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Part 1: Saskia de Vries
A general overview of flipping journals to Open Access

Part 2: The *practicalities* of flipping to *Fair* Open Access

A. Ludo Waltman
*Journal of Informetrics* -> *Quantitative Science Studies*

B. Johan Rooryck
The flipping of *Lingua* -> *Glossa*

https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/27803834

Jeroen Bosman and Bianca Kramers, Nine routes to Plan S compliance, June 2019

Overview of journal flipping scenario’s:

Pressure from Stakeholders

1. Government and Funder Incentives - Top Down
   Welcome Trust and FWF Austria

1. Pressure from Authors, Society Members and Editorial Boards - Bottom Up
Overview of journal flipping scenario’s:

Non-author-pay funding

National Journal Subsidies
Finland: scientific societies can apply for grants, which typically award 5,000 to 10,000 USD per year – 50% matching

Time-limited Funding for the Conversion
Anthropology and Aging, Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine

Income from a Paper Version Subsidizing an OA Version
Journal of the Medical Library Association (JMLA)
Overview of journal flipping scenario’s

Non-author-pay funding 2

Society Subsidy
Brookings Papers on Economic Activity

Low Cost Infrastructure and Volunteer Effort
Ohio Journal of Science, Open Medicine

Joining Regional Journal Platform
SciELO, Open Edition, DoiSerbia

Joining Consortium or Library Partnership Subsidy
SCOAP3, OLH
Overview of journal flipping scenario’s

APC-Funded Scenario’s

Via Hybrid OA

Nature Communications: €4.290

Bundling APCs with Subscription Licenses

Offsetting / transitional deals: Springer – NL, MPG, DEAL, Austria
Plan S
Making full and immediate Open Access a reality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>routes to Plan S compliance</th>
<th>A. existing/new APC gold journal/platform</th>
<th>B. existing/new non-APC gold journal/platform (diamond)</th>
<th>C. flipping journals to APC gold (by publishers or editors)</th>
<th>D. flipping journals to non-APC gold (diamond), by publishers or oads.</th>
<th>E. hybrid journal in transformative (model) agreement / transformative jrnlt</th>
<th>F. CC-BY-(SA) OA in hybrid journal &amp; self archiving the published paper</th>
<th>G. archiving publisher version, CC-BY-(SA)</th>
<th>H. archiving AAM, on publication, CC-BY-(SA)</th>
<th>I. sharing preprints and using overlay PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. compliant?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. example(s)</td>
<td>PLoS, 1000s more</td>
<td>Open Library of Humanities, 1000s more</td>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Infection, 1000s more</td>
<td>Scoap</td>
<td>agreements listed at esac-initiative.org</td>
<td>all hybrid journals allowing CC-BY-(SA)</td>
<td>(MNRAS, APS journals)†</td>
<td>Royal Society, (Emerald / Sage journals)†</td>
<td>Discrete Analysis /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. current use / availability</td>
<td>sizeable amount</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
<td>(agreements:) yes, in some countries</td>
<td>sizeable amount</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>very limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. effect on publishers</td>
<td>gold publ. win, evt. decreasing subscriptions</td>
<td>more competition / perhaps evt. decreasing subscriptions</td>
<td>change in business model / probl. for high rejection</td>
<td>new partnerships or loose journals to funders/institutions</td>
<td>need to negotiate transformative arrangement (not for transformative jrnls)</td>
<td>journals keep role if CC-BY-(SA)† is allowed</td>
<td>evt. decreasing subscriptions, need to solve sustainability?</td>
<td>keep large part of perceived value</td>
<td>change publishing model or loose out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. effect on researchers</td>
<td>away from trad. venues and IF-thinking</td>
<td>away from trad. venues and IF-thinking</td>
<td>depends on (funding for) APC</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>limited effect</td>
<td>almost no restriction on journal choice, but need to pay APC</td>
<td>small effort</td>
<td>small effort, accept limitations</td>
<td>adapt to new idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. effect on libraries</td>
<td>away from hybrid deals &amp; IF-thinking</td>
<td>away from hybrid deals &amp; IF-thinking, pot. role in funding</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>potential role in funding</td>
<td>(help) negotiate transformative deals</td>
<td>current type read &amp; publish deals remain relevant</td>
<td>role insofar as hosted in IR / cancel subs evt.</td>
<td>continued role, esp. hosting in inst. repo</td>
<td>chance to play role in curation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. effect on funders</td>
<td>supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels?</td>
<td>supporting (own) platforms / lower APC levels?</td>
<td>depends on APC levels? / pot. role in funding</td>
<td>lower average APC levels? / pot. role in funding</td>
<td>depends on size of contribution to arrangement &lt;2025</td>
<td>no financial burden / no reduction of role hybrid</td>
<td>no financial gain</td>
<td>no financial gain</td>
<td>adapt to new idea, change assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. effect on societies</td>
<td>big, because of subscription dependence</td>
<td>big, because of subscription dependence</td>
<td>change in business model / probl. for high rejection</td>
<td>change in business model / probl. for high rejection</td>
<td>need to change business model</td>
<td>journals keep role if CC-BY-(SA)† is allowed</td>
<td>evt. decreasing subscriptions?</td>
<td>evt. decreasing subscriptions?</td>
<td>limited role, perhaps in quality assurance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. effect on editors of trad. jrnls.</td>
<td>fewer submissions, lower status</td>
<td>fewer submissions, lower status</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading flip)</td>
<td>none (or big role in leading flip)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>new role in overlay journals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. overall pub cost</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>depends on market / funding sources</td>
<td>remains high at least until deal has effect</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>remains high</td>
<td>substantially lower?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. fits changes in assessment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. cOAlition S members may approve the use of the CC BY-ND license for individual articles
2. these examples allow immediate sharing but not with CC-BY-(SA) and copyright retention yet

Jeroen Bosman & Bianca Kramer, 20190615, accompanying post: tinyurl.com/nine-routes-190531
Closer look at the first five routes:

A. Existing/new APC gold journal / platform: Public Library of Sciences
B. Existing / new non-APC gold journal / platform: Open Library of Humanities
C. Flipping journals to APC gold (by publisher or editors) Lingua -> Glossa
D. Flipping journals to non-APC gold (diamond): SCOAP3
E. Hybrid journal in transformative deal (temporary route) Plan S versus DEAL DE
The Fair Open Access Principles

* The journal has a transparent ownership structure, and is controlled by and responsive to the scholarly community.
* Authors of articles in the journal retain copyright.
* All articles are published open access and an explicit open access licence is used.
* Submission and publication is not conditional in any way on the payment of a fee from the author or its employing institution, or on membership of an institution or society.
* Any fees paid on behalf of the journal to publishers are low, transparent, and in proportion to the work carried out.
Discussion

* Would the various stakeholders have a preference and why?
  publishers, funders, societies, universities/libraries, researchers (authors, editors, peer reviewers), general public, others?

* How can different stakeholders effect the transition?

* What would be minimum requirements for transformative deals to really become full open access by 2024?
Fair Open Access | Addresses and links

Johan Rooryck (Leiden University) | j.e.c.v.rooryck@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Saskia de Vries (Sampan) | s.c.j.devries@sampan.eu

Ludo Waltman (CWTS) | waltmanlr@cwts.leidenuniv.nl
## Cost comparison

1 journal with 100 articles subscribed to by 400 libraries
Subscription fee € 2000 per year
Article processing charge € 1000 per article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subscription model</th>
<th>Fair OA</th>
<th>Fair OA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current model</td>
<td>Transition period 3 yr</td>
<td>Operational stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscription fee</td>
<td>€ 2000/year</td>
<td>Article processing charge</td>
<td>Article processing charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 400 subscriptions</td>
<td>€ 1000/art</td>
<td>€ 1000/art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x 100 articles</td>
<td>x 100 articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OLH &amp; management fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k€ 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>€ 800.000</th>
<th>€ 128.000</th>
<th>€ 100.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per library</td>
<td>€ 2000</td>
<td>€ 320</td>
<td>€ 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per article</td>
<td>€ 8000</td>
<td>€ 1280</td>
<td>€ 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/27803834

Jeroen Bosman and Bianca Kramers, Nine routes to Plan S compliancy.