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1. Attendees:

- Tracey Clarke, University of Sheffield
- David Clay, University of Salford
- Richard Wake, University of Southampton
- Ann Betterton, Sheffield Hallam University
- Sue Geale, University of Hull
- Neil Smyth, University of Nottingham
- Patricia Killiard, Cambridge University
- Sarah Molloy, Queen Mary University
- Bethan Adams, University of Hertfordshire
- Gary Hall, Coventry University
- Jane Housham, University of Hertfordshire Press
- John Normansell, Manchester University Press
- Lara Speicher, UCL Press
- Cecy Marden, Wellcome Trust
- Brian Hole, Ubiquity Press
- Diana Beech, Research Information Network

and:

- Roger Tritton, Jisc Collections
- David Ball, David Ball Consulting
- Eelco Ferwerda, OAPEN Foundation
- Lotte Kruijt, OAPEN Foundation
2. Agenda:

**Introduction**
1100-1110 Arrival and tea/coffee
1110-1120 Introduction to project (R Tritton)
1120-1150 Presentation of current services provided by OAPEN and of other central OA services currently available (E Ferwerda, based on overview document circulated).

1150-1300 **Develop use cases for centralised services**
Develop and discuss use case for centralised services. Breakout sessions with a focus on four main areas:
- Quality assurance
- Aggregation, deposit, preservation of OA publications
- Discovery and dissemination
- Reporting: OA policies, usage, impact
Led by David Ball.

1300-1400 **Lunch**

1400-1530 **Determine focus for pilot**
Breakout sessions to describe and discuss potential:
- Scope for service(s)
- Success criteria
- Metrics to measure demand
- Wider context:
  - Dependencies, partnerships, requirements
  - Perceived value
  - Other potential services

1530-1600 **Lessons learned and next steps**
3. Introduction to project (Roger Tritton) - presentation summary

Roger Tritton (RT) welcomes the workshop’s attendees and thanks them for taking the time. He introduces himself and those responsible for the project (Eelco Ferwerda, David Ball and Lotte Kruijt)

After this introduction, RT says a word about some current Jisc projects:

- OAPEN-UK: going since 2010, goal is to create base of evidence about perceptions of monographs, challenges of developing OA monographs, and business models for open access monographs.
- Institution as eTextbook Publisher: Goal of this project is to test out the potential for HE institutions to become publishers of eTextbooks. And to see whether there is potential for HE institutions as creator of textbooks to support libraries (and therefore students) in more extensive access to high quality and relevant textbooks than is the case now.
- National Monograph Strategy: This has been a 6-month project in which Jisc is working with UK academic institutions (and with RLUK and SCONUL) to identify what key priorities exist for more effective collection, preservation, supply and digitisation of monographs – and to identify ways in which a national approach to any of these questions might be useful. The National Monograph Strategy is now moving into a new prototyping and piloting phase.

After mentioning these three on-going projects, RT introduces today’s centralised services project:

Goals:
- To identify what are most essential activities for management of OA monographs
- To identify those elements of OA monograph publishing for which having a centralised service to deliver might be useful
- To ensure they can be made available to stakeholders in the scholarly communications process as comprehensively and effectively as possible
- To create a core set of use cases that we can use to guide the project as potential services are specified

We expect to focus on some specific areas in which services might be relevant:
- quality
- aggregation and deposit
- preservation / dissemination and discovery
- reporting
RT stresses that - should other areas where services of value could be developed emerge - we will be keen to capture those too. After this session, the intention is to go forward to:

- validate services seen as most useful
- build pilots to test specification points
- develop business models for potential new services
- identify technical and organisational aspects of developments

This will result in a final report by next summer. The services that are specified should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, and Relevant.

After RT’s introducing presentation, all attendees briefly introduce themselves and describe their interest in the management of OA monographs.
4. Presentation of current services provided by OAPEN and of other central OA services currently available (Eelco Ferwerda)

After a brief introduction of OAPEN, Eelco Ferwerda (EF) lists OAPEN’s services. The main service is the deposit service. Its central aims are:

- Support research funders’ and institutional policies for OA monographs
- Provide a central infrastructure for services in the areas of dissemination, quality assurance and digital preservation
- Become the central, trusted repository for OA monographs
- Aggregate OA monographs from publishers
- Help establish and maintain standards and requirements for the effective publication, discovery, access, dissemination, and preservation of OA books

And the central benefits:

- Integrate OA books in existing supply chains for monographs
- Improve supply chain where possible:
  - Access to publications
  - Usage
  - Quality assurance

OAPENs Deposit service consists of the following components:

- Aggregation, hosting
- Dissemination, discovery
- Quality assurance
- Metadata creation and enhancement
- Metadata feeds for libraries (with OCLC, etc.)
- Usage reporting (with IRUS-UK)
- Digital preservation (with CLOCKSS, etc.)
- Management reporting (usage, grants, compliance)

Borrowing from A. Swan, EF lists existing services for OA books, including:

- Publishing platforms (OpenEdition)
- Publishing services and software (OMP)
- Funding agency (KU)
- Preservation services (CLOCKSS, Portico)
- Discovery services, directories (DOAB)
- Registries (ROAR, Sherpa RoMEO / Juliet)
- Quality assurance / standards (OAPEN, DOAB)
- Search services (BASE)
- Advocacy (SPARC)
• Deposit services (OAPEN)
• Subject repositories (arXiv, EuropePMC)
• Usage and impact services (Google Analytics, IRUS-UK)
• Metadata creation and enhancement (OAPEN)

Swan also identified various service gaps:
  Social impact
  Compliance monitoring
  Monitoring and harvesting funded research output
  Tagging OA content
  Citation analysis, impacts
  APC agency services
5. Develop use cases for centralised services

In this part of the workshop, led by David Ball, the attendees break out in four small groups to develop use cases for centralised services. Each group is assigned to one service, and develops a use case of this service for each actor. Each use case is structured by the following format, taking the researcher as an example:

- **Someone**
  - Researcher
- **Wants something**
  - To find a high impact publisher
- **For a reason**
  - To maximise dissemination
- **But faces challenges**
  - Finding and evaluating publishers
- **Possible solutions (without OAPEN)**
  - Visit publishers’ websites, ask colleagues...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Funders</th>
<th>University Publishers</th>
<th>Repository/Library Managers</th>
<th>Research Managers/Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery/dissemination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number in the grid above refers to the elaboration of the use case below:

1. **Funder – quality assurance**

This group explains that the solution is to give more money to supporting institutions (national and international), instead of spending it on centralised services. The funder’s focus should be on publishing research that is supported by its organisation. Important issues in this regard:

- Academic rigour
• Faster publication
• Promotion of aims of funder
• Reliability / security of publisher used

2. Funder – aggregation etc.
• Wants to:
  o assess return on investment
  o check compliance
  o increase value / ROI / impact
    ▪ reuse
    ▪ collaboration
• Why: best use of funds
• Challenges: comes down to problems finding information:
  o lack of author acknowledgement of funding
  o lack of metrics
    ▪ usage and impact
  o poor metadata from publishers
  o lack of metadata from publishers
  o lack of standard for metadata exchange
  o community collaboration required
• Solutions: this basically comes down to establishing standards:
  o FundRef
  o DOIs
  o metadata standards
    ▪ MARC etc.
  o Machine readability
  o RDF / XML etc.

3. Funder – discovery/dissemination
• Wants to find the publications (monographs) that were funded and identify those which are OA
• Because funders want to monitor compliance
• Difficult – no way to find all the monographs
• Solution: tag metadata with funder information and OA status (to NISO standards) and gather it together

4. Funder – reporting
• Wants: reports to show what they funded was worthwhile; auditing and accounting for public money
• Reason: fair return on investment
• Challenges: quantifying (e.g. staff time); creating new tools
• Solutions: finding standardised reporting mechanisms

Following on this use case, one of the attendees (Gary Hall) says we should ask ourselves why we want standardisation. Responses included that this is because we need an agreed language; for example in auditing expenditure of public money.

5. University publishers – quality assurance
This group discussed the importance of centralisation, or decentralisation, of services. Issues raised included:
• Peer review process: potential for consortial approach
• Promote research / reputation

6. University publishers – aggregation etc.
• Wants:
  o discoverability
  o a good reputation
  o metrics – use / reuse / impact
  o income
  o preservation
  o validation
• Challenges: basically all comes down to the lack of standards. We should all use the same metrics.
• Other challenges noted included
  o lack of harvesting standards / methods
  o branding
  o institutional inertia
  o lack of aggregators
  o consortium access
  o enabling effective use by different personas (“Is use by you the same as use by me?”)
• Solutions: a solution is to work with existing platforms:
  o DOAB / OAPEN
  o platforms (e.g. OpenEdition, Ubiquity Press)

7. University publishers - discovery / dissemination
• Wants: maximum discoverability and use
• Because: may be difficult to know which platforms to sign up with?
• Difficult: where to get this information and perform comparison
• Solution: transparent information regarding discovery services, guidance on options

8. University publishers – reporting
• Want:
  o show high impact
  o added value
  o royalties
• Reason:
  o to attract authors
  o demonstrate value to institutions
• Challenges:
  o lack of new measurements/metrics
• Solutions:
  o new measures; testing measures
  o advocacy

9. Repository / library managers – quality assurance
The group explains that there are a lot of new entrants to the field. The problem is how to assess the quality of all those new entrants. They say they do not really have an instant solution for this, but important issues are:
• Version control
• Permanence
• Licensing / copyright
• Transparency / quality of peer review

10. Repository / library managers – aggregation etc.
• Want: basically a solution that is easy (simple and accessible)
  o overview of options
  o repository manager: content aggregated
    - with control of data
  o library manager: access to aggregator
• Why:
  o LM: level of service
    - completeness
    - value for money – non duplication of effort
  o RM: maximum dissemination
• Challenges:
  o non-siloed discovery services
  o fragmentation
• permanence
• compatibility
• Solutions: this is all about easy and permanent:
  o DOAB

11. Repository / library managers – discovery / dissemination
• Want: basically open metadata. Currency of metadata: it is really important that metadata is opened up as soon as possible after publication. Other priorities include
  o good enough standards
  o from a single source
• Reason: cost of metadata is a barrier to use
• Difficult: metadata is hidden cost and OA books not always there
• Solution: see ‘want’!

12. Repository / library managers – reporting
• Want: cross-funder standardised reporting
• Reason: efficiency, time saving, reduces confusion
• Challenges: changing, evolving landscape (either centralised or decentralised)
• Solutions: Jisc brokerage (data reuse)

13. Research managers / researchers – quality assurance
We need services addressing QA that are quicker, discoverable and not centralised.
Furthermore:
• Rigorous
• Support submission to the REF
• Speed to publication
• Discoverable / Altmetrics

Challenge of finding a publisher that suits my particular specialism / my publishing needs. Do not expect to find one publisher that meets needs of all authors in all settings.

14. Research managers / researchers – aggregation etc.
• Want:
  o maximum dissemination
  o access to corpus
  o reputation
  o metrics for own work
  o impact (research manager)
  o increase book sales
• Challenges: if the culture changes slowly, the OA field changes slowly as well. And because there are different cultures, it is not possible to have one solution for all.
  o inertia
  o interdisciplinary cultures
  o lack of publisher support
  o funding needed
    ▪ aggregator allows advertising, POD
• Solutions: 'gathering things together':
  o central services: OAPEN, British Library, etc.
  o better integration with:
    ▪ social networks
    ▪ search engines

15. Research managers / researchers – discovery / dissemination
• Want / need: to maximise dissemination
• Reason: be recognised for their research
• Difficult: knowing the publisher is using the infrastructures available in the best way. With new entrants to the field, you hand over control with little knowledge of the publisher.
• Solution:
  o have more info on publisher website
  o being able to find their books in their library catalogue!

16. Research managers / researchers – reporting
• Want
  o wide impact / dissemination
  o good service from publisher
• Reason
  o career progression
  o prestige
• Challenges
  o New or different managers
  o metrics – untried, undeveloped, not widely adopted / understood
  o cultural change
• Solutions: also lie in cultural change:
  o advocacy
  o standardisation
  o case studies
  o tool kits
  o new service provision, e.g. kudos
6. Presenting the results/determining focus

After the presentation of each group’s discussion of the use cases, the workshop organisers tried to capture the results in the following grid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Univ press</th>
<th>Repository manager / library manager</th>
<th>Research manager / researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QA</strong></td>
<td>Want to ensure quality and speed in publication process.</td>
<td>Transparency, version control, permanence, clarity on licensing in place</td>
<td>Rigorous, speedy, measurable, discoverable, accountable publishing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregation, deposit, preservation</strong></td>
<td>Optimise ROI and impact of each book: sourcing metadata; making use of available / standard metadata</td>
<td>Discoverability; building reputation; metrics understood by all; preservation: work with existing platforms</td>
<td>Easy access to all relevant OA books, wherever they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery, dissemination</strong></td>
<td>Finding publications funded by funder and identifying those published as OA: Ensuring metadata is in place</td>
<td>Ensure maximum discovery and use of books, but unclear which service providers do a good job: need transparent information</td>
<td>Metadata is hidden cost: open metadata published asap, including OA identifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting</strong></td>
<td>2 Optimise ROI and impact of each book: sourcing metadata; making use of available / standard metadata and reporting mechanisms</td>
<td>Demonstrate impact and added value to attract authors: develop metrics</td>
<td>Cross-funder standardised reporting – brokerage between funders and libraries to enable standardised reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the discussion of the use case results, participants commented on the grid. From this discussion, a core set of use cases for potential centralised services were identified. See the subsection 7 for this list.
7. Lessons learned and next steps

After discussion of the grid, we drafted a core set of use cases for potential centralised services:

1. Peer review
2. Rigour of publishing process – transparency/accountable
3. Faster publishing process
4. Proof of impact
5. Developing/accessing metadata – asap, open
6. Access to research corpus
7. Discoverability (transparent)
8. Preservation, permanently useable
9. Reputation, prestige, promotion
10. Transparency of cost, business model
11. Improved dissemination
12. Clarity of OA status
13. ROI
14. Cross funder reporting
15. Conversation: communication with peers; evidence of re-use

Reflecting on this list, further discussion took place and the following notes were taken:

1. One group elaborated on what they called a ‘Sherpa/Romeo for books’. Cecy Marden was so kind as to email us a list from her team of what information could be included in this service:

   • Peer review process, including speed
   • Licences offered
   • Which formats will be freely available
   • Which discoverability tools are their titles (including OA titles) absorbed by. E.g. Dawsonera
   • Does the publisher provide impact metrics, and to whom?
   • How can the metadata for their titles be harvested/can it be harvested?
   • What preservation system do they use?
   • What is the average cost of publishing OA with them? Do they make this information available on their website?
   • Do they have a data policy?
   • Will they deposit in any repositories, if so, which?
The core issues are: bringing information together, gathering information on licensing. In doing so establishing an overview because, currently, it is hard to get the whole.

2. A service collecting information from publishers; where you can look up publishers. For potential authors to establish what their options are.

3. A place where you can look up platforms and their respective capabilities.

4. A service to create lists of books published via funders (including licenses). Potential to use CrossRef for this purpose. This should list any books, also in print, basically any book with a DOI. It should also be possible to track funded monographs, collecting information about the books. This is a way to measure compliance. Need identified to specify metadata, establish what references / metadata are required, and what is missing.

5. An interesting question is if the book is the right format for the future. Issues that arose included:
   - How do I get my book published?
   - How could we learn from things already happening – sharing information. Transparency around business models is needed.
   - A sustainable future for books needs to be established.
   - We should experiment with different business models – build interactive templates for range of business models?

6. EF asks if we should start with an inventory of projects. GH suggests a roadmap. It is also important to get support from people who do not really know how publishing works. Perhaps through a blog? Or rather in a consulting role? This could be research groups, groups of academics, disciplines, etc. It is most important to get these groups engaged.

7. This concerns points 6, 9, 13 and 14 on the list: We need a means to get funder IDs into metadata. EF notes that CrossMark by CrossRef can record other things about publications, variable metadata travelling along with publication. This could be a starting point.

8. The view was expressed that we want to get to a point where APCs are not charged or where at least they are much cheaper than they are now.

9. The group also touched upon green models for OA monographs. There is a need for intelligence on lengths of embargoes and clarity for authors on different models available.
After this discussion of specific services, RT suggests that we look at a wider context of OA for monographs. What is essential here? This should be rearticulated and specified. Jisc Collections and OAPEN will create very-high-level specifications for potential services – based on this list and the larger themes / ideas / challenges we heard in the meeting; and to consider potential dependencies and partnerships to deliver these. At that point, we would like to share this information with all participants and hear their comments on how well we have interpreted what we heard and the value they see for the services outlined.

The best way to do this is by email to get response from the workshops participants, keep them involved, receiving constant feedback on ideas. We could also introduce other interested parties to the discussion.

At this point EF introduced the issue of the ‘Green road’ in OA monograph publishing in this discussion. Problems regarding the Green road are:
   - Embargos are too long; they should be shorter to make it worthwhile.
   - Contracts for books are different from those for articles.
   - Pre-print manuscripts of monographs have a different status, unlikely to be shared in the same way as pre-print articles.

EF suggests that it is a good time to explore how a green road to OA monographs might work.

After this discussion RT thanks everybody for their attendance and input and promises that we will keep all participants involved by email.