

PlanS: la giusta direzione?



Elena Giglia
University of Turin
Italy NOAD – OpenAIRE
elena.giglia@unito.it



Photos are mine. Feel free to reuse from Flickr/eg65



Il percorso oggi

...chi è a favore

... chi è contro

... e cosa dice chi l'ha pensato

...da dove viene PlanS

- 
- DALL'ESIGENZA DI SVELTIRE UNA «TRANSIZIONE»
ALL'OPEN ACCESS TROPPO LENTA E INEFFICACE
 - DAL COUNCIL ON COMPETITIVENESS DI MAGGIO 2016

[non solo PlanS, anche AmeliCA]

Principles to achieve Open Access Jan 24, 2019

Europe

Plan S
Making full and immediate Open Access a reality

Authors retain copyright of their publication with no restrictions. All publications must be published under an open license, preferably the Creative Commons Attribution Licence CC BY. In all cases, the license applied should fulfil the requirements defined by the Berlin Declaration:

The Funders will ensure jointly the establishment of robust criteria and

Latin America and the Global South

AmeliCA | Open Knowledge for Latin America and the Global South Social Sciences and Humanities

1 Scientific knowledge generated by public funds is a common good and access to it is a right.

Open Access must be legally protected in order to avoid the appropriation of

3 Open Access has no future or meaning without an evolution of research evaluation systems.

AmeliCA Conocimiento Abierto
@Ameli_CA

Following

"Although Plan S is not focus on a single business model, the only one that is mentioned is APC. If Plan S pursuit global acceptability, the diversity of bussiness models should receive equal mentions and planned actions, including the definition of how funding could be..."

May 1, 2019

16:29 - 1 mag 2019

The Funders will monitor compliance and sanction non-compliance.

Plan S from AmeliCA's perspective May 1, 2019

1 Plan S and AmeliCA definitely share a common goal: achieve full and immediate Open Access to publications from publicly funded research.

AmeliCA is the widening of Redalyc's work
Redalyc contribution to the regional publishing is shown in the 1,300 journals and more than half million full-text articles available in Open Access

2 Plan S and AmeliCA also share the support of DORA

Redalyc last year required as mandatory for a journal to be index the DORA's signature
DORA recently confirmed that almost 50% of the signatures comes from Redalyc

3 We celebrate cOAlition S is committed to fulfil the target.

4 Our concerns about Plan S are not a matter of ends but of means.

5 their funding is standardised and capped (across Europe);

6 ations, and libraries to align ably to ensure transparency;

7 solely publications, but it is is for monographs and books (longer than 1 January 2020);

8 for hosting research outputs (chiving function and their ential for editorial innovation;

9 nt with the above principles;

10 three 'I' homogenize the conditions of the development of science and the conditions of the South are different from those of the North.

[ma sono sulla stessa linea]



Plan S
Making full and immediate Open Access a reality

May 1, 2019

Why Plan S 10 Principles Funders & support Implementation About Contact

[Go back](#)

São Paulo Statement on Open Access

01/05/2019

The representatives of [African Open Science Platform](#), [AmeLICA](#), [cOAlition S](#), [OA2020](#), and [SciELO](#) – five of the major worldwide Open Access initiatives – met on 1 May 2019 during the annual meeting of the Global Research Council in São Paulo, Brazil. They are united in their common mission of making knowledge available and accessible wherever it can have the greatest impact and help solve humanity's challenges regardless of where it was produced.

The combined effect of the five initiatives has generated a new momentum in the push towards universal, full, and immediate Open Access.

The Five Initiatives Jointly State That:

- They consider that scholarly and scientific knowledge is a global public good. When generated by public funds, free access to it is a universal right.
- They share one common ultimate objective: providing universal, unrestricted, and immediate Open Access to scholarly information, including use and re-use by humans and machines.
- They share the belief that this common goal can be achieved through a variety of approaches.
- They will pursue points of alignment among their approaches and ways to cooperate towards reaching the shared objective.
- They seek an active dialogue with all stakeholders, including researchers, research funders, universities, libraries, publishers, learned societies, governments, and citizens to take into account the diversity of the global scholarly community.

Let's make Open Access a reality!

...perché amo PlanS (e AmeliCA)

We recognise that researchers need to be given a maximum of freedom to choose the proper venue for publishing their results and that in some jurisdictions this freedom may be covered by a legal or constitutional protection. However, our collective duty of care is for the science system as a whole, and researchers must realise that they are doing a gross disservice to the institution of science if they continue to report their outcomes in publications that will be locked behind paywalls.

We also understand that researchers may be driven to do so by a misdirected reward system which puts emphasis on the wrong indicators (e.g. journal impact factor). We therefore commit to fundamentally revise the incentive and reward system of science, using the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)⁴ as a starting point.

PlanS Preamble

- **PAYWALLS SONO UN DISSERVIZIO ALLA SCIENZA E ALLE ISTITUZIONI**
- **I RICERCATORI POSSO ESSERE MOSSI DA UN SISTEMA DI INCENTIVI FUORVIANTE**

...reazioni e posizioni

Unlocking Research

University of Cambridge Office of Scholarly Communication

[Home](#)

[Blog archive](#)

[Upload your manuscripts](#)

[PlanS Cambridge](#)

Plan S – links, commentary and news items

© February 10, 2019 [Uncategorized](#) [Plan S](#) [Office of Scholarly Communication](#)

The discussions around Plan S are voluminous. On 8 February 2019, the opportunity to provide [feedback on Plan S](#) closed.

We have been attempting to maintain a list of commentary and news stories on Plan S at the end of one of our blogs: [Most Plan S principles are not contentious](#). This has now grown so large we have moved the list into this dedicated blog. We will continue to try and keep it up to date – please let us know if we have missed anything that should be added.

Please note that there is a [list on the Open Access Tracking Project](#) using the tag "oa.plan_s" which is crowd sourced and updated in real time, so is more comprehensive than this effort. There is also a comprehensive [Reddit list](#) curated by Jon Tennant available. A smaller list (but with different links) is [also available](#).

Commentary, news stories & press releases

These are presented here in reverse order of publication (most recent first).

- **Forbes** – Highly Profitable Medical Journal Says Open Access Publishing Has Failed. *Right*. (published 1 April)
- **New England Journal of Medicine** – No Free Lunch – What Price Plan S for Scientific Publishing? – Editorial (published 21 March)
- **Scholarly Kitchen** – “Strategic and Non-strategic Society Publishing” (published 18 March)
- **Publishing Perspectives** – Interview With the Plan S Implementation Committee’s David Sweeney (published 18 March)
- **NursingOpen** – “Time to plan for Plan S – Editorial” (published 15 March)
- **Samuel Moore** – Plan S: how open access can nurture new positive and collective forms of ‘academic freedom’ (published 15 March)
- **LSE Impact blog** – Making Waves – Assessing the potential impacts of Plan S on the scholarly communications ecosystem (published 14 March)
- **Jon Tennant in The Wire** – Plan S: Achieving Universal Open Access to Research Papers is Becoming Unavoidable (published 11 March)
- **Information Power** – Towards transition strategies and business models for Society Publishers who wish to accelerate Open Access and Plan S, An initial discussion document from the Society Publishers Accelerating Open access and Plan S (SPA-OPS) project (released 11 March, no date)
- **Times Higher Education** – ‘Up to half’ of European papers to be open access under Plan S (published 8 March – requires login)
- **Riksbankens Jubileumsfond** – Letter about Plan S (dated 6 March)
- **LSE Impact blog** – Plan S and the Global South – What do countries in the Global South stand to gain from signing up to Europe’s open access strategy? (published 6 March)
- **European Journal Clinical Investigation** – Plan S: funders are committed to open access to scientific publication (published 6 March)
- **Editorial JACMP** – Plan S – what is its meaning for open access journals and for the JACMP? (Published 6 March)
- **Insights** – From Finch to Plan S: and you may ask yourself, well how did I get here? – Special collection (published 6 March)
- **Science** – A report about Plan S’s potential effects on journals marks a busy week for the open-access movement (published 6 March)
- **Jon Tennant** – Plan S – Time to decide what we stand for (published 5 March)
- **Clarivate** – New report by Institute for Scientific Information on Plan S poses key

🏠 16 📧

#plan_s

... reazioni negative

Sept. 2018

For Better Science

A Response to Plan-S from Academic Researchers: Unethical, Too Risky!

Summary

Open access (OA) publishing in general has many advantages over traditional subscription, or toll access (TA) publishing. OA publishing is available to a larger public, but also expands the reach of research, increasing the impact of their research. Plan S is a threat to academic freedom.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT RISK!

Plan S Open Letter

Signatories

[1712]

<https://sites.google.com/view/plansopenletter/signatories>

Clearly there are complications here, but I hope at least that the above analysis gives a clearer view of the boundary where Plan S has landed. For what it's worth I believe that academics should certainly be as free as possible to choose where to publish, in acknowledgement of their professionalism and expertise. I think it is therefore important that the implementation of Plan S strives to ensure that there remains a rich variety of outlets. But we also need to acknowledge that at present academics' publishing choices are constrained by the [perverse incentives that have grown up around metrics of journal prestige](#). For that reason, I was pleased to see that reform of research evaluation is at the heart of Plan S. If it can help to drive real change on this front, arguably Plan S will make a positive contribution to academic freedom.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM:
ON WHAT, NOT «WHERE» TO
PUBLISH... AND TODAY AREN'T
YOU CONSTRAINED BY THE
EVALUATION CRITERIA?

Reciprocal Space

Oct. 2018



Home About Stephen

← Ten Years a Blogger

Endings and Beginnings

Academic freedom and responsibility: why Plan S is not unethical

Posted on October 1, 2018 by Stephen

... molte positive

1.925

Open Letter in Support of Funder Open Publishing Mandates

We, the undersigned, believe that the world's scholarly literature is a public resource that only achieves its full value when it is freely available to all. For too long we have tolerated a pay-for-access business model for scholarly journals that is inequitable, impedes progress in our fields, and denies the public the full benefit of our work. We therefore welcome efforts on the part of public and private research funders to require that publications based on

liately freely and openly available without restrictions on access or use.

ed to transform scholarly publishing by changing the explicit and implicit rules under nize that funder mandates may superficially limit our publishing options in the short to a system that optimizes what we really care about: maximizing the reach of our research community and public.

scholarly communication costs money, and support substantial investment in this everyone to freely access and use the scholarly literature. We acknowledge that ensuring that all scholars everywhere have the unfettered ability to freely share their ns recognized. And we therefore commit to continue working with funders, ns and other stakeholders until we have created a stable, fair, effective and open tion.

<http://www.michaeleisen.org/petition/>



Jan. 28, 2019



Joint Statement on Implementation Guidance for Plan S

Plan S is an initiative by cOAlition S to achieve full and immediate Open Access to scientific publications after 01 January 2020 in Europe. At the heart of the plan are 10 principles currently being developed into a set of implementation guidelines. We, representatives of early-career and senior researchers across Europe, have already commented on Plan S and hereby reaffirm our general support and offer our views on the implementation guidance.

We c concerns and for the open consultation on compliance via either author-accepted manuscripts. It is crucial, however, that cOAlition S ensure appropriate regulations, funding, and support. We r tement on Plan S: disruption for doctoral dissertations should be minimised; venues with no author-facing fees and societies as well as open infrastructures should be supported; institutions and funders should modernise their researcher evaluation and implement the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA).

GIOVANI RICERCATORI

(1) We agree that copyright on publications should stay with the original copyright holder and not be transferred to publishers. The copyright holder is typically the author and/or institution, which can depend on legal requirements, but is often not explicitly stated. We encourage cOAlition S to recommend the author as copyright holder where legally possible.

- LA LETTERATURA SCIENTIFICA HA VALORE SOLO SE CONDIVISA CON TUTTI
- PER TROPPO TEMPO ABBIAMO TOLELRATO IL MODELLO «PAY PER ACCESS» HE IMPEDISCE LA CONOSCENZA
- ABBIAMO BISOGNO DI UN SISTEMA APERTO SOSTENIBILE



... alcune tragicomiche

EMS on new developments concerning Open Access

Two months ago the EMS reiterated its position on open access, see [here](#).

While scientific publishing may move in this direction, any change of the system must be done in a balanced way taking into account the interests of all parties involved, in particular that of the scientific community.

However, at the moment we are witnessing several disturbing developments. The European Commission (EC) announced its "Plan S" which would make so-called "Gold Open Access" obligatory from 2020 within the EU. The participation of big commercial publishers in formulating this plan was explicitly mentioned. Furthermore, the EC has selected Elsevier as a subcontractor responsible for implementing the plan. In our view this is an obvious conflict of interests. We are surprised that the EC, with its manifest willingness to fight big internet companies, should turn a blind eye to such a serious problem in its own backyard.

This decision will have a serious and lasting impact on the future of Open Science and innovation in Europe, the livelihoods of European citizens, and even the legitimacy of the European Commission. A number of people have accordingly supported [a complaint](#) to the European Ombudsman, requesting that this decision be revoked.

The European Mathematical Society shares these worries about the future of scientific publishing and strongly supports the complaint.

<https://zenodo.org/record/1305847#.W6UXwvYzU2w>

Submitted by [Vicente Munoz](#) | 1 / Oct / 2018

EMS e le fake news:

- Attribuisce il complaint di Jon Tennant (uscito a luglio) a PlanS uscito a settembre
 - Afferma che Elsevier è subcontractor per monitorare PlanS
 - Insinua che PlanS sia stato «scritto con gli editori»

...Houston, abbiamo un problema

- PLAN S PENSATO PER EDITORI, NON PER AUTORI
- PLAN S VUOLE FORZARE IL SISTEMA, NON ESSERE ADATTABILE



Lenny Teytelman

@lteytelman

Nov. 28 2018

Following



Reminder - you can't criticize Plan S for "not being flexible enough so that all of today's journals are deemed compliant." As [@ashleydfarley](#) said - the whole point of Plan S is to force the current system/journals to change.

Ashley Farley @ashleydfarley

Plan S isn't meant to fit into the traditional publishing system. It's meant to drive systemic change in a broken system. Hybrids were meant as a way to transition. Now it's become the ugly norm. I would love to see more conversation around solutions that #PlanS is pushing for

... dopo il feedback



DAI FEEDBACK:

- PREOCCUPAZIONI REALI
- FAKE NEWS
- DEMAGOGIA PURA

- Genuine concerns – mostly from the smaller society publishers, which support open access, but don't quite know how to make it work in their environment and financial set-up;
- “Fake news” – comments accusing Plan S of being “only about ‘gold’ OA”, ignoring “platinum” OA and repositories, etc. He dismissed those criticisms and those who utter them should just read the Plan S proposals properly;
- “Demagoguery” – attempts to derail the process by casting aspersions that are not based in fact, such as the assertion that Plan S “would hamper academic freedom”, that OA stood for “low quality and absence of proper peer review”, for “promoting ‘predatory’ journals”, and that Plan S would be “putting an end to global scientific cooperation”.

The criticisms in the latter two categories are of a spurious, emotional, “shooting-from-the-hip” nature, and they do not cut any ice once you carefully think about them. About the first category, Smits said he has, and cOAlition S members have, sympathy for those concerns, and they will be considering how to help.

Houston, abbiamo un problema / 2



*Research

Advertise

Company

Robert-Jan Smits: the future for Plan S

Smits said he had not been surprised by the pushback Plan S has received from some researchers. He quoted two pieces of advice he received as envoy. First: universities and researchers are “coin-driven”, and mainly motivated by winning funding. Second: “The biggest inhibitor to change and modernisation in the academic system is the academic system itself.”

But he said he thinks some of the arguments against Plan S have been “unfair”. He reserved his greatest ire for accusations that Plan S will prevent Coalition S-funded researchers from collaborating with people who do not face restrictions on where and how they can publish.

“I thought that scientists work together across borders to extend the frontiers of knowledge and solve problems for society,” he said. “If now scientists tell me that they will not cooperate anymore if they are not allowed to publish behind a paywall, I think we have a serious problem with the role of science in our society and we probably have got to have a more fundamental debate.”

Chi ha paura di Plan S?

News & Views Careers Events Reports & Data

Feb. 19, 2019

Who Gets to Talk?

INSIDE
HIGHER ED

Admiss

Sub

#News

Who's Afraid of Plan S?

Research funders, publishers and academics ponder the consequences of a European initiative that could have a major impact on scholarly publishing in the U.S.

By Lindsay McKenzie // February 19, 2019

7 COMMENTS

Steven Inchcoombe, chief publishing officer at Springer Nature, said that some of the principles of Plan S could have "unintended consequences that could be adverse rather than positive for the accelerated transition to open access."

Springer Nature wants to accelerate open-access publishing "as quickly as possible," said Inchcoombe. "Plan S has stated that that is also their goal, so we should be all pushing for the same outcome, but some of the things that they've come up with are just not going to be effective," he said.

GLI EDITORI!!!!!!!

Hybrid journals should be embraced, "rather than eliminated," as this is an area where open-access publications are growing rapidly, said Inchcoombe.

Funding for immediate open-access publication is also a concern, he said. "Publishers have to generate income; if they don't charge for the content they provide, it's very hard to see how publishers can do it all for free. Making researchers reliant on some sort of grant funding to fund OA is not a sustainable model at scale."

Read-and-publish deals, in which institutions pay to both access subscription-only content and publish open-access articles, are a good solution to support open access in the long term, said Inchcoombe. The University of California System, for example, is pursuing such a deal with Elsevier.

Chi ha paura di Plans?

Science Home News Journals Topics Careers

ONE APP... THOUSANDS OF JOBS

- Jobs are updated 24/7
- Search thousands of jobs
- Get job alerts for new opportunities

Science Careers

Download on the App Store

Log in | My acc

SHARE

f 231

t

9

in



DAVIDE BONAZZI/SALZMANART

Scientific societies worry Plan S will make them shutter journals, slash services

By Jeffrey Brainard | Jan. 23, 2019, 12:05 PM

...ma a Berlin14 l'editore Copernicus ha dimostrato il contrario, dati alla mano...

Houston, abbiamo un problema / 3



"In the OA movement, it seems to a lot of people that you have to choose a road: green or gold or diamond," says Colleen Campbell, director of the OA2020 initiative at the Max Planck Digital Library in Munich, Germany, referring to various styles of OA. "Publishers are sitting back laughing at us while we argue about different shades" instead of focusing on a shared goal of complete, immediate OA.

Because of its bold, stringent requirements, she and others think Plan S can galvanize advocates to align their efforts to shake up the publishing system.



DAVIDE BONAZZI/SALZMAN A

Will the world embrace Plan S, the radical proposal to mandate open access to science papers?

Jan. 2019

By Tania Rabesandratana | Jan. 3, 2019, 2:00 PM

...cirisiamo / 1

In 2016, the New England Journal of Medicine published an editorial [against data sharing](#) in research, calling those who re-analyze published data, "parasites". Yesterday, the journal published another [editorial](#) in a similar vein, but this time against open access. I don't have time to rebut each pernicious editorial attacking open access, but this one is high profile and is currently gleefully being shared by opponents of open access (for example, [here](#) is a VP from Elsevier promoting it).

The people spreading this editorial highlight its three key objections to open access:

1. OA increases costs of publishing
2. OA does not accelerate science because citations for subscription journals are higher
3. Researchers still prefer to publish in subscription journals

I am setting a 60-minute timer and will address as many of the misleading points as I can.

Data and Open Access Parasites: NEJM is at it again

Lenny Teytelman March 22, 2019

March 29, 2019



No, the costs have not come down, but it's not because the internet is more expensive than print or because OA journals charge more than subscription ones. The costs have not come down because subscription journals have not switched to open access, so they maintain their exorbitant profit margins, and many double-dip and charge extra for those who want their articles to be open access.

If you actually [analyze](#) real open access journals (not hybrids that get both subscriptions and open access fees), you can see that author-pays open access publishing, because it's transparent pricing, is much less expensive, even for the highly selective journals. Today, the biggest subscription publishers are enjoying 30%-40% profit margins. If we switch from subscription publishing to pay-to-publish open access, these margins are likely to drop to 10%-20%. This is exactly why the subscription publishers are [fighting](#) the recent [Plan S](#) funder initiative to mandate immediate open access. The publishers' profits, like those of *NEJM*, are threatened by Plan S, and hence this editorial.

It is outrageous for this *NEJM* editorial to pretend that open access increases costs, while the whole point of this piece is to maintain the profit margins by lobbying against Plan S and the switch to open access.

And the parts about "we still want curated content and only subscription journals can provide it" - I have a hard time responding to this without profanity. First of all, it is equating almost 13,000 rigorous open access journals with blogs and Youtube. They ALL DO peer review and curate content! Moreover, highly selective journals like *eLife* and *PLOS Biology* are different from *NEJM* and

...ci risiamo / 2

Data and Open Access Parasites: NEJM is at it again



Lenny Teytelman

March 22, 2019



March 29, 2019



My timer is ringing. I'll stop here. The end of the editorial:

"eliminating subscription-based publication models without having alternatives in place that can reliably produce independently vetted, cautiously presented, high-quality content might have serious unintended consequences for the integrity of the scientific literature."

No open access advocate is proposing that. We've had reliable alternatives in place for almost two decades now. This editorial is a classic piece of [FUD](#) (fear, uncertainty, and doubt) that I have been seeing more and more of from subscription publishers as they panic about Plan S. NEJM should be ashamed for publishing this, but given their view of good researchers as "parasites", I'm not surprised that they did.

Plan S – Time to decide what we stand for

March 5, 2019



Reflecting on the recent *consultation* period for Plan S, a funder led proposal for achieving universal open access to research papers, **Jon Tennant** argues that whereas, the consultation has in many ways followed the contours of previous OA debates, OA has now become an unavoidable part of academic life and has moved into the mainstream. For this reason, he argues that it is vital now, more than ever, to ensure that OA discussions are conducted as broadly and transparently as possible.

The open access (OA) movement is a millennial. Conceived around 25 years ago in conjunction with the internet, open access has become a global movement to promote the free and rapid sharing of scientific information. From these beginnings, few would now argue with this principle, but it is estimated that only around 28% of the total scholarly literature is currently legally OA. Depending on

This is perhaps the defining feature of Plan S. Previously, OA has been something that can be ignored, or as a mandate, or policy one must abide by. All of the other accompanying tensions around public versus private, appropriate expenditure of public funds, how OA impacts different communities and demographics, how to reform research evaluation, what the best 'model' for OA is, have resurfaced again, but this time with an incredible amount of engagement that was not present before.

Plan S has added a sense of urgency to the debate and drawn more academics into the bizarre, and complex, world of scholarly publishing, which, by and large, is not something that most researchers have any sort of formal training in. This has drawbacks, as in a field that has a rich history of research and debate, many actors can feel like they are having the same conversations again and again. More generally, I am also concerned about how the different information being shared about Plan S, and OA, is having an impact on the wider understanding of the issues, as well as the development of Plan S itself.

Reset

TLAČÍTKO
PRO SLEPCE

PUSH TO
RESET THE
WORLD

#spaceutopian

Plan S – Time to decide what we stand for [March 5, 2019](#)

The whole point of Plan S was to disrupt the status quo and transform the world of scholarly publishing. If it yields to those who it is trying to disrupt, at the cost of the greater good, than that's not exactly progress. Open Access is not a business model, so let us stop treating it as such. I believe that science can help us shape the world to be better, and can help solve the enormous problems that our planet currently faces. I do not believe that having it under the control of mega-corporations and elite individuals or institutes helps to realise this, or is in the principles of fundamental human rights.

...un occhio diverso

4. Support scholarly-centred and sustainable Open Access publishing models that maximise the benefits of research

A scholarly-centred approach to Open Access that recognises the centrality of the work of researchers as producers of knowledge, peer reviewers and editors, is the guiding principle that should underpin the development of any new publishing models. The ultimate goal should be to maximise the benefits of research and circulate knowledge not only within research communities but also society at large through sustainable publishing practices.

We also recommend that funders collaborate with the European Commission to explore whether the use of the Open Research Publishing Platform could be extended to all publicly funded publications, beyond those created through Horizon 2020 or Horizon Europe projects. However, such a platform must remain independent, transparent and

7. Ensure coherence between Plan S and Horizon Europe

The new framework programme for research and innovation is currently under negotiation and will make Open Science its *modus operandi*.

We recommend the Commission to ensure that its approach to Open Access in Horizon Europe is consistent with Plan S. A harmonised approach will greatly benefit researchers and help maximise impact.

Recommendations

1. Involve universities in a staged implementation of Open Access and promote care before speed

The implementation of Open Access through Plan S requires dialogue and collaboration among universities, research funders, the European Commission, and learned societies. For this dialogue to happen in a meaningful and structured way, we need to exercise care before speed. As stressed in our response to the consultation, the timeline for Plan S is too ambitious. Implementing it as it stands would be unwise without having proper transition measures and due consideration of the implications for research practice.

How long?

March 28, 2019

Interview With the Plan S Implementation Committee's David Sweeney



In News by Mark Piesing / March 18, 2019 / 1 Comment



'My question for those who say it's too tight a time scale,' says Plan S task force co-chair David Sweeney, 'is how long do you want?'



...yes, but...

...COSA CI SERVE ANCORA PER ANDARE
OLTRE QUEL «MA»???



Micah Vandegrift

@micahvandegrift

Feb. 12, 2019

Segui



Here's my summary of what I've heard and read: "I/we support and believe in open access, but..." What do we need to do globally to get past the "but..."?

...grazie!