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Goals

- Revenue neutrality for publishers
- Accelerate knowledge creation
- Greater transparency
- Rapid transition
- Rights retention
- Cost reduction for libraries
- Equity for authors
- Simple workflows
- Equity for readers
- Cost neutrality for libraries
Increase institutional research impact
End commercial dominance in journal market
Reasonable profits and surpluses
Global scalability
Works for high output and low output
Works for high resourced and low resourced
Local context consideration
De-colonize publishing
Fair and equitable pricing
### APC-Based

Read and Publish – Publish and Read

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Characteristics &amp; Flavors</th>
<th>ISU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• Transitional  
• Workflow heavy  
• Join/Membership  
• Multi-payer | ![Logos] |
APC-Based

Read and Publish – Publish and Read

Pros

• Equity for readers
• Rapid transition to OA
• Multi-payer compatible
• Scalable
• Funding follows author

Cons

• Equity for authors w/waivers
• Article economy
• Cost control & sustainability
• Article level workflows
• May preserve status quo
• Transparency
• Data heavy
**Publishers**

Annual Reviews, Berghahn Books, International Water Assoc., Pluto Journals, European Mathematical Society Press, De Gruyter, EDP Sciences,

---

**Characteristics**

- Subscription like
- Participation threshold
- Free-rider control
- Easy to adopt
- Workflows are light

---

**ISU**

---

S2O Community of Practice: [https://subscribetoopencommunity.org/](https://subscribetoopencommunity.org/)
## Non-APC

### Subscribe to Open

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Equity for readers</td>
<td>• Scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equity for authors</td>
<td>• Annual offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rapid transition to OA</td>
<td>• Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy to implement</td>
<td>• Cost control &amp; sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scalability</td>
<td>• May preserve status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publishing agnostic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tiered Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publishers</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>ISU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Association of Computing Machinery, | • Tiers based on publishing  
• Single fee  
• Unlimited publishing  
• Discounts read participation | |
Non-APC

Tiered Model

Pros

• Equitable for readers
• Rapid transition to OA
• Easy to implement
• Transparent (ACM)
• Cooperatively developed
• Scalability

Cons

• Equitable for authors w/waivers
• Data heavy for publisher
• Cost control & sustainability
• May preserve status quo
Collective, Community, & Sponsorship Models

Publishers


Characteristics

- Single fee
- Transparency
- Community based
- Unlimited publishing

ISU

PLoS CAP Model Description: https://plos.org/resources/community-action-publishing/
Non-APC

Collective, Community, & Sponsorship Models

Pros

• Equitable for readers & authors
• May challenge status quo
• Rapid transition to OA
• Transparent
• Cost control
• Highly collaborative
• Scholar led/ Academy owned

Cons

• Free riding
• Sustainability
• Time intensive to coordinate
• Scalability/one-off approach