



Royal Historical Society (UK) Submission to Plan S: Schematic replies to the consultation framework

Introductory statement:

This document provides schematic replies to the Plan S consultation. Full discussion of the issues identified here is provided in the attached document, 'Plan S and UK Learned Societies: The View from History'. For ease of reference, the schematic outline indicates the main page numbers of the full report on which material is discussed. Both this schematic outline and the full response document can be accessed from: <https://royalhistsoc.org/policy/publication-open-access/>.

Plan S questions:

Is there anything unclear or are there any issues that have not been addressed by the guidance document?

Unclear:

- 1) What specific organisations will carry the significant financial costs of Plan S implementation? In the UK context, will Quality Related (QR) funding be reduced to fund Plan S compliant open access (OA)? [see especially pages 10-12 and 20-23 of full report];
- 2) The interpretation of 'publically funded research', and especially the role of charities within Plan S is ambiguous. [see especially pages 2-3];
- 3) The definition of 'research article' needs to be clarified to allow editors to assess what proportion of their content would fall under this rubric. Many History journals publish substantial content in addition to 'research articles': forums, debates, historiographical reviews, etc. Will this material fall under, or outside, Plan S mandates [see especially pages 3, 50]
- 4) Is CC BY (as opposed to CC BY ND) merely 'preferred' or is it uniformly mandated by Plan S? [see especially pages 9-10 and 19-20];
- 5) How will Plan S Funders protect and promote the career development of ECRs and researchers at less advantaged institutions nationally and globally? [see especially pages 4, 21, 31-32 and 39-40].

Not Addressed:

- 1) The potential for Plan S implementation to reify or exacerbated known disparities within the research community (including inequalities against which the UK Equality Act affords legal protections), and the ways in which Plan S Funders will proactively work to ensure that these statutory protections are in force [see especially pages 3-4, 12, 33 and 43];
- 2) The nature and implications of Humanities (and some Social Science) research data for Plan S implementation, including the problematic [see especially pages 19-20];
- 3) The composition of the History research community, including the significant proportion of non-affiliated researchers [see especially pages 4 and 27-28];
- 4) The dominant funding base of most Humanities (and some Social Science) research appears to have been fundamentally misapprehended by the authors of Plan S [see especially pages 4,-5, 11, and 39-43];
- 5) The existing ecosystem of Humanities' journal publishing, and the role of learned societies within it appears to have been ignored in formulating Plan S [see especially pages 35-44];
- 6) The salience of non-research article material (such as research forums, debates, historiographical reviews, etc.) in Humanities journals) [see especially page 50];
- 7) The central place of monographs in Humanities research and publication [see especially pages 35-36];
- 8) The value added of specialised professional editing [see especially page 18];
- 9) The international character of humanities research and publication [see especially pages 27, 28-29 and 42-43];
- 10) The financial viability of existing online OA platforms in the Humanities, which lack a significant track record [see especially pages 15-18];
- 11) The ability of existing online platforms to be scaled up with sufficient rapidity to accommodate Plan S without damaging the quality of research publications [see especially pages 15-18];
- 12) Who will monitor Plan S and Plan S Funders? [see for example page 3].

Are there other mechanisms or requirements funders should consider to foster full and immediate Open Access of research outputs?

- 1) The interdiction of Hybrid OA journals requires reconsideration—Plan S Funders should consider further fostering hybrid models of OA;
- 2) Analysis of the financial consequences of zero embargo Green OA outside STEM disciplines is urgently needed.

Margot Finn, President

Richard Fisher, Vice-President, Publications

On behalf of the Royal Historical Society, London

February 7th 2019