JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Project Document Cover Sheet

PROJECT PLAN

Project

Project Acronym	IncReASe	**Project ID**		
Project Title	Increasing Repository Content through Automation and Services			
Start Date	1st May 2007	**End Date**	31st Dec 2008	
Lead Institution	University of Leeds			
Project Director	Brian Clifford			
Project Manager & contact details	Rachel Proudfoot Edward Boyle Library University of Leeds LS2 9JT 0113 343 7067 r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk			
Partner Institutions	University of Leeds, University of Sheffield, University of York			
Project Web URL	http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase			
Programme Name (and number)	Repositories and preservation programme (04/06)			
Programme Manager	Andrew McGregor			

Document

Document Title	*Project Plan*		
Reporting Period			
Author(s) & project role	Rachel Proudfoot, Project Manager White Rose Research Online Steering Group		
Date	19/07/07	**Filename**	Increase_Project_Plan_v1.0_Jul07.pdf
URL	*if document is posted on project web site*		
Access	☐ Project and JISC internal	☒ General dissemination	

Document History

Version	Date	Comments
0.1	28/04/2007	Draft project plan for internal circulation
0.2	09/07/2007	Draft project plan for internal circulation & to JISC
1.0	19/07/2007	Project plan for external dissemination

JISC

IncReASe - JISC Project Plan Template

Overview of Project

1. Background

Although the number of institutional repositories has grown significantly in recent years, and continues to grow, two of the main problem areas identified by the repository community are:

- securing repository content
- maintaining repository content growth

with various strategies suggested to promote open access deposit. (e.g. Henty 2007; David & Connolly 2007; Mackie 2004 ; Hey 2004)

It may be useful to differentiate between researchers' pre-existing research outputs (referred to by Les Carr as "the legacy mountain"[1]) and new research being submitted for publication. Offering researchers an easier way to deposit older works, making the most of pre-existing metadata from a variety of sources, may help to both increase repository content and make the repository a more attractive proposition to researchers as a service which reflects the breadth of their research output.

A number of studies have shown that whilst researchers may be interested in open access and would be willing to deposit their work if required to do so, translating this into routine deposit of research has been challenging (e.g. Swan & Brown 2005; Mark & Shearer 2006). This project will look at researcher workflows in a number of different disciplines with a view to building in routine deposit of new works in White Rose Research Online. Deposit will be as simple as possible and will utilise features of the ePrints 3 repository software. The project will build on the researcher user needs analysis work of the EVIE project[2].

For both legacy and new content, copyright checking will, in part, utilise the RoMEO database from SHERPA but the project will also need to look in detail at the implication of bulk import for copyright management.

Some repositories have adopted a mediated deposit approach where material is deposited on behalf of researchers – usually by library staff. Other repositories have encouraged researchers to self-deposit their work. Both approaches have pros and cons. There is a need to strike the balance between assuring quality and copyright compliance – a role currently being fulfilled by repository staff – and the facility to make research available quickly, using processes that can be scaled up to meet the demands of large HE institutions. The IncReASe project will take a pragmatic approach to handling repository content, and will map out a hybrid workflow involving academics, institutional administrators and repository staff.

The repository landscape at the local, national and international level is increasingly complex with repositories handling different types of content (for example, multimedia materials, teaching materials), repositories for specific subject disciplines (arXiv, PubMedCentral) and repositories linked to funding bodies. The project will look at the institutional repository in its broad landscape but will pay particular attention to the relationship between repositories and compliance with research funder grant conditions.

---

[1] Carr, L. (2007) quoted in Hitchcock, S. (2007) Warning on repository legacy deposit burden. *EPrints Insiders blog.* Online at http://www.eprints.org/community/blog/index.php?/archives/198-Warning-on-repository-legacy-deposit-burden.html [accessed May 24 2007]

[2] *Embedding a VRE in an Institutional Environment.* Online at http://www.leeds.ac.uk/evie/ [accessed 13 July 2007]

2. Aims and Objectives

2.1 Aim

The project aims to increase content in White Rose Research Online, to automate aspects of the repository ingest process and to start to embed the repository within research workflows by lowering barriers to deposit and investigating repository based services which may be useful to researchers. The project aims to produce reports and scenarios which will be helpful to other institutional repositories working towards embedding a repository within their own institutional workflows.

2.2 Objectives

The IncReASe project will:

- survey sources of metadata and full text across the White Rose Consortium
- test mechanisms for bulk ingest to the repository
- enhance repository metadata using DROID and JHOVE
- investigate whether it is possible to achieve economies of scale by organising the repository buffer by publisher
- investigate enhancing metadata using CrossRef
- identify strategies for scaling the repository from a pilot service based on central mediated deposit to a hybrid deposit model repository capable of ingesting and making available research outputs from the Consortium
- review the relationship between institutional repositories and national and subject repositories, and explore the workflow implications for the population of Research Council repositories in particular
- explore issues for academic and research staff around the research and publication lifecycle, and make recommendations for the optimal point at which research outputs should be deposited in both subject and institutional repositories
- investigate what services could be offered back to depositing researchers in order to increase the utility of the repository and a feeling of greater ownership by the depositing community
- produce reports, workflows and case studies of general interest to the repository community.

White Rose Research Online will:

- double in size over the course of the project.
- be capturing 20% of research outputs across the consortium by the end of the project.
- maintain a high proportion of full-text outputs, with at least 80% full text content
- offer services back to White Rose depositors: these could include tailored statistics, feeds for local databases and personal page generation

The three partner institutions will adopt and promote a formal open access policy.

3. Overall Approach

3.1 Strategy / Methodology

The IncReASe work builds on the experiences of the White Rose partners in advocating the repository to researchers and providing and managing a shared institutional repository. The project can be divided into four phases:
  (i)   Investigation of metadata sources across the Consortium and identification of pilot departments for workflow analysis and bulk data upload
  (ii)   Metadata enhancement as part of the repository ingest process
  (iii) Building repository deposit into the standard research workflow
  (iv)   Offering services back to departments

Early phases (i) and (ii) will enhance the existing core repository service, implementing features of the EPrints 3 software and identifying opportunities for bulk ingest. Workflow analysis will enable the

development of a strategy for the embedding phase (iii) and, as greater mass of content is achieved, repository based services, phase (iv) will be feasible.

The project addresses key areas outlined in the *Repositories and Preservation programme,* specifically:

- Building a critical mass of content
- Embedding repositories to support research
- Sustaining repositories into the future.

Project success will require careful liaison with the Research Support Offices at the three White Rose institutions and collaboration with ESRC repository staff.

3.2 Scope and Boundaries

Pilot departments will be selected from across the consortium and investigation of metadata sources will also be carried out at all three institutions.

The project aims to identify pilot departments based on:
- pre-existing sources of metadata and/or full text (such as populated personal web pages, departmental publication databases, project pages, institutional publication databases)
- interest in and willingness to engage with the IncReASe project
- subject spread: we will actively target departments from at least three diverse subject areas (for example, Computer Science, Philosophy, Geography).

The scope of the project will, to some extent, be dictated by the levels of cooperation and interest from White Rose departments and research groups.

3.3 Critical Success Factors

- Increased and sustained growth of White Rose Research Online achieved partly through retrospective content gathering but, critically, showing sustained deposit of newly produced research.
- Dissemination of the IncReASe experience through presentations and reports, case studies, deposit scenarios and workflows of relevance to the wider repository community.
- Inclusion of funder metadata in repository records and export to / import from the ESRC repository.

4. Project Outputs

4.1 Main Deliverables

- **Project web site** to host outputs and disseminate progress.
- **Database prevalence and pilot department reports**: a survey of pre-existing sources of full text and metadata across the White Rose Consortium and report on identification of pilot departments, ingest of data from these departments and impact on continued population.
- **Research workflow scenarios and services interview report:** Who deposits work in the repository? When? What information should be fed back to the researchers? Are there departmental variations in the deposit process and the appeal of repository based services?
- **Research funder workflow scenarios**: these will illustrate how research outputs can be linked to relevant grant information, how the repository can help researchers demonstrate funder mandates have been met and how White Rose Research Online can feed / harvest from the ESRC repository.
- **Data harvesting and metadata enhancement technical report**: the practicalities of harvesting from multiple sources and a data ingest model.
- **Automation issues report:** this will address non-technical issues such as copyright and author permissions.
- **Web scraper perl script**.

4.2 Knowledge and Other Outputs

The Project Team will organise a regional event for repository practitioners and interested staff from the White Rose universities.

5. Project Outcomes

The project will add to the growing corpus of freely available academic research readily obtainable by all those with access to the internet. The increased growth of White Rose Research Online will help to demonstrate the ongoing viability of an institutional repository and also provide a model for consortial collaboration. The project will involve considerable discussion with academic staff and should increase their engagement with the research dissemination process and help to inform the development of repository based services. The project should start to bring together material currently dispersed across institutional networks into one, central place and thus increase its visibility, discoverability and the likelihood it will remain accessible in the longer term. The repository should feed into existing departmental or personal databases of research outputs, helping researches to manage their research outputs and improving the quality of metadata attached to those outputs.

6. Stakeholder Analysis

List key stakeholder groups and individuals that will be interested in your project outcomes, will be affected by them, or whose support/approval is essential, both within your institution and in the community, and assess their importance (low/medium/high).

Stakeholder	Interest / stake	Importance
White Rose research staff	Support and cooperation from researchers is essential for the success of the project. Through participation, the researchers should improve the visibility of their research and help to shape the development of the institutional repository to be of most benefit to them	High
JISC Repositories and Preservation Programme	Project funder and sponsor	High
Repository community within the UK	The project will add to the body of high quality, openly available research outputs, investigate throughput of research deposits and demonstrate the development of an institutional repository post pilot period.	High
Global repository community	White Rose Research Online demonstrates and unusual but successful consortial model which may be of interest to other groups of institutions considering a shared repository. Bulk import and interfacing with external repositories is also of general interest to other repositories.	Medium
Research Councils	The project aims to help grantees make their work available in accordance with funder conditions.	Medium
Research support staff within institutions	The project should help to bring together grant	Medium

information and subsequent research outputs, thus enabling research support staff to ensure that grant conditions have been met.	

7. Risk Analysis

List factors that could pose a risk to the project's success, assess their likelihood and severity, and how you will prevent them from happening (or manage them if they if they occur). Cover the types of risks listed and any others that apply.

Risk	Probability (1-5)	Severity (1-5)	Score (P x S)	Action to Prevent/Manage Risk
Staffing				
Staffing is not recruited in time for start of the Project, caused by tight timescale and grading discussions with HR.	5	4	20	The Project Directors will co-ordinate the initial project set-up work until staffing appointed.
Staff members leave during the course of the Project caused by short term nature of the project and growth of repository posts elsewhere, resulting in slowing down the project.	4	3	12	Team members will have 3 month notice period so some overlap of contracts may be possible. We will ensure that other key staff are closely involved in the Project, so disruption is minimal. We will ensure that the Project is well documented so new staff could take over if required.
Project staff feel overwhelmed by the volume of work, caused by large numbers of potentially importable research records and resulting in stress and possibly one area of the project feeling "delayed" by another area of the project.	2	3	6	The flow of work may well ebb and flow during the project and this should be recognised in meetings and reports. It will be important for all team members to understand each other's roles and to work flexibly to achieve the overall goals of the project.
Organisational				
Key stakeholders do not buy in to/support the Project. There are a number of potential causative factors: lack of time, perceived lack of fit between the project aims and researcher aims, alternative research dissemination models – such as open access publishing. This could result in lack of cooperation from researchers / departments.	2	4	8	The project team will ensure regular information flow to all stakeholders, and seek feedback on direction and progress at every opportunity. There will be a communication strategy for the Project. The project has been partially framed by request from researchers, so the appeal of the project should be high. The broader repository and open access landscape should be kept under review in case modifications to the project become logical.
Space for project staff may be difficult to find, resulting in the project team being geographically dispersed.	3	3	9	Regular meetings and communication will be instituted to avoid isolation and the Project Plan and Work Packages will be

				regularly discussed to ensure the team is working coherently.
Disagreement between project partners caused by differing aims at the partner institutions.	2	3	6	The management structure for the project makes use of the existing repository steering group; a group which is used to working together effectively. Project partners will be fully involved in documentation for the project, including the project plan and workpackage development to obtain a coherent set of aims from the outset.
Technical				
It is not possible to upload from a number of metadata sources.	1	3	3	The existing capabilities of ePrints 3 software should enable us to do this.
Insufficient technical skills available to complete all technical aspects of the project, caused by staff loss or lack of experience and resulting in a barrier to completion of workpackages.	2	4	8	A skills audit will be undertaken at the beginning of the project upon the appointment of key staff to identify training needs.
System downtime caused by maintenance, power failure resulting in loss of service to depositors and end users.	4	3	12	The repository is regularly backed up and will shortly be linked to a UPS. Mirroring the database will be considered during the course of the project.
External suppliers				
Academic publishers make archiving policies more restrictive caused by changing business practices / perceived threat from open access and resulting in increased difficulty making works available on open access.	2	4	8	Build in efficient embargo handling into the system and build in an author request facility to the repository. Be prepared to review the repository collection policy, including greater inclusion of pre-prints. Inform academic researchers and research committees of the issues and encourage copyright retention / use of the JISC Licence to Publish.
Legal				
Bulk import of full text contains work which cannot be deposited for copyright reasons	5	2	10	We will need to make it clear to researchers that there are versioning issues in self-archiving and encourage them to make their final draft available wherever possible. Copyright request procedures will be incorporated into the workflow.

8. Standards

List the standards the project will use in the table below. Also indicate:

- *Any deviations from the standards that JISC recommends.*

- *Where choices exist in an area, the reasons for the standards selected.*
- *Where proprietary standards are selected in an area where open ones are available, the reasons for their use and their scope of deployment.*

Name of standard or specification	Version	Notes
OAI-PMH	2.0	
W3C Recommended standards		
JSR-168		portal
Dublin Core		
RSS	2.0	
LDAP		

9. Technical Development

A technical issue log will be maintained. Technical developments will be documented and summarised in the **Data harvesting and metadata enhancement technical report.**

10. Intellectual Property Rights

Project outputs will be made freely available to the UK HE and FE Community under non-exclusive licence. Any software or code outputs will be release under an appropriate open source licence.

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

List all project partners (including subcontractors), their roles, and the main contact. Indicate the date a consortium agreement was signed (or will be signed), and send a copy to the programme manager.

University of Leeds (Lead site)
Role: budget handling, staff recruitment and employment, engagement with local project champion, input to Project Management Committee

Contact:
Brian Clifford
Head of Learning and Research Support (Deputy Librarian)
Brotherton Library
University of Leeds,
Leeds.
LS2 9JT
UK

Email: b.e.clifford@leeds.ac.uk
Tel: 0113 343 5270
Fax: 0113 343 5561

University of Sheffield
Role: input to Project Management Committee, engagement with local project champion

Contact:
Peter Stubley
Assistant Director, Academic Services
University of Sheffield Library
Main Library

Western Bank, Sheffield, S10 2TN
UK

Email: p.stubley@sheffield.ac.uk
Tel: (+44) (0)114 222 7327
Fax: (+44) (0)114 222 7290

University of York
Role: input to Project Management Committee, engagement with local project champion

Contact:
Elizabeth Harbord
Head of Content and Customer Services
J.B.Morrell Library
University of York
YO10 5DD
UK

Email: eah8@york.ac.uk
Tel: : +44 (0)1904 433869
Fax: :+44 (0)1904 433866

12. Project Management

Management of the project will utilise the same steering group structure as White Rose Research Online. Project progress will be monitored closely through regular meetings – approximately every 6 weeks - and internal reports. Day to day decision will be taken by the Project Manager but strategic decisions will be discussed and approved by the Steering Group.

The Project Officer and Technical Officer will report to the Project Manager and attend the Steering Group meetings when appropriate.

In part, University of Leeds' PRINCE2 based Project Management Methodology will be used.

12.1 Project Manager

Rachel Proudfoot
White Rose Repository Officer and IncReASe Project Manager
Edward Boyle Library
University of Leeds
LS2 9JT

The Project Manager will:

- Prepare the project plan
- Coordinate and manage project work
- Monitor project progress and performance
- Ensure that project outputs are delivered on time
- Identify risks, problems, and issues, and escalate them as appropriate
- Manage communication within the project and with the programme manager
- Prepare progress, final, and other reports
- Arrange meetings (e.g. management committee) and write the minutes
- Manage project resources, including the budget
- Coordinate work on any legal agreements, e.g. consortium, vendor, or license agreements
- Maintain project documentation
- Ensure that the project abides by the letter of grant, the JISC Terms and Conditions, and the JISC Project Management Guidelines.

12.2 Project Team

Project Director:
Brian Clifford
Head of Learning and Research Support (Deputy Librarian)
Brotherton Library
University of Leeds
LS2 9JT

Project Manager: 0.3 FTE
Rachel Proudfoot
Edward Boyle Library
University of Leeds
LS2 9JT

Project Officer: 0.5 FTE post to be appointed

Technical Officer FT post to be appointed

12.3 Training

A skills audit will be undertaken at the beginning of the project. It is anticipated that the Technical Officer will attend EPrints 3 training in Southampton.

12.4 Project Champions

One project champion will be identified from each institution; their role will be to act as an advocate for the project in relevant fora and provide independent input to the Steering Group.

12.5 Management Committee

Management committee will:
- Steer and guide the project
- Review progress and outputs
- Review outcomes and their impact on the community
- Advise the project team
- Represent the interests of the project partners
- Agree important decisions and changes to plan
- Discuss risks, problems, and issues, explore solutions, and identify any that should be escalated to the programme manager
- Formative evaluation – reflect on how things are going and what could be improved.

13. Programme Support

Practical advice and support on implementing the scholarly works application profile would be useful.

14. Budget

See Appendix A.

Detailed Project Planning

15. Workpackages

See Appendix B*.*

16. Evaluation Plan

Indicate how you will evaluate the quality of the project outputs and the success of the project. List the factors you plan to evaluate, questions the evaluation will answer, methods you will use, and how success will be measured. Expand as appropriate on how you will conduct the evaluation.

Timing	Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success
Monthly	Growth rate	Overall growth rate and % of new research outputs captured.	Records added per month. Comparison of White Rose outputs indexed by Web of Knowledge for specific periods cf % of those outputs available through the repository.	Growth rate should have at least doubled by the end of the project. At least 20% of new research outputs should be captured.
6,9 and 12 months after pilot phase	Impact on pilot departments	Has content for the departments increased? Has increase become self-sustaining?	Monitor growth rate over a period of time. Seek feedback from key contacts within the department. Attend departmental meetings to obtain feedback and thus inform further developments / strategies.	Continued addition of new research outputs from the pilot departments.
Ongoing	Copyright and permissions management	Is it possible to bulk ingest metadata and (i) obtain full text (ii) manage copyright issues of those full texts (iii) gain adequate deposit permissions from researchers	Map out a clear workflow for managing ingest. Highlight and addresses causes of bottlenecking.	Ingest can be handled without creating bottlenecks. 80% of content should be live within three weeks of ingest. Only those where additional permissions are required should take longer.
Ongoing	Effectiveness of workflow models and case studies.	Is it possible to build deposit into standard researcher workflow? Are workflows useful to other repositories? Are case studies helpful to other repositories?	Outputs will be made available on the project web site and comment invited.	Positive feedback on project outputs. Adoption of workflow models by other repositories.
ESRC pilot phase. Review after 6 months.	ESRC workflow	How can ESRC funded work be identified and either deposited in the ESRC repository or harvested by the ESRC repository? Can an	Identify metadata requirements, harvesting requirements and undertake	Feeder pathways established between the ESRC and White Rose repository which could be adopted by

		effective workflow to assist ESRC, fundees and the research office be established?	pilot testing with known ESRC related records.	other repositories. ESRC Workflow Report.
12-18 months	Development of repository based services	What types of services could be developed to assist researchers? Can a pilot service be established within the timescale of the project (e.g. feed for departmental research publication web pages)	Discuss possibilities with pilot departments and project champions. Scope technical requirements. Establish exemplar(s).	Exemplar service(s) continue to run effectively post project
End of project	Summative assessment	How effectively has the project met its objectives and contributed to those of the JISC programme? Can lessons learnt be used to develop the repository and embed it more firmly within the consortium partners?	A review will be undertaken by the Project Management Group, with input on the external facing aspects of the project invited from other stakeholders.	Availability, with other outputs, on IncReASe web site

17. Quality Plan

Explain the quality assurance procedures you will put in place to ensure that project deliverables meet quality expectations and acceptance criteria. Complete the table below for each of the major deliverables providing as much detail as possible. Repeat the table as many times as necessary to accommodate all deliverables.

Output	Project web site (1)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Start of project	Accessible	W3C guidelines	Compliance with	TO	Use webxact service or similar
Ongoing	Useful content for the repository community	Invite web site comment. Publicise web site and contents.	Positive feedback	PM	
End of project	Website available for at least 3 years	Agreement with host site (Leeds) and mothballing procedure	Website remains available and usable	PM	

Output	Database prevalence and pilot department reports; pilot impact report (3, 4,10, 19)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Dec 07 – Jun	Survey of existing research	Detailed web site survey. Interviews with	Bulk import from pilot departments. Workflow analysis	PO, PM	

08	output collation practices sufficient to identify pilot departments and estimate possibilities for further roll-out.	key personnel. Identification of pilot departments.	from pilot departments. Case Studies and Report document(s).		
Oct 08	Assess impact on pilot depts.	Monitor growth in pilot departments.	Monitoring at 3,6, and 9 months. Final report documenting growth over this period.	PM	

Output	Web scraper perl script (5)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Feb 08	Script extracts both metadata and attached files from personal web pages. Results capable of import to repository.	Import testing including manual quality checking of metadata quality.	Script available for reuse by other repositories.	TO	

Output	Research workflow scenarios (8,12,18)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
May 08 – Oct 08	Workflows encompass bid to output	Detailed interviews with key personnel. Researchers will be invited to comment on case studies and workflows.	Positive comment from researchers.	PO, PM	
May 08 – Oct 08	Reports are of use to wider repository community	Web site feedback. Feedback invited from repository colleagues. Management Committee review.	Positive feedback.	PM	

Output	Research funder workflow scenarios (11, 13)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**

| Jun 08 | Effective workflow for ESRC deposit | Discussion with ESRC. Testing of different scenarios. | Data exchange between ESRC repository and WRRO. | PM, TO | |
| Jun – Oct 08 | Grant information data exchange between grant offices and WRRO. | Establish clear set of goals with Research Office. Test scenarios. | Successful data exchange between Research Support office(s) and WRRO which continues after pilot testing. | PM, TO | |

Output	Services interview report (14)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
May – Aug 08	Views polled from a number of disciplines on what services might make the repository more attractive.	Methodology to poll a variety of academic staff plus input from library staff.	Completed report	PM, TO. PO	

Output	Centralising deposit report (17)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Oct 08	Overview of current practice and suggested methods for encouraging centralised deposit.	Scenarios applicable to various departments and at other institutions.	Completion of report. Dissemination to repository community.	PM, TO	

Output	Data harvesting and metadata enhancement technical reports (9, 15, 20)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
May 08	The report details data harvesting from a number of sources and clearly explains how external tools have	Invite comment from other repository managers / technical staff.	Completed report.	TO	

	been incorporated into the repository ingest process to improve metadata quality.				
Sep08	Reusable guidelines for bulk import.	Invite comment from other repository managers / technical staff.	Completed guidelines.	TO	
Nov 08	Technical report for WP 3 drawing together harvesting methods and technical issues encountered	Steering group review. Invite comment from other repository managers / technical staff.	WP 3 Technical Report covering harvesting experience.	TO	

Output	SWAP review (6)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Feb 08	Thorough review of repository metadata fields	Seek input from metadata specialists / cataloguing staff across the consortium	Implementation of swap if appropriate.	PO	

Output	Automation issues report (21)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Nov 08	Report highlights issues and potential solutions when undertaking bulk ingest.	Steering Group review.	The report highlights issues and suggests solutions for the automation scenarios identified.	PM	

Output	Completion and Final Reports (23, 24)				
Timing	**Quality criteria**	**QA method(s)**	**Evidence of compliance**	**Quality responsibilities**	**Quality tools (if applicable)**
Dec 08	Draw together lessons	Steering Group review.	The report highlights issues and suggests	PM, PO, TO	

	learnt		solutions for the automation scenarios identified.		

18. Dissemination Plan

Explain how the project will share outcomes and learning with stakeholders and the community. List important dissemination activities planned throughout the project, indicating purpose, target audience, timing, and key message.

Timing	Dissemination Activity	Audience	Purpose	Key Message
Jul 07	Project web site	Repository community. White Rose research community. White Rose library community.	Raise awareness and engage repository community. Feed comments into project development.	This is what we are doing – is it useful to you?
July 07	White Rose Newsletter	White Rose researchers	Announcement of project	WRRO is expanding.
Autumn term 07	Institutional newsletters	White Rose researchers	Raise awareness	SHERPA is award winning; WRRO is expanding and deposit will be easier than ever!
Autumn term 07	Report to Research Committees in pilot departments.	Potential depositors and collaborators	Gain buy-in from key personnel and departments.	We want you to deposit your work; what's the best way for you to do this?
tbc	Regional dissemination event	Regional repository and library staff. Interested White Rose staff – including researchers and administrators.	Dissemination of results of IncReASe. Raised awareness amongst potential depositors.	What has worked and what has not worked in gaining content for WRRO and in embedding WRRO in research workflows across the consortium.
As opportunities arise.	Conference posters	Repository and research communities	One to one engagement and feedback.	Aims and work to date.
Late 08 / early 09	Peer reviewed publication(s).	General library community	Dissemination of lessons learnt.	This may be of use to you in your own institution.
Ongoing	Collaboration with the Repositories Support Project.	Repository staff	Dissemination of project outputs.	These experiences may be of use to you in your own institution.

19. Exit and Sustainability Plans

Explain what will happen to project outputs at the end of the project (including knowledge and learning). Focus on the work needed to ensure they are taken up by the community and any work needed for project closedown, e.g. preservation, maintenance, documentation.

Project Outputs	Action for Take-up & Embedding	Action for Exit
Legacy content import workflow	Publicity to other departments. Transparency of process. Outline of work required and benefits enjoyed.	Publicity across the White Rose consortium. Service level agreements.
New research deposit workflow	Review open access deposit policy through Research Committee / Board.	Papers to relevant internal committees. Proactively identify and seek new research outputs.
Review of ingest processes including metadata enhancement	Document the workflow, build into routine ingest processes.	Technical and procedural documentation.
Data output services to feed other repositories	Document the workflow.	Ensure documentation and lessons learnt remain available.

List any project outputs that may have potential to live on after the project ends, why, how they might be taken forward, and any issues involved in making them sustainable in the long term.

Project Outputs	Why Sustainable	Scenarios for Taking Forward	Issues to Address
Web scraper script	May be of use to wider repository community	Make script openly available	

References

Davis, Philip M. and Connolly, Matthew J.L. (2007) Evaluating the Reasons for Non-use of Cornell University's Installation of DSpace. *DLib 13(3/4)*. Online at http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html [accessed 12 July 2007]

Henty, Margaret (2007) Ten Major Issues in Providing a Repository Service in Australian Universities. *DLib 13(5/6)*. Online at http://www.dlib.org/dlib/may07/henty/05henty.html [accessed 12 July 2007]

Hey, Jessie M. N. (2004) Targeting Academic Research with Southampton's Institutional Repository. *Ariadne*, (40). Online at http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue40/hey/intro.html [accessed 12 July 2007]

Mackie, Morag (2004) Filling Institutional Repositories: Practical strategies from the DAEDALUS Project. *Ariadne* (39). Online at http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue39/mackie/ [accessed 12 July 2007]

Mark, Timothy & Shearer, Kathleen (2006) Institutional Repositories: A Review of Content Recruitment Strategies. *Libraries: Dynamic Engines for the Knowledge and Information Society, World Library and Information Congress: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council, 20-24 August 2006, Seoul, Korea*. Online at http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla72/papers/155-Mark_Shearer-en.pdf [accessed 13 July 2007]

Swan, Alma and Brown, Sheridan (2005) Open access self-archiving: An author study. Truro: Key Perspectives Ltd. Online at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/Open%20Access%20Self%20Archiving-an%20author%20study.pdf [accessed 13 July 2007]

Appendixes

Appendix A. Project Budget

Appendix B. Workpackages

Appendix C. Numbered Milestones