

Institutional Repository Project**Briefing Paper – Institutional Repository Policies****Author:** Dr PR Butler**Date:** 08 April 2008**Filename:** IRProject_BriefingPaper_IRPolicies_v1-0**Version:** 1.0 (Draft)**1. Purpose of this document**

This document summarises the policy areas that require consideration to establish and maintain an institutional repository. It is a guide for discussions around what policies will be applied to the University of Manchester's Institutional Repository.

Policy areas described here come from:

1. the Repositories Support Project website, <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/repos/rules>
2. the LEADIRS Workbook "Creating an Institutional Repository" published by MIT Libraries, <http://www.dspace.org/implement/leadirs.pdf>
3. a review of policy statements on other university repositories, see section 3

For further details contact, Dr Phil Butler, Institutional Repository Manager, Tel: 0161 275 1514, Internal: x51514, Email: p.butler@manchester.ac.uk, web: <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/institutionalrepositoryproject>.

2. Policy areas**2.1. Submission**

This covers issues of who can submit content, for example whether individuals can self-archive or individuals can submit content on behalf of others. Submission may be optional, encouraged or mandatory. Submission may be prior to or post formal publication.

Certain repository advocates have strongly argued that institutional mandates are the only way to achieve high submission rates and a repository which contains a high fraction of an institutes research outputs.

2.2. Content

This covers what is submitted, what metadata is compulsory and whether metadata-only records are allowed. A content policy determines the quality of content the repository stores. Requirements for large amounts of metadata increase the quality of information stored but may act to discourage self-archiving because of the effort required to provide the information.

In the repository community there is a debate about whether repositories should always contain only items that are available in full text so not to disappoint users and support the basic concept of open access; or whether repositories which contain metadata only records without the full text attached are still useful. In the latter scenario the presence of a metadata record at least highlights the existence of a piece of research to the wider world and makes it more visible.

The content policy would also need to cover management tasks on the repository to maintain the overall quality of content. These might include de-duplication of records, metadata checks and updates (e.g. broken URLs, empty metadata abstract, DOI), and conversion of file formats. Over time it may not be possible for repository administrators to contact the originals authors/owner of the content to authorise this changes. As a consequence administrators may need powers to undertake such operations in the absence of the original authors knowledge.

The University's Intellectual Property policy would impact on this policy area. The University's legal obligations with regards data protection, freedom of information and disability support also impact on this area.

2.3. Withdrawal/Takedown

Legal advice in the repository community recommends having a strong withdrawal/takedown policy. This is to accommodate situations where submitted content is subsequently found to breach some other policy or legal requirement (e.g. copyright). Equally this is required to accommodate complaints received from a third party. In such circumstances good practice is to immediately embargo the content, investigate the issue and restore public access to content once all parties have been informed and the issues resolved.

2.4. Metadata re-use

To maximise the exposure and impact of research outputs, it is necessary that the repository content is easily accessible to others and as widely as possible. It therefore helps to let third parties re-use the metadata for the items in your repository for their own purposes.

Metadata re-use also covers the degree of availability of content supported by the institutional repository. Normally this should be 24/7 but to accommodate maintenance operations there may be a need for "periods of risk" where access to metadata is not guaranteed.

This policy area is intended to reassure third parties can safely reuse metadata. This re-use may be for non-profit use only or both non-profit and commercial use. SHERPA/OpenDOAR recommends allowing reuse commercially because any loss of potential revenue is far outweighed by the benefits accrued from the additional exposure of your material.

2.5. Full-item re-use

This must comply with all copyright owner requirements.

Full-item re-use extends simple read access to reproduction, performance and other re-use of items in your repository. Re-use policies should always be defined explicitly. Without a stated policy, people may assume that they do not have permission to re-use full items reducing the value of the content.

Re-use permissions and conditions do not necessarily have to apply to the repository as a whole. Individual items can be tagged with differing rights permissions and conditions if required.

It is normal practice to allow people to reproduce or re-use deposited full items free of charge for personal research or study, educational purposes or not-for-profit purposes. It is usual to ask for full bibliographic references to be given and/or links/URLs to the original metadata page and retain author accreditation.

It may be necessary to state the number of copies, one, multiple or unlimited that individuals can make of the material. This also applies to web robots that harvest content for indexing by search services. Policies need to be in place to ensure fair-use of content and discourage mass downloading of content without prior permission. Text-mining and citation analysis activities apply equally here.

Generally speaking, repositories do not allow commercial re-use of full items without prior permission of the copyright holders.

2.6. Preservation

Preservation policies need to cover issues such as,

- How long do we undertake to retain items for, indefinitely or some limited period?
- What are our intentions to ensure continued readability and usability of the items in the repository?
- Does the repository support content deletion?
- How are items withdrawn? Are they deleted entirely, or do we remove them from public view? Do the original URLs remain valid, and if so, do they point to 'tombstone' citations or to replacement items?
- How does the repository accommodate corrections or data corruption?
- Does the repository allow for items to be changed after they have been committed to public view? Does the repository allow multiple versions? Does the repository allow for *addenda* and *corrigenda*?
- What happens if the institute decides to close down the repository?

This policy area has implications for hardware requirements and maintenance costs.

2.7. Embargo

This area covers processes for temporarily or indefinitely preventing content stored in the repository being publically visible, including metadata and/or the full item. This is required to support publishers copyright and where appropriate protect intellectual property.

One strategy that can be adopted as a holding measure for embargoed full item content is to make use of an e-print request button. This is a button in the metadata record activated when an embargo is in place and which allows the reader to easily contact the author of that content and request a one off copy via email or hard copy.

3. Example Institutional Repository policies

- University of Bristol Repository of Scholarly Eprints (ROSE), <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/is/library/collections/rose/>
- University of Cambridge, http://docs.repository.cam.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=40&Itemid=89
- University College London, <http://eprints.ucl.ac.uk/about.html>
- University of Nottingham, <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/policies.html>
- University of Oxford, <http://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk/access/about.php>
- University of Southampton, <http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/repositorypolicy.html>
- White Rose Research Online (Sheffield/Leeds/York universities), <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/docs/information.html>
- University of South Australia, <http://arrow.unisa.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Index>