Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of UK Research and Innovation

Subject: Open Access Monographs

Sourcing Reference Number: UK SBS CR18077

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)
www.uksbs.co.uk

Table of Contents

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS) brings a commercial attitude to the public sector; helping our Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for the Contracting Authorities of shared business services in the UK public sector, continuously reducing cost and improving quality of business services for Government and the public sector.

Our broad range of expert services is shared by our Contracting Authorities. This allows Contracting Authorities the freedom to focus resources on core activities; innovating and transforming their own organisations.

Core services include Procurement, Finance, Grants Admissions, Human Resources, Payroll, ISS, and Property Asset Management all underpinned by our Service Delivery and Contact Centre teams.

UK SBS is a people rather than task focused business. It's what makes us different to the traditional transactional shared services centre. What is more, being a not-for-profit organisation owned by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), UK SBS' goals are aligned with the public sector and delivering best value for the UK taxpayer.

UK Shared Business Services Ltd changed its name from RCUK Shared Services Centre Ltd in March 2013.

Our Customers

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Services (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.

Our Contracting Authorities who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed here.

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

UK Research and Innovation

Operating across the whole of the UK and with a combined budget of more than £6 billion, UK Research and Innovation represents the largest reform of the research and innovation funding landscape in the last 50 years.

As an independent non-departmental public body UK Research and Innovation brings together the seven Research Councils (AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, STFC) plus Innovate UK and a new organisation, Research England.

UK Research and Innovation ensures the UK maintains its world-leading position in research and innovation. This is done by creating the best environment for research and innovation to flourish.

For more information, please visit: www.ukri.org

Research England

Research England is a new council within UK Research and Innovation, operating from April 2018. As a key component of the research funding system, Research England will oversee UK Research and Innovation's England-only functions in relation to university research and knowledge exchange. This includes providing grant funding to English universities for research and knowledge exchange activities; developing and implementing the Research Excellence Framework in partnership with the UK Higher Education funding bodies; overseeing the sustainability of the Higher Education research base in England; overseeing the £900 million UK Research Partnership Investment Fund; and the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF).

https://re.ukri.org

Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

In this section you will find details of your Procurement contact point and the timescales relating to this opportunity.

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority Name and address	**UK Research and Innovation** **Research England** **Nicholson House** **Lime Kiln Close** **Stoke Gifford** **Bristol** **BS34 8SR**
3.2	Buyer name	Amelia Stroud
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£29,167
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	**All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here.** **Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	04/06/2018 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	12/06/2018 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	15/06/2018 14.00
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	28/06/2018 14.00
3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available if face to face clarifications are required	W/C 02/07/2018
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	06/07/2018
3.12	Anticipated Award date	11/07/2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	13/07/2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	31/10/2018
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

Introduction

In 2016 Professor Adam Tickell, Chair of the Universities UK Open Access Coordination Group (UUK OACG) was asked to put forward a set of recommendations on open access research by the former Minister for Universities and Science, Jo Johnson. As part of his report, Professor Tickell recommended that a working group on open access monographs should be established to perform an intelligence sharing and monitoring role in the first instance, and to later advise and help drive the progress of any pilots of OA monographs.[1]

The UUK Open Access monographs working group was formed in late 2016 to monitor and evaluate progress towards OA book publishing. The group is chaired by Professor Roger Kain (Professor of Humanities, School of Advanced Study and Vice-President Research and HE Policy, British Academy)[2] and includes representation from a range of organisations including Jisc, the Wellcome Trust, Research England, the British Academy, librarians and publishers (including commercial, university, and academic-led presses).

The group's remit is to:

    i.   Monitor and evaluate progress towards OA book publishing
    ii.   Promote and accelerate cultural change towards OA academic books
    iii.   Promote innovation and diversity in business models for OA monographs
    iv.   Advise on technical barriers to OA publishing and make recommendations for further work and investment.
    v.   Advise on how best to overcome perceived and actual policy and legal barriers

The working group has identified the need to carry out a quantitative analysis of the current landscape of long-form outputs in the higher education (HE) sector. The OACG fully endorsed this work in March 2018.

This work will be jointly funded by Research England, Jisc, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and the British Academy (BA). A steering group has been established to ensure

---

[1] The other three working groups are: Efficiencies; Repositories; and Service Standards. The four groups were formed following Professor Adam Tickell's Independent advice to the Minister for Universities and Science in 2016 on open access to research publications. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/open-access-to-research-independent-advice Minutes and papers from the meetings of the UUK OA monograph working group can be viewed via the UUK website: http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/research-policy/open-science/Pages/uuk-open-access-coordination-group.asp.

[2] The UUK OA group was chaired by Professor Shearer West from its inception in December 2016 until October 2017.

that the needs of the project partners are being met. The main contact for the successful tender will be a member of Research England's research policy team.

This project is not being led by UUK. Rather, the UUK OA monograph group is acting as a vehicle for bringing together appropriate stakeholders with an interest in open access academic books. The steering group for this project includes representation from Research England, Jisc, the AHRC, the BA, Research Libraries UK (RCUK), SCONUL, University College London (UCL) Press, Palgrave Macmillan, the Association of University Presses and two independent consultants.

The Open Access monographs working group will be engaging with academics and learned society stakeholders separately from this consultancy to investigate attitudinal challenges. An event in September 2018 has been scheduled to initiate an open dialogue with the academic community. The Arts and Humanities Alliance (AHA) is leading on this work. The organisation of this event is a distinctly separate, but complementary strand, to the consultancy work proposed.

Information on project partners

Research England is responsible for the research and knowledge exchange functions of the former Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). Established in April 2018 under the terms of the Higher Education Research Act (HERA) 2017, Research England operates as one of one of the nine councils that make up UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). It is responsible for providing grant funding to English universities for research and knowledge exchange activities; developing and implementing the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in partnership with the UK Higher Education funding bodies; overseeing the sustainability of the Higher Education research base in England; overseeing the £900 million UK Research Partnership Investment Fund; and the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF).

In December 2016 the former HEFCE announced their intention to move towards an open access requirement for monographs in the exercise that follows the next REF, expected in 2027 or 2028. Work in this area will be taken forward by Research England.

Jisc is the UK higher education, further education and skills sectors' not-for-profit organisation providing digital services and solutions for UK education and research. Jisc operate shared digital infrastructure and services, negotiate sector-wide deals with IT vendors and commercial publishers, and provide trusted advice and practical assistance for universities, colleges and learning providers.

Jisc are working to develop services, provide support, and influence policy in order to enable UK higher education to realise the rewards of open access, including long-form outputs.

The AHRC funds world-class, independent researchers in a wide range of subjects from history, archaeology, digital content, philosophy, language, performing arts and much more. The AHRC exists to promote and channel the research that brings a cultural understanding into the realm of international development; sustains the UK's flagship cultural institutions; and addresses the distinctive needs of the fastest-growing, creative sector of the UK's economy.

As of 1 April 2018 UK Research and Innovation brings together the seven Research Councils (including the AHRC), Innovate UK and Research England.

The BA is the UK's national academy for the humanities and social sciences. The BA has three principal roles: as an independent Fellowship of world-leading scholars and researchers; a Funding Body that supports new research, nationally and internationally; and a Forum for debate and engagement – a voice that champions the humanities and social sciences.

Aims

We require a consultant to work with the four project partners and the Steering Group to develop the method to capture the information on monograph publishing in the UK, with a specific focus on open access. We are particularly interested in understanding the specific challenges and barriers (perceived and real) from a range of stakeholders including (but not limited to): learned societies and subject associations, Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Research), research librarians, publishers (traditional, commercial, new university presses and academic-led presses) and funding organisations.

The consultant will carry out interviews with a representative sample of these key stakeholders in order to pinpoint practical challenges such as technical issues, licensing arrangements and book sales. The consultant will then seek to address these challenges (where possible) by conducting a quantitative analysis of data available from publishers, funding organisations and HEIs (including libraries).

The project partners and the steering group also require an analysis of a pre-defined set of questions. We anticipate that there will be some crossover between these questions and those identified through interviews with stakeholders. These questions may be further refined after further discussions with stakeholder groups.

We expect that obtaining and analysing quantitative evidence will be the prime focus of this consultancy in terms of time. We anticipate that some of this data will already be available. For example, information from REF 2014 submissions will be available from Research England. The consultant should engage with stakeholders throughout the project in order to identity and to fill current evidence gaps.

The successful consultant will be expected to draw upon the evidence gathered and put forward a set of conclusions on the implications of open access for academic books. Specifically these conclusions should highlight:

i.   The key challenges and concerns raised in stakeholder interviews and (as far as possible) reflect how the report has sought to answer these challenges;
ii. Outline the implications for making books open access and *not* making books OA;
iii. The effect that the proposed requirement for OA monographs in the REF after next may have on long-form academic publishing;
iv. Future activities that will support the journey towards open access.

The main aim of this work is to provide a robust evidence base that will be used to inform future policy decisions on open access and the final project report will contribute further understanding of the current landscape of open access monographs. It will also be used to inform future policy development, such as the move towards a requirement for open access monographs in the REF after 2021 proposed by the four UK Higher Education Funding Bodies (expected to take place in either 2027 or 2028).

The final report from this project will be a valuable output to be considered as part of the UK Research and Innovation open access review scheduled to take place over the next twelve months.

Objectives

The objectives of this project are:

  i.   Drawing on relevant and current international literature on open access monographs, the consultant will identify a set of key challenges and questions across a range of stakeholder groups.

  ii. The consultant will review and refine these questions through interviews with a representative sample of relevant stakeholders. These interviews should be designed to draw out very specific challenges or barriers to open access relevant to the stakeholder group.

  iii. To use the information above to identify a set of challenges and questions that may be addressed (in whole or in part) through data analysis. We recognise that some data may already be available to analyse as part of this work, and consultants should also seek to fill any gaps where this evidence is not currently available. We anticipate that the consultant will work closely with publishers, research librarians and funding organisations as part of this work.

  iv. To gather evidence on a pre-defined set of questions that have been established by the project funding partners and the steering group. We anticipate that there will be a degree of crossover between questions posed by the project funding partners and those identified in the literature review and with stakeholder interviews. The questions put forward by the steering group may be further refined following discussions with stakeholder groups.

  v.   Use the evidence to provide a set of conclusions that clearly articulate the implications for making books open access, and for *not* going OA. The conclusions should indicate whether or not the requirement for OA monographs in the REF after next is helpful in changing the publishing culture.

Deliverables

  i.   A list of challenges and questions formed from literature and cross referenced with questions put forward by the steering group.

  ii. Interviews with a representative sample of key stakeholders.

  iii. A final list of challenges and questions to by investigated following agreement from the steering group..

iv. Evidence gathering and data analysis of the challenges identified through stakeholder interviews and by the project partners and the steering group.

v. A set of conclusions that clearly sets out the data and evidence for each question. The conclusions should also set out the implications for UK research practice and policy (including international collaborations, for publishers and for research funders) of going open access (and not going OA), identifying future activities that will support the journey towards open access.

Approach

In order to achieve the above objectives, the project will be approached in three strands.

Strand one – Stakeholder interviews (estimated 12 days' work)

Drawing on current international literature on open access monographs, the consultant will identify a set of key challenges for OA monographs across a range of stakeholder groups. We expect that the synthesis report produced by the UUK OA monograph working group [pending publication] will inform part of this work. Given that a significant issue with making books open access for books are the associated costs, an update of publisher Book Processing Charges (BPC) should be included in the final report.

The consultant will identify a representative sample of stakeholders to interview. These interviews should seek to review and refine the questions already identified by the consultant. The consultant should seek to understand stakeholder perceptions of OA, drawing out specific challenges and barriers to open access relevant to the stakeholder group. An understanding of both financial and non-financial incentives should emerge from this work. Consultants may also wish to consider asking what steps stakeholders are taking in the OA monographs space with respect to the likely requirements for the REF scheduled to take place in the mid-2020s. It would also be useful to understand the appetite for OA monograph publishing in UK universities, and the degree to which academics and researchers support OA publishing initiatives.

The selection for interviewees should include a broad representation of stakeholders, including different types of publishers (traditional, commercial, NUPs and ALPs), funders, Pro-Vice-Chancellors (Research) and research librarians. We anticipate that these interviews will also include engagement with learned societies and subject associations in order to pinpoint discipline-specific challenges with open access academic books. The consultant should provide a clear methodology in their approach to selecting interviewees.

The consultant will use the information gathered from stakeholder interviews to finalise a set of questions that they will seek to answer through data analysis (Strand 2). For each question the consultant should provide information with regard to the availability of data or evidence to support the answering of the question and the methodology used to analyse the data. Specific challenges around gathering and/or analysing the data should be clearly signposted

We anticipate that there will be a number of challenges raised in regard to open access that cannot be answered at this time, or will be informed by future policy making decisions. These

should be clearly indicated in the final report. We also recognise that not all challenges identified in stakeholder interviews will be susceptible to an analysis of quantitative data, and similarly these should be clearly signposted in the final report.

Strand two – Data analysis (estimated 30 days' work)

Using the information from strand one, the consultant will analyse existing data and gather new evidence to answer specific queries raised by stakeholder groups. We anticipate that some of the data required will already exist: for example, Research England will be able to provide information on REF 2014, and extensive analysis has already been carried out on outputs submitted to Panel D in the last REF.[3]

Initial discussions with the publishing and the academic library community have been positive and welcoming, and we expect the consultant to build upon these relationships as part of the qualitative and the quantitative approach in this work.

The four project partners and representatives from the steering group have also formulated a set of questions to answer as part of this project. We anticipate that there will be a certain degree of overlap between questions that emerge from the stakeholder interviews and the questions raised by the steering group. Engagement with stakeholders at interview stage should look to enhance these pre-defined questions and, where possible, investigate new avenues that have not been addressed by the SG.

Questions put forward by the steering group are set out below. **Where indicated, the consultant should select a representative sample of stakeholders (for example, publishers and universities) to gather this information from.** The sample of publishers should include commercial presses, NUPs and ALPs. The selection of universities (where relevant) should consider size, research intensity, and region. At least one UK academic library from outside of England should be included in this exercise.

Although we expect this project to heavily focus on the humanities and social sciences, consultants may wish to consider an appropriate method of including academic books that are aligned with the Science Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) subjects as part of their analysis.

Questions put forward by the steering group can be broadly split into four distinct themes:

Publishing and purchasing trends

By obtaining evidence from a representative sample of publishers:

1. How many monographs are being published or contributed to each year by UK academics (disaggregated by type of output such as single-author books, collection of essays and scholarly editions);[4]

    i. How many of these books published by UK authors are in other languages;

---

[3] See Tanner, Simon (2016) An analysis of the Arts and Humanities submitted research outputs to the REF2014 with a focus on academic books: An Academic Book of the Future Report, King's College London, November 2016 http://doi.org/doi:10.18742/RDM01-76

[4] We would also be interested in obtaining information on books edited by non-UK academics in which UK academics publish essays as part of this question.

ii. How many of these titles are being purchased by academic libraries in the UK (and how many libraries);

iii. How many of these titles are being published open access?

2. What are the overall sales revenues for UK-authored monographs each year, distinguishing if possible between print and e, UK and overseas sales, and library and retail sales?

3. What percentage of publishers' books were returned to the REF 2014? Results should be disaggregated in order to determine, if possible:

    i. What portion of their total published monographs does this represent?

    ii. What portion of their whole book sales does this represent?

    iii. What portion of the whole income of the company does this represent?

4. What analysis can be drawn from understanding the long tail of book sales (including ebook sales)? Specifically, are there any patterns in book sales for monographs submitted to REF 2014? Results should be disaggregated across UOA and type of output (monograph, scholarly edition, edited collection).

5. What analysis can be drawn from information on price points for long-form outputs, identifying trends across units of assessments (UoA) and type of output (for example, are 'trade' or crossover books priced lower than critical editions purchased by academic libraries)?

6. What proportion of monographs generate royalties for their author? Results should distinguish between royalties received, type of output and price point.

The role of academic libraries

By obtaining evidence from a representative sample of libraries:

7. How much do UK university libraries spend each year on monographs, distinguishing if possible between UK-authored and overseas-authored, and print and e-books?

8. What is the current spend of academic libraries on open access monographs – are there any trends? Can libraries reduce existing spending on monographs to free up funding to support open access without negatively impacting on their role as a provider to the research community?

9. Are libraries able provide the required funding to support the UK's cost of a transition to OA monographs using BPCs; – what evidence is there to support the report's conclusions?

Embargo periods

By obtaining evidence from representative sample of stakeholders (including publishers, funders and academic libraries):

10. Is there any evidence in favour of a green vs. gold distinction in relation to books as opposed to articles? How can the information on book sales be used to inform/ shape potential embargo periods for 'green' open access academic books?

Licensing

Through drawing on the evidence gathered as part of Q1-7 (above)

11. Conduct an analysis of type of Creative Commons licence disaggregated by type of long-form output and by UOA, identifying trends (if any) across the data. Analysis should specifically look at the presence vs the absence of the ND option in relation to open access books.

12. What are stakeholder preferences for licensing arrangements for academic books?

Outputs submitted to the REF

By reference to all academic books, edited collections and scholarly editions submitted to panels C and D in REF 2014:

13. What information can be drawn from an analysis of long-form outputs returned to the REF published by non-UK publishers? Results should be disaggregated by type of output, UoA and language.

14. What proportion of monographs submitted to REF in panels C and D were directly connected to a grant from RCUK?

15. What proportion of monographs and edited collections submitted in REF 2014 to Main Panels C and D would have been exempt if exceptions were granted in respect of:

   i.   The inclusion of third party rights;

   ii. Non-English publications;

   iii. Publications published by non-UK presses;

   iv. UK researchers co-authored with international collaborators

Strand 3. Conclusions and implications of open access policy in the UK (estimated 5 days' work)

The third strand of the project will collate the two aspects of the study and put forward a set of observations that will address the following:

   i.   The key challenges and concerns raised in stakeholder interviews and (as far as possible) reflect how the report has sought to answer these challenges;
   ii. Outline the implications for making books open access and *not* making books OA;
   iii. Whether or not the requirement for OA monographs in the Ref after next would be helpful in changing the publishing culture;
   iv. Future activities that will support the journey towards open access.

Attendance of an open access monograph event with learned societies and subject associations (estimated 3 days' work)

The consultant must be available to attend an event organised by the UUK OA monographs group in mid-September 2018. The successful consultant will provide a 15-20 minute presentation on the emerging outcomes from the project an audience made up of

representatives from learned societies and subject associations. The consultant should utilise this event to engage with the academic community and to gather qualitative information to supplement the interviews carried out in the early stages of the project.

Information gathered at this event should be clearly signalled in the final project report. Attitudinal and practical challenges to open access as raised by the academic community will form part of the report's evidence base that will be used to inform future policy decisions.

The consultant will also be required to attend a workshop organised by the UUK OA monographs working group in autumn 2018. This event (separate to the one for learned societies and subject associations) will be aimed at publishers and will include representation from commercial presses, NUPs and ALPs. More information will be shared with regard to this event in due course.

The approach will also include:

i. Discussion with relevant Research England staff and reference to partner organisations and other relevant parties outside Research England where relevant and practicable
ii. Correspondence with the selected institutions
iii. Regular update calls between the consultant and Research England team.
iv. Attendance at the UUK OA Monograph working group meetings (

Project Milestones

i. Methodology (to be agreed with the steering group).
ii. Qualitative review
iii. Interim progress meeting
iv. Data analysis
v. Submission of draft report and recommendations
vi. Submission of final report

Background to the Requirement

In December 2016 the four UK Higher Education Funding Bodies signalled their intention to move towards a requirement for open access monographs in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) after next (expected to take place in either 2027 or 2028). The UUK OA monograph group recognises that work must be done now to inform policy.

Open access for journals has taken place incrementally, with policy makers and funders taking careful consideration over appropriate policy exceptions to ensure that high quality research continues to be published. Developing policy for OA monographs will likewise require careful consideration to understand what is in scope and what is out of scope for future requirements of open access monographs.

We draw on a definition of a monograph as set out by Crossick (2015) and Collins, Milloy and Stone (2015). Defined as an academic book written on a single research topic of subject that is usually between 80-100,000 words, the monograph provides a detailed examination of a specific topic, with a carefully constructed presentation of evidence and contextual analysis. The term is also used more broadly to include edited collections of research essays, critical editions of texts and other works. It may also include other types of research such as scholarly exhibition catalogues (Crossick, 2015). They are usually written by one author and typically aimed at, but not restricted to, a scholarly audience (Thompson, 2005; Williams et al., 2009; Vincent, 2013).

It is important not to be too constrictive in the definition of a monograph. Much of the evidence submitted to the Funding Bodies' consultation on open access in the post-2014 Research Excellence Framework (2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c) commented on many different forms of book-related outputs based on researchers' scholarly work. This included book chapters, edited collections, catalogues, critical editions or mid-form publications, which are longer than a journal article but shorter than a typical monograph. We also need to emphasise the increase in experimentation with digital-only books, which can take a variety of forms but still consists of a 'detailed examination of a specific topic'. Examples are the experiments with enhanced books (published with additional supporting multimodal data), living, processual or iterative books (published in various versions during the research's life span, often in a collaborative wiki-setting) and expansive digital books (books that add additional or update existing multimodal data after formal publication).[5]

The monograph holds a particular significance to scholars in the arts and humanities, with 66% of researchers having published an academic book, and 95% considering it 'important' or 'very important' to publish a monograph (Milloy & Collins, 2014).[6] Simon Tanner's analysis (2016) on outputs submitted to Main Panel D (Arts and Humanities) for REF 2014 provides headline figures that can be used to contextualise the current monograph landscape.[7] Panel D had the highest number of monograph submissions, with 8,513 books submitted.[8] Thirty-nine publishers had 20 or more books submitted (5,232 books, or 61.4% total) with 46% of all books submitted from just ten publishers (3,926 books).[9] The total number of publishers returned to Panel D was 1,180, indicating the extremely long tail of publishers whose books have been submitted to the REF (Tanner, 2016).

The recent UUK report monitoring the transition to open access for articles in scholarly journals (Jubb et. al., 2017) shows that the UK has made progress towards open access for journal articles. The UK is above the global average of open access publishing, with 37% of UK-authored articles in 2016 openly accessible immediately, with 54% of articles accessible within 12 months. The proportion of UK-authored articles published on immediate Gold OA terms rose from 12% in 2012 to 30% in 2016, an annual growth rate of over 30% sustained throughout the period.

---

[5] For examples of experimental monographic projects see University of Minnesota Press's Manifold project and the Jisc funded Living Books about Life book series published by Open Humanities Press.
[6] The report includes researchers across varying career stages, from PhD and postdoctoral level; to readers and the professoriate.
[7] Units of Assessment (UOA) included in Main Panel D for REF2014 were: Area Studies; Modern Languages and Linguistics; English Literature; History; Classics; Philosophy; Theology and Religious Studies; Art and Design: History, Practice and Theory; Music, Drama, Dance and Performing Arts; Communication, Cultural and Media Studies, Library and Information Management.
[8] Books refer to monographs, edited collections, and scholarly editions
[9] The top ten most submitted publishers to Main Panel D in REF2014 were: Oxford University Press; Palgrave Macmillan; Cambridge University Press; Routledge; Ashgate; Manchester University Press; Edinburgh University Press; Continuum International Publishing; and Bloomsbury Publishing.

However, this has come at a considerable financial cost to the sector, and more can be done to establish the value of gold OA publications.

Funding is crucial in order to support a transition to OA books (ABOTF, 2017, Adema & Stone, 2017), and to provide an infrastructure that fosters a publishing ecology for monographs (Adema & Stone, 2017). However, given that only a small proportion of AHSS research is funded from project grants, there are considerable pressures, making Book Processing Charges (BPCs) unaffordable for most researchers (Bargheer et al., 2017). Eve et al. (2017) also makes clear that costs for open access academic books that are aligned with current BPCs are unsustainable for both institutions and funders. At the moment it is not clear where the responsibility for covering the costs for OA monographs will lie – with the funder or the institution, a combination, or via other routes still to be explored fully. There are also questions about the long-term sustainability of BPCs and whether this is the best and only route for funding OA monographs.

Given that the UK is 'home to a traditional global publishing industry' (Ferwerda, Pinter & Stern, 2017), with the top four UK based publishers producing 6,650 monographs in 2016 alone,[10] it currently falls behind internationally in open access publishing for academic books. The Knowledge Exchange landscape study on open access and monographs (Ferwerda, Pinter & Stern, 2017) reports that the number of OA books (published in the UK) accessible through the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB) is just 594. Comparatively, Germany and France have 1094 and 1069 books available on DOAB respectively. The UK has a marginal lead over the Netherlands, who have 525 monographs accessible through the DOAB platform. However, given the size of the UK in relative terms to the Netherlands, the UK can clearly do more to support open access research for academic books.

Certainly, open access is an attractive option if the funding can be secured (Ferwerda, Pinter & Stern, 2017) and research has shown that making books available in open access has a direct positive effect on their usage and discoverability (Ferwerda, Snijder & Adema, 2013; Lucraft 2017; Emery et al., 2017).[11] Open access has also led to an increased usage of books by readers and institutions in countries (such as in the Global South) that struggle to access academic work (Gatti, 2013; Snijder, 2013; Tennant, 2016). Eve et al. (2017) highlight that the issue of 'who pays' for open access charges is one of the central obstacles in a transition to OA academic books. Eve et al. suggest that any move to OA has implications for the purchasing budget of academic libraries. According to SCONUL data from 2012-13, £47.5 million of academic library budgets were spent on books and printed material, with a further £14.7 million for e-books.[12] However, a large portion of this budget expenditure is expected to contribute towards text books, rather than research monographs.[13]

The UUK OA working group and the OA steering group acknowledge that further work must be carried out in order to provide a robust evidence base for OA monographs. An analysis of the data available is essential in providing such an evidence base. Supported by interviews with

---

[10] Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Palgrave Macmillan and Routledge.

[11] The recent report published by Emery et al. (2017) on 'The OA Effect' concludes that publishing a book with Springer Nature leads to 7 times more downloads, 50% more citations and 10 times more online mentions than publishing a book through the traditional closed route. There is a need to be cautious with book download and usage data though, as Rupert Gatti has outlined:
https://rupertgatti.wordpress.com/2017/12/11/handle-with-care-pitfalls-in-analysing-book-usage-data/

[12] Eve et al. note that figures for e-books also include book subscription services and are therefore not comparable like for like with the book budget.

[13] Eve et al. estimates the ratio of expenditure between textbooks and monographs at 80:20, rising to as high as 95:5 in teaching intensive universities. Ratios provided are estimates only, and have been provided by authors of the paper with extensive experience of working in and with libraries.

publishers, funders, UK academic libraries, as well as the academic community, this report aims to shape the future of open access policy for academic books in the UK.

ii.   Scope

The successful consultants would be expected to propose a sample selection methodology that:

- Demonstrates a reasonable spread of universities and their libraries representative of differing research intensities
- Where possible draws on projects across a good geographical spread.
- Includes at least one university from outside of England.
- Engages with a representative sample of publishers where appropriate.

Consultants may wish to consider an appropriate method of including academic research books that are aligned with the Science Technology Engineering and Maths (STEM) subjects as part of their analysis.

Summary

The objectives of this project are:

vi. Drawing on relevant and current international literature on open access monographs, the consultant will identify a set of key challenges and questions across a range of stakeholder groups.

vii. The consultant will review and refine these questions through interviews with a representative sample of relevant stakeholders. These interviews should be designed to draw out very specific challenges or barriers to open access relevant to the stakeholder group.

viii. To use the information above to identify a set of challenges and questions that may be addressed (in whole or in part) through data analysis. We recognise that some data may already be available to analyse as part of this work, and consultants should also seek to fill any gaps where this evidence is not currently available. We anticipate that the consultant will work closely with publishers, research librarians and funding organisations as part of this work.

ix. To gather evidence on a pre-defined set of questions that have been established by the project funding partners and the steering group. We anticipate that there will be a degree of crossover between questions posed by the project funding partners and those identified in the literature review and with stakeholder interviews. The questions put forward by the steering group may be further refined following discussions with stakeholder groups.

x.   Use the evidence to provide a set of conclusions that clearly articulate the implications for making books open access, and for *not* going OA. The conclusions should indicate whether or not the requirement for OA monographs in the REF after next is helpful in changing the publishing culture.

Milestones

The external contractor will be expected to deliver the following mandatory key deliverables:

i.   Statement of methodology and project plan outlining the work activities they will undertake, deliverables and timetable. Consultants should clearly state how they will identify HEIs and publishers selected for analysis and how they will be assessed. A risk assessment with levels of risk owners identified and mitigating actions to address

should be produced alongside this statement. Proposed approaches will be discussed and refined at the inception meeting which will be held following appointment in London (September 2018)

ii. Submit qualitative review from interviews with a representative sample of stakeholders. This work should identify a set of challenges and barriers to open access that may be addressed through further quantitative work.

iii. Submit quantitative analysis, responding to the pre-defined set of questions put forward by the SG and (where possible) the challenges identified in stakeholder interviews.

iv. Submit a draft report with quantitative and qualitative analysis and a draft set of conclusions

v. Submit final report and recommendations

vi. These reports will need agreement with the four project partners, which will consult with the Steering Group.

vii. Attendance at an inception meeting (July 2018), one interim update meeting (late August 2018) and one final report review meeting (estimated late October 2018) in Central London. The successful consultant will also be required to attend a meeting of the UUK OA Monograph working group (estimated October/November 2018).

viii. Attendance an event hosted by the Arts and Humanities Alliance (AHA) in central London in September. The consultant will be asked to provide a brief 15-20 minute presentation based on the emerging findings of his/her work.

ix. The consultant will be expected to be in regular communication which will include email, telephone and face to face meetings as required with the Research England policy team to ensure that objectives and milestones are being met and that the project is progressing as expected in terms of scope and time. Potential issues or risks should also be monitored and managed appropriately through an update of the risk register.

Approach

The approach will include three strands of work:

1. Interviews with stakeholders
2. Data analysis;
3. Producing a set of conclusions on the implications of open access academic books.

Timing and resources

It is estimated that this assignment will require approximately up to 50 days work for the consultant(s) including planning and reporting. The consultant will also be required to attend a one-day event for learned societies and subject associations in September 2018. The work will be carried out in summer – autumn 2018.

Conflicts of interest

Any consultant selected will be required to confirm the individuals carrying out the work have no conflicts of interest either with the institutions or with the publishers selected to participate in the project. Where the appointed consultant has any potential conflict of interest these should be identified and discussed with the Steering Group.

Terms and Conditions

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

Section 5 – Evaluation model

The evaluation model below shall be used for this ITQ, which will be determined to two decimal places.

Where a question is 'for information only' it will not be scored.

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 (5+5+6 =16÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	**Q No.**	**Question subject**
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Quality	AW6.2	Variable Bids
Quality	PROJ1.1	Non-Disclosure Agreement
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Approach	30%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Staff To Deliver	10%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Understanding the enovironment	30%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Project Plan	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

Each question will be judged on a score from 0 to 100, which shall be subjected to a multiplier to reflect the percentage of the evaluation criteria allocated to that question.

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20**%.**
Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:
Score = {weighting percentage} x {bidder's score} = 20% x 60 = 12

The same logic will be applied to groups of questions which equate to a single evaluation criterion.

The 0-100 score shall be based on (unless otherwise stated within the question):

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.
40	Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.
60	Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
80	Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.
100	Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider.

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

Example
Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40
Your final score will (60+60+40+40) ÷ 4 = 50

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100.
All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion.

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.
Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.
Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.
Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 (80/100 x 50 = 40)

The lowest score possible is 0 even if the price submitted is more than 100% greater than the lowest price.

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

Bidders should note that the evaluation questionnaire is located within the **e-sourcing questionnaire.**

Guidance on completion of the questionnaire is available at http://www.uksbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

DO:

7.1   Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.

7.2   Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure

7.3   Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.

7.4   Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.

7.5   Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution

7.6   Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.

7.7   Do consider who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.

7.8   Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.

7.9   Do provide clear, concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.

7.10   Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.

7.11   Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

What makes a good bid – some simple do not's ☹

DO NOT

7.12   Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.13   Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.

7.14   Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.15   Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.

7.16   Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.17   Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.18   Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.19   Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.20   Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.21   Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.22   Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.23   All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

7.24   Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool.   Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.

7.25   Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.26   Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.27   We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.28   All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.

7.29   We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.30   If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.31   Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.

7.32   Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public

7.33   Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34   Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.

7.35   We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.

7.36   If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.37   Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

7.38   Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks

the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

7.39   All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.40   All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, the Contracting Authority may disclose within Government any of the Bidders documentation/information (including any that the Bidder considers to be confidential and/or commercially sensitive such as specific bid information) submitted by the Bidder to the Contracting Authority during this Procurement. The information will not be disclosed outside Government. Bidders taking part in this ITQ consent to these terms as part of the competition process.

7.41   The Government is introducing its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme on the 2nd April 2014 to replace the current Government Protective Marking System (GPMS). A key aspect of this is the reduction in the number of security classifications used. All Bidders are encouraged to make themselves aware of the changes and identify any potential impacts in their Bid, as the protective marking and applicable protection of any material passed to, or generated by, you during the procurement process or pursuant to any Contract awarded to you as a result of this tender process will be subject to the new GSC. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-security-classifications

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- Emptoris Training Guide
- Emptoris e-sourcing tool
- Contracts Finder
- Equalities Act introduction
- Bribery Act introduction
- Freedom of information Act