

Open access and learned societies

Rita Gardner

Debating Open Access, published 2013
by the British Academy

- Learned societies are a fundamental part of the research ecology, providing a substantial intellectual, public and reputational good, at minimal cost to the UK public purse.
- Learned societies' 'not-for-profit' work in support of their disciplines is typically funded, in part, from overseas income derived from publishing; their journals also directly contribute to the international standing of UK research.
- Most existing learned society journals in HSS are likely to become hybrid.
- Green OA is likely to be dominant for the HSS disciplines in the current transition framework, for reasons of funding limitations and the more restrictive forms of CC-BY licensing preferred by HSS authors.
- The insistence by RCUK on a policy with short Green OA embargo periods is unsupported by evidence; learned societies must continue to work together to pursue an appropriate balance between access, excellence and sustainability.
- The current dearth of evidence needs to be overcome if societies in HSS are to argue their case(s) more effectively during the transition period.
- Societies increasingly recognize they will need to adapt their publishing and other strategies in the new and uncertain publication environment.

I have been quite deeply involved in the open access 'journey' – as it is described by officials from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and Research Councils UK (RCUK) – for the past two years. My point of departure was the Finch Working Group, where I was one of three representatives from learned societies. As the only society voice from a discipline (Geography) with strong roots in the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS), and in a process that was being driven largely by experience in the Bio and Life Sciences, I found myself akin to how I imagine Livingstone felt crossing Africa – a long way to go, negotiating very many different cultures each with their own language, outlook and agenda, and not a map in sight.

That the multitude of stakeholders represented on the Finch Group¹ managed to reach a consensus after a year of tough negotiations, a compromise that was agreed by all involved and fully endorsed by BIS, is still, I believe, a remarkable achievement. It came at a cost to every sector involved in those negotiations. That it was achieved at all was due to the fact that everyone was able to sign up to two statements that guided the process. The first concerned the three underlying principles that should underpin 'how' to achieve open access in scholarly publishing: access, excellence and sustainability. At no point were they assumed or drafted to be anything other than equal. The second concerned the concept of a 'mixed economy', whereby Gold and Green routes to publishing were both seen as part of the open access landscape for a good time to come. The stated 'preference' for Gold, thus giving immediate access to readers to the published article, was predicated on there being sufficient money in the system to pay for article processing charges (APCs) at rates that were sustainable for publishing businesses, including learned societies' publishing.

For learned societies² in their role as publishers of some of the most long-standing and highly rated international journals, *excellence* underpinned by rigorous peer review was already a given. Most learned society journals were also already offering open access, in various forms and to varying degrees, beyond the published articles that sit behind subscription paywalls. Most leading journals had offered a Gold option for some years; though take-up rates in HSS had been uniformly very low. It was quite common for pre-publication versions of accepted papers to be able to be lodged in institutional repositories; some journals enabled a portion of articles to be placed online with immediate free access; and many were part of philanthropic programmes that enabled free or very low cost access to institutions in the poorer nations of the world. A minority of societies already had full open access journals, supported either as a non-income-generating collective, or operated with commercial publishing partners. In short, many learned societies were already cognisant and engaged in open access.

There are wider debates around how to ensure excellence and quality in the future, and how that relates to highly ranked journals. The Finch

Working Group did not accept, nor do I, that community sourced, post-publication peer review can readily replace traditional pre-publication peer review. The assurance of quality in the article at the time of publication will continue to be essential for those who use the content, whether in business, professional practice, in policy or public realms. There is also little doubt in my mind that the majority of scholars will continue to wish to publish in highly rated journals with well-developed international reputations and rigorous peer review, despite assertions by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) that journal status is irrelevant in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) process.³

I have come across no learned society that does not believe in, and support, open *access* in principle. Equally, I have come across none that do not see *sustainability* as the key principle for the future operation of open access in their context. This is sustainability in two ways; firstly in terms of sustaining the continuity and excellence of their journals which, in many instances, have built international reputations for their disciplines over decades and centuries, and which act as flagships for the standing and status of UK scholarship and academic leadership internationally. It was no surprise, with the recent ESRC/AHRC International Benchmarking Review of Human Geography in the UK, in which the subject was ranked as world leading, to see the international standing of 'British' journals and the range and number of leading journals edited by UK academics, as one of the criteria taken into account.⁴

It is also sustainability in terms of their publishing business models and reasonable expectations of income; neither Green nor Gold comes for free. The Gold model relies on the APC income meeting the full range of publishing costs and enabling profit margins; Green is underpinned by a traditional subscription business model but with papers being made available to all after an agreed embargo period. The greatest risk to the combination of excellence and financial sustainability in publishing therefore lies in insufficient resources to pay for Gold, which could be for any one of a variety of reasons, or Green embargoes that are too short and thus undermine subscriptions, with libraries simply waiting until the material is available for free.

My view is that in HSS the Green route is likely to be the dominant one, both because there is insufficient money in the system to pay for Gold and because there are concerns about the least restrictive CC-BY licence that goes with it owing to the amount of money in the system and the preferences of authors regarding licences. Some 50% of academics returned to the 2008 Research Assessment Exercise were in HSS and yet only about 10% of RCUK funding was awarded to those disciplines; and this is before we take account of the fact that only 30 universities currently qualify to receive open access publishing funds from RCUK. The many calls on QR funding that already exist will probably limit the extent to which institutions will support Gold APCs via that route. Furthermore, from some of the calculations that I have seen, the APC levels that existing leading journals in HSS with high rejection rates and lengthy papers will genuinely need to charge, if they are to remain profitable, most probably price them out of the effective marketplace as full Gold journals. Moreover, authors in receipt of RCUK funds or submitting their articles to REF 2020 and who do not wish to subscribe to CC-BY licences requirements, can choose to publish in the Green route where, under current guidance, more restrictive licences are possible. In a recent JISC-sponsored survey⁵ 79% of academics preferred the CC-BY-NC-ND (non-commercial and non-derivative) licences.

Most learned societies in HSS are likely therefore, in the new open access context, to convert their established journals to hybrid journals, combining Gold and Green routes and still retaining some papers fully behind paywalls. The main income will still arise from institutional subscriptions and this will then enable the journals to offer Gold APC charges at a more affordable and competitive rate. In this scenario the embargo period is critical: short enough to give reasonable open access and long enough not to undermine subscriptions. No one yet knows where this balance in embargo periods lies for HSS, or even if it needs to differ between different disciplines within HSS. We do know that in many instances HSS journals have half-lives for citation and readership of three to four years, or longer, but whether this is a good predictor of embargo lengths for sustainability is an open question. On the other hand, recent studies have shown that 6 month embargoes would definitely undermine subscriptions.⁶ This issue

was recognised in the Finch Report, which identified the need for longer embargoes in HSS, proposing up to 24 months in a transition period and possibly beyond. To many societies this seems a not unreasonable trial embargo period at least until more evidence of impacts has been collected. In the Humanities, in particular, calls for 36 month embargoes persist.

Why does publishing sustainability matter so much to the learned societies? Put simply, they use their publishing income to help support the breadth of their work for the academy. Learned societies taken together across STEM and HSS generate well over a hundred million pounds sterling of income per year from publishing and invest the surpluses from that in supporting UK scholarship and in helping to ensure that UK research has a strong international presence. Thus, learned societies play a key role in the research ecology of the UK, supporting disciplines and their practitioners, advancing and sharing knowledge and, in some cases, engaging schools, policymakers and the wider public beyond the academy. A number also offer professional accreditation to sustain standards in the practice of their disciplines. Their work complements that of other agencies and reaches tens of millions of people each year. The HSS alone has more than 200 learned societies and subject bodies.⁷

Learned societies differ widely in their size and range of activities, from turnovers of less than £100,000 per year and a volunteer workforce, to turnovers of £40m plus with hundreds of staff. Those in HSS (either wholly or in part) tend to be at the lower end of that range, the largest having a turnover of c. £11m per annum and more than 100 paid staff. Income sources include membership subscriptions; publishing; events and activities (e.g. conferences); enterprise activities (e.g. consultancy and room hire); and in some cases, fundraising and legacies. Publishing activities are a significant income source (>30%-65% total gross income) for many learned societies. On average publishing generates around 50% of total gross income for a sample of 53 leading (non-medical) learned societies in the UK; the range being 4.4% to 97.5%.

The majority of the income from journal subscriptions (between 80% and 90% in many cases) comes from overseas subscribing institutions.

So the suggestion made in some of the recent debates that public money in the UK (i.e. university subscriptions to journals) is, and should not be, underpinning learned society activities is pure nonsense. Further, indirect income is also tied to publishing, notably practitioner members who subscribe to societies in order to receive the journals, income from reprints, archived collections or collated themed volumes. The net income generated is reinvested to support learned society activities since the majority are charities and operate on a not-for-profit basis.

In short, learned societies are a key part of the research ecology of the UK and provide a very substantial intellectual, public and reputational good, at the heart of which is support for their discipline and its practitioners in the UK academy. They achieve that with income generated, often in large part, by successful publishing of scholarly journals that earn subscription income mostly from overseas; and in the process they do not place a drain on the UK public purse. Their journals also directly contribute to UK reputation and international standing. Their ability to absorb risk and to invest in new ventures is limited, unlike that of their globalised, commercial publishing partners. Learned societies, with the possible exception of the Royal Society of Chemistry and the Institute of Physics, tend to lack the scale, business acumen, borrowing capacity or cross subsidisation possibilities present in the large commercial publishers. Hence they are more vulnerable to change than the commercial publishers. This is why the principle of sustainability is vital to learned societies and why they have responded with such vigour to the RCUK policy implementation proposals.

Why was there a stand-off? In July 2012, following hot on the heels of the Finch Report publication, RCUK announced its policy and guidance for implementing open access publishing in relation to the research it funds; a policy updated from that introduced in 2005, which had been largely ignored. In a number of key respects the 2012 policy diverged from, and was tougher than, the recommendations in the Finch Report. Unwittingly learned societies suddenly found themselves caught, largely powerless, in the crossfire of a battle between an evangelical RCUK/Wellcome Foundation and the commercial publishers over rising costs and profits;

a battleground informed almost entirely by experience in the Bio and Life sciences, fuelled by changes in digital technology and presented outwardly as an argument about public access to scholarship and public benefit from public expenditure.

At the heart of this battle, for the learned societies, was sustainability and principle: sustainability in terms of Green embargo periods and principle in terms of licensing requirements. The Finch Report had referenced non-commercial licensing (not commercial licensing), RCUK demanded full commercial reuse for Gold published papers and data. RCUK policy was, and still is, uncompromising on demanding embargo periods of one year or less in HSS after a transition phase during which there is more relaxed guidance. Their initial guidance failed to recognise a key Finch Report recommendation that if a journal offered a Gold route and a scholar did not have access to Gold funding, then the journal could implement a longer embargo period of up to 24 months. This was critical for learned society sustainability in publishing in the HSS, as indeed it also was for science, where policy embargoes are 6 months and transition arrangements should have allowed 12 months but did not.

Nine months later, after an inordinate amount of wrangling in public, and two revisions from RCUK in the first quarter of 2013, there is finally RCUK guidance in place for a transition period of five years from April 2013 that is consistent with the Finch Report and BIS endorsement of it. The HEFCE consultation process is ongoing but it has stated that in terms of embargo and licensing it is likely to follow the lead of RCUK.⁸ The fact that it has taken Select Committee inquiries in both the House of Commons⁹ and the Lords¹⁰; innumerable meetings with officials, special advisors and ministers; a considerable advocacy campaign; and more than five conferences (British Academy, Academy of Social Sciences, Society for Biology and the Royal Society, Wiley-Blackwell and the Foundation for Science and Technology) to draw attention to the issues being faced by learned societies and to, effectively, end up back where Finch Report started from, indicates the scale of the problem. The amount of time, energy and effort that has been spent to achieve a position that should never have been in doubt in the first place, is hugely frustrating.¹¹

At best, the last nine months has resulted in a transition policy/guidance that, together with the long lead time in journal production and sales, will probably ensure sustainability of most current journals for five years. It has removed the most contentious elements of RCUK initial guidance, notably reference to market forces and convoluted routes by which researchers were encouraged to seek cheaper Gold journals or Green journals with short (not 24 month) embargo periods if they could not afford their first choice Gold journal. It has clarified the fact that it is the researcher who decides where to publish, and that if APC money is not available to him/her, for whatever reasons, from their institution, they may in Humanities and Social Sciences choose a Green route in a journal with a 24 month embargo period provided that journal also offers a Gold route option. It has also given time and an extended review process over the transition in which to collect evidence of implementation, impact and unintended consequences. The fact that RCUK has already produced its final policy indicates they have a clear end point in mind. Vital for the learned societies will be agreeing and collecting systematically, evidence to help inform any arguments to be made to change that policy.

I am, nevertheless, no clearer as to what are the real motives driving RCUK policy seemingly towards access, excellence and yet potential unsustainability for existing publishers, especially learned societies and perhaps especially in Humanities and Social Sciences. However, without understanding the true underlying motivation, it remains difficult to understand how best to respond. One thing is clear though, RCUK are making every effort to influence other research funders worldwide, through Science Europe and other fora, in favour of their policy with its Gold preference and short Green embargoes. I am not alone in finding this immensely worrying, not least because the rest of the world, where it has stated a preference, seems to be favouring the Green approach. As the Chief Executive of ESRC has said publicly, a very worrying scenario for Humanities and Social Sciences would be a global response to open access that is focused largely on a Green route and with short embargoes (i.e. 12 months or less in Humanities and Social Sciences, and 6 months in other discipline areas). Science Europe has already set out a policy statement, similar to that of RCUK, citing a 12 month maximum Green embargo for

Humanities and Social Sciences¹² journals and changes they would wish to see in hybrid journals, among other points. This reinforces the question – what is the real motivation to pursue such seemingly aggressive and speedy change linked to non-precautionary policymaking?

It is easy to draw a simplistic conclusion that the last nine months was just about money, especially as publishing revenues will have increased significantly in the past ten years or so for most societies. Of course money came into it, but so too did the wider roles of learned society publishing, and the manner in which learned societies in Humanities and Social Sciences felt they were being treated.

Concerns that the learned society sector was not being sensibly consulted, understood or valued by policymakers were keenly felt, as was the failure to welcome, in terms of policy, the fact that ‘one size does not fit all’ in relation to publishing practice, citation and readership. The inexplicably pressured rush to policy formulation and implementation in an uncertain, risky and poorly-evidenced environment, and with little consultation, especially in relation to Humanities and Social Sciences, had no rationale for the societies; and was indeed also questioned in the Lords inquiry. Learned societies also voiced concerns over implications for equity and access for academics, especially in Humanities and Social Sciences, to Gold APC funds, in another of their roles in representing the interests of scholars in their disciplines.

In all, many societies were left reflecting on behaviours that sought to place the UK in a leadership position globally, with associated high financial risks (and possibly reputational gains?) of being ‘out in front’ of the rest of the world, and which gave every appearance of being ideologically driven and unwilling to seek compromises to carry UK stakeholders, especially learned societies, in the process. Many in the Humanities and Social Sciences societies felt unappreciated and dispensable. Undoubtedly the research councils will have different perceptions of this difficult period and of the Humanities and Social Sciences learned societies’ positions.

It is arguably in its indirect effects that the learned societies’ advocacy, across the sciences as well as Humanities and Social Sciences, has been

of greatest importance in the longer term. I believe there is now greater awareness of the issues the societies face and of the influence that the societies can bring to bear from among their contact networks. There is also understanding and support for their cause among university leaders and among the House of Lords. That is not to say, however, that learned societies do not in part bear some responsibility for the tensions between funders, universities and publishers. How many societies have asked that subscription increases year on year be kept to a minimum, or even debated that with their commercial publishing partners? How many have turned down inclusion of their titles in consortia bundles? That said, society journals tend not to be among the most expensive of journals.

Nor can societies afford to be complacent. We have been suddenly catapulted into a high risk environment, especially those for whom publishing revenue is a major source of income. Societies have low risk appetites, as charities, and tend to have little in the way of either financial resilience or trustee / staff expertise in strategic planning for a very different future. So, how do we adjust our activities in the medium term to lower publishing income levels, since this is likely to be the case even if a sustainable future beckons for our journals? How do we garner more income from existing sources or make savings on running costs – increase membership subscriptions, pursue legacies, merge or share services? How do we identify new income sources? If there had been untapped great ideas out there, then the more innovative of the societies would already have been on the case. How do we reduce or spread future risk in our publishing? Societies more than ever need to be attentive to the needs of their authors and reviewers, and to sustain the multiple relationships we have with the academic and practitioner communities through our activities – as volunteers, subscribers, beneficiaries, advisors – in order to retain membership, gift and legacy income.

The current economic environment is not conducive to growth in most of the learned society income sources; the one exception has been the increase in publishing revenues in recent years. In the context of an extended economic downturn, introducing new uncertainty and risk over the very source of income that has been the most resilient and which

is often among the two highest earners (the other being subscriptions) for learned societies is ironic. The best that many can hope is that total income can be sustained at current levels in real terms for the transition period, thus giving some breathing space for planning and evaluation. What will happen in the longer term, as a new equilibrium in publishing evolves, is unpredictable at present since there are simply too many unknowns. Issues over policy in relation to Green embargo lengths and licensing styles, are compounded with uncertainty over when and how the rest of the world will respond, how consumers (authors) will change their behaviours, the extent to which institutions will use APCs as a marketplace, what the end point will look like globally in terms of balance between Gold and Green routes to scholarly publishing, and how the commercial publishing partners will adapt. These all influence the risk to journal continuity and income and ultimately to society activities for the academy.

In the evolving open access debate, it has become quite clear to me that some stakeholders do not understand what learned societies do, how effective they are and the value for money they offer. Societies have been both surprised and frustrated to discover this. It can be explained perhaps, in part, by societies differing so widely in size and scope; partly though it speaks of complacency on all parts and the need for better communication and listening. As well as making the cases for their disciplines, learned societies need to make the case for themselves. Of course, they have rarely had to before since they are not in direct receipt of government funding. The challenge for learned societies is to demonstrate their 'added value' in ways that have meaning and that can be measured, hence the new project at the Academy of Social Sciences (funded by ESRC) to undertake a systematic assessment of learned societies' funding and activities and, where possible, to assess benefits and costs. This will complement activity and data collected by others, notably from those who attend the British Academy's bi-annual meetings of HSS learned societies and subject associations.

Above all, there will be few quick fixes either to adjusting publishing futures or to managing change. Learned societies will need time to adjust

and other stakeholders need to be understanding of that. It is not to say learned societies are inept or idle, far from it, but lasting adaptation to progressive change takes time. I know from my own experience, that for the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG) it took more than ten years of strategic and sustained effort, in an economic upturn, to grow and diversify income sources, to extend work to new audiences and to develop a reputation in new areas of activity.

It is not difficult to see the challenge and threat that a rushed, inflexible and non-precautionary transition to open access, or an unsustainable policy end point globally means for learned societies in the short and long term. Equally, in a digital world it is easy to see that the nature of publishing is changing and will continue to change. Learned societies will have to continue to adapt to and manage that change.

Looking forward

Learned societies have proved remarkably resilient, many celebrating centenaries or even approaching bicentenaries. One might have thought that in the digital world their rationale could be lost, but far from it, they appear to be no less in demand or needed than before. While the current open access experience for learned societies is a risk, and potentially a future hazard for many, I firmly believe that there will be some positive outcomes to recent events too. This is in addition, I hope, to the evolution of open access policies and implementation to meet, effectively and equally, all the agreed criteria of excellence, access and sustainability.

The wider legacy will come, I suggest, in six areas. First, the shock effect has awoken some societies to the need for longer term, strategic business and financial planning, a position that the larger and more active societies tended to reach a few years ago. It was not, however, the ideal way to come to that realisation.

Secondly, adapting to and mitigating external changes are a fact of life in the 21st century, and it is a rare organisation that can successfully turn its

back on change. The societies who are well-placed to do so are already establishing new fully open access journals, bringing their reputation and ethos to bear in offering good quality open access at relatively affordable rates. Regardless of whether the rationale is in hedging bets or offering new opportunities, the move is a low cost, sensible one for keeping options open under uncertain conditions. On a broader scale, learned societies are part of the UK's knowledge economy and they can expect to see the pace of change and external competition increasing, so having a forward-thinking, adaptable and change-welcoming culture is important to their future survival.

Thirdly, the collective action referred to previously has demonstrated the power of the contact networks that reside in individual societies, and the impact that the collective sum of independent actions of advocacy can have. Greater awareness of sister bodies and of how we can collaborate across, as well as within, different sectors has been forged through dealing with perceived adversity. Effective collaboration between individual societies has also been enhanced.

Fourthly, the learned societies, in HSS as well as in STEM, have raised their profile in government and with policymakers as a result of this issue. With some notable exceptions, their profiles have tended to be relatively low, perhaps understandably so, as they are not organisations that campaign publically on issues or seek to capture headlines with PR-led campaigns.

Fifthly, most learned societies are deeply embedded within, and supported by, their academic communities, and are seen to provide a disciplinary 'home', an independent and trusted voice and arbiter of quality, contact networks and advocacy, with some of the longest-standing and most highly regarded journals and international conferences. There are early, welcome signs that communities are rallying behind the societies in support of their journals, further strengthening the embedded relationships.

Finally, the societies are fully aware of the need to monitor impact on their publishing activities over the transition period. Agreed guidelines

as to what that means need to be established between the different sector groupings of learned societies so that we can approach the task in a ‘joined-up’ manner. This is particularly important given the difference in views between sectors as to what approaches to learned society open access publishing may be sustainable for each in the future.

One thing is for sure, the learned societies must be armed in 2014, 2016 and 2018 with the evidence about embargo periods, licensing, realistic APC values, and ‘customer’ behaviour that was so needed and yet so lacking in 2012; they should have data on their worth and added value; and they will be better able to act collectively and use constructively the power of their contacts and constituencies to help make objective and evidence-led arguments. They will be persistent in doing so. Many may also already be embracing the opportunities that open access might bring, and most will have greater clarity over the potential impacts and probabilities of different risks to publishing in their disciplines and how best they might mitigate them.

What most risks undoing the progress that has been made is, in my view, active lobbying by RCUK internationally such that, even if only inadvertently, it results in unsustainable open access policies in the rest of the world where the lobbying power of learned societies, with perhaps the exception of the USA, is considerably less than in the UK.

Acknowledgements. I warmly thank my colleagues, Drs Catherine Souch and Madeleine Hatfield, for their support with data gathering, thoughtful commentary and discussion throughout the open access review process; and Catherine for her helpful comments on an early draft of this essay.

Dr Rita Gardner CBE is Director of the Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers), the learned society and professional body for Geography and geographers in the UK. She has led the Society through a period of substantial development in the past fifteen years. At the heart of the Society today is the safeguarding, advancing and promoting of the discipline and its methodologies; and exchanging new geographical knowledge within and between research, higher education, schools, expedition, public and policy audiences in the

UK and globally. The Society's work engages 3 to 4 million people each year and its 16,800 members and Fellows are drawn from some 160 countries.

Recent wider involvement includes a Non-Executive Directorship of the British Antarctic Survey; Member of the BIS Working Group on Open Access to Scholarly Publishing; Chair of the Steering Committee for the International Benchmarking Review of UK Human Geography; Chair of the Academy of Social Sciences Working Group on Open Access Publishing. Appointed as non-political advisor for Geography to the Secretary of State for Education and Skills, 2006-2010, she continues to be closely involved with the Department for Education on Geography curriculum matters.

Prior to joining the Society, she had an academic career as a physical geographer in London University at Kings College (1979-1994) and Queen Mary College (1994-1996). Educated at University College London (BSc) and the University of Oxford (D Phil), she holds the Busk Medal for her research on environmental change in the tropics. She was awarded a CBE for 'Services to Geography' in 2003, and holds Honorary Doctorates from the Universities of Gloucestershire and Southampton, and an Honorary Fellowship of Queen Mary, London University.

© Rita Gardner, 2013.

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs

3.0 Unported License.

Notes

- 1 Representatives were drawn from BIS, RCUK, HEFCE, independent funders (Wellcome Foundation), libraries (British Library), JISC, universities, learned societies and commercial publishers. See Appendix A of the report for full details, www.researchinfonet.org/publish/finch (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 2 This paper specifically concerns learned societies and not the National Academies, who are funded differently; many of the comments are also relevant to professional bodies.
- 3 See HEFCE's FAQ on REF (June 2012) www.ref.ac.uk/faq/all (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 4 The full report can be found at www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Human-Geography-Benchmarking-Review-Report_tcm8-25257.pdf (accessed 13 May 2013).

- 5 Summary results of the OAPEN-UK HSS Research Survey Results are reported at: <http://oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/files/2012/07/OAPENUK-Researcher-Survey-Results.pdf> (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 6 The potential effect of making journals free after a six month embargo. A report for the Association of Learned, Professional and Society Publishers [ALPSP] and The Publishers Association, May 2012 www.publishingresearch.net/documents/ALPSPPApotentialresultsofsixmonthembargofv.pdf. See also *Logos* 23:3 (2012), pp.16-27.
- 7 A directory, which is not fully comprehensive, is provided by the British Academy www.britac.ac.uk/links/uksahss.asp
- 8 HEFCE's consultation on REF 2020 launched on 25 February 2013, www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/news/news/2013/open_access_letter.pdf (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 9 BIS Commons Select Committee on Open Access: www.parliament.uk/BIS (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 10 House of Lords Select Committee on open access, www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/science-and-technology-committee/inquiries/parliament-2010/open-access (accessed 13 May 2013).
- 11 Approximately a quarter of the responses to the calls for evidence for the House of Lords enquiry were from learned societies, and they were instrumental in both the enquiries being held. Of particular note towards the culmination of the process were the summit meeting held by David Willetts to try to resolve the differences between RCUK, BIS and the learned societies, and the tenacity of Lord Krebs as Chair of the Lords Science and Technology Select Committee in not only producing a speedy and critical enquiry report but in following through with comments on RCUK revisions.
- 12 Science Europe position statement: Principles for the transition to open access to research publications. April 2013, www.scienceurope.org/uploads/Public%20documents%20and%20speeches/SE_OA_Pos_Statement.pdf (accessed 13 May 2013).