



**OAPEN – OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING IN EUROPEAN
NETWORKS**

**Report on Best Practices and
Recommendations**

Jean Kempf, Janneke Adema, Paul Rutten

About OAPEN

OAPEN (Open access Publishing in European Networks) consists of a number of European university presses and universities, and is open to new partners. The publishing partners are all scholarly presses predominantly active in Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) and book publishing. Together, the partners aim to develop and implement a sustainable Open Access publication model for academic books in the Humanities and Social Sciences and to improve the visibility and usability of high quality academic research in Europe. OAPEN is the first international Open Access project in the area academic book publishing and is supported by the European Union.

About this Report

This report is the third in a series of studies conducted by OAPEN on digital monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences. The first report focused on the needs of users and stakeholders, and the second looked at the existing (and developing) publishing and business models. The aim of this report is to provide the different players—publishers, funders, librarians, readers, scholars and politicians—with a set of recommendations concerning the strategic issues in Open Access book publishing. For those already in the process of developing an Open Access policy, this report maps out the issues and decisions they may confront.



eContentplus

This project is funded under the *eContentplus* programme¹,
a multiannual Community programme to make digital content in Europe more accessible, usable and
exploitable.

¹ OJ L 79, 24.3.2005, p. 1.

1 Table of Contents

1	Table of Contents	3
2	Introduction	5
3	Summary of main recommendations	7
4	Open Access and the book	9
4.1	<i>What is Open Access? A working definition</i>	9
4.2	<i>Why Open Access?</i>	9
4.2.1	The financing crisis: a well-known case	10
4.2.2	The digital opportunities	10
4.2.3	Open Access as a part of the solution, although it does create problems	11
4.2.4	Open Access publishing and Open Access archiving	12
4.3	<i>The future of the book</i>	12
5	Quality	14
5.1	<i>Peer review, editing and metrics</i>	14
5.1.1	Peer review today.....	14
5.1.2	Editing.....	15
5.1.3	Metrics	16
5.1.4	Beyond peer review and metrics.....	16
5.1.5	Quality as stability in a trusted setting	17
5.1.6	Recommendations.....	17
5.2	<i>Reputation and reward</i>	18
5.2.1	Mixed economy	18
5.2.2	Lack of reward	18
5.2.3	Language issues and quality	19
5.2.4	Recommendations.....	19
5.3	<i>Branding</i>	19
5.3.1	Open Access and branding	19
5.3.2	Branding and publishers	20
5.3.3	Branding and universities	20
5.3.4	Recommendations.....	20
5.4	<i>Advocacy</i>	20
5.4.1	Recommendations.....	21
6	Open Access Book Models	22
6.1	<i>Definitions</i>	22
6.1.1	The publishing model	22
6.1.2	The business model.....	22
6.1.3	The publishing process	22
6.2	<i>Publishing models</i>	23
6.2.1	Large variety	23
6.2.2	Main models	23
6.2.3	Recommendations.....	23
6.3	<i>Publishing process</i>	24
6.3.1	Formats, workflows and infrastructures	24
6.3.2	Recommendations.....	25
6.3.3	Copyright	25
6.3.4	Recommendations.....	26
6.4	<i>Business models</i>	27

6.4.1	A few misconceptions.....	27
6.4.2	The hybrid and author-pay models	28
6.4.3	The shift of library budgets.....	28
6.4.4	Services in the economic models.....	29
6.4.5	Sustainability	31
6.4.6	Recommendations.....	31
7	Conclusions.....	33
8	Annexes.....	34
8.1	<i>The players.....</i>	34
8.1.1	Scholars.....	34
8.1.2	Publishers.....	34
8.1.3	Academic libraries	35
8.1.4	Funding agencies	35

2 Introduction

This report aims to define certain common standards that could serve as a solid basis for Open Access book publishing in a fast changing landscape. As such, we hope it will constitute the first step towards a common approach for Open Access book publishing, both as regards the degree of Open Access and the instruments used to establish quality.

Open Access to the results of scientific research is not just a new technical or economic paradigm. It entails a particular conception of the “politics” of science and the specific ethics of the researcher, of his needs and duty, but also towards the society at large.

The open circulation of the results of scholarship is of paramount importance not only for science itself but also as a means of improving its accountability and fulfilling its social function. This is how we interpret the European Union mandate of making Europe “a knowledge society”: excellence goes hand in hand with accountability, which requires open and accessible scholarly debates and the free circulation of information. Also, the open circulation of scholarly findings needs to be part of the necessary rebalancing of the world map of science and scholarship by allowing developing countries to access vital information for their own scientific, social and economic development, on their own terms.

This report is the third in a series of studies conducted by OAPEN on digital monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences. The first report focused on the needs of users and stakeholders, and the second looked at the existing (and developing) publishing and business models.² The aim of this report is to provide the different players—publishers, funders, librarians, readers, scholars and politicians—with a set of recommendations concerning the strategic issues in Open Access book publishing. For those already in the process of developing an Open Access policy, this report maps out the issues and decisions they may confront.

Given that Open Access is developing at such a rapid pace, any study of the field is bound to be at least partially outdated by the time it is released. Therefore, this report aims first to raise the fundamental questions that will continue to shape the field until extensive experimentation manages to change it by validating some of the hypotheses raised below. We are aware of the fact that no one—not even the best analyst—can predict the future, and that any move in the digital world will mean investments without any guarantee of recoupment. Despite these uncertainties, we observe a strong belief in the need to experiment, or at least to “occupy the field” in order “to be ready when the day comes”. This problem is not specific to publishing but generic to the new digital economy. We believe, however, that one way to escape this conundrum is to boldly

² Janneke Adema and Paul Rutten, *Digital Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences: Report on User Needs* (OAPEN, 2010). Janneke Adema, *Overview of Open Access models for ebooks in the Humanities and Social Sciences* (OAPEN, 2010).

change the paradigm. The several issues listed in this report should keep Open Access publishing of Humanities and Social Sciences monographs high on the agenda of the politics of science and scholarship, without either being too short-sighted nor too long-sighted.

What our interviews have shown is that the most forward-looking players were combining their traditional core activities and competencies with an openness towards a *redistribution of roles*. In this newly developing scholarly communication network, they were involved in experiments and trials in which they explored new roles and activities and developed new services. The activities concerned are: (1) providing financial resources for scholarly research, (2) study and research leading up to material for publications, (3) producing scholarly content, (4) preparing content for publication, (5) providing access to published content, and (6) guaranteeing the long-term availability of scholarly works through conservation and storage.

Players were particularly aware of the fact that the future will most probably see the advent of new ensembles and new forms of cooperation, not only due to growing disintermediation—whose limits will become apparent following a period of strong belief in it—but also due to the search for greater efficiency. The structure of the field of scholarly communication is changing: parties are cooperating in new settings, replacing the neatly structured publishing chain with a modular network of relationships. In this context, the main challenge is to design the processes in such a way that *cooperation is seamless*.

This report will first propose a brief working definition of Open Access and examine the choice of Open Access as opposed to other forms of digital publication. It will then tackle the main issues underlying the debate on Open Access monograph publishing. After our analysis of each issue we offer a series of recommendations based either on observed practices or desirable potential developments. Inevitably, each stakeholder will value these issues and rank their priorities differently. However, as publishing is a cooperative operation, no one can afford to ignore the views of others in the field.

3 Summary of main recommendations

- The need to experiment and move forward while keeping an eye on the current communication practices in the Humanities and Social Sciences, leads us to recommend a two-tier model—based on a funded Open Access edition and a for-sale print edition—for Open Access publishing of monographs in the HSS. This would be based on the current practices while developing flexible models that are open to change, given the evolution of the needs and requirements of the scholarly community with a younger generation of scholars, and the advent of new technologies and networks.
- Open Access can only exist if it builds up on traditions to extend, improve and deepen quality control. Scholarly quality should remain the central criteria in all decisions and choices. We thus recommend the use of standardised and transparent peer review policies. Traditional peer review methods can be made even more transparent by adding the review reports (with the author's and reviewers' consent) to the final publication. The quality of publications can be improved by being clearer about methods and data used, for instance by publishing the data alongside the publication.
- Simultaneously (new) quality criteria for digital texts and enhancements must be promoted. This is of paramount importance for the reputation structure surrounding new Open Access book publishing initiatives, which still need to fight sets of negative perceptions towards Open Access and digital texts. We, therefore, recommend the use of a full range of procedures and instruments: traditional peer review, metrics or new assessment tools, alternative peer review systems— (including pre-and post-publication (collective) reviewing), — branding (whether at the publisher, series or platform level) and sponsoring of publications by renowned scholars.
- Any progress in the field will be dependent upon the players in the field becoming tied to a powerful advocacy on the part of the players. Open Access is not only a pragmatic solution to an economic problem; it is a choice as regards the future of science, especially in the HSS. Advocacy strategies are recommended and should focus on associating scholars more closely with Open Access publishing, most of all by providing information, by connecting them through editorial boards and by using ambassador systems. Publishers and academic bodies should actively lobby for Open Access both at the side of scholars as well as on the side of funding agencies. Libraries can lobby for both Open Access archiving as well as for Open Access publishing. Funders and Universities can be Open Access advocates by setting up funds and mandate systems.

- To ensure trust and quality, libraries should also incorporate enhancements and versionings in their workflow. We recommend that national libraries take on the task of the long- term curation and preservation of works should be secured by national libraries.
- New forms of collaboration— (most of all on a cross-university level—) should be experimented with. Libraries, publishers and research communities should work closer together in Open Access book publishing initiatives, especially to create new funding and subsidy mechanisms and workflow efficiencies. Smaller publishers could also set -up common platforms (such as for instance the OAPEN platform) to brand their content and collectively ensure its quality.
- HSS scholarly publishing has never been fully sustainable on commercial criteria and most of the revenues now drawn from publishing are either directly or indirectly public or semi-public money. Any future economic model therefore will be a complex mix of solutions. The determining factors, however, will be the following:
 - The possibility to channel revenue directly from the source (library budgets, foundations, direct grants) to the publishing unit, covering the cost of the first copy. The funding could also go to the public development of platforms used by public and private concerns alike, in the same economic model as those of roads built on public money but used by private individuals.
 - The possibility to develop a for-profit (added- value) service structure over a non-profit base.
 - The parallel continuation of traditional print publishing alongside digitization, either to furnish printed copies of digital texts (digital Open Access texts can encourage the sales of printed books, especially the back list), or as a means of long- term preservation.
- We recommend standardization on the level of formats (preferably XML), policies, infrastructures, and software (preferably Open Source), although the systems should still be as modular, flexible and interoperable as possible. Integration with other (connecting) workflows (scholars/libraries) should also be ensured.
- To make sure we live up to the Open Access principles of the Berlin Declaration, the use of the most liberal copyright licenses is recommended. To ensure standardization, Creative Commons licenses are preferred. For new works, one should strive for a CC-BY option (which allows adaptations and commercial re-use). For copyrighted backlist titles, it is recommended to stay within the CC paradigm and strive for a CC-BY-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works license.

4 Open Access and the book

4.1 *What is Open Access? A working definition*

Open Access is a way of distributing or making scholarly research accessible in the sense that it is digital, online, free of charge and free of copyright and licensing restrictions hindering free circulation and consultation.³

4.2 *Why Open Access?*

The main purpose of Open Access is to establish a better dialogue among scholars in order to improve research efficiency, and also to improve and optimise the relationship between the scholarly community and the society at large. As such, it is a concept driven by scientific policy for scholarly reasons, before being an economic model. The academic community has discovered that Open Access to scientific production and research data can enhance the quality as well as efficiency and effectiveness of research in all fields. For instance, Open Access allows vast quantities of material (including material originally printed such as books, periodicals or archives) to be searched systematically and with greater sophistication than before—a rich feature that was not possible in the pre-digital era. Open Access is also a significant factor in improving access to and dissemination of the results of scholarship, much of which is publicly financed. Lastly, Open Access in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) is also a way of saving academic publishers' preferred format—the monograph—from completely disappearing, as there is at present little or no viable model to sustain it in the long term.

The rationale for Open Access in Humanities is, however, different than in Science, Technology and Medicine (STM), where speed of publication is of the essence. In HSS publishing, an Open Access embargo period might exist without significantly impairing the nature and benefits of Open Access. Also, in the case of HSS documents, the full text is as important as the data itself. Therefore the impact of a given piece of research needs to be measured differently since knowledge and communities are structured differently. A final difference is that in STM the costs of publication are minor in comparison to the costs of research, while in the HSS the publication of a monograph could take up a substantial part of the research costs.

We do not want to downplay the serious economic issues induced by the shift to Open Access but they should be seen as subservient to the primary aim of improving scholarly communication and thus research. On the whole, and although the perfect economic model still needs to be found, we recommend a change in paradigm (by initiating a change in funding), which could even lead to savings⁴ and certainly not to increased

³ Peter Suber, *Open Access overview*: <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm>.

⁴ See for instance John Houghton's report for the Knowledge Exchange, where he looked at the costs and benefits of Open Access publishing. Although his research focused mainly on journals, he estimates that in

costs *for society as a whole*. Indeed, the question of the desirability of change in scientific communication is moot, for the present system—dominated by print journals and especially print monographs—is under such heavy attack from both the existence of a new digital world on the one hand and the financing crisis on the other that one needs to rethink the means if one wants to save the ends.

4.2.1 The financing crisis: a well-known case

While the prices of journals (especially in STM) have risen steadily over the last decades, libraries have seen a relative stagnation of their acquisition budgets. Moreover, acquisition budgets tend to prioritise journals in STM, leading to a further cutback in the number of monographs from acquisition lists. The overall decline in monograph sales has led HSS publishers to focus more on general (trade) books instead of scholarly monographs. This has proven to be detrimental to the variety and accessibility of specialized scholarly work in book form in the Humanities and social sciences.⁵ In addition, this crisis has consequences for the careers of HSS scholars, making it harder for them to publish their books and next to impossible for younger scholars to get their thesis published, which is a necessity in many cases to attain tenure and establish reputation.⁶

Such situations could logically lead to a rethinking of the hiring procedure within HSS, which could be based on the number of articles published by a candidate rather than only the number of books. It could also persuade HSS scholars to abandon the book format for the more easily manageable short form—the article. However, most scholars still believe the long form—the book, whatever its material form beyond the folio—remains necessary hermeneutically (see [below](#)). A pure and simple shift towards Open Access is thus not in the interest of research, even though economic constraints may force such a shift in the end.

4.2.2 The digital opportunities

The digitization of information can have very positive consequences for the Humanities not only at the research level but also at the publication/dissemination level. Traditional small print runs can be seen as an ineffective dissemination method, as the target audiences turns out to be small and the availability of books in libraries is limited. Open Access could help to improve communication—which can only benefit scientific progress—given that material available online may still remain inaccessible to many

an Open Access world: ‘Open access or ‘author-pays’ publishing for journal articles might bring net system savings (...).’ John Houghton, ‘Open Access – What are the economic benefits? A comparison of the United Kingdom, Netherlands and Denmark’ (June 2009) iii.

⁵ See for instance: Albert, N. Greco and Robert Michael Wharton, ‘Should university presses adopt an Open Access [electronic publishing] business model for all of their scholarly books?’ *ELPUB2008. Open Scholarship: Authority, Community, and Sustainability in the Age of Web 2.0* – Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Electronic Publishing held in Toronto, Canada 25-27 June 2008 / Edited by: Leslie Chan and Susanna Mornati, 154. John Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age* (Cambridge: Polity Press 2005) 93-94.

⁶ Steffen Bernius et al., ‘Open Access Models and their Implications for the Players on the Scientific Publishing Market’, in: *Economic Analysis & Policy*, vol. 39 No. 1 (March 2009) 105.

scholars (i.e., in developing countries or in cases where a library does not have a subscription). The increased usage of openly available books is already evidenced by the success of Google Book Search and SpringerLink, and could mirror the success of openly available e-journals. It may also contribute to more efficient use of the growing volume of available relevant information by allowing people to search and find information suited for specific purposes, which is complicated and time consuming in the print world. Furthermore, one should not forget the new opportunities the digital provides for access and connectability with the content, which offers the possibility to update, enhance and improve it in a collaborative setting.

From an economic point of view, one may expect these developments to lead to a more efficient and cheaper publishing system. Costs could be reduced via innovations in the publishing model, while more efficiency might be achieved through strategic partnerships designed to share resources and costs, or through disintermediation and the de-linking of functions. Hence the rise of “librifiers” (libraries that are increasingly taking on the role of publisher), library-press combinations (e.g. Newfound Press) and publishers set up and led by academics (e.g. Open Humanities Press). In all these cases, the different functions in the publishing chain are increasingly separated from the players traditionally responsible for fulfilling them. Innovations can also be made in the publishing process, for instance by using digital (printing) techniques and/or new infrastructures based on open source software—of which the Public Knowledge Project’s Open Journal Systems and Open Monograph Press, which are still under development, are good examples. These kinds of new production processes can also lead to decreases in storage space needed for physical book copies, which can again lead to cost reductions.

4.2.3 Open Access as a part of the solution, although it does create problems

The long-term benefits of Open Access are still unclear, and all those involved agree that the transitory period will be most difficult. This calls for special phasing measures as well as the creation of strong incentives (not simply financial but also political) to help weather this transition.

Integrating this mode of access and dissemination into a publishing model has serious consequences for the underlying economic model, despite its potential hermeneutical benefits. In the demand-side model, the consumer pays for the content consumed. When the consumer (whether it be an individual or an institution) does not pay, either the producer or a third party (patron, advertiser, etc.) must pay for the publishing service. This is known as the supply-side model, to which a variety—or a mix—of different business models can be applied, based on a sharing of resources, funding, advertising and adding value during the production process.

Such a change from a demand-side model to a supply-side model implies a reorientation of revenue flows and a change in the gatekeeping system (or arbitration system), which is now provided *ex post facto* by libraries or readers. It should be noted, however, that in this transitory phase, and given the present lack of adequate “reading machines” for digital books, the printed book often remains a reference for thorough study and in-depth

reading. Digital Open Access versions will thus need to be supplemented by printed editions, at least in the short to medium term.

4.2.4 Open Access publishing and Open Access archiving

Commonly known as the “gold” and “green” roads respectively, Open Access publishing and Open Access archiving are rather different in their structure, model and impact on the economics of publishing. Green Open Access, which is the archiving of previously published material in a repository that can be freely accessed by all, can be a way to improve dissemination and discussion in the scholarly community. It does, however, pose problems of long-term access, raise complex (and perhaps unnecessary) issues of versioning and, most importantly, does not help the economics of publishing. It can, however, be seen as a good transitory system, albeit one we feel can only exist alongside a true publishing policy, which Green Open Access is not.

Gold Open Access, on the other hand, aims to invent models of publishing that allow for the free distribution/access of scholarly texts at their source (the publisher or his direct intermediary, the library or some other platform). This implies a change in the economics of scholarly publishing, and although it may appear more complex and risky (old habits die hard), it addresses the fundamental issues of scholarly communication head on.

4.3 The future of the book

The book form still remains central to the epistemology of the Humanities. The long format is necessary, as scholars must describe, map out and take command of their field before coming to the thesis. And the thesis itself needs space to develop. Also, as HSS treatises can be characterized as having a more individual approach in which the individual scholar’s interpretations are considered the most important aspect of the work, the book format plays a central role in that it allows the development and formulation of an original complex argument or a prolonged set of thoughts. The monograph seems to be able to meet the demand for this complexity and the sometimes idiosyncratic, multifaceted nature of reasoning. If the scholarly article in the Humanities remains a significant source, books and articles seem to fulfil different functions (analysis of primary texts versus critical dialogue).

All our findings have demonstrated that for many stakeholders, the printed form for books (i.e. long texts) is still extremely important and will probably remain so for some time.⁷ This was particularly true for the producers and end users, who are often the same (i.e. researchers/academics but not exclusively; civil society is also a very important end user of HSS materials). On the other hand, librarians regard eBooks as more efficient than printed books. One of their arguments is that they are easier to access (any place, anytime, anywhere), stimulating wider dissemination and enabling simultaneous use,

⁷ Janneke Adema and Paul Rutten, *Digital Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences: Report on User Needs* (OAPEN 2010) 52-53.

which is not feasible with a printed book. Moreover, in the long term, additional eBook services can be provided, increasing the use-value of the digital documents compared with the printed book.⁸

In this future scenario—or even in the current situation for the humanities scholar already immersed in the digital world—openly accessible information is a must. In order to conduct experiments with large amounts of data or to explore open research, liquid publications, collaboratories and wikis, the free availability of information for users in various global settings is a necessary precondition. Information can then be much more easily mined and reused; it can become truly interactive, offering a variety of possibilities for new scholarly methods and forms of analysis in the Humanities as well as new forms of publications that expand on, and thus not necessarily abandon, the format of the book. Seen in this light, one could conclude that the factors determining the futures of academic publishing, scholarly communication and the praxis of research and analysis are converging. Current developments therefore touch the core of scholarship, including the HSS.

In the final analysis, one must remember that what counts is that books are the centre of invisible communities and rely on them for their continued existence. Digital publishing coupled with Open Access can not only enhance those communities but also make them actually visible. The book of the future will be part of new ensembles, new systems of knowledge and conversation, where the book will be only one form of reading, one possible platform amongst many. Economic pressures should not be the cause of the demise of the role of the book in HSS; instead, technology should be used to adapt it or even *reinvent* it altogether. In the meantime, the OAPEN studies and this report in particular will propose flexible ways of experimenting with scholarly communication, preserving the hermeneutic function of the book while inventing new modes of integration.

⁸ Ibid., 60.

5 Quality

The issues outlined below have been identified as those that matter most to stakeholders, with the degree of importance varying according to the stakeholder. For those wanting to start with Open Access publishing, this presentation should offer an efficient point of entry and, we hope, a compass if not the roadmap to guide them through their journey ahead.

Each section is organised around a statement of the issue, followed by suggestions as to the best way of achieving results in the current situation. The suggestions were drawn from the examples we analyzed in the *User Needs Report* and the *Open Access Models Report*.

Clearly, all the values mentioned here are interconnected and build upon each other. None is more important than the other, except perhaps quality, which is the name of the game despite widely varying views of what quality is and how to ensure it.

5.1 *Peer review, editing and metrics*

The Internet is not perceived as an environment where quality is guaranteed; indeed, the contrary appears to be the case. Whether this is due to the ease of access to web distribution, to worries about the stability and reliability of new media formats or technological innovations, to a general suspicion of free goods (seen as inferior ones) or to a more complex mystique surrounding documents in paper format that is entrenched in the humanities for obvious cultural reasons—or a combination of the above—remains unclear. Whatever it may be, these perceptions could hinder the development of eBooks and Open Access and may affect their development and perceived value. It is something publishers have to deal with when they move to the digital world, although one may well hypothesize that the problem is temporary. In this transition, the mediating role of the publisher is of paramount importance. Its reputation and expertise ensures the end users that the content is trustworthy (see also "[Branding](#)"). But this “differential value” may also turn into an asset, as free content is accessed by more people (because it is free) and thus acquires a powerful usage value which in turn enhances reputation (e.g. the Open Humanities Press).

5.1.1 **Peer review today**

In scholarly publishing, peer review ensures that the scholarly contributions that are accepted by academic publishers meet the standards of their respective disciplines. This process of certification establishes the quality, validity and authenticity of a registered scholarly claim. Other mechanisms, such as the marketing of content through the brand of a particular publisher or journal, play an additional role in the establishment of quality. These traditional systems, which remain essential in the perception of users, are now

being complemented by new ways of establishing levels of quality and legitimacy such as citation metrics, usage statistics and “open commentary”.

Peer reviewing, which has been the alpha and omega of classical scholarly publishing, is now under threat, first and foremost due to the simultaneous increase of scholarly output and of the workload of academics who review manuscripts. Peer review is also perceived to be a flawed process, even though it is so far the best system that publishers and the scholarly community have been able to come up with. Lastly, in HSS, the peer reviewing of books, as opposed to that of the short form (articles), is organized in stages: the work is first reviewed for ideas and content, leading to a first rejection or acceptance, and then at a closer level for the argument posed. As a result, it requires a greater investment in time and money on the part of publishers and bears heavily on the economic balance of the operation, especially as the rejection rates are higher in HSS than in STM.⁹

In Open Access publishing, reviewing must be conducted with the utmost rigor, as Open Access still has an image problem: it is often perceived to be the second or third best option for authors who have been rejected by top publishers. This image should change in time as branding (and certification) becomes better established and as recognized scholars start publishing in Open Access. This should thus be one of the main tasks of acquisition editors: to convince recognized house authors to accept the challenge and help pave the way of recognition.

The digital world may offer an opportunity to cut costs while improving the process by going beyond traditional peer reviewing. In particular, it could allow the two stages of peer review to use different digital tools. The level of demarcation and filtering (of the good from the less good) can be seen as supplemented by download statistics and citation counts, and the level of improvement and communication can be supplemented by tools such as open peer review systems and user comment functionalities.

5.1.2 Editing

Next to the peer review process, editing has traditionally been of paramount importance in the Humanities and Social Sciences. This function remains crucial for the continued guarantee of high-quality works, especially in the digital environment where scholars are increasingly publishing their works directly on the web without the interference of intermediaries. Even though texts may be of high scientific quality in terms of content, the quality in terms of the language, format and layout may be unacceptable. Digitization has led to efficiency gains in the process of the editing of the manuscript. This editorial function, traditionally performed by the publisher, thus remains one of the assets and necessities of qualitative formal scholarly communication in the HSS. In addition to peer review, the editorial process is an area in which the publisher’s quality can be established. Others, however, claim that these services are no longer unique to or essential for the

⁹ Mary Waltham, *The Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing Among Social Science and Humanities Associations*. Report on a study funded by a Planning Grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (February 2009) 31.

publisher's brand, where other stakeholders (e.g. libraries) are also able to offer and support these services.

5.1.3 Metrics

The digital nature of texts allows for sophisticated quantitative measurements of “usage” which many attempt to correlate with the “value” of the content. This is known generically as metrics and is of interest to all stakeholders.

This report is not the place to debate the validity of metrics such as download statistics and citation indexes. They have been heavily criticized in the research community (even in STM) as being crude and meaningless, or even dangerous when manipulated by people who do not understand them and want quick and simple answers to complex questions. The greatest criticism is that metrics measure only the outside phenomena surrounding a publication. We hope that a model can be built to somehow incorporate an evaluation of the content in an indirect manner. Most scholars have serious misgivings about it.¹⁰ Furthermore, metrics for books remain an underdeveloped field, mostly because most books are not accessed and read digitally, but also for more complex reasons which are based on the very nature of HSS subjects, the life span of HSS books and the way communities debate about them. All in all, feedback about use is interesting to authors and publishers (to guide their marketing) but it should not be used to assess quality, as high figures do not necessarily mean high impact.

Open Access publishing may allow for a rethinking of quality indicators that would move beyond peer review and metrics, resulting in a mix of indicators.

5.1.4 Beyond peer review and metrics

5.1.4.1 Web 2.0 technologies

Although recent research suggests that the traditional peer review system is here to stay, other research shows that Web 2.0 technologies could play a major role in quality control, since the scholarly community is dissatisfied with the current peer review system. The trend is towards more collaborative and discursive approaches to judging contributions to a field. As scholars begin to rely more and more on these informal channels as a means of disseminating and communicating research results, the boundaries between formal and informal publications will continue to blur. New forms of quality control could lead to more transparency about the way that scientific contributions are judged. This transparency can already be established at the traditional peer review level by being open and clear about the policies used to judge a work. Supplementing the publication with primary materials could also offer more transparency into the way the research was conducted and on what it was based. This could add to the overall quality of publications.

¹⁰ Adema and Rutten, *Digital Monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 55, 85-86.

5.1.4.2 Quality curve

As content is separated from form, digital texts allow for different versions of the same content, which is what makes them different in nature from printed texts. Robert Darnton first outlined in his famous 1999 essay what such layers could be.¹¹ This fluidity, however, can serve other purposes than enriching the content. It can also be the basis for a quality curve, or quality *cursus honorum*, where manuscripts are first published after traditional peer reviewing to ensure basic minimal quality, then are open for discussion (quoted, reviewed, annotated)—a stage in which they either gain extra value or are left alone. The work may eventually be attributed other quality markers such as enhancement, printing or picked up for translation (one of the markers of relevance for an academic book). The passage of the text between various “statuses” is seamless but, as Jean-Claude Guéron suggests, vital if one is to differentiate between quality (a text passing thresholds and deserving to be published, i.e. made public) and excellence (a text belonging to the top list in an international competition). Both types are necessary in a balanced research economy.¹²

5.1.5 Quality as stability in a trusted setting

The last quality index is that of long-term preservation. Any publisher launching into digital publishing, whether Open Access or not, must first resolve this aspect and inform authors of the solution it proposes. Given the costs involved in updating and maintaining the required software, this function is best carried out by national libraries, which are already in the patrimonial business. The printing of a few patrimonial copies of at least the core text might prove to be a good solution as long as the digital monograph keeps a form relatively close to that of the printed one. When the text becomes much more specific and layered, this will, however, be only a partial solution.

5.1.6 Recommendations

- Promote “collective” or “extended peer reviewing” whereby a text would be available to a community for a certain time in order to collect comments and then only be finalized in its “publishable” form by the author. This final process can be organized by the publisher or perhaps more efficiently by new intermediaries located in universities, research organizations or academies, or by service providers at a national level (examples: <http://www.futureofthebook.org/> or <http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpres/plannedobsolescence/>). One of the benefits of this system is that it provides more transparency, and thus greater accountability, while making “conversation” central to the book cycle, straight from the beginning.

¹¹ Robert Darnton, “The New Age of the Book,” *The New York Review of Books*, March 18, 1999 (<http://www.nybooks.com/nyrev/index.html>)

¹² Jean-Claude Guéron, ‘[Optimizing Research Sharing in the European Research Area: Cyberinfrastructure, Quality and Open Access](#),’ paper delivered at the ERA 2009 conference, September 29, 2009.

- Improve the transparency of the analytical and empirical bases of the text, in particular by publishing the data used alongside the main text.
- Add the peer review reports (or the significant elements thereof) to the digital text (both as part of branding and as the beginning of a debate around the book) as well as the post-publication comments (direct comments in the form of a blog or appending of reviews of the book) [see [services](#) below]. This should be done with the consent of the authors and the reviewers and according to the acceptability of the measure by the given discipline.
- To improve the generally negative perceptions concerning the durability of digital publications, we recommend incorporating enhancements, data, versionings and Open Access into the preservation workflow of libraries.
- Assure long-term preservation through national libraries, which are already in the patrimonial business, and print a few patrimonial copies of at least the core text.

5.2 *Reputation and reward*

5.2.1 **Mixed economy**

The scholarly communication system needs to ensure that the various stakeholders are compensated, recognized and rewarded for the value they add to the system. There should be a fair balance between the value added by the different stakeholders and the compensations received (directly or indirectly) for these services. The mixed economy of the scholarly communication system—in which some stakeholders primarily pursue public interests and values (in most cases universities, scholars and funding agencies) and some primarily corporate interests (in many cases, private publishers)—makes the system both unique and vulnerable at the same time. Despite its fragility, the system has remained remarkably stable. This can be explained by the fact that all of the stakeholders have something to gain from the system and therefore are willing to cooperate. Reputation and reward are related to the claim of moral rights, honour, tenure and career advancements, and impact factors, but it can also be measured in monetary terms: wages, profits, grants, funding, and economic and scientific returns for the society at large as requested by funders and public institutions.

5.2.2 **Lack of reward**

The rewards of scholars are symbolic and economic but in an indirect way (grants, jobs, tenures, contracts for textbooks and other publications generating revenue). In HSS, there is little direct pecuniary return. Reward thus should be seen as a contingent variable, not a fixed immutable entity that publishers have to work around. A period of transition is inevitable, but evidence shows that it might be much shorter than expected.

The argument of “lack of reward” is often invoked when authors shy away from digital Open Access publishing. Reputation in the HSS is still very much connected to the

publication of a printed book and to print publications. Publishers, who want to serve the scholarly community, tend to align with this position. They also fear that digital experiments will have an adverse influence on their authority and trustworthiness and will thus harm their enterprise's brand name. Despite the growth in readership—to be distinguished from intellectual impact—that digital publication may create, and despite the desire of users to engage in new forms of digital multimedia scholarships and informal communication (blogs, etc.), the institutional prestige and rewards are insufficient for the moment. In fact, we believe that when the reputation system starts to take these new forms of publication and communication at face value, the scientific practice will also fundamentally start to change.

5.2.3 Language issues and quality

Digital publication did not create the language issue in scholarly publication but it has certainly made it more acute. The “levelling effect” produced by the new digital accessibility (prudishly called “process of convergence”) has an impact on the future of languages other than English in the scholarly world that is far from negligible and that cannot be solved by the milieu alone. Indeed, in HSS, language is part and parcel of the scientific process and is not only a passive carrier of information. Concepts and even objects exist within language. On the other hand, all scholars are aware of the need for greater international exchange. Publishing directly in English will undoubtedly deeply affect the nature and quality of international research (erasing originality and putting non-natives at a disadvantage), and resorting to translation proves to be almost impossible financially in fields that are already grossly underfunded. The solution lies neither in the hands of publishers nor authors, but at the European and national levels. Nonetheless, those on the frontline need to argue for diversity and quality and defend it in their practice.

5.2.4 Recommendations

- Promote (new) quality criteria for digital texts and enhancements. This is of paramount importance for the reputation structure surrounding new Open Access book publishing initiatives, as we still need to battle the negative perceptions towards Open Access and digital texts.

5.3 Branding

5.3.1 Open Access and branding

Reputation is closely related to brands (universities, publishers, libraries) and stimulates competition within the system. There are serious misgivings, however, about the adverse effects of Open Access on brands. Publishers are concerned that Open Access may be bad for their brand, because they fear the impact of citations in general may decline because of the perceived lack of prestige of Open Access publications (despite evidence to the contrary). On a related note, publishers also fear a loss of scholarly independence if research is funded by funding agencies or through research grants. They see Open Access

as government interference and a threat to the peer review system. Open Access publishing is also seen as a way of removing the commercial incentive for publishers, and this is deemed to be harmful to quality standards.

5.3.2 Branding and publishers

Although branding in academic publishing is taken less seriously by the users than in other sectors, the brand name of publishers is actually more important in online publishing than in print. Since so much material is available on the Internet, reliable brands act as signposts of quality.

5.3.3 Branding and universities

For universities, branding is also of pivotal importance to promote their research and scholarship. This can be done through the various institutions the university employs. One way to increase the visibility of its scholarship is for universities to set up a university press, whether as a new start-up or by employing the resources already available to the university. For instance, universities can combine the strengths of the various institutions to establish publishing opportunities (e.g. through library-press, academic & ICT collaborations, in whatever combination).

5.3.4 Recommendations

- As in other sectors, we believe that a strengthening of the fundamentals of publishing (core functions and values) may be the best way of weathering the period of transition towards complete digitalization.
- It is necessary to find the right level of branding. In this respect, we believe that the common platform (such as OAPEN) can constitute a powerful way of branding by proposing content at the highest quality level.
- Create an endorsement system by leading figures on the model of trade publishers. This can not be the sole peer reviewing mechanism but would be both a quality certification system and a marketing tool. Endorsement would also work for systematic indexing and cross referencing by specialized platforms and/or institutional repositories and sites.

5.4 Advocacy

As stated in the introduction, Open Access publishing is not only a pragmatic response to the difficulties encountered in HSS publishing but also a wilful reinstatement of the values of research and knowledge at the core of society. Together with the digital revolution, which is still beginning and whose consequences are only barely visible, this calls for more advocacy of Open Access publishing. It is still a trial-and-error situation, and the long-term benefits need to be specifically promoted, but also explored.

5.4.1 Recommendations

- Involve scholars closely with the move towards Open Access publishing within the editorial boards or through specific work groups or even information and advocacy meetings within the publishing house. This advocacy work is best done at the local and national levels. It can be done in contact with Open Access national advocacy groups, research and funding organizations, and first and foremost by involving university authorities (in particular the officer in charge of research, e.g. Rector Magnificus, Provost or VP for research depending on the country).
- Publishers and/or specific sections of national academic bodies (such as Academies) must be present at scholarly conferences to “lobby” and inform scholars about Open Access. This requires not only speeches but a hands-on approach with the available technical tools.
- Promote an “ambassador system” whereby renowned scholars make their publications openly accessible. They are the ones who have nothing to lose and who can convince younger scholars that this should not be detrimental to their careers.
- Renowned scholars are also the ones who can influence hiring and promotion committees as well as funders (whether as members or as lobbyists) that quality is as present in Open Access publishing as in traditional publishing, provided quality is appropriately checked.
- Libraries have an important role to play in this respect, not only by encouraging their clients/scholars to deposit their works online (green Open Access) but also by promoting gold Open Access publishing.
- Funders and universities can also play an important advocacy role through mandates and by acknowledging that the Open Access availability of scholarly books should be part of the research costs (thus setting up Open Access funds).

6 Open Access Book Models

6.1 Definitions

Publishers with a systematic or experimental approach to Open Access have to define three general aspects of their operations: the publishing model, the business model and the publishing process.

6.1.1 The publishing model

The publishing model looks at the different stakeholders in the publishing value chain or network (authors, publishers, libraries, universities, academies, societies and funding agencies) and their (collaborative) involvement in publishing activities. The most common publishing models in this respect are the commercial (for-profit) publisher and the (non-profit) university press (usually in the form of a collaboration between the university and the press). In the digital age, other publishing models have rapidly emerged and have become more common, such as university press/library collaborations, presses set up by academics or academies, presses set up by libraries, presses set up by societies or (almost) any other combination of actors in the chain. These different publishing models are not essentially new in terms of the activities employed, but are based on new combinations enabled by applications of digital technology, making it easier for players in or outside the university system to take on publishing activities in new formations.

6.1.2 The business model

The business model considers which funding or other income mechanisms are used to (fully or partly) pay for the costs of publishing or, in other words, to sustain the publishing process and in some cases generate profits for owners and shareholders. According to the publishing model used, funds are obtained from the sale of printed books and (added value) electronic editions, additional services or value-added content, grants, subsidies, sponsorships and endowments, etc. Cost reductions may result from the sharing of resources (ranging from human resources to distribution infrastructures and technological facilities) between different stakeholders and even publishers. In most cases, the business model used will consist of a combination of revenue models. Various publishing models can be based on different business models.

6.1.3 The publishing process

The publishing process looks at publications at the level of the publishing production chain (from content delivery to editorial/typesetting and dissemination/access). What kind of (digital) workflow is used, what kind of formats are supported, what kind of print process is used (offset, digital printing, POD, etc.), what kind of copyright policies are in use, what kind of platforms are used to present and disseminate the content (both digital and print)? The arrangement of the peer review process is an essential and critical element in the publishing process.

6.2 Publishing models

6.2.1 Large variety

The publishing models used by Open Access book publishers seem to be much more varied than their business models. Strategic collaborations may vary from title to title or from series to series and do not need to be on a consistent, permanent structural basis. This does not only have to do with the different backgrounds of the initiatives but mostly with the fact that the digital format, environment and the availability of digital tools (and open source software) has made it easier for new and also established players in scholarly communication to enter into (HSS) book publishing and to set up strategic working coalitions.

6.2.2 Main models

Three trends in Open Access publishing stand out: 1) the rise of the so-called library-press collaboration (e.g. Newfound Press), 2) the setting up of a new institutional player - the scholarly communication or publishing office within universities (for instance the Scholarly Publishing office of the University of Michigan Library), and 3) the increased and continued importance of academics, and academic departments (including ICT departments) in Open Access initiatives (e.g. Open Humanities Press). Similarly, inspired by economic motives, collaborations are being sought with other (commercial/non-profit) publishers and with universities and university institutions, both in the form of content and resources sharing as well as at the level of services and consultancy, especially when data or primary materials are involved.

6.2.3 Recommendations

- In order to develop Open Access publishing, new collaborations could be created. This can take place at the level of the publisher or of the book series or even of the individual book. New collaborations are necessary to develop the potential advantages open access publishing can bring to the scientific community. The new role of the publisher is being a broker and a constructor of alliances, not clinging to the traditional publishing chain inherited from the print age. Some of these partnerships could evolve from existing collaborations already in place in print book publishing, taking on a new form alongside completely new alliances born in the digital era.
- In particular, these partnerships could develop within existing core institutions such as universities. University presses, which are naturally and ideally placed in this new system of alliances, should welcome the opportunity to work closer with and focus more on their home institutions.
- Publishers and research communities should be encouraged to work closer together in order to promote the the involvement of scholars with publishing as an important aspect of scholarly communication.

- Academic libraries and publishers should be encouraged to work closer together in order to create infrastructural and economic efficiencies. University presses are ideally placed there. With the coming of the digital age and the emergence of digital warehouses for scholarly content (repositories), the task of a library has changed from that of a custodial role to that of an active contributor to the evolution of scholarly communication, adding to the role of service producer that of content provider. Simultaneously, publishers are increasingly shifting from a content-provider to a service-provider role. The Ithaka report¹³ states, however, that although libraries are good in organizing the information, according to the library provosts, they lack the expertise of the publisher in being able to accurately choose what actually merits publication. Libraries also lack marketing expertise, awareness-raising and the prestige of a publisher's brand.

If the publishing houses are too small, they could join a shared electronic publishing infrastructure across several publishers or universities (e.g. OAPEN), which could thus act as portal and distributor as well as service provider (either direct or indirect).

6.3 Publishing process

6.3.1 Formats, workflows and infrastructures

At present, digital infrastructures range from the highly complex, based on XML with automated metadata adding, to the most simple ones. In some cases, publishers merely offer publications online on their website and delegate the print-on-demand production and sales to on-demand printing companies. Depending on the publishing model used, the digital infrastructure of libraries and universities is used. Through these infrastructures, libraries (or other players) arrange for the digitization, scanning and full-text searchability of the books, and can make connections with other collections by using protocols like OAI-PMH, Z39.50 and OpenURL. Sometimes this is done manually; sometimes it is incorporated in the platform. Some of the initiatives we surveyed also focus on the development of research tools that assist in the research process itself (from Open Access to open scholarship). This development reflects the changing role of publishers (and librarians), which are increasingly turning into service providers for scholarly research instead of only peer-review arrangers and preservation centres.

There is also much difference in the amount of time it can take to produce a digital book. Open Book Publishers, for instance, claims to be able to publish the printed monograph three weeks after receiving the final manuscript; on the other hand, the extensive multimedia digital publications from Gutenberg-e, with their own interactive websites, took on average three years to be published.

¹³ Laura Brown, Rebecca Griffiths, and Matthew Rascoff, *Ithaka Report. University publishing in a digital age* (2007) 16.

As the coming period will see fast and numerous changes, interoperability, modularity and flexibility can best be achieved by relying on open source software and infrastructures, and especially by developing large platform-sharing consortia, where resources and expertise are most effectively shared while each publisher keeps its editorial line and works at the level of sophistication suited to its own means. In any case, it is most important that both preservation and multi-platform use be kept in mind and thus, for the present, we recommend an XML base whenever possible. Interoperability is also vital for dissemination (and not simply for searchability and portability), in particular for libraries. Any chosen standard should fit in with that of other publishers as well as be adaptable to library workflows. For now, many libraries do not catalogue Open Access material, as their cataloguing is only triggered by and based on the purchasing of content. Open Access platforms must provide adaptation services and workflows (seamless and interoperable) that would allow libraries to include Open Access material in their own catalogues.

6.3.2 Recommendations

- We recommend the use of standardised formats, policies and infrastructures that at the same time offer maximum modularity, flexibility and interoperability.
- We recommend the use of open source software and infrastructures.
- We suggest that publishers work from an XML-base, where possible, to achieve maximum interoperability.
- We recommend the creation of a publishing workflow that pays extra attention to integration on both the input side (authors' manuscripts or, in the case of a collective platform, the content provided by publishers) as well as the output side (adaptation to the library infrastructure).
- We recommend the use of standardised peer review policies as well as standardized formats concerning the adding of metadata. This will not only create more efficiency in the system but also more clarity and transparency concerning the procedures used.

6.3.3 Copyright

Copyright protects the moral rights of the author, allowing for clear attribution. It also protects the commercial interests of the various stakeholders, among them the publishers and in some exceptional cases (where royalties actually become significant) those of humanities and social sciences authors. Digital publication erases the traditional fixed boundaries of the text (thus raising problems of authorship through re-use), while Open Access places the author back at the centre of the system, with a system of publishing contracts evolving into non-exclusive licenses to publish, i.e. of the author granting rights to other parties. Such a situation is seen as not only complex but threatening to some of the parties involved in scholarly communication.

6.3.3.1 Moral rights and derivatives

Copyright is meant to ensure that a specific author takes responsibility for a specific text and puts a claim on its content. One of the issues facing copyright in the digital age is the issue of the integrity of the text. Even when using more “open” or alternative copyright licenses (as, for instance, Creative Commons), there seems to be a fear amongst (Open Access book) authors and publishers to allow derivative works (i.e. versioning and adaptations of the work as would be allowed in true Open Access fashion after the Berlin Declaration). Such fears, although understandable, may be a barrier to the benefits brought about by the new liquidity of texts. We believe that technical solutions can and will be found to ensure both the traceability of statements and the benefits of re-use.

6.3.3.2 Economic interests

As stated earlier, HSS scholars overwhelmingly write for impact (creating indirect rewards) rather than for direct (pecuniary) rewards. Most print runs of monographs are c. 200 to 600 copies, so for most authors, the royalties are extremely low. Contracts should therefore favour the most liberal forms of protection of IP in order to maximize visibility. Publishers must understand that fact, and models must be developed that will continue to stimulate the protection (e.g. against severe forms of plagiarism) and development of science as they did in the print era. This will most probably mean shifting the source of revenue from direct “sales” of the product (the book) to other ones, closer to the source. (See chapter on [economic models](#)). As to fears of the possibility for Open Access content to be stolen, it should be remembered that tracing infringement and plagiarism is less complicated with digital documents than with printed ones.

The traditional practice was that academic authors would hand over the copyrights to the publisher. This practice is changing towards an arrangement where only the exclusive rights to commercially exploit the journal article or the monograph (and thus raise direct revenue) are given to the publisher, while authors retain the right to publish preprints on personal websites and place them in academic repositories. Non-exclusive licenses are however also in use, enabling the possibility to use commercial (search) services on top of the content in library and platform settings and the use of commercial translation tools. To secure revenue for publishers, temporary/time-based exclusive licenses can also be established.

6.3.4 Recommendations

- Copyright licenses based on the principle of Open Access (see the Berlin Declaration) could simplify matters for scholarly works in the digital realm and put copyright back in its function of protecting the rights of authorship and creative ownership. For new works, we recommend the use of the most liberal Creative Commons licence: CC-BY (which also solves digital rights management issues).
- We recommend standard licenses with respect to copyright policies. Again, our preference lies with Creative Commons licenses, as they are the most well-known licenses as well as very clear and easy to use and communicate.

- For backlisted works (for which contracts have already been signed), we recommend staying within the Creative Commons paradigm, using for instance the CC-BY-NonDerivative-NonCommercial license.
- Where publishers insist on some sort of exclusive license to the content, we recommend temporary exclusive-licenses (again within the Creative Commons paradigm).

6.4 Business models

The Open Access business models are based on three pillars: 1) cutting costs and creating efficiencies through inter alia digital publishing and the use of innovative publishing models, 2) developing a complex mix of subsidies and funds from different sources and partners on top of the ‘simple’ hybrid model (which might even differ for each book), and 3) building up services in addition to or next to the Open Access content.

6.4.1 A few misconceptions

6.4.1.1 (Open Access) digital publishing is cheaper

Contrary to a claim often made, digital publishing is not cheaper. However, it results in more services and turns out to be more efficient at the level of dissemination. Small print runs are an ineffective way of dissemination, where the target audiences are small and the availability of books in libraries is very limited. Also, as the costs for editing and peer review remain the same in a digital publishing model, there is not much difference in first-copy costs. Lastly, monograph publishing is more costly than journal publishing, as a print version must be kept alongside the digital one in order to serve the community in its different needs, at least for some time to come. This adds a constraint but also points to a rather simple classic model called “hybrid”, where revenue can still be gained from print sales alongside the free digital version and costs can be saved by making distribution more efficient.

6.4.1.2 Open Access publishing introduces a whole new economic model based on subsidies and not the market

In truth, monograph publishing in HSS has never been self-sustaining and has always relied on some form of additional funding. Given the size of the audience for highly specialized works, subsidies and institutional and governmental funding have always been (a large) part of HSS book publishing and will therefore also remain part of (most) Open Access business models. A complementary approach is to consider publishing as an integral part of the costs of the research process itself.

6.4.1.3 Author-pay Open Access undermines quality, or is akin to vanity publishing, whereas true market competition promotes quality

There is no hard evidence that market competition has provided the best possible service at a fair price; rather, the contrary appears to be the case (see the serials crisis, for

instance). Quality control also does not seem to be better protected in the present system, which has failed to solve the problem of vanity publishing. Finally, in the present system, public funding is already an important factor of sustainability, making many publications possible (most are at least partly funded by a grant). One could even say that in the heyday of academic publishing, the systematic/automatic buying of all monographs published by the major (and sometimes not-so-major) university presses by (American and English) libraries was more akin to indirect subsidizing than to the free play of market forces.

6.4.2 The hybrid and author-pay models

6.4.2.1 The hybrid model

In the hybrid model revenue is generated from the sale of conventional (print) books while the online version is freely available. The model can be refined by offering a free “basic” version of the document, and to have pay services on top of this basic layer (see below). The free online availability of digital monographs can also serve as an advertising and marketing tool, both for the press and its content. It is not, however, a model that can be sustainable in the long run (anticipating the decreased use of print in the digital age), but it can serve as the basis for mixed funding and revenue models, as funding from research budgets has always been part of academic monograph publishing.

6.4.2.2 The author pay model

The author-pay model is commonly used in STM journals. It is a simple system by which some form of institutional backing or subsidy is given to the author to make the publication of his monograph possible after it has been accepted by a publisher. It is already common practice in academic publishing, as part of the budget of most monographs is made up of these funds. The risk entailed is obviously that quality control and efficiency would become less stringent, given that the money is available. Or it would displace the arbitration to bureaucratic levels (selection committees who would be seen as “irresponsible”). The solution may lie in a diversity of sources, or matching funds, by which not one institution is the sole source of decision. The burden of collecting these various matching funds will be akin to the work of a movie producer, and should be done (as it already is in practice) by the professional in the publishing chain, i.e. the publisher.

6.4.3 The shift of library budgets

This is a variation on the author-pay model where money can be allocated directly to the publisher. It is, however, much more radical in its approach (as it tackles old habits) but might prove best adapted to the new landscape of academic publishing. To increase efficiency and to use the presently available funds to produce more output and increase accessibility, a proposed change in the present monograph publishing system would be to relocate certain funds from academic libraries, or library consortia, to publishers. The upfront financing of publishing houses for the production and Open Access publishing of relevant academic works for the broad academic community should replace the present library-driven market where (public or community) money is allocated to libraries to buy

the output of publishers. It introduces costs and inefficiencies in the system, as publishers spend large sums on marketing while increasing numbers of monographs don't sell enough to cover their costs and the actual print copies on libraries' shelves by scholars and students remain largely unknown.

Open Access publishing would enable publishers to finance the production and publication of more relevant monographs and to lower the costs, while the quality/efficiency/innovation would not have to suffer as long as the proper checks were used.

This would also be tremendously beneficial for publishers working in small language areas that experience specific problems in terms of economic viability. Publishing in small language areas restricts the market considerably compared to publishing in English, and translation/exports costs are often an impossible hurdle for them.

6.4.4 Services in the economic models

6.4.4.1 Definition

What is usually called "services" is a wide array of features that come in the prepublication (or even research phase) or in addition to the text itself and characterize the digital matter over the printed one (although there are some services attached to print as well). In this respect, they are different from the enhanced digital book, which is a cyber expansion of the book itself and not strictly speaking a service, or even of other forms of cyber-scholarship or data preservation. This is probably the most coveted zone of digital publishing, as it is where monetization can take place while keeping the Open Access principles alive. It is also a needed development of added value which can increase the impact of scholarly content if one wants scholars and readers to use them.

6.4.4.2 Platforms

Whether the content is sold or open, marketing efforts (also called "dissemination") are a must if the publication is to reach its audience. Readers need not only know of the existence of the object, they also need signposts to get to it and easily assess its quality. This is particularly true of libraries that do not integrate Open Access content, as their workflow is based on the purchasing of content. Open Access platforms or providers must thus offer a specific service to libraries to allow them to integrate content without being saddled with a double workflow that they would not be able to afford. Another way this dissemination could take place is through the creation of a complete digital environment, involving several platforms performing various different but related tasks around research. This can be, for instance, a publication platform (journals and monographs) linked with a scientific blog platform, a scientific social network tool, and interfaced with a scientific agenda listing events and call for papers. Such environments exist: Revues.org is a good example. They can be centred on a given community as part of their research and teaching activity (learned society, scientific group, university) and then include e-learning and e-science facilities. Quite simply, they may involve (as is

already the case in certain libraries) print-on-demand facilities for their clients so that a library's online resources or even backlist out-of-print titles can be printed.

6.4.4.3 Services as revenue

Services on top of the Open Access content are seen as an important potential revenue stream and have already been experimented with by several publishers. Once again, it is too early to know how profitable these might be and how they can help the complete Open Access economy, but they will certainly be part of any future business plan.

6.4.4.3.1 Services adapted to libraries

These services are directed at the different stakeholders.¹⁴ Some services are more focused on libraries and their clients (scholars as readers), offering full browsing functionalities and full text search, extended database searches, navigation tools, enhanced interactive multimedia publications, connections to blogs, podcast and online resources and social media sites, the possibility of linking (forward linking, trackbacks), the addition of user-generated content in library repositories (tags, tag clouds, comments, annotation, reviews) generally referred to as "Web 2.0 applications" as they offer possibilities to interact with the information. In order to strengthen their reliability, these services will also be required to implement Digital Object Identifiers, which should be adaptable to eBooks. Platforms or collections of eBooks enable both the building of significant services and the possibility for meaningful connections with the other texts in the collection and with texts and information sources outside of the collection. Licenses to these platforms or book collections can then be sold to libraries, where other forms of package or bundle sales can also be used.

6.4.4.3.2 Services adapted to publishers

For publishers, added-value services focus mostly on web marketing, e-management and print-on-demand services as well as distribution and the use of the publishing platform (statistics on usage, downloading, print sales, etc.), conversion services, republishing and reprinting services, and advice on copyright clearance. In some cases, downloading and printing are also seen as added-value services, where the publications can be read online but an extra charge needs to be paid to download or print the (whole) file, although we should clearly consider whether we are still talking about Open Access publications in these cases. Sometimes books will also only be available in PDF and libraries or their clients need to pay for more advanced or flexible formats like HTML, EPUB or XML. In some cases, a publisher will also ask a fee for editorial, proofreading and copy-editing services.

6.4.4.3.3 Consultancy services

Consultancy services are also offered, mostly to other publishers in the form of marketing and management services, and information on how to build or set up an Open Access publication infrastructure. Consultancy services are also offered to authors, advising and aiding them for instance with the set-up of digital publication.

¹⁴ The OAPEN platform under development will feature these services.

6.4.4.3.4 *Innovative services*

Some publishers also offer more innovative services, mostly focusing on scholars, such as experimental research environments where more ‘forward looking services’ like versioning, liquid publications and new forms of peer review and quality establishment are being explored. Experiments are being done with new forms of informal publication like blogs, wikis or networked books, focusing on a phase beyond Open Access and moving into open scholarship.

6.4.5 **Sustainability**

From the data we gathered, it is hard to predict which models will turn out to be sustainable in the future. For one, the existing initiatives are still in an experimental stage. Furthermore, it is difficult to define the concept in abstracto. Different models might be sustainable (or unsustainable) in different contexts, depending on the goals (or the business plan) of a specific publisher. One thing is clear, however: Open Access experiments currently rely on subsidy structures. It may even be that academic publishing is on the verge of a revolution with Open Access, realizing that Open Access publishing is considered as a necessary function which cannot be solved by a traditional customer market. This is already the case in scholarly monograph publishing which heavily relies on subsidies and operates in a market which is hardly a free or open one. In other words, the “sustainability” of the Open Access model should rather be seen in its efficiency and effectivity, for instance in attaining reliability or in its capacity to be innovative and flexible instead of bureaucratic.

The question is also whether one wants to look at the sustainability of specific models or at the sustainability of the scholarly communication system as a whole. As with the serials and subsequent monograph crisis, the system of monograph publishing in HSS is no longer sustainable; therefore systems which at least increase accessibility to and visibility of the work should be preferred. Furthermore, rather than focusing too much on the sustainability of Open Access models in HSS book publishing, perhaps the logical conclusion that needs to be drawn is that book publishing in these fields is not sustainable and has not been sustainable in the past (at least for a long time). Additional funding of the publication thus should be seen as a natural necessity in new publishing models.

6.4.6 **Recommendations**

- In order to accommodate the continued need felt amongst HSS scholars, we recommend the use of a hybrid model where the free online Open Access edition is supplemented with a printed edition.

- We recommend (experimenting with) the development of services on top of the Open Access online content, in order to serve the needs of HSS scholars for interconnectedness and interactive texts and in order to develop these services into a potential income or revenue stream.

- We recommend that, in order to sustain the monograph, funders recognize that publication costs should be an integral part of the research costs in HSS book publishing.
- Open Access funds should be set up on an institutional basis to pay for the cost of (at least) the Open Access edition.
- A system of distributed funding of Open Access publications (the producer model) is preferred, to ensure the autonomy of the research.

7 Conclusions

Book publishing in the Humanities and Social Sciences finds itself in the midst of a period of change and upheaval. The transition to digital forms of communication and publication offers much potential for the renewal and strengthening of scholarly publishing, a sector that has truly suffered from the rarefaction of money as well as the adverse side effects of the rise of spending in Science, Technology and Medicine.

After a careful study of all the players in the field, we conclude that Open Access publishing is the preferred road to follow in this transition as it offers benefits for all stakeholders involved in scholarly communication and publishing. This means increased accessibility and dissemination leading to better research and greater benefits for society at large. Open Access also raises questions and causes worries. These concerns have to do with the establishment of quality and hence trust in an open digital environment; with the integrity of the text and the flexibility and liquidity of information as a result of the possibility to copy, re-use and adapt; with the need to invent new publishing and business models and workflows that are more integral to digital needs and practices and that allow a sustainable development.

When these issues are solved in a satisfactory manner (and perhaps only then), Open Access publishing will allow for a veritable development of the Humanities in the digital world. However, in order to experiment with large amounts of data, explore the possibilities of open research, liquid publications, etc., the free availability of information in various global settings is a necessary precondition. Only open information can be easily mined and reused; only open information can become truly interactive, offering the potential for new scholarly methods and analytical formats.

Through Open Access publishing, publishers can also improve their relationships with their authors by offering them services already during the research stage. In the next phase of the move to Open Access, the focus in the digital realm will shift from product to process in which publishers could aid scholars by setting up branded research environments which can also offer multiple publication paths, both formal and informal.

Although the role of the publisher in the publishing chain may remain relatively stable (in terms of choice, quality assurance and coordination of production), the structural position of publishing in the economic model may change dramatically. In the medium term, we believe academic publishing could evolve into a service sector providing services to scholars, faculties and academic consortia, taking on specific tasks and roles in knowledge creation and distribution. In this scenario, these activities could replace the publisher's present role of investor and risk taker in the market for academic information, and at the same time reaffirming one of the basic principles of the chain of scholarly publishing: the paramount importance of quality assurance and efficient dissemination/access as essential to good science.

8 Annexes

8.1 *The players*

The scholarly communication system, which includes academic publishing, is characterized by a fragile balance between the various stakeholders (or players), albeit one that has been in place for a long time now. A variety of players have traditionally performed the many roles within the system. This balance, which holds the system together, is largely based on the shared values governing the field. Different trends and developments seem to be currently disturbing that balance, at least as far as the publishing of monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences is concerned.

The general trend is a blurring of the traditional barriers and growing competition, where each player may play new roles in the chain which increasingly evolves into a network that is more flexible than a chain and in which roles (or functions) are far less tied to specific players or stakeholders in scholarly communication: anything goes. It is important to briefly define what these roles are.

8.1.1 **Scholars**

Scholars perform a variety of roles in the scholarly publishing process. First of all, they create the scientific content in their role as authors. Thus, scholars function as writers and citers, those who submit material for publication. But they are also the main targets of scholarly content in their role as readers, constituting the main audience for scholarly publications. Finally, in their role as editors and peer reviewers, they certify submitted publications as part of the system of quality control of scholarly publishing.

8.1.2 **Publishers**

Publishers take care of the registration of a work by accepting a manuscript as a forthcoming publication, thereby certifying the relationship between the author and the submitted text. They also organize peer reviews and provide an editorial office to ensure the appropriate quality of the content. They control and raise awareness of the dissemination of the content published. They also handle the editing, marketing and distribution of the works, among other tasks. Thus, publishers take responsibility for the organizational aspects of scholarly publishing and assume the economic risks. They add capital, expertise and management skills. As part of that process, publishers develop brands, such as journal titles, book series but also the company's name, which is associated with particular disciplines and a certain level of quality and prestige. These brands are signposts in the academic information market, representing value for publishers and reputation for authors, thereby appealing to scholars who must publish. While publishers in the past assumed all of these roles, some of them have since been outsourced to third parties or even taken on by others like academic libraries and even scholars.

8.1.3 Academic libraries

Academic libraries assume a number of roles. One of their main tasks is the acquisition of relevant publications for their prime customers: scholars, faculty members and students. In this capacity, they operate as gatekeepers who decide which publications should be accessible in the institutions they serve. Academic libraries are thus the main target market for academic publishers and are the decisive factor for publishers when they are planning new publications or, in a broader perspective, developing new services and platforms. Furthermore, libraries also provide access to relevant publications to keep staff and students up to date with developments in their respective fields; academic libraries are responsible for the organization of the information available, ensuring that it is easily retrievable and searchable. Libraries have increasingly developed into service providers for their customers, in addition to their roles as collectors and curators. Libraries are also responsible for the preservation of scholarly information for its long-term safekeeping.

8.1.4 Funding agencies

Institutions that fund research are another important actor in scholarly communications. They are chiefly financed by the government but sometimes also by private funds. Their role is to fund the research activities of scholars and universities and fund academic libraries that purchase scholarly publications. The incentive for public authorities to finance scholarship, directly or through universities, lies in the fact that scholarship fosters economic and scientific growth and public knowledge in general. Funding agencies basically provide money for research and receive publicly available knowledge in the form of published publications in return. Thus, they are also very interested in the archiving of scholarly content. In rewarding scholars and institutions with research grants or job contracts, universities and funding agencies use publication track records as a yardstick for scholarly quality. Peer-reviewed scientific publications therefore play a key role in the allocation of research funds. The chances of receiving funding increase as scholars and academic institutions show an increasingly impressive publication list. Universities are also interested in creating and branding research environments by establishing university presses, which they (often partly) fund to publish relevant scholarly output, mostly but not exclusively in the fields that are most important to their institutions. Their motives are diverse: the ability to select the best academic works for publishing, to stimulate scientific development and to brand their university's products. In some exceptional cases, a university press can be a source of profit for a university.