

1) Open Access overview at SIAM

- Green

SIAM has a very liberal green OA policy, much more liberal than most publishers, allowing authors to post the final published version on the Author's personal noncommercial website and on the noncommercial web server of the Author's institution with no embargo. Authors may also post the final draft of the Work, as it exists immediately prior to editing and production by SIAM, on noncommercial pre-print servers like arXiv.org.

- Hybrid – All SIAM journals offer the hybrid OA option.
- Gold – SIAM assessing sustainability of a Gold OA journal, but in general APC (article processing charge) funding is a challenge in mathematics.

2) Plan S

- Announced Sept 2018, initially Science Europe and 11 European funders, originally slated to come into effect Jan 2020.
- Feedback phase concluded in Feb 2019, revised implementation guidance issued in May 2019, will now come into effect Jan 2021. Very rushed timeline that has not allowed full consultation across all stakeholders.
- Plan S mandates that any corresponding author funded by a Plan S funder has to publish open access, without an embargo and using the CC-BY license. APCs may be capped in future but no amount specified as yet.
- Hybrid OA is banned, Plan S funders will not pay APCs in hybrid journals
 - BUT hybrid is permitted under “transformative agreements” for several years, e.g. publish-and-read, read-and-publish agreements that combine subscriptions and open access.
 - **Who generally has the content scale, infrastructure and legal & sales teams to negotiate and manage such “transformative agreements”? The large commercial publishers. This exception in Plan S effectively permits hybrid OA for large commercial publishers but bans it for independent societies like SIAM.**
 - The revised implementation guidance says model contracts will be coming that societies can use for transformative agreements, but it is still an open question whether transformative agreements will scale down to e.g. 20 journals.
- Plan S wants a global flip and to explicitly end subscriptions, effectively moving to a pay-to-publish world as opposed to pay-to-read.
 - BUT China and the US have not signed up to Plan S and they are the two largest research producers. China currently receives highly discounted subscriptions, they would pay more under a pay-to-publish model. The US is not centrally

administered in the way some European countries are, although it might work for some systems, e.g. California.

- **Real risk that Plan S is replacing a barrier to read (which is debatable in mathematics given the arXiv) with a barrier to publish. What will be the impact on authors without funding or authors from emerging countries?**
- **The pay-to-publish model incentivizes quantity, not quality. If a researcher has funds for an APC, and if their paper is defensibly publishable, the incentive is for the publisher to accept it as this generates more revenue. Selectivity is punished.**
- **'Free rider' issue – institutions that publish a lot will pay a lot more; institutions that read but don't publish, including commercial corporations, will pay nothing into the system.**
- **Plan S wants it to become irrelevant where an author publishes – but under Plan S **most authors are being effectively shut out of the most respected, widely read venues in their fields.****
 - Robert-Jan Smits, former EU Special Envoy on Open Access and architect of Plan S – ["Why is Plan S necessary? Because researchers are irresponsible. They still chase the journal impact factor. They have not made their journals open access. We need Plan S."](#)
 - But tenure and promotion committees use proxies such as the Journal Impact Factor as an indicator of quality and assess the researcher accordingly. Researchers know the respected venues in their field. China is highly focused on the Impact Factor. Researchers are not "irresponsible", they are following the incentives in their profession.
- **The Plan S insistence on CC-BY is problematic as it allows commercial reuse and potential misuse, with no control from the author.** Many authors may not realize how liberal CC-BY is. An author's article could be repackaged along with any other content, narrative, or context and then sold commercially – all without the author's consent being necessary. Their reputation can be used at will. CC-BY should be the author's choice.
- Plan S also insists on authors retaining copyright. While most publishers are happy to do this, it does mean authors are then responsible for enforcing their copyright in cases of violation. Again, copyright retention should be the author's choice.

3) Wiley / Projekt DEAL agreement in Germany –

- National deal between Wiley and ca. 700 German institutions.
- The DEAL institutions will pay a Publish and Read fee per article published – EUR 2,750 (~\$3100), the DEAL corresponding author can publish in Wiley's hybrid journals, all DEAL institutions can also read Wiley's journals.
- Agreement also includes a 20% discount on Wiley's Gold APCs.
- Highly debatable whether the agreement is Plan S-compliant. Plan S permits hybrid as a transition to "full Open Access within a clearly defined timeframe." The German agreement does not commit the Wiley journals to going fully OA.
- **Wiley have built in a financial baseline as well as a 6-month unilateral termination. DEAL will have to publish a minimum no. of articles each year (calculated as the actual number published in the second half of 2019 x 2). If DEAL institutions publish fewer articles, they still pay for the baseline number regardless.**

- DEAL have incentivized themselves to push Wiley author marketing, the agreement stipulates that they will help Wiley hold numerous on-campus events (50 workshops per year, 2 per year at top 10 member institutions), DEAL are incentivized to hit that baseline and encourage content to be submitted to Wiley to ensure they don't lose out financially.
- Danger of consolidating market power by incentivizing content to be funneled towards large commercial publishers and away from independent society publishers.

4) Pressures on SIAM and other independent societies

- Will such “transformative agreements” scale down easily from large commercial publishers to independent societies? Significant administration and infrastructure = more cost.
- Is the OA movement about making content openly available, or is it about reducing the profit margins of the large commercial publishers? If the latter, then there is a very real risk that independent societies will become the collateral damage in that fight.
- The further irony is that in a pay-to-publish OA world, the large commercial publishers will have more market power due to their economies of scale, ability to publish at volume and hit lower APCs. Many current publish-and-read / read-and-publish deals are based on historical subscription spend and do not appear to be reducing costs.
- This in turn is accelerating the migration of independent societies to commercial publishers, which in turn increases the market power of the large commercial publishers. This cycle is highly unlikely to reduce costs, while there are risks to the quality standards that independent societies maintain.
- In order to reach lower APCs the other options for societies like SIAM are to drastically cut costs, for example, around copyediting, production values, technology, and/or to reduce selectivity & quality and simply publish more. Would that really serve our readers, authors and members?
- SIAM's existing open access policies are very liberal. And indeed SIAM is open to experimenting further to better serve researchers, faculty and students. But open access has to be done in a financially sustainable way that enables independent societies to maintain quality and avoid a race to the bottom.