



Comments on the current status of Plan S

Luke Drury

- Revised implementation plans represent a big improvement - more realistic and less prescriptive.
- Still too much emphasis on APCs and not enough on preprints, repositories and new publishing models.
- Urgent need to bring in voices from the global south, Latin America, Asia etc.
- But no going back! Everyone agrees that Open Access is a good thing (just not how to get there).



ALLEA Response to Plan S

December 2018

**Produced in Nov-Dec 2018 time frame.
Input from various working groups.
Copies available online.**

- Emphasised need for dialogue with research performing communities both within Europe and Globally (picked up by ISC with a useful blog series) - much knee-jerk opposition to Plan-S was the sense that it was being arbitrarily imposed without consultation.
- Warned of unintended consequences and need to be careful not to create perverse incentives (e.g. encourage predatory publishing).
- Pointed to vicious interaction with research assessment and justified concerns of early stage researchers (SFDORA is fine, but in reality?) but did not consider it an infringement of academic freedom.
- Emphasised need to locate open access within the broader context of open science - hardly need to state this here!
- Copyright not that straightforward, but creative commons the way to go - case for CC-BY-NC or CC-BY-ND especially in the humanities.
- Pointed out financial and legal issues around the APC proposals.



Current

BLOG

Plan S and Open Access in Latin America: Interview with Dominique Babini

Open Access publishing is more widespread in Latin America than in any other region of the world, and continues to grow. We sat down with CLACSO's Open Access Advisor Dominique Babini to find out why.

<https://council.science/current/blog/plan-s-and-open-access-interview-with-dominique-babini>

Shows that non-APC federated institutional repositories can be a very effective route to OA

Plan S in Latin America: A precautionary note

Humberto Debat¹ & Dominique Babini²

¹Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agropecuaria (IPAVE-CIAP-INTA), Argentina, ORCID id: 0000-0003-3056-3739, debat.humberto@inta.gob.ar

²Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), Argentina. ORCID id: 0000-0002-5752-7060, dasbabini@gmail.com

Latin America has historically led a firm and rising Open Access movement and represents the worldwide region with larger adoption of Open Access practices. Argentina has recently expressed its commitment to join Plan S, an initiative from a European consortium of research funders oriented to mandate Open Access publishing of scientific outputs. Here we suggest that the potential adhesion of Argentina or other Latin American nations to Plan S, even in its recently revised version, ignores the reality and tradition of Latin American Open Access publishing, and has still to demonstrate that it will encourage at a regional and global level the advancement of non-commercial Open Access initiatives.

<https://peerj.com/preprints/27834/>

Some questions for us to debate...

- Are we dealing with publishers or platforms (cf recent editorial in Nature)?
- Are so-called “transformative deals” really transformative in any meaningful sense?
- Can/should we separate peer-review from publication and make it a more transparent and on-going process?
- How do we escape the absurd fetishisation of Journal impact factors and reform research assessment?