



## Project Document Cover Sheet

Project Information			
<b>Project Acronym</b>	IncReASe		
<b>Project Title</b>	Increasing repository content through automation and services		
<b>Start Date</b>	01/07/07	<b>End Date</b>	31/12/08
<b>Lead Institution</b>	University of Leeds		
<b>Project Director</b>	Bo Middleton		
<b>Project Manager &amp; contact details</b>	Rachel Proudfoot Edward Boyle Library University of Leeds LS2 9JT 0113 343 7067 r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk		
<b>Partner Institutions</b>	University of Leeds, University of Sheffield, University of York		
<b>Project Web URL</b>	<a href="http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/">http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/</a>		
<b>Programme Name (and number)</b>	Repositories and preservation programme (04/06)		
<b>Programme Manager</b>	Andrew McGregor		

Document Name			
<b>Document Title</b>	Progress Report		
<b>Reporting Period</b>	Jul 07 – Oct 07		
<b>Author(s) &amp; project role</b>	Rachel Proudfoot, Project Manager		
<b>Date</b>	18/10/2007	<b>Filename</b>	Increase_progress_report1_1007.doc
<b>URL</b>	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
<b>Access</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General dissemination

Document History		
Version	Date	Comments
0.1	18/10/2007	Draft progress report for internal circulation
1.0	26/10/2007	To JISC



## JISC Progress Report Template

### *Overview of Project*

#### **Grant Statement**

The project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions attached to it.

Owing to delays in staff recruitment, it was agreed with Amber Thomas that the project end date could be extended until 31 Dec 2008 on the understanding that monies already received would be carried forward to cover the period 01/10/08 to 31/12/08.

### **2. Aims and Objectives**

There have been no changes to the original aims/objectives outlined in the project plan.

*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.*

### **3. Overall Approach**

The overall approach to the project remains the same, centred around 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

A slight change in approach is the proposed inclusion of an online questionnaire to supplement data gathered through web site analysis and staff interviews. The questionnaire is currently being developed with a view to distribution in 2008. The aims are:

- To supplement information gathered by analysing departmental web sites
- To poll information on what departmental systems (not necessarily public) are in place to gather metadata (and possibly full text)
- To gather details of where researchers are required to / choose to deposit details of their publications (inside and outside their University)
- To identify drivers for deposit
- To identify areas for potential service development
- To publicise White Rose Research Online

## 4. Project Outputs

*Summarise progress during the reporting period and milestones/deliverables achieved.*

- Project plan and web site created.
- Consortium agreement under discussion.
- No other milestones were scheduled during this reporting period.

We have made reasonable progress during the reporting period though have been held back to some extent by the difficulty in recruiting a Technical Officer. This post is central to much of the IncReASe project activity and is the only full time post attached to the project. However, we have begun a mapping of the departments, faculties and research centres at the three universities, focusing on the extent of online collections of publications. This is being modelled using MindGenius (mind mapping software) and will also be written up as a report once it is finished. This information can then be used to help determine appropriate sources for harvesting data and potential case studies.

White Rose Research Online has migrated to the Eprints3 platform and we are implementing some of the new features, in particular import from EndNote and import using DOIs.

The Project Team will be contributing to a Repository Support Project event, hosted by the University of Leeds, in November 2007.

## 5. Project Outcomes

*Summarise achievement against objectives, list outcomes and findings to date, and any interim conclusions.*

### **Growth**

2264 items (July 2007) 2519 items (mid Oct 2007)

Our target is to double the repository content over the course of the project, which would require in the region of 127 deposits per month. We are slightly under this target but this is perhaps not surprising at this early stage.

*How do you see the project developing? Has progress changed the project in any way, and are there implications for the programme?*

Other than changing the order of work to accommodate limited technical support, there have been no major changes to the project so far. There will be an additional investigative strand through the introduction of an online questionnaire to assess the current locations / destinations of publication metadata across the Consortium.

Although not addressed specifically in the original Project Plan, the period of the IncReASe project will coincide with the introduction of etheses deposit in at least two of the three White Rose partners. It is therefore planned to include etheses data in the web site analysis. We know from previous experience that there is significant support for the introduction of etheses from academic staff and the inclusion of White Rose theses is perceived as beneficial for the profile and take up of the wider White Rose repository service.

A new development since the start of IncReASe is the proposed development of a publication database at the University of Sheffield, which has subsequently expanded to address broader dissemination issues and is called *University Research Visibility Improvement Project (URVIP)*. As the emphasis of WRRO has been – and continues to be – provision of full text, it is not a comprehensive reflection of the research output of the three institutions. WRRO staff are involved in the discussion of URVIP; it is very likely the resulting architecture will include WRRO. The key aim will be for researchers to create and deposit metadata – and full text – once, which may then be used for a variety of purposes.

*What lessons have been learned that could be passed on to other projects or applied elsewhere?*

We have had some difficulty in recruiting to our technical post (originally called IncReASe Technical Officer). Various suggestions have been made as to why this may be the case: for example, the

timing of the advert over the summer to a shortage of suitably skilled staff. After taking advice, we simplified the job description and removed some of the repository specific jargon. We also changed the job title to "Software Developer – IncReASe Project". Hopefully this will help in our renewed recruitment effort.

## 6. Stakeholder Analysis

*Summarise the project's engagement with stakeholders including users.*

Stakeholder	Engagement
White Rose research staff	We have worked closely with the Philosophy Department in Leeds to import a database of research outputs. The IncReASe project has been publicised using local publications and web sites across the consortium.
JISC Repositories and Preservation Programme	Attendance at programme meeting and contribution to jiscmail list
Repository community within the UK	White Rose / Leeds will be hosting a Repositories Support Project even in November and project staff are working with RSP staff to create the agenda for the day. This will include a presentation by Rachel Proudfoot, IncReASe project manager on meeting funder requirements, relevant to Workpackages 4 – 7. In addition Rachel Proudfoot and Beccy Shipman, Project Officer, will work together with Julie Allison, University of York, on a SWAP workshop, particularly relevant to WPs 4 and 7.  We have undertaken investigative work on how WRRO and the RePEc system may link, including creating a local RePEc archive. A short case study is available at: <a href="http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/eprints_repec.html">http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/increase/eprints_repec.html</a>
Global repository community	Nothing to report yet.
Research Councils	Basic information has been provided on compliance with Research Council grants: <a href="http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/docs/funders.html">http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/docs/funders.html</a>  It is planned that this information will be expanded.
Research support staff within institutions	The funder information (above) will be expanded in conjunction with the central research support offices at the three institutions. Liaison is ongoing. The Project Manager attended an induction course organised by the Association of Research Managers and Administrators; this provided an opportunity to discuss institutional repositories with White Rose staff and research administrators from other institutions. Particularly relevant in the light of research funder requirements.

## 7. Risk Analysis

*Summarise any problems that have occurred and any mitigating actions taken.*

A key post for this project is that of Technical Officer; this is the only FT post linked to the project. We had advertised this post twice, unsuccessfully. The job description has been reworked and the post is going to be advertised for a third time. We considered various strategies to take the project work forward in the absence of this post and our adopted strategy is as follows:

- 1) the University of Leeds has agreed to provide temporary additional support for the project: a permanent member of the Systems Team who is familiar with repository work has been assigned to the project for two days a week between October 15<sup>th</sup> 2007 and the end of the calendar year
- 2) this arrangement will be regularly reviewed
- 3) the feasibility of external consultancy has been considered; we have not taken this option as yet but it remains a possible course of action, if appropriate
- 4) the work order has been changed to reflect the limited technical support during the early phase of the project (see 12. Project Management)

## 8. Standards

No change.

## 9. Technical Development

No change.

## 10. Intellectual Property Rights

*Summarise progress clearing any third-party rights.*  
Nothing to report.

## *Project Resources*

## 11. Project Partners

No change.

*What other institutions or organisations are you or do you plan to collaborate with?*  
ESRC  
DRIVER

## 12. Project Management

*Note any changes in project staff or their roles since the last report. Briefly explain any problems or gaps with staffing and the effect this has had on the project schedule.*

The Project Director is now Bo Middleton who was recently appointed to the post of Head of e-Strategy and Development at the University of Leeds.

The PT Project Officer, Beccy Shipman, has been appointed and started work 06/08/07.

The FT Technical Officer (currently being readvertised as Software Developer – IncReASe Project) is still vacant. This has had an impact on the project schedule.

The original plan and deliverables remain the same. A revised *Workpackages* document is attached as Appendix B with some adjusted timings.

## 13. Programme Support

*Summarise contact with/influence of the programme, e.g. with the programme manager, formal or informal links with other projects, or programme-related activities.*

Contact with the Programme Manager has been useful – particularly because of our recruitment difficulties. As the SAFIR project is based in York, one of the White Rose partners, there has been close contact between the staff involved, with the IncReASe Project Manager sitting on the Academic

Project Acronym: IncReASe  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk.  
Date: 24/10/2007

Advisory Group for SAFIR. It is also anticipated that the SAFIR repository and White Rose Research Online will also share a common member of staff for the duration of the two projects; the project managers for IncReASe and SAFIR will be in regular contact.

*What further support would you like from the programme, e.g. guidance, workshops, etc?*  
Testing SWORD in the context of UKPMC deposit (see below).

*Do you have any suggestions for improving the programme?*

There is a significant and urgent need to test the feasibility of deposit into UKPMC via a local institutional repository. Will SWORD help with this process? UKPMC seems to require sign-off, twice, by the appropriate principal investigator: will input via a local repository help or hinder this process. Until we have resolved this question, advocacy of the institutional repository to staff in biomedical sciences will always prove difficult as there is inevitable confusion about where best to deposit. It also means that advocacy using the research funder mandates is diluted because it is not possible to say, across the board, that deposit in the local repository will meet funder requirements. We have an objective to investigate this within Workpackage 5, the timescale being April-May 2008. However, an earlier investigation would be desirable. Given our difficulty with resources at present, I don't feel we can bring this forward within the IncReASe project; is anyone else actively investigating this?

## 14. Budget

Attached as Appendix A

## Detailed Project Planning

## 15. Workpackages

*Report progress against plan, noting key activities during the reporting period. Explain why any targets haven't been met.*

### Workpackage 1: Project management

Required project documents and web site delivered bar consortium agreement. The exact form of the agreement is currently being agreed. Various logs have been introduced: issues, lessons learnt and a wishlist / enhancement log to record possible technical enhancements to the EPrints software and/or its interaction with other systems. A Bi-Monthly Project Progress report has been introduced: this will be used to keep the Library Directors and Management Teams up to date with project development but will also have a wider circulation amongst library staff.

### Workpackage 2 : Survey of activities

Several potential databases for import have been identified from survey work and from contact with White Rose researchers. A database of philosophy papers provided in EndNote has been imported to the repository. The full text files were provided separately. This has increased the Philosophy Department in Leeds' repository presence from a handful of papers by two interested authors to ninety full text papers from twenty two authors (over half the Philosophy staff). The challenge will be to sustain deposit into the repository in the longer term but it is hoped that the current content will provide a springboard for positive publicity which will engage the interest of the Philosophy staff.

The web site survey work is well underway – in fact, ahead of schedule. It was hoped to undertake the pilot imports before undertaking the web site survey work. This has not occurred because of our technical staff delay, however, this has not had a significant effect on the survey work and the initial findings from pilot work will be fed into the development of our online questionnaire to researchers and our subsequent work with similar departments.

### Workpackage 3 : Harvesting

Project Acronym: IncReASe  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk.  
Date: 24/10/2007

Testing has been undertaken of import into Eprints3 using DOI and EndNote formats. The main drawback with DOI import is that non-resolving DOIs (of which there may be several – particularly with newer publications) cause the process to fall over so no records are imported.

We are behind schedule with testing organisation of the Eprints buffer – some progress on this front is highly desirable before we deal with large, bulk imports of data.

Initial work on mapping the repository fields against the University of Leeds Publication database has taken place. It is hoped that full linkage will be achieved once the relevant staff have more time after the RAE submission deadline.

#### Workpackage 4 : Metadata enhancement

DOI importing tested.  
SWAP review brought forward and ongoing.

#### Workpackage 5 : Integration with funder repositories

Work is scheduled later in the project. However, we have had some preliminary contact with an ESRC funded project based at Leeds University which may be of relevance to this workpackage.

#### Workpackage 6 : Integration with local systems

We have completed field mapping between University of Leeds Publication and White Rose Research Online and reached a preliminary agreement for a ULPD/WRRO deposit workflow.

Repository staff discussed the proposed University of Sheffield publication database with research / computing services staff and are actively exploring whether the two systems fulfil different roles and how the two systems will interface. Hopefully this will be a mutually beneficial development.

#### Workpackage 7 : Evaluation and dissemination

Monthly growth rate monitoring is ongoing and we will be tracking the growth of University of Leeds philosophy department.

*List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.*  
The next reporting period is taken to be from October 2007 – April 2008.  
Inevitably, there will be some changes in the timing of deliverables with a significant technical component because of our reduced technical support.

#### Workpackage 1: Project management

- Ensure Consortium Agreement (or, more likely, Memorandum of Understanding) is signed and submitted to JISC
- Continue to monitor progress and effectiveness
- JISC Programme Meeting

#### Workpackage 2 : Survey of activities

- Pilot three database imports. The timescale may be delayed but it is hoped that this, and the Pilot Test Report, will be completed within the next reporting period.
- Complete the web site analysis and administer an online questionnaire to research staff.

#### Workpackage 3 : Harvesting

- Linkage between University of Leeds Publication Database and White Rose Research Online
- Import sample databases
- Address author agreement processes where deposit is not directly by the author
- Web page scraper PERL scripts
- Review repository import mechanisms and interface

#### Workpackage 4 : Metadata enhancement

- Automatic RoMEO check (carried over from previous reporting period)
- Introduce funder metadata

- Review of scholarly works application profiles implementation

#### Workpackage 5 : Integration with funder repositories

- Agree metadata requirements and harvesting process with ESRC
- Test push and pull mechanisms with ESRC

#### Workpackage 6 : Integration with local systems

- Establish link between University of Leeds Publication Database and White Rose Research Online
- Input to Sheffield's *University Research Visibility Improvement Project*.

#### Workpackage 7 : Evaluation and dissemination

- Contribute to the Repository Support Project Professional Briefing and Networking event in Leeds, 29/11/07

## 16. Evaluation Plan

*Report progress against plan, and note any evaluation results during the reporting period.*

- Growth rate monitoring ongoing.

*List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.*

- Impact monitoring on pilot departments
- Assessment of copyright and permissions management issues
- Case studies will be made available for comment via the IncReASe web site

## 17. Quality Assurance Plan

*Report progress against plan, describe the QA procedures put in place, and any QA results during the reporting period.*

The project web site is a temporary design pending the appointment of the Software Developer-IncReASe Project. However, the home page meets basic accessibility criteria, as assessed by the Watchfire WebXACT service. Further quality checking once the technical post is filled.

*List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.*

- Web survey of appropriate depth and detail to provide pilot departments and estimate possibilities for repository roll out.
- Assess success of web scraper PERL script

## 18. Dissemination Plan

*Report progress against plan, noting dissemination done, whether you feel it was successful, and any publicity the project received during the reporting period.*

- Coverage in the White Rose Update :  
<http://www.whiterose.ac.uk/downloads/updatesummer2007.pdf> (paper copy circulated to all departments across the Consortium)
- Publicity via subject librarians at the three Universities e.g. inclusion in the University of Leeds Library Science and Engineering Team Newsletter:  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/library/teams/sci-eng/2007-08.pdf>
- White Rose Research Online Open Access blog:  
<https://elgg.leeds.ac.uk/openaccess/weblog/>
- Update to the White Rose Research PVCs
- Presentation on the Project to University of Leeds Library Reps meeting

*List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.*

Project Acronym: IncReASe  
Version: 1.0  
Contact: r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk.  
Date: 24/10/2007

- Publicise the repository via University newsletters
- Report to Research Committees in pilot departments
- Collaborate with Repositories Support Project

## **19. Exit/Sustainability Plan**

*Report progress against plan, noting any issues related to archiving, preservation, maintenance, supporting documentation, etc.*

- Recent discussions in the context of etheses have highlighted the need for a clearer undertaking on preservation – particularly if the ecopy will replace the hard copy. We will be addressing the requirements for local backup and database restoration in Leeds (backups are currently daily but a more robust infrastructure could be put in place).

*List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.*

- Document the ESRC deposit workflow.

## Appendix B



### Workpackages and Deliverables

	2007						2008												
	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
<b>1: Project Management</b>																			
Project Plan																			
Project web site and text for JISC site																			
Consortium Agreement																			
Progress reports																			
Completion Report																			
Final Report																			
Web site mothballed																			
<b>2: Survey of existing activities</b>																			
Pilot test report																			
Metadata and database prevalence report																			
Research workflow case studies																			
Workpackage report, evaluating workflows																			
<b>3: Harvesting of data</b>																			
Imported data: case studies																			
Web scraper perl script																			
Guidelines for bulk import																			



Workpackage and activity	Earliest start date	Latest completion date	Outputs (clearly indicate deliverables & reports in bold)	Milestone	Responsibility
<p>WORKPACKAGE 1: <b>Work-package 1: Project Management</b></p> <p><u>Objective:</u> To manage the project effectively</p>	01/07/07	31/12/08			
1. Produce project plan, work-packages plan, evaluation plan, quality assurance plan, outline budget, risk analysis, dissemination plan, exit/sustainability plan.	13/07/07	18/07/07	project plan, ( including work-packages plan, evaluation plan, quality assurance plan, dissemination plan, exit/sustainability plan) outline budget, risk analysis	1	PM
2. Sign consortium agreement.	20/07/07	31/07/07	Consortium agreement.	1	PM, SG
3. Implement issues log and lessons learned log.	01/07/07	01/07/07	Issues log and lessons learned log.		PM
4. Text for JISC web site	13/07/07	13/07/07	JISC site web page	1	PM
5. Produce project web site.	13/07/07	13/07/07	Project web site.	1	PM (preliminary) TO
6. Staff induction: induct IncReASe Project Officer and undertake Project Officer and Project Manager skills audit.	01/08/07	30/09/07	ePrints 3 training (date tbc)	PM attended May 05	PM
7. Monitor activities against original project plan	Ongoing				PM
8. Regularly evaluate progress and effectiveness.	Ongoing				PM
9. Network closely with the JISC Programme Manager and other projects in the cluster & attend Programme Meetings.	Ongoing				PM, PO. TO

10. Produce progress reports.	30/09/07	30/06/07	Two progress reports per year	2,7,16	PM
11. Draft final report.	01/11/08	30/11/08	Draft final report.		PM
12. Submit final report.	01/12/08	31/12/08	Final report	24	PM, PO, TO
13. Completion report including financial statement.	01/12/08	31/12/08	Completion report (including Lessons Learned)	23	PM, PO, TO
14. Archive project web site.	15/12/08	31/12/08	Web site status clear. Available for at least 3 years.	22	TO, PM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 2: <i>Survey of existing archiving activities and workflows</i></b>					
<b>Objective:</b> Phase 1 Identify initial databases to act as a testbed for harvesting, processing and level of full text obtainable Phase 2 Expand the survey to identify departmental and research centre activity across the consortium The result of WP2 will be used to inform WP3; issues raised in WP3 will inform the development of WP2 Phase 2					
15. Review research workflow investigation by EVIE.	01/08/07	30/08/07			PM
16. Identify at least three different existing databases for sample harvesting. Liaise with departmental staff, undertake harvesting, request full text.	01/07/07	28/02/08	Pilot databases.		PM, PO, TO
17. Evaluate successes / difficulties of the pilot.	01/11/07	28/02/07	Pilot test report.	4	PM, PO, TO
18. Decide on the aims and scope of the broader survey.	01/10/07	31/01/08			PM, PO
19. Undertake survey and report.	01/10/07	30/06/08	Website review. Database prevalence report.	10	PO

20. Pre-existing non-repository archivers: identify academics who regularly archive on their own pages (across the three institutions and across several subject disciplines). Discuss workflow and the role of the repository.	01/10/07	31/05/08	One-to-one interviews. Case studies	8	PM, PO
21. Identify academics with no known archiving activity (across the three institutions and across several subject disciplines). Discuss workflow and the role of the repository.	01/10/07	31/05/08	One-to-one interviews. Case studies	8	PM,PO
22. Consider at what point(s) data could be deposited in subject and institutional repositories.	01/10/07	31/05/08			PM, PO, TO
23. Evaluate success of workpackage.	01/06/08	31/07/08	Report on workpackage, evaluating workflows.	12	PM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 3: <i>Harvesting of data</i></b>	<i>01/07/07</i>	<i>30/11/08</i>			
<b>Objective:</b> to import bulk data from a variety of institutional sources and investigate the issues involved.					
24. Preliminary testing of ePrints 3 features - particularly bulk import from a test source	01/07/07	<u>31/08/07</u>			TO, PM
25. Create technical issues log	01/07/07	15/07/07	Technical issues log		PM
26. Test customisation of the ePrints buffer: organisation by publisher field	01/09/07	<u>30/11/07</u>			PM,TO
27. Integration with ULPD: field mapping and bi-directional testing	16/07/07	<u>28/02/07</u>			TO, PM
28. Agree ULPD to repository workflow and agree publicity for ULPD users	01/09/07	01/01/08	ULPD workflow.		PM, Leeds Research Office
29. Investigate conversion of sample database	01/09/07	<u>28/02/07</u>	Successfully imported databases.	3	PM,TO

outputs to XML. Import sample databases from Sheffield and York into the repository.			Case studies.		
30. Investigate import tools produced by other projects e.g. DAEDALUS	01/07/07	31/08/07			TO
31. Establish standardised process for third party rights clearance and obtaining author agreement.	1/10/07	30/11/07			PM, PO
32. Investigate and trial web page scraper perl scripts for personal and departmental web page metadata.	01/01/08	<u>30/04/08</u>	Web scraper perl script	5	TO
33. Investigate import from personal or departmental drives and explore the applicability of WebDAV.	01/03/08	30/04/07			TO, PM
34. Suggest guidelines for bulk import of database or web page based metadata.	01/08/08	30/09/08	Guidelines for bulk import.	15	TO, PM
35. Review repository import mechanisms and interface. Consider introducing enhanced user services such as pointing to web pages for automatic or mediated metadata creation. Review repository user feedback during deposit.	01/03/08	30/04/08			PM, PO, TO
36. Collate findings of WP3.	01/11/08	30/11/08	Technical Report.	20	TO, PM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 4: <i>Metadata enhancement</i></b>	<i>01/08/07</i>	<i>31/05/08</i>			
<b><u>Objective:</u> to enhance metadata quality through automated means and to review repository metadata against agreed standards</b>					
37. Investigate and implement automatic RoMEO check to populate publisher field	01/08/07	<u>31/12/07</u>			PM, TO
38. Investigate DOI population from Crossref and field population via DOI	01/08/07	30/09/07			PM, TO

39. Introduce grant / funder metadata	01/12/07	28/02/08			PM,PO
40. Review metadata against the ePrints Application Profile. Review metadata against metadata and OAI-PMH standards. Improve as necessary.	<u>01/10/07</u>	28/02/08	Review of scholarly works application profile implementation	6	PO, PM
41. Introduce mechanism for identifying lead / corresponding author for the repository	01/03/08	01/05/08			PO, PM
42. Investigate "author version" indicator	01/03/08	01/05/08			PO, PM
43. Investigate indicators for full text, embargoed full text, off site full text, non full text	01/03/08	01/05/08			PO, PM
44. Investigate technical metadata creation	01/10/07	<u>01/06/08</u>			TO
45. Metadata enhancement report	01/05/08	<u>31/07/08</u>	Metadata enhancement report	9	PO, PM, TO
<b>WORKPACKAGE 5:</b>					
<b><i>Integration with Funder Repositories</i></b>					
<b><u>Objective:</u> to establish a workflow for deposit of work in the ESRC repository, investigate deposit in UKPMC and suggest deposit scenarios.</b>					
46. Liaise with ESRC and agree metadata requirements and harvesting mechanisms	01/12/07	28/02/08			PM
47. Test push and pull mechanisms with ESRC repository	01/01/08	<u>31/04/08</u>			TO, PM
48. Publicise deposit to ESRC grantees through the three Research Offices	01/04/08	30/06/08			PM
49. Assess the ESRC workflow	01/05/08	30/06/08	ESRC workflow report	11	PM, PO, TO
50. Review UK PubMedCentral deposit and harvesting possibilities	01/04/08	31/05/08			PM, PO, TO
51. Assess the UKPMC workflow	01/06/08	31/07/08	Research funder workflow scenarios.	13	PM, PO

<b>WORKPACKAGE 6:</b> <b><i>Integration with local systems</i></b>	<i>01/05/08</i>	<i>31/10/08</i>			
<b>Objective:</b> to link the repository with local administrative and departmental systems and investigate offering the repository through local portals. To locate the repository in personal and institutional research workflows.					
52. Investigate user authentication mechanisms: LDAP and Shibboleth	<i>01/05/08</i>	31/07/08			TO
53. Investigate what would be involved in surfacing the repository through portals	<i>01/05/08</i>	30/09/08			TO
54. Investigate the repository and OpenURL and offer repository as a target resource e.g. from Web of Science	01/08/08	30/09/08			TO
55. Agree ULPD to repository workflow (see Workpackage 3)	<i>16/07/07</i>	30/09/07			PM
56. Review input workflows from existing databases (see Workpackage 3)	01/05/08	31/05/08			PM, PO
57. Interviews re outputs from the repository; (a) what local systems need to be fed? Does the repository replace or feed existing databases? (b) what repository statistics would be valuable and how should these be delivered?	01/05/08	31/08/08	Interview staff from departments where we have harvested an existing database. <b>Services interviews report</b>	<b>14</b>	PM, PO
58. Work with the Research Offices at Leeds, Sheffield and York to investigate repository input and output in the context of their local systems.	01/08/08	31/10/08	Establish when, how and which data can be exchanged. Review roles and responsibilities.		PM, TO, PO
59. Review subject librarian relationship with the repository e.g. regularly including repository statistics and other information in departmental reports / dialogue.	Ongoing		Liaison with subject librarians and senior library staff. Review roles and responsibilities.		PM
60. Evaluate opportunities to facilitate the transition	01/09/08	31/10/08	Centralising deposit report.	<b>17</b>	PM, PO

from distributed to centralised deposit.					
61. Suggest roles and responsibilities scenarios (academic, intermediary, research office, library, external systems)	01/09/08	31/10/08	Workflow for local systems: roles and scenarios	18	PM
<b>WORKPACKAGE 7: Evaluation and dissemination</b>	01/07/07	31/12/08			
<b>Objective:</b> to evaluate the success of the project, disseminate outcomes and suggest workflow models for automated deposit and "deposit once use many times" scenarios.					
62. Monthly growth rate monitoring	Ongoing	31/12/08			
63. Implement evaluation plan and lesson learned log.	Ongoing	31/12/08	Completion Report	23	PM
64. Monitor impact on pilot departments	01/04/08	31/10/08	Impact report: 3, 6 and 9 months post pilot	19	PM, PO
65. Evaluate feasibility of and issues raised by automated repository population mechanisms.	01/10/08	30/11/08	Automation issues report.	21	TO, PM
66. White Rose dissemination activities.	Ongoing		White Rose research outputs workshop, reports in local magazines and web sites, presentations to subject librarians, regional dissemination through White Rose Consortium. Recruitment of White Rose Research Online departmental champions.		PM, PO
67. Publicise to AUA and Brunswick Group.	As appropriate		Report for the Brunswick group re grant metadata, example workflows and the relationship of institutional and subject repositories.		PM
68. Dissemination to library community.	As		Article in Ariadne or similar.		All

Project Acronym: IncReASe  
 Version: 1.0  
 Contact: r.e.proudfoot@leeds.ac.uk.  
 Date: 24/10/2007

	appropriate		Presentations at appropriate workshops and conferences.		
69. Review dissemination to other stakeholders: e.g. funders, subject repositories.	Ongoing				PM
70. Reports for JISC and other deliverables	Various				All

Members of Project Team:

*PM=Project Manager*  
*PO=Project Officer*  
*TO=Technical Officer*  
*SG=Steering Group*