

Discussion on Publication Strategy at ACP General Assembly 2019-10-03:

First Part: Presentations

Thomas Schiex' presentation arguing to leave (slides available at...):

- Motivations to leave:
 - Open access (some researchers do not have access to our papers)
 - Cost
 - Adaptability
- Two different situations:
 - CP LNCS/Springer conference
 - Constraints journal
- Examples to follow:
 - JMLR
 - JAIR
 - Open Journal System
 - Overlay journals
 - LIPics, OASlcs (and EPiC)
- The CP proceedings case is an easier move
- The Constraint case is a more difficult case:
 - Impact factor: A journal cannot live on old publications
 - Our community is too small to have 2 journals
- 2 Plans:
 - Conference: a CP vote for shifting to an OA hosted service or overlay journal
 - Journal: The current EC stays until the kickstarter vote (Michela apparently ok)

Eugene Freuder's presentation arguing to stay:

- There can be better and risky ways to achieve what we want:
 - Plan S for open source
 - Copy editing errors: Springer did not have any complaints in the past 6 months. It seems fixed so we can negotiate with Springer.
- There are positive reasons to stay:
 - Springer does provide services
 - Their web site has many features
 - They have a good reputation
 - It has worked well for 25 years
- Consider the effort and risk involved in doing something new:
 - It is not only setting things up, it is also maintaining them:
 - Maintaining a web site
 - The ACP hackathon will help. But it takes effort
 - There are success stories, but there are also failures:
 - Constraint letters. It is not on DBLP. Great effort that did not last two years.
 - We do not want a CP Brexit

Second Part: Discussion

M.: Has finished university 8 years ago but and finds it hard to access the papers. For papers on personal web pages, it is easy. Otherwise, it is very difficult without signing up.

M'.(SAT community): The case for the CP conference seems very clear: go open access. For the journal is not. One option is to put pressure on Springer: for example, say no more books published if they do not open access the proceedings and journal.

C.: Surprised to hear that Springer has a good reputation. LNCS (and Springer in general) also publish volumes of low quality.

R.: On the issue of metrics; Journal ranking is getting more serious, and the metrics are not controlled by us. Even DBLP is quite conservative (for good reasons). Open access is nice to have but can carry a major risk. How about virtual access? Every author puts their papers in an open access place (could even be a box tick when attending CP).

Thomas: It is OK to do it. But you are not authorized. There is an X months embargo.

Eugene: You can put the preprint on ArXiv. Peter van Beek got permission from Springer to keep such an archive with papers from the journal.

K. (who comes from India): I started to publish in the theoretic community (STACS?). In his community, there were similar discussions and concerns. All these concerns will last. A lot of conferences moved out. All in all, a very positive experience to go open access.

P.: TPLP is published by CUP, but all papers must appear on the ArXiv and a shadow journal which is OA. Only issue is to make people aware of what to cite (the journal). Maybe possible to put pressure on Springer to allow this?

Maria: Note that for the journal, we can only make recommendations to the editorial board.

E.: How long will Plan S take? What is Springer going to do?

Eugene: unsure but thinks it is relatively soon.

Thomas: It will not be soon. Also, Plan S allows Gold OA, where the cost is on authors. It requires costs to be made transparent, but transparency does not mean cheap: the cost of making a paper open is 2xxx \$.

Eugene: publishers make too much money, but if things worke for us, do we want to change?

J.: For young people, Springer might be evil but brings reputation (at least in France). How will young people be evaluated when they do not have Springer on their CV? I don't like Springer, but it does not cost a lot of money. It might be too early to leave, given our size, as Springer might make a move. If we do not have Springer's reputation, what is the reputation of CP? CompSci is already special: we publish in conferences rather than journals. At least, we can say that we publish at Springer.

D.: Just went for tenure, with one third of papers in Constraints. The evaluation committee did not know Constraints and never published in Springer, but they knew lncs and this was good.

R.: Whatever is your CV, they will evaluate you with metrics. Papers have to be indexed. CS is already special compared to other sciences.

T.: I am sure it will be indexed

Thomas: Must distinguish conference and journal. CP's proceedings are not indexed by Web of Science. IJCAI's are. Google Scholar indexes both. DBLP, I cannot tell. But for Corpus and Google Scholar, I have no doubt. The index depends on the reputation of the program committee. For the journal is different. The ACP should be registered to a specific international institution, and then having it indexed is a possibility. It is not a foolish move forward. There will be the kickstarter and then the ACP has to approve.

T.: AAAI is not with Springer (it is with CUP). It is Open Access and get indexed.

J.: They have 10,000 submissions this year. How many in CP. Compute the ratio.

E.: Open Access will make our papers more visible, but it would be better to make our conference more popular before switching. We like CPAIOR, but at Univ of Melbourne, it is not counted as a real publication. Once we have a strong publication, we can think about making it open.

P.: worried about the journal moving given what happened to Journal of Logic Programming: the board mass resigned from journal JLP and moved to TPLP, but the previous journal still exists. They inherited the h-index and now have a very low one. All history papers will get bad h-index by abandoning the journals. So the index is taken from what is now, not at the time we published the paper.

Thomas: The kickstarter mechanism avoids this by making it *impossible* to recruit a new editor.

P.: You cannot enforce that. In LP, everybody stopped publishing and reviewing papers for that old journal, but the journal still exists and has awful scores..

Thomas: It is irrelevant to the newer papers.

K.: It is possible for a community to move away from Springer. FTTCS??? is a conference with similar size and did it. Plus, nobody from India (and the rest of Asia) has access to Springer, they keep asking the authors by email. If the future is going to Asia, most people there do not have access to our papers. This community will move to other conferences/journals.

C.: There are arguments for and against. I would list what matters to us: visibility, reputation, access, cost. Lets list them and see pros and cons. What really is the argument.

Thomas: We had that approach

M.: Journal papers are great but are not that important. Open access for the conference is what matters most.

M.: It seems that all concerned about the move is tenured. Have not heard from young people.

J.: we have heard about what we would lose if we leave, but not what we will remain. If we leave: what is the plan and what will remain? Right now this is unclear.

Thomas: Check the LIPCS or OASIS conditions. They do it for us. Example of JAIR fully OA and fully autonomous.

Freuder: Need to find someone to lead things.

J.: How long have these proceedings been around? How successful are they?

Thomas: Don't know but I will check

Christian Schulte: I would like to stress one point. There is something implicit to that proposal. If we are moving away from Springer, Thomas assumes that the ACP will take the responsibility.

Thomas: I agree with that, There must be an upper level entity, and for me it was implicitly the ACP. It is certainly the case for CP. But it is harder for Constraints.