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Berlin declaration (2003)

1. Open access contributions must satisfy two conditions: The author(s) and right holder(s) of such contributions grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship (community standards, will continue to provide the mechanism for enforcement of proper attribution and responsible use of the published work, as they do now), as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in an appropriate standard electronic format is deposited (and thus published) in at least one online repository using suitable technical standards (such as the Open Archive definitions) that is supported and maintained by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving.
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
Open Acces and the Ethos of Science

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.”

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).”
The Reality: no breakthrough for Open Access
Plan S : One Main Shared Objective

“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.”

I call upon funders from Europe and beyond to join cOAlition S and upon researchers, universities, research organisations, libraries, and publishers to express public support and to help accelerate the transition to full and immediate Open Access by 2020.

—Robert-Jan Smits
Open Access Envoy of the European Commission

http://scieur.org/coalition-s #cOAlitionS
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.
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
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 is not about one particular model

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Routes to Plan S compliance</th>
<th>A. existing/new APC gold journal / platform</th>
<th>B. existing/new non-APC gold journal / platform (diamond)</th>
<th>C. flipped journals to APC gold (by publishers or editors)</th>
<th>D. flipped journals to non-APC gold (diamond), by publishers or editors</th>
<th>E. Hybrid journal in transformative deal (temporary route)</th>
<th>F. CC-BY OA in hybrid journal &amp; self archiving the published paper</th>
<th>G. archiving publisher version, on publication, CC-BY</th>
<th>H. archiving AAA, on publication, CC-BY</th>
<th>I. sharing preprints and using overlay FR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Compliant?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Example</td>
<td>PLoS, 1000+ more</td>
<td>Open Library of Humanities, 1000s more</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Infection, 1000s more</td>
<td>Scape (no transformative deals yet?)</td>
<td>all hybrid journals allowing CC-BY</td>
<td>(MNRAS, APS journals)</td>
<td>Royal Society (Emerald journals)</td>
<td>SciPost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current use / availability</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
<td>none, with exceptions and exceptions</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>limited, with exceptions</td>
<td>limited, with exceptions</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effect on Publishers</td>
<td>gold pub win, etc., decreasing subscriptions</td>
<td>more competition / perhaps even decreasing subscriptions</td>
<td>change in business model / prob. for high rejection</td>
<td>new partnerships or loose journals to funders/institutions</td>
<td>need to change business model</td>
<td>journals keep row if CC-BY is allowed</td>
<td>evtl. decreasing subscriptions, need to solve sustainability?</td>
<td>keep large part of perceived value</td>
<td>change publishing model or lose out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Effect on Researchers</td>
<td>away from trad venues and IF-thinking</td>
<td>away from trad venues and IF-thinking</td>
<td>depends on (funding for APC)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>limited effect</td>
<td>almost no restriction on journal choice, but need to pay APC</td>
<td>small effort, accept limitations</td>
<td>adapt to new idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Effect on Libraries</td>
<td>away from hybrid deals &amp; IF-thinking</td>
<td>away from hybrid deals &amp; IF-thinking</td>
<td>potential role in funding</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>potential role in funding</td>
<td>current type read &amp; publish deals remain relevant</td>
<td>role is far as hosted in IR / cannot subvert</td>
<td>chance to play role in curation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Effect on Funders</td>
<td>supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels</td>
<td>supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels</td>
<td>lower average APC levels / pot. role in funding</td>
<td>depends on who pays APCs during the deal</td>
<td>need to change business model</td>
<td>journals keep row if CC-BY is allowed</td>
<td>evtl. decreasing subscriptions?</td>
<td>limited role, perhaps in quality assurance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Effect on Societies</td>
<td>big, because of subscription dependence</td>
<td>big, because of subscription dependence</td>
<td>change in business model / prob. for high rejection</td>
<td>change in business model / prob. for high rejection</td>
<td>need to change business model</td>
<td>journals keep row if CC-BY is allowed</td>
<td>evtl. decreasing subscriptions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effect on Editors of trad. jnl.</td>
<td>fewer submissions, lower status</td>
<td>fewer submissions, lower status</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading title)</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading title)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading title)</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading title)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Overall pub cost</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>substantially lower?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Changes in assessment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

Jeroen Bosman & Bianca Kramer, 20181130, accompanying post: tinyurl.com/nine-routes
cOAlition S: Who is Involved?

**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
- 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
- Jordan
- India

Coordinated by:

[Images of logos for Science Europe and the European Union]
cOAlition S expands globally

Wellcome and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation join the Open Access coalition

To ensure that research findings are shared widely and are made freely available at the time of publication, Wellcome and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation have today (Monday) joined cOAlition S and endorsed the principles of Plan S.

14th BERLIN OPEN ACCESS CONFERENCE
ALIGNING STRATEGIES TO ENABLE OPEN ACCESS
Hannover House, Berlin, 3-4 December 2018

14th BERLIN OPEN ACCESS CONFERENCE
ALIGNING STRATEGIES TO ENABLE OPEN ACCESS
Hannover House, Berlin, 3-4 December 2018

Supporting Plan S, a model making research accessible and advancing science globally

The African Academy of Sciences, the Continent’s leading pan-African, cross-field promoter and supporter of scientific research in Africa, today endorsed the progressive open publishing position, Plan S, of the European Union.
Europa macht vorwärts mit Open Access

Forschungsergebnisse sollen rascher als bisher öffentlich zugänglich gemacht werden. Was ein neuer europäischer Plan regelt, stösst in der Schweiz nur auf halbe Zustimmung.

Martin Angler
13.9.2018, 14:24 Uhr
Public consultation

PRESS RELEASE

20.02.2019

cOAlition S:

Making full and immediate Open Access a reality

Feedback on the Implementation Guidance of Plan S Generates Large Public Response

( Brussels, 20 February 2019) Over 600 individuals and organisations provided feedback to cOAlition S on the implementation guidance of Plan S. Originating from over 40 countries, respondents providing feedback include researchers, librarians and libraries, publishers and editors, universities, learned societies, research funders and performers, and other interested citizens and organisations.
The way forward: change the reward system

San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment

A number of themes run through these recommendations:

-- the need to eliminate the use of journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, in funding, appointment, and promotion considerations;

-- the need to assess research on its own merits rather than on the basis of the journal in which the research is published; and
For More Information

http://scieur.org/coalition-s

Thank you for your attention!
Marc Schiltz