

## Report of 'Green OA for books'

Joint Jisc and OAPEN Round table discussion

January 19<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 AM – 3:00 PM

Jisc Collections London Office

Brettenham House, 5 Lancaster Place

### Agenda

11:15	Introduction (Eelco Ferwerda)
11:20	Round of introductions participants
11:30	1 <sup>st</sup> round: Identifying issues and challenges
12:30	Lunch
13:00	2 <sup>nd</sup> round: Finding possible solutions
14:00	3 <sup>rd</sup> round: Recommendations for OA policies
14:40	Round-up (Caren Milloy)

### Attendees

- Stephanie Kitchen
- Muriel Swijghuisen Reigersberg
- Gabriel Boddard
- Naomi Segal
- Martin Eve
- Lara Speicher
- Alison Jones
- Sarah Kember
- Ben Johnson
- Cecy Marden
- Neil Smyth
- David Clay
- Paola Marchionni
- Neil Grindley
- Chris Keane
- Katie Shamash
- Bill Hubbard
- Caren Milloy
- Eelco Ferwerda
- Lotte Kruijt

## Introduction (Eelco Ferwerda)

Participants were invited to give a balanced view on green OA for monographs. During the roundtable, participants will be asked to explore issues and solutions that may work for books. If the conclusion is that we can not come up with a solution, this is still a message for policy makers and will form part of the recommendations.

Before starting, participants determined what is meant by 'monographs' And agreed that discussions should include all long publications (not articles).

### 1<sup>st</sup> round: Identifying issues and challenges

To kick off the discussion and in order to identify the issues and challenges, the participants were asked to imagine they were an author of a monograph that was the result of research funded by an FP7 grant and were required to make the monograph available in open access after the grant period. How would they actually do this? Immediately, participants identified that finding a publisher that would allow an author to self-archive would be extremely difficult and is a fundamental issue.

#### Versioning

The participants discussed that versioning of books is very hard as there are no clear boundaries due to the close interplay between textual development, editing and the conversations between authors and their editors. It is therefore hard to identify the 'original work' and separate the contributions made.

The question of what would be acceptable to academia was discussed; would academics trust using the submitted manuscript if it was available in OA or do they only feel confident using the final published version as a basis for their research? Participants noted that the amount of contribution from the publisher would differ by title and having access to the manuscript. Even if it would not be the final published version that would be made OA, this may be better than having access to nothing, especially in some fields of research.

#### Terminology

Participants spoke of how the current terminology used with open access, particularly the term 'green', is not helpful in transitioning to new models for monographs. By carrying over the terminology from journals we continue to replicate the perception that green is the poor cousin to gold, especially because of the long embargo periods for HSS. New terminology could be one way to overcome this – looking at supporting openness as opposed to open access. However, in defining terminology we need to be practical and ethical.

One participant also pointed out that as there is a major lack of funding for gold OA monograph publishing, gold OA will only work with institutional support. But given that

revenue streams within institutions are unlikely to flip to such support soon, we really need to focus on driving OA for monographs, which needs to be a green approach.

Other subjects we should think about in discussing OA terminology:

- Licensing and reuse is a concern of academics.
- We should also think of book content: books might have pictures or texts by other authors; data linking is interesting; copyright clearance and the costs associated with this is an issue here.

### **The role of repositories**

Participants held a discussion on the role of repositories. Institutional repositories have a symbiotic role with the IPR of institutions – providing long-term access, preservation and discoverability of research outputs. However, if repositories were to be used to support a green OA monograph through self-archiving or a centralised model, participants questioned whether staff had the correct skills and expertise to support this. Participants also questioned how to handle edited volumes with multiple chapter contributions, how research data would be integrated and whether the institutional repository would really provide the right level of discoverability and preservation.

Some participants suggested that subject repositories might be more appropriate for green OA, as academics tend to be more aligned with their subjects, and subject repositories could offer more value and economies of scale.

However, one participant pointed out that academics are aligned with colleagues, and there is often no funding to start a subject repository. Furthermore, the university is a stable factor while subject-based repositories do not often have such longevity or sustainability.

Another question that came up is whether national or local repositories are more valuable. One participant felt that locally based repositories are important, because they imply more personal contact.

Participants talked about what exactly a repository should offer for green OA. Answers included preservation and discoverability, ‘getting the message out’, and also user-friendliness (the issue is that people do not think about making their work OA, so what we need is something easy-to-use, the path of least resistance as political conversation will not work). The high use of Academia.edu was noted as an example of something easy-to-use and user friendly but it was clear that this site is not about research in the same way that repositories are.

### **Economic Profiles**

Different types of monographs have different economic profiles and this was raised by participants as an issue for green as it makes gold models more attractive for publishers due to the lower risk of loss of revenue. The lack of stability in knowing when costs will be recouped in green OA makes it a harder sell.

Participants also raised that authors do not raise green OA with publishers or discuss it before their publishing contracts.

## 2<sup>nd</sup> round: Finding possible solutions

In this session, participants were invited to work in small groups to explore possible solutions to green OA for monographs. They were invited to be open and not restrained in their thinking. Three potential solutions were identified:

1. The Embargoed Version of Record' Model
2. The Trigger Model
3. The Direct Publication Model

### The 'Embargoed Version of Record' Model

In this 'straw man' model the publisher fee is set at £0 (no book processing charge) and after an embargo period of three years, the title is made OA but with no copying or download available. A link to a paid version is available for those that wish to purchase a copy. To overcome the 'right to read' issue and avoid any copyright law conflict, the OA version would be XHTML to allow text mining. This model would allow authors to comply with funder mandates that require OA, as it would be free to read in three years. This model could be combined with a sliding scale where you could reduce the embargo length or remove it completely through some form of payment. For example, for £4000 you might have a twelve-month embargo and CC-BY-NC-ND licence applied, or for £8000 you might have immediate OA with a CC-BY licence.

To support and drive this model, you would need clear strong mandates to be negotiated by funders with publishers, HEFCE to provide brownie points / accreditation for publishing an OA monograph, an easy to read interface and additional training for repository staff to manage the OA monographs post embargo period.

### The Trigger Model

A trigger model where a publisher sets BPCs to make a book available in OA (immediate gold). Once there have been enough sales to cover the costs, it becomes green OA. When it never reaches that, it will be published in green OA with a set embargo period anyway.

In the 'trigger model' a publisher sets a fee that - once achieved - would cover the costs of the publication of the book. Once there have been enough sales of the books to recoup the fee, the book is made openly available under a green model

The idea behind this model is that it would support publisher sustainability and enable reputation associated with publishing with publishers to continue and also enable open access after the embargo period. The risk is low to publishers but there would need to be a discussion about the embargo length, how this would be agreed, and the cut off period in case a title did not recoup its fee. This model would require financial transparency, tracking of embargo lengths, and consideration paid to how the model would scale. However, even a set embargo period of five years would be preferable to none.

## The Direct Publication Model

In this model academics deposit their manuscript into a repository. Open peer review and editing takes place. The peer review could be organised prior to or post deposit and could be undertaken by peers or a research committee.

It was felt that this model would work for some subject areas and titles but not in all situations. It may even be considered as an additional route and would most likely be undertaken by academics that want to do it this way. If it were to be successful, this direct model would need to be recognised by the REF. There was also a suggestion that this model could work in association with New University Presses.

In addition to the three models identified, participants discussed the following:

- Testbeds: it was highlighted that there is a need for more experimentation and for testbeds to be funded (perhaps by BIS).
- Incentives: in order to encourage experimentation, there need to be more incentives, not just financial but this could also take the form of 'brownie points/accreditation' from HEFCE as a driver for academics and publishers.
- Funding: a shift in funding could be considered, such as using QR funding to support green OA initiatives.
- Royalties: we need to understand authors' expectations and consider if royalties should even be an element of open access or not.

One last discussion was around the value of the research itself, with some participants arguing that if the research itself is worth funding, then the book as well as the output should be freely available to all, otherwise the research should not have been funded at all!

## 3<sup>rd</sup> round: Recommendations for OA policies

In this session, participants were invited to discuss what recommendations could be made to support the development of OA policies for monographs.

### Accreditation

Policies need to incentivise a transition to OA monographs through clear accreditation.

### Funding

- Research funders should allocate more resource to post-grant publishing of outputs.
- There needs to be more funding allocated to experimentation and innovation.

### **Training**

- Consideration needs to be given to training options for OA support staff and those that provide advice and guidance to academics.
- Training needs to be offered to librarians that deal with repositories and contracts.

### **Contracts**

- A review of book contracts and licenses should be undertaken to make this whole area more transparent and clearer for authors and their institutions. This should make clear what is and is not allowed. Some publishers allow green for chapters but it is not widely known.
- Contracts should be encouraging OA, not deterring it.
- We should be bold; we want to make sure that all books are OA in twenty years.

### **Flexibility**

- Policies need to be consistent, not just within countries but globally and should recognise the broad spectrum of monographs types.
- We need to recognise the future of the book and the role of research data/open data.

### **Terminology**

- Policies should not be constrained by green and gold terminology and need to be aware that the business models for gold and green are often likely to be interlinked for OA monographs. It is not one or the other.
- Definitions for licensing need to be clearer.
- We should be moving away from the idea of 'version of record' in the current infrastructure. The OA version should be the version and there should not be any differentiation.

### **Sanity**

- Policies should be based on what people actually want and what will really work in practice.
- Use cases should be developed to inform policy developments. These use cases should try to find answers to questions such as: who is going to be using OA monographs? Are they using it for text mining? How long can they wait? What is the purpose of green OA and what would people get out of it? These questions will help inform a policy that is based on real demand and behaviour. Be connected, be bold!

### **Round-up (by Caren Milloy)**

Caren Milloy summarised the key themes from the roundtable. Participants were thanked for attending and informed that the outcomes from the workshop would be included in the final report of the project.