

Plan S: Making Open Access a Reality by 2020

Stephan Kuster
Science Europe

CLORA, 5 February 2019

SCIENCE
EUROPE
Shaping the future of research



Motivations for Open Access

1. Scientific: publication paywalls hamper the dissemination of research outcomes within the scientific community
2. Societal: publication paywalls hamper the uptake of research outcomes by society
3. Ethical: Results from publicly-funded research should remain in the public domain
4. Economic: the subscription model of publishing has become unsustainable

Plan S : Strong principles

- ⦿ **No** publication should be locked behind a **paywall**
- ⦿ OA must be immediate, *i.e.* **no embargo periods**
- ⦿ Publication under an **open license**; no transfer/licensing of copyright
- ⦿ **Transparency** about pricing and contracts
- ⦿ **No hybrid** model of publication, except as a transitional arrangement with a clearly defined endpoint



The 10 Principles of Plan S

- ◉ Authors retain copyright of their publication with no restrictions. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY. In all cases, the license applied should fulfil the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration;
- ◉ The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of robust criteria and requirements for the services that compliant high quality Open Access journals and Open Access platforms must provide;
- ◉ In case such high quality Open Access journals or platforms do not yet exist, the Funders will, in a coordinated way, provide incentives to establish and support them when appropriate; support will also be provided for Open Access infrastructures where necessary;
- ◉ Where applicable, Open Access publication fees are covered by the Funders or universities, not by individual researchers; it is acknowledged that all scientists should be able to publish their work Open Access even if their institutions have limited means;
- ◉ When Open Access publication fees are applied, their funding is standardised and capped (across Europe);
- ◉ The Funders will ask universities, research organisations, and libraries to align their policies and strategies, notably to ensure transparency;
- ◉ The above principles shall apply to all types of scholarly publications, but it is understood that the timeline to achieve Open Access for monographs and books may be longer than 1 January 2020;
- ◉ The importance of open archives and repositories for hosting research outputs is acknowledged because of their long-term archiving function and their potential for editorial innovation;
- ◉ The 'hybrid' model of publishing is not compliant with the above principles;
- ◉ The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliance.



Roads to compliance with Plan S

Open Access journals or Open Access platforms	Deposition of scholarly articles in Open Access repositories without embargo	Hybrid journals under Transformative agreements
--	---	--

- cOAlition S «Guidance to Implementation» specify the roads to compliance
- cOAlition S members will ensure financial support for OA publishing via the prescribed routes to compliance
- In 2023 cOAlition S will review the effects of Plan S on achieving a transition to full and immediate OA



Requirements for compliance

Open Access journals or Open Access platforms	Deposition of scholarly articles in Open Access repositories without embargo	Hybrid journals under Transformative agreements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOAJ registered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Version of Record (VoR) or Author's Accepted Manuscript (AAM) • OpenDOAR registered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal committed to a full OA transition • Collaborate with ESAC to register contracts

- ◉ CC-BY 4.0 license required. Rights retained by author/institution
- ◉ Scholarly articles reviewed according to the standards within the relevant discipline, and according to the standards of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)



cOAlition S: Who is Involved?

National funders:

- ⊙ Austria: FWF
- ⊙ Finland: AKA
- ⊙ France: ANR
- ⊙ Ireland: SFI
- ⊙ Italy: INFN
- ⊙ Luxembourg: FNR
- ⊙ Netherlands: NWO
- ⊙ Norway: RCN
- ⊙ Poland: NCN
- ⊙ Slovenia: ARRS
- ⊙ Sweden: FORMAS
- ⊙ Sweden: FORTE
- ⊙ UK: UKRI

European funders:

- ⊙ European Research Council
- ⊙ European Commission

Charitable foundations:

- ⊙ The Wellcome Trust
- ⊙ The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- ⊙ Riksbankens Jubileumsfond
- ⊙ Compagnia di San Paolo

Global dimension

- ⊙ African Academy of Sciences
- ⊙ National Science and Technology Council, Zambia

Coordinated by:



Is Plan S different from other initiatives?

- ⦿ Plan S aims to **align OA policies**
- ⦿ Plan S entails **mandating** OA by funders
- ⦿ Funders **commit to cover costs** (APCs, platforms, journal flipping)
- ⦿ Plan S sets a clear **timeline: 2020**
- ⦿ Plan S is about **principles**, not about particular publication models



Plan S : Concerns - Criticism – and Misrepresentations

- ⦿ « Will we no longer be able to publish in *Science* or *Nature* ? »
- ⦿ Violation of academic freedom ?
- ⦿ Plan S is Gold OA only ? APC-based only ?
- ⦿ Plan S threatens the existence of learned societies.
- ⦿ Plan S will be more costly than subscription-based publishing.
- ⦿ Plan S will be detrimental to quality; will play into the hands of predatory publishers.



For More Information

⦿ <http://scieur.org/coalition-s>

Thank you for your attention!
Stephan Kuster



Plan S is not about one particular model

Nine routes towards Plan-S compliance (based on the 20181127 guidance document)

routes to Plan S compliance	A. existing/new APC gold journal / platform	B. existing/new non-APC gold journal / platform (diamond)	C. flipping journals to APC gold (by publishers or editors)	D. flipping journals to non-APC gold (diamond), by publishers or eds.	E. hybrid journal in transformative deal (temporary route)	F. CC-BY OA in hybrid journal & self archiving the published paper	G. archiving publisher version, on publication, CC-BY	H. archiving AAM, on publication, CC-BY	I. sharing preprints and using overlay PR
1. compliant?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	unsure
2. example	PLoS, 1000s more	Open Library of Humanities, 1000s more	Epidemiology & Infection, 100s more	Scoop ²	(no transformative deals yet?)	all hybrid journals allowing CC-BY	(MNRAS, APS journals) ¹	Royal Society, (Emerald journals) ¹	SciPost
3. current use / availability	sizeable amount	limited	very limited	very limited	none yet?	sizeable amount	limited	limited	very limited
4. effect on publishers	gold publ. win, evt. decreasing subscriptions	more competition / perhaps evt. decreasing subscriptions	change in business model / probl. for high rejection	new partnerships or loose journals to funders/institutions	need to change business model	journals keep role if CC-BY is allowed	evt. decreasing subscriptions, need to solve sustainability?	keep large part of perceived value	change publishing model or loose out
5. effect on researchers	away from trad. venues and IF-thinking	away from trad. venues and IF-thinking	depends on (funding for) APC	none	limited effect	almost no restriction on journal choice, but need to pay APC	small effort	small effort, accept limitations	adapt to new idea
6. effect on libraries	away from hybrid deals & IF-thinking	away from hybrid deals & IF-thinking, pot. role in funding	limited	potential role in funding	(help) negotiate transformative deals	current type read & publish deals remain relevant	role insofar as hosted in IR / cancel subs evt.	continued role, esp. hosting in inst. repo	chance to play role in curation
7. effect on funders	supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels	supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels?	depends on APC levels	lower average APC levels? / pot. role in funding	depends on who pays APCs during the deal	no financial burden / no reduction of role hybrid	no financial gain	no financial gain	adapt to new idea, change assessment
8. effect on societies	big, because of subscription dependance	big, because of subscription dependance	change in business model / probl. for high rejection	change in business model / probl. for high rejection	need to change business model	journals keep role if CC-BY is allowed	evt. decreasing subscriptions?	evt. decreasing subscriptions?	limited role, perhaps in quality assurance?
9. effect on editors of trad. jrnls.	fewer submissions, lower status	fewer submissions, lower status	none (or big role in leading flip)	none (or big role in leading flip)	none (or big role in leading flip)	none	none	none	new role in overlay journals?
10. overall pub cost	depends on market	depends on market / funding sources	depends on market	depends on market / funding sources	remains high at least until deal has effect	remains high	remains high	remains high	substantially lower?
11. fits changes in assessment	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	++

¹ these examples allow immediate sharing but not with CC-BY and copyright retention yet

The way forward

- ⊙ Plan S implementation have been published in November 2019
- ⊙ A public consultation runs until 8 February 2019
- ⊙ Mid-term goal: let's change the way we assess and reward science



Are OA mandates violating academic freedom ?

AAAS Statement on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, 2017 :

“Scientific freedom is the freedom to engage in scientific inquiry, pursue and apply knowledge, and communicate openly (sic)”.

Robert K. Merton, 1942. The Normative Structure of Science :

“The institutional conception of science as part of the public domain is linked with the imperative for communication of findings. Secrecy is the antithesis of this norm; full and open (sic) communication its enactment.”

