



Contribution ID: 53

Type: not specified

## Current status of Spanish institutional open access repositories

DRIVER I project drew up a detailed report of European repositories based on data gathered in a survey in which Spain's participation was very low. Of the 12 institutional repositories registered in the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) in the sample period (June 2006 to February 2007), only three responded. This meant that Spain presented a completely false image of the implementation of repositories. It was therefore necessary to carry out a detailed national study with a high response rate offering comparable data to those obtained from the DRIVER I project. Following the model of this project, the present report wishes to show the current situation of repositories created by Spanish institutions and to fill the gap left by previous studies. The data were gathered through a web survey for which the link was communicated by e-mail to directors of universities libraries and directors of information and documentation services of research centres. The survey was sent to a total of 104 institutions. The first messages were sent in July 2008. The questions contained in the survey were the same as those used in the DRIVER I study, translated into Spanish, with a few modifications in the response options. The questionnaire was divided into the 6 sections: A: Information on the documents deposited in the repositories B: Technical infrastructure and technical issues C: Institutional policies regarding the digital repositories D: Services created on top of the digital repositories E: Stimulants and inhibitors for establishing, filling and maintaining repositories F: The institution and its digital repository

### Summary

Following the 6 sections of the survey the most relevant results and statements were as follows:

#### Information on the documents deposited in the repositories

- The majority of the materials deposited were research articles and doctoral theses.
- The number of research articles and doctoral theses deposited increased four-fold from 2007 to 2008
- In the case of journal articles the published or post-print versions were deposited in 73% of the cases.
- In order of importance, the thematic areas were social sciences, life sciences, engineering, natural sciences and plastic arts.
- Most materials were available in open access immediately or after an embargo.
- The materials deposited were far from including the whole scientific production of the institutions.
- In most cases the materials were deposited by specialized staff.

#### Technical infrastructure and technical issues

- The software most used was Dspace, followed by Eprints
- More than 90% of the IRs used persistent identifiers for the documents
- Preservation was a subject of concern and was taken into account in the management of the institutional repositories
- Over 80% of the IRs had statistics on usage and access
- The metadata standard most used was qualified and unqualified Dublin Core
- There was no agreement on whether to use controlled vocabularies or lists of subjects for indexing, or on which to use
- The use of unique author identifiers was not yet widespread (approximately 30% used it)

#### Institutional policies regarding the digital repositories

- There were no clear institutional policies, and depositing was generally voluntary
- Special interest tended to be given to open-access awareness-raising campaigns and integration in larger platforms

Services created on top of the digital repositories

- The IRs were generally included in the main directories and harvesters.
- There were as yet few repository services. The only generalized one was that of statistics.

Stimulants and inhibitors for establishing, filling and maintaining repositories

1. Most important stimulants for the development of institutional repositories:

- Our easy and simple way of using the repository.
- The increase in visibility and citations.
- The interest of decision-makers.
- Integration of the digital repository with other systems.
- Search services.

1. Most important inhibitors for the development of institutional repositories:

- Lack of institutional policies or mandates
- Lack of an institutional accountability policy.
- Lack of commitment to depositing by Spanish research financing bodies
- Lack of integration/linking of the digital repositories with other systems
- Lack of economic support from national programmes
- Lack of coordination of digital deposits by a national body

1. Most important priorities for services created on top of the digital repositories:

- Advisory services (promotion of open access)
- Citation index services
- Personalized services for authors
- Preservation services.
- Research assessment/evaluation services
- Usage statistics services

1. Priority list for the development of digital repositories at nacional and European level:

- Open access mandate
- Quality control and standards
- Clear institutional open-access policies
- Funding

**Primary author:** Dr MELERO, Reme (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (CSIC))

**Co-authors:** Prof. ERNEST, Abadal (Departament de Biblioteconomia i Documentació, Universitat de Barcelona); Prof. ABAD, Francisca (Departamento de Historia de la Ciencia y Documentación, Facultad de Medicina, Universitat de València); Prof. RODRÍGUEZ-GAIRÍN, Josep Manel (Departament de Biblioteconomia i Documentació, Universitat de Barcelona)

**Presenter:** Dr MELERO, Reme (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (CSIC))