



## **IRIScotland project extension proposal**

### ***Overview of Project***

#### **Background**

This proposal for a short extension to the IRIScotland project will build on a number of areas developed during the original IRIScotland project, which ran from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2005 until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2007. The original project built an OAI PMH based search and browse service, designed to harvest all HE research metadata in IRs for the geographic area of Scotland. In addition the project built a pilot hosting repository, designed to provide space for smaller institutions without the facilities for setting up their own repositories, or for unaffiliated scholars. The project encouraged a number of smaller institutions to participate in the initial testing of the IRIScotland hosting repository. We visited these institutions initially to assess the requirement for repositories and open access approaches (18 institutions in all). Later we visited a smaller number of institutions which were in a position make submissions to the hosting repository, and demonstrated the technology on site. This process took place relatively late in the project, so there was not much opportunity to capitalise on this user feedback for the development of the hosting repository.

The project also explored metadata issues for the Scottish geographic area, and produced good practice guidelines and a draft metadata agreement. During the period of the project the ePrints Application Profile was under development (later the Scholarly Works Profile). A number of issues arise from the development of application profiles for repositories, some of which are cultural, and some represent technical challenges for repository developers and implementers. These require further exploration, particularly it will be possible to expose richer SWAP profile metadata in the near future.

A third area explored by the project is network infrastructure. The project presented on this subject in San Antonio in the US, in Geneva, and in Manchester in 2007.

We also produced a deliverable on the subject of network infrastructure for repositories (D1.6/D4.4), outlining the functional possibilities of an organised and efficient infrastructure, including de-duplication of records, disambiguation, name authority services, enhancement of metadata records, etc. This was included as a section in the IRIScotland project final report. Throughout the project we were conscious that developments in the UK information environment could result in duplication of effort (particularly in harvesting), loss of quality in search results, and uncertainty among researchers and stakeholders about the usability of the results.

#### **Aims and Objectives**

##### Technical Development

The extension to the project will create a branded access point for the pilot hosting repository, designed to supply repository services for smaller institutions (WP2). At the moment it is possible to search the holdings of individual Scottish IRs through the central harvester's search facility. However we do not have branded access to the hosting repository available. The presence of such branded space, tailorable for each institutions requirements (via stylesheets) would be a major incentive for smaller institutions to become involved in depositing their research output in the hosting repository.

Project Acronym: IRIScotland  
Version:0.4  
Contact:philip.hunter@ed.ac.uk  
Date: 25 March 2008

The new version of Digital Commons is using brandable space for researchers, departments and individuals as a major selling point for institutions interested in having a third-party IR service.<sup>1</sup>

There are two very significant differences between the Digital Commons implementation of hosting and search and the IRIScotland model – Digital Commons makes cross search possible by including everything within the same database. The IRIScotland approach is distributed, and exploits metadata harvested from independently managed institutional repositories.. The Digital Commons business model prices its services by the number of students per institution served, and the pricing model starts with institutions having no less than 3,000 students. Digital Commons is therefore not addressing the requirements of the academic community in the same way (we are aiming to provide hosting services for institutions of around 400 students downwards, and demonstrating services aiming at a global view of research outputs within a geographic area).

#### Metadata Guidelines

We can extend the good practice guidance for metadata produced by the original project, and include advice on the use and implementation of the SWAP profile and other modified DC-based profiles (WP3). It is expected that these will come into use in the near future. There is also some work which needs to be done on promoting both the metadata agreement and its use within the Scottish Common Information Environment. The Centre for Digital Library Research (CDLR) at the University of Strathclyde will provide an updated set of guidelines, in conjunction with other interested parties, including the Scottish Library and Information Council (SLIC), the Scottish Common Information Environment, and the Scottish Government. The CDLR will also produce an updated version of the draft metadata agreement for Scotland, taking account of richer APs, and promote the take-up of this agreement by SCURL, SLIC and the Scottish Government. The project will present at one international conference.

#### Advocacy

Further advocacy work needs to be done, principally on the basis of the response to the initial project survey (April – May 2006), the follow-up tour of institutions (spring – autumn 2007), and the site visits and demonstrations which took place between November and December 2008 (WP4). Following on from this work, we will carry out a series of discussion groups with academics at institutions within Scotland. These meetings will be with academics publishing research, rather than the senior librarians, librarians, & and technical implementers we met with during the original project. The NLS business analyst and the project manager will do demonstrations and walkthroughs in the case of institutions which have no IR of their own.

The aim will be to ask in more detail for their views on open access, and repositories, why they do /do not deposit in either institutional or subject based repositories, what their views are on mandates etc. These discussions will be carried out locally at a range of institutions. The geographical spread will cover Aberdeen, Dundee, Stirling, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and St. Andrews. We will engage the help of the Scottish Library & Information Council to help us access the Scottish Government in order to promote the use of the technology and open access in general. The project will close with an advocacy event.

#### Network Infrastructure

We propose to survey the issues around network infrastructures with other players in the field, with a view to understanding to scope and the desirability of agreeing a way of working, in order to create efficient and quality assured processes for repository aggregation and search (WP5). We also intend to discuss the consequences of the absence of rational network infrastructure.

---

<sup>1</sup> The system was demonstrated in a webinar with Robin Beecroft, Tim Tamminga and Mahendra Mahey on the 13<sup>th</sup> of March 2008.

The existing IRIScotland project Board remains in place, and will continue to oversee and advise on further work. All partners in the original project have confirmed their willingness to continue their involvement in an extension to the project. Management of the project will be through a management group composed of the workpackage leaders.

The proposed period for the project is from the 25<sup>th</sup> of March until the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2008.

## Project Outputs

- Public branded access point for smaller institutions to virtual repository space in the hosting repository (WP2)
- Report on metadata good practice for application profiles, including the Scholarly Works AP.(WP3)
- Updated metadata guidelines for Scottish Institutional Repositories. (WP3)
- Report on Network Infrastructure issues and requirements up to the European level (WP5).
- Advocacy work based on the existence and usability of the IRIScotland aggregation & search service, and the hosting repository.
- An advocacy event to promote the work of the project. General dissemination. (WP4)
- Final Project Report (WP1)

## Gantt Chart for IRIScotland project extension

Wkpackage	March	April	May	June	July	August
WP1 Project management	Plan	Project meeting (monthly)	Project meeting (monthly)	Project meeting (monthly)	Project meeting (monthly)	Final project report/ Dissemination event
WP2 Technical development		User consultation	Revision and iterative development	Final development & testing work		Availability of institutionally branded repository space
WP3 Metadata Guidelines		Extension of metadata guidelines	Extension of metadata guidelines	Extension of metadata guidelines	Completion of WP3 deliverables	Involvement in dissemination event
WP4 Open Access Advocacy		Meetings with academic researchers across Scotland (in conjunction with NLS business analyst where appropriate). Meeting with Scottish Government.				Report on Advocacy
WP5 Network Infrastructure		Email discussion with WP5 participants	Teleconference & email discussion	Teleconference and email discussion	Email discussion and report writing	Report on Repository Network Infrastructure issues
WP6 Formative evaluation		At project meetings	At project meetings	At project meetings	At project meetings	Evaluation report



## Appendix B. Workpackages

<p>Workpackage 1 – Project Management</p> <p>Workpackage Leader Philip Hunter</p>	<p>Co-ordination of the project (0.5FTE), organisation of meetings and events; production of the two paper deliverables from WP3 &amp; 5; and the final project report. Representation of the project at site visits, and at external conferences and meetings. Co-ordination of dissemination, and day-to-day running of the project. Co-ordination of a project management group. Liaison with the existing IRIScotland project Board.</p> <p>We are also proposing a large meeting at the end of the project, where we will invite people from across Scotland (including members of the Scottish Government, with SLIC as liaison on our behalf, and the Sunday Times in Scotland) to both promote the prototype services, and sum up the project. All partners will participate in this meeting.</p>
<p>Workpackage 2. Development of Hosting Repository Browsing Interface</p> <p>WP Leader James Toon</p>	<p>This will be co-ordinated by the project, and the programmer will be seconded from Edinburgh University for a period of two months during the five months of the project. The actual development work will be done in conjunction with the National Library of Scotland Trusted Digital Repository (TDR) team, who were responsible for the technical development of the IRIScotland hosting repository from the summer of 2007 up until the end of the project in December 2007, and are continuing to develop and refine the deposit functions and workflow aspects of the repository.</p> <p>1 month user consultation and prototype development work on the branded repository front-end, 1 month revision and iterative development of functionality in consultation with the business analyst and the user group, 2 months of final development and testing work on the branded repository front-end.</p> <p>The NLS TDR manager will manage the development of the user interface. The goal is the production of a branded interface to the repository for institutions who require virtual repository space, such as the Scottish Crop Research Institute, Glasgow School of Art, the Scottish Agricultural College, Glasgow Caledonian University, and the National Library of Scotland. For the duration of the project we will have access to the services of a business analyst supplied by the National Library of Scotland, to refine the requirements of the branded view of the IRIScotland hosting repository (0.25 FTE).</p>
<p>Workpackage 3 Metadata Guidelines</p> <p>Workpackage Leader: Dennis Nicholson</p>	<p>The metadata guidelines produced during the original IRIScotland project were concerned with the application profiles which existing repository configurations can expose for harvesting. During the course of the project, we were involved in the development of the Scholarly Works Application Profile (SWAP), which is an AP based on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) model. With the arrival of plugins in the near future for repository technologies, making it possible to expose other and richer metadata profiles, good practice guidance requires to be extended to SWAP. The Centre for Digital Library Research (CDLR) at the University of Strathclyde will provide an updated set of guidelines, in conjunction with other interested parties, including the Scottish</p>

	<p>Library and Information Council (SLIC), the Scottish Common Information Environment, and the Scottish Government. The CDLR will also produce an updated version of the draft metadata agreement for Scotland, taking account of richer APs, and promote the take-up of this agreement by SCURL, SLIC and the Scottish Government. The project will present at one international conference.</p> <p>There will be two conference meetings, conducted by Access Grid, by telephone, or in person in Edinburgh or Glasgow. Dennis Nicholson will co-ordinate the production of the updated guidelines and the metadata agreement for Scotland. The deliverables will be produced by month 5 of the project.</p>
<p>Workpackage 4 Advocacy Strand</p> <p>Workpackage Leader: Susan Ashworth.</p>	<p>Following on from the survey and advocacy work carried out during the original project, we will carry out a series of discussion groups with academics at institutions within Scotland. We will organise a number half-day events around Scotland These meetings will be with academics publishing research, rather than the senior librarians, librarians, &amp; and technical implementers we met with during the original project. The NLS business analyst and the project manager will do demonstrations and walkthroughs in the case of institutions which have no IR of their own.</p> <p>The aim will be to ask in more detail for their views on open access, and repositories, why they do /do not deposit in either institutional or subject based repositories, what their views are on mandates etc. These discussions will be carried out locally at a range of institutions.</p> <p>We will ask library staff at the various institutions to identify interested academics and to set up the meetings. Funds will be required to pay for local hospitality and also to pay for the costs in travelling to the institutions. Payment will not be required for staff time.</p> <p>Start date: mid-April. End date: end July.  Geographical spread: aiming to cover Aberdeen, Dundee, Stirling, Edinburgh, Glasgow, possibly St. Andrews  Frequency of meetings: intention to have one or two meetings in the same geographical location on the same day, half-day event at each institution.</p> <p>Personnel: Morag Greig, Susan Ashworth (Glasgow University), plus contributions from library staff at individual institutions (i.e. organising participants, venues, catering etc.)  The findings will be written up in a short report, and there will be a presentation at a concluding event.</p>
<p>Workpackage 5 Network Infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Workpackage Leader: Philip Hunter</p>	<p>The issues around network infrastructures will be surveyed and analysed with other players in the repository field, with a view to understanding to scope and the desirability of agreeing a way of working as part of a rational infrastructure, in order to create efficient and quality assured processes for repository aggregation and search. The consequences of the absence of rational network infrastructure will also be discussed. Issues include:</p>

	<p>disambiguation of records, deduplication, name authority functions, the use and scope of identifiers and document handles; workflows for repository infrastructures, etc. What is best done at which level of infrastructural service will be explored, building on the outline of a possible infrastructure included in the IRIScotland Final Report. Those who have agreed to participate in this study, and to provide recommendations where possible, include Ethosnet at the British Library, Intute, 'The Depot' (EDINA), the National Library of Scotland, The Edinburgh Research Archive, and the Centre for Digital Library Research. There will also be involvement by the Scottish Library and Information Council (they are also contributing £5000 for dissemination). We also will solicit a contribution from DRIVER, to explore the European level of integration of network infrastructure for repositories.</p> <p>There will be at least two conference meetings conducted either by Access Grid or by telephone. The co-ordination and development of the deliverable (a paper report) will be conducted by email and telephone discussion. The final version of the report will be complete by month 5 of the project (August 2008).</p>
<p>Workpackage 6   Workpackage leader Carolyn Rowlinson   Formative project evaluation</p>	<p>This workpackage will monitor the mechanics of the project's progress. The leader of the workpackage will be closely involved in key meetings and will report on progress at the end of week 10 of the project, and at the close of the project in August.</p>

**Project personnel:**

Project Director: Sheila Cannell (Director of Library Services, Edinburgh University Library)

Philip Hunter (0.5 FTE) Project Manager (WP 1 & 5) (Edinburgh University Library)  
Martin Velecky (1 FTE, 2 months) Java Programmer (Edinburgh University Library)

James Toon, TDR Manager at the National Library of Scotland (WP2)  
Susan Ashworth, Glasgow University Library (WP4)  
Morag Greig, Glasgow University Library (WP4)  
Dennis Nicholson, Director of the Centre for Digital Library Research, University of Strathclyde (WP3)  
Gordon Dunsire, Deputy Director of the Centre for Digital Library Research, University of Strathclyde (WP3); Carolyn Rowlinson, University of Stirling

Other personnel who have agreed to participate in our workpackage no 5 on 'Network Infrastructure issues include: Chris Awre (University of Hull) and Anthony Troman (British Library), both representing the Ethosnet project; Christine Rees and Theo Andrew of EDINA, representing The Depot; Vic Lyte (Intute) and Linda Kerr (Intute RS).

The DRIVER project will also be invited to contribute a European perspective to this report.