



Towards a Roadmap for Open Access Monographs

A Knowledge Exchange Report

Published May 2019. Revised version published June 2019



© Knowledge Exchange 2019

Title: Towards a Roadmap for Open Access Monographs

Authored by: Janneke Adema

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3238545

First published May 2019, revised version published June 2019. This 2nd version of the report was updated to include a revised summary of the examples of other funder policies on page 18.

This report outlines the key findings and recommendations coming out of the *Knowledge Exchange Stakeholder Workshop on Open Access and Monographs*, which took place in Brussels in November 2018. Thanks are due to the Knowledge Exchange OA Monographs Task and Finish group who contributed their time and expertise to the event:

- ▶ Angela Holzer, DFG
- ▶ Sarah James, Knowledge Exchange
- ▶ Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition and OPERAS
- ▶ Graham Stone, Jisc
- ▶ Jeroen Sondervan, Utrecht University
- ▶ Jean-François Nominé, CNRS
- ▶ Birgit Schmidt, Göttingen State and University Library
- ▶ Sami Syrjämäki, Federation of Finnish Learned Societies
- ▶ Verena Weigert, Jisc

We'd also like to thank those who presented, spoke, chaired, facilitated and took notes at the workshop sessions. See Annex 1 for the workshop programme.

All content published can be shared (CC BY 4.0) creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0



Contents

Executive summary	2
Knowledge Exchange Stakeholder Workshop	4
Aim of this report	4
Introduction	5
KE Landscape Study on Open Access and monographs	5
Knowledge Exchange Survey on Open Access Monographs	5
Context: A European Roadmap	6
Keynote: Focusing on European Citizens and the Impact of OA Monographs for them	7
Section 1: Is Open Access countering the allegedly imminent ‘death of the book’ in the humanities and social sciences?	9
Discussion Points	13
Section 2: Mandates and beyond? Policy development for Open Access monographs	14
Questions	15
Examples of other funder policies	17
Roadmap 1: Policies	19
Roadmap 2: Author engagement	22
Roadmap 3: Technical infrastructure	25
Roadmap 4: Monitoring and Open Access Book Watch	27
Recommendations for Stakeholders	31
Annex 1: A Knowledge Exchange Workshop on Open Access and Monographs	34
Overview of the Knowledge Exchange work on Open Access and Monographs	34
Knowledge Exchange stakeholder workshop	34
Workshop programme	35

Executive summary

This report outlines the key findings and recommendations coming out of the Knowledge Exchange (KE) *Stakeholder Workshop on Open Access and Monographs*, which took place in Brussels in November 2018.

This two-day event consisted of introductory talks on the current open access (OA) monographs landscape, followed by funder and publisher panels and a selection of in-depth workshops that explored how we can support OA monographs through *Author Engagement, Policies, Technical infrastructure, and Monitoring*. The aim of this workshop was to emphasise the importance of monographs as a format in the OA landscape, and to encourage further collaboration and the sharing of best practices. Based on the outcomes of the workshop this report includes a set of best practices and recommendations for various stakeholders in order to outline next steps towards a European roadmap for OA monographs.

The introductory talks highlighted how there remains a lack of consistency at a European level for the support of OA books, with respect to funding, recognition, infrastructure, and awareness. The work KE does has been important in this context, most importantly through its *Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs* and its 2018 stakeholder survey which identified next steps for OA monographs. Simon Tanner's (King's College, London) keynote focused on the importance of citizens in the debate of who OA for monographs is for (especially where it concerns the value and potential impact of OA for monographs).

The funder panel with Steven Hill (Research England/UKRI) and Jean-Claude Kita (FNRS) outlined how OA policies for books are taking shape in the UK and Belgium, highlighting the importance of finding a balance between mandating and incentivising. Olaf Siegert, (Leibniz Association) looked at the policy development for OA monographs in Germany, reporting back from a national

workshop on "The Future of the research monograph", organised by the Alliance of German Science Organisations. In *the publishers panel*, Margo Bargheer (Göttingen University Press/AEUP), Sarah Kember (Goldsmiths Press), Myriam Poort (Springer Nature) and Leena Kaakinen (Helsinki University Press), reflected on whether OA can counter the alleged 'death of the book' in the HSS, reflecting on the importance of the monograph for the humanities and both the format and the field's future sustainability in an OA context.

The author engagement workshop, led by Sebastian Nordhoff (Language Science Press) explored some of the tactics that can be used to encourage author take-up of OA monographs. *The policies workshop*, led by Alain Beretz (Université de Strasbourg), focused on the policies of OA monographs and explored what, on a policy level, needs to be done to improve stakeholder alignment and make sure OA policies (funding, mandates, quality and discoverability) are practical, feasible and aligned with researchers' needs. *The technical infrastructure workshop*, led by Pierre Mounier (OpenEdition), focused on defining the specific efforts that could be made to improve the integration of monographs in the scientific information system by providing adapted technical infrastructures. *The monitoring workshop*, led by Eelco Ferwerda (OAPEN) looked at how to establish a permanent Open Access Book Watch to monitor progress, identify good practices, examples, and business cases, and to provide a tool for funders and policy makers.

Each of these workshops formulated recommendations and action plans, which together form first steps towards a European roadmap for OA monographs.

Based on these outcomes, specific stakeholder recommendations were formulated:

For *Funders* these highlight the importance of policy interventions to encourage change, of sustainable policies that allow diverse publishing options, of the funding of infrastructures and platforms, and of more networked action between funders on a European level.

For *Authors and Universities*, these highlight the importance of the monograph as a format for humanities scholarship, of acknowledging the fears that exist around OA, of balancing mandating and incentivising, and of community engagement.

For *Publishers* these focus on a need for more transparency around the cost of OA monographs, and on the importance of alternative (non-BPC) funding models.

For *Technology Providers and Platforms* these emphasise the need for common technical requirements for monographs, for dialogue between stakeholders to define technical standards and their implementation, and for robust governance of technical infrastructures; for *Libraries* they focused on their potentially more active role in (financing) the publication of OA monographs, and on the long-term sustainability of OA monographs.

For *Citizens* they emphasise the societal impact and the value of OA monographs for those outside of academia.

With respect to *Monitoring* they highlight how an Open Access Book Watch could help us monitor OA for books, how we should start collecting data now, and on how monitoring should be a collective stakeholder effort.

Knowledge Exchange Stakeholder Workshop

In November 2018, The Knowledge Exchange (KE) organised a *Stakeholder Workshop on Open Access and Monographs*, which took place in Brussels (Belgium) over two days. This workshop brought together experts and key stakeholders in the open access (OA) monograph landscape, providing them with the opportunity to reinforce the importance of OA monographs being integrated in the development of an OA culture, and to encourage collaboration and the sharing of best practices.

The workshop opened with an introduction to the OA monograph landscape, followed by funder and publisher panel sessions. Following these the participants were able to choose between two of four workshop sessions on supporting OA monographs through

1. **Policies**
2. **Author engagement**
3. **Technical infrastructure**
4. **Monitoring (Open Access Book Watch)**

Participants were encouraged to share their knowledge during these sessions, the outcomes of which have been collected in this report, which includes a set of best practices and recommendations for various stakeholders in order to formulate next steps for OA monographs. This report has been and will be distributed widely to the community for further open peer review, reactions and comments.

Aim of this report

The aim of this report is to, based on the outcomes of the workshop, draft a set of KE best practices and recommendations for key stakeholders to inform them in their development of next steps to support OA Monographs. This report:

- ▶ Provides summaries of the talks delivered by key stakeholders at the workshop
- ▶ Presents, based on the discussions in the workshop, outstanding challenges and possible solutions and reflects on best practices around the four topics mentioned above
- ▶ Develops specific recommendations for different stakeholder groups including funders, policy makers, infrastructure providers, authors, publishers, universities.

Introduction

OA for monographs is mandated by only a few funders, such as the FWF (Austria), NWO (Netherlands), and the Wellcome Trust (UK).

However, in a rapidly evolving landscape, recent announcements concerning an OA mandate for monographs from Research England (formerly HEFCE) at the UP Redux conference in February 2018 and from Frederique Vidal, the French Minister of Higher Education, Research and Innovation at the LIBER conference in July 2018, have shown an increasing OA commitment for scholarly books across Europe. Furthermore **Plan S and COAlition S** (bit.ly/2Q1H5UK) as well as the recently published **report** (bit.ly/2P2gPtb) on the “Visibility of Open Access Monographs in a European Context” from the EU funded OPERAS project show a growing commitment on a European level.

KE Landscape Study on Open Access and monographs

To ensure awareness of the position of OA monographs, often neglected in the OA discussion, KE published a “Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs”. This in-depth study, published in 2017, compared and contrasted access to and identified commonalities and differences across books in eight European countries. It builds on in-depth interviews with experts from over 70 institutions across Denmark, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, UK, France, Norway and Austria, a survey and also an analysis of existing information. The report defined the OA monograph landscape and found that both OA monographs and the policies and models that support them appear to be growing. However, it reported considerable variation between each country in the study. **The report** (bit.ly/2la2rhV) has been widely downloaded and discussed on social media and in conferences, such as Redux2018 and LIBER2018. A **short summary** (bit.ly/2lvUXFF) of the findings of the report is also available.

Knowledge Exchange Survey on Open Access Monographs

In order to take the work of the Landscape Study forward, KE conducted a survey to identify next steps that should be considered to support the transition to OA Monographs. Conducted between April and May 2018, the survey received 233 responses from academic libraries, universities, authors and publishers from 25 different countries. On behalf of KE the survey was analysed by Jisc Collections to identify emerging themes (around OA monograph policies and funder engagement; university presses, academic-led publishing and traditional publishers; publishing platforms; quality; author awareness; business models; costs; and collaboration). The survey report is available **here** (bit.ly/2UrVq2P). The results were used to help inform the set up for the KE Stakeholder Workshop. The results of the survey were also presented at the workshop to inform the discussions.

Context: A European Roadmap

Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition; Jeroen Sondervan, Utrecht University;
Graham Stone, Jisc

In the open science movement the monograph has been left behind in terms of openness, policies and format (closed access print remains dominant in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)).

In many ways this is a perception though, contradicted by the reality of multiple initiatives, experiments and projects around OA monographs taking place across various European countries. The Knowledge Exchange landscape study provided evidence of this. Yet there remains a lack of consistency at a European level for the support of OA books, with respect to funding, recognition, infrastructure, and awareness. There is a risk that, given the strong push at the European and the national level to move from OA publications to open (big) data (ie the European Science Cloud), that despite all the initiatives that have developed to support and develop OA monographs, these initiatives are not organised, aligned, and consistent enough amongst themselves, putting them at risk of being superseded by an open science movement moving in the direction of open data. This would be disastrous for the HSS.

The hard work we have to engage with is to build a more consistent and healthier ecosystem to develop the growth of OA monographs. Various KE initiatives are working together to identify the challenges we have to face, as evident from the landscape study and survey described above. We need an active commitment from the different stakeholders; we need to respect the differences of disciplines, academic cultures and of the various stakeholders' activities. But we also need to work together. This needs to be a conversation between us all.

Therefore, the aim of the *Stakeholder Workshop on Open Access and Monographs* was to establish and identify the first (or most important or urgent) building blocks towards a European roadmap for the development of the OA monograph. We need to enter a second phase at this point. This workshop was a call to action, working towards a set of principles, developing building blocks for a roadmap towards the transition to OA monographs, around which the community can come together and collaborate, moving things further towards something workable, sharing experiences and breaking stereotypes. Could this be the basis of a so-called '*Brussels Declaration on Open Access Books*'? Of a '*Plan M(onographs)*'?

Keynote¹: Focusing on European Citizens and the Impact of OA Monographs for them

Simon Tanner, King's College London

Citizens are key stakeholders in the debate around the value and impact of OA monographs. We should place them at the centre of the conversation, especially as they are often excluded in lists of stakeholders for whom OA is for.

Though the general public is diverse and diffused, we cannot neglect them. One thing we tend to do is divide stakeholders into categories to make their characteristics and needs more manageable. For example, the EU **defines citizens** (europa.eu/youreurope/citizens) as EU nationals and their families, but they also characterise them as consumers of information and knowledge-based resources. Here we can see a clear line from being a citizen to being interested in what academics do, which brings us to the question of the impact of OA. EU guidelines on impact focus, amongst others, on what the problem is that is being addressed by research and who will be affected: what is the economic, social and environmental impact of OA? What does impact mean in these contexts? Impact is *"about the measurable outcomes arising from the existence of a resource that demonstrate a change in the life or life opportunities of the community"* (Tanner 2012 (bit.ly/2nJoHEK)). Although this definition is quite a high bar, 'life-opportunities' is a key aspect here, where impact could involve tiny incremental benefits since it is mostly about simply *improving life*. What is hard to establish, however, is *how much* of this change is due to something being available in OA or simply digitally.

Even so, impact is expressed through values, which, including those underlying OA, are individually understood and attributed. Yet when we collectively share these values we can start to agree on what we value as a society and this can have a magnifying effect. For example, the *Balanced Value Impact Model*, which is the underlying theoretical model of the **Europeana Impact Playbook** (bit.ly/2ifKcZi), has helped them and their network partners to measure the impact of their heritage activities.

However, when trying to find impact in OA, what becomes clear is that there is little data still for books. Yet where it concerns OA in its wider sense (focused on academic outputs) we can, following a narrative approach, provide examples of citizens that have been affected by OA with respect to **health** (go.nature.com/1QWNY6n), **the environment** (bit.ly/2eUA1XW), **economics and social and educational contexts** (oastories.mit.edu). These citizen voices need to be part of our debates.

The **Academic Book of the Future report** (bit.ly/2XCFyrh) analysed the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) book submissions in the UK. There were over a 1000 unique publishers represented, yet only 39 publishers had 20 or more books submitted and 46% of submissions were from the top ten most submitted publishers. There are still a lot of unknowns in this context, we have no idea how many of these books were available in OA, for example. What this research did show is how bibliometrics are very unhelpful to analyse books. For example, only 85% of books submitted were discoverable in library catalogues, due to issues with ISBNs etc. This is important in the context of citizen impact, because in order to find this information first we must be able to locate it. We don't know how many of the 7000+ impact case studies submitted to the REF were supported by OA publications (or even by books). We know that books have impact, but we don't have good measures of that impact in place at present, mainly because we are not trying, we are not actively seeking to know. If we don't ask impact questions we will have insufficient data.

Footnotes

1 Simon Tanner's slides are available here: bit.ly/2lc8KBA

What then are steps we can take to show citizen impact? We can start by asking impact questions, we are not asking these at the moment.

1. We must look for impact *with* citizens; we need better evidence, better research and measurement into this is needed
2. We need better functionality for OA books
 - › Books need to be full-text searchable. If a citizen can't find your book by its content it might as well be invisible. We need to demonstrate that these resources are beneficial to individuals
 - › Citations within books need to become part of our metrics
 - › We need a proper identifier for books: ISBN does not cut it
3. Funders and policy makers should use mandates to nudge behaviour but balanced with the awareness that additional requirements on academic institutions will be largely unfunded

Section 1: Is Open Access countering the allegedly imminent 'death of the book' in the humanities and social sciences?

As a result of shrinking acquisition budgets for libraries, there have been papers discussing a looming long-term disappearance of the scholarly book since as early as the 2000s.

Other factors also came up in the literature as to shifts in practice shown in decreasing book citations in scholarly communication. But is there a real trend jeopardising the existence of monographs, or is the landscape more complex and can OA consolidate monographs in communities with long-standing book practice traditions or facilitate new practices with new players? In a nutshell: *The Monograph is dead, long live the Monograph?*

Sarah Kember – Goldsmiths Press

The death of old media has tended to be overstated historically. Critical theorists such as Derrida already announced the book's death in the 70s, yet the book persists—if a little bit undead—in a zombie state: in the form of overly standardised monographs—produced for CVs—or expensive books sold to struggling libraries; all is not necessarily well in the world of the monograph. Yet the primary issue concerns a need to re-evaluate professionalisation in the academy, especially the emphasis on productivity in research. In the UK the dominance of audit cultures, increasingly precarious labour, the commercial exploitation of free labour, and gender and other biases in scholarly practices such as peer review and citation, are all symptoms of this.

Some form of intervention is needed here but that does not mean OA by itself is the saviour of publishing or the monograph, there is a distinct possibility it will be the opposite. Especially since the mandate in the UK is at the moment preceding any notion of a (range of) sustainable business models, or any commitment to additional public funding. There are serious concerns around academic freedom, as well as costs, funding, quality, and equality and diversity (who and what counts

as scholarly publishing?). These issues need to be addressed and not simply managed. The problem with monographs is part and parcel of the problem with the academy, namely its increasing domination by a neoliberal rationale; OA policy exacerbates the problem by over-emphasising commercial innovation and under-emphasising other values around invention, experimentation, and social intervention through publishing: these are very important to Goldsmith Press. We should avoid reducing creativity to market competition.

Plan S is evidence of policy making that has lost sight of the HSS and is somewhat careless about book publishing. We must accept that the old print infrastructure is not simply going to be replaced by a digital one, it will coexist and evolve with it. Book publishing is hybrid (print+digital), it will need embargoes to mitigate costs, cannot work with fixed BPCs, or a CC BY licence, in as far as IP is not separable from the form and content of the book. We need to widen our core values beyond compliance, efficiency, monitoring and transparency: these are the values of neoliberalism and are too narrow. We cannot seek a one-size fits all OA model. The history of media does not support substitutive models (new replacing old), we don't need to give in to technological solutionism. Scholarly research, writing and publishing is complex institutionally, we need to recognise that complexity, it exceeds simple technical solutions. We may look at more systematisation and automation (which might work for funders and feed values of efficiency, transparency and monitoring) but the main beneficiaries of this are not funders, academics or institutions, but platform providers and tech start-ups, some of whom have little investment in the ecology of scholarly communications beyond the desire to

monetise processes and services in the immediate short-time future. Therefore we should open out from OA because of the extent to which it delimits and dominates what we can say and do with scholarly publishing. OA needs a slightly more modest role, it is a significant part of, but not a destination for publishing: there isn't one. OA is part of the conversation about the future of the monograph, but academics should be part of this conversation too and so should a much wider range of institutions who are increasingly likely to have to pay for BPCs and who will struggle to do so out of existing research budgets.

Margo Bargheer, Association of European University Presses

Being from a humanities background myself, helps me better understand what scholars need. I head-up Göttingen UP (GUP), which was OA from the start and is embedded into a team which supports open science. As such the press also supports teaching and training—including around what OA is—around campus and I am also head of Electronic Publishing here. GUP does not stand alone, it is part of a development of embedded presses in Europe, set up within universities or research institutions. GUP have pooled their forces in the working group of German speaking UPs and the Association of European University Presses (which I chair), which includes presses with different business models (not only OA) and different challenges to face. The German situation is unique in that they have a strong commercial system that co-exists with UPs, which are usually of a newer generation.

We can use the metaphor of 'a nice little villa' to explain what academics want and expect from book publishing. The problem is that publishing has evolved in such a way that only publishers who offer 'a villa' as a publishing option are seen as valid, those that do not provide villas are seen as lower quality. But does not having a villa devalue your being as a human being? GUP understand that scholars want a villa but they want to explore what

they can offer as an institution as this scales to the whole system of scholarly communication.



Credit: The four functions of publishing (adapted from Roosendaal & Geurts 1998)

Reference: Roosendaal, H. E., & Geurts, P. A. T. (1998). Forces and functions inscientific communication: An analysis of their interplay. In M. Karttunen, K. Holmlund, & E. R. Hilf (Eds.), CRISP 97 cooperative research information systems in physics. Retrieved from bit.ly/2VYdx17.

The four big functions in scholarly publishing ie registration, awareness, certification and archiving (Roosendaal and Geertz) are completely incorporated into the format of the book. Digital technologies disrupt this. This one value chain, with one producer (the publisher), which includes awareness and dissemination, does not have to take place in the book: we can move this outside of the book in a digital environment.

We need to consider that it is this model of 'one book, one value chain' that authors, readers and institutions expect, and we are facing a disruptive situation. For GUP as a press this means consistently re-adjusting our levels and oscillating between different poles: our authors want us to be specialised but as an institution we can't be overly specialised, as we are an institutional brand. We have to find a balance between needing to be highly selective (aiming for the highest quality) or looking at the minimum quality that an embedded publisher can provide. We then need to balance this with available (limited) resources and our obligation to our authors as an UP, meaning we have to offer our services widely. This might result in smaller, yet still lovely, houses. We feel that what we offer our authors is sufficiently qualitative, and most importantly, we offer OA. Publishing with GUP means OA + print with CC BY licences. Our business model rests on authors and editors needing to contribute (which is typical in the German system where authors subsidise book publishing, but with GUP they get OA). We don't do all of this on our own, we try to embed ourselves within the working groups mentioned earlier, but we also look at the standards that need to be fed into, which we do with OASPA—even though some members of OASPA see OA as a new way to make money. UPs such as GUP have a strong role and meaning in this context. The book is never going to die because it happens to be the best format for humanities scholars. In some ways it is the best manifestation of the long argument, which won't go away in the HSS as it is their laboratory, it is what they work in. The book as a format should become more fluid etc but at the same time it shouldn't get lost in the digital environment either.

Leena Kaakinen, Helsinki University Press

I am the publishing director of Gaudeamus, which is owned by the University of Helsinki and publishes academic and non-fiction literature in Finnish. I am also publishing director of Helsinki UP (HUP), which publishes in English. The management of HUP's operations is shared between Gaudeamus and Helsinki University

Library, combining the expertise of a professional publisher and an academic library, which is very important in this context. HUP is a member of the Ubiquity Partner Network and I am the chairperson of the Finnish Association for Scholarly Publishing. HUP's aim is to maintain quality, we are not-for-profit, fully open access, adhere to strict peer review and we have an editorial board making all the publishing decision. We will publish monographs, edited volumes and journals in English. HUP will provide free to download HTML and PDF formats, full-text search, and print-on-demand books and ebooks for sale. Our first publications will be out next year after a call for papers in the spring. Helsinki University funds them.

Why is a new university press needed? The University of Helsinki wanted its own university press and wanted to advocate for OA too. HUP felt these things could be combined. Our mission is to:

1. Find solutions for the present problems in scholarly publishing
2. To provide a good quality publishing service to researchers, supporting them, not the other way around
3. To disseminate research widely—the traditional dissemination model has a lot of problems, we can do better

NUPs are needed to create more high-quality OA publishing channels and to push towards OA, as there are still many misconceptions around OA that need breaking. In Finland there is very little funding for OA, it is scattered and confusing for authors. HUP didn't want to wait for this situation to somehow clear up, but wanted to create this initiative to push and solve these problems. We have established working groups, of which I am a part, to advance OA in Finland and resolve these issues. In conclusion, the book is still needed for the HSS, and needs to be part of the OA discussion.

Myriam Poort, Springer Nature

Springer Nature was founded a few years ago out of a merger. We are both a traditional and an OA publisher. Our book programme was launched in 2012 (for Springer) and 2013 (for Palgrave Macmillan) the two publishers within our group who publish most of the book content, across all subject disciplines. We publish OA and we want to support researchers in building the infrastructure and technologies that support their needs with respect to OA publishing. We do this for a number of product types: monographs, short-form books, edited collections, book chapters, and reference works. We use a CC BY licence and all our OA books are available digitally as well as in print. The publishing process is similar for an OA book as for a regular book but there are also differences. At some point we flip books to OA when for example funding becomes available, but this always happens before publication. OA books are peer reviewed to ensure quality similar to regular books². We charge a fee for our services, which differs between Palgrave (depending on book type and discipline) and Springer (depending on number of pages). Books are copy-edited and they receive the same active marketing: they are included in our ebook connections, available on Amazon and published in multiple formats (EPub, HTML, PDF). We also deposit our books in DOAB.

We have conducted research on what drives authors to publish OA with us, including:

1. Achieving the widest dissemination without access barriers
2. Being beneficial for their career, raising their profile
3. Addressing ethical concerns around giving back to society, addressing the issue of equal access to knowledge

Springer Nature has conducted a survey ('**The OA Effect**' (bit.ly/2Sw5t2e)) of our own books, comparing

OA books to non-OA books. We found OA books have seven times more downloads, 50% more citations and ten times more online mentions. OA helps the book, and the book is not dead in our experience, the number of books we publish in the HSS grows each year. Print sales can be a challenge, but the online world and ebook collections sales offer great opportunity. Our report only provides metrics though, not what the impact of OA is.

Some of the challenges we face include funding, and the last few years we have done extensive work on our infrastructures: there are workflow issues as OA books are treated differently on our platform. This involved platform development, including accounting and invoicing. We also had to educate our publishing staff on what OA is. We have a team now working with authors to identify funding, but also to help with concerns authors raise, including misconceptions around OA especially with respect to quality and peer review and using third party materials.

Footnotes

- 2 One of the recommendations coming out of the workshop is that we need to be aware of how we use language around OA. OA often remains the "experimental" or "alternative" option, or, in this case, the "irregular" one.
-

Discussion Points

The Death of the Book and the Humanities

- ▶ The future death of the book or the long-term sustainability of OA books needs to be on our agendas. However, we need to consider that books have always gone out of print and become unavailable. New embedded UPs should make use of their connection with institutional libraries, and there are also deposit services such as the OAPEN Library, which distribute the responsibility for a task that smaller publishers shouldn't be doing themselves. In some countries such as Finland there is also talk of national preservation strategies for books
- ▶ There is still a lot of investment in the traditional form of the book in the humanities, but there is also a great deal of interest in experimental scholarship, exploring the boundaries between scholarship and publishing. Publishing is not a passive vehicle for what scholars do but a mode of evolving what they do
- ▶ Should we be more concerned with the death of the humanities than with the death of the book? Does the lack of concern academics show around access to their work, and their lack of engagement with the general public, signal the death of the humanities? Humanities as a field needs to rethink what they consider a decent publishing option, what values they want to promote
- ▶ In thinking about the future of the monograph and the future of disciplines, what do we want books to do, and what role does OA play in this? Book publishers currently spend 60/65% of their revenues on sales, marketing, discovery and distribution. Do authors still want this and think this is worthwhile to do, given this is a major part of the cost base?
- ▶ Don't think of publishing in binary (print/digital, open/closed, legacy/new) either/or terms. OA, although it offers possibilities, is not a panacea to the fundamental issues we are facing around the neoliberal system—including precarity and ill health—and the impoverished values of the academy—including dominant values around metrics, fully embedded within the system. If there is a binary here anywhere, a clear-cut either/or is whether academia is properly publicly funded or not. We train huge amounts of scholars each year but at the same time we limit their publishing options (eg by sparse access to BPCs). We need more publishing options that are less competitive and less selective

Section 2: Mandates and beyond? Policy development for Open Access monographs

Monographs in OA are a vital topic—on the European level as well as in national science policy debates. One important aspect of the current discussions is the development of adequate policies for the support and funding of OA monographs.

Funders are viewed as playing a key role in promoting OA. For example, in some countries such as the UK and France, government plans may guide their policies. While variety is a source of valuable insights into different ways and means of encouraging an open dissemination of scholarly communication, the survey commissioned by KE also highlighted that respondents saw international coordination and specific funding efforts as essential to foster OA monographs.

Steven Hill, Research England, a council of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)

Regarding the place of policy making and funding in the debate on OA monographs, there is a need for policy intervention in this place. As scholarly communication involves a wide array of stakeholders (authors, publishers, universities, users, funders) there is a real risk that all actors might agree on the basic idea of making scholarly content open, but they then turn to look at one another to solve *how* to implement change; no one is ready to change their frameworks first. This is a classic policy problem where the only solution is some form of intervention. Policy intervention is therefore important in this space as it can take us from a relatively stable state into another state. It can move the dial and change the way people think about things. It is really hard to bring about this change without having some catalyst where all stakeholders can line up behind.

Regarding UK policy developments around OA monographs in the context of the national research assessment process (REF) there has been a move from encouraging to mandating as a process of policy

intervention. OA for monographs is already encouraged through subtle soft policy interventions (ie the element of the ‘research environment’ in REF 2021), where institutions can get extra credit in this process if they can show a demonstrable commitment to OA, including for monographs. In future assessment exercises the UK will be moving more to a requirement around OA monographs as part of that move from encouraging to mandating. Yet this move is not only about rules and regulations. It is important to be part of a conversation with the university sector about how to make this transition through to an OA monograph world. Part of that is done through working with the universities’ representative body, Universities UK, and through working with Roger Kain, who chairs the **UUK OA monographs group** (bit.ly/2GCeRMi). That group, made up of a wide range of stakeholders, has helped start a national conversation through engagement events and by gathering the additional evidence needed to make a policy. The final stage of this process involves the national UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) review of OA policy of which monographs will be a part. The outcomes of the UUK OA monographs group will feed into thinking around OA monographs in relation to potential mandates from research project funders and also as part of the national research assessment exercise.

Making policy in this space is not straightforward given the complexity of the landscape. There are things about monographs that we need to respect in thinking about policy:

1. We need to think carefully about timing, ie when we can be clear about policy and when we can expect monographs to be available OA. Many books submittable to the next research evaluation are already in contract or already written, and we need to respect that
2. We need to respect the diversity of views within the HSS community on the question of licensing. This includes the debates that are going on in that community whether CC BY is an acceptable licence for scholars. We need to think carefully through issues of third- party rights
3. We need to be clear that we are not covering creative works, that these are separate types of scholarly output. We also need to have provisions in place to take care of trade books
4. We need an evidence base to enable us to think about the balance between different funding models and particular about the role of green OA

All of these are really important but are adjuncts to a policy response that needs to be clear and set a clear direction. Just because we can't do everything is not a reason for doing nothing.

Questions

How will the mandate relate to REF as it will apply not only to grant funded projects but to all books submittable to the REF. What kind of commitment is there for further additional funds to be made available for either BPCs or the development of repositories?

Steven Hill: The mandate applies to articles or books submitted to the REF irrespective of how they are funded. That doesn't mean many aren't related to project funding activities (eg ERC and AHRC funding). We fund universities at quite a substantial level and they can already use that funding to pay for OA books. We are reviewing our policy and we haven't yet decided against the idea of an actual dedicated fund: funding might be distributed in ways that relate to the volume of activity in book publishing, for example. The risk of that is that it will drive BPCs higher or that it doesn't put any downward pressure on them. We will need to think carefully of how to implement such a fund and work out whether it will have a cap. We are aware that the funding issue is there, but there are different ways of addressing this and a dedicated fund is only one option we will be looking at.

Should we take researchers' past record of OA publishing into account when they apply to funds?

Steven Hill: We fund on the basis of past performance in the national research evaluation. In the next evaluation we have a requirement that journal articles are OA before they are eligible to be submitted to that evaluation. But we have been criticised by the academic community for possibly excluding from that assessment high quality research that happens to have been published in a closed access or paywalled format; this is seen as unfair, and we need to articulate criteria around that. That is why within that policy environment we actually have quite a lot of flexibility for researchers to have exceptions to that policy because we are sensitive to that particular concern.

Jean-Claude Kita – Wallonia-Brussels Federation Scientific Research Fund, Belgium (FNRS)

The F.R.S.-FNRS is one of the two main funding agencies in Belgium. We have identified three main issues:

1. How to encourage the dissemination of OA monographs
2. How to provide policy or funding initiatives that do not discriminate in terms of disciplines or communities
3. How to enable further collaboration or sharing of best practices from an organisational perspective

The F.R.S.-FNRS, which promotes the valorisation of research outputs by stimulating and funding fundamental research at French-speaking universities in Belgium, has signed the Berlin Declaration and implemented an OA mandate in 2013. With monographs the F.R.S.-FNRS are still in a very experimental stage. The constraints we are experiencing (similar to other countries) revolve around the physical format of the medium, its different dissemination channels (ie via library catalogues) and higher production costs, and a publishing system that is not ready to handle OA books.

What kinds of strategies can we devise to promote OA publishing? It is important we take into consideration what HSS scholars want (eg increased readership and visibility of their research outputs) and what challenges they are facing. To do so we need to understand their objectives in publishing a monograph in OA, which differ according to whether they are early career researchers (ECRs) or tenured, and whether they are publishing a chapter or a book. Choosing a publication strategy based on their objectives might help target the most appropriate publishers and book series and find the most suitable business models for OA monographs—especially in a context in which the BPCs commercial publishers charge for books and chapters are unaffordable to most Belgian scholars.

Yet we also need to consider the challenges funders face; for example, how best to overcome legal barriers, licensing issues, and publishers' policies when implementing a mandate for OA monographs? Scholars need guidance here which is often lacking from funders. An additional challenge involves identifying a suitable business model, be that Green, Gold or Diamond OA. There is also the issue of adapting the current evaluation and promotion process to digital research outputs, where academic prestige/quality is mostly still linked to the physical output. Many scholars do not trust the digital book, thinking it compromises their development or their ability to get research grants. Funders need to put more incentives in place for digital works in evaluation assessments.

What funding instruments are at hand at the F.R.S.-FNRS? We have put out a funding call for OA books and periodicals, which, for its 2018 call had a success rate of around 50% (€160.000 granted out of a €350.000 budget). When made OA and subjected to international editorial control as well as anonymous peer-review, the funding covered typesetting costs, graphic design, reproofing, and translation of the publications. The way forward for us is international collaboration, which is a vehicle for facilitating wider adoption and acceptance of OA monographs, especially concerning the enforcement of mandates. Funders need to fund international OA infrastructure services (eg OAPEN, DOAB) and we need an alignment of policies to support the dissemination of OA content (eg Science Europe). We also need to participate in transnational calls (eg ERA-NETS; OpenAIRE2020, FP7) next to devising collective strategies for implementing new quality assessment criteria. In conclusion what is clear is that the transition to OA monographs needs to be a collective effort of all stakeholders (libraries, funders, and learned societies).

Olaf Siegert - Leibniz Association

As already mentioned in the “Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs”, Germany has a very decentralised research landscape—universities are funded not by the central government but by the (16) federal states, all with their own research policies, ie there is not one clear policy route. The university sector is very strong in research output, but Germany also has large non-university research organisations, ie Max Planck, Helmholtz, Leibniz, Fraunhofer and the Academies of Science. They account for roughly 20-25% of all research outputs. The monographic disciplines (humanities and social sciences) are mainly represented at the universities, Leibniz and the Academies. To coordinate the different interests and activities concerning research policy issues, the “Alliance of German Research Organisations” was formed. Within the Alliance there is the “Digital Information” Priority Initiative, which started in 2008. At first the initiative was mainly coordinating, setting up working groups and producing guidelines. More recently they have also started to fund prominent projects (including the **DEAL project** (projekt-deal.de), which negotiated with big publishers and the **OA2020-DE** (oa2020-de.org/en) project with the National Contact Point OA, funded by both the DFG and the Alliance). One of the topical working groups of the initiative deals specifically with scholarly publications, including OA monograph business models.

This working group organised an expert workshop in September 2018 in Bonn on the topic “The Future of the Research Monograph”. 50 invited participants came together to gather views from three stakeholder groups: Authors/Learned Societies, Funders, and Libraries. One session (with four-five inputs) was organised for each stakeholder group. The workshop looked at ways to organise support for OA in the monographic disciplines and which supporting and transformational strategies will best enable an OA oriented publishing culture. The event started with a keynote by Eelco Ferwerda on the KE Landscape Study (which included the results of the

German country study). The subsequent session on different stakeholder views brought the following results:

- ▶ The author session found that authors still want the printed monograph as a publishing format, but they acknowledged an additional OA version would be beneficial due to higher visibility and better use (annotations, looking for quotes etc.)
- ▶ The funder session found it to be problematic that there are still no defined standards to fund OA monographs. One of the main obstacles is the calculation of costs (which cost aspects are fundable and which not? How can we achieve more transparency?). It was felt that more shared experiences and networked action between funders is needed
- ▶ The library session found that libraries play multiple roles (not just funding OA monographs, but also archiving, metadata management, inclusion in discovery systems and library-led publishing). Using acquisition budgets for new financing models (eg crowdfunding or membership models) could become more important in this context and it was felt libraries could play a more active and visible role between authors and publishers in an OA setting

Networking of funders was seen as something to be explored next, especially since quite a few universities and research organisations are now setting up dedicated funds for OA monographs. The Alliance wants to support this. Once more standards have been identified, they also want to publish guidelines for funders and they want to continue promoting the multiple roles for libraries. As a possible next step the Alliance wants to expand the workshop structure to include publishers in order to explore good business models for the future, especially for the German language model.

Examples of other funder policies

The Wellcome Trust recently announced a new policy which they will start monitoring in 2020, but it only affects articles. Wellcome's history with respect to OA policies includes having a policy in place for articles since 2005, which they updated to include **scholarly monographs and bookchapters in 2013** (bit.ly/2HYMFFo). They are still in the process of thinking critically about how to best put an OA policy forward for monographs. They see monographs as an important resource for the community and for citizens. Currently they support OA (monograph) publishing through BPCs and they mandate green OA if publishers don't offer that option. For more details and recent announcements including the implementation date of now 1 January 2021 of the new OA policy see (wellcome.ac.uk/funding/guidance/open-access-policy).

The European Research Council (ERC) is funded under the EU Research Framework Programme (FP). Generally, the same rules related to OA apply as to the rest of the FP, but there are some specificities in the ERC's approach to OA. The ERC has been supporting OA for all kinds of scholarly outputs including monographs, chapters, and other long-text publications since the very beginning (the first statement on OA by the ERC Scientific Council was published in 2006, even before the official launch of the ERC in 2007). There has never been any doubt on the side of the ERC Scientific Council whether monographs should be included in the ERC's provisions on OA. By now, grantees and applicants are well aware that the OA obligations under the grant agreement also apply to monographs and book chapters. This is made very explicit in the work programme and the information for applicants, so that applicants can budget for this in advance. Sometimes applicants are not fully aware of the amounts they should budget for BPCs, and of the restrictions that publishers impose on Green OA for books and chapters. Another challenge relates to the fact that costs related to OA for books published after the end of the project cannot be charged

to the grant anymore. Some publishers have been creative in trying to find solutions in such cases, adapting their publishing contracts, but this is not always possible. According to a study that the ERC has commissioned and that will be published soon, the ERC's OA rate for books and chapters that have emerged from ERC projects funded under FP7 and the first three years of Horizon 2020 is about 40% (according to the same study, the OA rate for peer reviewed journal articles covering the same period is significantly higher at more than 70%). While 40% may not seem very high, one has to take into account that during the first few years of the ERC's operation there was only a recommendation by the Scientific Council and no mandate as such. The OA mandate has only been included in the grant agreement as a best effort condition in 2012; it became a strict mandate under Horizon 2020. For now, there are no caps for BPCs.

The European Commission proposes a new and streamlined policy for OA in Horizon Europe. Open access is mandatory in Horizon 2020 for all peer-reviewed publications. However, the current Annotated Grant Agreement, which was compiled early in the Framework Programme, effectively excludes monographs from this obligation and rather recommends that they are provided in open access. While it is not possible to change this interpretation in Horizon 2020, Horizon Europe will explicitly mandate OA to monographs, thus including this very important research output in its mandate. Currently, all costs for OA publishing are eligible and there are no caps on BPCs, while details on financial support of open access in Horizon Europe are being finalised.

Roadmap 1: Policies

Formal mandating of OA for monographs has only been adopted in a few countries, though some incentives are already appearing in others.

The KE landscape study compared different OA policies in eight European countries and found significant variations due to the differing political structures. This stakeholder and policy fragmentation is an important and recurring issue and although there are many programmes to promote OA, most policies are based on recommendations rather than mandates, and apart from a national OA strategy, monographs often aren't included in OA policies. Often heard reasons why things aren't progressing more quickly are the strong focus on journal publishing and the complex structures of monograph publishing. What, on a policy level, needs to be done to improve stakeholder alignment and make sure OA policies for monographs (funding, mandates, quality and discoverability) are practical, feasible, and aligned with the daily practices of researchers?

Key Issues

- ▶ Monographs are not present in policies as much as journal articles are. Do we need specific policies for journals and monographs? Is Plan S too narrow in this respect?
- ▶ Up to now we have many recommendations and few mandates. What we need is a sustainable policy (taking into account business, academic and career concerns). If mandates precede sustainable business models this will not work (monographs also cost more than articles, and are more vulnerable to financial risks)
- ▶ New ideas are missing in this area, current policies or mandates are set up to continue business as usual, we should instead find ways to change the costs or financial structure of (OA) publishing
- ▶ How do we take diversity (country, language, disciplinary) into account? One size does not fit all. Should we move from policy to policies? The monograph itself is also not a monolith, there are many different kinds of monographs (eg first books, PhD theses, trade books and books that bring in no revenue at all, experimental books)
- ▶ How do we implement policy and move beyond wishful thinking? Work and investments from different stakeholders will be needed here. Perhaps we should take things step-by-step and not try to come up with solutions for everything all at once
- ▶ We need to have standards, for example what do we mean by OA publishing?
- ▶ Researchers are unhappy if too much responsibility is put on their shoulders. What can we reasonably ask authors to do (eg depositing a copy of their publications in a repository)? Academic culture needs nurturing more than top down orders. But do we sometimes need a stick, not just carrots?
- ▶ Would a policy guide be useful? A wishlist for OA monographs should include a simple policy (two pages max), transparency of costs, rules set by scholars, and realistic targets. We need to keep in mind what this policy is for and whether the guidance is pointing to the wanted direction. What is the difference between policy and guidance in this respect?
- ▶ We see a preference for specific licences in funding and mandates, do scholars have enough knowledge about this? Consider humanities scholars and their concerns around the CC BY licence (allowing derivatives)

- ▶ Funding infrastructures is something funders are not that familiar with (although some, eg Wellcome, are now beginning to fund platforms). What are the issues here for funders, what are the types of infrastructures they are considering or the nature of the infrastructural processes they would look to fund?
- ▶ We need to fund services. Infrastructures are funded to provide the necessary publishing services for monographs researchers need. For example, the EC has funded services through the research infrastructure work programmes. The interoperability of the various types of services for monographs is important (see HIRMEOS and OPERAS). Funders now pay for these services provided by commercial publishers either directly through deals or (indirectly) through BPCs. Providing publishing services that will be operated more according to the public interest instead of commercial interests is important. To what extent do you outsource services to entities whose interests do not necessarily align with universities or funders?
- ▶ OA is revealing issues around the cost of publishing that we have been largely ignoring before: how much does it cost to support and publish a discipline, for example?
- ▶ BPCs and OA are not the same, with BPCs we are creating another layer of access problems for the Global South, not access to content but access to publishing options. In addition to this, BPCs connected to brands can lead to inflation of prices
- ▶ We need to prioritise actions, tackle the most relevant areas first and take it from there, as part of a rolling effect
- ▶ Policy needs to address societal impact and the value of OA activity for those outside of academia, eg citizens, teachers
- ▶ Monitoring should be an integral part of the policy
- ▶ Any policy guide should have clear implementation chapters as well as discipline specific chapters
- ▶ We need to respect scholars concerns about licences (eg issues around no-derivatives) but we should also accumulate a body of evidence of scholarship published under liberal licences that has not been used in ways that people are uncomfortable with. We need to be clear about the benefits of more liberal licences while still permitting less liberal ones
- ▶ There is a danger of national funders linking large monolithic infrastructures where, tactually, supporting smaller initiatives that are interoperable with each other might be a better way to go. Funders might need to make choices whether they fund universities directly or enable publishing activity by authors or whether they fund infrastructure activity, given imited budgets
- ▶ It makes sense for funders to provide investment in infrastructures, but we need to put some thought into how as initiatives, infrastructures and stakeholders we team up to remodel financial flows in order for consortial models and platforms to exist, including setting up a legal body which can pay up front. It is not only the platform itself funders could fund but also the process of how to establish new agreements on financial and sustainability issues

Recommendations

- ▶ We need to make sure that we know what we are talking about before implementing policies, including certain standards and a clear definition or explanation of what is meant by OA

- ▶ Funders should reflect on how they can support the organisational aspects of infrastructures, including organisational costs: setting up and running the organisation, administrative costs, human resources etc. Business models can then be found for the services infrastructures provide, but this is a different aspect
- ▶ Instead of BPCs we need to explore other (platform) models and treat global authors alike, based on their merits and not on what they can afford. Academics should retain their brands and not sell out to publishers, otherwise we will end up in the same situation as with subscriptions
- ▶ Academics fear mandates that require them to publish OA without any funding to do so. We need clear paths for researchers to apply for funding if we choose a BPC model or we need to explore other forms of (institutional) funding that are easy for authors and take away their fears

Roadmap 2: Author engagement

Author engagement is key to the success of OA for monographs. However, there is evidence to show that there is still a lot of mistrust and misinformation surrounding OA for monographs from many authors and their learned societies.

The KE survey showed that concerns over costs, funding and quality issues were high on authors' agendas. The survey also found that a change in authors' attitudes was seen as a key area for the further development of OA monographs in respondents' countries. What tactics that can be used to encourage author take-up of OA monographs?

Language Science Press (LSP), founded in 2014, is an example of a press committed to community engagement, amongst others by making use of public supporters' lists, community proofreading, autonomous scholar-led series, conference ambassadors etc. LSP's engagement stems from being unhappy with the existing publishing landscape: they were authors in need of a publisher. Linguists are also rather good at organising themselves, in taking fate into their own hands (see eg the *Lingua/Glossa* case). This might have to do with size as the field is not too large. LSP is therefore less focused on author engagement and more on community engagement—the community of which they are a part. As such the LSP brand is about being community-based, open and lean (ie they have no costs related to warehousing, rights management, royalties, marketing etc.). In order to engage authors, they do build upon prestige, be that from big names, by producing high quality books, or by being innovative (using novel features, being more flexible etc). Organisationally they engage authors mainly through their collaborative approach, developing books together with authors. For example, LSP works with a model of continuous integration (adapted from software development) using GitHub/Overleaf/paperhive/docloop instead of first and final proofs. LSP does not require BPCs and offers transparency on costs, and with that choice to their

authors. Having a print copy remains very important to their authors, but in general OA is something linguists want: many of them do fieldwork abroad, they want their books to be openly available there. Being a community-based press LSP does not really have to advertise, this is one area where discipline focused presses differ from general purpose presses, here engagement means something different.

Author Concerns

- ▶ *Issues around quality and prestige.* OA presses tend to be smaller and more recently established, and hence publishing with them is often actively discouraged by institutions (often also due to perceptions around conservative research assessments). University leadership and university processes have not yet embraced OA in the way they should. Similarly, the **Springer Nature survey** (bit.ly/2bni02J) found that 41% of scholars have some concern about the quality of OA, especially scholars outside of Europe
- ▶ *Issues around BPCs and funding for OA monographs:* Mandates can turn out to be unintended incentive systems for inflated BPCs, or can provide stakeholders with another way to set prices according to their existing models. Authors simply cannot afford these (inflated) BPCs and feel uncomfortable giving large amounts of public money to commercial publishers. Where can authors find funding for OA monographs?
- ▶ *Issues around derivatives and licences for OA books.* The issue of derivatives concerns amongst others translation and direct quotation. In the UK anthropologists are concerned about interviewer-

interviewee trust as words could be used out of context when not using a CC BY-ND licence. There is a similar issue with translations where these are seen as a real intellectual contribution. This is separate from issues around third party rights, which create problems for certain fields, eg music and art history

- ▶ *Issues around trade books and theses*¹. There are certain research-based trade books (counting towards research assessments, but also read by the general public), which academics derive income from. There is a perception that OA might lead to less print sales here (and with that less royalties). How will this fit into an OA mandate? For example, course adoptions where instead of libraries buying 20 copies of a book, students are offered access to an OA version. Similarly, when making a thesis OA, there exists a fear that these subsequently won't get published as books
- ▶ *Issues around marketing and exposure*. It's not enough just to publish openly. Advertising is needed, books need to be found. Is OA only potentially more open to international exposure? What is the point of publishing OA, what do authors gain from that? OA does not necessarily mean better dissemination and availability

Recommendations

- ▶ We need to acknowledge the fears and often valid concerns authors have around OA monographs and engage with them by:
 - ▶ Taking academics seriously, be willing to have this debate with communities—often a debate of hearts and minds. If you want authors to choose OA monographs, then publishers, societies, funders etc need to engage with their communities
 - ▶ In some cases, educating authors to counter and remove fears. For example, the UUK OA
- ▶ monographs working group is hosting events where academics can express their concerns, understand their options and perhaps find their concerns are not founded on reality. Fear around licences can often be mitigated by providing additional information, as can fear around print sales by providing evidence that shows the effect of OA can be positive or neutral at the very least
- ▶ Acknowledging those fears that exist within fields/communities and being pragmatic (ie offering various licensing options or various (open) review options). We need to respect that certain communities have certain preferences for the usage of their works—see the issue of derivatives and translations
- ▶ Engagement means going where academics are, it is about identifying research communities. For example, LSP emerged from a community practice, there are other cultures or practices where this might work too. It is about community engagement more than author engagement
- ▶ Mandates are one way of affecting authors' behaviour, but they should be about incentivising too, highlighting the quality and prestige of OA (in hiring, assessment etc). Incentivising university leadership is particularly important, they need to step up to support their academics in publishing OA. Universities are signing up to DORA the declaration on research assessment, which emphasises the academic significance of a publication, not where it is published. This message also needs to be conveyed to senior staff/supervisors, where mythologies often perpetuate through generations
- ▶ We should fund training programmes to ensure HSS scholars are trained from the very beginning to understand the publishing system. Misconceptions arise from a lack of training. If we make humanities scholars rely heavily on publishing to communicate,

then we need to take training seriously and fund it. At the same time, we should be careful when using the word ‘training’ — academics are a little tired of being trained

- ▶ Engagement means supporting early-career researchers. For example, the Royal Historical Society (RHS) in the UK is publishing OA free of BPCs for early career authors’ books. The RHS brand might mean something too for authors and university management
- ▶ Engagement involves taking away fears around (often new, digital and open) infrastructures, services and platforms, by ensuring that they are interoperable and provide transparency on costs, licences, review policies etc. We need to work collectively within disciplines and on a national level to support these publishing infrastructures and to provide authors with information and choice. Solving issues around infrastructures, taking away fears around BPCs and long-term availability, will make author engagement much easier
- ▶ More openness and transparency about the real costs of publishing an OA monograph would be really useful to help authors determine what a sensible BPC is. This way authors can choose
- ▶ We should point out success stories, where on a concrete level OA has done some good, has advanced something, from the point of view of citizens. It is important that researchers tell these stories themselves and to each other. We need to stop managing academics and their expectations, we should talk to them rather than at them
- ▶ We need to be aware of how we use language around OA, it often remains an ‘experimental’ option, the ‘obscure alternative’; scholars do not want to go there. If we are serious about OA being just another

way of producing books we should remind ourselves how we communicate this. Language and framing are important to engage scholars

- ▶ We need to analyse why the printed book format has been such a successful communication concept that has shaped humanities research and thinking. Understanding this will help us both better understand the pressures academics are under and better translate this communication concept to a digital work

Roadmap 3:

Technical infrastructure

The dissemination of OA monographs depends on the availability of technical infrastructures adapted to this particular format.

While the technical infrastructure for research data and articles is continuously improving in terms of accessibility, quality assurance, indexing, crosslinking and preservation, scholarly books clearly lack a similar effort. At a global level, the adoption of **FAIR principles** (bit.ly/1Rp786e) seems to be more difficult for monographs; at European level, the development of the European Open Science Cloud is widely influenced by data intensive research models that ignore the monograph as a specific research output. As a consequence, most of the technical standards regarding data exchange, content structuration, metadata, identifiers and metrics have been designed to manage other research outputs and to use them for monographs leads to challenges that hinder interoperability. How can we define the specific efforts that could be made to improve the integration of monographs in the scientific information system by providing adapted technical infrastructures?

Examples of national monograph infrastructure projects

- ▶ In Finland, the Organisation of Finnish Learned Societies, funded by the Ministry of Education, runs a national service for 80 journals and they are planning a similar service for monographs (with a connection to Finland). Due to the number of different players for monographs, this will be harder to establish. There is not much talk about funding for OA monographs in Finland, it is more about creating a technical platform for societies that want OA monographs, editorial processes etc in a similar way to Open Journal System and Open Monograph Press (OJS/OMP). Member societies can use the platform for free but funding for the platform is not yet resolved

- ▶ OA publishers have difficulty accessing the channels that library acquisition departments use to buy print and e-book content. The supply chain or discovery in library catalogues and to book suppliers is the main issue here, where free content is hard to register into these systems. In the UK, Jisc's National Bibliographic Knowledgebase is looking into this, including open licensing of metadata

What are the technical specificities of the monograph?

Next to the diversity issue we need common technical requirements for monographs so that they can be fully integrated into technical infrastructures, including (European Open Science Cloud (**EOSC** (bit.ly/1VpLbUh)) and **OpenAIRE** (openaire.eu)). Infrastructures and technical standards are very much designed around articles, they haven't fully addressed the specificities of monographs. Do we need additional technical standards to enable this, or specific standards (eg specific protocols, ISBNs, DOIs)? What we need mostly perhaps is a minimum standard. We also need to consider the capacities of the community to adopt these standards. In the HIRMEOS project for example, the main target is not the publishers but the technical infrastructures, working towards adopting standards. We need mediation with publishers, they need to be able to rely on these technical platforms. We also need to understand what researchers need to discover books, what are their requirements?

Main points to concentrate on:

- ▶ The main approach towards integration and infrastructure creation should be around determining the various actors or levels of actors that are involved. In this context there is a continuous integration chain that

links researchers (as authors and information seekers), publishers, publishing platforms (which should be our main target), scientific information systems (for metadata and discovery, ie discovery services, book suppliers, bibliographic databases, library catalogues—each with their own standards), and the European Open Science Cloud (where information needs to feed into, with a focus on researchers)

- ▶ We need to establish which standards would be relevant (ie **BITS** (bit.ly/2KZTiLh) (Book Interchange Tag Suite), ONIX, ISBN, DOI, ORCID, other identifiers, etc). How can we facilitate the dialogue between all these stakeholders to define the standards? The important point though, is to work on common implementation practices of the standards, because their flexibility usually allows for differences in terms of implementation that hinder real interoperability
- ▶ The main target we need to concentrate on is publishing platforms, which are currently in the middle of everything, translating between players and interpreting standards. What we need is standards that can be used by everyone (without being too loose) and minimum requirements with respect to metadata that needs to be provided by a platform. Suppliers might be quite open to this, as it helps them integrate OA books. We need to find out more about what their expertise and difficulties are. We need exit strategies—ie no bind into a platform—and long-term preservation

Recommendations

- ▶ There are many different platforms out there but what is needed is a unifying structure, which we can call ‘infrastructure’ that helps with these services and, establishes protocols etc. This needs to be something that concentrates on the elements around books and helps other players to feed in information in an agreed way. From here we can then export into other systems
- ▶ We need to take a critical look at critical dependencies, eg ISBNs. What is not working well and what can we do?
- ▶ We need to explore issues of governance; how can we have a collectively managed infrastructure? We need to explore the governance side first and then move forward
- ▶ We need to explore the technical governance between stakeholders, and include libraries. This needs to be based on community ownership. How do we assess the openness and sustainability of the governance?
- ▶ We need a good practice checklist for governance
- ▶ We need to identify technical standards and infrastructures and evaluate them (identifying all the pain points). We need to identify where authors and citizens experience problems
- ▶ We would need a subset of stakeholders who would like to build on this infrastructure, for example a small set of publishers, and see whether this scales (ie going through the workflow to establish where friction arises, where in the workflow do things get lost, do issues arise, what are the gaps, what is missing?)
- ▶ We need to set up a demonstrator, for example scholar-led publishers are wanting to set up a prototype for a decentralised infrastructure
- ▶ We need a study to understand the platforms better, not just another study, but one that clearly demonstrates evidence of the benefits for authors and readers
- ▶ We need to involve the library community and include the requirements of funders

Roadmap 4: Monitoring and Open Access Book Watch

Monitoring of OA publications is becoming a very important aspect of research evaluation. It has proven to be very difficult to monitor OA research output by institutions, on a national level, and on a global level.

Different services are offering monitoring tools (for example Unpaywall or Clarivate, etc) but for monographs this is in its early days. There are no clear figures on OA monograph output. The KE landscape report identified several knowledge gaps in this area, for example, monograph output in numbers, geographically, by type, by openness (and compared with volume and language of closed books). The KE study proposed to establish a permanent Open Access Book Watch (OABW), to monitor progress, identify good practices, examples, and business cases, and to provide a tool for funders and policy makers. What are the most pressing gaps and can we identify possible solutions as well as investigate the outlines of an OABW? How could it help those who are working with OA monographs? To initiate this we need to focus on several questions: why do we need an OABW, what would we monitor and for whom, and how can we achieve this? Subsequently we need to look at first steps towards a workable approach.

Why is an OA book watch needed?

- ▶ Monitoring of OA content is on the agenda in many places, articles are already monitored (in a more systematic way). If we want to make progress with OA books do we need to revisit this question for books?
- ▶ At the moment creating and providing evidence for the impact of OA is difficult and cumbersome, an OA book watch could help us keep track
- ▶ Depending on the stakeholder, it could assist in measuring progress and monitoring policies and it could be a tool to help establish policies
- ▶ If we could collect and monitor, we could convene stakeholders without always repeating the same messages and issues, like an echo chamber. We need to move on
- ▶ It would help make the diffuse OA landscape more comparable and interoperable, we don't have the same data across countries to measure progress. This would mean defining common parameters to measure and compare (eg what a monograph is differs among countries)
- ▶ For funders it might assist in implementing, monitoring and evaluating policies, compliance and impact. At the moment the data we are getting from repositories and metadata are a mess, things are often mislabelled or not labelled at all
- ▶ The fear of negative impact is a worry for funders, though if we can monitor impact, we can also monitor negative impact to work through the complexity and increase transparency
- ▶ We are not monitoring OA books already because this isn't something a single entity, for example a publisher, can do by themselves
- ▶ Books are a closed environment if they are only available in print in closed access. In a repository, there is not much to go on in this situation, except for metadata: title, author and publisher
- ▶ It would help us share knowledge and make the market more comprehensible across borders

- ▶ Getting more information and transparency on costing and pricing considerations in terms of measurement would be useful to funders and publishers
- ▶ Institutions currently need to do real digging to know what comes out of their OA effort
- ▶ On a national level most countries have no idea what their book output is

What would we monitor?

- ▶ What we want to achieve is a monitoring system. This needs key indicators that publishers can capture, that work across countries and that we can build on, including: Authors affiliation; Institution; Country; Funding sources; Quality assurance process; Type of book; Licence/copyright (holder); Identifiers; Publisher; Year of publication; Language; Subject area; Whether it is OA or not; Citation; Costs, pricing, BPC's; Green OA
- ▶ To do this, we need to define what a monograph is and how to count this. We want to focus on academic, peer reviewed books (this needs to be clearly defined as this varies across countries)
 - ▶ It was noted that textbooks can't be included, as they are published in a different way for a different market. However, OA textbooks are an emerging issue with many countries (including four KE countries) working to explore this. Including textbooks adds a lot of complexity to this project, however we want to keep this in mind for the future
- ▶ Once we have defined what a monograph is we can measure the output (% of OA in whole book market)
- ▶ Usage and Altmetrics

BPCs

How can we map the actual (and hidden) costs of creating a book accurately? Do BPCs cover all the costs of producing an OA book? This would also have to include how OA books that don't use BPCs are currently being financed. This would involve looking at what institutions are spending and contributing as well as academics. Business models can be very complex and some books also have revenues and pay royalties to authors. Is it possible to record all of these things? Do we need to set standards for monitoring? Also see the **Open APC (treemaps.intact-project.org)** project in this context (although this project only focuses on articles).

For whom are we monitoring?

The monitoring process should be adjusted to target funders, policy makers, publishers, universities, researchers, citizens etc. We have to be sure that the recipients actually want this information or whether they want something else. Should this be a data driven watch or a narrative based watch, for example? We have to make sure that this is set up in the right way. It would be useful if at the start of the project a survey is conducted or stories are collected to gather requirements.

How would we start to monitor?

- ▶ At the moment there is no clear system to monitor data. However, we could use the many systems already collecting the information we want to monitor, ie CrossRef, Buchverein (Germany), Dimensions, National Bibliographic Knowledgebase (NBK), Nielson book data, OCLC, CRIS data, Proquest, EBSCO (reaches 90% of libraries in the world, eg Yankee Book Peddler and GOBI), DOI, ORCiD, The European University Association, DOAB, Researchfish, and other existing systems capturing identifiers

- ▶ By setting and agreeing the criteria that we monitor against. Most importantly we need a definition of a monograph/academic book and perhaps some kind of agreed persistent identifier that is the same across the board
- ▶ After setting a protocol and agreeing two or three key indicators, we should approach universities to report back on this. It was noted that this would need to be driven by a larger institution
- ▶ There will need to be a platform to collect this

What are the first steps towards a workable approach?

- ▶ We need to identify what is most important and urgent
- ▶ Develop a proposal that we can submit to KE or elsewhere
- ▶ It would be good to identify stakeholders who would have an interest in funding an OABW or in being part of an OABW working group: CrossRef and OCLC, OASPA, funding agencies, Liber, EU Association of Universities, DOAB, national research bodies
- ▶ We need to start monitoring now instead of waiting for data to become available and more interoperable. This includes monitoring what is already out there (eg the **REF dataset** (bit.ly/2PAD6Pi) (Tanner) and the forthcoming **UUK OA monographs group study** (bit.ly/2GCeRMi)). We can use data we have used in the past as a baseline
- ▶ We need to engage with different stakeholders to find out what motivates them to take part in this process. For example, academics feel monitoring is something that is done to them (eg by funders) rather than with them
- ▶ We need to determine the length of time over which monitoring needs to take place (eg five-ten years for books)
- ▶ We should establish something similar to **OpenAPC** (intact-project.org/openapc): what is being paid towards BPCs and what services are included in this. This should be provided by universities, but publishers should also play a role. We could create a website where researchers can find what the different costings are (eg to add images). If possible, diamond publishers should also be included, listing the services they provide for free, highlighting non-BPC models
- ▶ We need more standardised categories for research outputs in order to efficiently monitor, but we also need to define different types of categories, otherwise we won't know what we are measuring
- ▶ We need a clear methodology, including what we identify as progress (some kind of progress watch). How do we monitor and what kinds of outputs will we monitor?
- ▶ We need to establish who is doing the monitoring and what their interests are. Do we leave this to the market or should monitoring be a collective effort from different organisations? Publishers should not decide on what should be monitored (the supplier should not get to define what the method is or how we define monitoring) but they should be part of that process
- ▶ We should look at achieving an overview of pricing and spending (from two different sides: funders and libraries) and funding (eg in the UK there is **Researchfish** (researchfish.net))

- ▶ Monitoring can also be more general or more granular depending on the context. In this sense we might need different levels of aggregation. We should in first instance be looking at indicators, these are not proof but they indicate something of importance
- ▶ We need to establish some limits to what we could reasonably monitor. When content is openly available we lose control of it to some extent. We need to feel confident about where we stop monitoring; A monitoring group should also define its boundaries to what should be measured
- ▶ We should determine the kind of project we want, should it for example be national (start from one country) or international
- ▶ We should start by looking at the quick wins we could achieve (eg DOIs for books)

Recommendations for Stakeholders

Funders

- ▶ Policy intervention is crucial in the space of OA monographs to move things forward. This includes a focus on how we implement policy, ie defining standards whilst ensuring diversity, prioritising actions, and monitoring impact. However, new ideas are missing in this area. Instead of continuing business as usual, policies or mandates should aim to change the costs or financial structures of OA book publishing
- ▶ What is needed most are sustainable policies. Mandates without sustainable underlying business models will not succeed. If we want to take away academics' fears around OA monographs we need a) clear paths for them to apply for funding (if we mandate a BPC model) and b) to explore other forms of (institutional) funding. Sparse access to BPCs creates new inequalities, limiting publishing options. We need more publishing options that are less competitive and less selective
- ▶ Funders should fund infrastructures and platforms for OA monographs to provide the necessary services for monographs academics need, ie those that will be operated more according to the public interest instead of commercial interests (outsourced to commercial publishers). What is key here is interoperability and funding for the organisational costs around setting up and running infrastructures
- ▶ More shared experiences and networked action between funders is needed (for example in the form of a policy guide), especially now quite a few universities are setting up dedicated funds for OA monographs. There also remains a lack of consistency at a European level for the support of OA books, with respect to funding, recognition, infrastructure, and awareness

- ▶ An OA Bookwatch could help us monitor OA for books. Measuring progress and monitoring policies could provide evidence for the impact of OA. For funders it might assist in implementing, monitoring and evaluating policies, compliance, and impact, and whether their policies are effective

Academics and Universities

- ▶ The book is regarded as a vital format for humanities scholarship. We need to continue investment in the traditional printed format, highlighting its importance for the humanities. At the same time, we need to promote more fluid and experimental digital humanities scholarship too, as these are essential formats for an evolving humanities
- ▶ Academics and the concerns they have around OA monographs should be taken seriously and we should engage with them on these issues. Concerns should be mitigated where possible by debate, by countering misconceptions, and by training (where appropriate), but we also need to acknowledge the concerns that exist within communities by being pragmatic (ie by offering various licensing options or various (open) review options)
- ▶ A balance needs to be found between mandating and incentivising author behaviour around OA monographs. Academics are unhappy if too much responsibility is put on their shoulders. Highlighting the quality and prestige of OA (in hiring, assessment etc) is equally important to support academics in publishing OA. Where it concerns mandates we need to be aware that additional requirements on academic institutions often go largely unfunded

- ▶ Engagement involves identifying research communities. It needs to include support for early-career researchers (especially where it concerns BPC models). We should emphasise success stories, but academics should tell these stories themselves, to each other
- ▶ Different stakeholders need to be engaged to find out what motivates them to take part in a monitoring process for OA books, such as an OA Book Watch. For example, academics feel monitoring is something that is done to them (eg by funders) rather than with them (ie metrics are not the same as impact). A collective effort is required to establish who is or will be doing the monitoring and what their interests are in that

Publishers

- ▶ More openness and transparency about the real costs of publishing an OA monograph is essential, outlining what is being paid towards BPCs and what services are included in this for example
- ▶ To promote alternatives to BPCs, other (platform) funding models should be explored. This would also have to include how OA books that don't require BPCs are currently being financed (eg diamond OA). Alternative funding models, which treat global authors alike, based on their merits and on not on what they can afford, are crucial to prevent further and new inequalities in scholarly communication

Technology Platforms and Providers

- ▶ Although diversity remains important, common technical requirements for monographs are required so that they can be fully integrated into technical infrastructures (including EOSC and OpenAIRE). This also includes standards concerning what a platform is (ie does it allow interactions of protocols and metadata to enable the creation of websites that align (ie APIs))

and how platforms relate to a unifying structure which we can call 'infrastructure' (which helps deliver services and establish protocols etc.)

- ▶ Facilitate a dialogue between stakeholders to define technical standards and evaluate them from there (where do users experience problems?). What is important here is to work on common implementation practices of these standards, where their flexibility usually allows for differences in terms of implementation, which hinders real interoperability
- ▶ When developing technical infrastructures, issues of governance are important to determine how we can have a collectively managed infrastructure. This includes the technical governance between stakeholders, based on community ownership. When developing technical infrastructures, the governance side should come first
- ▶ At the moment there exists no clear system to monitor data around OA books, such as an OA Book Watch. However, there are many systems already out there collecting the information required. This should be monitored now rather than waiting for data to become available and more interoperable. The data used in the past can be used as a baseline

Libraries

- ▶ Libraries play multiple roles (not just funding OA monographs, but also archiving, metadata management, inclusion in discovery systems and library-led publishing). Using acquisition budgets for new financing models (eg crowdfunding or membership models) could become more important. Libraries could play a more active and visible role between authors and publishers in an OA setting

- ▶ The long-term sustainability of OA books needs to be on our agendas. New embedded UPs should make use of their connections with institutional libraries. There are also deposit services such as the OAPEN Library, which distribute the responsibility for a task that smaller publishers shouldn't do themselves
- ▶ Similar to the OpenAPC initiative, libraries could host a community-run resource or platform outlining what fees different publishers are charging, which would help authors, universities and funders make a balanced choice around what a sensible BPC is

Citizens

- ▶ Policy needs to address the societal impact and the value of OA monographs for those outside of academia, eg citizens, teachers. Citizens are key stakeholders in this debate, we should place them at the center of the conversation. We must look for impact *with* citizens

Annex 1: A Knowledge Exchange Workshop on Open Access and Monographs

When: November 7-8, 2018

Where: Brussels, Belgium

Venue: Hotel Leopold Brussels EU, Luxemburgstraat 35, Rue du Luxembourg | 1050 Brussels, Belgium

Website: hotel-leopold.be/en

Overview of the Knowledge Exchange work on Open Access and Monographs

Knowledge Exchange report, summary and survey

To ensure awareness of the position of Open Access monographs, often neglected in the Open Access discussion, Knowledge Exchange (KE) published a “Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs”. The in-depth study, published in 2017, compared and contrasted access to and identified commonalities and differences across books in eight European countries. It outlined areas of good practice, and important gaps in knowledge and information which may need to be filled before Open Access for monographs can progress.

The report (bit.ly/2xrf1EO) has been widely downloaded and discussed on social media and in conferences, such as Redux2018 and LIBER2018. A short summary (bit.ly/2IWUw7s) of the findings of the report is also available.

The report defined the Open Access monograph landscape and found that both OA monographs and the policies and models that support them appear to be growing. However, it reported considerable variation between each country in the study. In 2018, KE commissioned a follow up survey to help identify the next steps that should be considered in order to continue to support the transition to Open Access.

Knowledge Exchange stakeholder workshop 7-8 November 2018, Brussels, Belgium

Stakeholder commitment

Open Access for monographs is mandated by only a few funders, such as Austria, the Netherlands, and the Wellcome Trust in the UK. However, in a rapidly evolving

landscape, recent announcements concerning an Open Access mandate for monographs from Research England (formerly HEFCE) at the UP Redux conference in February 2018 and from Madame Frederique Vidal, the French Minister of Higher Education, Research and Innovation at the LIBER conference in July have shown an increasing Open Access commitment for scholarly books across Europe. Furthermore the recently published **report on the “Visibility of Open Access Monographs in a European Context”** (bit.ly/2P2gPtb) from the EU funded OPERAS project shows a growing commitment on a European level.

Workshop key objectives

The workshop will bring together experts and key stakeholders in the Open Access monograph landscape and give the opportunity to reinforce the importance of Open Access monographs being integrated in the development of an Open Access culture, to encourage collaboration and to share best practices.

Workshop outline and outcomes

The workshop will open with an introduction to the Open Access monograph landscape followed by funder and publisher panel sessions. Participants will be able to choose between two of four workshop sessions on supporting Open Access monographs through 1) *Author engagement*, 2) *Policies*, 3) *Technical infrastructure*, and 4) *Monitoring and Open Access Book Watch*. Participants are encouraged to share their knowledge during these sessions. Following the workshop, KE will use the outcomes of the workshop sessions to draft a set of best practices and recommendations for various stakeholders in order to formulate next steps. These drafts will be distributed to the community for open peer review, reactions and comments.

Workshop programme

Day 1: Wednesday, November 7

12:00- 12:30 **Registration and refreshments including a light lunch**

12:30- 12:45 **Welcome and introduction to the workshop**

Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition

12:45- 12:55 **Introduction to Knowledge Exchange (KE)**

Sarah James, Knowledge Exchange Office

12:55- 13:30 **General introduction to the Knowledge Exchange (KE) landscape study and follow up survey**

Eelco Ferwerda, OAPEN Niels Stern, Royal Danish Library, Graham Stone, Jisc

Presentation of the major findings of the **Knowledge Exchange Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs in Eight European Countries (bit.ly/2xXZn2U)** and an overview of the results of a survey KE conducted between April and May 2018 to help identify the next steps that should be considered to continue to support progress in Open Access for monographs.

3:30- 14:15 **Keynote: Focusing on European citizens and the impact of Open Access monographs for them**

This talk will place the citizen at the centre of the debate about the value and potential impact of Open Access for monographs. It will consider how they are or could be effected by OA mandates, policy and infrastructures using the EC's own impact policy agenda as a focal point to consider the economic, societal/ community, innovation and operational impacts.

Simon Tanner, Pro Vice Dean (Impact & Innovation), Arts & Humanities, Professor of Digital Cultural Heritage, Department of Digital Humanities, King's College London

14:15- 15:15 **Session 1: Mandates and beyond?**

Panelists:

Zoé Ancion, French National Research Agency (ANR). Doris Haslinger, Austrian Science Fund (FWF). Steven Hill, Research England, a council of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). Jean-Claude Kita – Wallonia-Brussels Federation Scientific Research Fund, Belgium (FNRS)

Funders are viewed as playing a key role in promoting Open Access, in a context where in some countries government plans guide their policies as in the UK and France or where other practices prevail in other countries across Europe. While variety is a source of valuable insights into different ways and means of encouraging an open dissemination of scholarly communication, the survey commissioned by KE also highlighted that respondents saw international coordination and specific funding efforts as essential to foster Open Access monographs.

Chair: Serge Bauin, National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)

15:15- 15:45 **Coffee break**

15:45

15:45-
17:00

Supporting Open Access monographs through:

Workshop 1: Author engagement

Author engagement is key to the success of Open Access for monographs. However, there is evidence to show that there is still a lot of mistrust and misinformation surrounding Open Access for monographs from many authors and their learned societies. The KE survey showed that concerns over costs, funding and quality issues were high on authors' agendas. The survey also found that a change in authors' attitudes was seen as a key area for the further development of Open Access monographs in respondents' countries. This workshop will encourage delegates to explore some of the tactics that can be used to encourage author take-up of Open Access monographs.

Chair: Sebastian Nordhoff, Language Science Press

Workshop 2: Policies

So far, formal mandating of Open Access for monographs has only been adopted in a few countries, though some incentives are already appearing in others. The KE landscape study compared different Open Access policies in eight European countries and found significant variations due to the differing political structures. This stakeholder and policy fragmentation is an important and recurring issue and although there are many programmes to promote Open Access, most policies are based on recommendations rather than mandates, and apart from a national Open Access strategy, monographs often aren't included in Open Access policies. Often heard reasons why things aren't progressing more quickly are the strong focus on journal publishing and the complex structures of monograph publishing. This session will focus on the policies of Open Access monographs and will ask the question what, on a policy level, needs to be done to improve stakeholder alignment and make sure Open Access policies (funding, mandates, quality and discoverability) are practical, feasible and aligned with the daily practices of researchers.

Chair: Alain Beretz, Université de Strasbourg

Workshop 3: Technical infrastructure

The dissemination of Open Access monographs depends on the availability of technical infrastructures adapted to this particular format. While the technical infrastructure for research data and articles is continuously improving in terms of accessibility, quality assurance, indexing, crosslinking and preservation, scholarly books clearly lack a similar effort. At a global level, the adoption of FAIR principles seems to be more difficult for monographs; at European level, the development of the European Open Science Cloud is widely influenced by data intensive research models that ignore the monograph as a specific research output. As a consequence, most of the technical standards regarding data exchange, content structuration, metadata, identifiers and metrics have been designed to manage other research outputs and to use them for monographs leads to challenges that hinder interoperability. This session will focus on defining the specific efforts that could be made to improve the integration of monographs in the scientific information system by providing adapted technical infrastructures.

Chair: Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition

Workshop 4: Monitoring & Open Access Book Watch

Monitoring of Open Access publications is becoming a very important aspect of research evaluation. It has proven to be very difficult to monitor Open Access research output by institutions, on a national level, and on a global level. Different services are offering monitoring tools (for example Unpaywall or Clarivate, etc) but for monographs this is in its early days. There are now clear figures of the Open Access monograph output and the KE landscape report identified several knowledge gaps in this area, for example monograph output in numbers, geographically, by type, by openness (and compared with volume and language of closed books). The KE landscape study proposes to establish a permanent Open Access Book Watch (OABW), to monitor progress, identify good practices, examples, and business cases, and to provide a tool for funders and policy makers. In this session we look at the most pressing gaps and identify possible solutions as well as investigate the outlines of an OABW and analyse how it could help all who are working with Open Access monographs.

Chair: Eelco Ferwerda, OAPEN

17:00- Bringing back results

17:30 Feedback from workshop sessions

Closing remarks for Day 1

Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition

19:00 Knowledge Exchange Conference Dinner

The Orangerie, Hotel Leopold: hotel-leopold.be/en/eat/orangerie

Day 2: Thursday, November 8

9:00- Introduction to the day

10:00 *Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition*

9:10- Session 2: Is Open Access countering the allegedly imminent ‘death of the book’ in the humanities and social sciences?

10:20

Panelists:

Margo Bargheer, Association of European University Presses. Sarah Kember, Goldsmiths University Press. Leena Kaakinen, Helsinki University Press. Myriam Poort, Springer Nature

As a result of shrinking acquisition budgets for libraries, there have been papers discussing a looming long-term disappearance of the scholarly book since as early as the 2000s. Other factors also came up in the literature as to shifts in practice shown in decreasing book citations in scholarly communication. But is there a real trend jeopardising the existence of monographs, or is the landscape more complex and Open Access can consolidate monographs either in communities with long-standing book practice traditions or even facilitate new practices with new players? In a nutshell: *The Monograph is dead, long live the Monograph?*

Chair: Jeroen Sondervan, Utrecht University

10:20- Policy development for open access monographs**10:40** *Olaf Siegert, Leibniz Association*

Monographs in Open Access are a vital topic - on the European level as well as in national science policy debates. One important aspect of the current discussions is the development of adequate policies for the support and funding of Open Access monographs. This Session will provide one example. Olaf Siegert will report on a national workshop on "The Future of the research monograph", organised by the Alliance of German Science Organisations in Germany. In this workshop different stakeholders (including researchers, libraries and funders) discussed different ways to support Open Access as a business model for monographs. The talk will focus on outcomes of these discussions and elaborate on common grounds and differences in opinion regarding the future implementation of Open Access monograph policies. This policy briefing will highlight some of the issues that would best be included in Open access monograph policies.

10:40- Coffee break**11:00**

11:00- Supporting Open Access monographs through**12:05 ▶ Workshop 1: Author Engagement***Chair: Sebastian Nordhoff, Language Science Press***▶ Workshop 2: Policies***Chair: Alain Beretz, Université de Strasbourg***▶ Workshop 3: Technical Infrastructure***Chair: Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition***▶ Workshop 4: Monitoring & Open Access Book Watch***Chair: Eelco Ferwerda, OAPEN*

12:05- Bringing back results**12:35** Feedback from workshop sessions

12:35- Reflection on the workshop and closing remarks**12:50** *Jeroen Sondervan, Utrecht University**Graham Stone, Jisc*

12:50- Next steps from a Knowledge Exchange perspective**13:00** *Jean-François Nominé, National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)**Verena Weigert, Jisc*

13:00- Lunch, Hotel Leopold**14:00**

Knowledge Exchange Office
C/O Jisc,
One Castlepark,
Tower Hill,
Bristol, BS2 0JA

t: 0203 697 5804

e: office@knowledge-exchange.info