



Open Access Repositories in Finland (FI)

Rita Voigt

**Helsinki University of Technology and OA–JES
Coordinator for Institutional Repositories in Finland**

DRIVER Summit – 17.1.2008 – Göttingen



TEKNILLINEN KORKEAKOULU
TEKNISKA HÖGSKOLAN
HELSINKI UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY



OA-JES project (2006-2007)

- Promoting Open Access Publishing in Finland.
- Funding: Ministry of Education.
- Initiative: Finnish Open Access Working Group.
- 4 parts:
 - Advocacy (Kalle Korhonen, Univ. of Helsinki).
 - Coordination of IRs (Rita Voigt, TKK).
 - The National Library of Finland, development of a centralized DSpace-based platform, definition of tasks.
 - TSV, development of a publishing tool for OA journals.
- Phase 1 → duration: 1.3. – 31.12.2006.
- Phase 2 → 2007, duration unclear, 2-12 months, final report due in April 2008.
- Results: Increasing awareness, new repositories, various networks – and different views.





IRs in Finland

- 20 universities (nearly all have an IR, own or part of a centralized solution).
- In addition independent research institutes, discipline-based.
- University mergers expected during the next few years, as a result 5-7 universities in 2010?
- Co-operation vs. competition...
- The National Library has carried out a survey on IRs in Finland as part of the Nordbib project last October. Results?
- Alternative figures compiled mainly through harvesting known repositories and analysing the contents → as a result becoming an (inofficial) aggregator of Finnish repositories.
- Roughly 50 % own software, 50 % DSpace.
- Content mostly doctoral dissertations, other theses. Only a couple of university repositories with other scientific material (reports, articles), little non-textual objects, primary data very rare.





Institutional Repositories – (OA-JES) definitions

- In addition to bibliographic metadata the **full text** is available for all publications.
- The full text is **stored locally** (in most cases; collaborative partnership solutions for smaller institutions). The institution is responsible for the availability of its objects. Outsourcing the archive is possible, but may have its problems.
- Both metadata and full text are **open access**.
- Permanent availability and access to the publication is ensured → each publication is given a **persistent identifier** (URN or other).
- The repository is **OAI compatible**.





Guidelines

- OA-JES recommendations are quite in line with the DRIVER guidelines, e.g. use of sets, DC metadata usage.
- set=driver, metadataPrefix=oai_driver
- A couple of recommendations taken from DINI (set structure, some of the certification criteria).
- URN as persistent identifier. First URN resolver implementation in co-operation with the Univ. of Uppsala (SE) and the German National Library.
- Throughout the project emphasized to focus also on the connections with other data systems (CRIS, library catalog etc.).
- Encouraged to keep and make use of richer metadata, if it is available anyhow.



Problems

- Project funding and organization in general.
- Implementation of the OA-JES criteria vary from 100 % compatibility to no compatibility at this stage – although compatibility could easily be accomplished.
- Problems with metadata semantics comparable to experiences reported in e.g. DRIVER and KE studies.
- Harvesting DSpace repositories → usual problems when they provide only the default OAI interface.
- Lack of awareness about the harvesting functionality? Focus on ingest and local search interface.
- Metadata has to be interpreted and normalized.
- Set names have to be interpreted and normalized, sometimes completely meaningless to any outsider.
- Who should do the job: Data provider / Aggregator / Service provider?





Future directions?

- Network of repositories vs. centralized repository.
- Interoperability through shared software / common software?
- The National Library's vision...
- The scenario of the major big universities...
- Interoperability through common standards and best practices.
- Agreement on these in collaboration with all partners involved.
- Who is in charge? Who gets the funding?





Finland and DRIVER – expectations, suggestions, expertise



- DRIVER as a driving force to promote the implementation of guidelines (both OA-JES and DRIVER recommendations). Greater credibility?
- Step towards a certification of repositories.
- Communication with service providers, what do they want?



- Bringing together suitable Finnish repositories with service providers.
- Enhancing metadata, esp. ETD metadata (DART-Europe, GUIDE, NDLTD...).
- Multilingual metadata.
- Complex objects.





Thank you !

rita.voigt *at* tkk.fi

