



DARIAH Winter School in Prague

Open Data Citation for Social Sciences and Humanities

24th to 28 of October 2016

Session 8: Economy of Open Access & Open Data Publication

8-Economy of Open Access & Open Data Publication	3
Open access business models for humanities	3
STEM disciplines: the rise of APC model	3
Finch Report	3
Jisc Report	4
PLOS	4
Max Planck digital library	4
APC pre-exists to open access and open access exists without APC	5
OA business models in the humanities and social sciences	5
The invisible rise of institution supported journals	5
Another report in French	5
Weakness of the institutional support model	6
Freemium model for journals. The example of OpenEdition	6
The case of books	8
Freemium model for books: the example of Open Book Publishers	9
Freemium for data: the example of OECD publishing	9
Conclusion	10
Contact	10
Sdvig Press	11
Research challenge	11
Publishing house	11
Structure	12
How to finance the project	13
Editorial and Governance board	13
Contact	14

8-Economy of Open Access & Open Data Publication

Open access business models for humanities

Pierre Mounier, OpenEdition & EHESS, France

The goal of this presentation is to give some landscape about the development of open access in the SSH, particularly under the perspective of business models. It is maybe puzzling to speak about "*business model for open access*", there is like contradiction between the two terms and my objective is to demonstrate that there is no. In fact, there are not only one but many developing business models for the SSH publication in open access.

STEM disciplines: the rise of APC model

STEM are Science, Technique, Engineering and Medicine. It is the leading force driving the whole ecosystem of publication and scholarly communication towards open access. The first initiatives were developed in STEM disciplines and where the most important business model emerged. I will then show that those models doesn't fit well with the Humanities.

With open access there is a distinction between the two roads to open access:

- *the green open access model*: development of open archive and self archiving from authors of publication into institutional or disciplinary repositories
- *the gold open access model*: it used to designate the fact of publication in open access; an open access journal or book series by itself whatever the business model behind. But things have changed over time so that now for many people it only became the APC model. APC stands for Article processing charge. It means that journal publishing open access charges the author to publish an article open access. This is the dominant business model for open access in STEM disciplines.

Finch Report

In Europe, UK and the Netherlands have developed this model but the real start at political level was given in UK with the [Finch report](#): it was commission chaired by Janet Finch, a sociologist specialised in sociology of science, where specialists were asked to evaluate the cost of a major shift for UK research publication from subscription based journals to open access APC based journals. The report has been really important because it was the first time that there was a global evaluation of the financial cost to his shift. It evaluated an important additional cost during the transition period from subscription based scholarly publication system to an open access publication system and gave an important impetus for this shift. Now the entire research in UK is shifting towards this new model. Research funders are really helping in this process. This is a "shift from a reader-pays to an author-pays system, which in turn requires a shift in publications processes and business models".

Jisc Report

[Jisc](#) has been monitoring the evolution of the APC cost paid by 14 UK institutions to allow their researchers to publish open access with Article Processing Charges in different journals. During the three last years, there was a huge growth of the number of paid APCs and a huge growth of expenditures paid through APC, but it doesn't mean yet that the cost is growing up because this is just the number of APCs paid. This indicates that the shift is on the way. But this report also demonstrated that the average cost of each APC is also evolving and appear to be growing. It is the case with the so-called full open access journal, it means that all the articles are open access, the business model is completely based on APC, but it is also true with so-called *hybrid journals*. An hybrid journal is a traditional journal subscription based that allow researchers to publish individual articles open access provided that they pay the APC. If as an author you are mandated by your funder to publish your article in a particular traditional journal, you can do it, but then you have to pay the APC. The hybrid model is in fact really common and it is the most criticised as well because this it is based on two sources of revenues: from the authors and from the libraries subscribing to the journal, it is sometimes called "*double dipping model*".

PLOS

A good example of massive model based on APC, not from a commercial publisher but from a non-profit pro open access initiative from the academy community is the Public Library Of Science ([PLOS](#)). It is a *massive business model* because it is based on massive publishing, massive collecting of APC, so the average APC of each article to be published in PLOS is lower than with commercial publishers but the business model can run because it is based on massive publishing. You can find all information on their website: last year they published 31 000 articles, this is really huge. It generated around 42 million dollars revenues. And it works, they are balanced - they are non-profit so they have to break even their budget not to make profit.

This trend is powerful, at least in the STEM disciplines and the APC model is supporting this trend.

Max Planck digital library

A very interesting initiative in Europe comes from the Max Planck digital library. They published a white paper to propose to the scientific community to gather funding to allow a major shift towards APC model and open access model. They proposed the generalisation of what the physicist are doing for several years now with the project [SCOAP3](#). The idea is simple, the consortium gathers money from subscriptions that are paid by the libraries of this institution in order to shift the usage of this cost to APC cost. This gives a major incentive to publishers to shift all their journals towards open access APC based. During the last open access conference in Berlin, they presented this white paper called "[Disrupting the subscription journal's business model for the necessary large-scale transformation to open access](#)". They took into account all the articles published during one year referenced and indexed into the [Web of Science](#). Then they filtered to how many articles are open access. They multiplied that with the average cost of an APC to have the cost of shifting all the articles to open access and they compared it with the current subscriptions paid by the

institutions. They showed that in three countries, Germany, United Kingdom and France, if you compare the current costs covered by subscriptions to the potential cost of shifting everything towards APC, then the comparison stands. They explain that it would not cost more and in some case it can cost less, or at least the same.

APC pre-exists to open access and open access exists without APC

We must remember that APC pre-exist to open access. Open access didn't invented the APC model, even in subscription based journal, in many cases the author also had to pay Article Processing Charges. And the APC model previously **was a Page Processing Charge**, the charge was paid page by page with additional costs for figures, tables and additional data. So when a researcher wanted to make available more data in his article, he had to pay more because it entailed more cost. Of course, open access exists without APC model. There is no need to make the equivalence between gold open access publishing and APC model. If you look at the Directory of Open Access Journal ([DOAJ](#)), the article [Open access Article Processing charges: DOAJ survey May 2014](#) has been published two years ago and it showed that around 60% of the journals registered in the DOAJ are non APC journal, they do not charge the author. So in fact, the majority of open access journals today are non-APC.

But how do they live? How do they support their operation?

OA business models in the humanities and social sciences

The invisible rise of institution supported journals

Financial support from the institutions should be highlighted. They support with work force and infrastructures most of the open access journal today. Examples:

- [Revue.org](#): almost none of the journals are APC based because they are in SSH and it is not a meaningful business model for SSH. Most of the journals are supported by their institution.
- [SCIELO](#): It is much bigger than revue.org, it covers all Latin America, particularly Brazil. You have more than 1200 journals published open access and most of them are also supported by their institution to operate.
- [Redalyc](#): It is based in Mexico and covers journals from different Latin American countries.

One major supporting tool for the development of those institution supported open access journal is [OJS](#) from the Public Knowledge Project ([PKP consortium](#)). It is an initiative from the Simon Fraser University in Canada who developed a lot of tools to allow small publishers or institutions to set up websites or platforms to publish open access their own journal; one of these tool is Open Journal System, but they also recently developed Open Monograph Press ([OMP](#)), the equivalent of OJS for books. In 2015, there was more than 10 000 installation of OJS everywhere in the world. It means several thousands of journals run by this kind of tool which are supported by their institution. The library of a university can set up a publication platform for journals of the university to be published open access.

Another report in French

[Publier: à quel prix ? Etude sur la structuration des coûts de publication pour les françaises en SHS](#). It was a study made by a French consortium to evaluate the cost of publication of an article. They used an online survey and made interviews with university presses and different journals in France to evaluate the cost of edition and publication of an article, open access or not. The result showed that the average cost of article publication was around 1 300€, taking into account proofreading, typesetting, peer-reviewing, etc.

Weakness of the institutional support model

This model is interesting because it ensures revenues for the journal to operate, backed up by its own institution. But it has some weakness: when the institution decides not to subsidise anymore because the policy has changed for example.

- [Terrain](#) is an important anthropological journal in France which was subsidised so far by the Ministry of Culture. One day, for many reasons, the Ministry of Culture decided to stop to subsidise this journal. So it was the end of the journal. Their last issue was on the topic of *Nostalgia* to say goodbye. But, a few month ago another institution, the [CNRS](#), decided to step in, to take back the journal and to allocate one full-time editor to run the journal. The journal will soon reborn and it will be the topic of the next issue! Even if it is good news, it was disrupted during several months.
- [HAU journal](#) (also from anthropology) => If there is a weakness because a journal is supported by only one institution, then it can interesting to have support from different institutions, like this it lowers the risk that institution disengage from the journal. It is a journal of ethnographic theory founded a few years ago by scholars from different countries. Very rapidly, they made the development of their journal supported not on one institution but many. Now they have set up a network of ethnographic theory: [HAU-N.E.T.](#) It is supported by a huge number of different institutions from various countries. So each year, some institutions can step out but it is not a problem anymore because there are other institutions stepping in. In fact, it regulates the budget of the journal and ensures some sustainability.
- [Open Library of Humanities](#): The business model of this platform of journals is not based on institutions directly but on the libraries of the institutions. You can see on their website how it works: libraries pay a small amount each year and if they have a sufficient number of libraries, it can cover the cost of operation of the platform and of the journals hosted; if more libraries participate, it lowers the cost by article published for each library. And this support gives the right to participate to the board, no other privilege. So the **libraries can participate to the governance of the project**.

Freemium model for journals. The example of OpenEdition

This model is used by several players in the field amongst which you can find [OpenEdition](#). When we, at OpenEdition, decided to use the freemium model to propose to our journals to use this model, it was not primarily for financial or economic reasons. We have chosen it because we made a survey around 2009 in the libraries about the visibility of our open access content in the libraries and we found out that this visibility was less important in those libraries than the visibility of the paid content in the same libraries. We have commercial competitors which are not open access and we saw that the journals disseminated or publishing by this competing platform were more visible in the library

catalogs and more used by library. It was counterintuitive because when you publish open access you assume that those resources would be more visible than the "gated content".
=> *When you are in a library, you have limited human resources, so you have to make a choice and of course allocate human resources to maximise usage on what you pay for. It is just good management.*

So we had this paradox that every librarian we talked to was supporting open access, but on their ordinary daily business they were maximising their time on what they pay for. So we thought that if we want our open access resources to be visible and used inside the libraries, then we have to make them pay for something. And that was the beginning of the logic of using this freemium model where the resources are still open access because it continues to increase visibility but not inside the libraries specifically. It increases discoverability of the resources on the open web where most of the users are but we developed specific services to be paid by librarians to support this open access resources and to justify the fact that they give more visibility to these resources inside the library.

Freemium: a business model to address 3 challenges

- To increase sustainability for Open Access publications
- To set up a business model adapted to specific needs of humanities and social sciences scholarly communication
- To increase impact of Open Access publications in libraries

Freemium is a business model by which a product or service is provided free of charge, but money (premium) is charged for *advanced features, functionality, or virtual goods*. The word "freemium" is a portmanteau neologism combining the two aspects of the business model: "free" and "premium". But in fact, freemium is a common business model in the digital world, in press but not only: [Lemondé](#), [Wired](#), [The New York Times](#), [OpenBook Publishers](#) or [OECD](#). Some articles are free and some others are not, or additional services can be paid for. If you have a smartphone, most of your apps are freemium, you can download them and use them freely but you can buy additional services inside the app. But there are many ways of implementing freemium. For OpenEdition, the freemium model is from libraries for publishers:

- Open Access on the Web (html) – free (you can read online, copy/paste, print, save, etc.)
- Pdf and epub download and other services licensed to libraries – premium (no DRM, no download quotas)
- 66% of income for books and journals publishers
- Partnership with libraries consortia: [Couperin](#), [Crepuq](#), [CIFNAL](#)

There is an incentive in the freemium model to add constantly new premium services, that is why we developed added values services for the libraries. It is not only the ability for their public to download pdf and epub, it is also the ability for them to have Counter statistics on their campus, it is a standard to evaluate the usage electronic resources in libraries. They also have hotline, long-term preservation of the content, all metadata that can directly fill their catalog, etc. It gives the library incentives to maximise usage of this open access resources but it also gives us incentives to answer the specific needs of the libraries. For example, libraries used to say us for years that it would be nice to have a MARK record of

metadata to be able to be ingested in our catalog. So the incentive was to make this development for the libraries.

=> We are in constant dialogue with the libraries that ask us new services and we have to answer to this.

The results of the freemium program at Openedition are pretty good, we have around 150 journals from our platform, participating to this program and getting revenues. We have 50 books publishers and more than 110 libraries subscribing to the program. It took a lot of time to convince the American libraries because we are far from them but eventually we did it. So year after year the revenues are growing. The results also are good on a usage level - the first aim was to maximise usage in the library. We can calculate retrospectively the usage before we implemented the premium program, make a comparison and deduce some impact of the program. For example, Year after year, when [Cyberge](#) entered the program, there was a growth of the usage inside the library. Is is only a hint, not a global survey.

Freemium can be complementary to another stream of revenue which can be the support of one or several institutions. Freemium is not here to replace other business models, but it can be an additional model.

How to cite an article in freemium? => Html is available. We developed a feature numbering each paragraph in the html, so your citation practice will be better than citing a page because it is more precise and meaningful as you cite a meaning part of the content and not a formal part which is a page, which depends on the layout.

The case of books

Some say that open access for books is infancy, somehow it is right, but it is just the beginning. There are many initiatives trying to develop open access book publishing in SSH.

Some fundamentals:

[Open reports](#), a book publishing platform from the Netherlands with a European scale, that produces a lot of reports and surveys, studies to assess the business models of open access book publishing, the usages, to identify challenges to overcome, etc. For example in the report "[A project exploring Open Access monograph publishing in the Netherlands. Final Report](#)", they calculated the average cost of publishing a book in the Netherlands, as the French did, so the total average cost for one book publishing, open access or not, is around 12 000€. Other studies confirmed this evaluation. They also divided the different parts of the cost and separated:

- the first copy preparation cost, without printing, distribution and commercialisation costs, the "open access cost". It is the cost publishing a book, in open access or not, the cost of preparing the first digital copy of a book.
- Then you have the cost of selling, printing, distributing the book.

They found that the open access cost was around 50% of the total cost. So the cost of publishing an open access book on a platform, a pdf on a platform is around 6 000€, not so

much in fact. Their message to funder is that if you want to fund open access book, then it is not so much to add to a research project budget.

Important output of this study:

- Visibility and discoverability of open access books are higher than traditional books. In the methodology of the study, they took 50 books open access and 50 other books, non open access. Scientifically, they tried to take the same type of books, authors have the same prestige, publisher the same, same subject, etc. In term of usage, OA books are higher because they are more discoverable.
- They also showed that there was almost no impact on the sales of the print copy of OA books. It means that when you publish a book OA on the Internet, if you have a print copy of the book that you distribute by other means, you can also sell your printed copy of the book at the same level as if the book was not open access.
=> There is no negative impact of distributing OA book on the Internet on the sales.

London Economics Report “[Economic analysis of business models for OA monographs January 2015](#)”. This report helps us a lot to categorise the business model we can find in OA book publishing:

- *Traditional publisher*: Oxford University Press, for now, OA is very marginal in this business model
- *New university press (NUP)*: UCL Press, the library is leading this completely digital and OA initiative
- *Mission-oriented OA*: Language Science Press - Unsatisfied scholars about publication set up their own publishing organisation
- *Freemium OA*: OpenBook Publishers
- *Aggregator/distributor*: OAPEN (works with Knowledge Unlatched) or KU Books - they are the middleman between the publisher and the libraries.
- *Author payment model* (Book Processing Charges, BPC): Ubiquity Press, they separate the different functionalities that an author want to subscribe to order to publish his book; the cost can be different if for example the author does by himself the typesetting or proofreading, he will not have to pay for it; he can also have additional services to maximise the visibility for example. It is not a package, you can choose the services you want.

Freemium model for books: the example of Open Book Publishers

Books are available in different format and you can buy the paperback, the print version of the book. You can read everything OA in html. The book is OA on the platform but if you want to download additional formats, then you have to pay for that. First, they disseminate their books on several platforms, for example on [OpenEdition](#) or [GoogleBooks](#), so it increases the visibility and the usage as it reaches out different part of the audience through different channels. Regarding the revenues, they have a business model mainly based on the sales revenue but they also have other streams of revenue: they have grants, for example, the authors receiving grants can give it to the publisher to support the business model of the publisher; they also have a specific library membership program so their users can download freely the pdf or epub files or have a rebate on the print version.

Freemium for data: the example of OECD publishing

Business model for open data publication: I have found only one very good example of business model on data with [OECD](#) freemium with the editorialisation of data. The OECD has several research projects and they publish on a daily basis journals, books and statistical series with a freemium model. It means that most of their content, data and publication, is available OA on their platform. They also propose to institutions to subscribe to additional services based on the editorialisation of their content, publication and data. So as a user, unregistered, you can download data but if you want, for example, to access to data in different format or if you want to aggregate some data and download this aggregation you made yourself on the platform, or if you want specific representation of data to copy/paste in your own publication, or if you want to do some advanced search in data, then you have to be affiliated to an institution that subscribed to [OECD iLibrary](#). I think that what is interesting here is that you have free access to raw data, but there is lot of work of editorialisation to support these premium services that to be paid. They are also constantly improving their business model: some previously premium services become free because they invent new services that are premium. In fact, one major point made by the London Economics report is that **with the freemium model, there is a strong incentive for innovation** because you cannot maintain forever the same service as premium. Usage is evolving, demand from users is evolving too.

Conclusion

“It is a numbers game, so bust out your Excel spreadsheet. It's all about finding things in the margins - lots of little things rather than one key thing”.

From the inventor of Dropbox, D. Houston, in "[Case studies in Freemium: Pandora, Dropbox, Evernote, Automattic and MailChimp](#)", Gigaom, March 2010.

It means that you cannot elaborate your budget on one stream of revenue, you have to elaborate it on many different streams of revenue which are complementary. This is a way to make a sustainable business model.

=> Diversification of the publishing business model! It is not anymore a matter of selling books in bookshops and libraries but also:

- Funding (gold)
- Print (on demand) sales
- Premium services income
- In-kind institutional support
- Crowdfunding

Contact

[Pierre Mounier](#) is deputy director of [OpenEdition](#), a comprehensive infrastructure based in France for open access publication and communication in the humanities and social sciences. OpenEdition offers several platforms for journals, scientific announcements, academic blogs, and, finally, books, in different languages and from different countries. Pierre teaches digital humanities at the EHESS in Paris. He has published several books about the social and political impact of ICT, digital publishing and digital humanities.

Associate Director for international development [OpenEdition](#)

Coordinator of OPERAS: <http://operas.hypotheses.org>

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0691-6063>

Twitter: [@piotrr70](https://twitter.com/piotrr70)

Email: pierre.mounier@openedition.org

Sdvig Press

Patrick Flack, [Sdvig Press](#), Swiss

Patrick Flack is managing editor of [Sdvig Press](#), an open access non-profit academic publishing house. He is a researcher who came into this role of publisher because of the demand and the structure of his research project. The publishing house itself is not a traditional one but more a hybrid between a publishing house, a digital infrastructure and a research project. Its mission is to respond to a specific research challenge. The point is not OA per se, but OA is an integral part of the project, a mean to make it function and a manifesto for the research project that gave birth to the publishing house.

Research challenge

My research itself is focused on the history of structuralism, not only French structuralism, but structuralism in Central and Eastern Europe. The idea behind this project is to counter the usual vision we have of structuralism with Saussure, the great Genevan linguist, with schools in between Prague, Copenhagen and Geneva; and Claude Levi-Strauss from whose work the structuralist movement as we usually know it (Barthes, Lacan, etc.) evolved. In fact, the origins of structuralism are far more complex and we want to show that the network of the history of structuralism is not only French focused, but involves a lot of scholars and thinkers from different disciplines in Prague, in Russia, etc.

The research challenge is important as some authors are little known and have written in different languages (German, Russian, Polish, etc.). Moreover, the corpus necessary to represent the history of structuralism and counter narratives that are strongly established since the French movement from the 60's is enormous. Worst of all, most sources have not been curated and edited in a proper way: many books have not been republished and critically edited. This is why it is now necessary to make as many texts as possible accessible otherwise no researchers will be able to take an interest and conduct their own research. The corpus has to be curated and made accessible in a multilingual way. This task has to be done sustainably, internationally and cooperatively. Publishing and curating the corpus is an integral part of the research, otherwise the established narratives will not move.

Publishing house

It has been developed as a solution to this research challenge. The main problem is not really a specific research problem because the corpus is really wide (and allows for competing interpretations), but it is to get the project financed for a long period of time. The publishing house basically started with the idea of print on demand publishing and OA, through a presentation of Pierre Mounier. But moving beyond the OA publication of such digital material, we then wanted to have a virtual environment where we could work on and

structure the whole corpus. We took some inspiration from [OpenEdition](#), for example [hypotheses.org](#) the blog platform and turned this into a digital project and a curated data and text repository with overlay services. We have a few journals but most importantly, we have platform oriented services: [Acta Structuralica](#), [Phenomenological Reviews](#), [Open commons of Phenomenology](#), [Structuralica](#), [PACEM](#). Organizing the publishing activity around a community was a decisive moment for this project.

Structure

The most mature project, the Open Commons of Phenomenology is discussed here as an example. The most important part is in the [repository](#), with the major authors of phenomenology. You can select authors, have a short bibliographic introduction, then a complete bibliographies. This is not as in a library catalog or [Worldcat](#) where they have basically everything that has been inputted; we went to the Husserl archive and we found a complete edited bibliography and inputted everything: <http://open.org/pers-100275> The granularity is at the chapter and article level. We do not only input a book, we also include all chapters and all articles. Ex: [Maurice Merleau-Ponty](#), [La structure du comportement](#).

We respect copyright, it is always indicated on the page of the publication, so the pdf is made available if the copyright allows it. If not, for example Merleau-Ponty is free of right in Canada, so there is a copy on the Canadian website but we didn't repost it on the website, we linked it externally.

All the data is strictly and carefully curated and structured. We have a function like in Worldcat, if you estimate that something is duplicated or missing; or you can find all the translations, or other editions, etc. It is a very efficient way if you are doing the history of publication of a philosopher: these information are structured and presented in a way that is useful to users.

=> The platform offers not only contents or data itself, it structures it, it presents it in ways that are immediately useful to users.

Finally, it is exhaustive, up to a point of course; you can always find new publications of an author, but if you go to the Merleau-Ponty's page on the open commons, you will have everything from him. If it is the Heidegger page which is under copyright, you will have links to all the text. Every single text is quickly and efficiently accessible in pdf. We carried out OCR (Optical Character Recognition) and a real digital edition. This is the backbone of the platform, in a way, the part we intent to sell.

Another way the data is organized is by journal and author. It can be very hard to carry it out in library catalog, especially if it is an old journal that has a banal name, like "People and School" because it will always give a hundred results to find the review. The database is still quite *small*, still we have 25 000 entries and 2000 full texts.

When you are logged in, you can submit references with a two-stage process and declare metadata (title, subtitle, editor, language, DOI, rights, etc.). You need to link to translation or original edition, that's how we can move so efficiently behind. When you save your submission, it goes to the moderator, it will create an input from you and it will be reviewed and corrected if needed. This brings quality to data. It really makes sense to do curate

carefully and check the data is correct and structured, linking to the author, to other publications.

The other aspect of the project which was inspired by hypotheses.org is to have blogs for research projects or society pages. For example, [North American Society of Early Phenomenology](#) has a blog here where they post call for papers and so on. Its feed is replicated on the main page. [Scuola di Milano](#), a group of researchers who want to input a lot of bibliographical information and present them also has a blog here. It is really at the frontier of being a blog, a project, a page and almost a journal. We haven't given it a ISSN, individual posts don't have a DOI, but we can decide to do that. They have a research group that could become the editorial board, it could change into a journal.

An interesting feature that explains why we didn't use hypotheses.org for this blog is that each philosopher has a page and it is then linked directly to the main database, it gets the bibliographical data and publishes it on the blog page. This gives the possibility to present results or data which they have imputed in a common database (accessible from different platforms). This idea is to have 20 or 30 research projects which we select, then they input information about authors with linguistic capacity. We aim at integrating visualisation tools (timelines and maps).

We also have templates to input biographical data with *events* in the structured database, so all will be connected as well with an author page. This allows to know all the courses an author gave and to link it to who were the students attending as well. This will be combined with the bibliographical data. It obviously gives a lot of possibilities of visualisation that can be integrated in the research project or institutes' webpages.

With a structured database where you have all phenomenology and structuralism and 10 to 20 platforms which would cover the whole field of relevant thinkers, I can do my work - and many other researchers can carry out their own. It is the institutional name that is an incentive for quality; a quality dimension, so in that sense it is not completely open structure: it is an academic scholarly publication or communication form.

How to finance the project

We have two important parts. The thing is not about making money, but how to finance the project and its labour cost.

- Digital library can use as an infrastructure and contribute with qualified working hours, which cost us nothing except answering some emails, setting up the blogs, etc.
- Freemium model: all the content is open access and we offer extra features: full bibliography in a full list, visualisation with timelines, maps, biographical data, etc.

Editorial and Governance board

Our strategy is to become *incontournable* and make scholar recommend the platform to libraries. It is a project for the community, community based, like the [commons](#), scholars just need librarian to support by subscribing. The organisation is non-profit, it means that all the money goes directly back to the project, to develop the technical side, to do translations,

reedition and develop further projects. And the big dream is that the commons doesn't stay digital, it is also real world community, so we would love to make conferences and make an institute of open commons, to have real world places. My colleague also owns a second hand bookstore in Lausanne, so we have this completely digital global open access project but the physical place where people would communicate and talk about research can be part of the project as well. It is a revolution, as Stiegler says, with the Internet compared to invention of the printing press, it changes a lot of things, not only about publishing books, it changes the way you cooperate.

Contact

Patrick Flack is the managing director of [sdvig press](http://sdvigpress.org/), an open access, non-profit academic publishing house. He is also associate member of the Central-European Institute for Philosophy (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague). Since completing his PhD in 2011 (Comparative Literature, Charles University in Prague), he has worked in Helsinki, Leuven and Berlin as a post-doctoral researcher funded by the Swiss National Scientific Foundation. His research focuses on structuralism and a trans-cultural, interdisciplinary approach to its historiography.

With sdvig press, he is currently developing a number of open access thematic platforms – such as the [Open Commons of Phenomenology](#) – designed to function as sustainable infrastructural and communication hubs for their respective scientific communities. The development of these platforms is linked directly with international institutions (Husserl Archives, Czech National Library, etc.), embedding their research projects, archival holdings and editorial outputs.

Sdvig Press: <http://sdvigpress.org/>

Twitter: [@panflack](#)

Email: flack@sdvigpress.org