The state of the nation: A snapshot of Australian institutional repositories

by Mary Anne Kennan
and Danny A. Kingsley

Abstract

This paper provides the first full description of the status of Australian Institutional repositories. Australia presents an interesting case because of the government's support of institutional repositories and open access. A survey of all 39 Australian universities conducted in September 2008 shows that 32 institutions have active repositories and by end of 2009, 37 should have repositories. The total number of open access items has risen dramatically since January 2006. Five institutions reported they have an institution-wide open access mandate, and eight are planning to implement one. Only 20 universities have funding for their repository staff and 24 universities have funding for their repository platform, either as ongoing recurrent budgeting or absorbed into their institutions' budgets. The remaining are still project funded. The platform most frequently used for Australian repositories is Fedora with Vital. Most of the remaining sites use EPrints or DSpace.

Contents

[Introduction](#)
[Background](#)
[Methodology](#)
[Results and discussion](#)
[Conclusions](#)

Introduction

This paper aims to provide a 'snapshot' of the state of Australian Institutional repositories as at September 2008. In doing so, it builds on similar research canvassing institutional repositories in particular countries such as the United States (Bailey, *et al.*, 2006; Lynch and Lippincott, 2005; Rieh, *et al.*, 2007), Canada (Shearer, 2006), Britain (Wilson, 2006) and France (Baruch, 2007).

A complete description of the Australian Institutional repository situation does not currently exist. To date there have been several international surveys incorporating data from Australian repositories including an international study which looked at 13 nations (van Westrienen and Lynch, 2005). The information on Australia used in this paper was obtained by sending a survey to one university librarian in Australia who answered the questions (van Westrienen, 2005). Because the survey did not distinguish between digital thesis repositories and institutional repositories, and because the statistics requested were generally for averages across the country, the picture painted by this research of the Australian repository situation was somewhat optimistic.

One 2007 survey presented data from 56 institutional digital repositories from 11 countries, including Australia (Primary Research Group, 2007). This study only canvassed five Australian universities and has attracted some criticism within the open access community because of its small sample size given the worldwide nature of its scope (Oppenheim, 2007).

There are currently several Web sites which collate information about repositories worldwide, but these pose problems for creating a definitive list for a single country. The *Registry of Open Access Repositories* describes the platform the repository is based on, when the repository was registered with the service and gives a cumulative deposit (Brody, 2007). However there is no way of distinguishing what type of deposits these are (images, or metadata-only items for example, do not fit the criteria of open access pre- or post-print papers). In addition, where an institution has changed platforms, the two repositories appear as separate entities, even if the earlier repository has been absorbed into the newer one. *OpenDOAR*, another world-wide institutional repository list, provides a description of the repository, the number of items in it, the software platform, the content, and policies (Pinfield, 2008). However this information is not complete for every repository and in some cases the information is up to two years old. Both of these Web sites are discussed in depth in another paper (Carr and Brody, 2007).

Currently there are several Web sites [1] which specifically contain information about Australian repositories. However, these sites contain different information (for example a list of URLs, software platforms, and policies) but are irregularly updated. The *ARROW Discovery Service* [2] (ADS) run by the National Library of Australia searches simultaneously across the contents of Australian university research repositories. The Web site also lists the number of items in each repository and gives statistics on popular creators and institutions (ARROW, 2008). While these sites are valuable resources for the Australian academic community, they are incomplete and it is unclear when and how the information is updated.

The research described in this paper will collate information already available, provide information for a specific moment in time and provide additional information that will inform the open access and institutional repository communities.

Background

Australian institutional repositories present an interesting case because the Australian government has been pivotal in supporting the development of institutional repositories in Australia. In 2002, in a report to the Australian government, the Chief Scientist highlighted (among many other things) the importance of the accessibility and dissemination of research (Batterham, 2002). In 2003, as a major funder of research, the Australian government through the department responsible for research funding, allocated funds on a competitive basis for the development of research information infrastructure including open access institutional repositories in universities. As a result a number of universities and consortia began repository testing and implementation from this time (Australian Department of Education Science and Training, n.d.). Of the many projects supported, three were directly related to institutional repositories:

- Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR);
- Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW); and,
- Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively (RUBRIC).

The ARROW project comprised of a consortium of universities and the National Library of Australia, focusing on identifying and testing software or solutions to support institutional repositories. The APSR project focused on demonstrating the feasibility of using open source software to establish institutional repositories capable of providing open access to a broad spectrum of digital objects relevant to the research process. The RUBRIC project was funded to support smaller universities to establish institutional repositories using products tested or developed by ARROW and APSR (Shipp, 2006).

In 2003 a Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) survey on institutional repositories [3] identified six universities that had established e-print repositories. A further 14 universities were considering establishing a repository, and ten responded that they had no plans for a repository.

More recently a research evaluation exercise called *Excellence in Research in Australia (ERA)* is being implemented across all universities. One aspect of this project, titled 'Accessibility of Publications' will require universities to develop repositories to support open access (Harvey, 2008). In addition, the Government has allocated Aus\$25.5 million to Australian universities in the 2007-2009 funding period for the development of institutional repositories for publication reporting (Australian Government, 2008). Repository use is also being encouraged in other ways. In 2007, the two largest research funding bodies in Australia requested recipients of their grants place their results in a repository (Australian Research Council, 2007; National Health and Medical Research Council, 2007). Despite these considerable incentives, only 22 of the 39 universities had a repository listed on the ARROW Discovery Service in March 2008, and 26 are listed there currently (September 2008). Given government funding, the ERA and changes world-wide in the repository landscape we envisage that considerable change is taking place. This paper plans to document some of that change and provide a snapshot of Australian institutional repositories as of September 2008.

This survey targets those institutional repositories in Australian universities providing open access to the academic output of the institution. Most Australian universities have a repository for digital theses as part of the Australian Digital Theses (ADT) Project [4], which became a national project in 2000 after being established by a government grant in 1997 (CAUL, 1997). This survey focuses on a broader view of research than just theses and we asked respondents not to report thesis only repositories. In addition, institutional repositories that have been developed at non-university research or government institutions have not been included in this research.

Methodology

We constructed a survey based on questions aiming to provide background information on the current state of open access institutional repositories in Australia. The survey was developed using the commercial Web-based survey software produced by 'SurveyMonkey' [5]. The survey was pretested by two repository managers and a domain expert in open access and institutional repositories for clarity of expression and relevance. The survey was distributed to repository managers on Monday, 25 August 2008. Reminders were sent the weeks beginning 1 September and 8 September. The final survey was received on Friday, 12 September 2008.

The Web-based survey was distributed via a link in an e-mail message to repository managers who were initially identified from a list provided by the ADS at the National Library of Australia. This list was correlated with a list from Universities Australia, the industry peak body. We invited the 38 repository managers from the lists provided, plus one from a private university not affiliated with Universities Australia. In a few instances the recipient forwarded the survey to a different contact within the Institution.

Results and discussion

From the 39 potential respondents, we received 38 responses, a response rate of 97.4 percent. Not all of the 38 respondents answered each question; therefore numbers reported for each question may be different. Similarly where percentages are given they may not add up to 100 due to rounding. Of the 38 responding institutions, 32 institutions have active repositories, of which 31 are openly accessible, in that the public can search and open items within them. Three more Institutions were planning to launch later in 2008, and two indicate they have plans to launch in 2009, and the closed access repository is planning to open access to items in 2009. Thus of the 38 responding Australian universities, 37 should have repositories by the end of 2009.

Table 1: Year Australian Institutional repositories were planned, pilot tested and operational.

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
Planning — year began	1	1	3	4	4	9	10	4	2	38
Pilot testing — year began			2	5	3	3	10	10	3	36
Operational — year began			1	3	2	3	8	10	5	32

Interestingly, however, despite the growth in operational institutional repositories, the funding is not secure. Only 20 universities have funding for their repository staff and 24 universities have funding for their repository platform, either as ongoing recurrent budgeting or absorbed into their institutions budgets (see Table 2). In the notes field attached to the question, some respondents without ongoing funding indicated they were expecting, or hoping, that the funding would be absorbed into their institution's operational budget after the project funding, or that they had applied to their institution for ongoing funding. Eighteen universities' repositories were on some form of project funding. Of those, 11 indicated their funding would run out at the end of 2008, six in 2009 and one in 2010. It will be interesting to see how this situation is resolved. The others did not note when their project funding would expire.

Table 2: Funding arrangements for Australian Institutional repositories as at 2008.

Funding area	Ongoing recurrent annual	Project	Absorbed into library/institution	Total responding
Staffing	4	15	17	36
Software/repository platform	8	11	17	36
Hardware replacement	9	6	17	32
Other	2	0	1	3

Given these issues with funding, we were interested in how universities were staffing their repositories and how many full-time equivalent (FTE) staff were allocated to repositories. Not surprisingly we found a broad range of staffing numbers and options. Only six universities indicated that they allocated staff to the marketing of the repository, with four of these being less than 0.5 FTE. Seven universities also indicated that they employed a business analyst, three of these being one full-time staff member, the remainder were less than 0.3 FTE. Of the 10 universities providing faculty/academic support, three have one or more FTE staff, with the remaining seven having less than 0.5 FTE staff allocated to the role.

Five institutions reported they had an institution-wide open access mandate (which we define as a requirement by the institution that researchers deposit a copy of all their published works in the institution's repository). Only four are recorded in ROARMAP [6]. This however may change. Mandates are likely to spread in Australia with the 2008 Innovation Report by the Australian government containing recommendations such as:

Recommendation 7.10: A specific strategy for ensuring the scientific knowledge produced in Australia is placed in machine searchable repositories to be developed using public funding agencies and universities and drivers.

Recommendation 7.14: To the maximum extent practicable, information, research and content funded by Australian government including national collections should be made freely available over the Internet as part of the global public commons ... (Australian Government Department of Innovation, 2008).

Interestingly, while only five universities mandated deposit of their research output in the form of author's versions of peer reviewed output, 20 mandate that research students deposit theses. And despite the Government's increasingly clear indications of support of open access and mandates, only nine institutions indicated they were planning a mandate, and only 20 institutions indicated that at the time of the survey they were not. A mandate is one successful way for an institution to recruit content to its repository (Cochrane and Callan, 2007; Sale, 2006). We were interested in what other methods of content recruitment were applied. Table 3 below indicates that most repositories relied on individual approaches to researchers by repository staff and voluntary contributions to repositories. Also interestingly 18 institutions report that they are planning on tying in their repository submissions with Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) reporting. The Australian government uses data from HERDC about research income and publications to determine future funding allocations. Other content recruitment methods reported include: batch ingest from research reporting systems and faculty Web pages (usually metadata only) coupled with various full text recruitment strategies, running official launches coupled with demonstrations, trawling the Internet for material, running workshops by repository champions, working with faculty on digitisation projects and harvesting material from publisher databases where publishers permit the use of publishers' PDF files.

Table 3: Methods of recruiting content for Australian Institutional repositories.

Recruitment method	Yes	No	Planned	Total responses
Voluntary contributions	26	3	8	37
Publicity about the institutional repository in campus news outlets	21	2	12	35
Presentations by repository staff	26	1	9	36
Presentations by liaison librarians	15	6	13	34
Individual approaches by repository staff	28	2	7	37
Individual approaches by liaison librarians	21	5	8	34
Mandate requiring deposit — theses	20	6	10	36
Mandate requiring deposit — other research outputs	5	21	8	34
Tied in with HERDC reporting	15	2	19	36
Ingesting content from pre-existing departmental or other Web sites	19	10	6	35
Other	9		2	11

With few exceptions, the Institutional repositories in Australia are the responsibility of the Institution's library. At five universities the repository falls under the umbrella of the Division of Information, which incorporates Information Technology and the Library. Three others indicated the repository was jointly shared by the Library and Research. In some Institutions, responsibility for the repository is shared amongst several organisational units, for example, one stated that the Library was responsible for metadata, the Research Support Office for policy and ICTS for the server, and another indicated the Library works in collaboration with Research Services and the Information Technology Director.

Not surprisingly, given that most of the repositories are run by the library, or the library has a say in their management, most of the repository managers have a background as a librarian. Of those that indicated "Other" in Table 4, four identified as library systems or IT managers, one as e-Research program co-ordinator, one as university archivist, two as contractor or project manager, and one was both a library staff member and IT staff member.

Table 4: Professional backgrounds of individuals responsible for institutional repositories at Australian universities.		
Position title	Percent	Number
Librarian	71.1	27
IT staff member	2.7	1
Administrative staff member	2.7	1
Researcher/academic	0	0
Other	24.3	9
Total		38

Given that most repositories are developed and maintained by librarians we were interested to see what types of repository specific training those running repositories had been given (Table 5). Only 14, or 39 percent, had received repository specific training, although 20 (55.6 percent) had received repository software related training, and 28 (77.8 percent) had attended repository related conferences. Most (33 or 91.7 percent) had attended APSR or ARROW workshops. Only six (16.7 percent) had received training specifically related to scholarly communications.

Table 5: Training received by Australian institutional repository managers.		
Training type	Percent	Number
Repository specific training	38.9	14
Scholarly communications training	16.7	6
Workshops (e.g., APSR, ARROW)	91.7	33
Software related training	55.6	20
Conferences	77.8	28
Other	16.7	6

The 'Other' responses included: participant in e-mail lists, OAKList training, self-development and reading widely.

The platform most frequently used for Australian repositories is Fedora with Vital. Most of the remaining sites use EPrints or DSpace, although there is a sprinkling of other platforms (Table 6). Two universities are still deciding on which repository platform they may use, one deliberating between DigiTool or Fedora + Fez, and the other as yet undecided.

Table 6: Repository software platforms used in Australian institutional repositories.		
Software platform	Percent	Number
Fedora (with Vital)	34.2	13
GNU EPrints	15.8	6
DSpace	15.8	6
bepress/Digital Commons	10.5	4
Fedora (with Fez)	7.9	3
DigiTool (ExLibris)	7.9	3
Equella	5.3	2
Repository software not yet selected	2.6	1
Total	100.0	38

By a small majority, most universities belong to a consortium (Table 7). Of those that do, consortium membership is highly correlated with choice of repository platform for ARROW members, where 13 of the 16 ARROW members report operating on the Fedora/Vital platform. APSR has focussed more on interoperability and its membership operates on a mix of DSpace (3), Fedora+Fez, EPrints and Equella.

Table 7: Consortium membership amongst Australian universities.		
Consortium	Percent	Number
ARROW	42.1	16
APSR	15.8	6
RUBRIC — Previously	n/a	(5)
No consortium	39.5	15
Skipped question	2.6	1
Total	100.0	38

We also surveyed respondents regarding the services they offer their Institution's academic community. The results are presented in Table 8 below. Additional services reported included: scripting of a search box to be placed on Faculty, School, or Individual Web sites, generating personalised lists of publications, scripts to generate citation lists from local content, assistance with setting up open access journals, value adding DOIs and other permanent URLs, adding copyright statements, adding abstracts and keywords, assigning Field of Research Codes (FOR codes) allocated by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, adding ISI LOCs and Scopus links, and bulk ingesting records from EndNote Libraries. One repository offered a 'do it for you, all inclusive service'. Two repositories (based on the Fedora/Vital platform) reported problems with their download statistics resulting temporary disablement of this function. Interestingly, eight (22.2 percent) of the 36 Institutions responding to this question already link their open access repositories with their research reporting and 17 (44.7 percent) plan to do so. If a full text, author's peer-reviewed pre-publication manuscript must also be submitted this will provide a much needed boost for open access in Australia.

Table 8: Services offered by repositories to academics.				
Services to academic community	Yes	No	Planned	Total responses
Assistance with deposit	28	1	7	36
Assistance with copyright clearance	26	2	8	36
Download statistics	19	3	14	36
E-mail messages with information about downloads, etc.	5	18	9	32
Link to the author page in repository for authors' e-mail signature or Web page	11	12	10	33

Personalised Web page or CV	5	19	11	35
Reward or recognition for deposit	2	27	4	33
Link deposit with other research reporting	8	9	17	34
Other	4	2	2	8

John Shipp (2006) reported approximately 9,000 items in the 14 repositories in existence in January that year. We asked survey recipients for their current holdings broken down by type (as we were trying to distinguish particularly between holdings that were metadata only, and true open access holdings). Only 11 of our respondents responded to this question, with informal verbal reports from the non-responders indicating that this was difficult for them to provide. Those that did respond are reported in Table 9 below. Please note that the figures in the second column of this table are for full text journal articles and conference papers only, although most institutions collect many other resource types. The figures in the first column for the ADS are for total repository holdings; therefore we are unable to discern whether they are full text, metadata only, or what format or type of content is represented by the numbers. We can however clearly see that the total number of items has risen dramatically in the one and a half years since Shipp's report, even when only a small number of repositories full-text holdings are reported. Not unexpectedly the institution with the highest number of full-text holdings has the longest standing deposit mandate, Queensland University of Technology.

Table 9: Comparison between the number of records on the ADS and the number of full-text journal articles and conference papers reported in survey over the same period.		
University	Number of records on ADS as at 20 September 2008	Number of full-text journal articles and conference papers reported in survey 25 August–12 September 2008
Australian National University	2,861	
Bond University	119	
Central Queensland University	2,710	
Curtin University of Technology	1,773	
Flinders University	2,738	
Griffith University	15,814	1,704
James Cook University	1,039	
La Trobe University	Not on ADS	1,171
Macquarie University	1,456	
Monash University	3,047	132
Queensland University of Technology	11,247	9,343
Southern Cross University	580	
Swinburne University of Technology	7,847	7,000
University of Adelaide	42,644	
University of Melbourne	2,343	1,023
University of New South Wales	2,419	
University of Newcastle	2,743	340
University of Queensland	81,389	
University of South Australia	6,744	5,682
University of Southern Queensland	2,975	1,309
University of Tasmania	4,595	3,941
University of Sydney	2,588	
University of Technology Sydney	431	
University of Western Sydney	2,382	1,255
University of Wollongong	2,751	
University of the Sunshine Coast	1	
Victoria University	604	
Total	205,840	32,900

The broad ranges of content types held in repositories are indicated in Table 10 below. Of the respondents who answered they were collecting 'other' or additional material, few included details. Those that did gave examples such as PowerPoint presentations, documents, books, research reports, architectural designs, reference entries, abstracts, complete conference proceedings and simulation codes and outputs.

Table 10: Current and planned collection of different content types in Australian repositories in September 2008.		
Content type	Number of repositories currently collecting	Number of repositories planning to collect
Journal articles/conference papers	35	
Book chapters	30	

Working and technical papers	30	1
Metadata only records	25	1
Research data (e.g., survey responses, interview transcripts, scientific data)	7	2
Images	22	2
Sound recordings	11	
Software	6	Possible
Video recordings	12	1 (+ 1 possible)
PhD and Masters theses	27	2
Honours theses	15	1
Other	11	3

We asked further questions about the holdings in repositories over time, and the HERDC reportable items, to try and ascertain the potential numbers of deposits in repositories against actual deposits. We received too few responses to these questions to make reporting them worth while. Similarly, responses to our questions regarding download statistics did not garner enough responses to warrant reporting.

The Open Archives Initiative (OAI) [7] develops and promotes interoperability standards that aim to facilitate the efficient dissemination of content. The OAI's Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH) was created to facilitate harvesting of distributed resources. It is "a simple, yet powerful framework for metadata harvesting. Harvesters can incrementally gather records contained in OAI-PMH repositories and use them to create services covering the content of several repositories" (van de Sompel, *et al.*, 2003). OAI-PMH could be used, for example, to provide federated searching, to enable papers deposited in institutional repositories to have their metadata exposed and be harvested by other repositories, for example disciplinary or subject repositories.

We received 36 responses to our questions about Google Scholar and OAI-PMH compatibility. Sixteen (44.4 percent) respondents indicated their repositories were registered with Google Scholar, and 16 (44.4 percent) were planning to register. Five (13.5 percent) were not registered and not planning to. Twenty-eight (75.7 percent) are OAI-PMH compliant and nine (24.3 percent) are planning to be. We were surprised that only 18 of the 31 active repositories supplied us with their OAI-PMH URLs. We asked for these because, like the repository URL, the OAI-PMH URL exists to make the content of the repository public.

The URLs, OAI-PMH URLs and other institutional information regarding the repositories reported in this survey are supplied in the [Appendix](#).

Conclusions

Australian repositories are growing rapidly, but repository staff are still using labour intensive ways of recruiting content for repositories, for example by individually approaching researchers and trawling the Web and databases for work conducted within their institution, when it is clear that the current Government is indicating that it will support mandates.

Most repositories in Australia are run by libraries and librarians. This is probably appropriate as librarians are information managers by profession. However, repository work also involves an understanding of information systems and technology, awareness of the detailed world of scholarly communication as well as more specialised information science skills such as informetrics, bibliometrics, webometrics and log files analyses. There is clearly a need for more specialised training or education, either as a part of, or in addition to, existing programs (Zuccala, *et al.*, 2008). While the Australian consortiums ARROW and APSR have clearly been filling some of this role with their workshops, as repositories evolve and the consortium's funding completes, more specialised formal training is likely to be required.

Australia differs from the U.S. in the most prevalent repository software platform. Rieh, *et al.* (2007) found DSpace the most popular platform in the U.S., but in Australia the popularity of Fedora is most likely to be related to high membership amongst universities of the ARROW consortium which collaborated with VTLS [8] (a company which specialises in library software solutions) to develop the user interface and other web based applications called Vital for the Fedora platform.

This survey indicates there is continued strong growth of institutional repositories in Australia. Some are still on project funding, but increasingly they are absorbed into the institution's operational costs with ongoing recurrent funding. There are clear indications from the Australian government that it would like universities to make their research more openly accessible and institutional repositories are firmly slated to play a role in this agenda. The growth will continue.

About the authors

Mary Anne Kennan is currently a Research Associate in the School of Information Systems, Technology and Management, Australian School of Business at the University of New South Wales. She recently completed a PhD entitled "Reassembling scholarly publishing: Open access, institutional repositories and the process of change".

Danny Kingsley submitted her PhD thesis entitled: "The effect of scholarly communication practices on engagement with open access: An Australian study of three disciplines", in December 2008. She is an associate lecturer and course convenor for the Centre for the Public Awareness of Science at the Australian National University, and works in the ANU's Research Office. She has worked as a science communicator for 12 years.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Alison Dellit of the ARROW Discovery Service at the National Library of Australia in providing the contact details for repository managers. We also thank Arthur Sale from the University of Tasmania for helping us to clarify the OAI-PMH, and Colin Steele, Maude Frances and Paula Callan for their comments on our survey design.

Notes

1. See <http://leven.comp.utas.edu.au/AuseAccess/pmwiki.php?n=Activity.AustralianRepositories>, accessed 29 September 2008; http://www.edna.edu.au/edna/go/highered/hot_topics/pid/2816, accessed 29 September 2008; and, <http://metalogger.wordpress.com/2008/08/04/australian-university-repositories-research-and-publications/>, accessed 29 September 2008.

2. <http://search.arrow.edu.au/>, accessed 29 September 2008.

3. <http://www.anu.edu.au/caul/surveys/eprint-repositories2003.xls>, accessed 29 September 2008.

4. <http://adt.caul.edu.au/>, accessed 29 September 2008.

5. <http://www.surveymonkey.com>, accessed 29 September 2008.

6. <http://www.eprints.org/openaccess/policy/signup/>, accessed 29 September 2008.

7. <http://www.openarchives.org/>, accessed 29 September 2008.

8. http://www.vtls.com/about_us, accessed 29 September 2008.

References

ARROW, 2008. "ARROW Discovery Service," at <http://search.arrow.edu.au/>, accessed 19 August 2008.

Australian Department of Education Science and Training, n.d. "Accessibility Framework," at http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/policies_issues_reviews/key_issues/accessibility_framework/, accessed 4 December 2006.

- Australian Government, 2008. "Research Quality," at http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/policies_issues_reviews/key_issues/research_quality_framework/asher_and_lap.htm#Australian_Scheme_for_Higher_Education accessed 1 October 2008.
- Australian Government Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, 2008. "Venturous Australia Report: Review of the National Innovation System," Melbourne, Australia, at http://www.innovation.gov.au/innovationreview/Documents/NIS_review_Web3.pdf, accessed 1 October 2008.
- Australian Research Council, 2007. "ARC Discovery Projects Funding Rules for Funding Commencing In 2008," at http://www.arc.gov.au/pdf/DP08_FundingRules.pdf, accessed 20 April 2007.
- Charles W. Bailey, Karen Coombs, Jill Emery, Anne Mitchell, Chris Morris, Spencer Simons and Robert Wright, 2006. "Spec Kit 292: Institutional Repositories," at http://works.bepress.com/ir_research/2/, accessed 16 August 2008.
- Pierre Baruch, 2007. "Open access developments In France: The HAL Open Archives System," *Learned Publishing*, volume 20, number 4, pp. 267–282; also at <http://www.lingentaconnect.com/content/alps/lo/2007/000000020/00000004/art00005>, accessed 20 September 2008.
- Robin Batterham, 2002. *The chance to change: Final report of the Chief Scientist*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Tim Brody, 2007. "Registry of open access repositories," at <http://roar.eprints.org/> accessed 18 August 2008.
- Leslie Carr and Tim Brody, 2007. "Size Isn't everything: Sustainable repositories as evidenced by sustainable deposit profiles," *D-Lib Magazine*, volume 13, numbers 7/8, at <http://dlib.org/dlib/july07/carr/07carr.html>, accessed 18 August 2008.
- Tom Cochrane and Paula Callan, 2007. "Making a difference: Implementing the EPrints mandate at QUT," *OCLC Systems and Services*, volume 23, number 3, pp. 262–268, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10650750710776396>
- Council of Australian University Librarians, 2008. "Australasian Digital Thesis Program," at <http://adt.caul.edu.au/>, accessed 19 August 2008.
- Leeanne Harvey, 2008. "The Future of the Accessibility Framework and Research Assessment — Open Access Collections," at http://www.apsr.edu.au/open_access_collections/presentations.html, accessed 16 February 2008,
- Clifford A. Lynch and Joan K. Lippincott, 2005. "Institutional repository deployment In the United States as of early 2005," *D-Lib Magazine*, volume 11, number 9, at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lynch/09lynch.html>, accessed 9 February 2008.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. 2007. "NHMRC Project Grants Funding Policy for Funding Commencing in 2008," at <http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/funding/ files/profundingpol.pdf>, accessed 20 April 2007.
- Charles Oppenheim, 2007. "Re: International Survey of Institutional Digital Repositories," published on LIS-ELIB@JISCMAIL.AC.UK.
- Stephen Pinfield. 2008. "OpenDOAR — Directory of Open Access Repositories," at <http://www.opendoar.org/>, accessed 18 August 2008.
- Primary Research Group, 2007. "The International Survey of Institutional Digital Repositories," at <http://www.primaryresearch.com/2008031221-Libraries--Information-Science.html>, accessed 18 January 2009.
- Soo Young Rieh, Karen Markey, Beth St. Jean, Elizabeth Yakel and Jihyun Kim 2007. "Census of institutional repositories in the U.S.: A comparison across institutions at different stages of IR development," *D-Lib Magazine*, volume 13, numbers 11/12, at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/november07/rieh/11rieh.html>, accessed 18 August 2008.
- Arthur Sale, 2006. "Comparison of IR content policies in Australia," *First Monday*, volume 11, number 12, at <http://journals.uic.edu/fm/article/view/1324/1244>, accessed 18 August 2008.
- Kathleen Shearer, 2006. "The CARL Institutional repositories project: A collaborative approach to addressing the challenges of IRs in Canada," *Library Hi Tech*, volume 24, number 4, pp. 165–172.
- John Shipp, 2006. "Open access in Australia," In: Nell Jacobs (editor). *Open access: Key strategic, technical and economic aspects*. Oxford: Chandos, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/07378830610669547>
- Herbert van de Sompel, Jeffrey A. Young and Thomas B. Hickey, 2003. "Using the OAI-PMH ... differently," *D-Lib Magazine*, volume 9, numbers 7/8, at <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july03/young/07young.html>, accessed 16 August 2008.
- Gerard van Westrienen 2005. "Completed questionnaires: Country update on academic Institutional repositories," paper presented at the *Making the strategic case for institutional repositories: CNI-JISC-SURF conference* (Amsterdam).
- Gerard van Westrienen and Clifford A. Lynch, 2005. "Academic institutional repositories: Deployment status in 13 nations as of mid 2005," *D-Lib Magazine*, volume 11, number 9, at <http://dlib.org/dlib/september05/westrienen/09westrienen.html>, accessed 16 August 2008.
- Tom Wilson, 2006. "Institutional open archives: Where are we now?" *Library and Information Update*. CILIP: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, at <http://www.cilip.org.uk/publications/update/magazine/archive/archive2006/april/tomWilsonApril06.htm>, accessed 19 August 2008.
- Alesia Zuccala, Charles Oppenheim and Rajveen Dhiensa, 2008. "Managing and evaluating digital repositories," *Information Research*, volume 13, number 1, at <http://informationr.net/ir/13-1/paper333.html>, accessed 16 August 2008.

Appendix: Institutional results from "A census of institutional repositories in Australia" survey, September 2008.

Institution	Repository name	Open repository Web address	Future repository or log-in controlled Web address	Org. unit responsible for the repository	Year repository operational (or planned)	Repository software package
Australian Catholic University	Research Connect	Not yet available	http://researchconnect.acu.edu.au (requires a login)	Library	2008	Equella
Australian National University	Demetrius	http://dspace.anu.edu.au/		Division of Information	2003	DSpace
Bond University	e-publications@bond	http://epublications.bond.edu.au/		Information Services	2006	bepress
Central Queensland University	ACQUIRE	http://acquire.cqu.edu.au		Division of Library Services	2006	Fedora (with Vital)
Charles Darwin University	eSpace	Not yet available	http://espace.library.cdu.edu.au	Library & Information Access (LIA)	(2009)	Fedora (with Fez)
Charles Sturt University	CRO-CSU Research Output	http://blby.unilinc.edu.au:8881/R?func=search&local_base=GF001-CSU01		Library, in collaboration with Research Office	2007	Digitool (ExLibris)
Curtin University of Technology	e-space@curtin	http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au		Library	2005	GNU EPrints, migrating to Digitool in September
Deakin University	Deakin Research Online	http://www.deakin.edu.au/dro		Library	2008	Fedora (with Fez)
Flinders University	Flinders Academic Commons	http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/		Library	2006	DSpace
Griffith University	Griffith Research Online	http://www.griffith.edu.au/researchonline/		Division of Information Services	2007	DSpace
James Cook University	JCU EPrints	http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/		Information Services (i.e., JCU Library)	2006	GNU EPrints
La Trobe University	ARROW at La Trobe	http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/arrow/		Library	2008	Fedora (with Vital)

Macquarie University	Macquarie University ResearchOnline	http://www.researchonline.mq.edu.au		Library	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
Monash University	Monash University ARROW Repository	http://arrow.monash.edu.au		Library	2006	Fedora (with Vital)
Murdoch University	Murdoch Research Repository	Not yet developed		Library	unknown	Fedora (with Vital)
Queensland University of Technology	QUT EPrints	http://eprints.qut.edu.au		Library	2003	GNU EPrints
RMIT University	Not yet developed	Not yet developed		Library and Research & Innovation	(2009)	Possible options: Digitool and Fez
Southern Cross University	ePublications@SCU	http://epubs.scu.edu.au/cql/oal2.cql		Library	2007	bepress
Swinburne University of Technology	Swinburne Research Bank	http://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au		Online Services and Strategies Unit	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Adelaide	Adelaide Research and Scholarship (AR&S)	http://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/		Library	2006	DSpace
University of Ballarat	UB Research Online	http://researchonline.ballarat.edu.au		Library	2008	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Canberra	Research repository (final name to yet to be determined)	Not yet available	http://loms-dev.canberra.edu.au (test version requires a login)	Library for metadata, Research Support Office for policy, ICTS for server	unknown	Equella
University of Melbourne	University of Melbourne EPrints Repository (UMER)	http://www.lib.unimelb.edu.au/eprints/		Library	2002	Digitool (ExLibris)
University of New England	e-publications@UNE	http://e-publications.une.edu.au/dspace/		Library, in collaboration with Research Services and Information Technology Directorate	2008	Fedora (with Vital)
University of New South Wales	UNSWorks	http://www.unsworks.unsw.edu.au		Library	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Newcastle	NOVA	http://nova.newcastle.edu.au		Library Services, Academic Division	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Notre Dame Australia	ResearchOnline@ND	Not yet available	http://www.researchonline.nd.edu.au (yet to be published)	Library, with guidance from the Research Office	(2008)	Digital Commons (not open source)
University of Queensland	UQ eSpace	http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/		Library	2003	Fedora (with Fez)
University of South Australia	arrow@UniSA	http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/		Library	2003	Fedora (with Fez)
University of Southern Queensland	USQ EPrints	http://eprints.usq.edu.au		Library/Division of Academic Information Services	2005	GNU EPrints
University of Sydney	Sydney eScholarship Repository	http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/		Library	2006	DSpace
University of Tasmania	UTAS EPrints	http://eprints.utas.edu.au/		Library	2004	GNU EPrints
University of Technology, Sydney	UTS iRepository	http://eprints.lib.uts.edu.au/dspace/		Library	2004	DSpace
University of the Sunshine Coast	Coast Research Database	http://research.usc.edu.au/		Library	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Western Australia	Not yet available	Not yet available		Information Resources Access Management Section	unknown	Digitool (ExLibris)
University of Western Sydney	UWS Research Repository	http://arrow.uws.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Index		Library	2007	Fedora (with Vital)
University of Wollongong	Research Online	http://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/44/		Library	2006	bepress
Victoria University	Victoria University EPrints Repository	http://eprints.vu.edu.au		Library	2005	GNU EPrints

Institution	Consortium membership	Reg'd Google Scholar?	OAI-PMH compliant?	OAI-PMH harvesting URL	A policy or statement about the purpose of the repository
Australian Catholic University	No consortium	No	Planned		Yes (not provided)
Australian National University	APSR	Yes	Yes	Not provided	http://sts.anu.edu.au/demetrius/about/about.php
Bond University	ARROW	Yes	Yes	Not provided	http://epublications.bond.edu.au/about.html
Central Queensland University	ARROW	Planned	Yes	http://acquire.cqu.edu.au:8080/fedora/oai?	http://acquire.cqu.edu.au:8080/vital/access/manager/Index
Charles Darwin University	No Consortium	Planned	Planned		http://www.cdu.edu.au/library/repository/repository.html
Charles Sturt University	No consortium (Digitool)	Planned	Planned		http://www.csu.edu.au/research/publications/cro/policy.htm

	working group is informal support group)				
Curtin University of Technology	No consortium	No	Yes	http://espace.library.curtin.edu.au/OAI-PUB?verb=Identify	http://espace.lis.curtin.edu.au
Deakin University	No consortium	Planned	Yes		http://www.deakin.edu.au/dro/help.php?topic=main
Flinders University	Previously in RUBRIC	Yes	Yes		http://www.lib.flinders.edu.au/~dspace/faq.html
Griffith University	No consortium	Yes	Yes	http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace-oai/request	http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/
James Cook University	No consortium	Yes	Planned		Yes (policy will available on http://www.jcu.edu.au/policy/)
La Trobe University	ARROW	Planned	Planned		Yes (not provided)
Macquarie University	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Planned	Yes	Not provided	http://www.researchonline.mq.edu.au:9080/vital/access/manager/A
Monash University	ARROW	Planned	Yes	http://oai.lib.monash.edu.au/oai/provider	Yes (not provided)
Murdoch University	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Planned	Planned		Yes (not provided)
Queensland University of Technology	ARROW	Yes	Yes	http://eprints.qut.edu.au/perl/oai2	http://eprints.qut.edu.au/Information.html
RMIT University	No consortium	Planned	Planned		In planning
Southern Cross University	No consortium	Yes	Yes	Not provided	Download from http://epubs.scu.edu.au/
Swinburne University of Technology	ARROW	Planned	Yes	http://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au:8080/fedora/oai?verb=Identify	http://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au/vital/access/manager/About
University of Adelaide		Yes	Yes	Not provided	http://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/faq/
University of Ballarat	ARROW	Planned	Planned	Not applicable	Yes — still in draft
University of Canberra	APSR	Planned	Yes	Will be available once production server is finalised	Yes — still in draft
University of Melbourne	APSR	No	Yes	http://dl.unimelb.edu.au/OAI-PUB?verb=ListRecords&metadataPrefix=oai_dc&set=umer	http://www.lib.unimelb.edu.au/eprints/
University of New England	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Planned	Yes	Not provided	http://e-publications.unsw.edu.au/vital/access/manager/About
University of New South Wales	ARROW	Yes	Yes	http://unsworks.unsw.edu.au/fedora/oai	http://unsworks.unsw.edu.au/vital/access/manager/Legal?title=Abou
University of Newcastle	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Planned	Yes	http://oai.newcastle.edu.au:8080/oai/provider	http://nova.newcastle.edu.au/vital/access/manager/About
University of Notre Dame Australia	No consortium	Planned	Yes	Not provided	Yes — still in draft
University of Queensland	APSR	Yes	Yes	http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/oai.php	http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/about.php
University of South Australia	ARROW	No	Yes	http://arrow.unisa.edu.au:8080/fedora/oai	Yes
University of Southern Queensland	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Yes	Yes	http://eprints.usq.edu.au/cgi/oai2	http://www.usq.edu.au/eprints/policies/collectiondevpolicy.htm
University of Sydney	APSR	Yes	Yes	http://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/oai/request?	Yes (not provided)
University of Tasmania	No consortium	Yes	Yes	http://eprints.utas.edu.au/perl/oai2	http://eprints.utas.edu.au/
University of Technology, Sydney	APSR	Yes	Yes	Not provided	http://utsescholarship.lib.uts.edu.au/about
University of the Sunshine Coast	ARROW, previously in RUBRIC	Planned	Planned	Not applicable	http://research.usc.edu.au/
University of Western Australia	No consortium	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
University of Western Sydney	ARROW	No	Yes	http://arrow.uws.edu.au:8080/oai/provider	No
University of Wollongong	No consortium	Yes	Yes	Not provided	http://ro.uow.edu.au/about.html
Victoria University	No consortium	Yes	Yes	http://eprints.vu.edu.au/cgi/oai2	Yes (not provided)

Editorial history

Paper received 8 October 2008; accepted 15 January 2009.

This paper is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial-ShareAlike 2.5 Australia license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/au/).

The state of the nation: A snapshot of Australian Institutional repositories
by Mary Anne Kennan and Danny Kingsley
First Monday, Volume 14, Number 2 - 2 February 2009
<http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/rt/printerFriendly/2282/2092>