We’ll learn
1. what Open Access is and what is not, DISPELLING SOME MYHTS
2. how to do it in practice

Take home messages
• there are TWO roads: deposit and publishing
• you can be Open AND comply to the evaluation criteria, ALWYAS
Access to knowledge is a human right, "it gets me out of bed in the morning" @tonyR_H #coasp9 Useful to remind people. OA isn't just $
Open Access

The Open Content definition defines five rights[2], also known as the five Rs. that should hold true for a copyrightable work to be truly open:

- **Retain** - the right to make, own, and control copies of the content (e.g., download, duplicate, store, and manage)
- **Reuse** - the right to use the content in a wide range of ways (e.g., in a class, in a study group, on a website, in a video)
- **Revise** - the right to adapt, adjust, modify, or alter the content itself (e.g., translate the content into another language)
- **Remix** - the right to combine the original or revised content with other material to create something new (e.g., incorporate the content into a mashup)
- **Redistribute** - the right to share copies of the original content, your revisions, or your remixes with others (e.g., give a copy of the content to a friend)

1. 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.
...Houston, we have a problem

OPEN ACCESS IN ITALY (IN 2019):
- OPEN ACCESS = JOURNALS
- WHERE YOU ALWAYS PAY TO PUBLISH
- AND THEY ARE ALL PREDATORY PUBLISHERS
## 10 Myths around Open Scholarly Publishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth 1</th>
<th>Myth 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preprints will get your research ‘scooped’</strong></td>
<td><strong>Copyright transfer is required to publish and protect authors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preprints typically provide a time-stamp and a DOI, therefore establishing priority of discovery</td>
<td>Copyright transfer procedures do not protect authors nor contribute to the advancement of scientific progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth 2</th>
<th>Myth 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JIF and journal branding are measures of quality for researchers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gold Open Access is synonymous with the APC business model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The JIF is a flawed metrics that was never meant to be used for evaluation of research and researchers</td>
<td>Most DOAJ-indexed journals do not have APCs and are funded from other sources, such as research institutes and grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth 3</th>
<th>Myth 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval by peer review proves that you can trust a research article</strong></td>
<td><strong>Embargo periods on ‘green’ OA are needed to sustain publishers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current peer review system is prone to a number of flaws including corruption, human bias and ghostwriting</td>
<td>Traditional journals can peacefully coexist with zero-embargo self-archiving policies on author manuscripts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth 4</th>
<th>Myth 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without journal peer review, the quality of science suffers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Web of Science and Scopus are global databases of knowledge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers are more than responsible and competent enough to ensure their own quality control as part of intrinsic scientific integrity</td>
<td>Neither represent the sum of current global research knowledge including Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth 5</th>
<th>Myth 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Access has created predatory publishers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Publishers add no value to the scholarly communication process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predatory journals have been around for a long time before the recent push towards Open Access publishing</td>
<td>Publishers are responsible for quite some key functions, from peer-review management to production and archiving of final version articles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**March 11, 2019**
The pillars

Knowledge is a common

Scholarly communication is a great conversation

The results of publicly funded research must be publicly available
Why do we need Open Access? [or: where does the money go?]

Corina Logan, 2018
Why do we need Open Access?

Corina Logan, 2018

http://bulliedintobadscience.org/
The Big Ten Academic Alliance will continue its advocacy for a sustainable and open ecosystem of publication. We believe the recent actions of the University of California and European institutions represent a critical pivot in that ecosystem. These and other similar efforts reflect growing momentum and urgency about the need for change. We believe the academic community must take action to better recognize and to rebalance the contributions that authors, institutions, and publishers make. Most importantly, the values of the academy toward the advancement of knowledge must prevail.

Sustaining Values and Scholarship
A Statement by the Provosts of the Big Ten Academic Alliance
June 10, 2019

We, the provosts of the Big Ten Academic Alliance, are committed to sustaining and advancing equitable modes of sharing knowledge. Our 14 institutions embrace individual mission statements that support the common good, equity of access, and the global impact and reach of our research and scholarship. Collectively, our institutions’ more than 50,000 faculty are supported by over $10 billion (2017) in research funding, and our institutions have similarly invested significantly in our capacity to further our missions to advance knowledge. Together, we produce roughly 15% of the research publications in the United States.
Benefits

... transparency on public funds...
Benefits / more knowledge

...anything is immediately VISIBLE on Google
...increased and faster circulation of ideas...
BOOSTING THE CREATION OF KNOWLEDGE
# THE IMPACT OF OPEN ACCESS

## Demonstrating Achievements
- Building Reputation
- Garnering Funding
- Developing Alumni Connections
- Strengthening Recruiting
- Contributing Stories for Public Relations

## Reputation Building
- Amplifying Scholarly Expertise
- Preserving Scholarly Legacy
- Developing Niche Field
- Forging Business & Government Partnerships
- Popularizing Research in Mainstream Outlets
- Modeling Innovative Teaching
- Launching Scholarly Career
- Improving Quality

## Advancing Knowledge
- Affecting Public Policy
- Advancing Innovation
- Linking Global Experts
- Building Local Community
- Improving Access to Education
- Updating Practitioners
- Connecting Cultures
- Informing Prospective Applicants

---

https://www.bepress.com/portfolio_dc/impact-open-access-framework/
Benefits / return on investments

access to research data increases the returns from public investment

OECD, Principles and Guidelines on Access to Research Data from Public Funding, 2007
Benefits / enabling services

POSSIBLE ONLY IF AUTHORS SELF-ARCHIVE IN OPEN ACCESS

Legal, fair, and sustainable.

We harvest our content from thousands of university and government web servers all over the world. The fullest articles we find there have been legally uploaded by authors, with permission from publishers.

Avoid Paywalls, Request Data.

Free, legal research articles and data delivered instantly or automatically requested from authors.

PubMed LinOut downloads

POUBMED LINKOUT

Distribution of Ha-RAS-1 proto-oncogene alleles in breast cancer patients and in a control population.


Author information

https://openaccessbutton.org/
Benefits / new tools

https://openknowledgemaps.org/

Map a research topic
Get an overview - Find papers - Identify relevant concepts

ADVANTAGES

Get an overview of a research topic: knowledge maps provide an instant overview of a topic by showing the main areas at a glance, and papers related to each area. This makes it possible to easily identify useful, pertinent information.

Identify relevant concepts: one of the most difficult tasks when you are new in a research field is to learn the "language" of the field. Open Knowledge Maps makes it easier for you by labelling research areas with relevant concepts.
Benefits / visibility and citations

BEWARE OF USING ONLY THIS CONCEPT

**Benefits / citations**

- Impact of the presence or not in ORBi on citations (average per article)
  - in Scopus (n=351)
  - in WoS (n=7673)

- Impact of open or restricted access on downloading on average per article
  - X 18.1

**Size of OA citation advantage when found (and where explicitly stated by discipline)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>% increase in citations with Open Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics/astronomy</td>
<td>170 to 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>35 to 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>-5 to 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical engineering</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>300 to 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications studies [IT]</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sciences</td>
<td>200 to 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/268516

http://sparceurope.org/oaca/

[but they don’t believe it]
Benefits / knowledge transfer

http://pasteur4oa.eu/resources/150#.WOOqLmfOPIU

Open Access to scientific information: facilitating knowledge transfer and technological innovation from the academic to the private sector

Author: Mafalda Picarra, Jisc

...SMEs: products on market 2 years before, had they known the research results

Access to Research and Technical Information in Denmark
Innovation, Analyse og evaluering 20/2011

http://goo.gl/0smE3N
Benefits / TDM

TEXT E DATA MINING
- they are crucial

...YOU CAN’T SEPARATE COMMERCIAL/ NON COMMERCIAL

JOURNALISTS

INDUSTRY (Bayer)
Why do we need a #tdm exception for everyone? @Senficon explains why the right to read should be the right to mine #copyright

What are the risks if a #tdm exception only applies to the #research sector? @Senficon says businesses and journalists may have to take business out of #europe
[the new Directive and Open Science]

...lukewarm +

- Article 11: Academic and scientific publications are excluded from the scope of Article 11, which means that these publications are not subject to the new right. Hence, sharing those publications online will follow the same rules as before.

- Article 13: Not-for-profit scientific and educational repositories are exempt from the scope of Article 13. Therefore, they are not subject to the new licensing rules that place the onus on platforms to self-monitor uploaded content for copyright infringement. As the new liability ruling does not apply to them, they may continue to operate under the existing notice-and-take-down regime.
Article 11(1) excludes “private or non-commercial uses of press publications carried out by individual users.” This is positive for individual researchers, although the exemption does not explicitly cover uses carried out by education, research and cultural heritage institutions, which we had requested in order to safeguard seamless access to information. The consequences on research are hard to foresee, as private and non-commercial uses are yet to be given a clear interpretation, but this is likely to result in a hurdle in access and sharing of press publications online.

Fears remain that the additional right will deter communication of news, affect the free flow of information, obstruct online licensing, and negatively affect authors.

managed to ensure that not-for-profit scientific and educational repositories are exempt from the definition of “online content sharing service providers” and therefore of the scope of Article 13. But the many other platforms used by researchers will have to abide by the new, highly coercive rules.

Generally, Article 13 creates a costly and burdensome liability regime and risks hindering digital innovation and user participation. The overall effect on the sharing and reuse of content is concerning. Given the vast amount of content online, automated scanning and excluding of content will be patchy at best and risks running counter to the principle of freedom of expression embedded in the copyright system. Indeed, many dread that “filtering” will be unable to spot legitimate uses of works, such as quotation, parody or criticism.
- Articles 3 and 3a introduce copyright exceptions for text and data mining, which form the basis of Artificial Intelligence.
- Article 4 facilitates digital and cross-border teaching activities.
- Article 5 allows digital preservation of in-copyright works including the use of digital preservation networks within a member state and across borders.
- Article 6 deals with contract override and ensures that the exceptions are not pre-empted by contractual terms or technological protection measures.
- Articles 7-9a create mechanisms that allow for the digitisation of in-copyright but out-of-commerce works through extended collective licensing or by way of an exception.
- Article 10b, dealing with works in the public domain, helps achieve the public interest mission of cultural heritage and research institutions in Europe.
Open Access and licenses

The Licenses

**Attribution**

CC BY

This license lets others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered.

Recommended for maximum dissemination and use of licensed materials.

View License Deed | View Legal Code

**Attribution-NoDerivs**

CC BY-ND

This license allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to you.

View License Deed | View Legal Code

**Attribution-NonCommercial**

CC BY-NC

This license lets others remix, tweak, and build upon your work non-commercially, as long as they credit you and license their new creations under the identical terms.

View License Deed | View Legal Code

**Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike**

CC BY-NC-SA

This license allows for remix, tweak, and build upon your work non-commercially, as long as they credit you and license their new creations under the identical terms.

View License Deed | View Legal Code

**Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs**

CC BY-NC-ND

This license is the most restrictive of our six main licenses, only allowing others to download your works and share them with others as long as they credit you, but they can’t change them in any way or use them commercially.

View License Deed | View Legal Code

http://creativecommons.org/choose/?lang=en
How Open Access works / green and gold
Green road – self-archiving

Author self-archives in an Open Access repository his/her final version of the paper, wherever it was published, according to copyright agreements.
Green road – self-archiving

82% of international publishers allows some kind of self-archiving (Elsevier, Wiley, Springer...); list:

SHERPA/RoMEO
Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving

...possible limitations:
- no pdf with the publisher’s layout
- embargo period requested

ONLY IF
you have signed a copyright transfer agreement...
if not, the author is the rights holder
Arsenate toxicity on the apices of Pismum sativum L. seedling roots: Effects on mitotic activity, chromatin integrity and microtubules

Stefania Dho, Wanda Camusso, Marco Mucciarelli, Anna Fusconi

Abstract

Arsenic (As) is one of the most toxic pollutants in the environment, where it severely affects both animal and plant growth. Despite the growing literature on As effects on plant development, alterations induced by this element on meristematic activity have not been fully explored. In this element on meristem activity study, short-term experiments were conducted to determine whether plant growth impairment was studied by evaluating apical meristem activity, chromatin fragmentation and microtubule organization. 

Keywords: Pea, Arsenic, Apical meristems, Alterations, Immunofluorescence, TUNEL test.

1. Introduction

Arsenic (As) is a toxic element, frequently found in soils and water. A main natural source of As is the eroding mother rock, even though a consistent part of As environmental pollution comes from human activities (Menarg and Hartley-Whitaker, 2002 and Patra et al., 2004). The As in unpolluted fresh water is usually in the range 1–10 µg/l. According to EPA and WHO, the maximum permissible As concentration in drinking water is 50 µg/l (Mandal and Suzuki, 2002).

Arsenic is a well-established human carcinogen (Qin et al., 2008a) and has been shown to be genotoxic in a variety of in vitro studies (Hughes, 2002). In plants, it severely affects growth and development, and its toxicity is strongly dependent on the concentration, exposure time and physiological state of the plant (Singh et al., 2007). However, plants vary in their sensitivity to As, and a wide range of species have been identified as As-contaminated soils (Meharg and Hartley-Whitaker, 2002). Besides, hyperaccumulators such as Pisum sativum, which tolerate high internal As content, may also use this As to defend themselves against herbivore attack (Mathews et al., 2009).

Higher plants take up As mainly as arsenate (V), the dominant form of phytoreavailable As in aerobic soils. According to Meharg and Hartley-Whitaker (2002), As competes with phosphate for plant phosphate transporters. Upon absorption, most arsenate is rapidly reduced to arsenite (III), due to an arsenate reductase activity (Xu et al., 2007), hence, the arsenite cytoplasmic concentration is generally high enough to exert toxicity (Meharg and Hartley-Whitaker, 2002). Both As species interfere with various metabolic pathways: arsenate, as an analogous chemical to phosphate, may replace phosphate in the TCA and in various metabolic pathways, such as the Calvin cycle and the pentose phosphate pathway.
AUTHORS DON’T HAVE TO CHANGE THEIR HABITS

• YOU CAN GO ON PUBLISHING IN THE MOST REPUTATED JOURNALS/SERIES, as requested by research assessment exercises
• then you make the content free by self-archiving your final version of the work
YOU CAN DO OPEN ACCESS
WHATEVER THE CRITERIA OF RESEARCH EVALUATION

THEY ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE!!!

© Mel Brooks
Why in an Open Access repository?
- provides a **unique and persistent ID** (handle), VS personal page
- long-term **preservation**
- is **no-profit** VS Research Gate / Academia.edu
- THEY CAN CLOSE TOMORROW
- THEY CAN BE BOUGHT TOMORROW

A social networking site is not an open access repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports export or harvesting</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term preservation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business model</td>
<td>Nonprofit (usually)</td>
<td>Commercial. Sells job posting services, hopes to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ResearchGate vs. Publishers: The Saga Continues...

May 2018

ResearchGate bows to pressure from publishers on copyrighted material

BY REBECCA TRAGER | 15 NOVEMBER 2017

Nov. 15, 2017
...and you have IRIS (AperTO) which is one of a kind in Europe: IR+CRIS
Every publisher with an embargo policy does obviously not believe they add any value themselves. So why should we?

1) IF YOU ASK FOR EMBARGO, WHAT KIND OF VALUE YOU ADD AS A PUBLISHER?

2) «WE PREVENT READING TO PROTECT READERS»

Elsevier stooping to new lows (no, didn't think it was possible either): "we prevent reading to protect readers" One more in a long list of Elsevier's insults to their customers' intelligence: bjoern.brembs.net/2017/10/why-

The whole point of the embargo is so that subscribers can get their money's worth. As you know, I wish everything was open access, but I'm just putting out there why embargoes exist.
A labirynth?
Green road - Sharing à la Elsevier

...isn’t it a bit difficult?

The difficulties are NOT technical. They are imposed by publishers.
This course helps you to become skilled in Open Access (OA) publishing in the context of Open Science. By the end of the course, you will:

- understand how to publish your work openly and be aware of the advantages
- be able to find an OA publisher for your research
- know how to find a suitable repository to provide OA and archive your work
- know how to publish OA monographs
- understand funders' expectations and policies on OA
- be able to secure funding for Article Processing Charges (APCs) where applicable

Start the Free Course: https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/node/2331

https://www.openaire.eu/oa-basics
Gold road Publishing Open Access

• you have to change your publication venue
• choose one of more than 13,000 Open Access journals listed in DOAJ, Directory of Open Access Journals
• 26.6% of the journals require APCs, Article Processing Charges, [250 to 2900 $]
• [bear in mind: even traditional publishers have been (and still are) asking for fees for figure, pages over...]

https://doaj.org/
Pay attention!

SUBSCRIPTIONS
- paid every year
- increase every year
- CLOSE the content for those who have no subscription

APC
- paid once and forever
- OPEN the content to all

DON’T MIX
- NATIVE OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHERS [NO REVENUE BUT APCs]
- TRADITIONAL PUBLISHERS OFFERING AN «OPEN OPTION» [MAIN REVENUE STREAM IS STILL SUBSCRIPTIONS]
Are OA journals different?

- **Publish Data with the Article**
  - Transparency
  - Reproducibility

- **Publish Reviews with the Article**
  - Transparency
  - Pieces of Knowledge

- **Publish under Creative Commons Licences**
  - Reuse
  - Text and Data Mining

- **Publish Quickly**

  (Often) Publish in Machine-readable Formats
  - Text and Data Mining
A new model

JOURNALS ARE COMMUNITY OWNED

The Fair Open Access Principles

1. The journal has a transparent ownership structure, and is controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community.

2. Authors of articles in the journal retain copyright.

3. All articles are published open access and an explicit open access licence is used.

4. Submission and publication is not conditional in any way on the payment of a fee from the author or its employing institution, or on membership of an institution or society.

5. Any fees paid on behalf of the journal to publishers are low, transparent, and in proportion to the work carried out.

The mission of the foundation is

a. to promote and support initiatives concerning (Fair) Open Access publications in the broadest sense;

b. to acquire resources and financially sustain (Fair) Open Access publications;

c. to support foundations financially and otherwise in various disciplines (xxxOA’s) that pursue the same goals;

d. to expand the Open Library of Humanities to other disciplines.

e. to propagate and promote the principles of Fair Open Access over all disciplines of science.
Quality?

Stop Predatory Journals

List of Predatory Journals

This is a list of possibly predatory journals. The kernel for this list was extracted from the archive of Beall's list at web.archive.org. It will be updated as new information or suggested edits are submitted by the maintainers of this site.

This list is only for individual journals. See the other list for publishers potentially engaging in price practices.

A
- Academic Exchange Quarterly
- Academic Research Reviews

Cites & Insights

Crawford at Large
Libraries • Policy • Technology • Media

Volume 14, Number 4, April 2014

Ethics and Access 1: The Sad Case of Jeffrey Beall

Open access (OA) is all about ethics, economies and equity, and the three intersect in various ways. OA is inherently at the intersection of libraries, media, policy and technology—but that's a different issue. This is in the first of a two-part essay, you need to read both parts to get a full picture of how we address a specific situation, and then have a robust and ethical discussion. Depending on how you think.

http://www.michaeleisen.org/blog/?p=1500

Scholarly Open Access

Why Beall’s List Died — and What It Unresolved About Open Access

By Paul Basken | September 12, 2017

Nine months after a academic librarian deleted his carefully curated list shaming more than 1,000 journals at various levels of quality, the Beall’s List Mystery remains unsolved.

Why, after so much effort and expense, did the University of Colorado at Denver abruptly shutter a list of journals it deemed untrustworthy nine months ago? While the project has ended, debates over its merits and impact live on.

Beall’s Litter

By Michael Eisen | Published Dec 5, 2017

Jeffrey Beall, a librarian at the University of Colorado in Denver, recently published a list of journals he deemed untrustworthy. The list included universities and other organizations. Beall’s list included a journal published by the University of Colorado at Denver’s Jeffrey Beall. Basken, an academic librarian at the University, then deleted Beall’s list.

It is NOT junk

Nothing has been deleted.

Walt at Random

The library voice of the radical middle.

http://walt.lishost.org/2016/01/trust-me-the-other-problem-with-87-of-bealls-lists/
Predatory?

QUALITY IS ABOUT EDITORIAL WORKFLOW NOT BUSINESS MODEL

(Springer 107 retractions for false review, Elsevier 7 journals withdrawn – they were paid by pharmaceutical firms)

IF REVIEWS WERE PUBLIC...

AND, IN THE END, IF YOU WERE NOT SO PRESSED TO PUBLISH OR PERISH, WOULDN’T YOU BE MORE CAREFUL???

THEY ARE 2%-5%

http://thinkchecksubmit.org/trans/italian/
THERE IS ALWAYS A WAY

"Open Access is too expensive."
The «red road»

Gold road is not the «Open Choice» offered by traditional commercial publishers (Elsevier, Springer, Wiley…)

- paying a 3000 $ APC, your single article becomes Open Access, but the journal is still by subscription

so, you pay twice...

you have to use it only if the funder asks for a shorter embargo period [in Horizon2020!]

[TO BE AVOIDED – YOU GET THE SAME RESULT SELFARCHIVING FOR FREE]
...what about the «transition to OA»?
... a speedy transition?

Towards a Plan S gap analysis? (1) Open access potential across disciplines

Kramer-Bosman Dec 5, 2018

15-20%

LOOK AT GREY [CLOSED]
12.2.2  **Strong Leadership: Strategic Focus on Research, with a High-Quality Brand Portfolio, Global Scale and Favorable Positioning to Benefit from Strong Growth in the Open Access Publishing Market.**

Brand strength is becoming increasingly important, as market participants increasingly differentiate in the open access market with regard to APCs according to a journal’s impact factor. Our open access portfolio includes a large number of leading brands, such as Nature Communications, Scientific Reports and Springer Open, and high impact factor publications, positioning us well to command premium APCs from authors.

Jean-Sebastien Caux
@jscaux

The prospectus for the IPO of Springer Nature proxy.dbagproject.de/mediacenter/re ... should be compulsory reading for any funder/university/agency representative negotiating with publishers. You can then question whether you should support #SciPost and similar initiatives, or can afford not to.

13:38 - 5 mag 2018

22 Retweet  28 Mi piace

Prospectus dated April 25, 2018

Springer

Prospectus for the public offering

Springer Prospectus Apr. 25
...an efficient transition?

A HUGE INCREASE IN APCs

... AND THE WINNER IS...
...a call: PlanS

IF YOU WANT TO UNDERSTAND PLAN-S WATCH THIS

WE NEED RADICAL AND ROBUST ACTIONS

...A TRANSITION LASTING 15 YEARS IS STILL A TRANSITION? OR IS IT MORE A «FURTHER EXPLOITATION»?

WE NEED RADICAL AND ROBUST ACTIONS

So there is a need for a radical solution

- 'Without intervention, immediate OA to just half of Europe's scientific publications will not be achieved until 2025 or later' (Research Consulting Report, page 3).

ESOF 2018 - Opening Up Open Science: Innovations, Ideas and Possibilities

July 11, 2018 min. 30.09-42.00 and 57.37-11.02
Plan S does not come out of the blue... Council Conclusions in 2016

12. AGREES to further promote the mainstreaming of open access to scientific publications by continuing to support a transition to immediate open access as the default by 2020, using the various models possible and in a cost-effective way, without embargoes or with as short as possible embargoes, and without financial and legal barriers, taking into account the diversity in research systems and disciplines, and that open access to scientific publications should be the principle that no researcher should be prevented from. Member States and relevant stakeholders, including to catalyse this transition; and STRENGTHEN the importance of open access to scientific publications must become a reality by 2020 –

---

OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>General Secretariat of the Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Delegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. prev. doc.</td>
<td>8791/16 RECH 133 TELECOM 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>The transition towards an Open Science system - Council conclusions (adopted on 27/05/2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...so in Sept. 2018 PlanS came out on Sept. 4, 2018.

**Plan S** Sept. 4, 2018

**Accelerating the transition to full and immediate Open Access to scientific publications**

No More Hybrid Journals

- TOPPED APCs

- **WHEN [AND ONLY WHEN] APCs ARE DUED, ISTITUTION PAYS**

Authors retain copyright via CC BY

In addition:

- 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 fulfill the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration;

- The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of guidelines for the services Open Access Journals and how to provide;

- 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.

**REVISED IN MAY 2019**

**POSTPONED TO JAN. 2021**

3660 OUT OF 13.759 JOURNALS WITH APCs 26.6%
Major changes in the new PlanS

Implementation guidance – key changes (1)

- Timeline extended by one year:
  - Calls published as of 1 January 2021 onwards
  - Transformative arrangements will be supported until end of 2024

- Greater clarity on compliance routes:
  - cOAlition S supports a diversity of business models
  - Plan S is NOT just about Gold OA

- Options for range of transformative arrangements are supported
  - Transformative agreements and transformative journals

Implementation guidance – key changes (2)

- Revised implementation plans represent a big improvement - more realistic and less prescriptive.

- Still too much emphasis on APCs and not enough on preprints, repositories and new publishing models.

- Urgent need to bring in voices from the global south, Latin America, Asia etc.

- But no going back! Everyone agrees that Open Access is a good thing (just not how to get there).

Luke Drury, OSFair Sept. 18, 2019

- Funders commit to implement DORA principles when undertaking research assessment

- Greater emphasis on the transparency of OA publication fees

- Option to request a CC-BY-ND licence as an exception

- Technical requirements for journals, platforms and repositories revised and simplified

Neil Jacobs, Open Science Fair, Sept. 18 2019
... some bad reactions from authors

**For Better Science**

A Response to Plan-S from Academic Researchers: Unethical, Too Risky!

**Summary**

Open access (OA) publishing in general has many advantages over traditional subscription, or toll access (open access, OA) publishing, which produces a larger public, but also expands the impact of their research. Plan S tries to make OA publishing free. But is it wise to do so?

**Signatories**

1509

[https://sites.google.com/view/plansopenletter/signatories](https://sites.google.com/view/plansopenletter/signatories)

---

**Academic freedom and responsibility: why Plan S is not unethical**

Academic freedom and responsibility: why Plan S is not unethical

Posted on October 1, 2018 by Stephen

Clearly there are complications here, but I hope at least that the above analysis gives a clearer view of the boundary where Plan S has landed. For what it’s worth I believe that academics should certainly be as free as possible to choose where to publish, in acknowledgement of their professionalism and expertise. I think it is therefore important that the implementation of Plan S strives to ensure that there remains a rich variety of outlets. But we also need to acknowledge that at present academics’ publishing choices are constrained by the **pervasive incentives that have grown up around metrics of journal prestige**. For that reason, I was pleased to see that reform of research evaluation is at the heart of Plan S. If it can help to drive real change on this front, arguably Plan S will make a positive contribution to academic freedom.
... and some positive

Open Letter in Support of Funder Open Publishing Mandates

We, the undersigned, believe that the world’s scholarly literature is a public resource that only achieves its full value when it is freely available to all. For too long we have tolerated a pay-for-access business model for scholarly journals that is inequitable, impedes progress in our fields, and denies the public the full benefit of our work. We therefore welcome efforts on the part of public and private research funders to require that publications based on research funded by them be available immediately freely and openly available without restrictions on access or use.

We need a stable, fair, effective and open system to transform scholarly publishing by changing the explicit and implicit rules under which scholarly literature is disseminated. We recognize that funder mandates may superficially limit our publishing options in the short term, but they can move us towards a system that optimizes what we really care about: maximizing the reach of our research community and public.

Young Researchers

Joint Statement on Implementation Guidance for Plan S

Plan S is an initiative by cOAlition S to achieve full and immediate Open Access to scientific publications after 01 January 2020 in Europe. At the heart of the plan are 10 principles currently being developed into a set of implementation guidelines. We, representatives of early-career and senior researchers across Europe, have already commented on Plan S and hereby reaffirm our general support and offer our views on the implementation guidance.

- SCHOLARLY LITERATURE HAS A VALUE ONLY WHEN AVAILABLE TO ALL
- FOR TOO LONG WE HAVE TOLERATED THE PAY-PER-ACCESS BUSINESS WHICH IMPEDES PROGRESS
- WE NEED A STABLE FAIR EFFECTIVE AND OPEN SYSTEM
... and some hilarious/tragic

EMS on new developments concerning Open Access

Two months ago the EMS reiterated its position on open access, see here.

While scientific publishing may move in this direction, any change of the system must be done in a balanced way taking into account the interests of all parties involved, in particular that of the scientific community.

However, at the moment we are witnessing several disturbing developments. The European Commission (EC) announced its "Plan S" which would make so-called "Gold Open Access" obligatory from 2020 within the EU. The participation of big commercial publishers in formulating this plan was explicitly mentioned. Furthermore, the EC has selected Elsevier as a subcontractor responsible for implementing the plan. In our view this is an obvious conflict of interests. We are surprised that the EC, with its manifest willingness to fight big internet companies, should turn a blind eye to such a serious problem in its own backyard.

This decision will have a serious and lasting impact on the future of Open Science and innovation in Europe, the livelihoods of European citizens, and even the legitimacy of the European Commission. A number of people have accordingly supported a complaint to the European Ombudsman, requesting that this decision be revoked.

The European Mathematical Society shares these worries about the future of scientific publishing and strongly supports the complaint.

https://zenodo.org/record/1305847#.W6UXwvYzU2w

EMS spreads fake news:
- referring Jon Tennant’s complaint issued in July to PlanS issued in Sept.
- stating that Elsevier is the subcontractor to monitor PlanS
- insinuating that PlanS was written with publishers
the biggest inhibitor is the system itself...]

Robert-Jan Smits: the future for Plan S

Smits said he had not been surprised by the pushback Plan S has received from some researchers. He quoted two pieces of advice he received as envoy. First: universities and researchers are “coin-driven”, and mainly motivated by winning funding. Second: “The biggest inhibitor to change and modernisation in the academic system is the academic system itself.”

But he said he thinks some of the arguments against Plan S have been “unfair”. He reserved his greatest ire for accusations that Plan S will prevent Coalition S-funded researchers from collaborating with people who do not face restrictions on where and how they can publish.

“I thought that scientists work together across borders to extend the frontiers of knowledge and solve problems for society,” he said. “If now scientists tell me that they will not cooperate anymore if they are not allowed to publish behind a paywall, I think we have a serious problem with the role of science in our society and we probably have got to have a more fundamental debate.”
Houston, we have a problem [again]

- PLAN S IS FOR PUBLISHERS, NOT FOR AUTHORS
- PLAN S IS INTENDED TO FORCE THE SYSTEM, NOT TO BE ADAPTIVE

Reminder - you can't criticize Plan S for "not being flexible enough so that all of today's journals are deemed compliant." As @ashleydfarley said - the whole point of Plan S is to force the current system/journals to change.

Ashley Farley @ashleydfarley
Plan S isn't meant to fit into the traditional publishing system. It's meant to drive systemic change in a broken system. Hybrids were meant as a way to transition. Now it's become the ugly norm. I would love to see more conversation around solutions that #PlanS is pushing for.
"What if Plan S fails? Is that a world you want to live in? So please join us" says @njneilj at #OSFair2019 #PlanS #cOAlitionS @cOAlitionS_OA #OpenScience
[not only PlanS, also AmeliCA]

Principles to achieve Open Access

Europe

Plan S
Making full and immediate Open Access a reality

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

Latin America and the Global South

AmeliCA
Open Knowledge for Latin America and the Global South, Social Sciences and Humanities

Scientific knowledge generated by public funds is a common good and access to it is a right.

Open Access must be legally protected in order to avoid the appropriation of

Open Access has no future or meaning without an evolution of research evaluation systems.

3

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.

4

scientific communication as an essential axis.

The economical investment in Open Access must be coherent with its benefit to society just as commercial solutions are paid.

The adverse economic scenarios facing Open Access will have to be overcome with work schemes based on collaboration and sustainability.

It is necessary to recognize the diversity of scientific journals and stop the pressures that seek to homogenize them. In the other hand, journals must support the strengthening of institutional repositories by means of the disappearance of policies of embargo.

The social impact of science is the foundation of Open Access' existence.

It is necessary to respect the different dynamics of generation and circulation of knowledge by area, especially the dynamics of the social sciences and the humanities.

Open Access must be permanently conceptualized and accordingly defined. The three "I" homogenize the conditions of the development of science and the conditions of the South are different from those of the North.
We recognise that researchers need to be given a maximum of freedom to choose the proper venue for publishing their results and that in some jurisdictions this freedom may be covered by a legal or constitutional protection. However, our collective duty of care is for the science system as a whole, and researchers must realise that they are doing a gross disservice to the institution of science if they continue to report their outcomes in publications that will be locked behind paywalls.

We also understand that researchers may be driven to do so by a misdirected reward system which puts emphasis on the wrong indicators (e.g. journal impact factor). We therefore commit to fundamentally revise the incentive and reward system of science, using the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)⁴ as a starting point.

---

**PlanS Preamble**

- PAYWALLS ARE A DISSERVICE TO SCIENCE
- RESEARCHERS ARE DRIVEN BY A MISDIRECTED REWARD SYSTEM

SIGN DORA!
“There’s an implementation period,” he said. “From January 1, 2020, funders will only apply this to new grants or new calls for grants. This implementation period means the publications that will emerge from these new calls will be a couple of years down the line from then.

“We recognize that we can’t abrogate existing contracts that are in place and there are lots of contacts that are being signed now which cannot just be turned over. I fail to see that it’s quite the tight time scale that people make it out to be.

“My question for those who say it’s too tight a time scale,” he said, “is how long do you want? Given that we’re now talking about implementing principles which were agreed many years ago and that were then set out in transitional models. I don’t remember going back to scratch and resetting this clock for Plan S. We’re imposing the same open access guidelines that we’ve been working on for many years.”
Rome, Feb. 21 2019

Transformative agreements get control over hybrid costs

Subscription funds are converted to open access publishing funds

Costs and workflows shift from package level to the individual article level

Participants from 37 nations and five continents, representing research performing and research funding institutions, libraries and government higher education associations and rectors’ conferences, associations of researchers and other open access initiatives gathered at the 14th Berlin Open Access Conference held 3-4 December 2018 in Berlin. They affirmed that there is a strong alignment among the approaches taken by OA2020, Plan S, the Jussieu Call and others to facilitate a full and complete transition to open access. The statement that follows represents the strong consensus of all of those represented at the meeting.

We are all committed to authors retaining their copyrights,

We are all committed to complete and immediate open access,

We are all committed to accelerating the progress of open access through transformative agreements that are temporary and transitional, with a shift to full open access within a very few years. These agreements should, at least initially, be cost-neutral, with the expectation that economic adjustments will follow as the markets transform.

Publishers are expected to work with all members of the global research community to effect complete and immediate open access according to this statement.
In 2016, the New England Journal of Medicine published an editorial against data sharing in research, calling those who analyze published data, “parasites”. Yesterday, the journal published another editorial in a similar vein, but this time against open access. I don’t have time to rebut each pernicious editorial attacking open access, but this one is high profile and is currently gleefully being shared by opponents of open access (for example, here is a VP from Elsevier promoting it).

The people spreading this editorial highlight its three key objections to open access:

1. OA increases costs of publishing
2. OA does not accelerate science because citations for subscription journals are higher
3. Researchers still prefer to publish in subscription journals

I am setting a 60-minute timer and will address as many of the misleading points as I can.

No, the costs have not come down, but it’s not because the internet is more expensive than print or because OA journals charge more than subscription ones. The costs have not come down because subscription journals have not switched to open access, so they maintain their exorbitant profit margins, and many double-dip and charge extra for those who want their articles to be open access.

If you actually analyze real open access journals (not hybrids that get both subscriptions and open access fees), you can see that author-pays open access publishing, because it’s transparent pricing, is much less expensive, even for the highly selective journals. Today, the biggest subscription publishers are enjoying 30%-40% profit margins. If we switch from subscription publishing to pay-to-publish open access, these margins are likely to drop to 10%-20%. This is exactly why the subscription publishers are fighting the recent Plan S funder initiative to mandate immediate open access. The publishers’ profits, like those of NEJM, are threatened by Plan S, and hence this editorial.

It is outrageous for this NEJM editorial to pretend that open access increases costs, while the whole point of this piece is to maintain the profit margins by lobbying against Plan S and the switch to open access.

And the parts about “we still want curated content and only subscription journals can provide it” - I have a hard time responding to this without profanity. First of all, it is equating almost 13,000 rigorous open access journals with blogs and Youtube. They ALL DO peer review and curate content! Moreover, highly selective journals like eLife and PLOS Biology are different from NEJM and Nature in really just two ways: they charge society $2,500-$3,000 per article instead of $30,000-$50,000 at Nature/NEJM, and they are open access. So, eLife and PLOS Biology charge a fraction of NEJM and
... what about books?

https://www.doabooks.org/

10869 Academic peer-reviewed books and chapters from 256 publishers

News  Register for newsletter

- 2017-11-24 DOAB reaches milestone of 10,000 open access books & De Gruyter on its way to 1000 titles on degruyter.com
- 2017-07-06 New Features, New Publishers and Growth
- 2017-03-22 De Gruyter sponsors DOAB

Basic services

- Identification services will attribute several identifiers to the documents, hence allowing to create links between publications and other digital objects. The data service will produce 3 additional data: authors identification, documents identification, named entities identification.
- Entity recognition and disambiguation through entity-fishing service.
- Certification service will guarantee that monographs selected inside the platforms are compliant with common open science criteria: the certification service will produce and expose in a standardized way 2 additional data: description of peer-reviewing process and licence information

Advanced services

- Open annotation will add open peer review and open commentary to the documents and link to them through unique identification. It will increase interactions with users inside and outside the academic field. It will add 1 additional data to the document: annotations produced by the users.
- Usage Metrics services will standardize usage measures on the documents and add 1 additional data: usage indicators such as downloads and social media

http://operas.hypotheses.org/
The Amsterdam meeting

Title:
The Open Access Books Network (OABN)

Definition:
A multistakeholder network to support the development of open access books in Europe and address in a coordinated way the challenges OA books initiatives have to face

Participants:
Eelco Ferwerda (Oapen), Margo Bagheer (Göttingen University Press, AEUP), Vanessa Proudmann (SPARC Europe), Rupert Gatti (OBP), Jeroen Sonderman (UU), Pierre Mounier (OpenEdition)

Challenges:
• Lack of knowledge across Europe (usage, business models and policies particularly)
• Lack of coordination among the many specific projects and initiatives
• Gap between available technologies and tools and current usages in the academic community

Potential lines of action:
• Creation of an OA book watch that will collect all available information on usage, business models and policies, and elaborate standardized indicators to enable benchmarking.
• Support to the technical infrastructure needed for efficient dissemination of OA books
• Support to collective funding initiatives that enable small-scale projects to be funded through lowering of transaction costs
• Preparation of a EU funded project to increase OA books usage across different platforms (HIRMEOS 2)

From the Elpub panel to the Slack channel

Email: pierre.mounier@openedition.org

Summary: A landscape study on open access (OA) and monographs
Policies, funding and publishing in eight European countries
Publication date: March 2018

...the future...
Graph: Open access to scientific publication and research data in the wider context of dissemination and exploitation

- Dissemination plan
- Research results
- Data management plan
- Decision to disseminate/share
- Decision to exploit/protect
- Depositing research data
- Patenting (or other form of protection)

And/or

- Gold OA
- Green OA
- Access and use free of charge
- Restricted access and/or use

H2020 Programme
Guidelines to the Rules on
Open Access to Scientific Publications
and
Open Access to Research Data
in Horizon 2020

https://goo.gl/etRUZ
ARTICLE 29 — DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS — OPEN ACCESS — VISIBILITY OF EU FUNDING

29.1 Obligation to disseminate results

Unless it goes against their legitimate interests, each beneficiary must — as soon as possible — ‘disseminate’ its results by disclosing them to the public by appropriate means (other than those resulting from protecting or exploiting the results), including in scientific publications (in any medium).

29.2 Open access to scientific publications

Each beneficiary must ensure open access (free of charge, online access for any user) to all peer-reviewed scientific publications relating to its results.

In particular, it must:

(a) as soon as possible and at the latest on publication, deposit a machine-readable electronic copy of the published version or final peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication in a repository for scientific publications;

Moreover, the beneficiary must aim to deposit at the same time the research data needed to validate the results presented in the deposited scientific publications.

(b) ensure open access to the deposited publication — via the repository — at the latest:

(i) on publication, if an electronic version is available for free via the publisher, or

(ii) within six months of publication (twelve months for publications in the social sciences and

29.3 Open access to research data

(OPTION 1 for actions participating in the open Research Data Pilot: Regarding the digital research data generated in the action (‘data’), the beneficiaries must:

(a) deposit in a research data repository and take measures to make it possible for third parties to access, mine, exploit, reproduce and disseminate — free of charge for any user — the following:

(i) the data, including associated metadata, needed to validate the results presented in scientific publications as soon as possible;

(ii) other data, including associated metadata, as specified and within the deadlines laid down in the ‘data management plan’ (see Annex 1);
TEXT:
1. **DEPOSIT** A MACHINE READABLE VERSION (PRESERVATION/TEXT MINING) **ALWAYS – EVEN WHEN PUBLISHING OA**
2. **GIVE ACCESS** WITHIN 6/12 MONTHS [IF LONGER EMBARGO, PAY OPEN CHOICE – IT’S ELIGIBLE FOR REIMBURSEMENT]
3. IN **METADATA ALWAYS THE GRANT NUMBER**
4. **ASSOCIATE** DATA **WHENEVER POSSIBLE**
D.3 Costs of other goods and services (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible value added tax (VAT) paid by the beneficiary) are eligible, if they are:

(a) purchased specifically for the action and in accordance with Article 10.1.1 or

1. Costs of other goods and services (D.3): Types of costs — Form — Eligibility conditions — Calculation

The budget category applies to all RIA, IA and CSA grants under the General MGA.

Open access — Costs related to open access to peer-reviewed scientific publications and research data are eligible, if the eligibility conditions are fulfilled. With explicit agreement by the Commission/Agency, it can also include fees levied for a membership scheme (if this is a requirement for publishing in open access or if membership is a pre-condition for significantly lower article processing charges).

1.1 What? This section includes:

- costs for consumables and supplies (e.g. raw materials etc.)
- dissemination costs (including regarding open access to peer-reviewed scientific publications, e.g. article processing or equivalent charges, costs related to open access to research data and related costs, such as data maintenance or storage and conference fees for presenting project-related research)
- costs related to intellectual property rights (IPR) (including costs to protect the results or royalties paid for access rights needed to implement the action)
In gold open access, the payment of publication costs (article processing charges) is shifted from readers’ subscriptions to (generally one-off) payments by the author. Such author processing costs may be eligible \textit{(see Article 6.2.D.3)} — if incurred before the end of the action. Currently, an action for dealing with such costs incurred after the end of the action in FP7 is being piloted and further action in H2020 will be considered based on the outcome.

\textbf{COSTS MUST INCURR BEFORE THE END OF THE PROJECT}
ONE DAY OR
DAY ONE
you decide.

THANK YOU!