

Plan S consultation - Francis Crick Institute response

Respondents are also permitted to upload a supporting document to the feedback form.

These comments are made from the perspective of basic biomedical research.

The Crick is committed to immediate, unrestricted access to the published outputs of research through open access. The Crick's position on open access is consistent with the open access policies of the six Crick Founders; two of the Crick Founders are members of Coalition S. The Crick supports broader efforts to promote open access to published research at a national and international level.

The Crick's commitment to open access is part of our wider strategy. In our strategy document *Discovery without Boundaries* we espouse openness. Two of the Crick's strategic priorities are 'collaborating creatively' and 'accelerating translation'.

These values, as well as the policies of the Crick's major funders, all naturally lead us to strongly supporting open access. When we make research open, we increase the audience beyond disciplinary boundaries, and beyond the research community. This enhances the chances of multidisciplinary collaborations and translation to industry and healthcare.

Hence, we **welcome the debate** on Plan S and **support the ambition** to make all research outputs fully open, in line with the 2003 Berlin Declaration. However, we are not convinced that the timeline for Plan S is achievable or reasonable.

We urge Coalition S to consider planning for a delayed or phased implementation, or to espouse softer targets in the early years of implementation (i.e. expecting considerably less than 100% compliance).

Science is global and the issues need worldwide consideration and (agreement). Consider Coalition S has done well to bring several funders together in agreement, but we note the **absence** of many major research funders, particularly **NIH** and the **Howard Hughes Medical Institute**. While this remains the case it is difficult to see how Plan S can be effectively implemented.

We are concerned that as it stands, the effect of Plan S may affect **smaller high-quality presses** more severely than large commercial publishers. It would be ironic if the long-term effect of Plan S was to strengthen the market position of commercial publishers.

We note the support for **DORA**, which we endorse, but we remain concerned that current Crick early career researchers may in future need to seek funding from funders that still rely on journal impact factors. Their careers may thus be penalised by having spent time in an institution bound by Plan S. Coalition S

should undertake strong advocacy to persuade such funders to abandon flawed metrics.

It is good to see the support in Plan S for central institutional funding of charges - we consider this the most efficient way to manage such charges.