
The COAPI Cats: The Current State of Open Access Repository Movement and Policy Documentations

Bijan K. Roy*, Subal C. Biswas**, Parthasarathi Mukhopadhyay***

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 29 August 2015

Revised 6 October 2015

Accepted 30 October 2015

Keywords:

Open Access,

Open Access Policy,

Self Archiving,

Open Source Software,

Open Access Repository,

Institutional Repository

ABSTRACT

The paper investigates open access (OA) self archiving policies of different Open Access Repositories (OARs) of COAPI (Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions) founder members as reported in June 2011 (i.e. a total of 22 members against a total of 46 COAPI members as reported by Open Biomed (<http://openbiomed.info/2011/08/coapi-cats/>)). The paper consulted three databases (OpenDOAR, ROAR and ROARMAP) in order to evaluate twenty-two (22) COAPI-members OARs self archiving policy documentations and highlights of some progress on issues so far. After analyzing policy documentations, key findings have been highlighted and common practices have been suggested in line with global recommendations and best practice guidelines at national and international levels for strengthening national research systems. The paper has implications for administrators, funding agencies, policy makers and professional librarians in devising institute specific self archiving policies for their own organization.

1. Introduction: COAPI

COAPI (Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions) was formed against the recommendations proposed in two conferences held in the summer of 2011 from 22 North American institutions with existing faculty initiated open access (OA) policies. The University of Kansas (KU), which in June 2009 became the first U.S. public university to adopt OA policy regarding scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals, recently announced that it had spearheaded the formation of a 22-member COAPI. The objective of the COAPI is to bring together representatives from North American universities with established faculty OA policies and those in the process of developing such policies, to share information and experiences and to illuminate opportunities for moving faculty-led OA

* Assistant Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, The University of Burdwan, India (bijankumarroy@yahoo.co.in)

** Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, The University of Burdwan, India (scbiswas_56@yahoo.co.in)

*** Associate Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, The University of Kalyani, India (psmukhopadhyay@gmail.com)

International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology, 6(1): 69-84, 2016.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5865/IJKCT.2016.6.1.069>

forward at member institutions and advocating for OA nationally and internationally. COAPI will offer a collection of best and evolving practices to act as a roadmap for inspiring, promoting and implementing open access policies at institutions without existing or effective OA policies. The main objective of this study is to provide the current status of self archiving policies for OARs of COAPI-members.

2. Literature Review

A survey conducted by the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) found that research libraries mainly in North America have taken on a leadership role in both policy formulation and defining operational deployment roles for OARs at research universities. Basically, CNI is engaged in developing and managing networked information content; building technology, standards, and infrastructure; and policy and consultative activities. Almost all the COPAI member institutions belong to the CNI group. Lynch and Lippincott (2005) in their survey of the individual and consortia members of the CNI, concluded that 40% of respondent institutions have some type of OARs operating and that 88% of those who do not yet have a repository are planning to set up OARs. The survey also indicated that the number of repositories in non-research intensive universities was limited, while the majority of doctoral-granting institutions either had established or were planning to establish IRs. Another researcher (Westrienen & Lynch, 2005) surveyed IRs developed by CNI members abroad.

A team of The Primary Research Group (Primary Research Group, 2007) presented data from 56 OARs from eleven countries including the USA and Canada, and representations from Europe and Latin America, and early adopters of IR technology worldwide (Ware, 2004a). This report covers costs, budgets, software, personnel, OA policies, marketing, relations with faculty and other contributors of content, and many other issues relevant to those managing or designing an OAR including OARs of COPAI members.

Bailey et al. (2006) surveyed the 123 member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) regarding their IR efforts and published findings in an ARL SPEC Kit. It is important to note that ARL includes 12 COPAI members. The survey found that eighty-seven libraries (71%), including the University of Oregon and the University of Kansas responded to the survey. Of those, 37 (43%) have an operational IR, 31 (35%) were planning for one by 2007 at the latest, and 19 (22%) had no immediate plans to develop an IR. This SPEC Kit includes documentation from respondents in the form of IR usage statistics, deposit policies, metadata policies, preservation policies etc.

In the MIRACLE project (MIRACLE - Making Institutional Repositories a Collaborative Learning Environment), Markey et al. (2007) reported that almost 85% of the research university respondents were either planning, pilot testing, or had already implemented IRs. Only 37% of the respondents were either planning, pilot testing, or had already implemented repositories. This project reported a brief discussion on the initial struggle of developing OARs in universities in North America. This project investigates the implementation of IRs in colleges and universities of the USA in order to identify models and best practices in the administration, technical infrastructure, and access to repository collections. Another group of authors (Markey et al., 2007; George, 2006) reported the development

of IRs in the USA as a whole. Additionally, Rieh et al. (2007) reported that the majority of the research universities in the USA had implemented OARs for their own organization. Other researchers (Shreeves & Cragin, 2008) reported that only 40% of the institutions that offered doctoral degrees in the USA had an IR. On the basis of the above mentioned research studies and other related studies, the following key events (Table 1) are identified (<http://www.sparc.arl.org/COAPI>).

Table 1. Key Events in the Development of COAPI

2011	<p>A group of universities in North America formed the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI). The first call was in July 2011 and the second in late August when the decision to form the coalition was made.</p> <p>This new alliance, the Coalition of Open Access Policy Institutions (COAPI), was announced on August 3, 2011 in a press release issued by the University of Kansas.</p> <p>COAPI's first face-to-face meeting happened at a ½ day meeting held prior to the Berlin 9 conference in Washington DC, November 2011.</p>
2012	<p>In January 12, 2012, the first major action was completed as a coalition: the submission of a lengthy response to the White House's RFI.</p> <p>In June 23, 2012, COAPI members met over breakfast at ALA in Anaheim, CA, created a Coordinating Group that began meeting in Spring 2012.</p> <p>In March, 2012, half-day meeting at SPARC's OA meeting in Kansas City.</p> <p>In June 13, 2012, member universities of the (COAPI) submitted letter to be circulated among congressmen supporting FRPAA (Federal Research Public Access Act).</p>
2013	<p>In September 16, 2013, the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research (FASTR) Bill was introduced.</p>
2015	<p>In March, 2015, the Fair Access to Science and Technology Research (FASTR) Bill passed.</p>

3. Open Access Self Archiving Policy: A Status Report

There are many OARs coming online and everyday one repository is being added to the OpenDOAR (Directory of Open Access Repositories) and ROAR (Registry of Open Access Repositories, 2015) databases. As per the OpenDOAR (2015) database, the total number of OARs is 2947 (August 2015) from all over the world whereas North America (Continent-wise) possesses 569 (19.3%) OARs and stands in 2nd position after Europe and Asia which possess 1300 (44.1%) and 593 (20.1%) OARs respectively.

The United States (country-wise) possesses 470 (15.9%) OARs and stands in 1st position in the global repository movement. Another two North American countries, Canada and Mexico possess 72 and 27 OARs respectively. Many repositories with a mandate do not have a corresponding entry on the OpenDOAR or ROAR databases. Some repositories that have an open access mandate did not register their names in ROARMAP (Registry of Open Access Repositories Mandatory Archiving Policies) and their URL (Uniform Resource Locator) is not working properly. Some of these are pilot projects and some are now becoming full OAR services, and it is at this stage that they

need to start formulating policy documentation, or at least formalizing their policy decisions.

There are no sources that provide a numerical count or cumulative growth of all OARs in North America at any one point in time. In order to examine the development of open access (OA) mandate policies, this study consulted ROARMAP, a site created and maintained by the University of Southampton in England, as an online location for policy registration. The study consulted with other important sources like OpenDOAR and ROAR databases to improve the accuracy level. Other sources consulted included SHERPA/RoMEO (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research, Preservation and Access/ Rights METadata for Open archiving) Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving policy list; SHERPA/JULIET's research funders' open access policy list; SHERPA/FACT (Funders' & Authors' Compliance Tool).

The United States is the main contributor in this open movement and North America is witnessing not only the growth in the number of open access repositories (OARs) and journals, but also the development of other related expressions and initiatives that have emerged in the domain of science and technology institutions.

As per the ROARMAP (2015) database, a total of 724 (August, 2015) policy proposals and implementations have been registered and documented worldwide. All the mandates are listed under five (5) broad categories such as - *Funder* (79), *Funder and research organization* (54), *Multiple research organizations* (08), *Research organizations* (e.g. university or research institution) (512), and *Sub-unit of research organizations* (e.g. department, faculty, or school) (71). North America possesses 157 (21.6%) mandates (the United States 127 & Canada 29) both from institutional and funding agencies. The SHERPA/JULIET (2015) list/database of funder OA policies, archiving mandates, and guidelines, includes 14 from the United States and 15 research funder policies in Canada, making Canada second only to the UK in quantity. Nearly all of these Canadian funders are in the biomedical and/or health disciplines. From the SHERPA/RoMEO (2015) database (list of OA publishers copy right policy) it is noted that 578 publishers are from North America (66 from Canada & 505 from United States, and seven (7) publishers are from Mexico.

4. Need of the Self Archiving Policy

Much has been written to date about OA self archiving policy implementations because OA self archiving policy implementation is a difficult task. There are therefore many thousands of universities, research institutes, and research funding agencies across the world that have not yet implemented an OA self archiving policy. Policy pioneers have faced considerable challenges in meeting their own aims and achieving recognized success (Armbruster, 2011). Laundry lists of policy issues are given by Ware (2004b), Barton and Waters (2004), Rieh et al. (2008), and Shearer (2005). In a survey for OpenDOAR in early 2006, Peter Millington discovered that about two thirds of OARs registered did not have publicly stated policies (Millington, 2006). It is important that the necessary policies and procedures are in place to ensure that the responsibilities for content, management and maintenance of the repositories are accurately specified. Therefore, it seems appropriate at this time to ensure that policy documents are formulated correctly (Asamoah-Hassan, 2010),

but the situation is not satisfactory. Some policies may be listed under a different name or entered incorrectly.

5. Methodology for Analyzing Policy Documentations

This analytical study is limited to only OARs of COAPI-members countries and for the analysis and interpretation of policy documentations, three databases, OpenDOAR, ROAR and ROARMAP have been consulted. Annex I provides basic information regarding all 22 repositories, but for the policy analysis, only 18 (81.8%) repositories (annex II) having OA self archiving policies (at least one policy mentioned in table 2) have been considered. Finally their policies have been discussed in relation to those issues mentioned in table 2. The policy documentations of selected OARs (annex II) have been discussed below under section eight (8) with broad headings that correspond to the evaluation criteria. Policies can be separated out into the following areas:

Table 2. Policies and Related Issues

Policy	Issues/Activities
Archiving Policy	Mandatory or optional; time; form & version
Content & Collection Management Policy	Type of materials; organization & management; categories & sub-categories
Copyright & Licensing Policy	Rights management; licensing pattern
Data Access Policy	Access to items; access pattern
Metadata Policy	Eligible depositors; schema used
Preservation Policy	File format; backup
Submission (Deposit) Policy	Eligible contributors; deposition rules
Withdrawal Policy	Reasons for withdrawal or removal

5.1 Archiving Policy

Devising an archive policy for any repository system is the most challenging task to the repository managers. Here, only 11 (50%) repositories have mentioned an archiving policy and have advocated for archiving an author's final version immediately after acceptance of publication. Only three (3) repositories (s.l.no. 9, 13, & 19) support archiving any version (e.g. pre or postprint that publisher allows) no later than the date of publication or distribution. Only one (1) repository (s.l.no. 5) has clearly stated that an article has to be archived within 6 month to 2 years after the acceptance of a publication. If no data is available, then authors are required to check SHERPA/RoMEO database or publishers' websites before archiving a journal article (s.l.no. 2, 4, 19, & 22). Not a single repository has mentioned whether they follow a mandatory deposit policy or an optional deposit policy.

5.2 Content and Collection Policy

Without content, a repository is just a set of empty shelves. The success of any OAR depends on quality and quantity of contents deposited to the system. There is no hard and fast rule regarding content type because the structure of the archive depends on the software, technical support, vision, and resources of the OAR (Roy, Biswas, & Mukhopadhyay, 2011, 2012, 2013).

Here, only ten (10) OARs have stated content policy. It is found that OARs contain scholarly works in digital form created, produced, submitted, or sponsored by the community members (i.e. students, research scholars, faculties). The types of content range from dissertations and articles to raw research data and data-sets; post-prints (peer-reviewed research articles); book chapters; working papers; theses, etc. Generally documents are text-based articles of various types though a few OARs show a little evidence of more complex digital materials, datasets, software, patents, etc.

It is found that only five (5) OARs have their own collection organization and management policy. Generally, collections have been organized either by '*Departments*' or by '*Subjects*'. Only two (2) OARs (s.l.no. 9 & 11) have explicitly stated who will manage the collections and how collections are to be organized. MIT (s.l.no. 11) organizes content under '*Departments or Units*'. Generally, library/librarians and information technology staff, along with other university library staff, organize and manage collections.

Another two (2) OARs (s.l.no. 17 & 18) have stated that each community or sub-community may set its own policies and guidelines regarding the specific content/deposit of content and submission processes. In truth, each collection can have its own submission process & authorization (contributors) set out in community policies. Not a single OAR has suggested using any control vocabulary to organize collections under suitable categories and sub-categories in order to fulfill the subject approach of the users.

5.3 Copyright and Licensing Policy

In any OAR system, the copyright issue is maintained and managed by open source license. Administrators can use a default license supported by the repository software or can use another license available in the open source domain (i.e. BSD license, MIT license, Common Public License, Creative Common License (CC), Apache Software License, etc). In addition, administrators can use their own licenses and if required they can make some modifications as per the specific requirements of the organization.

Repositories do not claim copyright over anything deposited in the system. Content contributors/authors (generally academicians) retain the copyright to their work, unless they explicitly give it away to a third party. They (authors) grant a non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate and/or distribute the work (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium. They, if required, can set conditions on the re-use of their materials without obtaining permission from the authority.

Nine (9) repositories (s.l.no. 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 15, 17, 18, & 20) have reported that authors/faculty members retain copyrights. Only four (4) repositories have a stated licensing model where CC

(Creative Commons) license is used by three (3) OARs (s.l.no. 1, 17, & 21) and another one (1) has its own license (s.l.no. 2). MIT (s.l.no. 11) has explicitly stated that it is the academic who is responsible for ensuring compliance with publisher copyright agreements.

5.4 Data Access Policy

By default, items should not have any access restrictions. Crow's short definition of institutional repositories (IRs) says that they should be "... *accessible to end users both within and outside of the institution, with few if any barriers to access*" (Crow, 2002). However, a variety of legitimate circumstances might require an institution to limit access to a particular content to a specific set of users. It is found that only four (4) repositories (s.l.no 2, 4, 11, & 19) impose restriction on access under special circumstances and access (in whole or in part) is limited only to the registered members. MIT (s.l.no. 11) has explicitly mentioned that the community retains the right to limit access to content at the item level either to MIT only or to specific individuals or groups. It is the responsibility of the communities to establish access control policies for content in their collections, or community level. Another two (2) OARs (s.l.no. 17 & 18) restrict access to groups of registered users at the item, collection, or community level, with approval of the community's administrator. Only one OAR (s.l.no 19) follows three level of access i.e. *open access to the public (default); limited access with respect to time (e.g., an embargo period) or to specific groups (community members); and, closed access*. It is also found that another three (3) OARs (s.l.no 5, 6, & 9) respect an embargo imposed by publishers or funders and allow full text access of the content only after the specified period is over.

5.5 Metadata Policy

Good quality metadata is extremely important for any repository system and systems differ widely in the handling of metadata schema (Roy, 2015). A total of seven (7) repositories have a stated metadata policy. Only two (2) repositories (s.l.no. 8 & 11) have suggested that metadata should be created and provided by an author or eligible contributors at the time of submission of items to the repository, though librarian/library staff, if required, may provide additional metadata for the particular object. It appears that three (3) repositories (s.l.no. 2, 17, & 18) follow an open standards metadata schema i.e. Dublin Core/Qualified version of the Dublin Core metadata standards. Not a single repository has recommended using a domain specific metadata schema for non-text objects like theses, learning objects, etc. It is not clear from the data provided by the repositories whether or not these entities support metadata harvesting by service providers.

5.6 Preservation Policy

Repositories have no formal preservation policy except for the recommendation of file formats that are likely to facilitate long-term preservation. This challenge remains a long way from being solved. Generally repositories accept many open file formats, and PDF is the common choice of

almost all repository managers. Only one (1) repository (s.l.no. 4) has recommended open standard format and provided formats list for preservation and access. There are at least four possible approaches to the problem: migration, technology preservation, emulation, and persistent object preservation. MIT (s.l.no. 11) prefers techniques like migration and emulation where necessary, and the University of Kansas (s.l.no. 18) keeps back up files according to current best practice.

5.7 Submission (Deposit) Policy

It is found that only community members (i.e. faculty members, staff, researchers) are eligible to deposit items to the repository. Only two (2) OARs (s.l.no. 7 & 8) have stated that on behalf of the authors, ‘*accredited members*’ of the organization or their ‘*delegated agents*’ may also submit. Even authors or submitters may ask the library for assistance or a library may help or offer a mediated service (e.g. mediated deposit) (s.l.no. 2). Only one (1) repository (s.l.no. 21) has mentioned that training, if required, may be provided to the submitters or depositors at the time of submission of items to the repository. A total of four (4) OARs (s.l.no. 4, 5, 9, & 14) respect an embargo imposed by publishers or funders. Another four (4) OARs (s.l.no. 2, 4, 19, & 22) have suggested checking the SHERPA/RoMEO database (in case of journal articles) in order to avoid legal conflict. Still, important issues such as workflow management are missing in the literature.

5.8 Withdrawal Policy

Studies strongly discourages withdrawal of items (Ware, 2004a; Probets & Jenkins, 2006; Roy, 2015) because one definition of IRs is that items should be cumulative and perpetual (Johnson, 2002). It is found that OARs support withdrawal of items under different circumstances. The common reasons are: falsified research; national security; copyright violation or plagiarism; and journal publishers’ rules. Though repositories do not support deletion of withdrawn items from the database, but recommend its removal just from the public view, the suggestion is that associated metadata of withdrawn items should remain visible and searchable.

6. Key Findings in Policy Documentations

Several key findings have been identified after analyzing selected repositories along with their policy documentations (annex I & II). As stated, many repositories that possess a good number of OA resources do not have any self archiving policy. It has been observed that many issues related to the OA self archiving policies are either not properly configured or not included at all. Generally repositories of elite institutions have more detailed policy documentations than those OARs that are at implementation stages or in their infancy.

A total of nine (9) key policies (annex II) have been identified, which are common to almost all repositories, and only 18 (81.8%) repositories have OA self archiving policy (at least one policy mentioned in table 2) documentations. The key findings are: all items are not available as full-text

(s.l.no. 3); all repositories having data access policy impose access restriction; around seven (7) repositories do not provide OAI-PMH base URL and thereby do not expose metadata for harvesting by service providers; non-availability of access and usage statistics is a common problem of almost all repositories (except s.l.no. 4, 9, & 17); a total of four (4) repositories have not mentioned software type; altogether three (3) repositories have not provided a total number of objects uploaded; a total of three (3) repositories have not mentioned content types; repositories are not in concert with others who have established a form of repository network at the national/international level; almost all the repositories are multidisciplinary in nature and cover subjects mainly related to Arts & Humanities; only one (1) repository (s.l.no. 18) has a customized user interface and it is available in Spanish & Portuguese other than the default English language; and four (4) repositories hold special items including administrative documents (s.l.no. 10), notebooks and sheet music (s.l.no. 01), links to other resources (s.l.no. 18), musical scores, posters, etc. (s.l.no. 19).

7. Key Recommendations

Several technical as well as non-technical issues have not been discussed in policy documentations of the OARs mentioned in annex II. The following recommendations may be considered at the time of devising an OA self archiving policy for building up institute-specific OAR systems.

- Most of the OARs don't have well stated policy documentations regarding different issues (annex II). It is well established that the success of any repository system depends on proper policy documentations, so, OA self archiving policies based on global recommendations and existing best practice guidelines are key to the success of any OAR system;
 - In archiving policy, it is not clear whether OARs follow mandatory/optional policy for inclusion of content. This study proposes to follow a mandatory archiving policy because only mandatory policy can be effective for encouraging wider contribution of contents to the OARs (Roy, 2015). Repositories should mention both archiving timing, i.e. when to archive, and archiving format, i.e. in which format it (content) is to be archived;
 - In content and collection policy, a repository may adopt control vocabulary or any appropriate subject taxonomy in organizing and managing collections to fulfill the subject approach of the users (Roy, 2014);
 - In copyrights and licensing policy, repositories should mention who holds copyrights of the items deposited and what the retention period should be for the objects deposited to OARs;
 - In data access policy, repositories should mention whether they provide full text access or metadata only, even if it is not clear whether repositories follow different access policy for different types of users depending upon the types of documents;
 - An embargo/retention policy has been neglected by most of the repositories. This study respects any embargo requested by the authors or journal publishers or any funders. No item (full text) should be accessible during this period and items should be submitted and archived only after the retention period expires;
-

- In metadata policy, repositories should use any standard indexing tools and should support extraction of metadata from different OAI-PMH compliant OARs. A repository may follow domain-specific metadata schemas in order to support, ingest, manage, and use of non-textual data in their collections;
- In submission policy, workflow issues have not been discussed. Repositories should mention different stages of workflows and different roles played by E-persons at different workflow stages;
- To be compatible with a global system and to achieve technical interoperability, OARs should apply open standards, open technologies, and open source software (OSS) as much as possible.

8. Conclusion

The OAR movement as Green Path (also known as self-archiving) to Open Access was initiated by leading universities in the USA like MIT. In fact most of the COPAI members belong to the USA although the base membership of COPAI covers the entire North America. This study shows that OA self archiving policies, even in these forerunner organizations, require improvements in different aspects like quality control procedures, version control, multilingual issues, user interface, etc. Some of these issues related to OA self archiving like archiving policy, content policy, collection policy, withdrawal policy, etc. are well covered by the COPAI members and some of the important issues like submission workflows, interoperability standard, preservation techniques, etc. are not included at all in the policy documents of these organizations. This study shows clearly the strength and weakness of the policies of COPAI members and argues that successful deployment of OARs requires that various OA self archiving policy issues should be clearly defined and followed by COPAI members. An in-depth analysis, as given in annexure II, shows that existing practices of the OARs of COPAI members do not provide an integrated OA self archiving policy framework. This is possibly due to the fact that different countries may have different approaches towards developing OAR strategies and policies depending upon varying local conditions. For example, funder mandates differ from country to country. Even within the same country these mandates differ from organization to organization on several levels. COPAI members, as leading players of OA self archiving in the world, need to develop a core set of OA self archiving policies with an option to add country specific and institution specific policies into the core part of the policy framework. The core policy framework is required to support by COPAI members as prominent players of the domain for promoting OA self archiving on a global scale. This paper recommends a set of policy elements (included in annexure II) as part of the core policy framework for COPAI members.

References

- Armbruster, C. (2011). Open access policy implementation: First results compared. *Learned Publishing*, 24(4), 311-324.
- Asamoah-Hassan, H. (2010). Alternative scholarly communication: Management issues in a Ghanaian university. *Library Management*, 31(6), 420-426. doi: 10.1108/01435121011066171
- Bailey, C. W., Coombs, K., Emery, J., Mitchell, A., Morris, C., Simons, S., & Wright, R. (2006). *Institutional repositories SPEC kit 292*. Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Barton, M. R., & Waters, M. M. (2004). *Creating an institutional repository: LEADIRS workbook*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Crow, R. (2002). *The case for institutional repositories: A SPARC position paper*. Washington, D.C.: The Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition.
- George, L. A. (2006). *SPEC online surveys: SPEC survey on institutional repositories*. Retrieved from <http://createchange.org/spec/surveys/index.html>
- Johnson, R. K. (2002). Institutional repositories: Partnering with faculty to enhance scholarly communication. *D-Lib Magazine*, 8(11). Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november02/johnson/11johnson.html>
- Lynch, C. A., & Lippincott, J. K. (2005). Institutional repository deployment in the United States as of early 2005. *D-Lib Magazine*, 11(9). Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lynch/09lynch.html>
- Markey, K., Rieh, S. Y., Jean, B. S., Kim, J., & Yakel, E. (2007). *Census of institutional repositories in the United States: MIRACLE project research findings*. Washington D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources.
- Mgonzo, W. J., & Yonah, Z. O. (2014). Design and development of a web based digital repository for scholarly communication. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, 4(2), 97-108.
- Millington, P. (2006, May). *Moving forward with the OpenDOAR directory*. In 8th International Conference on Current Research Information Systems, Bergen. Retrieved from <http://www.opendoar.org/documents/BergenPresentation20060512Handouts.ppt>
- OpenDOAR. (2015, August 2). *Home page of OpenDOAR*. Retrieved from <http://www.opendoar.org/find.php>
- Primary Research Group. (2007). *The international survey of institutional digital repositories*. New York: Primary Research Group Inc.
- Proberts, S., & Jenkins, C. (2006). Documentation for institutional repositories. *Learned Publishing*, 19(1), 57-71.
- Registry of Open Access Repositories. (2015, August 3). *Home page of ROAR*. Retrieved from <http://roar.eprints.org/index.php?action=search&query=india>
- Rieh, S. Y., Markey, K., St Jean, B., Yakel, E., & Kim, J. (2007). Census of institutional repositories in the US. *D-Lib magazine*, 13(11/12), Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november07/rieh/11rieh.html>
- Rieh, S. Y., Jean, B. S., Yakel, E., Markey, K., & Kim, J. (2008). Perceptions and experiences of
-

- staff in the planning and implementation of institutional repositories. *Library trends*, 57(2), 168-190.
- ROARMAP. (2015, August 6). *Registry of open access repositories mandatory archiving policies*. Retrieved from <http://roarmap.eprints.org>
- Roy, B. K. (2014). *Designing institutional digital repository for the university of Burdwan: A FLOSS based prototype*. (Doctoral dissertation, the university of Burdwan). Retrieved from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/54188>
- Roy, B. K. (2015). *Institutional digital repository: From policy to practice*. Germany: LAP.
- Roy, B. K., Biswas, S. C., & Mukhopadhyay, P. (2011). An analytical study of institutional digital repositories in India. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/692>
- Roy, B. K., Biswas, S. C., & Mukhopadhyay, P. (2012). Open access repositories in Asia: From SAARC to Asian tigers. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/808>
- Roy, B. K., Biswas, S. C., & Mukhopadhyay, P. (2013). Global visibility of Indian open access institutional digital repositories. *International Research: Journal of Library & Information Science*, 3(1), 182-194.
- Shearer, K. (2005). *Institutional repositories: The evolution of scholarly communication*. Retrieved from http://www.carl-abrc.ca/projects/institutional_repositories/ppt/CACUL2-Apr05.ppt.
- SHERPA/JULIET. (2015). *Research funders' open access policies*. Retrieved from <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet>
- SHERPA/RoMEO. (2015, August 3). *Home page of SHERPA/RoMEO*. Retrieved from <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/PDFandIR.php?la=en>
- Shreeves, S., & Cragin, M. H. (2008). Introduction: Institutional repositories: Current state and future. *Library Trends*, 57, 89-97.
- Ware, M. (2004a). *Publisher and library/learning solutions (PALS): Pathfinder research on web-based repositories: Final report*. Bristol: Publisher and Library Learning Solutions.
- Ware, M. (2004b). Institutional repositories and scholarly publishing. *Learned publishing*, 17(2), 115-124.
- Westrienen, G. V., & Lynch, C. A. (2005). Academic institutional repositories. *D-lib Magazine*, 11(9). Retrieved from <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/westrienen/09westrienen.html>

[About the author]

Bijan K. Roy, M.Com, MLIS, PhD is Assistant Professor in Library and Information Science, The University of Burdwan, West Bengal, India. His research interest includes open access, open source software, digital repository.

[Annex I] List of Open Access Repositories

S.L. No.	Name of the Repository	OAI-PMH	Software	Objects (Items)	Subjects	Contents Type
1	Arizona State University Library	http://repository.asu.edu/oai-pmh	N A	26884 items (2015-04-14)	Law & Politics; Multidisciplinary	Books; Multimedia; Unpublished; Learning Objects; Articles; Theses; Multimedia
2	Brigham Young University Library	N A	Digital Commons	1556 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	References; Theses
3	Columbia University Libraries	http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/catalog/oai	Fedora	15232 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Unpublished; Datasets; Multimedia
4	Concordia University Library	http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/cgi/oai2	EPrints	12966 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Conferences
5	Duke University Library	http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace-oai/request	DSpace	8287 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Unpublished
6	Emory University Library	http://oai.library.emory.edu/request?Identify?ListMetadataFormats	Fedora	5400 (2015-08-14)	Multidisciplinary	N A
7	Gustavus Adolphus College Library	N A	N A	N A	Multidisciplinary	N A
8	Harvard University Libraries	http://dash.harvard.edu/oai/request?Identify?ListMetadataFormats	DSpace	23207 items (2015-04-14)	Arts & Humanities General; Law & Politics	Articles
9	Indiana University-Purdue University Library	http://scholarworks.iupui.edu/oai/request	DSpace	5484 items (2015-06-29)	Multidisciplinary; Law & Politics; Management & Planning	Articles; Conferences; Theses; Unpublished
10	Lafayette College Library	N A	DSpace	951 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Books; Learning Objects
11	MIT Libraries	http://dspace.mit.edu/oai/request	DSpace	82669 items (2015-06-29)	Multidisciplinary	Theses; Unpublished; Multimedia
12	Oberlin College Library	N A	N A	N A	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Books; References

S.L. No.	Name of the Repository	OAI-PMH	Software	Objects (Items)	Subjects	Contents Type
13	Oregon State University Libraries	http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/oai/request	DSpace	54874 items (2015-06-29)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Books; Learning Objects; Conferences; Unpublished
14	Rollins College Library	N A	Bepress	1615 (2015-08-04)	Arts & Humanities; Education; Life Sciences	Articles; Books; Publication; Thesis
15	Stanford University Libraries	N A	N A	N A	N A	N A
16	Trinity University Library	http://digitalcommons.trinity.edu/do/oai	Digital Commons	1160 items (2014-06-05)	Multidisciplinary; Education	Articles; Theses; Learning Objects
17	University of Hawaii-Manoa Library	http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/dspace-oai/request	DSpace	27602 items (2015-04-15)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Conferences
18	University of Kansas Libraries	http://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/dspace-oai/request	DSpace	13073 items (2014-09-17)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Books; Software; Special; Multimedia; References; Datasets; Conferences; Unpublished
19	University of North Texas Libraries	http://digital.library.unt.edu/oai/	Aubrey	117247 items (2015-04-14)	Multidisciplinary	Theses; Books; Multimedia; Special
20	University of Northern Colorado Libraries	https://digitalunc.coalliance.org/oai2	Fez	2126 items (2014-09-17)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Special
21	University of Oregon Libraries	http://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/oai/request	DSpace	16522 items (2015-06-29)	Multidisciplinary	Articles; Theses; Multimedia; References; Conferences; Unpublished; Learning Objects
22	Wake Forest University Library	N A	DSpace	1665 (2015-08-09)	Law; Business; Medicine; Sciences	Theses; Books; Journals; Multimedia

[Annex II] Open Access Self Archiving Policies

Name of the Repository	Policies										No. of policies support
	Archiving (version & timing)	Content	Collection	Copyright & Licensing	Data Access	Metadata	Preservation	Submission	Withdrawal		
Arizona State University Library	Author's final version	Y	Y	Creative Commons	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	7
Brigham Young University Library	-	Y	-	Own	Restricted access	Dublin Core	-	Mediated deposit	Y	Y	5
Columbia University Libraries	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	-	Community Members	-	-	4
Concordia University Library	-	Y	-	Y	Restricted access	-	Recommended formats list	Respect embargo	Respect embargo	Editors can be contacted	6
Duke University Library	Author's final version (6 months to 2 years)	-	-	Author retains copyrights	Respect embargo	-	-	Respect embargo	-	-	4
Emory University Library	Author's final version	-	-	Author retains copyrights	Respect embargo	-	Y	Community Members	-	-	5
Gustavus Adolphus College Library	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	-	Accredited researchers or their delegated agents	Y	Y	5
Harvard University Libraries	Author's final version	Y	-	Author retains copyrights	Y	Authorized submitter	Y	Accredited researchers or their delegated agents	-	-	7
Indiana University-Purdue University Library	Author's final version No later than the date of publication	-	Y	Author retains copyrights	Respect embargo	-	Y	Respect embargo	Y	Y	7
MIT Libraries	Author's final version (post peer-reviewed, if allow)	-	Y	Author retains copyrights	Restricted access	Eligible contributor/depositors	Migration & Emulation	-	-	Y	7

Name of the Repository	Policies										No. of policies support
	Archiving (version & timing)	Content	Collection	Copyright & Licensing	Data Access	Metadata	Preservation	Submission	Withdrawal		
Oregon State University Libraries	An version that publisher allows	Y	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	6
	No later than the date of publication										
Rollins College Library	Author's final peer reviewed version	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Respect embargo	-	-	3
Stanford University Libraries	-	-	-	Author retains copyrights	-	-	-	-	Y	-	2
University of Hawaii-Manoa Library	-	Y	Y	Creative Commons/ Author retains copyrights	Restrict access at the item/ collection/ community level	Qualified version of the Dublin Core	-	-	Y	-	6
University of Kansas Libraries	-	Y	Y	Author retains copyrights	Restrict access at the item/ collection/ community level	Dublin Core	Back up	Community Members	-	-	7
University of North Texas Libraries	Not later than the date of publication	-	-	Author retains copyrights	Restricted access	Y	-	Community Members	-	-	2
University of Oregon Libraries	Author's final version	-	-	Creative Commons	-	-	As many format	Provide help/arrange training	Y	-	5
Wake Forest University Library	Author's final version	Y	-	-	-	-	As many format	Community Members	Y	-	5

a blank cell in the table indicates that this value was not calculated.