



**Working Group to assess publishing during Horizon Europe**

**Tuesday 10 November 2021 (14:00-16:00 CEST)**

**Draft Summary**

**Participants:** Chris Ibbott (Observer), Egbert Westerhof, Egidijus Urbonavičius, Kinga Gal, Klaus Hesch, Paolo Ricci, Robert Wolf, Mihaela Ionescu-Bujor, Yevgen Kazakhov, Frédéric Imbeaux, Rolandas Urbonas, Silvano Tosti, Rudolf Neu (Guest, IPP), Bastian Drees (Guest, EMBL)

**Summary:**

K. Gal presented the scope: According to the Model Grant Agreement, all beneficiaries need to make open all the peer reviewed publications without any embargo. Also, no charges can be paid any longer for hybrid journals (Please see Annex 1 for definitions). This means EUROfusion has difficulties to publish in Fusion Engineering and Design because of the 24 month embargo set by the Elsevier and in Nuclear Fusion as NF is a hybrid journal where ineligible page charges as well as 12 month embargo apply. To avoid embargo one could consider gold open access, however as most of the journals are hybrid journals, this is also not an option. The situation is even more difficult, because most of the national agencies have a strict publication policy and they also do not allow to pay charges to be paid for hybrid journals. E. Westerhof and P. Ricci confirmed that even though the national agencies forbid the payment of the page charges in hybrid journal they have other resources to pay the page charges for Nuclear Fusion. However, the 12 month embargo is still a problem. E. Westerhof has drawn the attention that DIFFERs mother organization NWO-I provides its employees with a nonexclusive copyright to their own publications which gives them the right to publish their manuscripts (and thus the AAM) without any embargo.



Bastian Drees Head of Library, EMBL Heidelberg presented the advantages of open access publishing as well as the reevaluation of the concept of paper or journal. Bastian believes we are in the early phase online publishing which requires a change not only in publishing, but also in mentality and grant assessment. There are in principle two ways of publishing: cure first and publish later and the other way around. The first way is the way we publish now and it implies quite some costs and it is slow, intransparent, unreliable, and inaccessible. It also increases the publication bias. The second way of publishing is newer and it is the way used by [Open Research Europe](#), the platform recently set up by the EC. Those platforms should not only include text, but also data and codes any other relevant information of the publication workflow. It should be allowing dynamic updating, version/quality control, and tracking of authorship. However, standards should be clearly defined. Open standards means substitutable service providers instead of monopolies and avoidance of another vendor lock-in.

However, different communities have different needs, and therefore it is unlikely that there will be one solution which fits all. Also bottom up approach is needed to be able to include the needs of each society. The needs should be standardized and answer questions for example what we consider data or metadata. This also can be done via different platforms, but those should be interconnected. Bastian for a long time believed that gold open access would be an option, however this has only lead to price increase without reaching its goal. The technology to publish everything open access is there, but this will only work if the communities agree to use them.

Rudi Neu, as the chief editor of Fusion Engineering and Design expressed his views and mentioned the advantages of the “classical” publishing.

R. Neu sees a few issues with open access publishing, though he agrees with the main concept. He as Editor of FED is for example paid for his work (this is not the case for all journals). He believes that open access in its present form is the opposite what it was originally aimed for. FED receives a large number of submissions as the journal is free of charge. 30-40% of the papers are rejected already at editorial level + ~20% by the referees. The reader is only faces 50% of the submitted information. In case of first publish then cure the papers, this information load on the reader would increase and one will be drowned by information.



On the other hand even though the number of submissions is increasing, the number of high quality reviewers is stagnating. This can be understood as referees are not paid. This could be a problem both for the classical journals, but also for open access platforms.

An advantage of the classical publishing that the editors have different [control tools](#) at hand to check the quality of the publication, tools which are only available. To establish such a quality control system is a major effort, see for example the EUROfusion pinboard. Public providers are not enough to establish and run such platform. This is why R. Neu sees a big value in classical publishing.

The information was followed by a discussion, especially on cost issues. R Wolf emphasized that there are quite a lot of hidden cost, see for example the pinboard. However, gold open access does not seem to be the right way to proceed. C. Ibbott also expressed his worries regarding gold open access: the cost for FED Special Issue is 500.000Eur, which is more than 10 times more of the earlier costs (my last info is 30000 Eur K Gal). He emphasized again that all FP7 and FP8 efforts to reach copyright agreements have been now proven obsolete, new solutions are needed. He mentioned the EC is happy with Open Access at EUROfusion.

It was discussed that a similar solution as DIFFER found (see before) could also be made available for the whole EUROfusion. (K Gal: Looking into this probably CC-BY licence is used.)

R. Wolf expressed that one should make sure EUROfusion is acknowledged in all papers. Also one should avoid low quality open access journals (some of MDPI journals for example), where the number of publication is increasing. Also when going for open access one should make sure the information load is kept under control.

F Imbeaux has emphasized the role of the quality control and he believes that this could be adequately done in an open access environment as well. R Neu mainly agreed, but he questions if this can be done quickly. Can we make a quick change if for example EUROfusion could pay for it?

E. Westerhof has admitted that the rules of Differ are also not fully compatible for open access. He would prefer a community solution.



**Recommendation:**

***Short term recommendation, while payments still can be performed for EUROfusion in FP8.***

PMU should still pay the page charges for Nuclear Fusion papers if the work was already started in FP8. The few cases where the work was performed solely in FP9, the decision should be taken by case by case basis.

**NOTE:** After the meeting I have spoken with Emilia, who has drawn my attention that we are extremely short of funds. She will think of a solution, but she is very skeptical.

PMU should also perform the payments for all fully open venues: NME, New Journal of Physics, MDPI journals. The number of those papers as well as their cost is negligible compared to the number of NF papers.

PMU should collect the peer reviewed unformatted manuscripts (author accepted version) possibly on publication, but at least regularly on the pinboard and make them open access according to the embargoes set by the publishers.

***Middle term recommendation for the time frame 2023-2024 (End of the transition period allowed by Plan S)***

***Nuclear Fusion:*** a worldwide fusion community driven change should be negotiated with IAEA. As DOE has similar requirements as the EC, the community agreement should not be an issue. The negotiations should be done at the level of the European Commission. It would be ideal if diamond open access could be negotiated.

***Fusion Engineering and Design:*** to be discussed

***Comment:*** preparations for long term solutions should be started.