Breakout Group 1: Business models

The discussion covered a number of topics that fell under the major headings of viability, sustainability and adaptability of digital repositories. The participants indicated the specific issues they wanted to discuss from a pre-prepared suggested set of topics, as follows:

The business case:
- Contributions from people who have successfully made the case to launch a repository gave a flavour of the ways this might be tackled:
- At one university the agreement of senior management was obtained on the basis of a case for preserving the research output of the university. Once this was secured, researchers were consulted and informed and won over to the idea of a repository. The repository was launched, initially using three existing staff who were moved from their current roles into repository-related work. Over time, three additional staff were recruited.
- One university began by creating a CRIS and then making the case to management that this management information tool would be improved by turning it into a proper research repository
- The Netherlands Cream of Science project acted as a stimulus in some cases, being a motivating tool for getting repositories set p and being filled in Dutch universities

User requirements work:
We discussed the usefulness of looking carefully at the user constituency before setting up a repository. People in different disciplines have varying information outputs – file formats, output frequency, the use of preprints, the importance of conference proceedings, books, and so forth. Understanding these variations enables better earl planning and progress, and helps to get the expectations right for the early days of the repository operation. One important reference in this respect is the findings from the TARDIS study (reported in an article by Jessie Hey in D-Lib magazine in 2003

Costs:
There was a brief discussion on the relative merits of using open source or proprietary software. Open source software is free, of course, but the loss of locally-required functionality is the trade-off.

The deposit process:
We addressed quality control in some depth, particularly how authors can be persuaded to incorporate deposit in their usual workflow. The more the authors do, the less effort falls upon the repository staff. Quality control of metadata entry can be achieved to a great extent by the repository software, which can auto-complete journal titles, for example to minimise keying errors by the depositor. Nonetheless, some repository managers hold the view that authors cannot create high-quality metadata, and certainly when enhancement of the metadata needs to be done this is a professional cataloguer's task, so there is an implication for repository staff in this respect. One participant, a researcher, suggested that the low voluntary rate of self-archiving by authors can be supplemented by repository staff harvesting items from author websites, where a higher number of authors tend to place their articles and other outputs. Respected thought-leaders within the researcher body in a university can be extremely effective in setting a self-archiving example and acting as champions for the repository and its goals.

The business plan:
The discussion centred on the fact that in many cases a formal business plan for the repository is not developed. One participant advised that a business plan should be made in all cases, *in the very least* for working out where the hurdles and bottlenecks are likely to occur in the progress of the repository.

Measures of success:
Comments on this topic were as follows:
- The number of items (preferably full-text articles) in the repository is the basic measure. The approach of this university was to set a target for a critical mass of documents in the repository and then, once that was achieved, to begin to build services upon the repository to really demonstrate its usefulness to the institution.
- A critical mass of documents is required if successful advocacy is to be carried out to the researcher community.

The influence of open access publishing (journals):
One participant raised the issue of the implications of open access article processing charges (APCs) being part of library budgets and what this might mean for repositories. Some funders are now willing to pay APCs and Wellcome, for instance, pays a lump sum for this purpose to institutions where it has grantholders. Some people were of the opinion that such APC money should remain in the research departments to pay directly for the publication of individual articles. Some OA publishers, though, have a membership scheme for institutions and membership fees tend to become the responsibility of the library. One person suggested that these fees should be viewed simply as another subscription that the library pays for, and as a longterm investment for a better future. But one thing that should NOT be paid from this pot of cash is 'open choice' APC fees (APCs charged by publishers who offer authors a is closed access. The reasoning is that the library has already paid for a subscription to that journal and should not pay twice.

Repository services:
Discussions on this topic were quite wide-ranging:

- Aron Lindhagen gave us a quick overview of the Lund Virtual Medical Journal, which is a virtual journal with issues compiled on a monthly basis by Lund University Library staff and is a listing, with pointers to the fulltext, of articles published (in any journal) by researchers in Lund's medical faculty. An 'article of the month' scheme has proved to be an attention-catcher and is very popular with researchers. Other faculties are now interested in emulating the idea. The LVMJ was not altogether smooth to set up but it is now working well.
- Other university libraries are supporting e-journal publishing by faculty using the Open Journal System software. The repository s not necessarily involved in this process although it may be used as a submission and storage location for articles.
- Data publishing is making data much more interesting and useful to the research community. A prediction from one of the participants was that repositories would be reclaimed from service areas, ridding themselves of the image (which they do sometimes have) of being 'graveyards' for articles, and instead really become a way to help researchers go about their work.
- One delegate reported that the services developed on his repository were so useful that it was difficult to keep up with user demands. A lesson – but a happy one – to finish on!

Alma Swan
Moderator