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Introduction

The CAIRSS 2012 Repository Managers Survey was conducted in June 2012. The response rate for the survey was 93.4% (43 out of a possible 46 respondents) – the highest response rate for a CAIRSS online survey to date. The 2012 Survey included respondents from across both the 39 Australian CAIRSS members and the 7 New Zealand CAIRSS members. The survey questions focused on several areas including general repository questions; repository staffing; repository software; repository statistics; repository copyright; mandates and policies; research workflows; repository perceptions; data management; and CAIRSS feedback.

The 2012 Survey was based on the previous 3 years of CAIRSS surveys (2009-2011). This was done so that trends may be established in some of the areas. In 2012 new areas were added to the survey including funding, and a section on how repositories seek feedback from their users.

Methodology

The 2012 Survey was conducted as an online survey in the same way as the 2010 and 2011 surveys. The CAIRSS Advisory Committee was given the opportunity to provide feedback on the Survey questions, and feedback received was integrated into the Survey structure. This included the inclusion of new questions in other existing areas, removal of some questions, and the two new sections.

Once the online survey had been constructed with the incorporated feedback from the Advisory Committee, all CAIRSS repository managers were invited to participate on a voluntary basis. Participants were informed that the sharing of the data from the 2012 Survey would be slightly different to in previous years. Where previously the dataset from the Survey had been de-identified before it was made available on the CAIRSS private website, the 2012 dataset would not be de-identified. The manner in which information from the Survey was made available has not changed in 2012 though – the Summary Report is still to be made available on the CAIRSS public website, and the dataset will still be available on the CAIRSS private website.

Participants were given ten days to complete the survey, and also invited to post any queries or requests for clarification about the Survey to the CAIRSS Repository Program Coordinator. Reminders were sent to all participants at regular intervals during the survey period.
Findings

The response rate from CAIRSS members in 2012 increased from 2011 to 93.4% (82.2% in 2011, 82% in 2010). There were two respondents within that group however, who chose not to answer most of the questions.

The 93.4% response rate included six out of a possible 7 CONZUL CAIRSS members (NZ) and 37 out of a possible 39 CAUL CAIRSS members (Australia).

General

Number of records in research repository

A steady increase in the amount of content in repositories can be seen over the four years of CAIRSS Surveys. In 2011 largest bracket of research repositories reported between 5,000 and 9,999 records (41%). However in 2012 the largest bracket are those repositories with between 10,000 and 19,999 (32%). Figure 1 below shows that the number of repositories with higher numbers of records is steadily increasing. It is also interesting to note that the percentage of repositories with more than 30,000 records is also increasing (15%).

![Figure 1: Number of records in research repository](image)

Percentage of Open Access records

The percentage of Open Access records in research repositories has been a continued point of interest to the CAIRSS Community and 2012 has proved to be no different. After a decrease in the 2010 percentage which was partly attributed to the ERA (Excellence in Research Australia) exercise, the 2011 percentage showed a slight increase. In 2012, when the second ERA was conducted, this percentage has once again dropped. It is possible that the ERA has again impacted upon the percentage of Open Access records for a number of reasons:

1. The prioritization of ERA activities in the appropriate timeframes within an institution means that recruiting the appropriate content for submission (which may include “dark” content) can take priority over recruitment of purely Open Access content; and

2. The requirement for institutions to retain content purely for ERA purposes, which may be so-called “dark” content, that is, content which is accessible only for ERA assessors, and not Open Access.

When the CONZUL institutions are removed from the responses, Figure 2 shows that in 2011 the percentage across Australian universities had increased to 37%, but that in 2012 it dropped back to 34%. While it is possible that this may be partly attributed to the ERA 2012 exercise, and anecdotal evidence supports this, it is also possible that further demands on institutional research repositories examined later in this report may also be partly responsible for this drop. If the CONZUL CAIRSS
members are included in the percentage of Open Access records, the figure increases to 40%. Alone, the CONZUL CAIRSS members reported 72% Open Access records in their institutional research repositories.

Given the NHMRC open access mandate announced in 2012, it will be useful to monitor this figure. 2013 will be a year with no ERA exercise, and the impact of the NHMRC mandate will start to be seen, so it is anticipated that there may be a rise in the overall percentage of Open Access content in Australian research repositories.

![Figure 2 Percentage of Open Access Records in Research Repository](image)

**Long term plan**

Questions in the 2012 around the area of long term planning for the repository were moved into the “General” section of the Survey.

Figure 3 shows that almost 60% of institutions reported they have no long-term strategy for their research repository, with almost 15% unsure as to whether one existed. Only 26.83% reported that they had a strategy.

![Figure 3 Does your Institution have a long-term strategy?](image)
Repository deposit mandates

Questions around the area of institutional mandates were also moved to the “General” section in 2012. Respondents were asked to indicate the existence of deposit mandates that exist in the institution. Looking at Figure 4 and 5, it can be seen that mandated deposit for ‘all research’ may possibly be on the increase, but that mandated deposit for Theses has possibly decreased. It is possible that the figures for both of these may have been impacted by variance in the 2011 respondents.

In 2012 CAUL CAIRSS respondents were also asked to indicate whether their institution mandates HERDC content. Almost two-thirds of institutions (64%) indicated that they do not mandate deposit
on HERDC content, nor does any other type of mandate outside of “all research”, theses, and HERDC exist at their institution.

### Figure 6 Mandated Deposit for HERDC and “Other” (2012 only)

#### Staffing

In 2012, respondents were once again asked to indicate which area within the institution the research repository sits. The figures have again remained fairly consistent, with the large majority of research repositories sitting under the direction of the Library (93%), or a combination of areas which include the Library.

### Figure 7 University areas responsible for research repositories
In 2012 the CAIRSS Survey asked respondents whether there had been any increase in research repository staffing in the previous 12 months. Almost three-quarters of respondents (73%) stated that there had been no increase in staffing in the previous 12 months.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their institution had undertaken research repository staff costing exercises in the previous 12 months. While this figure in 2011 indicated that most institutions (64%) had not undertaken a staff costing exercise, in 2012 this figure has increased even further with 83% of respondents reporting that they have not undertaken any staffing costing exercises in the past 12 months (Figure 8).

![Figure 8 Has your institution undertaken any research repository staff costing exercises in the past 12 months?](chart)

### Software

As in previous CAIRSS Surveys, respondents were asked to report on the software platform and version used for their institutional research repository. In 2011 some of the figures reported appeared somewhat skewed, due to a variance in which institutions chose to respond to the survey. In 2012, the figures reported have provided a far more accurate picture of software platforms in use throughout Australian and New Zealand institutional research repositories.

Figure 9 (below) shows that in 2012 the Dspace software platform is the most commonly used, followed by the VTLS VITAL software. Eprints and DigiTool maintain a steady presence within the IR community, followed by Bepress (Digital Commons), and Fez.
Statistics

Survey respondents were asked to indicate what types of statistics are currently in use with the research repository. In 2011, results indicated that just over 72% of institutions had some sort of end-user statistics in place, but fewer institutions (61%) indicated that they had some sort of back-end management statistics. In 2012, figures show that 83% of institutions have some sort of end-user statistics in place (Figure 10), while 80% of respondents indicated that they have some sort of management statistics (Figure 11).

Results show that while quite a number of institutions have some sort of end-user statistics in place, fewer institutions make use of management or back-end statistics, but that the use of both types of statistics seems to be on the increase. Repository statistics continues to be an area of interest to the CAIRSS Community with active discussions on the CAIRSS eList.
Figure 11 Are back-end management statistics in use in your research repository?

Links with Research Systems

Throughout the last 12 months, further work appears to have been done within the community around repository linkages with research management systems. Respondents were asked whether their research repository is integrated into a workflow with the institutional research management system. Figure 12 shows that in 2011, 64% of participants indicated that their research repository was integrated in some way with their research management system. In 2012, this figure has increased to 70% who now indicate that there is some integration.

Figure 12 Is your institutional research repository integrated into the workflow with your research management system?

Participants were also asked to indicate in which direction the data flows between the research repository and the research management system. Figures from the 2012 Survey (Figure 13) show an increase from the 2011 figures (Figure 14) in the number of repositories indicating that data flows from the institutional repository (IR) to the research management system (RMS) from 26.1% in 2011 to 41% in 2012. As in 2011 however, most of the workflows still go from the RMS to the IR.
The Copyright section of the CAIRSS survey was altered in 2012. As a topic of great interest within the CAIRSS eList continues to be that of copyright deposit permissions and retrospective theses permissions, this was integrated into the Copyright section of the 2012 Survey.

Each year the CAIRSS survey has asked respondents to indicate their usage of the OAKList, and each year this figure has steadily increased. However in 2012 for the first time this figure has dropped quite significantly to 68% from the 2011 figure of 92% (Figure 15). Given that the importance of Open Access and copyright permissions in research repositories does not seem to have diminished amongst the CAIRSS Community, further research needs to be conducted into why this figure has dropped so significantly – for example, are repository managers using other means of finding out this information, and if so, what are those other means? Or, is community knowledge at a level now that such resources are no longer required?
For the 2012 Survey, two questions were added around the area of retrospective submission of theses into the research repository. Firstly, participants were asked whether this has occurred within their institution, and secondly, participants were asked whether permission is sought from the thesis author prior to the thesis being added to the research repository.

The majority (75%) of institutions reported that yes, they had undertaken retrospective submission of theses into their research repository. The manner of these activities ranged from one-off projects to initiate an e-thesis submission policy, through to on-demand submission (i.e., as a thesis is requested), through to large-scale digitization projects. The majority (63%) also indicated that they sought permission from the thesis author prior to depositing the thesis. Some institutions indicated that they seek permission from every thesis author, whereas others indicate that they place the item in the repository and work with a take-down policy whereby an author may request the thesis be removed.

Data management

Throughout 2012, data management has continued as an area of interest for research repositories. As a number of institutions have now been involved in ANDS-related projects such as Seeding the Commons and Metadata Stores, participants were asked to indicate which data management solution is currently in use at their institution, choosing from ReDBox, VIVO/VITRO, or Other. While most participants indicated that they were either unsure, or as yet have no data management solution implemented, 16% of respondents indicated that they are using ReDBox, and 8% indicated they are using VIVO. 5% indicated an ‘Other’ which included in-house solutions. A number of the participants who selected ‘None’ also indicated that progress was being made towards either a ReDBox or VIVO solution, as their ANDS Metadata Stores project progresses.

Figure 15 Do you use OAKList?

For the 2012 Survey, two questions were added around the area of retrospective submission of theses into the research repository. Firstly, participants were asked whether this has occurred within their institution, and secondly, participants were asked whether permission is sought from the thesis author prior to the thesis being added to the research repository.

The majority (75%) of institutions reported that yes, they had undertaken retrospective submission of theses into their research repository. The manner of these activities ranged from one-off projects to initiate an e-thesis submission policy, through to on-demand submission (i.e., as a thesis is requested), through to large-scale digitization projects. The majority (63%) also indicated that they sought permission from the thesis author prior to depositing the thesis. Some institutions indicated that they seek permission from every thesis author, whereas others indicate that they place the item in the repository and work with a take-down policy whereby an author may request the thesis be removed.

Data management

Throughout 2012, data management has continued as an area of interest for research repositories. As a number of institutions have now been involved in ANDS-related projects such as Seeding the Commons and Metadata Stores, participants were asked to indicate which data management solution is currently in use at their institution, choosing from ReDBox, VIVO/VITRO, or Other. While most participants indicated that they were either unsure, or as yet have no data management solution implemented, 16% of respondents indicated that they are using ReDBox, and 8% indicated they are using VIVO. 5% indicated an ‘Other’ which included in-house solutions. A number of the participants who selected ‘None’ also indicated that progress was being made towards either a ReDBox or VIVO solution, as their ANDS Metadata Stores project progresses.
Participants were asked whether data management at their institution is integrated with their research repository. The majority (88%) indicated that no, there was as yet no integration. Only 10% of respondents indicated that there was some integration. Of the four (4) who indicated some integration, three indicated that the integration went from the data management system to the research repository, and only one indicated that the integration was from the IR to the data management system. Some respondents also indicated that some level of integration is currently being planned.

Further to this, respondents were asked whether there were plans to use the research repository to house research data metadata in the next 12 months. Interestingly, while 37% of respondents indicated that yes, there were plans to do this, 41% indicated that there were no plans, with 22% unsure. Of those who indicated there were no current plans, several indicated that it was still being considered for the future.

Given that the area of research data management will continue to impact upon research repositories, further monitoring of the integration between the two would be beneficial to the Community.

As with previous years, the survey asked respondents to indicate what (if any) persistent identifiers were in use in the research repository. Respondents were permitted to select more than one option, as different types of persistent identifiers are often found in use for different purposes. Figure 17 shows that institutions are still making significant use of Handles and DOIs. Some participants also commented that they were currently planning to implement other types of identifiers for other purposes, for example, research data.
Figure 17 Have you implemented any of the following types of persistent identifiers in your research repository?

Funding

One of the new sections in the 2012 Survey was around the funding of the research repository. The first question asked whether the research repository is funded through the library’s operational budget, and 90% of respondents indicated that this is the case (Figure 18).

Figure 18 Is the research repository funded through the library’s operational budget?

Participants were also asked whether any further funding is received to support the research repository. 68% of respondents indicated that there was no further funding provided, with only 27%
indicating that further funding was provided. Those who responded that there was some further funding were asked to provide more information on where this funding came from. Most respondents indicated that the further funding came from the Research Office to support HERDC, ERA or PBRF (NZ) processes, or from other project-related funds.

Non-CAIRSS Collaboration, Support and Linkages

CAIRSS Survey respondents were asked to indicate whether they are members of a repository software user group. 72.5% said that yes, they are members of a user group, with 21% finding the user group ‘Very Helpful’ and 62% finding the user group ‘Helpful’.

Most of the Survey respondents indicated that they subscribe to between one and three mailing lists (49%) while 29% subscribe to between four and six, and 7% subscribe to more than six. 14.6% responded that they do not subscribe to any mailing lists. When looking at RSS feeds, just over half (52%) indicated that they do not subscribe to any repository related RSS feeds, and 41% indicated that they subscribe to between one and three RSS feeds.

It is also interesting to note that many CAIRSS Community members (80.5%) do not have frequent (more than once a month) person-to-person collaboration with specific repository managers. Of the 19.5% who do, most stated that having similar software, or a repository manager's personal networks were usually what precipitated this collaboration.

CAIRSS Feedback

Feedback for CAIRSS included areas to be targeted by CAIRSS, and areas of improvement for the service. Two main areas of interest were described by the majority of respondents, and so come through as clearly being desired as target areas for future focus:

- Support and advocacy for Open Access (including further work as an Open Access ‘presence’ both nationally and internationally)
- Support, guidance and advocacy around funding body Open Access mandates

Other desired target areas indicated by the respondents included the following:

- Copyright issues including theses
- Data Management (including copyright and licensing)
- Statistics in repositories
- A possible role as a data repository user group for (eg) VIVO, RedBox, etc
- Promotion of repositories and increasing of full text content

Areas of improvement not already mentioned in the survey included the following:

- A request for more community involvement through more workshops, events
- Open Access of CAIRSS resources
- Further communication around ANDS and data management related activities
Observations

Observation 1
Results from the 2012 survey show that the percentage of Open Access content in research repositories has dropped from 2011. While this may be attributed to the ERA 2012 exercise, it is recommended that further research to be done around this, to establish what drivers have caused this drop. Given the NHMRC mandate announced earlier in 2012, it would also be useful to monitor how that impacts upon the Open Access content of repositories.

Observation 2
Responses regarding the use of OAKList indicate that use of the list has dropped significantly. It is recommended that further investigation be conducted to establish the cause of this decrease. This could also assist QUT in the ongoing planning around the OAKList.

Observation 3
Research data management continues to emerge as an area of interest to the community and should remain an area for CAIRSS to maintain a watching brief on. It will also remain important for CAIRSS to maintain a relationship with ANDS as the primary data management activity within Australia.

Observation 4
Feedback received from respondents indicates a wish to see more guidance and advocacy around Open Access. It is recommended that CAIRSS continue to work closely with COSIAC and other bodies to monitor this environment.

Observation 5
Feedback received from respondents also indicates a wish for further guidance and advocacy around funding body mandates. It is recommended that CAIRSS maintain its watching brief of funding body mandates, including continued involvement with COSAIC.

For more information / queries about the CAIRSS 2012 Repository Managers Survey, please contact CAIRSS Repository Program Coordinator, Caroline Drury at cairss