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Why is this important now?
“With effect from 2021, all scholarly publications on the results from research funded by public or private grants provided by national, regional and international research councils and funding bodies, must be published in Open Access Journals, on Open Access Platforms, or made immediately available through Open Access Repositories without embargo.”
2. Plan S Compliance

All scholarly articles that result from research funded by members of cOAlition S must be openly available immediately upon publication without any embargo period.

There are three routes for being compliant with Plan S:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Open Access publishing venues (journals or platforms)</th>
<th>Subscription venues (repository route)</th>
<th>Transition of subscription venues (transformative arrangements)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors publish in an Open Access journal or on an Open Access platform.</td>
<td>Authors publish in a subscription journal and make either the final published version (Version of Record (VoR)) or the Author’s Accepted Manuscript (AAM) openly available in a repository.</td>
<td>Authors publish Open Access in a subscription journal under a transformative arrangement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>cOAlition S funders will financially support publication fees.</td>
<td>cOAlition S funders will not financially support “hybrid” Open Access publication fees in subscription venues.</td>
<td>cOAlition S funders can contribute financially to Open Access publishing under transformative arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any chosen route to compliance, the publication must be openly available immediately with a Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY) unless an exception has been agreed by the funder.
Why is this so contentious?

The financial challenge of open access
OA has grown in the UK, but at significant financial cost

Payment for Gold OA via APCs has been the primary model for driving the growth of OA.

Hybrid Gold OA is the most prominent with UK researchers, though Pure Gold OA is increasingly popular, with proportions standing at 70:30 in 2016.
... which have contributed to some unintended consequences

The average APC increased in cost by 16% between 2013 and 2016.

The average cost of an APC is over 25% higher in hybrid OA journals than Pure Gold OA journals.

The gap between the cost of hybrid APCs and Pure Gold APCs is shrinking as Pure Gold APCs are increasing in price at a faster rate.

Expenditure on APCs has at least quadrupled between 2013 and 2016.

At the same time expenditure on subscriptions has continued to grow, though at a much slower pace.
It is unaffordable for UK institutions to transition to OA if we fund APCs and maintain subscriptions

- Growing proportion of funds committed to legacy publishers in form of subscriptions and additional payments for APCs
- Little evidence of spend moving from subscriptions to OA, increasingly limited free funds to invest in new OA models and publishers
- Despite increasing expenditure, proportion of UK research made OA shows only incremental growth
Are transformative agreements a solution?

Achieving financially sustainable open access
Transformative OA agreements aim to convert subscription expenditure into an OA fund that makes all of a consortium’s research output OA on publication, whilst maintaining access to any remaining paywalled content, for the same level of expenditure as under the subscription model.
Transformative agreements as a tool to accelerate move away from subscriptions to Open Access

• Under effective transformative agreements subscription spend visibly reduces and is used to fund OA

• By substituting OA for subscription spend we free funds to support demand, a diverse system of publishing and innovative models
The Springer Compact agreement is a good example of transformative agreement...

Before:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 APC spend</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>1,305,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total subs</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>9,381,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Grand total pre compact</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>10,687,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24% OA across all UK institutions

After:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Grand total</td>
<td>€10,728,095 0.4% over 2015 total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Grand total</td>
<td>€11,168,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 100% OA
- 4% increase over 2016
How can national transformative agreements help with the cost-allocation challenge?
As read costs diminish, those with low volume research outputs will wish to see costs reduce.

Target for transitional agreements where subscription and publishing costs are balanced.

Those with higher volumes of research outputs will see costs increase. Funds formerly used to pay to read will not necessarily transfer.

Current differential between read costs and publishing charges:

- Opportunity for reduced costs
- Likelihood for increased costs

Low volume research outputs: More likely to be able to publish full OA.

High volume research outputs: More likely to need to self-archive.

Credit to Chris Banks for this diagram.
There is enough money in our collective spend to cover all UK research output if managed at the national level.
The largest and most research intensive are also the largest individual contributors to overall expenditure.

The combined spend of mid-tier institutions makes up bulk of overall expenditure, even if they have weaker individual spending power.

Therefore all groups are essential to financial viability of the agreement.

Furthermore, since all institutions make considerable use of the material, there is a collective benefit from retaining access.

Not all institutions will publish a huge volume.

The contribution of those who publish less will help those who publish more, but their contribution will still enable them to publish fully OA.

However, if any cohort walks away, terms will be worse for all.

There is a shared mutual interest in maintaining contributions during a transition.
Springer spend to publishing comparison, 2018

The graph shows the percentage of total fee and the percentage of articles published for different bands in 2018.
Subscription spend profile of target transitional agreement
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Looking beyond transformative agreements
Revising and challenging current assumptions about the current system of scholarly communications

- Institutional funds are no longer allocated in advance and can be used to support open science, based on the requirements of country, institutions, disciplines, or researchers.

- How will we decide to utilise these funds?

- What opportunities for collaboration within and between countries will this allow?
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