WEBINAR 2: FUNDING PATHWAYS FOR LEARNED SOCIETY OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING
TODAY’S SPEAKERS

- **Curtis Brundy**, Associate University Librarian for Scholarly Communications and Collections at Iowa State University
- **Kamran Naim**, Head of Open Science at CERN
- **Malavika Legge**, Director of Publishing at Portland Press
- **Scott Delman**, Director of Publications for the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM)
- **Kathryn Spiller**, Licensing Manager at Jisc
3-PART WEBINAR SERIES

UNDERSTANDING LEARNED SOCIETIES
20 NOVEMBER 2019  7:30 A.M. – 9:00 A.M. PST / 3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. GMT
Join society publishing experts in a deep dive into the modern purposes, functions, and needs of scholarly societies—with particular attention to the publishing opportunities and challenges they face within an evolving scholarly communication ecosystem.

FUNDING PATHWAYS FOR LEARNED SOCIETY OPEN ACCESS PUBLISHING
6 DECEMBER 2019  7:30 A.M. – 9:00 A.M. PST / 3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. GMT
We next provide an overview of a variety of funding models that scholarly societies may consider in transitioning to open access publishing. We will explore the implications of each funding strategy—the pros and cons—as well as associated implementation needs or partnership dependencies.

ENGAGING SOCIETIES AND SOCIETY JOURNALS IN TRANSITIONING TO OPEN ACCESS
12 DECEMBER 2019  7:30 A.M. – 9:00 A.M. PST / 3:30 P.M. – 5:00 P.M. GMT
The webinar series concludes with an exploration of how authors and libraries can work with and support society journals and publishers as they prepare for and undertake an OA transition. We will examine the kinds of resources, consultations, and advocacy both needed and available for authors, libraries, and society journals.

More information and registration: http://ucblib.link/2Vf
Non-APC Open Access: The Subscribe to Open Model
WHY PURSUE NON-APC OA

- Increased momentum towards OA: motivated by funder mandates, values of scholarly community and mission imperative (for non-profit publishers/societies in particular)
- Predominant OA models that rely on APCs not suitable for all publishers
  - Lack of grant funding in some disciplines
  - Exclusionary potential of APCs for researchers in marginalized communities (particularly low-income countries)
  - Incompatible with certain forms of research output (e.g. commissioned review articles)
data analysis shows that there is enough money already circulating in the global market… in the subscription system and that could be redirected and re-invested into open access business models

(Schimmer, Geschuhn, and Vogler, 2015)
Will libraries redirect subscription spends to support costs of publication and support OA?
Private Provision of
Open Resources

Two principal approaches for addressing collective action problems:

1. Leverage group affinity and social incentives to encourage pro-collective behavior
2. Induce institutions to participate through economic self interest
Collective Funding Models
are Viable

- Knowledge Unlatched and Open Library of the Humanities strong examples
- Motivate participation through altruism, pro-group behavior and private benefit (e.g. governance input)
- Not yet proven scalable to many other publishers
Subscribe to Open
Model Origins

- Annual Reviews working with Raym Crow of Chain Bridge Group Consulting / SPARC
- Funded through grant from Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Transition Model

Elements

- Provide an adequate local incentive for institutions to participate
- Ensure that institutions continue to participate over time
- Satisfy institutional procurement policies that forbid donative payments
- Preserves vendor/customer relationship rather than altruistic collective contribution
Subscribe to Open

Underlying Logic

- Selecting S2O is in an institution’s economic self-interest
- Targets current subscribers
- Avoids collective coordination
- Uses existing procurement processes
- Guarantees OA only with full participation
- Recurs annually
Subscribe to Open Logic

Economic Self-Interest

- S2O offered at discount over price of subscription
- Only way to guarantee access to content is through participation in S2O
- If not everyone participates (offer failure), discount honored for S2O
- Participating institutions benefit regardless of action of others
- In event of offer failure, non-participating institutions would need to pay regular (i.e. undiscounted) subscription price
Subscribe to Open Logic
Targets current subscribers

- Journals’ subscriber base by definition represents institutions with expressed demand for content

- S2O not premised on attracting contributions beyond existing base
  - Potential perception that participation is voluntary rather than self-interested
  - Require expensive and time consuming collective coordination

- Once opened, supplementary funding models (e.g. targeting high-use non subscribers) could be explored
Subscribe to Open Logic

Avoids collective coordination

- Leverages economic self interest
  - Cannot be considered a donation
  - Avoids altruistic appeal
  - Does not require collective coordination

- Does not use revenue targets or progress indicators (e.g. thermometers), which might introduce group/collective dynamics and undermine the model
Subscribe to Open Logic

Uses existing procurement processes

- Offer communicated through conventional subscription/renewal system
  - Leverages established workflows, agent relationships, sales staff/infrastructure
- Avoids article-level transactions and workflows of APCs
- Maintains existing relationship between publisher and libraries (and associated budgets, etc.)
Subscribe to Open Logic
Guarantees OA with full participation

● Necessary to reinforce that S2O is a subscription: only way to guarantee access is through participation
  ○ Is an institution-specific decision
  ○ Cannot be interpreted as a voluntary donation

● Control of decision to publish OA remains with publisher (once internal revenue expectations have been met)

● Signals need for every institution to participate

● Accommodate natural levels of attrition
Subscribe to Open

Presentation

For an Individual Journal to “Subscribe to Open” and Save 5% —

- We will “Subscribe to Open” for 2020 and receive a 5% discount. We understand that open access to [journal name] in 2020 is only guaranteed if all subscribers participate. We will receive the 5% discount even if the content remains gated.
Subscribe to Open
Presentation

For collection subscribers, the invoice copy might read:

- “Subscribe to Open” for 2020 and receive a 5% discount on the [journal name] portion of the collection price. We understand that open access to [journal name] in 2020 is only guaranteed if all subscribers participate. We will receive the 5% discount even if the content remains gated.
Subscribe to Open Logic
Recurs annually

- Stability of model requires continued participation of sufficient subscribers to meet revenue requirements
- Offer should be repeated each year
  - Same logic applies—i.e. discount for participation, risk of non-participation—in subsequent years
- Provides publisher with option to revert to subscription model if collective action fails (lower risk)
- S2O remains a subscription (demand-based) procurement model
Subscribe to Open
Summarized

To summarize the basic elements of S2O, the offer:

● Targets a journal's current subscriber base using existing subscription procurement processes.

● Motivates participation via the economic self-interest of subscribers.

● Avoids reliance on altruism and pro-collective behaviour.

● Recurs annually to ensure ongoing participation and stable revenue.
Questions?

Kamran Naim

Head of Open Science

European Organization for Nuclear Research

kamran.naim@cern.ch
‘Transformative Renewals’ – transition pilots from a small, self-publishing learned society

6 December 2019

SocPC + TSP-OA webinar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biochemical Society + Portland Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bursaries and travel grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Careers support/guidance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem we are trying to solve with OA

1. Mission of the Society and service to the community
2. Stepping stone to open scholarship
3. Staying sustainable by rewiring subscription income in favour of (OA) publishing

OPEN SCHOLARSHIP
position statement from the Biochemical Society and Portland Press
October 2019

Open scholarship is the name given to a change in the culture of scholarly research, enabled by developing technologies and new opportunities for communication and collaboration. It encompasses topics including open access, open data, metrics, research integrity and public
Learning by doing…

R+P Pilots for 2020 – 2022

- Tx renewals for ~700 existing subscribers
- Tx agreements based on ‘total spend’ for national consortia in 3 countries

*Tx = transformative
Combines ‘Read’ and ‘Publish’ into a single offering against one fixed price
OPTIONS IN THE RENEWAL CYCLE

- **Existing subscriber**
  - Read access to subscribed paywalled content + unlimited APC-free OA publishing

- **Standard subscription renewal**
  - Read access to subscribed paywalled content + author-producing individual APCs for OA articles

- **Transformative 2020 pilot**
  - A 'read fee' frozen at the 2019 price for subscribing to our all-journal package
  - Perpetual access to 2020 paywalled content across our five hybrid journals

- **Read & Publish renewal for 2020**
  - A single ‘publish’ fee of £750 (less than the cost of one standard APC)
  - Unlimited APC-free OA publishing across all seven of our journals (five hybrid and two full OA)

**How it works**

**Tx Renewals**
What does this mean for libraries?

1. Rewiring current (subscription) spending via institutions

2. Removing individual-APC invoices for affiliated corresponding authors

3. ‘Uncapped’ so supports as much OA publishing as possible

‘All inclusive’ Tx renewal =

a. Uncapped, APC-free OA publishing for corresponding authors in ALL journals (5 hybrid and 2 full-OA)

b. ‘Read’ access to paywalled content with post-termination access
Pros and opportunities

• (RE) connecting and conversing with institutions
• Harnessing existing workflows allowing direct or agent-led renewals
• Could help attract more content and grow the journals
• Frictionless OA reducing per-article invoices
• Simple approach to pricing; value for money when compared with ‘total spend’ (i.e. spend on subscriptions plus APC)
• Scalable as no ‘counting down’ or ‘tokens’ or ‘waivers’
  All articles from eligible authors are OA articles by default
• The “uncapped OA” principle is in use with other learned-society publishers
Challenges and risks

• Transition depends on institutional uptake

• Might we introduce a ‘free rider’ issue…?

• Not sure how (if) offerings will affect submissions and publications

• This is a PILOT… sustainability…? Evolution of pricing in this model…?

• Workflows + sales agreements need re-doing; resource intensive

■ New reporting step to feed back on publishing activity
What's next; what needs to change?

1. Need to evolve pilots into long-term sustainable offerings

2. Lack of universally adopted persistent identifiers for institutions

3. Measuring value in these deals needs new types of reporting… Currently there is no cost-effective, independent, universal reporting mechanism (or standard)

4. In the future, a NEW approach to pricing of a “publish and read” offering…?
   - Co-developed - in partnership with institutions
   - Based on a revised set of metrics

OR:
R+P could be a stepping stone to the S2O model
Thank you for listening :-) 

Malavika Legge
Portland Press / Biochemical Society
@PPPublishing @BiochemSoc
Society Publishers’ Coalition
@SocPubC
malavika.legge@biochemistry.org
ACM OPEN

“Read + Publish” Transformative Model
Scott Delman

The ACM is the world’s leading publisher of scientific and technical information and conference organizer in the field of Computing
Publication Models for ACM

1950s - 1980s
Selling Individual Subscriptions

1990s - 2010s
The Big Deal for Institutions

2020 -
Open Access Read + Publish
ACM Open Access Initiatives

- Authorizer
- CHORUS
- OpenSurround for Conferences
- OpenTOC for Conferences
- Hybrid OA for all ACM Publications
- Gold OA Journals
- Open Access Read + Publish Agreements
Vision

• A Model to Sustainably Transition ACM Publications to Open Access Over the Next 5-10 Years

• A Model that has potential to scale to make 80% of what ACM publishes OA in the DL each year

• Funded by Institutions – initially libraries, but eventually from research grant overhead fees managed by universities

• Addresses major challenge and risk for ACM Publications – re-balances economics of ACM Publications back to the most engaged institutions that Publish + Read vast majority of ACM Publications (80%)

• OA publication fits ACM’s mission to accelerate the pace of innovation (greater usage, citations, etc.), so a sustainable model for transitioning ACM's Publication Program is highly desirable
Institutional Funding Model for OA

- Goal is for all “Peer Reviewed Research Articles” published by ACM to be OA in the DL (~80% of all articles published annually by ACM)

- Current “Big Deal” model is based primarily on annual license agreements with institutions paying to download and read articles published in the ACM Digital Library.

- Basic model transitions current “paid access” model for ACM Digital Library to a hybrid model based on “publication” and “access” over a period of roughly 5-10 years.

- The timeline for the transition will depend largely on ACM’s institutional partners…

- New "Publish + Read" model is based primarily on research intensive institutions paying a single annual fee that enables all affiliated corresponding authors to publish with ACM on an Open Access basis with access to complete ACM Digital Library included in annual fee.

- Initial Funding to come from University libraries, but model will only work long term when libraries are able to tap into "research grants" at the university level.
Institutional Collaboration

- Started engaging with California Digital Library (CDL) leadership in March 2018 to develop a sustainable model for Open Access publication with ACM

- Group expanded over the next 6 months to include MIT, Carnegie Mellon University, University of Minnesota, and Iowa State University

- All day in person meeting in April 2019 with representatives from all institutions listed above at MIT

- Group came to tentative agreement on new OA Model that was presented to BWG on April 30, 2019

- Continued tweaking Model, addressing concerns, adding detail, etc.
### Sustainability is the Core of ACM’s R+P Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top # Inst. By Article Output 2018</th>
<th># of Articles (cumulative)</th>
<th>% of Total Articles 2018</th>
<th>“Publish” Spend (cumulative)</th>
<th>“Read” Spend</th>
<th>% of Total “Read” Spend (~$20M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 100</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$5,619,600</td>
<td>$1,096,197</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 250</td>
<td>9,717</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$8,982,200</td>
<td>$2,277,839</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 500</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$11,758,900</td>
<td>$3,627,671</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 1,000</td>
<td>15,736</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$14,250,100</td>
<td>$6,367,983</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 2,700</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pre-Flip Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers Level</th>
<th>Article Output Range</th>
<th>Tier Pricing ($)</th>
<th># Institutions</th>
<th>Tier Revenue ($)</th>
<th>Cumulative Revenue ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$2,280,000</td>
<td>$4,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$6,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$9,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$10,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$12,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$2,175,000</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$19,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>$8,000*</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>$25,968,000</td>
<td>$45,318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19,700 Total in 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4220</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,318,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,318,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,318,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All Tier 10 institutions paying above $8,000 will be reduced to $8,000 as part of consortium deals which include Top Tier Level participants. All Tier 10 institutions paying below $8,000 will remain at current level with 0% increase during term of Agreements.
## Post-Flip Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers Level</th>
<th>Article Output Range</th>
<th>Tier Pricing ($)</th>
<th># Institutions</th>
<th>Tier Revenue ($)</th>
<th>Cumulative Revenue ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
<td>$2,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$2,280,000</td>
<td>$4,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>$6,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$9,575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td>$10,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$12,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>$2,175,000</td>
<td>$14,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$19,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>$2,500*</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>$8,115,000</td>
<td>$27,465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19,700 Total in 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4220</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,465,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All Tier 10 institutions will gradually be reduced to ~$2,500 level as certain OA thresholds are met, starting at 20% of total newly published “APC eligible” articles are published OA in the DL. See separate slide that shows “ramp down”.
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## Tier 10 Pricing Ramp Down

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Peer Reviewed Articles Opened in DL (Annually)</th>
<th>Tier 10 Pricing ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$2,500* (full-flip reached)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Upon “full-flip”, all future published articles in DL published OA, all remaining institutions must do “R+P” deals…no longer just access only, and authors from institutions that do not participate in the Tiered OA Model will be required to pay APC to publish with ACM on OA basis.
Non-Financial Considerations & Terms

• ACM must be committed to transitioning “Peer Reviewed” research publications 100% over time
• Institutions paying for OA access want authors to retain copyright and use CC-BY licenses
• Institutions want model and pricing to be completely transparent and visible to public
• Only corresponding authors’ affiliated with an institution are counted towards institution’s average 3 year Output Range
• Tiering based on average of 3 most recent full-year publication output history
• ACM needs to be transparent about how surpluses in early years will be spent by ACM:
  • Surpluses should support good works programs, such as diversity & inclusion programs, education programs, needs-based waivers for developing countries, acceleration of OA publication program, support for arXiv, etc.
• Deals should include Value-Added Services, such as “Automatic Deposits” into IRs and other services to be agreed
• Historical archive of ~500,000 full-text articles would remain behind paywall as incentive for “long tail” to continue paying for access over long term
Get in touch!

For more information about ACM Open or other ACM Open Access initiatives, please visit:

https://www.acm.org/publications/openaccess#acmopen

Or Contact Scott Delman, ACM Director of Publications at:

<scott.delman@hq.acm.org>
Accelerating the transition to open access
Working with society and smaller publishers
Process for Jisc 2020 pilots

Reach out to publishers
Share information on model agreements
Identify those keen to move quickly
Develop a model
Consult with librarians
Feedback to funders
Agree a final model to pilot
Library feedback

Librarians don’t feel ready for plan S either
Librarians like green open access
Concern about the scalability of ‘read and publish’ agreements
Concern about use of block grants for TAs
Concern about ‘APCs in the wild’
BUT
Supportive of working with society publishers
Working with Funders

UKRI
• carrying out an Open Access Review
• New policy not due until March 2020

Wellcome Trust
• Website now updated to state support for TAs with up front fees
• Detailed guidance due for publication January
Criteria for success

For librarians
Value for money, low admin, compliance with funder mandates

For Publishers
High subscriber uptake, increased market share, reduced admin

For Funders
Increased OA, decrease in cost per article

For Jisc
All stakeholders happy!