

eFAIR Cluster Meeting Minutes

Date and time Tuesday, 24th June 2003 11:00 – 12:30

Place Warwick Suite, Warwick Hilton Hotel

Present Neil Jacobs (ILRT), Pauline Simpson (TARDis), Jessie Hey (TARDis), Rachel Heery (ePrints UK), Susan Ashworth (Daedalus), Morag Mackie (Daedalus), Alison Allden (FAIR Advisory Board), Michael Day (ePrints UK), Bill Hubbard (SHERPA), Steven Hitchcock (FAIR Advisory Board), Gordon Dunsire (HaIRST), Fabio Simeoni (HaIRST), Susan Copeland (Electronic Theses), Richard Jones (Theses Alive!), Andrew Penman (Electronic Theses), Theo Andrew (Theses Alive!), Chris Awre (FAIR Programme Manager).

Apologies None

1) Deposit Agreements and the removal of material

Pauline Simpson (PS) reminded the eFAIR cluster group that the ePrints Soton deposit agreement has been circulated (<http://tardis.eprints.org/discussion/>) and welcomed feedback and discussion, especially concerning the author's right to remove work from the repository. A number of points were raised both for and against removal of work from repositories. A key issue raised by Bill Hubbard (BH) was that institutional repositories should be viewed by the academic community as reliable and that removing material would compromise this position. Too much change from the current 'print' system could lead to the situation where e-prints won't be cited. PS reiterated the point that not allowing removal may deter potential depositors. Richard Jones (RJ) pointed out that if pre-prints are cited then there is a clear need for a paper trail back to the original article, preferably with links to any post-prints if available. Removal of work will obscure this process. Rachel Heery (RH) and Gordon Dunsire (GD) both voiced caution and preferred to have an option for removal, perhaps moderated by an administrator. BH and Fabio Simeoni (FS) both suggested that pre-prints could be kept in institutional repositories but made unavailable to the public, unlike post-prints, which would be in the public domain. Access to pre-prints could possibly be mediated by the repository itself (BH) or through communication with the original author (FS).

The discussion was continued by BH who wanted to know whether we should be more explicit regarding the status of deposited material, as Nottingham has an assumption of permanence for all material. Susan Copeland (SC) suggested that the key issue is expectation. If some form of wording to allow withdrawal of material could be agreed upon and used, then removal of pre-prints at a later date would be acceptable to most parties. BH and Susan Ashworth (SA) also both suggested making it implicit that the pre-print status was impermanent, possibly through a disclaimer (SA) stating the pre-print represented work-in-progress. GD added to this point by suggesting that the distinction between refereed/non-refereed statuses should be incorporated in the metadata, as any institutional repository has a duty to inform potential users of the reliability of material. PS mentioned that the Status metadata field indicating refereed etc was already available in the original GNU Eprints software. BH reminded the Group that SHERPA would be defining Deposit

Agreement elements in a Work Package but this information would not be available until March 2004. A consensus: that the citation should remain in the database but annotated with an audit trail; any Deposit Agreement to reflect the above discussion. BH - maybe "any Deposit Agreement to take account of the issues raised in making clear the expectations and implications of deposition."

Action: TARDiS to circulate an amended deposit agreement (PS)

The discussions on resource type, status and interrelationships repeatedly raised the question of metadata standardisation to enable and simplify the development of post-harvesting services. In particular, FS felt that this is one of the most important missions of the cluster, and that other decisions are more parochial in nature and have no obvious benefit with regards to their standardisation. Various objections to this last point were raised, including the standard IPR issues and also that of users needs (MM).

2) RAE and Institutional Repositories

CA brought up the point of how external sources may influence institutional repositories (e.g. RAE). Michael Day (MD) indicated that under a different model we couldn't pre-empt what the new rules would be. However, it was suggested that if pre-prints weren't included in future RAE then institutions would not be keen to include such material in their repositories (GD). The final message was that there is an inherent danger if we try to sell institutional repositories as something else, rather than just addressing the original aim of improving scholarly communication. BH indicated that institutional repositories should be held separate from the RAE or research will be further incorporated into the political process.

3) News from RoMEO

The OAI will be working with the RoMEO project to develop a white paper on disclosing and harvesting rights under the OAI-PMH. This will then be discussed by a specially established OAI technical committee on rights, refined, and put out to the whole community for further discussion. It is hoped that the final specification will be completed by February 2004.

4) Document Types in GNU EPrints

TARDiS is looking at a variety of factors acting as barriers to deposit they have included the GNU Eprints software in this evaluation. Document types offered in the original software are not mutually exclusive and could present a difficult decision point early in the deposit process. The software code has been amended to offer rationalized document types within the TARDiS Project. Useful comments on the rationalized document types were contributed by the Group, however, a more thorough consultation is required before the TARDiS interface is released and possibly included in future versions of the GNU EPrints software.

Action: circulate TARDiS interface to cluster group (PS)

Other topics suggested for discussion

Multiple Authors (DAEDALUS)

Theses to be held centrally or at institution (ELECTRONIC THESES)

Open Access Journals (SHERPA)

Subject v Institutional Archives (EPRINTS UK / SHERPA)

Metadata Quality (ALL)