

Chapman University

## Chapman University Digital Commons

---

Library Presentations, Posters, and Videos

Leatherby Libraries

---

2-18-2020

### SCELC Open Access Webinar: Defining Plan S & Transformative Agreements

Kristin Laughtin-Dunker

*Chapman University*, [laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu)

DeDe Leshy

*Cedars-Sinai Medical Center*, [dede.leshy@csmc.edu](mailto:dede.leshy@csmc.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library\\_presentations](https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library_presentations)



Part of the [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Laughtin-Dunker, K., & Leshy, D. (2020, February 18). *SCELC open access webinar: Defining Plan S & transformative agreements* [Webinar]. [https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library\\_presentations/28](https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library_presentations/28)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Leatherby Libraries at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Presentations, Posters, and Videos by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu).

---

## SCELC Open Access Webinar: Defining Plan S & Transformative Agreements

### Comments

The Download button will provide a PDF of the presentation slides, while a stream of the webinar (with full audio) may be viewed below.

### Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

# SCELC Open Access Webinar: Defining Plan S & Transformative Agreements

Kristin Laughtin-Dunker and DeDe Leshy

February 18, 2020

# Presenters

Kristin Laughtin-Dunker

Coordinator of Scholarly Communications &  
Electronic Resources

Leatherby Libraries

Chapman University

[laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu)

DeDe Leshy

Senior Medical Librarian, Electronic  
Resources

Medical Library

Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

[dede.leshy@csmc.edu](mailto:dede.leshy@csmc.edu)

# History of Plan S

Kristin Laughtin-Dunker

February 18, 2020

# Plan S

- ▶ Initiative for OA publishing launched in September 2018 by cOAlition S, a consortium of research funders launched by the European Research Council.
  - ▶ 13 national research funding organizations and 4 charitable foundations from 13 countries:
    - ▶ European Commission
    - ▶ Austria: Austrian Science Fund
    - ▶ Finland: Academy of Finland
    - ▶ France: Agence Nationale de la Recherche
    - ▶ Ireland: Science Foundation Ireland
    - ▶ Italy: Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare
    - ▶ Luxembourg: Luxembourger National Research Fund
    - ▶ Netherlands: Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
    - ▶ Norway: Research Council of Norway
    - ▶ Poland: National Science Centre
    - ▶ Slovenia: Slovenian Research Agency
    - ▶ Sweden: Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development (Formas) *and* Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (Forte)
    - ▶ Wellcome Trust
    - ▶ Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
    - ▶ Swedish Riksbank's Jubileumsfond (RJ) (*\*support withdrawn March 2019*)
    - ▶ Compagnia di San Paulo

# Plan S

- ▶ Plan S is designed to be a decisive movement to make research and publications openly available. The “S” stands for “shock”.
- ▶ **Original statement: “After 1 January 2020 scientific publications on the results from research funded by public grants provided by national and European research councils and funding bodies, must be published in compliant Open Access Journals or on compliant Open Access Platforms.”**
  - ▶ This deadline has now been extended to January 1 2021 or, for publishers agreeing to implement Plan S in their policies after January 2020, one year from that agreement.

# Plan S

## Original 10 Principles:

1. Authors retain copyright and articles are published under an open license (preferably CC-BY).
2. Members of the coalition (funders) will establish robust criteria and requirements for compliant OA journals and platforms.
3. The funders will provide incentives to establish and support compliant journals, platforms, or infrastructures if they do not yet exist.
4. OA publication fees (APCs) should be covered by the funders or universities, not individual researchers.
5. OA publication fees are standardized and capped.
6. The funders will ask universities, libraries, and research organizations to align their policies.
7. All types of publications will be subject, but the timeline for books and monographs may extend beyond 2020.
8. Open archives and repositories are acknowledged for their importance.
9. Hybrid OA journals are not compliant.
10. Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliance.

# Plan S

- ▶ During a transition period, publishing in a hybrid journal that already has a transformative agreement to flip and become OA will be allowed.
  - ▶ The contracts must be publicly available and may not extend beyond 2024 (originally 2023).
- ▶ Green OA is OK as long as there is no embargo and there is a CC license.

# Plan S

- ▶ Criteria for OA journals and platforms:
  - ▶ Content must be immediately free to read and download, with a CC-BY, CC-BY-SA, or CC0 license.
  - ▶ Must have a solid review system in compliance with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).
  - ▶ Must be listed in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ).
  - ▶ Fee waivers for authors from low-income countries, and reductions for authors from middle-income countries.
  - ▶ Details about publishing costs impacting publication fees must be transparent.
  - ▶ DOIs must be used as permanent identifiers.
  - ▶ Long-term digital preservation strategy by deposit in archiving program (e.g. LOCKSS/CLOCKSS).
  - ▶ Accessibility of full text in a machine readable format (XML/JATS) for text mining.
  - ▶ Link to raw data and code in repositories.
  - ▶ High quality, machine readable article level metadata and cited references under a CC0 public domain dedication.
  - ▶ Machine readable information on OA status and license.

# Plan S

- ▶ Statements of support from:
  - ▶ Europe's National Institute for Health Research
  - ▶ SPARC Europe
  - ▶ Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology
  - ▶ COAR (Coalition of Open Access Repositories)
  - ▶ OASPA (Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association)
  - ▶ OpenAIRE
  - ▶ African Academy of Sciences
  - ▶ Faculty of 1000
  - ▶ Over 113 institutions from 37 nations in 5 continents in one joint statement; various individual statements.
  - ▶ Additional statements of support are linked on CoalitionS's website here: <https://www.coalition-s.org/supporters/>
- ▶ Other countries joining Plan S:
  - ▶ Jordan
  - ▶ Zambia

# Updates to Plan S

- ▶ The funders that make up cOAlition S announced revisions to the implementation plan on May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2019:
  - ▶ Timeline for official implementation has been extended one year to January 1, 2021, and to 2024 for transformative agreements .
  - ▶ Funders have agreed to revisit their assessment policies and not take into account the name or prestige of the journal a funded article appears in.
  - ▶ Funders are no longer required to place a cap on APCs.
    - ▶ Heather Joseph of SPARC is troubled by this because it “weakens an important cost-control mechanism” for scholarly publishing costs.
  - ▶ CC-BY licenses are no longer mandated but “preferred”.
  - ▶ Former Principle #8 has been eliminated and a new #10 added.

Source: New implementation guidelines and revised principles: <https://www.coalition-s.org/principles-and-implementation/>

# Updates to Plan S

Changes to the [10 Principles](#) (paraphrased):

- ▶ The former #8 (recognizing repositories and archives for their importance) has been removed.
- ▶ The former #9 has become the new #8:  
Funders do not support the ‘hybrid’ model of publishing. However, Funders may provide financial support for articles published in journals under a transformative agreement.
- ▶ The former #10 has become the new #9:  
The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliant beneficiaries/grantees.
- ▶ A new #10 has been added:  
The Funders commit that when assessing research outputs during funding decisions, they will value the intrinsic merit of the work and not consider the publication channel, its metrics, or the publisher.

# Reactions to Plan S: Objections

OASPA (February 2019):

- ▶ Plan S puts smaller/emerging OA and pure Gold OA publishers at a disadvantage because all the discussions are focused around large, hybrid publishers that have the money and power to negotiate transition plans with funders.
- ▶ Small publishers do not have the power to negotiate transformative Big Deals on national levels. These publishers make up the long tail majority of OASPA members.

Source: <https://oaspa.org/oaspa-feedback-on-plan-s-implementation-guidance/>

# Reactions to Plan S: Sao Paulo Statement on Open Access

- ▶ African Open Science Platform, AmeliCA, cOAlition S, OA2020, and SciELO met during the annual meeting of the Global Research Council and authored a joint statement (May 2019):
  - ▶ They consider that scholarly and scientific knowledge is a global public good. When generated by public funds, free access to it is a universal right.
  - ▶ They share one common ultimate objective: providing universal, unrestricted, and immediate Open Access to scholarly information, including use and re-use by humans and machines.
  - ▶ They share the belief that this common goal can be achieved through a variety of approaches.
  - ▶ They will pursue points of alignment among their approaches and ways to cooperate towards reaching the shared objective.
  - ▶ They seek an active dialogue with all stakeholders, including researchers, research funders, universities, libraries, publishers, learned societies, governments, and citizens to take into account the diversity of the global scholarly community.

# Reactions to Plan S: Objections

- ➔ Arianna Becerril-García (Executive Director of Redalyc (the Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal) and Chair of AmeliCA (Open Knowledge for Latin America and the Global South)):
  - ➔ Vocal critic of Plan S, which she fears would disadvantage and exclude researchers in the Global South, disrupt working OA systems in Latin America, and impose Eurocentric standards and systems on scholarly publishing if successful.
  - ➔ Would like to see Plan S funders provide money for non-APC journals, OA platforms, and technologies to support scholarly publishing.
  - ➔ Notes that 13-20% of European-authored papers are published in Latin America, but Plan S will not support those journals (which tend to be published via local universities as opposed to commercial journals that charge APCs).
  - ➔ Fears Plan S will lead to near-universal use of APCs, and would prefer to achieve OA through cooperation between academic institutions.

# Reactions to Plan S

## Directory of Open Access Journals (May 2019):

- ▶ The DOAJ had refrained from comment about Plan S, but released a statement to clarify some misunderstandings about their involvement in response to a working paper by the [Royal Historical Society on Plan S](#).
  - ▶ Explained their lack of coverage of SSHA journal titles and a plan to be proactive to get more of these titles listed in the DOAJ.
  - ▶ Agrees with the RHS' concern that Plan S disadvantages SSHA journals, many of which don't charge APCs. They pointed this out during the public comment period.
  - ▶ If DOAJ becomes a partner in Plan S implementation, they will adapt their website and editorial processes to reflect Plan S compliance.
  - ▶ Counters RHS' criticism of the quality of OA journals by pointing out that RHS only looked at structure and financing rather than standards for best practice and publishing standards in OA, and privileged journals from the Global North over the Global South.

# Reactions to Plan S

- ▶ Right now, journals/publishers have to decide whether to comply with the principles or potentially be ineligible to publish research from participating funders.
- ▶ **September 2018:**
  - ▶ [Springer](#): “[R]esearch funding agencies should align rather than act in small groups in ways that are incompatible with each other.”
  - ▶ [AAAS](#): Plan S won’t “support high-quality peer-review”, would disrupt scholarly communication, and would be unsustainable for *Science* journals.
  - ▶ [Elsevier](#) (Tom Reller): “[I]f you think that information should be free of charge, go to Wikipedia.” (translated from Dutch)
- ▶ **November 2018:**
  - ▶ Over 1,700 researchers have signed an [open letter expressing concerns](#) about unintended consequences if Plan S is implemented before specific implementation guidance is available, especially on researchers from non-EU countries who were not consulted in the creation of the plan if Plan S is implemented anywhere outside of Europe.
- ▶ **April 2019:**
  - ▶ [US OSTP Director Kevin Droegemeier](#) stated that US federal funders will not be joining Plan S and that the government will not tell researchers where they have to publish their papers.
- ▶ **May 2019-present:**
  - ▶ After the implementation guide was published, over 1,900 researchers signed [an open letter in favor of mandatory OA](#), but this letter didn’t mention Plan S specifically.

# Springer's Open Letter and cOAlition S' Response

- ▶ In November 2019, cOAlition S asked for [input on a draft framework for transformative journals](#).
- ▶ On 12/17/2019, Springer published an [open letter](#) appealing to cOAlition S to not lose the opportunity that transformative journals offer to speed up the transition to OA.
- ▶ Concerns:
  - ▶ Proposed timelines and rates of OA transition are unsustainable:
    - ▶ Speed of which the transition can occur is dependent on the rate at which funders, consortia, and institutions can support Gold OA.
    - ▶ Points to small proportion of published research that is funded by EU/ERC and cOAlition S.
    - ▶ Claim that the proposed transformative journal target requirements (growth of OA content by at least 8% per year) are not realistic and would require the two largest U.S. and the largest Japanese funder to switch to mandating and funding immediate OA in a single year, followed by equivalent scales of change each year after.
    - ▶ Even in the countries of existing cOAlition S members, takeup of transformative agreements is low and takes time.

# Springer's Open Letter and cOAlition S' Response

## ▶ Concerns:

- ▶ Waiver requirements are also unsustainable.
  - ▶ Would lead to more research published for free, undermining sustainability of journals.
  - ▶ Could lead to cost burden being passed on to the funders that committed to funding OA.
  - ▶ Could disincentivize additional funders from supporting Gold OA.
- ▶ If requirements for transformative journals are so stringent that publishers choose not to participate, it would negatively impact journal choice for cOAlition S-funded authors.
  - ▶ This could also damage or reduce international collaborations.

## ▶ Nice summary in Times Higher Education:

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/springer-nature-may-pull-plan-s-backing-over-unfair-rules>

# Springer's Open Letter and cOAlition S' Response

- ▶ Springer's proposed alternate timeline:
  - ▶ Year-on-year growth of OA content at same rate of increase in global research supported by funders committed to funding Gold OA.
  - ▶ Journals to flip when OA content reaches 90%.
  - ▶ Review progress in 2024.
- ▶ Springer would further commit to:
  - ▶ Actively promoting the benefits of OA publication.
  - ▶ Expanding transformative deals as rapidly as institutions/consortia/funders allow.
  - ▶ Increase transparency around pricing and publishing services.
  - ▶ Work with Plan S to convince more institutions/consortia/funders to support Gold OA.
- ▶ “[I]f cOAlition S agreed to such an alternative which could achieve large scale adoption, we would commit to putting all Springer Nature-owned journals... on the path to full OA.”

# Springer's Open Letter and cOAlition S' response

## ▶ cOAlition S' response:

- ▶ Stressed that the Transformative Journals framework was a draft and would be assessed after receiving feedback from all stakeholders by January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020. (Final version expected in March.)
- ▶ Transformative Journals were developed to help transition journals that are committing to full OA *outside* of transformative agreements.
- ▶ Counters Springer's argument that growth can only increase at the rate in which funders mandate and fund Gold OA by pointing to data from *Nature Communications* that shows the volume of published OA papers growing yearly even without a corresponding increase in funder mandates.
  - ▶ Also point out that this journal flipped to OA when <50% of articles were OA, far below the 90% Springer suggested.
- ▶ Springer's alternative model has no clearly defined timeframe for transitioning to full OA, calling it a "tactic to stall progress".

# Other Publisher Responses

January 2020:

- ▶ 45 HSS publishers released “[An HSS perspective on the mandatory criteria for transformative journals](#)”.
  - ▶ Feel that the “mandated criteria are far too prescriptive, and do not allow for experimentation of models that may be more appropriate for unfunded disciplines.”
  - ▶ Also concerned that this is asking small, low-cost publishers to subsidize the deals of larger publishers.
  - ▶ Growth rates are unrealistic for many HSS disciplines.
- ▶ The Society Publishers Coalition also [shared their response to the Transformative Journals framework](#).
  - ▶ Also share concerns about the sustainability of the required growth rate, and note that different journals may require different timelines in order to successfully flip.
- ▶ The Microbiology Society published [a case study about their experience with developing a publish-and-read model](#) that might help other society publishers transition to OA.

# Other Recent Updates

- ▶ November 2019: The Fair Open Access Alliance published the [FOAA Breakdown of Publishing Services and Prices](#) and invited publishers to use this breakdown to make their own fee structures transparent in accordance with Principle 5 of Plan S.
- ▶ November 2019: QOAM (Quality Open Access Market) started [a list of journals that are technically Plan S-compliant](#).
- ▶ January 2020: Wellcome and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) funded Information Power to produce a [report to improve the transparency of OA prices and services](#). This report was commissioned on behalf of cOAlition S and is intended to inform the continued development of Plan S.

# Transformative Agreements

DeDe Leshy and Kristin Laughtin-Dunker

February 18, 2020

# What is a Transformative Agreement?

Simple definition:

A contract that “...seeks to shift the contracted payment from a library or group of libraries to a publisher away from subscription-based reading and toward open access publishing.”

Source: “Transformative Agreements: A Primer” Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe. The Scholarly Kitchen, April 23, 2019. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/>

# Why Do Transformative Agreements Matter?

Transformative Agreements :

- ▶ Aim to contain costs associated with publishing and access to full text content
- ▶ Disseminate research by providing immediate open access to scholarly articles
- ▶ Preserve author's rights
- ▶ Provide a bridge to fully open access journals

Source: <https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-agreements/>

# Variations on Transformative Agreements

- ▶ **Read-and-Publish** - Payments to publisher for reading and for publishing are bundled together into a single contract.
- ▶ **Publish-and-Read** - Publisher is paid for publishing and reading (subscribed content) is included.

**Goals for the library:** To be cost neutral in relation to traditional subscription contract or to decrease costs and redirect subscription (reading) funds to publishing.

- ▶ **Pro:** cost control could be possible; institutional authors who publish open access do not pay separately, no double payments
- ▶ **Con:** may increase costs depending on negotiated price caps or controls; consequently, may not be sustainable

In both variations, the publisher's concern is meeting their revenue requirements.

Source: "Transformative Agreements: A Primer" Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe. The Scholarly Kitchen, April 23, 2019. <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/>

# Other Paths to Open

- ▶ Subscribe to Open - Annual Reviews model
  - ▶ 5 journal titles will be included in this model for 2020.
  - ▶ Existing subscription converts to Open Access at no extra cost with a 5% discount off subscription as an incentive to encourage subscribers to participate.
  - ▶ If all subscribers participate, then all back volumes will be opened; if not, then back volumes remain gated.
- ▶ Knowledge Unlatched is doing something similar for 13 anthropology journals through the Berghahn Open Anthro Subscribe-to-Open pilot that ran in 2019.

## Sources:

- 1) <https://www.annualreviews.org/page/subscriptions/subscribe-to-open-faq>
- 2) <https://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/2020/01/knowledge-unlatched-announces-results-2019-pledging-round/>
- 3) More details at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1262>

# Impact of Transformative Agreement on Specific Entities

## Society Publishers

- ▶ Transformative contracts between libraries with built-in APCs and large commercial publishers could siphon away OA publishing from smaller, competing publishers.
- ▶ Loss of business threatens the existence of small publishers that often the lack diverse business lines of large commercial publishers.

## Consortia

- ▶ Cost distribution among read or publish or blended members.
- ▶ Need infrastructure to track publishing.

Sources:

1) McNutt, M, “ Plan S” falls short for society publishers-and for the researchers they serve.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6377444/pdf/pnas.201900359.pdf>

2) Mellins-Cohen, T and Redvers-Mutton, G. Transformation: the future of society publishing. Insights,33,2020.

<https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.486/>

3) Source: <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/05/20/transformative-agreements-unravel-library-consortia/>

# Impact of Transformative Agreement on Specific Entities

## Smaller academic or special individual libraries

- ▶ Limited budgets
- ▶ No library funded APCs
- ▶ Limited infrastructure for keeping track of institutional publishing activity

## Researchers

- ▶ Traditional path to promotion/tenure highlights publishing
- ▶ Impact Factor
- ▶ Making the case to publish open to disengaged or disinterested individuals

# Some Key Elements in Transformative Agreements

## UC's Guidelines for Evaluating Agreements

- ▶ Agreements include comprehensive open access for UC corresponding authors across a publisher's full journal portfolio.
- ▶ Authors should retain copyright while publishers get an appropriate use license.
- ▶ No double payments. Subscription fees redirected to publishing fees.
- ▶ There may be a payment at the article level if other terms are consistent with UC Guidelines.
- ▶ Article payments should support a multi-payer workflow, eg. institutional funding and research funding.
- ▶ Publisher transparency about services provided and reasonable pricing.
- ▶ Terms should be publicly disclosable.
- ▶ Agreements should encompass broad range of strategies for achieving an open and sustainable scholarly communication system.
- ▶ Publisher policies and plans should include a commitment to full OA transition.

# Some Examples of Transformative Agreements and Recent Activity

- ▶ MIT was the first North American school to get a publisher to sign a “Read and Publish” deal in 2018 (with the Royal Society).
  - ▶ Contract acknowledges that the current hybrid/gold OA model is a transitional model on the path to full OA.
  - ▶ Idea is that over time, as more universities adopt this model, funding will shift from paying for paywalled content to supporting OA for research produced by authors at one’s institution.
- ▶ The American Chemical Society and Max Planck Society announced a similar “Read and Publish” deal on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019.
- ▶ The Bavarian State Library (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, BSB) also signed a Read and Publish deal with Cambridge University Press on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.
  - ▶ CUP had signed similar deals with Swedish and Dutch consortiums in the past.

# April 2019: Elsevier Signs Two Off-setting Deals

- ▶ Elsevier signed two deals in April 2019 that include some sort of off-setting.
  - ▶ #1: Norway (UNIT) and Elsevier
    - ▶ Signed a 2-year agreement that includes access to Elsevier journals and OA publishing in most titles.
      - ▶ Excludes titles owned by academic associations, Cell Press titles, and The Lancet.
    - ▶ The deal is for €9 million and represents a 3% increase over previous spending.
      - ▶ This is controversial in the OA world since the publisher is still making more money.
      - ▶ Contrary to Plan S (endorsed by Research Council of Norway) because it is hybrid open access.

Sources:

<https://www.scidecode.com/en/2019/04/norway-and-elsevier-meet-a-nine-million-euro-agreement-including-a-gold-open-access-clause/>

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/04/24/elsevier-agrees-first-read-and-publish-deal>

# April 2019: Elsevier Signs Two Off-setting Deals

- ▶ Elsevier signed two deals in April 2019 that include some sort of off-setting.
  - ▶ #2: France (Couperin Consortium) and Elsevier
    - ▶ France renewed and signed a 4-year deal.
      - ▶ Agreement provides for a gradual 13.3% reduction in costs over 4 years.
    - ▶ 25% discount on APCs, which are not included in the costs of the contract. Also a compensatory clause if APCs increase by >3.5%.
      - ▶ Excludes society journals, The Lancet, and Cell Press titles.
    - ▶ Allows automatic open access after 12 months to the accepted manuscript/post-print on Elsevier's platform. (Green OA)
      - ▶ After 24 months it will be deposited in the CNRS Open Access Repository.
      - ▶ License more restrictive than most Creative Commons licenses.
        - ▶ Most Elsevier journals allow deposit of accepted manuscripts with CC-BY-NC-ND licenses.
        - ▶ This license restricts redistribution and reuse even for non-commercial purposes.

Source: <https://www.scidecode.com/2019/04/does-the-french-couperin-consortium-beat-the-german-wiley-deal/>

# April 2019: UC/Cambridge University Press Deal

- ▶ UC's first OA deal with a publisher and Cambridge's first in the US.
- ▶ 3-year agreement that gives the UCs permanent access to CUP's entire collection and ability to publish OA.
- ▶ Subscription fees will go down as OA publishing goes up, so UC will see no significant increase to costs.

# December 2019: Updates to UC/Cambridge Agreement

Recap agreement basics:

- ▶ Overall costs to UC are capped
- ▶ UC reading fee for subscriptions will decrease as Publication fees (library funded APC costs) increase
- ▶ But “libraries’ budget alone cannot cover the full cost of all open access publications while continuing to pay for subscription access where needed.” p.2  
<https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/2019/12/publishing-open-access-journal-articles-with-cambridge-university-press/>

What will happen in 2020:

- ▶ UC libraries negotiated a 30% discount on Cambridge APCs
- ▶ The UC libraries will cover the first \$1,000 of the APC charge, after the discount is applied, for UC corresponding authors who wish to publish open access in a Cambridge Univ Press journal.
- ▶ If the APC exceeds \$1,000, then the corresponding author will be asked if grant funding is available to cover the excess. If grant funding is available, the author will be invoiced for the excess upon approval of the UC library funded component.
- ▶ If there is no grant funding, then the library will cover the entire cost of the APC.

Source: <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/2019/12/publishing-open-access-journal-articles-with-cambridge-university-press/>

# April 2019: JISC/Springer Agreement

Read and Publish agreement that meets the aims of Plan S:

- ▶ Limits the costs of OA publication while providing access to all of Springer's subscription titles.
- ▶ “Jisc and Springer Nature will also continue to work together to evaluate the agreement and gather evidence to inform the transition to open access” over the 3-year agreement.

# August 2019: Projekt Deal and Springer Nature MOU on Transformative Agreement

- ▶ MOU signed, with expectation of a final contract later that year.
- ▶ Expected that more than 13,000 articles by German scholars will be published OA each year.
- ▶ “[S]ets the scene for the world’s most comprehensive open access (OA) agreement to be finalised later this year.”
  - ▶ Final contract to run from 2020-2022.
  - ▶ “For 2020, the PAR component is based on OA publication of at least 9,500 articles and grants participating institutions with permanent reading access to 1,900 journals in the Springer, Palgrave, Adis and Macmillan portfolios.”
  - ▶ Also includes other discounts and backfile access.

Source: <https://www.hrk.de/press/press-releases/press-release/meldung/projekt-deal-and-springer-nature-reach-understanding-on-worlds-largest-transformative-open-access-a/>

# January 2020: Projekt DEAL and Springer Nature Transformative Agreement Finalized

## Basics:

- ▶ Participating German academic and research institutions will have reading access to all Springer Nature journals.
- ▶ Affiliated authors will be able to publish an accept manuscript as an immediate OA article in a Springer Nature hybrid or fully OA journal.
- ▶ Costs to be managed centrally by the author's institution.
- ▶ Publish and Read (PAR) fee will be €2,750 for each article published and will be paid from subscription funds.
- ▶ Contract runs from 2020 to 2022 with option to extend to 2023.

Source: <https://www.hrk.de/press/press-releases/press-release/meldung/springer-nature-and-germanys-projekt-deal-finalise-worlds-largest-transformative-open-access-agree/>

# November 2019: Carnegie Mellon and Elsevier Agreement

- ▶ The first successful transformative agreement between Elsevier and a U.S. institution.
- ▶ The 4-year contract will provide access to all Elsevier titles and allow OA publishing by Carnegie Mellon researchers.
- ▶ CM researchers only publish about 175 articles per year in Elsevier journals, so it is thought that this was a low-risk way for Elsevier to get good PR.
- ▶ CM signed an NDA but said they negotiated for a year and the failed negotiations with the UCs/CDL played in their success.

## December 2019: IOP and Jisc

- ▶ IOP and Jisc have signed a “read and publish” agreement that will give researchers at 58 UK universities the ability to publish OA in IOP journals without having to pay an article processing charge (APC).
- ▶ Four-year agreement that began on 01/01/2020.
- ▶ All accepted articles will be published with a CC-BY license and authors will retain copyright.

# January 2020: Updates from the University of California

- ▶ UC and Elsevier plan to reopen negotiations in the first quarter 2020, after UC ended negotiations in February 2019 over a journal subscription contract.
- ▶ UC is in negotiations with Wiley and Springer Nature to reach a transformative agreement.
- ▶ UC reached new agreements with Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) and Journal of Medical Internet Research (JMIR) - includes access to ACM journals. Affiliated researchers' articles will be made open at time of publication at no cost to the authors.
- ▶ UC agreement with Journal of Medical Internet Research (JMIR) - UC libraries will pay first \$1,000 of APC. Author can request further support from libraries if have no grant funding.

Source:

<https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/2020/01/oa-update/>

<https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-publisher-relationships/uc-and-elsevier/>

# Possible Changes and Agreements on the Horizon?

- ▶ Funder-driven open access - Recent rumor the US government would mandate immediate open access upon publication for papers from projects that received federal research funding source:
  - ▶ Immediate negative response from coalition of scientific research organizations and publishers: <https://www.the-scientist.com/news-opinion/what-to-expect-in-the-publishing-world-in-2020--66882>
    - ▶ Publishers' response linked from here with more detail: <https://www.infodocket.com/2019/12/18/a-coalition-of-125-scientific-research-and-publishing-organizations-announce-opposition-of-proposed-policy-of-immediate-free-distribution-of-peer-reviewed-journal-articles-reporting-on-federally-funded/>
    - ▶ Also: <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/12/science-groups-senator-warn-trump-administration-not-change-publishing-rules>
  - ▶ Then some publishers' rescinded their opposition: <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/rumored-2020-white-house-open-access-policy/>
- ▶ #OAintheUSA Twitter hashtag

# In progress...

- ▶ Pilot programs initiated between society publishers and individual university libraries, examples:
  - ▶ Iowa State University and American Physiological Society - “Read, Publish & Join” bundles read and publish with annual fee and society membership
  - ▶ Iowa State University and Oxford University Press agreement “in principle” for Read and Publish deal, would be OUP’s first in the US. source: <https://www.thebookseller.com/news/oup-does-its-first-us-read-and-publish-deal-1122671>
- ▶ Microbiology Society - offering Publish and Read as alternative to APCs and subscriptions though both will still be offered as alternatives. Fixed price with unlimited OA and usage. Consortia deals signed as well. <https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/publish-and-read>