

Plan S @5, webinar, 2 November 2023– transcript

Marc Schiltz- opening

0:10:00	Welcome to this webinar on five years since Plan S was launched. My name is Marc Schiltz,
0:17:00	I'm the president of Science Europe. I was one of the co-initiators of Plan S, so let me
0:26:00	say a few words before I hand over to the debate and the discussion. Plan S was launched
0:32:00	in September 2018 by a group of research funders with the aim to really accelerate the transition
0:41:00	to full and immediate Open Access in scientific publication. The overarching principle was simple
0:49:00	and compelling: no science should be locked behind paywalls and it was also clearly articulated that
0:56:00	open access which is worth that name should be immediate and not deferred by several months
1:03:00	or years and finally it was reaffirmed in that plan that authors should retain ownership over
1:09:00	their work. So simple, and I would say compelling principles as we can see and to be clear Plan S
1:17:00	was certainly not the first initiative to promote Open Access but it did, I think we can all agree
1:24:00	on that, shake up the scholarly publication landscape significantly. So what was so particular
1:32:00	about Plan S? Well, I would say first of all: Plan S was mandating Open Access by funders and that
1:41:00	was a kind of substantial difference with previous plans which were mostly
1:49:00	recommendations. So here was really a mandate by funders but in return it was also recognized
1:58:00	that where there are costs, funders should come up for these costs, whether these are costs
2:04:00	in the form of APCs, costs for the maintaining of platforms or the establishment of platforms or for
2:10:00	helping journals to flip to open access models. So that was in a sense the deal: we mandate
2:18:00	but we also as funders have a duty and have a responsibility to contribute to costs
2:26:00	that should occur. Another important aspect of Plan S was that it was an alignment of funders .
2:35:00	We had many different funder policies especially in Europe of course and here was the first attempt

2:42:00	where several funders put put their efforts together and say let's define a uniform set of simple rules by which we design our Open Access policies. And
2:56:00	also Plan S had a clear timeline which wasn't the case in previous initiatives.
3:03:00	So, we said 2021 should be the timeline where we switch to open access with possibility of Transformative
3:13:00	Arrangements but these should end by 2025. So clear timelines were set and it was about principles and
3:22:00	not about particular publication models, so we didn't opt for green versus gold with preference for this
3:30:00	for this or that. This was probably one of the strengths - but also maybe for some one of the weaknesses -
3:36:00	of the Plan S, that we did not make a clear preference for one or the other of the
3:43:00	the publication models. What was important is no paywall, Open Access, immediate Open Access and
3:50:00	rights retention for the authors. Since the launch 28 funders have joined the
3:59:00	cOAlition S, so it's a very large coalition with many national funders and with also number
4:06:00	of prestigious organizations and philanthropic funders and even there are those that have not
4:13:00	formally joined the coalition but whose policies actually mirror Plan S and last year,
4:20:00	No later than last year, the US White House Office of Science and Technology policy announced a policy
4:27:00	or announced principles which very much mirror Plan S principles. I was particularly pleased that
4:35:00	the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science in 2020 which was published in 2021 adopted by all member
4:43:00	states was very clear on principles and actually also very much echoes the Plan S principles
4:51:00	by clearly stating that the paywalled method of publication where immediate access to Scientific
4:58:00	Publications is only granted in exchange for payment is not aligned with the UNESCO
5:05:00	Recommendation. A disappointing, if we look a little bit in the future, a disappointing lesson of Plan S
5:12:00	has been that Legacy Publishers have not really committed to develop innovative Open Access models
5:20:00	that the world needs despite the funders' willingness to put money on the table. It seems sometimes that
5:27:00	they have spent more time to find astute ways of circumventing the rights retention policies
5:36:00	and reestablishing embargo periods rather than embracing Open Access and developing

5:44:00	innovative models. Probably that's why when looking in the future we have as funders to take a more
5:53:00	a clearer and a more decided stance on where we put our money and which Open Access
6:00:00	publication models we want to support with our funding and which ones we want to support less.
6:08:00	This webinar will be in two parts: looking back at the first five years of Plan S and then in the
6:14:00	second part looking forward. And I'm very pleased to be joined by Rachel Magee who is reporter
6:22:00	at Research Professional for moderating the first part and also by Jessica Polka who is the executive
6:31:00	director of ASAPbio and who will moderate the second part. With this, I hand over to you Rachel.

Panel I

6:40:00	Thanks Marc, hello and welcome everyone. I'm delighted to be here to moderate the
6:45:00	first part of this webinar which will look back at the first five years of Plan S. For this session
6:51:00	we have three excellent speakers: first we will hear from Johan Rooryck, who is the executive director
6:58:00	of cOAlition S, then we will hear from Robert-Jan Smits who was one of the initiators of Plan S and
7:04:00	developed it while he was in his previous role as Open Access Envoy at the European Commission. He is
7:11:00	now president of the Executive Board of Eindhoven University of Technology. And finally Heather
7:18:00	Joseph, executive director of the open research advocacy group SPARC will share her thoughts
7:24:00	with us. Each speaker will talk for around seven minutes which will give us plenty of time for
7:30:00	questions and answers at the end. We would like the session to be a dialogue between the speakers and
7:35:00	the audience so please type your questions in the Q&A function in Zoom both as the speakers
7:41:00	are talking and once they're done. I will monitor the Q&A throughout the session and we'll try to
7:47:00	get to as many of the questions as possible. So without further ado, I will hand over to Johan.

7:57:00	Thank you Rachel.
8:02:00	As executive director I would like to give an overview of what we did, reflecting on the past five years,
8:10:00	to what extent did Plan S deliver on its ambition to make full and immediate Open Access a reality,
8:18:00	what are key successes and what are the challenges remaining. First of all I think
8:23:00	we can all agree that scholarly communication system has changed a lot over the past five years, whether that is due to Plan S or not is very difficult to establish of course
8:33:00	but there is definitely an agreement between all stakeholders that the move to Open Access
8:40:00	is globally irreversible and simply good for science and society and there are a number of indicators – Marc has already mentioned some of those – that show that we are
8:50:00	heading towards the world in which all research is published Open Access namely we see that
8:56:00	more content is published Open Access than until now, there's been an increase of the number of research articles published in Open Access models which may in part be attributed
9:07:00	to the momentum created by Plan S. More funding agencies are implementing Open Access policies.
9:13:00	I mean, Marc again mentioned it, we grew from 12 funders to 28 funders but more importantly
9:19:00	a number of funders beyond Plan S have developed policies that are broadly aligned with it.
9:25:00	Canada, India, Germany, elsewhere, the US of course, the Nelson memo certainly are in line
9:32:00	with some of the policies – not all of the policies – but some of the policies that we have developed. I'm thinking of Rights Retention, the insistence on repositories and so on.
9:43:00	We also see new publishing models emerging or at least developing with more confidence.
9:49:00	I'm thinking of things like Subscribe to Open, the new importance given to Diamond Open Access,
9:55:00	the importance of preprint reviews. We also took a stand when we said that reviewed preprints are legitimate outputs that should be taken into account and also we are discussing more and
10:07:00	more I think non-APC models. We have taken some initiatives in that area as well. Of course, as I

10:15:00	said, and this is you know big caveat difficult to determine to what extent Plan S has played a role
10:20:00	in these developments, many factors have developed to the situation, including the rise
10:27:00	of transformative agreements, covid and so on but we've certainly been a catalyst.
10:34:00	I think, moving to the key successes of cOAlition S and Plan S, really there are two successes
10:42:00	that I would like to highlight. Again, echoing Marc, Plan S has reignited the ambition to move to full OA.
10:50:00	In the years prior to 2018 we could see that especially with hybrid journals Open
10:57:00	Access had stalled a bit, you know the part of Open Access in these hybrid journals was at 20%
11:02:00	and really I think the publication of Plan S in September 2018 reignited that discussion
11:11:00	and put full and immediate Open Access back on the agenda by trying to force publishers
11:18:00	to develop new models to address this demand. You could discuss to what extent
11:24:00	that was successful but even if it was - maybe not entirely - successful that we were able to change
11:29:00	the publishers, that will indeed inform as Marc said our road going forward, where we will
11:37:00	develop new models to address or to achieve Open Access. More importantly I think
11:44:00	Plan S demonstrated the benefits of collective action, a first attempt to get research funders
11:50:00	and performing organizations to align on the common OA policies and there is now also greater
11:56:00	coordination between institutions on open access issues. We collaborated with OA 2020 initiative for
12:02:00	transformative agreements and we also saw this in the collaboration with universities
12:10:00	who developed rights retention policies who very clearly said that they were
12:16:00	inspired by the rights retention policy developed by Plan S, which was for them the catalyst to
12:23:00	implement these rights retention policies. As you know, especially in the UK and in Norway,
12:30:00	these rights retention policies have been enacted as part of Institutional policies.
12:35:00	So, joining forces, funders and institutions, can play a crucial role in supporting the transition to OA.
12:42:00	I think that is also true for instance for Diamond Open Access, which is one of the things that we

12:48:00	should probably develop more in the future. Remaining challenges, (I still have a few minutes),
12:55:00	what can we do? well, the dominant open access business models are highly inequitable I think.
13:01:00	Since the UNESCO Recommendations on Open Science the issue of inequity has come back to the table
13:06:00	and of course it would be huge mistake if we simply swapped one system where paywalls deny
13:12:00	access to all researchers with another system where the ability to publish is restricted
13:18:00	to those who are able to pay APCs. That is clearly inequitable. We want a system where
13:25:00	all researchers can participate in the scholarly communication ecosystem without financial barriers .
13:31:00	And that means that we really need to develop alternative publishing models that do not rely on APCs and of course - only last week some of us participated in a global Summit - to advance Diamond
13:42:00	Open Access, where neither the reader nor the author pays, clearly the most equitable model.
13:50:00	At the same time we are still in partnership with Jisc and PLOS to create a multi-stakeholder group to look at non-APC business models and mindful that APCs are likely to persist
14:01:00	we want for the time being to make them more equitable. That's why we launched this study
14:08:00	on the purchasing price parity model which drew a fair amount of legitimate criticism, and
14:14:00	which is really a dialogue to discuss this model. Also we need to reform research assessment.
14:21:00	Research assessment has been too slow despite initiatives like DORA.
14:29:00	Researchers continue to believe that their future success depends on having an article published
14:34:00	in a high impact factor journal and we need to really change the academic reward system
14:40:00	via initiatives like CoARA showing that funders and institutions value the research that is undertaking
14:46:00	and all contributions to the research, so also peer review reports decisions, and that we do
14:53:00	not pay attention to the venue of publication. We also believe that the current prevailing
14:58:00	system, where peer reviews remain inaccessible, causes huge waste where articles are rejected and
15:04:00	the entire process is then repeated at different journals but we also don't have access

15:10:00	to the scholarly assessments. So, we want to move to a world where there is more open science in the sense that both preprints, peer reviews, and the final article are available Open Access.
15:21:00	But this is really the Towards Responsible Publishing proposal that seeks to address this issue.
15:27:00	and I will stop here because Bodo will address this issue in part two of the webinar. Thank you.

Rober-Jan Smits

15:34:00	Thanks, Johan. I'll go to Robert-Jan now.
15:38:00	Well, thank you very much and it's first of all great to see so many familiar faces on the screen and I'm very happy
15:44:00	to be in this panel together with Johan and Heather. But five years Plan S. What has it delivered?
15:51:00	Well, let me start with the good news and a lot what I'm going to say is repetitive following Johan's statements
15:57:00	I would like to mention five points related to the good news. I think first of all some 40% of all
16:03:00	scientific articles that are published each year at global level they're published in Open Access
16:08:00	40% and in certain countries this is even up to 80-90%. Secondly we see that a lot of new OA
16:18:00	publishers and platforms have entered the market and as such increased the services, the landscape
16:23:00	of services and enhanced of course competition. And a third I should also mention, I'll come back to
16:29:00	that later that the large commercial publishers have also expressedly mentioned that they will
16:35:00	sign up to open access. Fourth point which I would like to mention as a positive development is that
16:42:00	the transformative agreements have been signed to facilitate and actually to accelerate the
16:47:00	transfer to full and immediate Open Access and the last point the positive point I would like to mention which I think is quite impressive is that cOAlition S has stuck together and
16:57:00	the membership has even increased and in that context I should of course mention as well and
17:03:00	that was already mentioned by Marc Schiltz early on the fantastic development of the United States from the 25th of August last year, the White House OSTP announced guidelines which are very very much
17:14:00	similar to Plan S and of course AmeliCA in Latin America is also very much pushing for open access.

17:21:00	This context we talk about the coalition which stuck together and all kinds of say agreements
17:29:00	were signed with likewise initiative, the role of the European Commission I think should not be underestimated in this context. Now this on the good news. Let me also turn of course to some
17:40:00	concerns or the bad news. If 40% of all scientific articles published each year worldwide are in Open
17:47:00	Access means that 60% are still published behind paywalls and this is notably surprising despite
17:56:00	all the agreements and hard work which has been done but it's also worrying if I look at field, like cancer-related publications, 70% of all publications in the cancer field are behind paywalls,
18:07:00	for cardiovascular research it's 80% and for climate change it's 60%, and I think these figures
18:15:00	are shocking, are really shocking because they go against the heart the idea the objective of Open
18:21:00	Access. And I must also say a second point that the large commercial publishers have not really pulled
18:26:00	their weight and the figures I just mentioned show that and it gives the impression that they have
18:32:00	paid more lip service to OA than that they have really walked the talk and that's why I think
18:40:00	that the transformative agreements which have all been signed are just used or misused
18:48:00	for continuing the status quo because have a look at which of these transformative agreements are
18:53:00	delivering and accelerating transition and you'll be extremely disappointed just hardly anyone and
18:59:00	I think again this is not what was supposed to be done and this was not what supposed to be
19:04:00	expected. Now since I'm an optimist by nature, I think the glass is half full and not half empty
19:12:00	and thanks to Plan S and cOAlition S we have gone a long way. Yet at the same time
19:19:00	I noted there is a lot of work still to be done and I also notice irritation starting to emerge.
19:26:00	The fact that the European Science ministers on the 22- 23rd of May of this year issued a very
19:33:00	strong statement in which they more or less do not even mention the commercial players says
19:38:00	a lot. They call for non for-profit OA outlets and platforms to emerge and they take a very strong

19:47:00	distance, political distance from the large commercial publishers. And today cOAlition S
19:53:00	will present its new policy, I call this Plan S 2.0, which further will reduce the role of the
20:00:00	large commercial Publishers and put the author at the core, and this is fully in line what the
20:06:00	Ministers of Science have called for and the large publishers can only blame themselves for
20:12:00	this, for these radical measures to be taken. And that's why these new policy guidelines
20:18:00	which shortly will be announced and presented by cOAlition S, I can only support them because
20:24:00	there's only one thing we should aim for all together is to finish the job and to make Open
20:29:00	Access a reality and as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

Heather Joseph

20:37:00	Thanks Robert-Jan. Let's turn to Heather. Thank you so much thanks to my colleagues and my friends at cOAlition S for inviting me to
20:46:00	take part in this program today. I'm particularly pleased to be part of a program that's designed
20:51:00	to highlight not only looking back on the impacts of a very visible and energetic five-year advocacy
20:57:00	campaign to promote Open Access but one that's also dedicated to learning from those assessments and to propose frank, significant and really welcome adjustments to future approaches,
21:08:00	specifically ones that really emphasize the global community's ability to not only equitably access
21:14:00	research and scholarship but as has been said multiple times also to contribute to it and
21:19:00	benefit from it in equal measure. I may seem a bit of an odd choice to be speaking in this
21:25:00	webcast because as SPARC we did not endorse Plan S when it launched five years ago and
21:31:00	in fact we were pretty vocal in our opposition mainly to what we felt was too strong of an
21:37:00	emphasis on an APC approach as you know we felt that they would both quickly spiral into becoming
21:44:00	prohibitively expensive and that they would simply replace the barrier of access to research with a
21:49:00	barrier of contributing to research. As a library membership organization we also had concerns over

21:56:00	encouraging libraries to lock into multi-year contracts under the heading of transformative
22:02:00	agreements with commercial publishers as they now sort of asked libraries to pay to both read and
22:08:00	to publish and that doing that with commercial players was simply rewarding the same entities
22:13:00	that were operating with a goal of profit maximization rather than moving forward and really working to support efforts that aim to return control of research communication back
22:24:00	to the communities who fund and produce it. Community over commercialization was the theme of
22:29:00	this year's Global Open Access week and I think that's no accident as you can see that theme I think has really continued to take root. We were also concerned at the outset with Plan S that
22:41:00	concerted pressure from funders on institutions , libraries and researchers to back an approach
22:47:00	that was too dependent on APCs, transformative agreements, commercial publisher involvement
22:54:00	would not only entrench dominant systems of research communications specifically elite
23:00:00	high impact commercially run journals in Europe and North America where they were already dominant but also we were very worried that it could act as an accelerant to the adoption of these
23:10:00	mechanisms in vulnerable regions where they were not yet the dominant model - in Africa and
23:16:00	that they had the potential to weaken support for really important community-based models that have
23:21:00	been thriving in regions like Latin America for decades. Over the past five years
23:28:00	years as we've heard and as I absolutely agree there is no doubt that Plan S has had significant
23:35:00	positive effects on the Open Access landscape. As Robert-Jan and Johan both said that as a result
23:41:00	of the cOAlition's advocacy we see a greater number of research articles that are now not
23:46:00	only freely available to all to read but also to fully reuse and the advocacy efforts of the
23:51:00	cOAlition S partners and supporters has absolutely critically raised public awareness of the benefits
23:58:00	of and the global imperative for the open sharing of scientific and scholarly research. But
24:05:00	it is also true that over the past five years we have in fact seen some of the deleterious effects

24:10:00	that we worried about come to pass. We're certainly spending more on commercially published research
24:16:00	not less and we've seen commercial entities just adapt their business models to really capitalize
24:22:00	on the upside of volume driven APC based market pressures and we have seen National
24:28:00	funders particularly in vulnerable regions who are so worried that they'll be left behind in
24:33:00	the terms of the global standing of their research enterprises if they don't follow the same course
24:39:00	as institutions in the global North. And I think most worryingly we've seen a really massive
24:44:00	effort by commercial players who've embraced this APC centric OA to use it as a calling card
24:51:00	to embed themselves ever more deeply into the core workflows of our academic institutions and
24:57:00	research funders. However over the past five years we've also really seen our colleagues at
25:03:00	cOAlition S demonstrate something very important and that's a willingness to assess the impact of
25:09:00	the advocacy and the policies that they're advocating for. And the beauty
25:14:00	of research is never more evident when someone tries an experiment, objectively assesses the data
25:19:00	and concludes that the results point to the need for further change. We've seen our colleagues
25:25:00	at cOAlition S make adjustments to work towards eliminating support for hybrids, supporting green
25:30:00	deposit mechanisms, pre-prints, promoting author rights retention strategies and most significantly
25:37:00	to really examine how they can support mechanisms that'll move beyond the APC Journal model. And the
25:43:00	proposal that will be examined in the second half of this webcast is a really welcome expression
25:49:00	of these adjustments. I do want to note though that it's important for us to go into this
25:54:00	next phase clear-eyed. It will be a significant challenge to course correct towards these more
26:00:00	equitable models and in particular it will need clear sustained communication particularly to
26:07:00	those governments, funders, institutions, libraries and researchers in places where adoption of Plan S's
26:14:00	original requirements have already been adopted. Changing recently adopted policies is a multi-year

26:19:00	effort as certainly is going to be unwinding the myriad three, four, five year long transformative
26:26:00	agreements that have been inked with commercial players so I think we need to be realistic about the effort that will be needed to continue to move forward. And the point I most want to make
26:36:00	is that shifting to these systems moving beyond journals and shifting to these systems of research sharing that truly reflect and support regional, national and disciplinary community preferences
26:49:00	of course requires shifting how we structure communication and reward systems
26:55:00	but more importantly it requires us to change how we actually approach designing, building
27:02:00	and advocating for these systems with our Global colleagues. It requires us to commit to
27:09:00	actively choosing to take the time to understand and support efforts that are truly emerging
27:14:00	from within communities and not to fall back on familiar patterns that while well-intended end
27:20:00	up reading his top-down edicts onto communities. In short we really need to make a commitment to lead
27:26:00	by following and by lifting community-driven efforts for this next phase. But after looking
27:32:00	back I can honestly say that I look forward to productive collaborations with my friends and colleagues at cOAlition S as we work to support global systems for producing sharing and
27:43:00	benefiting from scientific and scholarly knowledge that are both open by default and also equitable
27:49:00	intentionally by design together. Thank you so much. Thanks, Heather. We will do some questions now.

Discussion panel I

27:54:00	I see there are a few in the Q&A so keep them coming in. I'll just start off with one for myself and
28:01:00	then turn to your questions from the audience. Johan you mentioned the successes of Plan S. I was
28:09:00	just wondering if you could touch on whether it's achieved all of the aims that were set five years ago.
28:14:00	All of the aims certainly not. I mean, you know, all of the aims would be all of
28:23:00	the research would be accessible in Open Access. But one goal I think
28:30:00	we have achieved is that the participating funders have these aligned
28:35:00	policies in Open Access and really also monitoring this. So there is
28:42:00	this great movement towards open access for all the funders, so I think

28:48:00	that is a success. Where we may did not quite succeed, I think, is in convincing
28:55:00	the publishers that this is the way to go. I mean, like Marc already mentioned,
29:01:00	I think there's been a willingness of the publishers to take our money but
29:07:00	there's not been a willingness to eliminate the hybrid model, for instance, which is something that we really put very high on the agenda and that was very much opposed in the same
29:16:00	way as the rights retention strategy was very much opposed although we thought that we
29:21:00	offered a fair deal there: we will keep the AAM and you can have the VoR. But that was not viewed like
29:28:00	that by the publishers. So I think, yes, the Mandate itself was implemented
29:35:00	the publishers whom we explicitly addressed did not hold their end of the deal, I would say
29:44:00	maybe for some that would not be a surprise but for me at least it informs our actions going forward
29:54:00	in the sense that Heather just outlined. We'll turn to the first question from the audience. So for developing countries, Open Access effectively closes
30:07:00	access to the production of science by imposing a steep price on publication of knowledge produced in those
30:12:00	countries while sadly relegating those countries to their historic role of mere consumers. What is
30:18:00	the realistic solution proposed by Plan S to this very pressing problem. I'll start with Johan.
30:29:00	Well, I think this is something that we've realized much more now, right?
30:35:00	I think the original idea of Plan S was let's join as funders and let's pay our way
30:42:00	towards open access and see where that leads, which I think as funders was
30:48:00	a reasonable idea. I mean funders fund right? and they have funds. But what I think was a bit lost
30:54:00	indeed was the fact that this was not possible for certain number of countries where
31:04:00	the APC is really an unsurmountable hurdle. I think what we also underestimated
31:10:00	was the extent to which publishers would not be creative about this. I mean it it is
31:16:00	a bit strange that we had to come up with the idea that an APC need not be a
31:23:00	single price for all countries in the world but that it could be variable as a function
31:29:00	of purchasing power parity. I mean the fact that that was an idea that had to come
31:34:00	out of our head and not out of the head of the publishers is a bit odd. Of course Elsevier
31:39:00	has now adapted to that. You can still wonder to what extent that is fair but it is strange that
31:45:00	these things happen so slowly. I still, personally, remain convinced that the way forward

31:54:00	is community-driven initiatives where we, as researchers,
31:59:00	take back the initiative of publishing and go towards a model where - that is a diamond model -
32:05:00	where authors or readers do not pay and that we really have much more control
32:12:00	over the scholarly communication system than we had before with a new covenant, so to speak
32:19:00	or a new covenant between publishers and researchers where we have control
32:26:00	over the content and they have services that they can offer us and that are time limited and
32:32:00	that we can enter into with clear eyes. Yes, Heather.
32:39:00	I just I want to follow on with what you're saying Johan and say I think that I'm not a part of Plan S but if I were
32:45:00	giving advice to funders I would say, funders the question I think really brings to light that funders fund knowledge production and going as close to the source of funding that knowledge
32:54:00	production in the research communities embedded in the research institutions rather than paying
33:00:00	publishers, it's sort of flipping the point of payment from the fundamental standpoint
33:05:00	of supporting that knowledge production where it's resident in our communities and then
33:10:00	allowing researchers to choose what the outlets their community wants to drive forward
33:15:00	and I think that's very much in the vein. I think indeed that is the case I mean you know it's not just about keeping your rights it's over the research
33:25:00	it's really also about controlling the way in which research is assessed.
33:31:00	how reviews are done. We need to have a much bigger say over the way scholarly
33:38:00	communication ecosystem is being governed than we have now. We've come to a monopoly
33:45:00	of academic publishing by private entities that really should not be the case any longer I believe
33:55:00	Well, the question was about the developing countries and I think we have to start of course from the principle that open access is in the benefit of
34:03:00	the developing countries. They are not at all benefiting from subscription based model and if
34:10:00	you go to that first say conclusion that next how should you organize it and I mean APCs
34:17:00	were never pushed or part of Plan S, Plan S also gave room for diamond for platinum so from that
34:25:00	point and green so from that point of view for the developing countries a system without expensive
34:31:00	APCs is a very good one and I think the most important thing is focus on Open Access funding

34:38:00	agencies make sure that you make requirements that only scientific publications following
34:44:00	public grants can be published Open Access and that there are enough say outlets there which
34:49:00	are not that expensive as the ones which are asking for an APC so it's keep the focus on the
34:57:00	objective, and that is open access. Keep the focus. I think in that context, this new interest for diamond that we affirmed last week in Toluca, to organize this on an international
35:09:00	level via Federation of Diamond Open Access and via a number of regional Diamond hubs is really a welcome one
35:15:00	I think because that will really benefit all participants in the scholarly communication ecosystem.
35:23:00	I'll direct this next one to Robert-Jan first. When you talk about large publishers
35:29:00	does this encompass subscription based publishers exclusively or does it also encompass
35:35:00	publishers like Frontiers which operate entirely on an open access model?
35:40:00	For me it's this about the subscription based publishers that's the one I was aiming at and these are the ones with are
35:47:00	mostly part of. Of course the transformative agreements which have not delivered as I mentioned
35:53:00	68% of journals which are in the transformative journal program did not meet the
36:02:00	modest targets of growth towards Open Access of 5% so I am very much disappointed by that and
36:10:00	if I look at the new content which was published by the big five say subscription based publishers
36:17:00	I may call them like that. They are still all behind paywall. 80% of the content published in
36:25:00	2021 by Elsevier, behind paywall, and for T&F it was 77% and for Wiley it was 66%, so you know it's really a pity
36:36:00	that despite all the discussions which have been taking place with these last commercial publishers
36:41:00	with transformative agreements with dialogue with commitments from these partners we still don't
36:47:00	see that they walk the talk to the extent that we had hoped for and therefore I can imagine also
36:54:00	and I can understand that the Ministers of Science of Europe were so really upset when they saw what was going on and that's why there will be now radical measures proposed by cOAlition S
37:06:00	in order to really move forward and again as I said before the large commercial publishers only
37:12:00	can blame themselves for not walking the talk. I had hoped always for a partnership that was one

37:18:00	of the big Ideas when I started with Plan S really we make the big flip we go this journey
37:25:00	together in full partnership not excluding anyone keeping everyone on board but you
37:30:00	know unfortunately 5 years later I have to come to the conclusion that this has not proven to be possible.
37:37:00	I'm guessing Heather and Johan have similar answers to that one so I'll move on.
37:43:00	Yes, I had to go first, sorry. I often compare this to the smartphone.
37:50:00	Smartphone was invented in year 2007. Five years later we all had smartphones, right?
37:57:00	And this is the technology that is vastly more complicated than publishing, because, you know,
38:02:00	I am an editor, I don't think publishing is complicated, it's really not.
38:08:00	It involves relatively simple technology compared to the smartphone. So why the publishers
38:15:00	were not able to do this in that defined timeframe, can only have to do with one thing:
38:21:00	I mean the current model the current subscription model is just too lucrative. I mean that's why
38:26:00	they oppose this nail and tooth I believe. And so I think we've given them that chance, five years
38:34:00	is long enough, and I do believe that we now slowly have to move towards other solutions.
38:42:00	We've heard a lot about commercial publishers and the need to bring publishing activity back
38:49:00	under the aegis of researchers. Plan S over the last five years has driven many researcher-led society journals into commercial publisher partnerships. What safeguards are being put in place
39:01:00	to mitigate against an acceleration of this trend? I'll go to Heather with this first.
39:10:00	I can't really speak to what safeguards you know Plan S is thinking about
39:15:00	but I do think that the trend of not for-profit publishers moving to commercial players
39:29:00	for revenue guarantees, for production guarantees is something that's a trend that was underway before Open Access actually started
39:37:00	I think OA may have contributed to somewhat of an acceleration but I think what's actually
39:43:00	interesting is we're seeing that trend begin to reverse and that's something to pay attention to as we think about the future of the policies that we want to put into place and safeguards. Right now
39:54:00	the publishers that can make the kinds of profits on publishing that they've become

40:02:00	accustomed to in the commercial environment are those that have cascade models right where a manuscript can be submitted to a high impact journal and then if it's rejected from that
40:10:00	journal it flows down and there are many options under that. That publishing imprimatur to
40:16:00	handle those manuscripts it's a volume driven business is all you know is the bottom line. Not for-profit societies, smaller societies, societies that don't have that volume-driven
40:27:00	advantage are not likely to profit maximize under the OA models that are coming
40:36:00	to the table. What's interesting now is that even under APCs the level of profit that a typical
40:45:00	commercial publisher can make through even that cascade model is really difficult, right? So the
40:51:00	scholarly societies that were traditionally really attractive targets to put into a commercial
40:56:00	publishers portfolio are increasingly being viewed as liabilities on their books rather than
41:02:00	as assets. That is causing - we're seeing at SPARC - a whole influx of scholarly societies whose contracts
41:08:00	are up with commercial publishers to say what are our alternatives, what other models can we
41:14:00	put into place, what are our options, how can we work with the library community, with funders
41:19:00	on alternatives to APC-based models that will allow us to remain independent and move forward.
41:25:00	So it's kind of a long roundabout way to say I actually think seeing that trend reverse
41:31:00	gives us an opportunity to renew a partnership with not for-profit entities who traditionally publish
41:37:00	for the pure motive of research communication rather than for profit maximization rather than the opposite trend continuing.
41:46:00	Johan would you like to add anything? Yes, I am not sure about the premise of the question
41:52:00	which is that cOAlition S would have driven these society publishers into the arms of commercial entities
41:59:00	I don't see the evidence for that, and I don't see the evidence for that because also there are alternatives
42:04:00	that have been exploited by a number of societies. I'm thinking of the Microbiology Society, for instance
42:10:00	who has gone to Subscribe to Open, which really is a quite equitable model
42:19:00	I always say it's the next best thing to Diamond, and a number of publishers have adopted this. I think of, for instance, Muton De Gruyter who have now adopted this for their journals.

42:28:00	There's I think a lot of potential there in subscribe to open
42:33:00	that allows these societies to retain their income levels to publish their journals while at the same time having open access for all, for both the readers and the authors.
42:49:00	So I do believe there is an alternative out there that does not require maximizing profits.
42:56:00	Can I just say very quickly on Subscribe to Open as it's a model that Raym Crow from SPARC developed
43:04:00	It's very much a transitional model, it is not designed to be a permanent Open Access model and I think
43:10:00	so when we're looking at Diamond which is, you know, active and thriving over the long term in Latin America, I just don't want to leave folks with the notion that it is supposed to be-all and end-all.
43:20:00	It's a risk mitigation transition strategy for not for profit publishers. Completely agree but in the meantime, you know, it can certainly serve that role for society publishers, I believe.
43:32:00	One thing which struck me when I met with these society publishers and remember meeting in London
43:40:00	how many there are and how small they are. Many of them didn't have scale and scope and therefore
43:47:00	were having a lot of difficulties financially with their business model. I told them, you know, join forces
43:52:00	and see what you can do together instead of each going on your own, you know, unite
44:00:00	and that was something which I also did not see happening that much but that would be I think a very very interesting model for them to join forces to build up scale and scope.
44:09:00	Robert-Jan if you had the power to create a funder open access policy now what components would it have?
44:18:00	That's a hard one. Well, I published an open piece on the Plan S,
44:23:00	what has been achieved and what should be the future although I understand very much the new policy of cOAlition S now supported
44:30:00	I still had always hoped for an all inclusive approach also still with, of course, the large commercial publishers.
44:39:00	One thing I would like to perhaps on the line is let's be extremely careful that we not go back
44:46:00	to an old system because I heard a lot of it should be again the author putting at the core at researcher should be again in the lead we had that situation before Plan S came
44:55:00	and nothing happened with regard to the transition to open access. So I think, of course, the researcher and the author should be at the core

45:03:00	but let's make extremely clear that the funders, they are the ones who call the shots in order to move now to the next phase and to also get the 60% into Open Access.
45:14:00	So my advice would be very very much, you know, make sure as funders
45:20:00	as cOAlition S, as OSTP, as AmeliCA, join together more than before to really complete the journey
45:30:00	together, because the funders, they call the shots, they have the money. Putting again everything back with the researches will only lead to an enormous dispersion
45:38:00	and scattering of all kinds of notable activities but not really finish the journey.
45:44:00	I've got a question for Johan. Will cOAlition S funders stand firm when it comes to no longer accepting transformative agreements?
45:54:00	Well, we had statements saying that we would no longer support these models
46:02:00	but of course individual funders may differ on this point.
46:07:00	I think transformative agreements are probably still necessary going forward.
46:21:00	What we have said is that we will leave transformative agreements to the libraries and you also see the library consortia are slowly moving away from this.
46:27:00	The clearest example is in Sweden who have clearly indicated that they want to move away from transformative agreements.
46:36:00	The issue is of course, as Heather indicated, a matter of transition, right in order to move away from transformative agreements you have to have alternatives ready
46:45:00	and we don't have those alternatives yet in the sense that we have them in certain parts of the world
46:51:00	like in Latin America, where we do have a very strong Diamond open access framework ready
46:57:00	we need to develop these same frameworks in North America, in Europe, in Asia, and only then
47:04:00	we'll be able to phase out these transformative agreements and the APCs. We need alternatives.
47:10:00	But Johan, I think we have to go for realistic alternatives. Diamond is entirely realistic.
47:18:00	No, I think Diamond is a fantastic, of course, route but let's look at the figures.
47:24:00	There are 29,000 Diamond journals worldwide, only 11,000 of those are registered in DOAJ
47:31:00	and 86% of these journals publish fewer than 50 articles per year.
47:37:00	Of course diamond is a fantastic route but are these the game changers for the future?
47:43:00	I'm only concerned to one thing: is to finish the journey to its full and immediate Open Access
47:49:00	but make sure that when you are looking now for other, say venues, outlets, like diamonds,

47:55:00	that these are, say, the outlets which can deliver and really, you know, complete the journey
48:01:00	and that's why I mentioned this figure with regard to Diamond because everyone talks now about diamond, and I love diamonds but you know the facts show that these are not going to be the game changers.
48:10:00	I would disagree there but, Heather, you can make that point better than me.
48:17:00	Yes, I would say, Robert-Jan, that the percentage of the market that Diamond journals make up is, you know,
48:26:00	it's an indicator, but what's transformative about the diamond model and, I know we'll hear more
48:32:00	from Ariana in the second half of the session, is actually the way that it embeds the research production
48:39:00	and communication process into the fabric of Higher Education and research institution
48:46:00	and offers the opportunity for there to be true partnerships with research funders, private and public at the source of knowledge production and to have that self-determination of what those research channels look like.
48:57:00	I think it also is actually an advantage that there are not a million Open Access Diamond journals and a million Open Access articles because I don't think that those are the measures of currency
49:06:00	that we want to be encouraging going forward. The other I think advantage and really exciting thing
49:12:00	about moving in a transition away from subscription access journals and into modes that are more commensurate with the diamond models is that that partnership
49:22:00	that embedding of the partnership with academic institutions also couples more tightly the partnership
49:32:00	that's possible to determine research assessment. If the institutions are responsible for producing funding
49:39:00	you know, supporting the research communication on a more molecular level the task of aligning research assessment metrics and rewards and incentives
49:50:00	becomes much closer to home, right? It's not outside people telling university administrators what to do
49:56:00	it becomes more organically coupled. So I know there were questions in the chat about an S2O as a transition model to what?
50:05:00	You can use S2O for as long as you want it's not going to expire, it's not going to go bad on you But it is an attempt to build a bridge to being able to make this more wholesale shift away
50:15:00	from things like the dominance of journals and journals as the primary indicator and currency of the realm.
50:22:00	I think we agree there. I think of course the diamond route is an interesting one and in certain continents it is very well established and it works fantastically, like other of course outlets.

50:33:00	The only thing I'm saying, make sure that by going for, say, these type of alternatives,
50:40:00	we are able to have enough power to complete the journey, that's the only thing.
50:46:00	Absolutely, but that needs coordination, right? I mean one of the conclusions of the study you site Robert-Jan
50:53:00	is indeed that these initiatives need much more coordination. I mean when I speak to Diamond Open Access journals and organizations that support them,
51:02:00	and as you know I'm the editor of a Diamond Open Access Journal, they all say we just don't have enough capacity,
51:07:00	we don't have enough money to accommodate all the journals that want to become Diamond Open Access
51:13:00	because they think it's the right thing to do. This is where we can make change, right?
51:19:00	I mean we can provide a system that is scholar-owned but that is as good as any commercial publisher
51:26:00	and that shouldn't be hard. If you see for instance the way MDPI has grown in the last few years
51:32:00	We could do exactly the same but within the scholarly societies and the scholarly institutions
51:39:00	We just need to organize it better. Again, I mean publishing, it's not hard, it's just a matter of organization
51:48:00	and providing the right incentives and providing the right structures to do so.
51:53:00	Johan, off the back of what you've just said, I was wondering if you could answer this question. There has been a lot of comments about Diamond Open Access as the preferred model but I haven't heard
52:03:00	any explanations about who is supposed to pay for Diamond Open Access publications? How can Diamond Open Access be a realistic alternative for established nonprofit publishers?
52:14:00	Well, I mean we definitely need more money. But if you just look at the money that is being spent
52:21:00	I think Chris Banks had this figure in the chat, 250 million in the UK,
52:30:00	you know, the things you could do with 250 million to build a diamond model I mean, you know
52:39:00	I mean, give me 250 million and I'll build you a diamond Open Access publishing system.
52:46:00	And I think Heather will agree with me. Of course it needs money and of course we need a transition. This is something that Robert Kiley often says.
52:56:00	We need to redirect the funds that we now direct towards transformative agreements and to APC
53:01:00	We need to redirect those funds to Diamond Open Access in the long run.
53:06:00	That is going to take time but that is really where we want, where we have to go I believe in order to make it work.
53:13:00	Let's not forget there's always someone who has to pick up the bill

53:20:00	Diamond is not cheap because even if the researcher him or herself is involved it's his salary which is being paid by the taxpayer so there's always a bill to be paid.
53:30:00	Absolutely, and now the bill for the commercial publishers is also being paid by the taxpayer
53:38:00	and I do believe that the taxpayer would be better served by a diamond open access system that is led and owned by the scholars themselves.
53:48:00	We agree 100%, Johan. It is also important to recognize the bills padded at this point with margins of up to, you know, 30-40%.
53:56:00	Redirects are very attractive to think about the money that's in the system
54:04:00	but I would subtract off the top profit maximization tips that we're currently paying
54:10:00	for commercial entities as one way to go. When I talk to funders lately this is one of the things that they also say
54:19:00	They make projections over 10 years and what they say is if we continue to pay these APCs and these transformative agreements going forward
54:26:00	the bill 10 years from now is going to be three times higher than it is now and that for them is increasingly becoming an incentive to invest in diamond.
54:35:00	And I do think that's where you also have other models becoming attractive
54:40:00	and, Johan, one of the things I didn't mention in my comments and I'm sort of kicking myself, is
54:46:00	one of the things I think that Plan S, that the cOAlition S, has done that's been very important is this real emphasis on asking for transparency in terms of real cost in the system.
54:55:00	We've been a victim of bundles in this scholarly communications landscape, of all kinds of different kinds
55:03:00	but bundles of costs that are opaque have been really really problematic in order to support a new model, really understanding and being able to look at what the actual costs are
55:15:00	so that for those portions of the communication process the preservation process where the payments are really required
55:24:00	we are looking at fee for service models where we know what we're paying for I do think that knowledge production is the responsibility of the funders
55:33:00	If you, as a research funder, you fund someone and they can't, don't or won't communicate what they found out,
55:39:00	the value of your investment as a funder is zero. So, the communication portion is I think
55:46:00	incumbent upon funders to support but the overarching services whatever they may be
55:52:00	from validation to registration to prioritization whatever buckets of services we choose as a community to want to support, it should be a service model with transparency for costs

56:04:00	that is competitive and not monopolistic as, Johan, I think you mentioned before. Yes, and glad you brought the issue of transparency up because we have the Journal Comparison Service
56:15:00	which aims at providing transparency for prices and in Open Access and this has been reluctantly taken up by the publishers.
56:27:00	Of the big five publishers only one, Wiley, has accepted to do that. We can't say that this call for transparency has been enthusiastically taken up by the commercial publishers.
56:39:00	Again, a reason I believe to move away from those models. We have just one minute left. So I'm just gonna ask one last question and if you can all be brief
56:50:00	How worried are you all about fake science and what do you think is needed within an open research system to fight it?
56:58:00	Could an unintended consequence of smashing the current system be a weakening of the focus of maintaining trust in science?
57:05:00	I'll go to Robert-Jan first. You want than in one minute?
57:13:00	Well, it's all about quality. It's all about quality and that is something which has to be guaranteed
57:19:00	by whatever outlet we work with, what other system we move forward towards what other community we want to put trust in. It's all about quality and insurance of quality.
57:29:00	And that's why, again, I'm disappointed by these large subscription-based publishers, because they offer quality
57:37:00	and it's a pity that they do not want to be part apparently of the system of the future.
57:43:00	So that would be my answer, quality that should be at the core. Thanks, Robert-Jan. Johan?
57:50:00	That issue will be addressed I believe by Bodo in the next section.
57:58:00	I believe that the system that is more open, in the sense that also reviews are open,
58:05:00	is actually very beneficial for exposing fake science because as a reviewer, if you see the reviews,
58:13:00	if you see the quality of the reviews, you know there's a difference between a five line review and a five page review.
58:19:00	I think we can all agree on that. Right now we don't have access to that. If you have access to that, you know where the quality is and you can expose fake science much more easily
58:29:00	but I will let Bodo come in on that. And, very quickly, Heather.
58:34:00	I would just say the openness can lead to increased ability to verify, so trust
58:40:00	but verify is always the watch word and I think openness gives us the opportunity to do that Cool, thank you. So we're out of time for this session and we'll now move on to the next one.
58:50:00	It's been great to hear the comments from Robert-Jan, Johan and Heather and the following lively discussion as well.

58:57:00	So thank you to all our panelists and thank you to the audience for the fantastic questions.
59:03:00	I will now hand over to Jessica who will be moderating the next session. Thank you.

Panel II

59:10:00	Thank you Rachel. It's been really interesting to reflect on the success of Plan S
59:16:00	in producing what I think is really powerful, collective action, as well as the challenges that have arisen with transformative agreements and the persistence of the inequitable APC model
59:26:00	but we also heard in the first panel about the cOAlition S flexibility in adopting its strategy
59:32:00	to deemphasizing profit maximizing business models and towards centering transparent dissemination of research and peer review.
59:40:00	So that's why I'm so delighted to moderate a continuation of that conversation about the future of Plan S
59:48:00	with the second panel. And before I introduce our speakers just a reminder to continue to use the Q&A feature to pose questions
59:55:00	and also to use the thumbs up button to upvote the ones that you find really interesting. All right, so it's my pleasure to introduce Bodo Stern who is chief of strategic initiatives at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.
1:00:08	Following his remarks we're going to hear from Arianna Becerril García, who is the founder and president of AmeliCA
1:00:16	which is a communication infrastructure for scholarly publishing and open science
1:00:22	and finally we're going to turn to Gemma Modinos who is a reader of Neuroscience and Mental Health at Kings College London and also the outgoing chair of the young Academy in Europe.
1:00:31	With that I'll hand it over to Bodo.

Bodo Stern

1:00:37	Thank you, I'm actually the only one who has some slides I don't know, should I share my screen or?
1:00:48	I think that would be great
1:01:06	Can you see that? okay, perfect.
1:01:12	Thank you. I'm excited to be on this panel as the cOAlition S representative that will give you an overview of the proposal Towards Responsible Publishing
1:01:22	and to start I would like to thank the cOAlition S team members who are listed on this slide.
1:01:29	We've spent many months on what I would consider a very fruitful collaborative effort to put together this proposal

1:01:36	and we are all very thrilled that this is now finally in the public domain. In a nutshell this proposal rests on two key concepts:
1:01:46	researchers decide when and what to publish and the scholarly record includes the full range of research products, not just the version of record.
1:01:57	And I I'd like to start with that second concept. We believe that open science can only be successful
1:02:07	and open access can only be successful if it needs more than just an open version of record
1:02:15	and we've already talked about some issues that arise from just focusing on the version of record
1:02:23	that monetizing the version of record leads to inequitable business models but I want to list a few other issues that arise from this singular focus on the version of record.
1:02:36	It does lead to a delay, a needless delay in dissemination. There are journals today where it takes longer
1:02:44	from submission to publication than 40 years ago, when the research article and the peer review reports
1:02:49	had to be shipped back and forth with the Postal Service. That's a problem.
1:02:57	The current system relies on a peer review process that can be opaque and
1:03:04	also is often repetitive and that is arguably both wasteful and it can also undermine quality control
1:03:13	as we discussed in the previous section about trust and fake science.
1:03:18	Finally I think, an important point here is that this focus on the version of record can lead to misaligned
1:03:25	incentives and I just want to call out that we are risking particularly the well-being of the
1:03:31	next generation of scientists if they feel like they need to get their research into the right
1:03:38	journal for their career advancement. So we think it's important to address these problems
1:03:45	to open up the scholarly record and to shine light on research and dissemination in real time and
1:03:51	that means that we shouldn't just share the version of record but we should share earlier
1:03:57	versions including the pre-print and the reviewed preprints and the peer review reports.
1:04:04	And only when that happens can anybody follow and validate how research progresses towards increasingly
1:04:13	trustworthy knowledge and in this process when we are open about it we can also generate trust signals that can then be used in curation of the literature and in research assessment.
1:04:26	So where are we today? Some research already share preprints but most of the time the peer-reviewed

1:04:34	content is still controlled by third parties. And while sharing preprints addresses to some
1:04:41	extent the problem that I outlined about delayed dissemination because preprints of course shares science earlier the other problems that I mentioned are not addressed in this current situation that
1:04:52	is on this slide depicted on this slide and this is exactly where the proposal is taking the status
1:04:58	quo to the next level. And this is where the key concept, the second key concept, comes into play.
1:05:04	That authors decide when and what to publish, authors shouldn't just be
1:05:12	able to share preprints freely they should be allowed to share their research outputs at
1:05:18	any point during the dissemination process. That still leaves a very important role for service
1:05:25	providers. They can still provide services and monetize those services but they would no longer
1:05:33	block researchers from sharing their science independently. Now, with this division of labor,
1:05:41	researchers control the content, service providers offer services, we believe we set the foundation
1:05:49	for what we call a scholar-led publishing system that can address those problems that I outlined earlier on.
1:05:56	And so, the proposal lays out five principles that underpin such a scholar-led publishing system
1:06:11	First, authors should decide when and what to publish and when they decide to publish the research outputs are shared openly with the CC BY license and
1:06:21	as Robert-Jan mentioned this is a good point where the funders can come in with their policies,
1:06:27	quality control mechanisms are community-based and open and that includes peer review,
1:06:33	all scholarly outputs including the peer review reports are considered in research assessment and finally
1:06:39	all stakeholders have a way to support a scholar communication system - and the proposal
1:06:45	gives a few examples in the form of a menu what steps stakeholders can take
1:06:52	to support a scholar-led, this type of scholar-led communication system.
1:06:58	Publication of this proposal is just the first step. The next step is a multi-stage consultation process
1:07:07	that is led by Research Consulting and the Center for Science and Technology Studies at Leiden University.
1:07:12	It starts right now in November with an online feedback survey and I encourage everybody

1:07:19	who has a view on this proposal to share their view because the outcomes of this survey
1:07:25	will then inform later stages of the consultation which include
1:07:31	several stakeholder focus groups in December and an online survey of researchers in March .
1:07:37	And if you want any further information about either the proposal or the consultation process
1:07:43	I direct you to this website of cOAlition S where you can have more information. Thank you very much and now I'll stop sharing.
1:07:52	Thank you so much, Bodo. Next, we'll hand over to Arianna for her remarks.

Arianna Becerril-Garcia

1:08:00	Thank you very much, and thank you for this invitation to participate in the webinar.
1:08:06	I feel very honored to have the opportunity to share our perspective on the future of scholarly communication.
1:08:13	I still believe that open access is a unique opportunity to achieve science as a global public good for the benefit of all
1:08:20	so we should reflect on what it means and how we can advance in this direction.
1:08:26	In that sense it is important that each route, plan be assessed in terms of something beyond open to read.
1:08:34	I mean every strategy should respond to the capacity to be inclusive to enable an active and equitable participation in science
1:08:44	that must be seen as a global conversation where the interaction and collaboration are maximized
1:08:49	and the use, applicability and social relevance include peers and the society in general within
1:08:55	a framework of universal benefits should be achieved. I'm glad that there's a common understanding that
1:09:02	we need to move away from APCs and transformative agreements addressing Open Access as an end
1:09:08	with no principles involved forms a breeding ground for solutions in which exclusion is intrinsic.
1:09:17	But how can exclusion be measured? How is epistemic justice assessed? In the Latin American region
1:09:24	scholarly communications are embodied in the research and educational institutions and thanks
1:09:29	to Heather Joseph that helped me to find a perfect adjective to describe the relation between the academic sector and publishing. Embodied is just the perfect term to depict it.

1:09:39	Lessons learned from such an ecosystem and key pieces in its success to have an equitable
1:09:46	and participatory knowledge circulation should be taken into account. In that sense taking openness as
1:09:54	a construct from the recommendations on open science from UNESCO and as a means to an end
1:09:59	from the recommendations on the 20 years of the Budapest Open Access initiative we need to raise
1:10:05	the bar. At this stage of maturity and global acceptance of Open Access resulting from worldwide
1:10:13	efforts including Plan S, I would like to underline five key points that from a systemic perspective
1:10:23	should be considered in order to move forward. Point one, your education organizations in the diversification of
1:10:34	publishers entities, research and higher education organizations should not only be consumers but
1:10:41	providers in terms of publishing the same way research is sustained and generated within these
1:10:48	institutions they should have or they should be responsible for disseminating its results. Funders
1:10:56	and governments should encourage and support research and higher education organizations to
1:11:01	play a role as publisher entities. This will result in a stronger market force that brings
1:11:09	independence and room for maneuver to funders and clear air to the system to be healthier.
1:11:17	Diamond is not “realistic”. Diamond is a reality. And Diamond cannot be assessed only by looking at DOAJ
1:11:25	unfortunately. 90% of the knowledge circulation for many of the Social Sciences and Humanities for example
1:11:32	is being circulated in the diamond sector. In the Latin American region, for example, it is the
1:11:38	mainstream actually. The contribution of Diamond should be assessed also from the channels where
1:11:44	it circulates. The point two: the journal critical mass. Well in nuclear engineering a critical mass
1:11:52	is the smallest amount of material needed for a sustained nuclear chain reaction. Well, the strength
1:11:59	of the Latin American ecosystem is the journal critical mass available more than 10,000 journals
1:12:05	compose that mass. Research and higher education organizations must be urged to contribute to this

1:12:12	journal critical mass. Diamond Open Access has reached a critical mass in some regions and in
1:12:18	some fields but we need more fields and more regions to have this critical mass.
1:12:27	Number three: the preservation of what is working well. Our records show that each week we lose one nonprofit
1:12:36	Open Access Journal due to a ravenous action of journals buy and sell Market. \$3,000 actually
1:12:43	are offered to journal editors to sell their journals and some others die because the lack
1:12:51	of resources, so we need to preserve what is working well. Point four: we need to think on
1:12:59	sustainability which is structural. Some other models namely diamond and green Open Access have
1:13:07	shown much more efficiency and they have proven to run more sustainable business models than the ones
1:13:13	coming from the commercial sector. And point five: economies of scale. We should think this equation
1:13:22	of academic publishers plus infrastructures to produce economies of a scale that can be more
1:13:29	competitive only by having competitive models just such as the ones that are being run in the
1:13:34	non-commercial sector the power and control of publishers on the current status
1:13:39	of the system in various fields and regions could be reduced and even better conditions for
1:13:45	negotiations can be achieved. So let's think about that and let's work for a future where science is
1:13:51	seen as a global conversation. Thank you very much.
1:13:57	Fantastic, thank you, so much Arianna. And finally, over to you Gemma.

Gemma Modinos

1:14:03	Hi, good afternoon, everyone. Thank you, Jessica. And of course, huge thanks to cOAlition S colleagues for inviting me to speak in this meeting, I'm delighted.
1:14:12	In my role as the former Chair of the Young Academy of Europe I was invited to speak a bit about
1:14:18	how early career researchers have seen Plan S and to talk about the opportunities but also the challenges.
1:14:26	So, in our perspective Plan S has been quite revolutionary, it has already been mentioned as well.
1:14:33	It was at the center of a movement that questioned the status quo of academic publishing

1:14:39	and really made unavoidable the conversation on Open Access and open science. You know, if you ask any scientist or scholar whether they would like their publications to be made
1:14:50	immediately Open Access, I don't know anybody who would say no. One of the best things about Plan S
1:14:56	that's also been mentioned in this regard and cOAlition S is that while at the beginning it was
1:15:03	perceived a bit of this is how things will be from now on which was probably necessary to really get
1:15:08	things into action, the people in charge have been very open to input from the research community and
1:15:15	Plan S has continued to evolve. Based on this input has identified unintended consequences
1:15:21	some of them have been mentioned and has adapted itself and we in the Young Academy but also with
1:15:27	our other colleague organizations of early career researchers in Europe such as Eurodoc and MCAA
1:15:33	we particularly appreciated that the views of early career researcher associations were invited and
1:15:39	were taken into consideration, for example to establish a monitoring framework which was
1:15:44	released in 2020. The main issues for early career researchers were the fears
1:15:52	that Plan S would actually exacerbate inequalities and this has also come up today in the meeting. So what if you or your PI or your institution does not have the funds to afford the fees?
1:16:02	and this is tightly linked to the way that researchers and research is assessed and we know
1:16:08	that this is particularly important for people who are early career researchers or people on a tenure track.
1:16:14	So what we've seen in recent years is that the research assessment reform has taken you know
1:16:19	stronger shape and the European commission also pushed the research assessment reform and now we have CoARA and so the two conversations are running in parallel because they are inevitably linked, and
1:16:30	yes the research assessment reform could be happening faster but it is a transformation
1:16:36	that it's difficult to coordinate and implement. For example, if now publishing Open Access
1:16:43	is part of how people's careers progression is assessed then what happens to non-cOAlition S-funded
1:16:49	early career researchers, right? So, when the Rights Retention Strategy came out and

1:16:55	I was Chair of the Young Academy at the time, cOAlition S has got in touch with us in case we wanted to do a webinar, to discuss and provide information and so, we saw that as an opportunity to dedicate
1:17:04	the session to researchers in early in EU13 countries and what this meant to them because based on our
1:17:11	membership views from some of our members located in EU13 countries the views were
1:17:17	that cOAlition S is for the rich countries, is for the privileged, that it didn't apply to them.
1:17:23	So we gathered anonymous questions before the event and Johan and his colleague were able to answer them directly and that had really good feedback. So for the future I think
1:17:34	the synergies between how Plan S advances and changes and how the research assessment reform is being implemented of course need to be closely tied this is a conversation that needs to happen
1:17:45	together. It will be paramount to make sure the people sitting in decision-making roles are not
1:17:51	just from funding bodies or institutions in Western Europe and that governmental mandates on
1:17:56	institutions and its researchers are also on board so I appreciate that Arianna brought up governments as well, that our colleagues in the humanities are heard as well and that particular
1:18:06	attention is paid to how any development may affect the career prospects of early career researchers.
1:18:11	Thank you. Thank you so much, Gemma. And I think your remarks really addressed one of the interesting questions
1:18:19	that we didn't have time to address in the last panel about how researchers can interact in a system
1:18:26	that's driving them towards publishing in these dominant journals. So moving towards the questions now

Discussion panel II

1:18:33	Question number one: what is the relationship between this new proposal, Bodo, and Plan S? How does it help achieve 100% Open Access?
1:18:46	How does this impact the goals of the first phase of cOAlition S to drive and force Open Access?
1:18:57	Thank you, for that question. Heather mentioned in the first session how Plan S has evolved
1:19:05	and I do think this proposal is also building on the original Plan S.
1:19:10	The goal of 100% Open Access is still the goal It's just that we are pushing in a slightly different direction

1:19:21	and an example of how this proposal can achieve 100% Open Access is look at the first principle:
1:19:27	authors decide when and what to publish. If authors have the right to share their work at any point
1:19:37	that is building up on what cOAlition S has called Rights Retention Strategy before.
1:19:45	That allows very quickly 100% Open Access. If scientists can share Open Access and they share it with a CC BY license
1:19:52	and publishers are not stopping them because they are shifting in the direction of this proposal
1:19:59	then we get Open Access very quickly and not with these high costs for the version of record.
1:20:13	I mean, we talked about this in the first part as well, there are of course costs but I think if we move away from
1:20:20	a business model that charges not just for the service but also for the content, and that is what publishers do today,
1:20:28	the profit margins are there because they can charge for the content but if they really charge for the services I think we have a much more equitable situation.
1:20:40	And then we still have to figure out how to pay for those without burdening authors, but I think it creates a much more equitable situation if we do separate content that is controlled by scientists
1:20:54	and services that are controlled and monetized by service providers. I hope that addresses it a little bit.
1:21:02	Yes, thank you Bodo. Just to check whether Gemma and Arianna would like to add anything into your perspective on this new direction for Plan S.
1:21:20	Just with regard to the new proposal, so far I've only been able to discuss it within my research group
1:21:26	but I feel that making the process transparent throughout is only going
1:21:33	to be an advantage not just for time consuming but actually making the process of publishing
1:21:39	and how research is assessed more transparent and PhD students, everyone I've talked to in the last
1:21:47	couple days about it, everyone is very much in favor of actually this not being
1:21:53	closed doors and being made public, for sure.
1:21:58	Thank you, Gemma. Alright, a further question about the proposed responsible publishing framework and Diamond OA initiatives.
1:22:10	There is a comment in the Q&A about how transformative agreements have enabled a large proportion of research
1:22:21	to be published Open Access and save the research community money and I guess the
1:22:28	the question here is how quickly do you think that this responsible publishing framework and

1:22:33	Diamond OA initiatives can supplant subscription based publishing or maybe another way to phrase
1:22:39	this is what is sort of the time horizon for this shift to a new business model. And I guess that
1:22:46	would naturally go first to Bodo but I would also love to - and I think Arianna might say it's already here - but I'd love to hear the other panelists as well.
1:22:55	I think the first to say is for sure that all the elements in this proposal are already in existence somewhere
1:23:06	and so they are working to some extent. I would hate to put a number of years out there
1:23:12	because five years ago maybe we would have said we would have a lot more Open Access content
1:23:17	I don't know so it's hard to really predict because it's such a complex system
1:23:23	it can only progress through evolution and we don't quite know. We know that we need more experimentation
1:23:31	but exactly how that evolution will play out is hard to tell except to say that I'm very optimistic that we will move in the right direction because we are
1:23:41	already moving. The direction is already there and we can see how the initial providers and
1:23:49	infrastructures that are built to support this system are already gaining traction and support.
1:23:58	I will say this proposal isn't really about business models. It's really more about how the process should work
1:24:08	and so in that sense it's a little bit orthogonal to what, I think Colleen, is asking about transformative agreements.
1:24:15	The service providers in general have to change how they approach their process.
1:24:23	They have to think about , you know, if we are providing a service, how can we make sure that that service is an output
1:24:32	that is openly available, that benefits everybody in a manner that then makes it also possible to be charging for that service
1:24:39	rather than for the actual content which is not the part that should be charged for
1:24:45	because that is something that the researcher can share freely.
1:24:52	Thank you, Bodo. And of course Arianna. Yes, Jessica, I agree and also I would say that the success depends on the success of the members of Plan S
1:25:04	to have this combination of these two important things: one, is okay we need sustainability, the system needs to be funded
1:25:15	and what is called alternative models should be supported as well, but also they need recognition.
1:25:21	So if funders succeed in having these alternative models, I don't like very much that term but because it is
1:25:30	not alternative in some regions, but alternative models to be a part of the research assessment systems
1:25:36	and the incentive systems and they are part of the policies and mandates

1:25:42	and if the contribution is really recognized, then I think it has a lot of potential to be successful.
1:25:51	Thank you. All right, next question. Very excited to touch on this topic, the barrier to change
1:26:01	is in a sense research assessment, that the priorities and incentives driving researchers
1:26:07	are perhaps part of the reason why we have had such adherence to basically hierarchies
1:26:14	of journals. So what can Plan S do beyond referencing DORA to change things and to
1:26:24	wean researchers off this toxic measure of impact. I would love to ask Gemma but
1:26:32	I'm sure that all of the panelists will also have interesting things to say about this. Maybe because the question is what can cOAlition S do maybe I would let Bodo go first and then I take it from there.
1:26:48	I think this is a question that we need to ask all of us, funders and institutions, how can we
1:26:54	improve research assessment, this is certainly something that we take very seriously.
1:27:01	I can speak for what we are doing at HHMI already. We have started to remove Journal names from all
1:27:08	our application materials. Journal names do no longer feature, that is a radical step
1:27:14	maybe I mean, but that is really in the spirit of DORA, that the publication venue should not matter.
1:27:20	Of course what would be nice in the future is if we succeed with this proposal,
1:27:30	then we wouldn't have to reinsert the journal name, the journal name would be gone but the peer review comments could then factor into decisions
1:27:40	the scientific scholarly discourse surrounding findings can be used in research assessment
1:27:46	because that's part of science. A journal decision is based on science on the peer reviews
1:27:53	but the decision itself isn't necessarily the science that we want. We want to consider
1:27:59	scholarship in research assessment and that includes the articles, the peer review reports and so
1:28:06	yes, we need to move towards that and I think there are efforts with CoARA and at
1:28:12	cOAlition S and I do really agree with the sentiment that this needs to happen in parallel
1:28:18	to changing the publishing system both of these tracks need to change simultaneously so that we
1:28:24	get the record out there in the open so that it can be used in assessment but assessment also

1:28:30	needs to change at the same time. Yes, absolutely, if I may add to that. You know, it is happening, the CoARA is having working groups
1:28:40	and it's all about how this can be implemented I know that even overseas people are also trying
1:28:47	to get on board and think about the research assessment reform because there is this toxic measures
1:28:55	as is here in the question by Robert but we are the ones assessing research
1:29:00	so we are the researchers but we are reviewing papers, we are reviewing grants, we sit in Grant panels,
1:29:09	we are Deans, we are Rectors, it is really up to us to make this change happen
1:29:14	and it's difficult because of course there are concerns that it might dilute scientific excellence
1:29:20	and that you know there was this prestige in publishing in certain places but that's not what the research assessment reform is saying. The research assessment reform is saying
1:29:29	let's take into account other contributions and then to look at the quality. We don't have to ditch altogether certain quantitative metrics but these are metrics that are not to evaluate the quality of a researcher
1:29:43	they are to evaluate a journal performance and so this needs to happen together
1:29:49	for the Open Access world to be really taking off at the same time.
1:29:57	All right, thank you so much, very interesting points and glad to hear that this work is underway.
1:30:03	The next question I think is a really interesting one from Matilda. While researchers mostly agree on the benefits of publishing open
1:30:14	there's more disagreement on pre-prints and open peer review and this definitely varies by discipline.
1:30:21	So how wise is it perhaps to center these measures in Plan S's strategy, linking the openness campaign
1:30:34	so tightly to open peer review, for example? I'd like to throw that open and hear responses from anyone
1:30:41	Perhaps Bodo, might be interesting to speak to it first. I do want to acknowledge that there is still some controversy around open peer review there. I think there are
1:30:52	two controversies. One is should the peer review be attributed to the peer reviewer
1:31:00	and I perfectly understand why this may under certain conditions not be easy
1:31:07	especially, for example, given the hierarchy that already exists in the community
1:31:13	when an early career scientist criticizes the work of a senior scientist, I mean it may be hard to put
1:31:18	the name underneath. But the peer-review report can still have a beneficial effect if it is published.
1:31:25	I mean that the science in the peer review can still speak without being attributed.

1:31:30	I think that is the argument that I would make knowing full well that
1:31:36	this will take time to really be widely, maybe more widely, acceptable. But the argument
1:31:43	that I would make is peer review is done by experts and the reason for it is we need the experts,
1:31:50	it's science, peer review is science, and in order to benefit the scientific progress
1:31:59	I think we should lay out the evidence. It's like data. We share the data because in order to build on science we need the data.
1:32:10	And I think the peer reviews are similarly important as scientific evidence that others can build upon.
1:32:18	Now of course, sometimes the peer reviewers get it wrong. Sometimes the authors get it wrong sometimes the data are wrong.
1:32:24	That's the error prone nature of science. But we can only move forward if we have the evidence out there and can build on it and can determine which one is right or wrong. If we don't share
1:32:33	the peer review reports and only have a journal decision we have no way of tracing this.
1:32:39	It's like making a statement about a discovery without sharing the data.
1:32:46	If we want it to be scientific I think there's good reason to say we need the evidence out there.
1:32:54	Thanks, Bodo, I think that's a great argument philosophically. I would love to hear maybe from Gemma as well about how early career researchers view this.
1:33:02	Yes, just very briefly. I did not think that what was meant was that the peer review process will be open
1:33:10	and the names of the reviewers would be open as well. So I took it as as we're doing it now but you you're
1:33:15	going to be able to see the reviewer comments and I think this is very beneficial for early career researchers as well
1:33:26	to be able to see the process, how other people think about this paper and probably is
1:33:33	also going to make the community be nicer in knowing that this is going to be seen and
1:33:43	it's not some anonymous comments that you're making so I think it will be beneficial you know, there's still a lot of research that sometimes are recipient of reviews that are not written
1:33:54	in an appropriate way and so I think that's actually something that will be mitigated.
1:34:00	Thanks Gemma. Arianna I'm curious how AmeliCA thinks about open peer review and preprints.
1:34:10	Yes, thank you for the question. I believe knowledge needs to be circulated
1:34:15	in different formats and in different ways and also peer review is also evolving to more open
1:34:21	practices and this is good for many fields and for different communities

1:34:29	as long as the scientific rigor is secure we need mechanisms for doing that
1:34:36	and also we need also mechanisms to identify if the aim of the research that is expressed in a
1:34:44	particular article in an individual article has been achieved and this is where other views and
1:34:52	metrics and cartographies - which is the proposal that we have been working on in AmeliCA and Redalyc to have an overview and a more comprehensive view of the task achieved
1:35:05	by this specific research that is published in an article- can be identified and can be described
1:35:10	and can be showcased. So for me we need these two kinds of mechanisms, one which secures the
1:35:19	the scientific rigor and also to have a more comprehensive view of the
1:35:27	aim of the research that has been achieved. Yes, Bodo, I think you have something to say.
1:35:40	I just noticed that there's another question in the chat that speaks to this open peer review
1:35:47	I just wanted to address, maybe answer that. It's a question about well who has time to read all these open peer review reports and I totally
1:35:54	understand and sympathize with this view. I don't think we should publish the
1:36:02	peer review reports because they will be widely read. The same is
1:36:08	true for data too. Most people read articles but they don't actually look at the spreadsheets.
1:36:13	But we still need them in order to be accountable and for the few people
1:36:20	that actually want to build on it on this work they will possibly look at all
1:36:25	of this information including the peer review reports and we'll get a better sense of how trustworthy this work actually is before they spend you know years or millions or whatever
1:36:36	or you know a much of their effort on building on it. So the point is not that
1:36:44	many people will read the reports, the point is that they are there for those who do need them and want to use them.
1:36:57	Thanks, Bodo. Arianna? Just a quick comment that this information is not only for the people who are interested in having a deeper look
1:37:05	but also let's not forget the artificial intelligence and other technologies that can mine this kind of information
1:37:12	to provide insights and to help the system to evolve because of identifying strengths or weaknesses in the process.
1:37:23	I think that's a fantastic segueway to another question which is how is AI going to change the publishing landscape
1:37:34	and the goals that are articulated in this new proposal? You know, I think Arianna's suggestion that AI

1:37:39	can help us digest a lot of this information is interesting and I would love to hear perspectives from Gemma or Bodo on that as well or any other further comments from Arianna.
1:38:04	I just want to highlight the importance of technology and artificial intelligence in terms to bring sustainability to the system,
1:38:10	to bring also more functionalities, to bring innovation but also to bring the power
1:38:18	of study the evolution of knowledge which is something that it's amazing from having this
1:38:23	kind of technologies and this is why we need to think where we are talking
1:38:31	about openness what open means in the future I mean I have the power and the end
1:38:36	and the permission and I am allowed to, for example, have this information in bulk
1:38:42	to be mined and to be processed in artificial intelligence algorithms for example, to provide, to generate more knowledge so it is important for
1:38:51	for sustainability, for innovation and for the evolution of the knowledge system itself.
1:39:00	I would say that AI promises to be both a curse and a blessing and I start with
1:39:08	a curse because I think it will be obviously so much easier to write papers and to write peer review reports with the help of AI so we could see an explosion of papers
1:39:18	and peer review reports and that then we face this increased problem
1:39:23	of who can read all of this. But of course the blessing is AI can also help us to condense down
1:39:28	what actually the contributions really are and not pay attention to what you know
1:39:35	the number of publications that somebody has published but really pay attention to what are the actual contributions that have been created for the benefit of Humanity.
1:39:47	So, I think AI will do both. It creates problems with
1:39:55	the current incentive system where we think we need to publish more and more but it will
1:40:00	also offer some solutions by condensing and really focusing us on what should really matter.
1:40:10	Great, thank you. And before we get too far away from the topic of publishing peer review reports
1:40:17	it is a good idea that - the question is posed - that peer review reports for rejected articles
1:40:26	should remain with the article so that labor isn't duplicated. However, where would
1:40:32	peer review reports for rejected articles be published? and I think that from the proposal
1:40:39	I have a sense of where that might be, but Bodo, I would love to hear from you what happens to

1:40:44	peer review of these articles that are today being rejected. Well, I will offer one solution, I'm not saying this is the only solution. There may be some creative solutions elsewhere
1:40:57	but of course the way that we think about peer review is: peer review itself is not
1:41:04	a pass- fail activity. Peer review is a scholarly activity that evaluates the work at hand and
1:41:11	so that means that the peer review itself isn't necessarily something that says accept or reject.
1:41:17	The peer review evaluates the scientific work and says what authors need to do in order to buttress
1:41:23	their conclusions or what is missing or what is really good about it but it's not itself a verdict, I mean a pass- fail verdict. That is something
1:41:35	that a curator would make afterwards so I would argue peer review isn't itself an accept or reject,
1:41:42	it is just a scholarly paper on this work and that should always be able to sit with any article.
1:41:52	It's the curation editors job to decide okay this work is something that I want to feature in my journal collection
1:42:02	and that is separate from the actual peer review. I think that is really important if we want peer review to be actually really a scholarly activity we need to dissociate
1:42:12	it from curation efforts. And I think that's a little described in the annex of the proposal
1:42:18	how that could possibly be worked out in one particular example.
1:42:26	Thank you Bodo. And Arianna? Just to add that the peer review adds value to the research process itself
1:42:34	and it's the communication and the interaction among researchers par excellence and
1:42:39	it's the core of the scientific validation so any practice that contributes with
1:42:46	more transparency in that sense it's very very welcome.
1:43:03	All right, thank you. A lot of support here for the value of peer review. I'd like to shift gears and look at a very popular question in the Q&A from Chris Banks. If as Bodo suggests,
1:43:18	we move to paying for services not content, then could libraries use their buying power
1:43:23	to Tender for publishing services? I would love to hear, Bodo, what you're thinking
1:43:34	about this and also how things are working and any comments from Gemma or Arianna.
1:43:40	I think I can see this question actually goes also in a direction for what Heather said earlier about bringing this process closer to where the research process actually happens. In the future

1:43:50	I see great opportunities for institutions to engage service providers to help their scientists
1:43:57	put together preprints and make sure that the data are in the right format
1:44:03	on the right repository. There's a lot of work that needs to be done where expert help from
1:44:08	providers can support institutions and rather than signing up to paying for the final article
1:44:15	it shifts towards supporting researchers at that institution to prepare their work for public release.
1:44:22	I personally think this is an important responsibility for institutions
1:44:28	and a better way of using their dollars that are currently spent on subscriptions.
1:44:43	All right, unless there are any further comments from Gemma or Arianna
1:44:48	I'll turn the conversation back to research assessment. How does cOAlition S propose to use
1:44:56	this leverage to alter the research assessment process in the way today's document suggests?
1:45:01	For example, would cOAlition S funders deny grants to researchers who institutions use traditional
1:45:07	quantitative bibliometrics such as counting the number of papers or the journal impact factor?
1:45:13	How is cOAlition S actually going to enforce these changes in research assessment that need
1:45:20	to happen in order to support the change? I feel like Bodo, you know, I'm calling on you
1:45:25	a lot here, but I would also love to maybe shift this question a little bit for Gemma and Arianna.
1:45:32	What do you think cOAlition S funders should consider doing in order to help
1:45:37	institutions change their policies? So maybe Bodo I'll put you on the spot first but I would also
1:45:43	love to hear from Gemma and Arianna. Actually I would like to hear what Gemma and Arianna have to say
1:45:55	I can't really say at this moment what exactly the implementation is. The CoARA you know is working on it, we are working on it
1:46:08	We need to work out exactly how we want to move in that direction I told you an example of what we are doing at HHMI with removing journal names
1:46:16	but there are many other things, narrative CVs, that are happening at places
1:46:23	luckily this doesn't have to be a solution where everybody adopts the same thing
1:46:33	this can be something where everybody experiments and figures out what is working well in their institution because obviously that it's a
1:46:44	local environment where researchers thrive and so we should adjust assessment also

1:46:50	to that local environment. But so there isn't necessarily one size fits all and we are still all of us are still working on this before we can really say this is something that
1:47:00	we all will implement together. But very happy to hear what advice we get from experts.
1:47:14	Well I mean I was really interested in actually what the answer would be to this question what is cOAlition S, what are the funders going to do, I mean there's people in the call
1:47:22	like Marc who've been, you know, really heavily involved in the research assessment
1:47:28	reform conversation and on the drafts and CoARA so I'd be really interested to know.
1:47:34	From my perspective what I think is that there's a move in which we are seeing
1:47:41	many funders, I'm sitting in the UK, so I know MRC and Wellcome Trust, you know, there's all these other
1:47:47	outputs being considered and in your Grant applications I know that there's moves to, you know,
1:47:57	people not being able to discuss Journal names and impact factors in Grant panels but
1:48:04	I think it's very important that that is actually being monitored and that there is accountability
1:48:10	for it, because as researchers now we have to fill all these other fields about
1:48:17	positive research culture and how we are ensuring this and it's great to be able to talk about this actually how well your students are doing etc. how's the impact of your work, but then is that
1:48:27	actually being taken into account in the funding panel while the reviewers have gone through 50 applications
1:48:33	a whole day, it's dark outside, you're tired and then in the end you just default to do they
1:48:40	have a Nature paper and how much money they have as PI and so I think not just saying but you know
1:48:48	training people in panels is very important and then monitoring that these changes that we want
1:48:53	are being adhered to. I think that's key and that's something that cOAlition S funders can do.
1:49:05	Thank you Gemma. And Arianna. Yes thank you. I'm also very interested in what cOAlition S is going to do on this but I can provide some insight because I think
1:49:18	something that is very important is well to move forward and to assess the quality of the contribution itself
1:49:28	beyond the venue where it's published but it's very difficult to do that. For example, in the work in Latin America we have these different layers of quality
1:49:39	that endorse the contribution of one single paper for example, the quality of a paper

1:49:46	which is validated by scientific peers and it is an important validation that we need to make but also the venue is also endorsing a quality process and ensures and secures that
1:50:00	the publication of this research finding is also made with standards and with all the
1:50:07	procedures that are considered quality and there are also the participation of infrastructures that
1:50:13	validate the quality of the publication itself so it is kind of a layer system of quality that can
1:50:19	be deconstructed and in a more granular way but I think the thing that the success depends on
1:50:34	is to assess the purpose of this single paper so how to identify what is the aim of this paper
1:50:42	and how we can identify the achievement in doing so is something that is in line with a Leiden Manifesto for example which is with a little different purpose but it's
1:50:54	to check the quality and the aim of the single article and then to identify
1:51:01	if that was one achieved. But I think there are a lot of channels and there are a lot of platforms and there are lot of strategies to identify that and I think we have to coordinate and to put things clear
1:51:14	in the implementation of the ideas of CoARA and FOLEC in Latin America to have something concrete.
1:51:24	My understanding is also that there are many cOAlition S funders that are doing some of this already through narratives of what is significant
1:51:33	about their contributions, their papers, so I think this notion of a narrative CV that highlights
1:51:39	in researcher's own word what have I contributed or in collaboration with others or in my team or as a trainee
1:51:52	I think that is really important and that is already happening at several cOAlition S funders.
1:52:00	All right, thank you Bodo. Maybe if we have time for one last question
1:52:06	just 10 seconds from each panelist. A really wistful question here from Bernie Folan.
1:52:12	Will journals always be with us? Are journals fit for our age or are they anachronistic?
1:52:18	We'd love to hear support from the format as well as critique and maybe just
1:52:25	a single one or two sentences from each panelist before we hand it back over to Marc.
1:52:36	We will always need some curators. In what form that will happen? you can
1:52:41	always call it a journal but it I suspect the journal in the future will look different from
1:52:46	the one that we have today. Thanks Bodo. Gemma?

1:52:53	I agree, I agree with Bodo. I think that we will need the journal structure but the way it's working now it's not a sensible way really.
1:53:05	Thank you. And Arianna, would you like to add anything? We will always need this validation mechanism of scientific validation. Now it is implemented in the journal format
1:53:18	but I think knowledge needs to be disseminated in many many different, diverse formats
1:53:25	in order to have a social relevance as well so maybe it can evolve
1:53:30	but we will always need this kind of validation as well.
1:53:37	Thank you so much, Arianna, thank you Gemma, thank you Bodo for your insights in this fascinating hour.

Marc Schiltz - closing

1:53:43	I now hand it back over to Marc to close out the session.
1:53:50	Yes, thank you. Thank you, Jessica, thank you all for all those on the two panels.
1:53:55	This has been an extremely lively and interesting discussion, five years after we launched Plan S
1:54:06	I think everyone on the webinar, on the call, realizes that we are at a particular juncture
1:54:15	because we are five years into it so in the first panel we have been able to take stock
1:54:26	of what has been achieved, where do we stand but it is also a particular juncture
1:54:34	because we're looking forward and I saw in one of the questions or chats this call
1:54:46	that we should not stop cOAlition S and I think certainly this is not our intention.
1:54:53	Incidentally during the call I just went quickly over the 10 principles of Plan S as we defined them five years ago
1:55:02	and actually they keep for almost all of them their validity. There is one or two which are no longer applicable
1:55:13	like the ones about monographs which we have updated Plan S to monographs
1:55:20	but otherwise I think they keep their validity and the idea is not to deviate from these principles
1:55:26	but to add maybe a more systematic reflection on the future model of publication
1:55:38	which is something that we, as I tried to explain, that we had left
1:55:44	to the publishers but that was only partially or not to an entirely satisfactory level taken up.
1:55:56	And I think Bodo has made a very good stance a very good talk on what our proposals are.
1:56:06	It's very important this distinction, between researchers that control the content and that keep ownership of the content, on one hand
1:56:18	and then service providers, on the other hand, who provide services
1:56:24	maybe in a transparent way may monetize these services

1:56:32	and I think this is the future road for publication models.
1:56:41	What we do wish is to get input on these principles so these are not set, cast in stone
1:56:50	this is a proposal and we would really very much like to call on everyone,
1:57:01	on all those on the call and beyond to read the new Towards Responsible Publishing proposal
1:57:09	and to share the feedback and I think on the slide you find further information
1:57:15	on how you can do that, how you can provide input so my wish at this point would be that
1:57:23	as a starting point for the research community to take control back over
1:57:31	the publication system and over the content while read the proposal and provide us with input
1:57:38	and feedback so that we can refine that proposal we can or you can tell us where
1:57:46	we are wrong and we can as I wish we should have a wide and open debate about this
1:57:56	and I will be very much looking forward to this discussion and this debate happening
1:58:02	over the next over the next weeks and months. And with this I thank again all the
1:58:11	all those that have been on the panels and of course also Rachel and Jessica for the moderation
1:58:19	for the excellent moderation, I thank all the ESF staff and cOAlition S members
1:58:27	for having organized and put in place this webinar and I hope that we will find each other
1:58:35	back in five years and see where do we stand and whether there is a necessity
1:58:40	to keep on and how the reality looks at that time. Thank you and see you soon, bye-bye.