



PROMOTING  
**RESEARCH  
EXCELLENCE**  
FOR **POLICY AND  
PROGRESS**

# ACADEMIA EUROPAEA CARDIFF KNOWLEDGE HUB

## POST-EVENT REPORT



### The future of research: Assessing the impact of Plan S

THE LEUVEN INSTITUTE  
FOR IRELAND IN EUROPE, LEUVEN, BELGIUM

6TH NOVEMBER 2019

#ImpactPlanS



# Introduction



Professor Theo D'haen MAE  
chairing the symposium

"I was delighted to chair the international symposium, *The future of research: Assessing the impact of Plan S*, and to welcome an audience of around 130 to the historic Leuven Institute for Ireland in Europe. We are particularly grateful to KU Leuven Libraries for their extensive support.

This report is a summary of the presentations and discussions that took place at the symposium. I hope you find it both interesting and informative.

If this report interests you, look out for Academia Europaea's next conference on Plan S, scheduled for 2021 and organised by the HERCulES (Higher Education, Research and Culture in European Societies) Group."

**Professor Theo D'haen MAE**  
Professor Emeritus, KU Leuven  
Editor, *European Review*

Join the discussion  
on Twitter:  
**#ImpactPlanS**



We are grateful to the Academia Europaea for generously supporting this event through the 2019 Hubert Curien Initiative Fund.

[www.ae-info.org](http://www.ae-info.org)



# Summary

An international symposium on the impact of Plan S, organised by the AE Cardiff Knowledge Hub with KU Leuven Libraries, took place at KU Leuven on 6th November 2019. The symposium's keynote address was given by Professor Johan Rooryck MAE, the newly appointed Open Access Champion. The rest of the symposium was dedicated to assessing the impact of Plan S on a range of stakeholders, including early-career researchers, research-intensive institutions, scholarly societies and publishers. The event concluded with a look at the future prospects for Open Access publishing and Plan S. This report gives a summary of each of the sessions.

**For further detail, the event programme and slides are available at:**  
<http://aecardiffknowledgehub.wales/2019/11/14/impact-plan-s>

**Panellists and organisers of *The future of research: Assessing the impact of Plan S***





Professor Johan Rooryck MAE, Open Access Champion, cOAlition S, delivering the keynote



Professor Sierd Cloetingh MAE, President of Academia Europaea, Hilde van Kiel, Director of KU Leuven Libraries, Professor Luc Sels, Rector of KU Leuven, and Professor Theo D'haen MAE, Chair of the symposium welcoming delegates to the evening reception at the historic University Library. The reception was kindly hosted by KU Leuven Libraries



A member of the audience contributing to the debate



University Library, venue for the evening reception



## Introductory remarks from the opening session



“Plan S is a topic close to the heart of the Academia Europaea. We are a pan-European academy of around 4,000 members, acting as the voice of science, freedom of expression and the sharing of knowledge. Our affiliates are the Young Academy of Europe, representing the future of science. This Plan S symposium is very timely, given the fast pace of change and the complexity of the issue.”

### **Professor Sierd Cloetingh MAE**

President, Academia Europaea



“Change is happening quickly. The Young Academy of Europe is a dynamic and innovative group of top European young scientists, with outspoken views about science and science policy. Young academies need to make their voices heard, not least on Open Research and Plan S.”

### **Dr Mangala Srinivas FYAE**

Chair, Young Academy of Europe

# Keynote address

## Professor Johan Rooryck MAE, Open Access Champion, cOAlition S

### *Plan S: From principles to implementation*

Back in the 1970s, researchers routinely went to the library to use traditional card indexes. Now, such indexes are obsolete, and the same principle should apply to journal subscriptions. They serve no purpose.

cOAlition S, a consortium of research funders, was founded in Europe. We are now developing a global presence, seeking more funders across Europe and worldwide. Concurrently, we are coordinating our actions with those of other players in Open Access, such as OA2020 and COAR (Confederation of Open Access Repositories).

*“Journal subscriptions serve no purpose.”*

Professor Johan  
Rooryck MAE,  
Open Access  
Champion



cOAlition S

**National European funders:**

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

**European funders:**

- European Commission
- European Research Council

**Charitable foundations:**

- The Wellcome Trust
- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Aligning Science Across Parkinson's

**Global dimension**

- World Health Organisation + TDR
- Jordan: HCST
- Zambia: NSTC
- South Africa: SAMRC
- African Academy of Sciences

**São Paulo Statement:** AmeliCA, SciELO, African Open Science Platform, OA2020, cOAlition S

**Coordinated action with OA2020**  
**Coordinated action with COAR**

## Membership of cOAlition S

Why is Plan S necessary? Firstly, it accelerates science and citizen science, by making research results available as quickly as possible. Secondly, research funders get more return on their investment in research, through a transparent and effective transition to full Open Access. Thirdly, researchers can expect far greater visibility of their work if they publish through Open Access. Research results are a public good and should carry an open licence, such as Creative Commons CC-BY. Plan S does not permit paywalls or embargo periods. Under Plan S, funders pay for authors to publish their work, as a normal part of doing science. We also have a commitment to assess research outputs based on DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment) principles, not on impact factor or other similar quantitative metrics.

The implementation period for Plan S is now a little longer than envisaged, as we have extended the timeline by one year. Publications from funding calls issued from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2021 must be Open Access. Transformative arrangements will be supported to the end of 2024. There are several possible routes to Plan S compliance:

1. The author publishes in a full Open Access journal.
2. The author publishes in a subscription journal but concurrently also in an Open Access repository.
3. The author publishes in a subscription journal that is under a transformative arrangement.

There are three possible *transformative strategies* to get to Plan S:

1. **Transformative agreements** are library consortia contracts with publishers to convert subscription deals to Open Access. There are already examples in several countries, such as Germany and Holland. Agreements must be transparent; they should be at least cost-neutral initially and they should save money in the long run.
2. **Transformative model agreements** with scholarly societies. Under these agreements, libraries continue to support learned society journals. Libraries pay the same costs as before for these journals, but in return for Open Access. The Society of Microbiology is an example in the UK, where a deal has been struck with the national consortium Jisc to support the Society's six journals.
3. **Transformative journals.** Under these arrangements, the share of Open Access publishing should increase as the level of subscriptions decreases. Publishers must commit to a full transition within an agreed timeframe.

At the same time, we acknowledge that there are still challenges:

1. The **cost of investment** in the transition and in the **capacity of the main players**. It includes the capacity of libraries and societies to negotiate and work with the changes; addressing gaps in publishing options for authors; and providing information and support.
2. The need for further **alignment of funder and institutional policies**.
3. The **transfer of costs** from readers to producers, and to research-intensive universities and countries. A new cost model is likely to be required in the future.
4. The need to address the range of **different models**, along with challenges in specific disciplines, geographical regions etc.
5. The requirement for increased **coordination** across countries, consortia, disciplines, funders and institutions.

On a positive note, there are examples of good collaboration with stakeholders:

- **With researcher groups.** cOAlition S is working with the Global Young Academy and others to develop indicators to measure the impact of Plan S on early-career researchers. cOAlition S has also established an ambassadors' network to engage with the research community.
- **With publishers.** cOAlition S is in discussion with publishers regarding the transformative journal model and learned society publishing. Some publishers are already supportive of the 'green' model, making them fully Plan S compliant.
- **With learned societies.** A consultancy, Information Power, has produced a report and toolkit (Wise & Estelle, 2019). As described above, we have a transformative model for societies.

- **With libraries.** Libraries can play a key role because they hold subscription budgets and can negotiate new agreements. Libraries can help in a number of ways, such as working with learned societies, managing journals and new platforms. They can also help researchers with setting up and managing new journals.
- **With universities.** There have been statements of support from pan-European organisations, such as the European Universities Association (EUA) and the League of European Research Universities (LERU).
- **With other Open Access players.** There has been support and statements from initiatives such as OA2020 and the African Open Science Platform.

Future activities of cOAlition S focus on **transparent pricing** and in **defining services** for the Open Access fee. We are working with the consultancy Information Power to provide a suitable framework, with a set of service 'baskets', as it is important to understand true detailed costs and pricing across different disciplines.

A new **governance structure** is being established for Plan S. There is an executive steering group and a leaders' group, supported by a Plan S office set up with the European Science Foundation and due to open early in 2020.

In conclusion, Plan S is part of a wider Open Science movement to make full and immediate Open Access a reality. We need to build a global coalition of funders, supported by institutions, researchers and publishers. We are all in this together.

*"We are all in this together."*



Professor Johan Rooryck MAE addressing the audience



## Discussion

**Q:** Is Plan S an example of evolution or disruption in publishing?

**A:** Open Access is a disruptive enabler. Publishers must change now or find themselves obsolete, as happened to Kodak and others. Why has it taken so long? Thankfully, some publishers are already contemplating change.

**Q:** Is a 'green' model possible if the publisher allows publication in a repository?

**A:** Yes, if there is no embargo.

**Q:** Publishing is profitable, particularly in the US. Why should publishers change?

**A:** There is also money to be made from Open Access. Many new Open Access publishers have highly streamlined operations. Open Access is not new, but the difference is that funders are now supporting the transition.

**Q:** Should overall costs go down or stay the same? Are there too many compromises?

**A:** Transformative agreements are transitional. We are giving an early warning to publishers that after three years we will negotiate, and prices will have to reduce. Pricing will become fully transparent. Once everything is Open Access, there will be more papers published and, as a consequence, more income should result.

**Q:** How will Plan S deal with predatory journals?

**A:** Researchers recognise predatory journals. cOAlition S provides guidance and a set of technical requirements, with criteria that exclude predatory journals.

**Q:** Surely transformative agreements will be in the countries with the power to make such agreements? Other countries do not have such research power, particularly in my discipline.

**A:** There is a national consortium of libraries in most countries and they have negotiated agreements with publishers. Transformative agreements cover the whole portfolio of publishers, not one only discipline.

**Q:** How can engagement take place with learned societies?

**A:** It is up to them and we cannot force them to change. Change is probably more feasible for the smaller societies, as larger ones have got used to a significant level of income. Nonetheless, societies will have to adapt to a different business model, based on the assumption that the subscription model is dead.

**Q:** What are the challenges of going global? A lot of journals, editors and societies are in the USA, and they see Plan S as a European initiative.

**A:** We are having conversations.

**Q:** Is this not a European project for European problems? How can we learn from others, for example, in South America?

**A:** We have looked at South American initiatives, such as SciELO and AmeliCA. South America is still paying high subscription costs, but these can be reduced through transformative agreements. Colombia is an example of securing a transformative agreement through a consortium arrangement. Libraries should recognise that they have a lot of power in the system and can fill the gaps, for example, in the humanities. We acknowledge that change in the humanities will be hard. The Royal Historical Society's report on Plan S (Finn, 2019) flags up the challenges, for example. Commercial and non-commercial providers should work together, not be divided.

*"Why has Open Access taken so long?"*

**Dr Matthew DiFranco, Chair of the Marie Curie Alumni Association, contributing to the debate**





# Panel 1: The impact of Plan S on early- and mid-career researchers



Gareth O'Neill, Plan S Ambassador

## Gareth O'Neill, Plan S Ambassador

Most researchers support Open Science but do not always understand it or how to comply with it. Institutions must support and train researchers, as well as incentivise change. During my time at EuroDoc we realised Plan S was a major issue and so we reached out to other associations of young researchers, namely, the MCAA (Marie Curie Alumni Association) and YAE (Young Academy of Europe). We asked two basic questions – why is Plan S happening, and what is it? The 'why' was clearly about declining budgets and increasing costs. The 'what' was not clear. We examined the Plan S principles and engaged with its two main architects, Robert-Jan Smits (formerly the European Commission's Open Access Envoy) and Marc Schiltz (President of Science Europe). We supported full and immediate Open Access, the retention of copyright ownership by the author, and we had some discussions around licensing. We published a response to the consultation process on Plan S, adjustments were made, and it is now in the implementation phase. We are confident that Plan S does not hurt the careers of early-career researchers.



Véronique de Herde, Eurodoc representative

## Véronique de Herde, Eurodoc representative

EuroDoc was involved in Plan S at an early stage, alongside our partners the Young Academy of Europe (YAE) and the Marie Curie Alumni Association (MCAA). We observed that criticisms of Plan S in the research community centered on two main concerns. The first focused on costs and equality of the ability to publish, namely, the fear that researchers with fewer means could be excluded within a 'pay to publish' landscape. The second concern related to research evaluation – based on the journal impact factor – and its impact on publishing costs. Some expressed the fear that the article processing charges (APCs) of journals would rise unfairly in parallel with the rise of the journal's impact factor and that the overall costs of the Open Access model would become unsustainable. We welcomed the revised version of Plan S because it addressed these concerns, firstly, by requesting transparency in costs and prices from publishers and, secondly, by proposing that the assessment of researchers would gradually move away from the journal impact factor. Currently, Plan S faces the challenges of greater coordination and the coexistence of diverse publishing models. Making the whole publishing landscape evolve towards cost-effective and fair Open Access solutions is a shared responsibility of the whole research community and not only of funders.

## Dr Matthew DiFranco, Chair, Marie Curie Alumni Association

The MCAA is an international non-profit association that represents researchers throughout their careers. Firstly, it is absolutely vital that researchers do not give up their copyright. Secondly, we must avoid an overly narrow definition of quality, and instead look at how well researchers perform across a range of scholarly activities. It makes DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment) principles important to early-career researchers. It is also critically important to look at the impact of emerging technologies on new models and how to change publishing models. Publishers are already considering this, but it is also an opportunity for cOAlition S to consider its leverage – for example, could it create a new platform?



Dr Matthew DiFranco, Chair, Marie Curie Alumni Association

## Professor Toma Susi FYAE, Vice-Chair, Young Academy of Europe

Discussions on Open Access have lasted for decades and relatively little progress has been made. Change must now happen. We spent many hours trying to fully understand Plan S and to give constructive feedback on it. The additional year before Plan S starts has been necessary and the revised guidelines on implementation are sound. The remaining concern is about evaluation and impact, and we need the support of universities to address it.



Professor Toma Susi FYAE, Vice-Chair, Young Academy of Europe

The panel discussing the impact of Plan S on early- and mid-career researchers





## Discussion

**Q:** What can publishers do to support early-career researchers?

**A:** It is vital to engage and communicate with the early-career research community. Early-career researchers are barely informed about the transition to Open Science. Explain to them what is happening, and why. Publishers should not be requesting the transfer of copyright. PhD students are often shocked by the publishing model they encounter; they assume everything should be open and available on the internet.

**Q:** Budgets are limited for early-career researchers. Article Processing Charges (APCs) are expensive and paid for from research budgets. Should early-career researchers expect to pay higher fees for higher impact?

**A:** No, the money should be redirected towards more beneficial activities and costs should go down.

**Q:** A lot of public money is going into private pockets. How can we keep the money in the system?

**A:** It depends so much on the specific country, the university, the funder. It should be possible to secure greater discounts on fees, but more negotiated deals are required to help achieve this. Researchers should be aware of how public funds are being spent. The publishing sector is worth billions of dollars, and a full Open Access system could yield considerable savings, which could be kept in the system. With investment, we could move towards open platforms. At the same time, we need transparency in costs, to know who is adding real value in the publishing process, and what the benefits are. Should Article Processing Charges (APCs) really subsidise a learned society's other professional activities? What kind of publishing model do we want? What kind of infrastructure? All in all, it needs more debate within the research community.

**Q:** If we stay cost-neutral, what are the savings? If there are platforms, what is important to early-career researchers?

**A:** Early-career researchers are seldom asked for their views, but instead are affected by decisions made by supervisors and others with greater power and influence. One positive step would be to get more involved in the peer review process. Instead of relying on the esteem of peer review for a journal title, we would like an open, transparent peer review system. The whole approach to research evaluation also needs to change.

**Q:** What would evaluation look like? It cannot only focus on outputs.

**A:** An online platform could support the entire research process, encompassing all steps in a research project – grant, methodology, data collection, results, assessment/revision – through to publication. Each of these activities could be assigned a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) and published separately and openly. Researchers should be acknowledged for undertaking all these activities, not just for publishing the final results. If we look at career promotions, many early-career researchers are struggling. We must evaluate the work of the individual and their transfer of knowledge. This should be a responsibility on all HR departments in universities.

We should also be concerned about the use of impact factors. Early-career researchers justifiably believe that they can only survive by publishing in certain journals, whereas what should really matter is the quality of the actual content they produce. It is easy for institutions to sign DORA, but then it needs to be implemented. Certain countries, such as Holland, are trying to move away from the impact factor.

**Q:** What about the 'softer' humanities?

**A:** The humanities could benefit even more if a less commercial approach is adopted. We should realise that a DOI can be assigned to many different types of output in research. In the humanities, it is difficult to separate process from outcome. An ND (No Derivatives) licence gives a creator a degree of control but it poses difficulties for other activities, such as Open Education. Monographs are expensive and book chapters are often closed access. Plan S should move towards opening up book content.

Transformative agreements are often signed with large publishers, with an increasing trend towards negotiated 'Big Deals' for Open Access articles. However, we do not know the impact on small and mid-size publishers. Large publishers have bought start-ups (for example, Elsevier acquired Mendeley and SSRN) for access to author data. We might ask ourselves, therefore, if the 'train has already left'? This is the real challenge to cOAlition S. We must react to the new business conditions and adopt a 'next generation' approach. In order to create new services, researchers must not give up copyright but could monetise it instead, partnering with governments, tech companies and in-house publishers.

**Q:** Should we publish less?

**A:** Yes!

*"Should we  
publish  
less? Yes!"*

# Panel 2: The impact on research and research-intensive institutions

**Professor Reine Meylaerts, Vice-Rector Research Policy, KU Leuven**

## *Plan S and a roadmap for Open Science*

KU Leuven is implementing a roadmap to Open Science, inspired by the LERU roadmap (LERU, 2018). Open Science is not dogma but rather should help us all to do better science. One of the biggest challenges we face is cultural change, and we must support researchers to be Plan S-compliant.

KU Leuven has tried to follow the LERU roadmap recommendations, working with other LERU members. They include appointing an Open Science Ambassador, developing a programme of cultural change, establishing advocacy programmes, and creating a communications strategy. We also collaborate with partners across Flanders.

Professor Reine Meylaerts (third from left) on the panel discussing the impact of Plan S on research and research-intensive institutions



Back at the start of 2019, KU Leuven brainstormed a number of practical ideas by which to implement the roadmap. These included appointing an Open Science Coordinator, implementing ORCID for all researchers, introducing training on Open Science for doctoral students, and establishing a pan-LERU publishing platform. Open Science and Research Data Management are now embedded in KU Leuven's research planning. An Open Science Taskforce is in place, with 4 Working Groups reporting to the Taskforce. These are:

1. The future of scholarly publishing.
2. Research Data Management.
3. Rewards and incentives and next generation metrics/evaluation.
4. Education, skills and research integrity.

We are in an open discussion on how to deal with the big questions and challenges that are posed by Plan S, and to try and answer them in collaboration with our partners.

**Professor Nora de Leeuw MAE, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Cardiff University**

## *The potential impact of Plan S from a researcher's point of view*

Cardiff University has signed up to DORA (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment) recently, after carefully reviewing the implementation procedures. DORA principles are now part of promotion procedures, representing a significant step towards Open Science.

Plan S provides a number of opportunities, including:

1. Helping research to be more widely available.
2. Providing access for developing countries.
3. Assisting SMEs and policy units to become aware of specific expertise and experience.
4. Assisting with the justification of public funding of research by the taxpayer.



**Professor Nora de Leeuw MAE, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Cardiff University**



At the same time, there are challenges:

1. Hybrid journals are not compliant.
2. There are barriers for early-career researchers to publish in so-called 'prestigious journals'.
3. Plan S is still very Europe-dominated, we need China and the US on board. Scientists are highly mobile.
4. There are financial implications for any university undertaking the transition.
5. Publishing can be difficult for developing countries.
6. Learned societies can be affected financially.

## Dr Ignasi Labastida i Juan, Chair, SPARC Europe Board

### *How to react to Plan S when your funders have not supported it yet*

No funder from Spain is supporting Plan S yet, and this needs to change. There are no transformative agreements in place either although there are many Spanish library consortia working on them. 'Wait and see' is the worst possible option. Spanish institutions have not yet done the full calculations of what they spend, and there is a need to do it to understand how we can benefit from Open Access. Until the last year, university rectors have tended to view the Open Access issue as a matter for libraries. This year, the conference of national rectors has committed to supporting change, but it is needed now and not just on the publishing side. What is required is a cultural change in the institutions, aimed at achieving a real transformation in the scholarly communication system. Spain has been favouring the 'green' Open Access model since 2011, but the percentage of articles available in repositories is still low. Each of us could undertake this practical action of getting our works into repositories.



Dr Ignasi Labastida i Juan,  
Chair, SPARC Europe Board

*"When you're a dean or a rector, how will you change the system?"*

## Discussion

**Q:** In countries such as Australia, there is silence about Open Access because they are dependent on Chinese students, who look at rankings. How do we address this?

**A:** This also happens elsewhere in the world. The assessment of quality matters, and the current publishing model is embedded in such a system. We need to change the approach. At KU Leuven, CV's are already evaluated differently; we ask for a narrative about achievements, supported by a list of publications.

China is very league table-focused, but so is the UK. A competitive environment is driven by the research councils in the UK, as well as the system of national research assessment. Good journals matter and non-compliant hybrid journals will cause problems. All rankings incorporate bias and we need full transparency.

**Q:** Open Access is seen as European. There are a lot of university presses in the US. How do we counter this problem?

**A:** Open Access could raise the impact of European science and lead to competitive advantage. In Brazil and Croatia, for example, most publications are Open Access. In fact, Croatia supports its own language research and Norway is also supporting some of its own journals. At the University of Barcelona, around 60 journals are open. We need to engage with society, and the more views an article attracts, the more it is cited, and the higher the impact factor.

**Q:** Research is competitive, and the reputation of journals has always been important. What other methods of evaluation might be feasible?

**A:** There is nothing wrong with measuring, but that is different from blind counting. Measuring should be 'intelligent'. Peer review is important, and we should value it more when we assess a researcher's CV. We should listen to the issues raised by the early-career researchers. In the UK's research evaluation process, all the articles are read. We do not only look at citation and outputs. We should take a more holistic approach, and Plan S can help here.

*"Perhaps in 10 years, there will be no impact factor."*

## Panel 3: The impact on learned societies and academies

### Wayne Sime, Chief Executive, Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP)

#### *The ALPSP response to Plan S*

ALPSP is an international trade association and network of 300 members in more than 37 countries. Our shared mission is to develop and strengthen the scholarly publishing community, and ALPSP has been significantly involved in the Plan S discussions. Given the diversity of the sector, no 'one-size-fits-all' solution is likely to accelerate transition at a global scale. ALPSP supports the general principles of Plan S but has concerns that its scale and complexity, together with the short timescale for implementation, could lead to unintended consequences. Concerns include:

1. The pace of change, given the very ambitious timeline.
2. The need for greater clarity on transformative agreements, with the opportunity for further review.
3. ALPSP advocates the retention of different licensing options.
4. The lack of universal funding for organisations and individuals that publish research.

The landscape is complex and the publishing sector is changing. Constructive stakeholder dialogue that includes consideration of the role of learned societies in future funding models is fundamental to a transition to a new Open future. The future of academic publishing will not be based on the traditional book or article, and lines are blurring between author and reader. The challenge for learned societies is that they may lack the necessary publishing infrastructure, financial investment is constrained, and they only want to change their business model once. At the same time, it is vital to recognise that money made by societies goes back into research and training. There will always be a need for high-quality publishing, and Open Access should benefit smaller societies because they are closer to their members in the research community than other types of publisher.



Wayne Sime, Chief Executive, Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers (ALPSP) networking at the symposium (right).



## Professor Ole Petersen MAE, Vice-President, Academia Europaea

### *Threats and opportunities for learned society publications*

I offer a personal view on the potential of Plan S, from a Biomedical perspective. First of all, it would be useful to conduct a SWOT analysis of learned society publishing in the Biomedical field:

#### Strengths:

- Run by scientists for scientists.
- Generally, papers are carefully evaluated and well edited.

#### Weakness:

- Not as lavishly produced and aggressively marketed as some commercial (for-profit) journals, which often have higher impact factors and therefore are seen, by many, as more 'important'.

#### Opportunities:

- Plan S may change the 'publication landscape' by making the impact factor less important and making for-profit subscription journals less acceptable, thereby giving learned society journals a competitive edge.

#### Threats:

- Many learned societies depend financially almost exclusively on income from their currently subscription-based scientific

journals. In order to maintain their journal income after switching to a complete Open Access model, they have to markedly increase the number of publications. Papers and standards may therefore decline.

There are problems associated with the majority of completely Open Access journals in the Biomedical field:

- Many of these journals are run by for-profit publishers.
- The business model depends on a large volume of articles, as income is derived from Article Processing Charges (APCs).
- Even truly non-profit journals need substantial APCs and have to publish large numbers of articles.
- Due to the large volume of articles being processed, both the selection of articles to be published and editing standards are generally unsatisfactory.
- In contrast to a few top commercial subscription journals, Open Access journals generally do not provide context for their original papers.
- The majority of Open Access journals do not currently have top scientists as editors.

*Function* is a new, high-quality open journal of the American Physiological Society (APS), a major society publisher. *Function* is headed by a top editorial group. The APS has created a unified strategy of meetings and journal communications, which will be managed by scientists to assure quality.

Finally, on reproducibility, all of us need to do better (Petersen, 2019). The self-correction of science happens but is often delayed or only partial. *Function* will address this.

Professor Ole Petersen MAE,  
Vice-President, Academia  
Europaea



## Professor Luke Drury MAE, ALLEA Board Member and Past-President, Royal Irish Academy

### *Reclaiming traditional roles of academies in the digital age: the opportunity offered by Plan S*

Academic journals have been around for 350 years. The norms and conventions of what now constitutes the vast bulk of scholarly communication (i.e. short papers published in volumes of a journal) have their roots in the proceedings of academies. Before that, science and scholarship were disseminated via monographs and books – still a valid channel, especially in the humanities. How did the academy (using this as an umbrella term for the scholarly community) come to lose control of journal publishing? Should it now aim to “take back control”, and is this feasible?

Before around 1980, many aspects of publishing were complex, expensive and highly skilled operations. Commercial publishers could make a convincing argument that they brought economies of scale and professional expertise to journal publishing. In reality, the explosion of commercially published journals had more to do with the realisation that there was easy money to be made – academic publishing now has global revenues larger than the music industry and profit margins of over 30%. Robert Maxwell, in particular, with his Pergamon Press Group, drove the proliferation of specialist journals, and Ben Lewin with *Cell*, pushed the concept of the highly selective elite journal publishing ‘high impact papers’. After 1980’s, the Internet started to take off as an essential channel of scholarly communication. In my field of physics/astrophysics, with the advent of the Internet and the TeX format in 1978, scientists started to exchange preprints. The result was the ArXiv repository, founded in 1991, which is enhanced by a discovery and text-mining system funded by NASA.

In reality, publishers are not adding much value to the research effort. There is minimal copy editing and peer review could be organised differently and better. Publishers do aid discoverability but, above all, they convey prestige.

What value could academies add? A key role of academies has been the recognition of excellence, which could recognise not only excellence of individuals but also of outputs. Academies could offer a better peer review service. They could run overlay journals at minimal cost. Perhaps they could run recommendation services. Research must be findable, and academies could promote broadly-based disciplinary discovery platforms, with proper text-mining and rich metadata. Academies could support and recognise innovative models for research outputs going beyond the traditional article format and conventions, for example, active links to open datasets and open software, living reviews, etc.

We must recognise that Elsevier is now a data analytics company, not a publisher. It has products at every stage of research and thus poses a threat. Science should be an open public good, and the academy must fight back through collaborative open services.



Professor Luke Drury MAE, ALLEA Board Member and Past-President, Royal Irish Academy addresses the auditorium

## Discussion

**Q:** Does ALPSP object to the available licensing options?

**A:** ALPSP wants to offer authors licensing options and choice, not only CC-BY.

**Q:** Is there a need for NC (Non-Commercial) licensing? It must be clear that the author is the copyright owner and the choice of licensing rests with them, not the society.

**A:** ALPSP would like NC as an option but there are differing views on this. It is about choice.

**Q:** Surely, societies should exist for the benefit of their members, not just as journal publishers?

**A:** Societies should be able to move to a publishing model based on Article Processing Charges (APCs) and transformative agreements. However, if society income is reduced then it can lead to financial problems. Journal publishers do more than copy editing and provide vital context, not just facts. Research integrity and ethics are important, and if good science is open, we can counter fake news.

*“If good science is open, we can counter fake news.”*

## Panel 4: Where are we going?

### Hannah Wilson, Associate Publisher, F1000 Research

#### *Adapting to Plan S: experiences from an Open Science Publisher*

F1000 Research's open publishing platform has three core components:

1. Open Access (using CC-BY licensing and currently based on an APC model).
2. Open Data (adhering to FAIR principles).
3. Open Peer Review (based on an author-led post-publication peer review process).



Hannah Wilson, Associate Publisher, F1000 Research (right)

There are a number of challenges with Plan S transformative agreements, which are leading to libraries reducing their budgets for APCs. This is particularly difficult for smaller open publishers like F1000 Research, which is very committed to innovation across all aspects of Open Science. We are rigorous in endorsing Open Data principles. We use a unique open peer review process and welcome the experimentation with models of evaluation and peer review that we are now seeing from other open publishers, especially in the life sciences. We are also looking beyond the current author-facing APC model. Our innovative approaches include:

- Institutional agreements (for example, with KU Leuven).
- Partnering with funders (e.g. providing the Gates and Wellcome Open Research platforms).
- Partnering with underrepresented communities (e.g. the African Academy of Sciences).
- Collaborating with publishers, for example, Emerald, where we are developing understanding of open research in the humanities and social sciences.

*“As an industry, we need to move beyond the author-facing APC model.”*

### Matthew Day, Head of Open Research, Policy and Partnerships, Cambridge University Press

#### *Where is Cambridge University Press going, and what might happen along the way?*

Cambridge University Press (CUP) is a not-for-profit publisher and part of Cambridge University. In the past two years, there has been a decisive move at CUP towards Open Research. Plan S has prompted us to act more quickly and comprehensively. On journals publishing, CUP will try to move to Open Access as fast as possible. We do need to bring learned societies on board. There will be more Open Research and we will need to understand and work closely with diverse communities in different countries and regions. CUP has an Open Research platform and is exploring innovative ways forward. People like the 'green' Open Access model, but there are different models of 'green', many increasingly liberal. However, 'green' depends on maintaining subscriptions and not making cancellations. Cancellations could have a dramatic effect on publishers like CUP, as income is needed to keep the whole system sustainable. Publishers do have the duty to promote trust and achieve a common understanding with the academic community.



Matthew Day, Head of Open Research, Policy and Partnerships, Cambridge University Press (centre)



## Dr Marc Schiltz, President, Science Europe

### *Why we needed to launch Plan S and where we go from here*

The history of Plan S began with Robert-Jan Smits, who contacted me with his vision to build an Open Access coalition. The Berlin Declaration on Open Access goes back to 2003 and, since then, there have been many statements, principles, policies and recommendations. The reality is that nothing has changed, for a number of reasons, and most articles continue to sit behind paywalls. Smits and I were determined to bring about real change and make things happen.

The motivations for Plan S are scientific, societal, ethical and economic. Yet the real drivers in the publishing sector revolve around impact factors, rankings, metrics and key performance indicators. We thus find ourselves in a 'prisoner's dilemma', and that is why we built the coalition. Plan S is different from other initiatives, on the following grounds:

- Plan S aims to align Open Access policies.
- Plan S entails mandating Open Access by funders.
- The funders commit to covering costs.
- Plan S sets a clear timeline, with a deadline of 2021 for research funded by the coalition partners and a final transition period of 2024.
- Plan S is about principles, rather than any particular publication model.

The future is for us to cooperate and to change the reward and evaluation system, where universities have a crucial role to play. We need to get more funders on board, and 'go global'. Institutions should sign DORA but also be serious about implementing it. We must engage with the wider civil society and the general public, ensuring they are aware that research is generally funded by public money.

Above all, we must be courageous.



Dr Marc Schiltz delivering the closing talk

*“Through Plan S,  
we can break free  
of the prisoner's  
dilemma”*

*“We must be  
courageous”*

## References

Finn, M. (2019). *Plan S and the history journal landscape*. Royal Historical Society. Available from: [https://royalhistsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/RHS\\_PlanS\\_Full\\_Report\\_Oct19\\_FINAL.pdf](https://royalhistsoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/RHS_PlanS_Full_Report_Oct19_FINAL.pdf)

LERU (League of European Research Universities). (2018). *Open Science and its role in universities: A roadmap for cultural change*. Available from: <https://www.leru.org/files/LERU-AP24-Open-Science-full-paper.pdf>

Petersen, O. (2019). Reproducibility – again. *The Journal of Physiology*, 597(3), 657-658. <https://doi.org/10.1113/JP277486>

Wise, A. & Estelle, L. (2019): *Society publishers accelerating Open Access and Plan S (SPA-OPS project)*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.4561397.v2>

This event is a collaboration between the Academia Europaea Cardiff Knowledge Hub, KU Leuven Libraries, the Young Academy of Europe and Cardiff University.

## Academia Europaea Cardiff Knowledge Hub

[www.aecardiffknowledgehub.wales](http://www.aecardiffknowledgehub.wales)

@aecardiff

Founded in 1988, Academia Europaea now has more than 4,000 leading scientists and scholars as members, including over 70 Nobel laureates. Promoting research excellence across all fields of scholarship, Academia Europaea exists for public benefit and to highlight the value of scholarship and scientific evidence. In addition to the headquarters in London, AE has a network of Hubs in Barcelona, Bergen, Cardiff, Tbilisi and Wroclaw, as well as an information centre in Graz. The Cardiff Hub opened in 2016 and is hosted by Cardiff University.



## KU Leuven Libraries

KU LEUVEN LIBRARIES

[www.bib.kuleuven.be](http://www.bib.kuleuven.be)

@KU\_Leuven

KU Leuven Libraries play a crucial role in the university's innovative and international research policy through large-scale physical and electronic collections. They maintain unique heritage materials, provide state-of-the-art solutions for digitisation, visualisation and information management, and provide research data management and advice on copyright, Open Access and Open Scholarship.

## Young Academy of Europe

[www.yacadeuro.org](http://www.yacadeuro.org)

@yacadeuro

Established in 2012, the Young Academy of Europe (YAE) is a pan-European initiative of outstanding young scientists for networking, scientific exchange and science policy. The YAE is organised as a bottom-up initiative of a dynamic and innovative group of recognised European young scientists and scholars with outspoken views about science and science policy.



## Cardiff University

[www.cardiff.ac.uk](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk)

@cardiffuni

Cardiff University is an ambitious and innovative university with a bold and strategic vision, located in a beautiful and thriving capital city. Its world-leading research was ranked 5th amongst UK universities in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework for quality and 2nd for impact. The University provides an educationally outstanding experience for its students.





ACADEMIA EUROPAEA  
CARDIFF KNOWLEDGE HUB

Academia Europaea Cardiff Knowledge Hub  
Cardiff University, CUBRIC, Maindy Road  
Cathays, Cardiff CF24 4HQ  
[www.aecardiffknowledgehub.wales](http://www.aecardiffknowledgehub.wales)  
Tel: +44 (0)29 2068 8249  
AECardiffHub@cardiff.ac.uk

Hosted by



FIND US ON  
SOCIAL MEDIA

