

## Compliance with Plan S of Australasian repositories

### Introduction

This project was set up following the announcement of the revised requirements that repositories need to comply with in order for them to be compliant with Plan S <https://www.coalition-s.org/principles-and-implementation/>. A small group of Repository Managers and Research Managers was convened of volunteers from CAUL/CONZUL member universities, with representatives across the main university groupings.

### Representation

Dr Ginny Barbour	<i>Director, AOASG</i>	Queensland University of Technology
Keely Chapman	<i>Coordinator, Research Repository</i>	RMIT University
Kate Croker	<i>Library Manager, Research Publications and Data Services</i>	University of Western Australia
Julie Gardner	<i>Repository Manager</i>	Victoria University
Luqman Hayes	<i>Team Leader, Scholarly Communications</i>	Auckland University of Technology (CONZUL)
Bruce Munro	<i>Library Manager, Gold Coast Campus</i>	Southern Cross University
Tracy Quixley	<i>Repository Services Coordinator</i>	University of South Australia

### Scope

1. Identify repository requirements from Plan S both required and recommended for Plan S compliance. (No other requirements beyond those for Plan S were included).
2. Survey institutional representatives in Australia and New Zealand and compile results.
3. Provide comments and recommendations for consideration by CAUL.

### Methods

The repository requirements were extracted into a Google sheet (see here [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1BrGmrj9vv1T5jIDlw6z\\_v8X15WfdyT2gr3HrrwdoHYE/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1BrGmrj9vv1T5jIDlw6z_v8X15WfdyT2gr3HrrwdoHYE/edit?usp=sharing), mostly verbatim, but where necessary either with a small amount of explanation, or by breaking them down into sub-questions.

The questions were then put into a Google form and this was sent out by CAUL office on Monday 26 August to all CAUL contacts, with a request to reply by COB Friday 30 August.

### Results

32 unique responses were received (response rate 68%).

Results are provided as Google sheet with duplicates removed.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1A5YWMR3nYxIO2VCWGe22jjQC3F2loZwgxZT3mboEvHk/edit?usp=sharing>

The full set of answers in figure form is also available if needed on an individual basis.

Results for the minimum requirements are provided in the table below.

Requirement	Yes	No	Yes partially	Don't know/not sure
Is your repository registered in the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR) or in the process of being registered?	28	4		
Do you make use of PIDs for the deposited versions of the publications (with versioning, for example in case of revisions), such as DOI [noted as preferable by Plan S], URN, or Handle?	26	6		
Is your repository able to provide high quality article level metadata in standard interoperable non-proprietary format, under a CC0 public domain dedication? This must include information on the DOI (or other PIDs) both of the original publication and the deposited version, on the version deposited (AAM/VoR), and on the Open Access status and the license of the deposited version.	10	3	16	3
Metadata must include complete and reliable information on funding provided by [cOAlition S] funders [or e.g. ARC/NHMRC/Marsden] (including as a minimum the name of the funder and the grant number/identifier). Can this be displayed in your repository?	19	4	9	
Can machine readable information on the Open Access status and the license embedded in the article, in standard non-proprietary format be displayed?	12	4	17	3
Does your repository provide continuous availability (uptime at least 99.7%, not taking into account scheduled downtime for maintenance or upgrades)?	31			1
Do you offer a helpdesk? (as a minimum an email address (functional mailbox) has to be provided; a response time of no more than one business day must be ensured.)	25	2	5	

## Comments

The Plan S minimum requirements for repositories do provide a useful baseline. Most ANZ universities are able to comply with at least some of the minimum requirements, however, none of the 32 universities which responded can fully comply with all of the minimum requirements. Neither can they comply with the Plan S expanded requirements for repositories.

## Recommendations

1. All ANZ universities should aim to comply with Plan S minimum repository requirements, especially being registered in DOAR by December 2020.
2. All ANZ universities should aim to comply with Plan S expanded repository requirements, although this is much more aspirational and will require significant effort. The highest priority is

probably the requirements that maximise discoverability e.g. OpenAIRE compliance of the metadata. These expanded criteria will be subject to review in 2024 by Plan S and may become mandatory after the review

3. CAUL Council endorse a Repository Advisory Group to support the implementation of the requirements.