UUK OA Monograph group

Meeting: 1

Practical Information
Wednesday 15th February 2017
2.30pm – 4.30pm
Room: Mendel 2
Wellcome Trust, Gibbs Building, 215 Euston Road, Kings Cross, London, NW1 2BE

Group Information
Chair: Shearer West (University of Sheffield)
Secretariat: Helen Snaith (HEFCE)

Attendees:

Allison McCaig	ARMA
Alison Jones	OUP
Chris Banks	Imperial College, London
David Prosser	Research Libraries UK
Eelco Ferwerda	OAPEN
Graham Stone	Jisc
Hannah Hope	Wellcome Trust
Helen Snaith	HEFCE
Janneke Adema	Coventry University
Kitty Inglis	SCONUL
Michael Jubb	Independent Consultant
Maja Maricevic	British Library
Martin Eve	Open Library of Humanities (OLH)
Nicola Ramsey	Edinburgh University Press
Nigel Vincent	British Academy
Roger Kain	School of Advanced Study
Ros Pyne	Springer/Nature
Rupert Gatti	Open Book Publishers (OBP)
Shearer West	University of Sheffield
Susan Bruce	Arts and Humanities Alliance

Apologies: Lara Speicher (UCL), Mark Llewellyn (AHRC)

AGENDA

Arrivals/ refreshments

1. Chair's welcome, apologies and introductions   (CHAIR)
2. OA Monograph landscape   (SECRETARIAT)
3. Discussion of collated responses   (ALL)
    a. What at the key barriers of OA monographs?
    b. What do stakeholders expect from a transition to OA monographs, and how might they seek to approach this transition?
    c. What are the characteristics of monographs that should be retained in any new system?
    d. What does the optimal future of the monograph look like?

Date of next meeting: Thursday 29 June, 2.30pm – 4.30pm.

Universities UK Open Access Monograph subgroup
Meeting 1: Wednesday 15th February 2017, 2.30pm – 4.30pm

In attendance: Shearer West (Chair); Janneke Adema; Chris Banks; Susan Bruce; Martin Eve; Eelco Ferwerda; Rupert Gatti; Hannah Hope; Kitty Inglis; Roger Kain; Alison Jones; Michael Jubb; Maja Maricevic; Allison McCaig; David Prosser; Ros Pyne; Nicola Ramsey; Helen Snaith (Secretariat); Graham Stone; Nigel Vincent.

Apologies: Lara Speicher (UCL), Mark Llewellyn (AHRC).

1. **Chair's welcome, apologies and introductions**

The Chair welcomed the group to the first Universities UK Open Access Monograph group. Apologies were received from Lara Speicher and Mark Llewellyn. The Chair noted that Professor Geoffrey Crossick will be acting as one of the consultants to the group. The two other consultants for the OA Monograph group are Eelco Ferwerda and Michael Jubb. Consultants are not required to attend the OA monograph meetings.

The Chair provided a brief background to the formation of the group. In 2011-12 the representative Finch group development recommendations to the UK Government on UK open access policy. Following this, the UUK OA Coordination Group (UUKOACG) was formed in 2014 to monitor the development and implementation of UK OA policies. The group is chaired by Professor Adam Tickell. Professor Tickell was requested (in a personal capacity) to provide a summary of progress of OA in the UK. In February 2016 he published the independent report 'Open Access to Research Publications'. The report recommends that there are four subgroups of OA that need developing. These are: Efficiencies; Monographs; Repositories; Service Standards. The Efficiencies group has met twice so far, and is due to meet again in May. The Repositories subgroup met for the first time on Friday 10 February. The Service Standards group have yet to meet.

The Chair noted that the Terms of Reference for the OA Monograph subgroup were agreed by the UUK OA Coordination group in December 2016. The Chair invited members of the group to propose any amendments to the ToR. It was noted that the group would need appropriate resources in order to carry out its aims and objectives as laid out in the ToR. Item 5.4 of the ToR notes that any budget required by the group will be taken to the central UUK OA group alongside a business case. The Chair commented that the group may not be able to action all objectives, but the breadth of the ToR will give the group a range of activities to consider.

2. Overview of OA landscape and OA Monograph activities

The secretariat provided an overview of the current OA landscape and OA monograph activities (Annex A). The overview of the OA landscape was put together by Neil Jacobs (Jisc) for the first OA Efficiencies group and it highlights the main stakeholders of OA. The secretariat invited members of the OA Monograph group to comment on the Powerpoint slide and to note any other groups of interest. Members highlighted: National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) groups in the States; Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (Mellon funded projects in OA are still ongoing); OA Scholarly Association (publisher's group). The group noted that we need to be aware of work being carried out in Europe and writing in languages other than English.

The group also discussed publications and activities specific to OA monographs. Members noted that the following items should be added to the list:

- Lever Press (US). Funded by a consortium of liberal arts college libraries, the Lever Press identifies the type of divide between monographs on OA digitised vs. the OA monograph that is made available in print.
- Library Coalition Directory (LCD) provides the most comprehensive list of libraries that offer publishing presses.[1] We should be aware of OA monographs that are being published under alternative models e.g. publishing by libraries (especially in the States). These library presses are logically distinct from University-led presses. Library presses are often encouraged to become New University Presses. Some traditional presses (e.g. MUP, EUP) list themselves in the LCD as publishers, rather than University Presses. One of the drivers for the University-led presses is much to do with the REF requirements.
- Academic Book Week. The Academic Book of the Future Project report will be published in March. This will cover a vast range of issues including open access, and highlights issues of the future of books that feed into OA. The report will be launched at an event held at the Wellcome Trust in May.
- London Book Fair: An event with the broadest definition of publishing that explores new business models.

ACTION: The secretariat will update the OA landscape and OA monograph slides and circulate amongst the group.

3. Group Discussion

The group were sent four questions related to OA monographs to respond to before the meeting. These questions were:

a. What at the key barriers of OA monographs?

b. What do stakeholders expect from a transition to OA monographs, and how might they seek to approach this transition?

c. What are the characteristics of monographs that should be retained in any new system?

d. What does the optimal future of the monograph look like?

Responses to these questions have been collated and circulated to the group to reflect upon. The Chair noted that HEFCE have signalled their intention to mandate OA monographs in the REF. The Crossick report highlighted a number of issues that will make this more difficult to achieve than OA journals. The Chair noted issues around various business models, licensing and third party rights, as well as cultural issues, e.g. what is the academic understanding of how OA monographs are produced? The Chair requested that members of the group consider one or two activities that would help with the transition to OA monographs. Responses are detailed below.

For the purposes of clarity this next section will reflect the minutes of the meeting in a thematic approach in order to capture the main points of discussion.

Business models

The group noted that open access has a significant part to play in the future of the monograph. However, the monograph market is increasingly diverse, and there are a range of complex issues in making monographs open access. As highlighted in the Crossick report (2015) any transition to OA must ensure that business models are acceptable to academics 'both as authors and of users of monographs.'[2] Furthermore, Annex C of the HEFCE REF Consultation document (2016) also notes that 'There will be legitimate reasons why some monographs cannot be open access, and we will be flexible about the proportion of monographs submitted to a future exercise that will be expected to meet open-access requirements.'[3]

---

[1] The 2017 LCD is available to view here:
https://www.librarypublishing.org/resources/directory/lpd2017
[2] Geoffrey Crossick (January 2015) 'Monographs and Open Access: A report to HEFCE'.
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/year/2015/monographs/

There is more innovation in the OA monograph landscape than in the journal landscape and this is demonstrated through the number of trials of business models, for example, Knowledge Unlatched. Under the Knowledge Unlatched model academics still get to publish with 'big name' legacy publishers that have registered with the programme. However, Knowledge Unlatched is not without its problems. As a relatively new business model there is not yet enough data to give broader assurance that this is a model worth pursuing. If there was enough choice of content in these schemes then this may be more scalable. It also has no pressure and will take an average price point. The model operates for legacy publishers and may not encourage innovation and new initiatives; instead it embeds the status quo in the publishing environment. The group should consider their approach to new business models: do we wait and watch and gather data and encourage the business models that are innovative? How do we do this? These approaches should also be considered on an international level.

The model for Knowledge Unlatched has proven that membership schemes work, and demonstrates that there is a supply side for OA monographs. It is on the demand side (libraries) that need further organising. As a model that works on scale, libraries should consider how they can support new business models: for example, Knowledge Unlatched has doubled the number of books on its subscription, although it is still not able to meet publisher fees. This may indicate that the model needs scaling up and needs more commitment from libraries. However, some librarians receive a lot of interest from OA ventures looking for assistance and it would be useful to have appropriate processes to deal with the decision-making at an institutional level.

The group acknowledged that it was difficult for existing publishers to experiment with new business models. Traditional presses are more risk adverse, although this leaves new University presses more exposed to risk. The Oxford Scholarship Online model does appear to be new and innovative, and they are starting to get some data from this which can inform strategy down the line. R&D is seen as fundamental to growth. There is a need for an R&D arm and this is very much absent from the publishing world.

From a Jisc perspective, we need to improve the routes to market discoverability. There is a two pronged approach to this: firstly to get OA monographs into the same space as print (i.e. being able to easily access them via a dedicated catalogue such as DOAB);

3 HEFCE (December 2016) 'Consultation on the second Research Excellence Framework'.
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/2016/201636/HEFCE2016_36.pdf

secondly, to introduce a membership scheme for OA monograph publishers. This should be integrated into library budgets.

Work carried out by other stakeholders:

The issues around the scaling of new business models is something that will be assessed by the Jisc collection deal over the next 12-18 months.

There is an appetite for the community to do more work on OA business models. SCONUL, RLUK and JISC may be able to carry out more work to understand the landscape.

Secretariat post-meeting comment: Eelco Ferwerda's 2014 paper 'Open access monograph business models' also provides a summary of some of the key models in OA.[4]

Action from the Chair:

There is currently no direct action to take at this time. However, information on OA business models may feed into other actions undertaken by the group.

Funding

To transition to open access we need more funding opportunities for OA monographs. The current lack of funding opportunities pose an issue for authors who wish to make their monographs OA. The lack of grants available is also an issue for publishers who wish to make authors' work OA. Books are already being paid for – how can we organise this funding to help monographs become a part of the open access space? There have been a number of studies which have attempted to find a cost for OA monographs, and the issue has been discussed extensively. Previous estimates have varied in method, from estimating direct costs of publishing a digital monograph, to cost-plus studies which account for overheads and other resources (for example, staff time). Costs for OA monographs are varied, ranging from £3,500 - £5000 (Open Book Publishers); £6,500 (plus extra costs for additional words, Cambridge UP); £5,900 - £7,700 (Manchester University Press)[5]; up to £9,340 (Ubiquity Press); £11,000 (Palgrave); with the Mellon-

---

[4] Ferwerda, E., (2014). Open access monograph business models. *Insights.* 27, pp. 35-38. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.46

[5] This figure was correct at the time of the meeting in February 2017. MUP OA monograph costs are now £9850 (+VAT 20% UK).

Ithaka Study put the cost at $15,140 - $129,909 per book.[6] Depending very much on the service provided, the nature of the book, and the means of availability, the costs of open access publishing can vary a great deal. There can be significant cost to funders and institutions in the publication of OA monographs, and we should not lose sight of this.

The group noted that the funding issue still hasn't been resolved for journal articles, and asking individual funders/ universities/ authors to meet the costs of OA is not sustainable. We need to reconsider our approach: if the government and funders want the sector to truly go OA, then they must put in place funding regimes to cover the cost. This does not involve pushing money towards publishers, but rather to give them to confidence to invest in open access if it were to become a larger part of the publishing landscape. We should not forget scale: open access publishers cover a small portion of publishers, and data from the last REF shows that over 1000 publishers were submitted to panel D alone.

The group discussed what a better funding model may look like and proposed that libraries could come together to distribute budgets differently. One idea put forward involved HEIs redistributing library budgets. For example, if universities requested a 10% change in their budget and diverted this to OA monographs then this could signal a change in the right direction. Alternatively HEIs could ring fence spending on monographs as long as they demonstrate a transition to OA. **Funding needs to be freed up and a reconfiguration of budgets allowed in order to make the transition to OA**.

The group also discussed the possibility of stripping back publisher functions. For example, authors that produce a long-form output submit their work to a publisher who then completes a set of functions (e.g. marketing, typesetting). Are all of these processes required? For specialist and limited audiences some publisher functions may be stripped down. However, the type of output should be considered when making this decision, and this may not work for crossover or trade books (who also need physical copies for dissemination). In addition to this, a move away from publishing with a legacy publisher to a researcher's own website *only*, seems a jump too far away from prestige.

Work carried out by other stakeholders:
The following studies have looked at how much a monograph costs to produce as part of a wider analysis on monographs:

---

[6] See: http://osc.cam.ac.uk/modern-monographs/open-access-and-monographs/oa-monograph-costs and http://www.sr.ithaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/SR_Report_Costs_Publishing_Monographs020516.pdf

1. Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. 'The costs of publishing monographs: toward a transparent methodology' (2016). Value the cost monographs at $39,892 (inclusive of press-level overheads). To note: multi-volume sets of books are counted as a single item in the study, possibly in order to drive up the cos of 'production'.
2. OAPEN-NL study.[7] Results from the OAPEN Netherlands study estimated that costs of a monograph is around 12,000 Euros.
3. The OAPEN-UK study[8] sets out the challenges of pricing OA books (p. 51).
4. Martin Eve's blog provides figures for running a small scholarly publisher (www.martineve.com); Rupert Gatti's (OBP) blog http://blogs.openbookpublishers.com/ and Gary Hall's (OHP) blogpost: http://www.garyhall.info/journal/2015/6/13/open-humanities-press-funding-and-organisation.html

Secretariat post-meeting comment: Eelco Ferwerda's 2014 paper 'Open access monograph business models' also provides a summary of publisher costs for OA monographs.[9]

Actions from the Chair:

The OA Monograph subgroup may wish to put forward a recommendation to the UUK OA Coordination group that centres on 'freeing up' library budgets to invest in the transition to OA monographs. However, this redistribution of library budgets would be over a transitionary period. We would expect to see a shift in budgets say, over a 5-10 ear period, rather than implement an immediate change. A gradual redistribution of funding demonstrates institutional commitment to OA. The group may wish to consider:

1. What might recommendations for a transition look like (e.g. time scales, percentage of funding reallocated)?
2. What might an acceptable 'redistribution' towards OA monographs include (e.g. funding researchers to go OA, subscribing to OA models)

Education and communication

Promotion and esteem within universities come from *where* texts are published. There is a need to address this issue at a senior level within HEIs, possibly through a charter or a contract of OA. There is a lot of impetus to get universities to sign up to Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), although this is more science focused. DORA stipulates

---

[7] http://hybridpublishing.org/2013/12/what-are-the-costs-of-an-open-access-monograph/

[8] http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/?s=&search_404=1

[9] Ferwerda, E., (2014). Open access monograph business models. *Insights*. 27, pp. 35-38. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.46

that we should look at the quality of research in recruitment and promotions, rather than the vehicle. The ethos and culture of the academic community needs to change and no one individual can do this. We need to have institutional support in the transition to OA and UUK can take a leadership role in order to make this change. Cultural changes in academia are some of the slowest changes to achieve, although the REF after next has the potential to be a big impetus in the transition to OA monographs. Any final policy adopted by HEFCE in relation to OA monographs will be subject to consultation.

The sector needs to encourage both younger and established researchers to publish open access, and there is a certain degree of role-modelling that needs to take place here. There seems to be a lot of author resistance and a lack of understanding around OA monographs, and this feeds through to ECRs from senior academics. To note: when educating and delivering messages on OA monographs we need to ensure consistency of expression in policy. This should be made easier by the transition across to UKRI, but this is a pain point currently experienced by HEIs in the transition to OA journals.

OA publishing needs insurgence and new models alongside routes from legacy publishers. Supporting both routes is the way forward. There seems to be a misconception around publishing OA monographs that is EITHER a digital version OR a physical copy, and that both cannot exist alongside one another. As a community we have been poor at confirming key messages surrounding this issue. No one has said that it is OA only BUT this seems to be the message that researchers are interpreting. As a sector, we need to drive forward the fact that physical and digital can co-exist in the same capacity. We also need to ensure that false rumours around OA (e.g. that it does not involve a peer review process) are stopped in their early stages.

There is a perception that if you publish open access that reputation is at stake. Young scholars should be reassured of their publication choices and should be made more aware of what OA is/ what it entails. When people are thinking about where to publish, they should take this into consideration automatically. There needs to be an increased awareness and education of OA. Researchers may also be hesitant in discussing OA with their publishers. Moving into legacy publishing space gives academics the confidence in open access, although we need to find a way of enhancing the reputation of new publishers to young scholars can go there. LangSciPress are a successful example of this. This is a scholar-led press that has been set up by a community-driven enterprise that bridges the cultural barrier of prestige.

We need to remember the definition of a monograph: a long-form argument demonstrating academic rigour that has undergone a peer review process. The monograph is not a harmonious format and may also include scholarly, crossover books, or edited volumes. There is nothing in the definition of a monograph that stipulates that it must be in print form. It is important to set out objectives of the scholarship from the vehicle in which they are presented. This alters the ability of any academic to look at innovation. We also need to define what successful dissemination means: we have the capabilities at this stage of getting the larger figures out to the academic community in order to inform and shape opinions. It would be useful to have detailed metrics around the dissemination of monographs, and print vs. OA (see section on 'Data and Information') and whether or not OA drives hard sales. When defining successful dissemination we should consider how this varies between disciplines e.g. historical crossover books. We need to consider how different disciplines work and how they want their work to be disseminated.

The group may wish to consider some crossover with the Repositories OA group in its activities, specifically in relation to authors requesting that monograph chapters be made open access. The readership of chapters may help reverse the esteem with which monograph publishing is held.

Work carried out by other stakeholders: LangSciPress is a good example of a successful, new publishing press that have a good reputation in the OA landscape. Others include Open Humanities Press, Open Book Publishers, Punctum Books, Meson press, Mattering Press.

Actions from the Chair. In order to drive forward cultural changes the OA Monograph group may consider:
1. Recommending that the UUK OA Coordination group put forward a concordat that all VCs sign on how digital outputs are viewed in the recruitment and promotion process.
2. Fostering a dialogue with academics (in particular senior leaders) on the benefits and the impediments of OA. The Chair has indicated that AHA can play a strong role in this action.

Data and information

There are currently few comprehensive sets of data that tells us how many monographs or academic books were published last year. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation published the report 'Monograph Output of American Presses, 2009-2013' (February

2017) although their research is restricted to members of the Association of American University Presses [10]. It would be useful to find out this information, alongside data of how many of these monographs published were OA. Making this kind of information public will help the case of open access as it highlights impact and engagement. However, the group notes that metrics is not typically a big driver of academic behaviour in the Arts and Humanities, and other engagement strategies still need to be considered. Academic culture change is key to driving OA monographs forward.

The Oxford Scholarship Online provides an online library of over 13,000 academic books from OUP. It would be useful for the group to understand how many people are reading these books online, (with a definition of readers – does this mean downloads/visits?) However, this the OSO may be used as a stat portal, and we need to understand the impact of this data beyond its use of compliance stats. We need to have useful metrics and real figures in order to change perceptions. If, for example, we were to compare sales and downloads and counter compliance stats, then we may start to get a more accurate picture of the OA landscape. It would also be useful to have information on where downloads/sales have taken place in order to understand how OA can reach a whole new audience that doesn't happen with physical print copies.

The group recognised that university libraries are the biggest market for publishers, although it is difficult to measure usage. Some libraries ask students not to shelve books so they can be counted, although this is not consistent across HEIs.

We should consider lessons learnt from the transition of journals to open access. OA increases citations and journal impact factor goes up: this is something that can be measured[11]. Although the half-life of a monograph is considerably longer than a journal we may wish to consider developing a methodology for these measurements now. We have a unique identified (an ISBN), so can we use this to understand how many volumes are accessed/ read in libraries.

More broadly, when learning from the transition to OA journals, we need to ensure that we are inspiring public access and ensuring a high level of discoverability: this needs to be amongst the public, not just the scholarly community. Things can be open, but not accessible.

---

[10] https://3spxpi1radr22mzge33bla91-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Monograph-Output-of-University-Presses.pdf
[11] https://www.nature.com/press_releases/ncomms-report2014.pdf, http://figshare.com/authors/Nature_Communications/598818

Work carried out by other stakeholders:

Mellon Foundation 'Monograph Output of American University Presses 2009-2013' (February 2017)

Altmetrics Badges for Books https://www.altmetric.com/products/books/

'Investigating OA Monograph services' (2014), published by Jisc also refers to the OPERAS consortium developing an altmetric H2020 project 'which aims to develop a number of central services to be implemented across different platforms for OA books'. https://www.jisc-collections.ac.uk/Global/Investigating%20OA%20Monograph%20Services/Jisc-OAPEN%20pilot%20Final%20report.pdf

Actions from the Chair: There is a great deal of work that has already been carried out on OA that the group should be careful not to duplicate. Instead, the group should focus on collating the available literature and survey outcomes in order to draw together relevant information that can be used to educate and inform the sector. Metrics (and altmetrics) will be used alongside a 'softer' approach in order to disseminate key messages around OA monographs.

Dealing with third party rights

Third party rights is not purely an OA issue, it is also an issue of being able to move content online – we are not going to be able to solve this. However, if all the stakeholders in the room were to agree that a licence-free approach for education/academic research books, then this would be a step in the right direction. Universities are currently bring art, library and museum collections together in one location, and we need these stakeholders to communicate with one another in order to make progress in this area.

Action from the Chair: There are currently no actions from the Chair at this time.

Next steps:

Minutes will be circulated to the group. The Chair will consider the outcomes of the group discussion and make a decision on what key activities the group should carry out.

Forthcoming publications/events

May 2017 – Academic Book of the Future publication launch at the Wellcome Trust.

June 2017 – RG project with Michigan Press (usage and e-book supply chain).

Date of next meeting: Thursday 29 June, 2.30pm – 4.30pm, UUK Woburn House, Tavistock Square, London

Ref	Theme	Action	Owner(s)	Status
103	Funding	Produce a discussion paper proposing how best to approach a transition in HEI library budgets towards OA monographs.	Martin Eve (OLH)	Ongoing
104	Education and communication	Propose recommendations to take forward to the UUK OA Coordination outlining an (optional) agreement committing universities to assess OA monographs on their own merits in funding, appointment, and promotion considerations.	Roger Kain (SAS)	Ongoing
105	Education and communication	Foster a dialogue about the benefits of and impediments to OA monographs in the HE sector	Susan Bruce (AHA)	Ongoing
106	Data and information	Conduct a 'fact-finding' exercise on what work has currently been carried out on OA (including metrics and alt-metrics). Use this to inform action point 105. Data required should be identified at action point 105 first.	TBC.	Ongoing

UUK OA Monograph subgroup
Wellcome Trust
Wednesday 15 February 2017
2.30pm – 4.30pm

Chair: Professor Shearer West
Secretariat: Helen Snaith

Groups convened by:

University leaders	University professionals	Funders	Publishers	Jisc / consortia	

University leaders

EUA Research Policy Working Group
Advisory body appointed by and reporting to the EUA Council
Members are Rectors across Europe

EUA 'High-Level Group on Big Deal Negotiations with Publishers'
High-level leaders engaged in negotiating "big deals" with publishers on behalf of universities

University professionals

(LIBER Open Access Working Group)
Licensing; negotiation, repositories, promote policies

ESAC Initiative
Pursues the developement of agreed service standards around Gold Open Access charges

Funders

National Endowment for the Humanities (US)

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

ScienceEurope working group: Open Access to Scientific Publications

Publishers

Note that commercial publishers are highly restricted by competition law in what they can discuss and agree collectively.

STM Board / subcommittees

OA Scholarly Association (OASPA)

Jisc / consortia

ICOLC
Library consortia - discussion on issues of common interest

Knowledge Exchange OA working group
sharing knowledge, planning collaboratively and focusing on joint development
Members are UK (Jisc), Da, De, Fi and NL

Universities UK OA Coordination Group
OA coordination, focus, monitor

UUK OA subgroup on efficiencies

(UUK OA subgroup on monographs)

(UUK OA subgroup on journal service standards)

(UUK OA subgroup on repositories)

RLUK shaping ethical and effective publishing
publishing academic journals fairer and more effective

RLUK Open Access Publisher Processes Group
share information about the issues and challenges, with members, Jisc and publishers

SCONUL Content Strategy Group
leads on SCONUL's campaign on the cost of content

UK Council of Research Repositories
Professional network

ARMA OA special interest group

RCUK Research Outputs Network
Internal group coordinating RCUK approaches to research outputs

RCUK OA practitioner group
Advising RCs on implementation of RCUK OA policy

Publishers Association Academic, Professional and Learned Publishers Council

Crossref and CHORUS Boards, etc

Radical Open Access Collective
Collective of academic-led book publishers

Jisc Collections Content Strategy Group
Advice to Jisc Collections

Jisc OA stakeholder group
Advice to Jisc on OA work
Members are RLUK, SCONUL, ARMA and UKCoRR

Jisc OA Policies and Services Advisory Group
Steer work on OA policy expression / services
Members are RCs, Wellcome, HEFCE, SCONUL, ARMA, UKCoRR Publishers Assn, ALPSP

Other

(UKSG) working group on metadata best practices
Considering industry best practice for publishers wrt to OA policies

Previous/ongoing projects specific to OA Monographs

Funders	Jisc	OAPEN	Other	Examples of alternative models	
Monographs and Open Access Geoffrey Crossick (HEFCE)	The National Monograph Strategy	OAPEN-UK (funded by Jisc and the AHRC)	Library Coalition Directory (LCD)	OAPEN	Knowledge Unlatched
Academic Book of the Future (AHRC)	The National Bibliographic Knowledgebase	OAPEN Researcher Survey	London Book Fair	Open Library of Humanities (OLH)	Open Book Publishers (OPB)
The Monograph Challenge Nigel Vincent (BA)	Investigating open access monograph services	OAPEN guide to OA Monograph Publishing Ellen Collins, Caren Milloy and Graham Stone	Shared print and storage study (HEFCE/UKRR/RLUK/BL/Jisc SCONUL)	Lever Press	LangSciPress
Academic Book Week	A landscape study on OA monographs (led by Jisc)			University-led presses	
	Benchmarking New University Presses Graham Stone and Janneke Adema				