarly databases, records in repositories (p.46) and metadata of the publications with information rights of re−use (p.52) were the most important measures. See Report on

include research information systems, repositories, and publication data management systems. As a result, RPOs maintain technical environments that can collect and process OA book necessary metadata. These systems must therefore be technically and legally designed in such a way that they offer equally good solutions for all publication types - including OA books - and that a strong demand and incentives are created to use them.[60] It is recommended that institutions follow best practices for aligning metadata that are used by infrastructure providers (see our recommendations to Open Infrastructure Providers (OIP) in section 4.7).

Time frame: Medium Term

4.2. Public and private Research Funding Organisations (RFOs)

Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) typically select and fund research projects, and monitor and evaluate their outputs. Where their policies include OA books, they may also contribute to funding the publication of those outputs that are in scope of their policy. This puts RFOs in an influential position to impose specific conditions not only on the nature and quality of the content of OA books, but also on the technical requirements that those books should comply with (e.g. metadata, machine readability). Those technical requirements, in turn, make OA books more discoverable, visible, and citable, in the interest of all.

Recommendation #1:
Raise awareness about OA books at all levels

When a new policy is introduced, a well articulated advocacy programme is usually necessary to reach reasonable compliance levels.[61] In addition to the general recommendations formulated above in Section 2, RFOs are in a unique position to raise awareness about OA books on four levels:[62]

---

the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261

[60] Schemas for metadata are provided by the Metadata Working Group, among others. See DataCite Metadata Working Group (2024): DataCite Metadata Schema for the Publication and Citation of Research Data and Other Research Outputs. Version 4.5. DataCite e.V. https://doi. org/10.14454/g8e5-6293 University publishers in German-speaking countries also recommend quality standards for metadata in their quality criteria: Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Universitätsverlage. (2022). Qualitätsstandards für Open-Access-Bücher (Version 2). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7075761 Guidelines for metadata allocation also exist at the institutional level, but these do not always have a comparable level of detail. For example: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (no year): Open Access and digital preservation. Information for Academy Researchers.

[61] Swan, A. (2012). Policy Guidelines for the Development and Promotion of Open Access. Paris, France. Accessed: University of North Texas Libraries, UNT Digital Library. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc141806/m1/50/

[62] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, Fig 3.10-11, p. 32-37.

(1) At the *national policymaking* level, RFOs can bring together national stakeholders, identify their needs, and ensure their participation. They can encourage funders and research organisations to align and speak with one voice.[63]

(2) At the *international* level, RFOs should consider aligning national OA book policies with transnational OA book policies such as those of cOAlition S or the European Commission (EC).

(3) At the *institutional level*, RFOs can raise awareness about the quality and prestige of OA books for funders and other stakeholders.

(4) At the *author level*, funders can promote OA books to allow more authors to participate and be aware of the possibilities. They should also provide authors with educational resources on issues related to licensing and secondary publishing rights.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Provide flexible funding in research grants for OA book costs.

Ensure that funding for OA book publication is included in research grants or otherwise provided to grant recipients. Since books are rarely finished within the duration of research projects funded by RFOs, it is important to decouple RFO funds for OA book publication from the project's duration.[64] RFOs should try to gain more insight into the funding needs for and specificities of OA books and increase investment in this area.[65]

Time frame: Medium Term

4.3. National policymakers

National policymakers have a particular responsibility in the Open Science landscape because they formulate priorities and requirements for a broad range of stakeholders in their national remit: the RPOs, RFOs, libraries, infrastructures, learned societies, and researchers in their country. They thus have the capacity to coordinate and align policies, set legislation, determine budgets and influence behaviours in Open Science, while also liaising with Open Science trends and policies at the international level.

---

[63] See PALOMERA interview: Germany (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4687)
[64] See the Dutch NWO policy in this regard https://www.nwo.nl/en/calls/open-access-books. Wellcome also provides open access funding when a research grant has ended, and FNR funding is eligible for up to 3 calendar years after the end date of the project, as stipulated in the grant contract with the FNR.
[65] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Pӑltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, Fig 3.11, p. 36.

Recommendation #1:
Consult with all national stakeholders

At the outset of policy development for OA books, national policymakers should consult with all national stakeholders about what is desirable and achievable in view of the specificities of the national academic publishing situation. This discussion should include the formats, the required quality of self-archived content and the type of peer review allowed or required, metadata, and the preferred types of licences for OA books. This will pave the way to more sustainable solutions and a policy that more stakeholders can embrace and realise.[66] The sustainability of this national strategy must be underpinned by investment in local, national and global scholarly communication infrastructure.[67]

Time frame: Short to medium term

Recommendation #2:
Formulate a national policy for OA books

We recommend that the consultation with all national stakeholders (Recommendation #1) be used to formulate a national policy for OA books. The consultation will ensure the widest possible uptake of the policy.

Open Science policies typically encourage, recommend or require OA to a wide range of research outputs. However, many Open Science policies refer to the general term "scientific publication" or "output", without specifically mentioning books. Various policies show a narrow focus on (a) OA publication of articles in journals, and (2) OA to research data.[68]

We recommend that national Open Science policies explicitly address OA for books and develop a specific strategy for them.[69] This will prioritise and accelerate OA to a type of research output

---

[66] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, pp. 1-2

[67] National Plan for Open Research 2022-2030 in Ireland. (2022). https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5192.

[68] See e.g. the Zotero dataset: zotero://open-pdf/groups/4935808/items/CN85TVZ4?page=10, The National Policy of the Republic of Cyprus for Open Access to Scientific Information. (2016.) https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4979, page 4, or the absence of any mention of OA books in Gurdal, G., Holt, I., & Kafali Can, G. (2019). Achieving Open Science Through OpenAIRE. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.3387265

[69] Examples of such national strategies for OA books include those that mandate depositing academic monographs in a repository, the Slovenian Scientific Research and Innovation Activity Act (ZZrID) and the National Policy of the Republic of Cyprus for Open Science Practices. The Austrian Open Science policy (2022) https://www.bmbwf.gv.at/dam/jcr:d0dad6b6-b94d-4e3e-8c4e-da12091be9b4/Open%20Science%20policy%20Austria%20eng..pdf also clearly states that all research publications including journals and books resulting from calls for projects that are publicly funded, must be disseminated via open access platforms or via an open public repository. The National Strategy for Open Science 2021-2028 in Slovakia recommends that grant agencies develop policies requiring the publication of research results in an open-access model under a public licence, for dissertations, monographs, university textbooks, funded by public resources. Slovenian Scientific Research and Innovation Activity Act (ZZrID). (2021).

that is an essential publication form in many disciplines. A policy targeting OA books also recognises these outputs and disciplines on the same level as others.[70] Policies for OA books must be framed by a clear argument about why OA for books is important, defining the end goal while leaving flexibility for how that end goal is to be achieved. National policymakers should also consider making policy more tangible and less principled. Reference to OA books should be included in any legislation about AI and text and data mining.

As already mentioned in Recommendation #2 of Section 3, national Open Science policymakers have a particular responsibility to serve their national research communities and its bibliodiversity. A national OA book policy should allow for the widest possible diversity in OA books. It needs to speak to scholarly standards rather than the priorities of governments or of the commercial sector.[71] National OA book policies should not only allow for OA books to be published internationally in English, but pay special attention to books that are written in the national languages and the local publishers that publish them. Each national OA book policy should ideally be based on an investigation of the specificities of the national academic publishing situation, and take these into account.

In addition, a national policy for OA books should be well aligned with international policies and actions for books. It should include measures and tools to give international visibility to national efforts for OA books, and make the results of this policy visible internationally, for example via the Council for National Open Science Coordination (CoNOSC) network.

Furthermore, to better ensure the right to share material openly, national policymakers can strive at the legislative level for a secondary publishing right without an embargo and with an open licence (see Section 3, Recommendation #4), so materials can be reused, e.g. in education.[72]

Finally, a national policy for OA books should be *fully explicit*. It should define precisely when the policy comes into force in order to allow for a period of transition amongst the broad range of stakeholders for OA books: publishers, funders and libraries. This period of transition may be effected through issuing recommendations rather than requirements.[73] The policy for OA books must provide guidelines for its implementation, include monitoring and compliance checking and be reactive to future challenges.[74]

---

https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5268; National Policy of the Republic of Cyprus for Open Science Practices. (2022). https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4977; Add Austrian OS policy (2022).; Government of the Slovak Republic. (20201). National Strategy for Open Science 2021-2028. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4953.

[70] Source: Country Overviews, Palomera WP 3 Report, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1360726

[71] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, page 9

[72] Austria interview, https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685

[73] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, pages 9-10

[74] Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, page 9. See also National Policy of the Republic of Cyprus for Open Science Practices. (2022). https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4977 and the National Open Access Monitor Ireland. https://oamonitor.ireland.openaire.eu/

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #3:
Establish mechanisms that fund OA books, programmes, and infrastructure

A national policy and strategy for OA books should include mechanisms that establish financing for the funding of OA books. The OA books policy should make it clear which national stakeholders – e.g. RFOs, RPOs, libraries, ministries – are responsible for funding OA books, and outline the complementarity between these actors, in consultation with the academic community. National policymakers can consider funding an alternative academic publishing system or platform rather than funding individual outputs.[75] We recommend that national policymakers invest specifically in OA books. In addition, national policymakers can incentivise public institutions to help fund the maintenance and operations of infrastructures that serve the OA book sector and efforts that connect and build capacity among them. This will help make this ecosystem more technically and financially sustainable in the mid to long term.

Funding should not be limited to OA books, but extend to programmes, services, and infrastructure for a range of institutional and smaller to mid-sized commercial publishers that have a national scope. In order to ensure equity and diversity in authorship and publishers, it is important to support infrastructures and networks for non-BPC-funded OA books. It is essential to develop and perpetuate national research funding strategies to fund Diamond OA books and, above all, to maintain or increase permanent public government funding to support a more equitable scholar-led Diamond OA ecosystem.[76]

National funding of OA books, funding programmes, and infrastructure should come with a requirement of a certain degree of cost transparency for the services delivered. Relevant OA book infrastructure should be in line with the Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure (POSI).[77]

Time frame: Medium Term

4.4. Libraries

Libraries as information and knowledge institutions who have been advocating for Open Access for almost two decades, frequently lead or feed into OA or OS policymaking at their institution when this is delegated to them by the university leadership. These policies can take on different forms: as part of university missions, as part of publishing or IP policies, research and reward policies, or as stand-alone OS or OA policies that have an institutional or faculty reach, and

---

[75] PALOMERA interview transcript Italy 2023 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4668
[76] Brun, V., Pontille, D., Torny, D. (2024). D5.1 IPSP Sustainability Research Report (1.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10907086, page 78
[77] Bilder, G., Lin, J., Neylon, C. (2020). The Principles of Open Scholarly Infrastructure. https://doi.org/10.24343/C34W2H

more. In addition, both academic and national libraries play an important role in managing and making available research outputs for the researchers of their home institution. Increasingly, libraries have also adopted a role in which they are the first-line help desk for researchers in their institution about everything related to Open Access. Many university libraries also curate repositories for Green OA[78], and often facilitate access to OA books through their own publication services, sometimes in collaboration with local university presses. Furthermore, libraries have considerable knowledge about the diversity of the publisher landscape. As a result, libraries are in an excellent position to advise prospective authors on OA books. Last but not least, libraries buy books, and as such are important funders of OA books: this makes them a key player in the OA book landscape.

Recommendation #1
Promote OA books in the institutional OA publication policy

Libraries should promote and help (further) develop their institution's OA or OS policy to include OA books, ideally developing an OA publication policy with university leadership, deans, department heads, and staff in their institution whilst aligning with funder and government policies. This policy should include information on versioning, rights retention, open licensing, metadata, support mechanisms such as infrastructure. Funding information and conditions for OA books should be aligned with institutional OA policies.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #2:
Raise awareness of the importance of OA books and their benefits

Libraries should raise awareness of the importance of OA books and their benefits, and provide clear and visible support for researchers and authors in the library's institution. This includes contact details for support staff, key benefits, training, resources and guidelines about options for OA book publishing, funding, and more.[79]

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #3:
Make OA books more visible

---

[78] For the difference between Green, Gold and Diamond OA, see Green, gold, diamond – different models for open access books. (2024). Open Access Books Toolkit. https://oabooks-toolkit.org/lifecycle/10944589-planning-funding/article/13868103-green-gold-diamond-different-models-for-open-access-books
[79] See DeSanto, D. 2023. Carrots and Sticks: A Qualitative Study of Library Responses to the UK's Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2021 Open Access Policy. College & Research Libraries, 84(3), 315–334. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.84.3.315

Libraries should develop workflows to make OA books more visible and discoverable in the Library catalogue or discovery system and integrated into Digital Learning Environments.[80] In particular, libraries can support the researchers at their institution to help make their books more visible and discoverable by encouraging them to call on their publishers to provide PIDs such as DOIs, ORCIDs and RORs. They need to provide rich metadata, including cited references, and increase discoverability through open infrastructures, such as the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB). Libraries can support lecturers to include OA books in teaching material and encourage OA books in reading lists. Libraries should ensure that the OA status and the OA licence are included in the metadata fields for OA books in their catalogues and systems, this is particularly essential for national and copyright/legal deposit libraries.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #4:
Provide researchers with clear information on OA books

We recommend that libraries help their researchers understand the criteria for publishing in OA. Librarians can help researchers prepare a checklist for OA publication, such as the Think-Check-Submit checklist.[81] They can take into account the researchers' personal and professional context: potential funding sources, appropriateness of the publisher for the content of the book, the quality and appropriateness of the publisher for the researcher's discipline, the publisher's OA options, their funder mandate to publish the book OA with a specific licence, etc.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #5:
Set financial and institutional incentives for OA books

Libraries should consider financially supporting OA books written by researchers at the library's institution, and consider non-BPC solutions for doing so (See Section 2, Recommendation #4). They can also financially support national and international infrastructures that support OA books through collection development budgets, OA funds, or other means, and specify limitations where relevant. In addition to financial support, libraries can help their institution develop institutional incentives for making researchers' books OA. Libraries should pay particular attention to non-BPC models such as the Open Book Collective for OA book publication, and strive to repurpose current spend towards OA books. We would also like to encourage libraries to recognise the value of funding OA book content beyond their own researchers (e.g. research by retired, disadvantaged, young, or unemployed scholars).

---

[80] See also: Fathallah, J. (2022). Open Access Monographs: Myths, Truths and Implications in the Wake of UKRI Open Access Policy. LIBER Quarterly: The Journal of the Association of European Research Libraries, 32(1). https://doi.org/10.53377/lq.11068, and Deville et al, (2019). Rebels with a Cause? Supporting Library- and Academic-led Open Access Publishing. LIBER Quarterly: The Journal of the Association of European Research Libraries, 29. https://doi.org/10.18352/lq.10277

[81] Think Check Submit. https://thinkchecksubmit.org/books-and-chapters/

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #6:
Consider playing a role in the archival and long-term preservation of OA books

Libraries should also consider supporting existing long-term solutions for the preservation of OA books as part of their OA policy. In a recent study on the preservation of OA books, only around 20% of available books could be confirmed as being included in the coverage of a preservation service provider.[82] As part of their archival policy, libraries should provide support to their authors to deposit a version of their OA books in their institutional repository. They should ensure that their repository policy includes OA books, specify the metadata required to deposit such books (e.g. the version, the time (immediate or embargo), PID or other information), and make sure that OA books in their repositories are linked with research data where applicable.

Time frame: Medium to Long Term

4.5. Researchers

Researchers are viewed here as potential OA book authors, and as front-line agents in the transformation of book publishing to OA. Researchers as book authors include Early Career Researchers, Senior Researchers, and Principal Investigators on research projects. Researchers need to be well aware of the opportunities and challenges of OA book publishing, of the specificity that the OA book represents in relation to non-OA books and other types of scientific production outputs, and of the need for researchers to contribute to the transformation of the system from within[83]. They are also often responsible for finding the funding to publish their OA book. Researchers must fully understand and internalise the way OA affects the conception and organic structuring of a book, and become familiar with the strategies to be adopted to boost its visibility, while safeguarding the reputation and recognition of this type of output by the community, as well as the impact it can have on careers.

The Knowledge Base did not provide specific recommendations regarding researchers and open book policies, so the useful information had to be extracted from recommendations made to other stakeholders, which could be mainly found in the material and findings collected from the PALOMERA survey results[84]. These show that authors are concerned about the quality and

---

[82] Laakso, M. (2023). Open access books through open data sources: assessing prevalence, providers, and preservation, Journal of Documentation, Vol. 79 No. 7, pp. 157-177. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2023-0016

[83] Tóth-Czifra, E., Błaszczyńska, M., Gelati, F., Admiraal, F., Blümm, M., Buelinckx, E., Chiquet, V., Gautschy, R., Gietz, P., Király, P., Vivas-Romero, M., Scholger, W., Szleszyński, B., Wuttke, U. (2023). Research Data Management for Arts and Humanities: Integrating Voices of the Community. Zenodo. https://zenodo.org/records/8059626, chap. 3.1.3. Digital monographs/collections (p.45)

[84] Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V.,

reputation of OA books, but at the same time are not very familiar with OA book publishing. Authors often have insufficient information about how to choose publishers, reliable and useful information about OA book publishing, and the aspects that should be taken into consideration when publishing an OA book.

In order to respond to these and other issues that more specifically affect the research community, recommendations are organised around three broad topics that could also be the focus of policies established by the RFOs and libraries that host researchers:

Recommendation #1:
Ask publishers for explicit information on OA policy

We recommend that researchers who are prospective authors identify the concrete criteria for publishing in OA, and prepare their own checklist as a function of their personal context: potential funding sources, appropriateness of the publisher for the content of the book, the publisher's OA options, their funder mandate to publish the book OA with a specific licence, etc. Researchers should seek help at their institutional library for this purpose.[85]

Researchers should build their own checklist with the help of Think-Check-Submit (TCS)[86] criteria and verify if they are aligned with publishers' OA policies. In the checklist below, we suggest a presentation of the criteria that is different from that of TCS, and that focuses on two additional aspects: the interoperability of publishers' platforms and multilingualism functionalities:

- The OA licences that are allowed by the publisher (these should ideally be standardised as much as possible, e.g. Creative Commons licences)
- If copyright applies, be specific about who holds copyright of the book.
- Are the dissemination rights of the book transparent for the author?
- Any embargo periods that apply on the non-OA version of the book.
- Whether the publisher allows for a Green OA archiving policy. This information needs to be specific: it needs to mention who will deposit and which version of the book will be deposited.
- Information on the publisher's business model, sources of revenue (including institutional support), and production cost (if possible). Researchers should prioritise publishing with a publisher that follows the Diamond publishing model (no costs for authors or readers)[87].

Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261

[85] The AuROA (funded by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research) developed a contract generator in German on the basis of a catalogue of services ("Leistungskatalog") that gives full transparency to OA book authors with participating service providers and publishers https://auroa.mioto.app/public/58b62051-c187-4fd5-b18b-cb7594bfab07 ; we recommend that similar work be done in other countries and made available.

[86] https://thinkchecksubmit.org/books-and-chapters/

[87] Plan S. Diamond Open Access. https://www.coalition-s.org/diamond-open-access/

- The prices of publication charges (BPCs etc.) need to be clearly listed, and any additional conditions mentioned. Prices need to be transparent: a breakdown of specific services and prices for these services is recommended.
- Information on where/how OA versions can be accessed (by reader and by machine)
- Information on legal deposit and other preservation/archiving policies
- Multilingualism of the contents and translation policy[88]
- The interoperability of the publisher's platform with discovery platforms (access to and dissemination to keywords and abstracts)[89]
- Ethics policy[90] (procedures and conditions for plagiarism or self-plagiarism)

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Understand the publishing process

Researchers must consider and understand the costs and the resources involved in OA book publishing. They should be proactive and include costs for OA books in the budgets of funding applications with RFOs, being aware of the funder's regulations in terms of eligible funding and maximum funds. Researchers should also seek advice in asking publishers for transparency in what services they perform and what elements they expect the author to contribute. Researchers should look in their research environment for good practices and examples in book publishing and understand accurately how it works.

Costs. It is important that the publisher is explicit and transparent about their costs. A transparent calculation of book processing charges is a way to make otherwise hidden costs explicit, and will allow the researcher to understand the different price points. A transparent calculation of costs and prices also helps the researcher to more convincingly apply for funds covering the cost of publication.

Metadata. Researchers should be aware about the value of metadata for interoperability and visibility. Book metadata fields (title, author, publisher), persistent identifiers (PIDs, including e.g. DOIs, as well as ORCIDs, ROR, and FunderIDs) are essential for providing unique identifiers for books, chapters, authors and grant numbers, and allow usage data to be tracked via different platforms and geographical areas. It is therefore important that sufficient and correct entries be included in the metadata record of the OA book.

Rights and open licences. Authors should be well aware of their rights. For example, they must retain the right to republish or self−archive their work in other venues. Researchers need to ask

---

[88] Manifiesto sobre la Ciencia como Bien Público Global: Acceso Abierto No Comercial. (2023). https://globaldiamantoa.org/manifiesto/#/, 2nd principle "Equity, diversity and multilingualism"

[89] Lutz, J. F., Sondervan, J., Edig, X. van, Freeman, A., Kramer, B., & Rosenkrantz, C. H. (2023). Knowledge Exchange Analysis Report on Alternative Publishing Platforms. Alternative Publishing Platforms. https://knowledge-exchange.pubpub.org/pub/d9h2tp1x#njzvmasyvag

[90] Committee of Publication Ethics. (2008). COPE Code of Conduct. https://publicationethics.org/files/2008%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf

publishers to provide the metadata of publications with information on the rights of re-use. Ideally, metadata is provided with a CC0 licence. Linked datasets should be shared as openly as possible, and as controlled as necessary.

Multilingualism opportunities. Researchers could explore the possibilities (tools and services) of automatic translation of keywords and abstracts provided by the publisher, in view of the widest possible access to their book.[91]

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #3:
Explore resources and support

Researchers should explore various resources that help them with publishing OA books when not enough information is provided by other stakeholders (publishers, RFO, policymakers, RPO, Libraries) regarding recommendations 1 or 2.

- Seek advice. Ask colleagues who have published books for advice; consult the librarians at your own institution or at the national library.

- Engage with infrastructure such as OPERAS National Nodes to receive national community support on OA issues.[92]

- The following tools and resources can be used by researchers interested in publishing their book OA:
    - OAPEN OA Books Toolkit: a free-to-access resource that aims to help book authors to better understand open access book publishing.
    - Knowledge Base: a collection of documents brought together by the PALOMERA project, that includes reports, policies, survey results and statistics relevant to policies regarding OA books in the European Research Area.
    - ThinkCheckSubmit: a tool that helps researchers discover what they need to know when assessing whether a publisher is suitable for their research - (available in many languages).
    - Directory of Open Access Books: A discovery service for open access books and a trustworthy source for finding a publisher.

---

[91] Tóth-Czifra, E., Błaszczyńska, M., Gelati, F., Admiraal, F., Blümm, M., Buelinckx, E., Chiquet, V., Gautschy, R., Gietz, P., Király, P., Vivas-Romero, M., Scholger, W., Szleszyński, B., Wuttke, U. (2023). Research Data Management for Arts and Humanities: Integrating Voices of the Community. Zenodo. https://zenodo.org/records/8059626, chap.3.2. Challenges in multilingualism (p.51)

[92] OPERAS is the Research Infrastructure supporting open scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) in the European Research Area. Its mission is to coordinate and federate resources in Europe to efficiently address the scholarly communication needs of European researchers in the field of SSH. OPERAS National nodes can help to establish bridges between information and stakeholders, since they aim to aggregate existing approaches and resources from the national community and systematically connect relevant national stakeholders engaged with Open Science in individual countries.

- [PRISM](#) (Peer Review Information Service for Monographs): A service that displays the peer review process for monographs, accessible via the Directory of Open Access Books, helping to improve trust in open access books.
- [Sherpa OA for Books](#)[93]: offers an overview of publishers' book policies to help authors and research organisations make informed and confident decisions in open access publishing and meeting funders' guidelines.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #4:
Share positive experiences about publishing OA books

Researchers should consider sharing good experiences of OA book publishing with their peers and faculty administrators.[94]

Time frame: Short Term

4.6. Scholarly societies

In the course of the research conducted in the PALOMERA project, including the interviews with various stakeholders[95], it became apparent that scholarly societies had not been included as a stakeholder group in the study's methodology[96]. This omission meant that the specific perspectives and roles of these societies were initially not directly explored or described in our findings. Rather, the main focus of the research was on gathering insights from Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) and Researchers, which were considered part of the broader environment influencing OA policies. We initially considered scholarly societies to fall under the broader category of the research community. However, we came to understand that none of the organisations we had consulted were specifically associated with scholarly societies that had formulated OA policies applying to books. This made us realise that scholarly societies can indeed play a significant role in the adoption and implementation of OA policies. Therefore, we decided to dedicate specific attention to scholarly societies due to their unique institutional influence and ability to conduct and support research in specific disciplines.

Scholarly societies (a.k.a. *learned societies*, *academic associations*) are organisations that promote and serve an academic discipline or a group of related disciplines[97]. There are about

---

[93] On 4 November 2024 Sherpa services will become part of the new open policy finder's web platform.
[94] See for example: Adema, J., Steiner, T., & Bowie, S. (2022). Part 2: A typology of experimental books. In: Books contain multitudes: Exploring experimental publishing (2022 update) (2nd ed.). Copim. https://doi.org/10.21428/785a6451.cd58a48e
[95] https://knowledgebase.oabooks-toolkit.org/collections/ef4a289b-2333-496d-82a8-ce701abe3f17.
[96] Maryl, M., Manista, G., Păltineanu, S., Stone, G., Laakso, M., Dryer, M., Bandura-Morgan, L., Davidson, A., Silva Ferreira, N. H., Snijder, R., Tummes, J.-P., & Varachkina, H. (2024). PALOMERA D2.1 Report on compiling the Knowledge Base. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10777132.
[97] The examples of scholarly societies in Europe in the SSH are: European Sociological Association (ESA), https://www.europeansociology.org/home; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie (DGS), https://soziologie.de/ or Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne, https://pts.org.pl/.

9000 scholarly societies in Europe[98], each contributing uniquely to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge in their respective fields. Some of them have their own journals, and in some cases they publish books as well. A distinctive characteristic of scholarly publishing in Finland, for example, is that learned societies publish around 70% of all publication outputs (journals, book series, conference series), and are dominant in the fields of humanities and social sciences.[99] Scholarly societies can be powerful actors in OA book publishing: they can promote the publication of OA books among their members, or set up OA book series for the purpose of promoting research in their discipline.

Recommendation #1:
Develop discipline-specific publishing standards and practices for OA books

Scholarly societies should leverage their disciplinary expertise to develop and promote open publishing standards and practices tailored to the unique challenges and opportunities of their discipline. This includes establishing guidelines for OA books or other long-form works relevant to their areas.

Recommendation #2:
Incentivise OA book publishing

To encourage and stimulate the proliferation of high-quality OA books, scholarly societies can establish programmes that recognise and reward excellence in OA book publishing. A good example is the ACLS OA Book Prize[100]. This could include awards or stipends for authors or publishers, specifically for OA books, along with promotional activities that highlight the value and impact of OA books within the academic community.

Recommendation #3:
Advocate for disciplinary needs with respect to OA books in OA policies

Scholarly societies occupy a unique position as the voice of their disciplines. They should leverage this influence to advocate for the specific needs and priorities of their fields in OA policies on all levels, and more specifically for OA books if this is a major output and mode of scholarly communication in their field. Such advocacy includes engaging with policymakers, funders, and other stakeholders to ensure that OA policies adequately address the diverse publication formats, funding models, and disciplinary norms that characterise book publishing in the discipline.

---

[98] Late, E., Pölönen, J. (2021). The number of Learned Societies in Europe. Zenodo. https://zenodo.org/records/5513561

[99] Late, E., Korkeamäki, L., Pölönen, J. and Syrjämäki, S. (2020), The role of learned societies in national scholarly publishing. Learned Publishing, 33: 5-13. https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1270

[100] https://www.acls.org/programs/open-access-book-prize/

4.7. Open infrastructure providers (OIP)

In these recommendations, we identify open infrastructure providers as open, community-focused, open infrastructure providers that focus on the provision of individual services to the wider OA book ecosystem. However, there are significant gaps in the infrastructure and there is a need to provide joint solutions to strengthen and develop open access book publishing across Europe and beyond. Open infrastructure providers can support the alignment of OA book policies in eight key areas:[101]

1. OA engagement and advocacy.
2. Publication infrastructure.
3. Quality assurance infrastructure.
4. Compliance checking infrastructure.
5. Hosting and delivery.
6. Discovery.
7. Preservation.
8. Monitoring and measuring of impact.

Much of the data supporting print and digital books are based on proprietary systems and much of the metadata is not open, e.g. library catalogue records or ONIX files produced by commercial companies and licensed to publishers. In order to support the FAIR principles, metadata should be open. This in turn supports the free flow of data, which will enable the recommendations below. These recommendations will be labelled in function of a time frame that consists of three levels: short term, medium term and long term.

Recommendation #1:
Encourage collaboration between open infrastructure providers

In order to encourage the free flow of open metadata about OA books and OA book policies, open infrastructure providers should begin to collaborate more strategically. This will ensure the free flow of high quality open book metadata to underpin OA book publishing and create efficiencies in the workflow, establishment of best practices for other stakeholders such as libraries, publishers and funders.[102]

---

[101] Ferwerda, E., Mosterd, T., Snijder, R., & Mounier, P. (2021). UKRI Gap Analysis of Open Access Monographs Infrastructure. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5771945
FAIR principles: https://www.go-fair.org/fair-principles/
[102] See Ferwerda, E., Mosterd, T., Snijder, R., & Mounier, P. (2021). UKRI Gap Analysis of Open Access Monographs Infrastructure. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5771945 ;
Mounier, P., Sondervan, J. & Stone, G. (2021). Investing in the Open Access Book infrastructure - A call for action. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4768388 ; Open Access Monographs: Making Mandates Reality event
https://copim.pubpub.org/pub/open-access-monographs-making-mandates-reality-rlukcopim-webinar/release/1
Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Ensure alignment of terminology

Misunderstandings between OIPs and with other stakeholders often arise because of unclear or overlapping terminology. OIPs should work with publishers and other stakeholders including libraries and funders to encourage the adoption of standard terminology.[103] For example the use of various terms to describe the version of record and author accepted version and adoption of ONIX vocabularies[104] or Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT)[105] to describe different contributor roles within a book. OIPs are ideally placed to take the lead on this issue.[106]

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #3:
Develop and adopt authority files

Open infrastructure providers should put forward recommendations to other stakeholders on a minimum set of metadata fields that can be used to identify an open access book or book chapter, including relevant PIDs. OIPs should encourage adoption of these authority files in order to create a baseline of metadata. Once this baseline is achieved for various stakeholders, data feeds can be set up in various formats to encourage the flow of open data. This is particularly relevant for national platforms, national libraries and institutional repositories, but is also essential for dissemination and discovery of open access books.[107]

---

[103] See section on National Libraries in Laakso, M., Bandura-Morgan, L., Bazeliuk, N., Davidson, A., Dreyer, M., Iannace, D. E., Manista, G., Maciej, M., Matthias, L., Ozkan, O., Proudman, V., Păltineanu, S., da Silva Ferreira, N. H., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Wnuk, M., & Varachina, H. (2024). PALOMERA Deliverable 3.1 – Report on Analysis Findings (1.1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13827250

[104] ONIX code lists Issue 66: https://ns.editeur.org/onix/en/17

[105] Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT): https://credit.niso.org/

[106] See Kierunki rozwoju otwartego dostępu do publikacji i wyników badań naukowych w Polsce: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5042 , for the importance of metadata and some suggestions for essential criteria. Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160

[107] See section on National Libraries in Laakso, M., Bandura-Morgan, L., Bazeliuk, N., Davidson, A., Dreyer, M., Iannace, D. E., Manista, G., Maciej, M., Matthias, L., Ozkan, O., Proudman, V., Păltineanu, S., da Silva Ferreira, N. H., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Wnuk, M., & Varachina, H. (2024). PALOMERA Deliverable 3.1 – Report on Analysis Findings (1.1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13827250 also: Stone, G., Gatti, R., van Gerven Oei, V. W. J., Arias, J., Steiner, T., & Ferwerda, E. (2021). WP5 Scoping Report: Building an Open Dissemination System. Copim. https://doi.org/10.21428/785a6451.939caeab About exploring the importance of open metadata and underlining it in future policy: Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 53. About encouraging the use of PIs such as ORCID IDs, DOIs for OA books, see Dreyer, M., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Gingold, A., Iannace, D. E., Pogačnik, A., Varachinka, H., Bandura-Morgan, L., Barnes, L., Laakso, M., Manista, G., Mounier, P., Păltineanu, S., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Rooryck, J. (2024). Report on the PALOMERA survey on open access policies for books in the European research area.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #4:
Encourage and participate in national publishing platforms

Many funders and other stakeholders are in the process of planning a national publishing platform, while others have already established them. From our review of the technical landscape in the ERA, most countries already have a moderately strong institutional repository environment, but its use for supporting OA book distribution is still not widely adopted.[108] OIPs should keep a watching brief on this development, potentially via the Funder Forum. An open dialogue at the planning and implementation stage will ensure that best practice is followed regarding authority files and metadata regardless of the way in which national platforms receive their data.[109] In this way OIP can ensure that their know-how and standards are taken into account in OA book policies.

Time frame: Long Term

Recommendation #5:
Allow metadata sharing with and reuse by national libraries, publishing platforms and institutional repositories

National libraries
In some regions, national libraries are responsible for providing funders with OA book policy data and this data may come to them from a variety of sources, e.g. institutional repositories, OIPs etc. OIPs should consider whether a feed of appropriate metadata (depending on the national needs) could be provided for national libraries to ensure that OA books are recorded and made available as part of the national library collection,[110] and that, in turn, this data could be provided to the funder.

Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13607261, p. 73ff,PALOMERA interview transcript Group Interview Library 2023 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4667 p.22, and Morka, A. (2021). A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160, p. 24 "In books, there are so many different types of metadata formats, subject codes, structures and requirements, e.g. Thema, MARC, ONIX. This is problematic as this makes finding both the metadata and OA books difficult."

[108] Country analysis, Palomera WP 3 Report, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1360726

[109] See the planned national platform in Slovenia; also Mahony, J. (2023). Towards an All-Ireland Diamond Open Access Publishing Platform: the Publish.OA.ie project. PUBMET 2023. https://pubmet2023.unizd.hr/mahony-abstract/ Home: Publish OA: https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5202   outline of all Ireland national publishing platform feasibility study. Interviews: PALOMERA interview transcript Bulgaria 2023, p.11 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4658; PALOMERA interview transcript Finland 2023 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4673 p.17.

[110] See section on National Libraries in Laakso, M., Bandura-Morgan, L., Bazeliuk, N., Davidson, A., Dreyer, M., Iannace, D. E., Manista, G., Maciej, M., Matthias, L., Ozkan, O., Proudman, V., Păltineanu, S., da Silva Ferreira, N. H., Stone, G., Tummes, J.-P., Wnuk, M., & Varachina, H. (2024). PALOMERA Deliverable 3.1 – Report on Analysis Findings (1.1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13827250

Timeframe: Long Term

Publishing platforms and institutional repositories
Institutions need to make an author's OA book available, but there are known issues with quality of metadata[111] and the availability of full text OA books in repositories. However, these repositories may be used to report to funders, or even to supply metadata.[112] In addition, some institutions are developing their own publishing platforms.[113] This is a very labour intensive process for the institution, who often do not know of the book's publication. OIPs should ensure that data can be shared with and reused by appropriate publishing and library platforms to create efficiencies for institutions and their libraries.

Timeframe: Medium Term

Recommendation #6:
Define a set of monitoring criteria in collaboration with RFOs and national policymakers

OAPEN's OA Books Toolkit identifies monitoring as an important part of the policy life cycle. OIPs should work with funders/policy makers to define a set of measurable monitoring criteria, using responsible metrics, which can be built into the funder policy.[114]

Time frame: Medium Term

4.8. Publishers

Publishers play a key role in the OA book publication landscape as the providers of publication services to researchers and their RFOs and RPOs. In a context where national OS policy makers, RFOs, and RPOs are increasingly formulating policies that require their funded researchers to publish OA under specific conditions (immediate open access, open licences), publishers should develop OA book policies that are well-designed, easy to read for prospective authors, and aligned with funder and institutional policies. In addition, publisher and publisher trade organisations should consider the standardisation of OA book publishing policies that support access and reuse so that all stakeholders know exactly what to expect and can easily

---

[111] See p.24 A Plan S for Books? Voices from the Open Access Books Community: Sessions Summary. http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/34f2-j160

[112] See PALOMERA interview transcript Bulgaria 2023, p.11 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4658, Repository Monitor https://oamonitor.ch/charts-data/repository-monitor/, PALOMERA interview transcript Switzerland 2023 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4691 p.7 we don't have a national platform, but institutional or cantonal ones. It would be desirable to bring these institutional or cantonal platforms together in a network in which there would be coordinated policies, information and services, and thus a more concrete exchange in everyday life.

[113] For example, PALOMERA interview transcript Italy 2023 https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4668

[114] Development Plan for the Central Technical Library of the University of Ljubljana 2021-2025. https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/5283.

compare publisher policies on a range of aspects. This will help to make open access easier for everyone to manage.

Recommendation #1:
Provide clear information on publisher OA book policies

Publishers can support their authors by providing clear and precise information about their own OA policies for books and book chapters, specifically about the types of books that are in scope of their OA policy. Publishers' OA book policies should also help researchers identify whether their RPO's or RFO's OA requirements will be met. In the scan of publisher offerings within the ERA countries, we found in general a weak presence of OA book publishing options among prominent national academic publishers in the countries, suggesting that there is a lot of room for growth in this department.[115]

In order for authors, librarians and funders to be able to easily match publishers against requirements, it is recommended that the following areas are addressed at a minimum in the publisher OA book policy:

- Open licences for OA books should be well-defined, such as the Creative Commons licences.[116] Publishers should avoid creating bespoke licences for this purpose
- Who owns the copyright of the book
- Any embargo periods that apply
- Information on rights retained by the author over the work post publication
- Information on who has the rights to provide re-use permissions for the work when required by the OA licence applied.
- Whether the publisher allows for a Green OA archiving policy. This information needs to be specific: it needs to mention who will deposit, and which version of the book will be deposited.
- Information on the editorial, peer-review[117] and ethical policies applied for OA books
- Information on the publisher's business model, sources of revenue (including institutional support), and production cost (if possible).
- The prices of publication charges (BPCs etc) need to be clearly listed, and any additional conditions mentioned. Prices need to be transparent: a breakdown of specific services and prices for these services is recommended.
- Information on where/how OA versions can be accessed (by reader and by machine)
- Information on legal deposit and other preservation/archiving policies
- Multilingualism of the contents and translation policy

---

[115] Country analysis, Palomera WP 3 Report, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1360726
[116] Other well-defined licences are possible as well, see e.g. the variety of licences used in DOAB.
[117] The necessity for providing qualitative peer-review and prescribing the peer-review procedures was highlighted by the PALOMERA interviewees, in particular from: Austria (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4685, pp.2-3, 13), Switzerland (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4691, p.2), Romania (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4680, p.2, 13), Turkey (https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14219/4690, p.7).

- Information about the dissemination strategy for OA books. How/where metadata and content is disseminated, and whether it is openly accessible (See Section 4.7, Recommendation #5).
- Align terminology with that of OIP (see Recommendation #2, Section 4.7)

The publisher website should have pages specifically dedicated to OA books and OA book chapters. Ideally, these pages are assigned a DOI or permanent URL so that they can be referenced and linked to by library, funder, and other third party information pages. The OA book and book chapter documents should list all of the above points and be written in plain language. The pages should be date stamped and be kept up to date, and be easy for authors to find. They should be prominent in website menus and linked to from as many relevant sections as possible e.g. from author/submission guidelines and publisher policy pages.

Time frame: Short Term

Recommendation #2:
Increase awareness of OA and its possibilities

Publishers will benefit from staying abreast of developments in OA now that it is a mainstream model supported by funders and institutions. Publishers can also take steps to promote OA books to authors and provide information which will in turn lead to better uptake and understanding within the scholarly community.

Promotion of OA books can take several forms:

- Publishers should stay informed about funder policies to define and adapt their own policies to them. Publishers can check the Knowledge Base for this purpose, since it includes a comprehensive overview of funder policies to OA books. Alignment between funder policies and publisher policies makes things easy for authors, and brings in more business.
- Publishers should raise awareness of OA books, drawing attention to its many additional possibilities compared to the traditional paper version, and showcasing the benefits of OA to researchers: greater visibility, citation advantages, etc. Specific innovations linked to digital publishing should be highlighted: these include embedding audiovisual material or enabling interactivity with readers. Innovation is a good argument of promotion (for publishers) and incentive (for authors and readers).
- Publishers should increase their expertise on OA and OA books in particular, and stay up to date on OA developments/training, learn about appropriate business models, and look at shared open access infrastructures. Shared knowledge about OA will lead to better standardisation of quality, norms, and practices.
- Publishers should make every effort to collect and provide access (at a minimum to authors) to download usage data for OA books and chapters.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #3:
Improve the discoverability of published OA books

Distributed open infrastructures make OA books more visible and discoverable. Consequently, OA books need to be made compatible with these infrastructures: books must be discoverable and information from various different sources for the same title needs to be linked. This requires the systematic use of persistent identifiers (PIDs) which provide the 'hooks' to integrate different data sources. Making sure that published content is discoverable and linked is more important for OA content which is distributed with fewer publisher controls. In a recent study the diverse metadata landscape for OA books was given a closer look, and the varying practices among publishers and aggregators for using ISBN and/or DOIs for books was a challenge for distinguishing what books are actually available[118].

Minimum requirements are:
- use of DOIs (at both the monograph level, and at the chapter level for edited books that include chapters written by different authors)
- use of other PIDs, such as ORCID, ROR, FunderID, … See Section 4.7, Recommendations #4 and #5)
- Ensuing that title metadata is widely distributed to openly accessible platforms (such as DOAB, OpenAIRE, OpenAlex …)

Note that we wish to avoid recommending specific solutions to PIDs: the objective is that OA book metadata contain external PIDs that can allow linking and lookup. Also see the recommendations for Open Infrastructure providers in Section 4.7.

Time frame: Medium Term

Recommendation #4:
Improve metadata for OA books

The following steps will support publishers of OA books on improving metadata, helping to make open access books more discoverable and widely distributed and, as a result, allowing open research to reach the scholarly community and the wider public. Also see the recommendations #4 and #5 for Open Infrastructure Providers in Section 4.7.

- Metadata should be made openly available using a public domain dedication like CC0. This can be achieved by providing metadata to a platform that itself makes metadata open (see Recommendation #3 above).
- As many PIDs as possible associated with the work should be included, since this facilitates linking (see Recommendation #3 above).

---

[118] Laakso, M. (2023), "Open access books through open data sources: assessing prevalence, providers, and preservation", Journal of Documentation, Vol. 79 No. 7, pp. 157-177. https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-02-2023-0016

- Whenever possible, disseminated metadata should indicate that a book title is open access and the OA licence adopted in both human and machine readable forms (see OIP Recommendation #3), including in copyright deposit submissions (see OIP Recommendation #4).[119]
- Explicit perpetual links to free digital version(s) should be provided.
- Where relevant, clear information should be provided about the RFO that has funded the underlying research as well as the funding for the publication itself.

Time frame: **Medium Term**

Recommendation #5:
Publish OA books in many formats

We recommend that publishers publish OA books in multiple suitable formats, including HTML, EPUB, PDF, print and make best efforts to ensure these formats are accessible for people with visual impairments,following international standards. It is important to offer multiple and accessible formats to readers because there are different ways of reading books that are all attuned to these specific formats.

Time frame: **Medium/Long Term**

---

[119] e.g. in ONIX records, this can be done by using the <EpubLicenseName> and <EpubLicenseExpression> fields in addition to the general open access statement in the <TextType> field.

Conclusion

In this document, the PALOMERA participants have formulated actionable, evidence-based recommendations for OA book policies for the relevant stakeholders. Our main goal was to make sure the recommendations were aligned and complemented each other across stakeholder groups. We realise that the implementation of these recommendations will require significant resources, as also outlined in the Knowledge Exchange call for action to invest in OA book infrastructure.[120] In line with the original remit of the PALOMERA project, the scope of the recommendations was deliberately limited to a specific subset of OA scholarly books. We hope that these recommendations will serve as a basis for policy recommendations for other types of OA books, especially textbooks, which would require input from experts in the domain of Open Educational Resources. We hope that future projects may address such additional urgent challenges.

---

[120] Knowledge Exchange: https://www.knowledge-exchange.info/news/articles/18-05-21 & Mounier, P., Sondervan, J., & Stone, G. (2021). Investing in the Open Access Book infrastructure - A call for action. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4768388