

Size Isn't Everything: Sustainable Repositories as Evidenced by Sustainable Deposit Profiles

Leslie Carr & Tim Brody, University of Southampton

The key to a successful repository is sustained deposits, and the key to sustained deposits is community engagement. This paper looks at deposit profiles automatically generated from OAI harvesting information and argues that repositories characterised by occasional large-volume deposits are a sign of a failure to embed in institutional processes. The ideal profile for a successful repository is discussed, and a new service that ranks repositories based on these criteria is implemented.

The definition of an institutional repository as “a set of services that a university offers to the members of its community for the management and dissemination of digital materials created by the institution and its community members” (Lynch 2003) has remained an accurate reference point for technical researchers and IT managers alike in the four years since it was coined. Whether the objective is facilitating open access to research publications, building scholarly collections, creating learning objects, scientific data archiving or long-term preservation, the key is to offer these services to the members of the university community. A significant measure of repository success should therefore be the university community's take-up of these services.

However at the time of writing, the only available way to measure the relative success of repositories is to compare the gross number of items that they hold. Services such as ROAR (the Registry of Open Access Repositories, roar.eprints.org) and OpenDOAR (Directory of Open Access Repositories, www.opendoar.org) try to quantify the development of repositories and the repository community through time, but both report the size of individual repositories. Davis and Connolly (2007) identify a problem with this strategy: a repository can exhibit respectable overall growth that is attributable mainly to special-case batch imports.

If it is true that community take-up is the foundation of the repository (without staff using the repository's services there would only be an empty repository), then it is necessary to find a simple way of measuring and reporting that take-up, preferably automatically and from outside the institution (so that it can be easily and frequently applied to all repositories). Fundamentally, take-up is evidenced by members of the community depositing their materials (be they publications, lecture notes, scholarly items, scientific datasets...) whereas a lack of engagement is evidenced by an absence of deposits. Although a lack of deposits is frequently discussed in the context of an Open Access agenda (*e.g.* as a failing of the Self Archiving methodology), it is an equal problem for any repository, whether or not it is primarily intended to deliver Open Access.

Xia and Sun (2007) attempt to develop a similar evaluation of repositories, but they base it on depositor identity (which conflates author and editorial processes) and full text percentages (difficult to determine) and selectively apply these criteria to a small number of repositories. This paper attempts to examine the deposit activity of the institutional repository, arguing for some simple metrics of “community take-up” that are available to external observers by analyzing the results of OAI-PMH harvesting. The metrics are demonstrated by embedding them into the ROAR registry of Institutional Repositories.

Large Repositories

Figure 1 charts the number of items in institutional repositories over a threshold of 10,000 records, as listed by ROAR on 1st Feb 2007. The largest (Cambridge University, UK) contains almost 180,000 digital items. These are all repositories that have achieved an obvious measure of success, featuring in the top 11% (by number of items held) of the institutional repositories catalogued by that registry.




Figure 1: Repositories containing more than 10,000 records

ROAR takes its data from Celestial, an OAI-PMH harvesting proxy that caches the latest version of every metadata record that is harvested from each repository in the world, including information about when each record first appeared¹. It is possible therefore, not only to determine the size of each repository at any instant, but also to build up a picture of its growth over time. In particular, the pattern of daily deposits can be analysed for each institution, and from that information some understanding of faculty-repository engagement can be determined.




Figure 2: Days in 2006 in which any Items were Deposited in Large Repositories

In figure 2 the ordering of repositories along the horizontal axis is the same as in figure 1 (largest to the left) while the vertical axis shows the deposit activity in terms of the number of days that deposits are made into the repository between January 1st and December 31st 2006. This graph reveals a big disparity between the deposit use of these repositories – some of

¹ Although OAI records are datestamped according to the time that their data was last changed, Celestial creates an accession date for each item so that it does not appear to be redeposited when its metadata is updated.

those with the biggest headline numbers are relatively little used. In fact, half of these large repositories are used for deposit less than half the time (100 days or fewer). Comparing all 236 institutional repositories rather than just the largest (figure 3), we can see that many of the smallest are as active as some of the largest although there is a general trend for smaller repositories to be used (*i.e.* receive deposits) on fewer days. Of course, if they had more deposits on more days then they would be larger!




Figure 3: Days in 2006 in which Items were Deposited in All Repositories

But figure 4 shows that it is not the case that larger repositories are necessarily receiving deposits more often. Each chart shows the days of the year across the horizontal axis, and the number of deposits received per day on the vertical axis. In these charts the deposit size is plotted in log form on the vertical axis so that the occasional huge deposits don't swamp the more frequent small ones. Two of the repositories have very 'gappy' deposit records, indicating many days of inactivity between (often numerically high) deposits, while the others have more continuous daily deposit activity.




Figure 4: Daily Deposit Rates in Four Large Repositories

Repository Deposit Activity

Some repositories receive infrequent but high-bandwidth deposits (many hundreds or thousands in an individual day), whereas others benefit from more regular but less high-volume inputs. Is there any significant difference in the two cases? Does it matter if a repository receives a daily fillip or a monthly boost if the numbers in both cases average out to provide a healthy year-on-year growth? Is there any significance in the fact that deposits appear only intermittently?

Since individuals do not create lectures or papers to fit in with repository timetables, it is likely that deposits would naturally come in an apparently random schedule. If we accept the Lynch 2003 definition of a repository – a set of services offered to the whole community within an institution – then we would expect to see evidence of whole-community engagement within the daily deposits. So unless some behind the scenes scheduling were controlling users' interaction with the repository (*e.g.* Physicists devote Mondays to the repository) then deposits would also appear randomly spread across the whole community and the whole subject range of the repository.

It is possible to make up some back-of-the-envelope estimates for the expected deposit rate for an 'average' institutional repository: an institution will have on the order of 1000 faculty², each of whom might create 10 items per working year, for example four articles, two presentations, a poster, a set of research data and two teaching resources. That makes a not-unreasonable figure of 10,000 items to be deposited into the institutional repository over the course of a whole year. If there are approximately 220 working days per year, then an average of 50 items would need to be deposited per day to achieve the target of 10,000 items per year. (In fact, many repositories seem to attract deposits on almost every day of the year, whether a weekend, a national holiday or part of a seasonal break.)

Without an intimate statistical knowledge of institutional staffing and management practices across the world it may be difficult to come up with a more reliable estimate for an expected deposit rate. Such a figure could be determined for a specific institution, but without global agreement on terms like 'faculty' these measurements would be difficult to compare meaningfully. In his science fiction comedy 'The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy' the author Douglas Adams coined a unit of measurement: "R is a velocity measure, defined as a reasonable speed of travel that is consistent with health, mental wellbeing and not being more than say five minutes late". In the same spirit we offer the following: *D is a deposit measure, defined as a reasonable rate of ingest that is consistent with capturing the community's scientific and scholarly output.* Given the very approximate estimates used to come up with a figure for *D*, we can make some broad statements about the expected properties of an active repository, one that is embedded into institutional processes and used by a broad range of staff. Such a repository should exhibit daily deposit profile whose graph (above) has the daily bars mainly concentrated in the central (10-100 deposits/day) region on the vertical axis. If the repository had reached the state of maturity where a thousand individuals were randomly depositing items independently of each other, and each depositor had a probability of 10/220 of depositing an item on any given day, then the Poisson distribution would predict extreme daily deposits outside the range 25-75 only once per decade.

To complicate this simple model, repositories based on software such as DSpace and EPrints

² UK institutions commonly returned 1,000 – 1,500 tenured *research active* staff in the last national research assessment exercise. Organisations of the order of 100 staff are probably departments and not independent institutions; those of the order of 10,000 staff are more likely to be consortia.

are designed to receive individual deposits and then marshal them into a workflow for editorial inspection and acceptance. Not all EPrints repositories insist on this; some institutions adopt the policy that visible responsiveness to faculty submissions is more important than editorial oversight that can be applied after the fact (or not at all). It may be that any system of editorial management means that deposits are inevitably going to be “batched up” to give a less-than-continuous profile in which daily deposits are dominated by one or another editor’s subject specialty. This is a potential explanation for the difference between a continuous and gappy deposit profile. DSpace repositories are partitioned into a number of communities, each of which has its own editorial processes. But in a well-embedded repository, the deposits will be randomly spread across the whole institution and the whole year; that is, shared out across *all* the individuals and departments in an institution, and hence all the communities and collections in the repository. As such, the overall total would not be subject to the delay of any one editor in particular or to any one school’s processes. Of course, each component of that total will be subjected to some delay or frustration, but taken together the repository will be subject to a range of unpredictable workflow timings whose net effect is to mitigate against very short, very high peaks (that are dozens of times greater in size than a normal day).

By contrast to the effects of ‘normal’ repository operation, batch inputs of legacy collections (for example, existing multimedia collections or historical sets of pre-digitised PhD theses) may inflate the figures. These pre-digitised and pre-catalogued resources can be easily adapted for high-throughput ingest and are often thought of as “low hanging fruit” as they give a repository the opportunity to easily gain in size. Such opportunities are a positive encouragement for users of the repository, but they are not a replacement for genuine, broad-spectrum self- or mediated-deposits from a wide range of schools, departments, topics, and users. Infrequent, high volume deposits may make up the numbers in the early stages of a repository, but they expose potential weakness if as special cases (existing digitised collections) they substitute for (or occlude the need for) popular (self- or mediated-) deposit on a regular basis.

Self archiving is a term commonly associated with Open Access, but even if the agenda that motivates a repository is Scholarly Collections (or Preservation, Teaching or Data Archiving), then a broad-spectrum buy-in by the faculty and research staff is a necessity to fulfill the objectives of the repository. Collecting the intellectual output of an institution’s staff requires a focus on their current activities and current output, and an engagement by the staff to use the repository services to start curating and depositing their current work on a systematic basis.

A high throughput is an intrinsically desirable goal, but it is not without its costs. Although the data input is scaled across the entire faculty, the editorial effort (or a key part of it) may be provided centrally, often by library staff. In such cases, high throughput demands more editorial resourcing to sustain timely workflow completion. Where the editorial staff are providing QA services (*e.g.* checking publication metadata accuracy or looking up DOIs and ISSNs) then demand for thorough and accurate information is called into question. These issues will be exacerbated by funding agencies’ adoption of Open Access mandates and by the developing requirements of research assessment activities. Although these are essentially management problems, the repository software should play a key role in providing as much quality assistance support as possible. The more that authors are helped to enter accurate and complete information, the smaller the load will be on the editors and repository administrators. Consequently, repositories should take advantage of external, editorially validated information services to provide as much automated checking or proactive input assistance as possible.

Monitoring Repository Deposits with ROAR

In order to examine the performance of repositories according to the criteria established above, ROAR has been extended to allow examination of the daily activity of any of its 700+ registered repositories. Figure 5 shows the most main adjustment, a histogram of instantaneous daily deposits (blue) superimposed on each graph of cumulative repository sizes (green) on the main repository listing pages.




Figure 5: ROAR reports enhanced with daily deposit data

As well as linking to each repository's cumulative data as a graph or table, the user is now offered various ways of finding out the deposit activity. First, a six-year history barchart is superimposed on the cumulative graph (as described above). Second, the number of days' deposits from the previous year are listed under three categories: counts of those days with 1-9 deposits, 10-99 deposits and 100+ deposits respectively. These three categories roughly correspond to "weak", "healthy" and "batch imports" as discussed above. These three categories have also been added to the repository ranking menu (figure 6), to enable a comparison of repositories on these bases. (Note that cross institutional, thematic and departmental repositories serve communities of different sizes and should not be judged in the same way.)




Figure 6: Sort by Deposit Activity

Further links provide access to a static histogram of the deposit profile for the previous year (with enough space for individual days to be clearly seen and weekend breaks to be noticeable) and to a table listing each deposit on each day in the last year (together with the OAI sets in which it appears) in tab-separated text format for further analysis as a spreadsheet.




Figure 7: Clickable SVG Graph showing an Individual Day's Deposit Breakdown

Finally there is a link to a separate page containing an interactive graph that allows the user to select an individual day to see its OAI records and containing sets (figure 7). On that page, each OAI identifier is linked to its harvested OAI record and also to the repository abstract page that describes that OAI resource. This information is provided by Celestial, the proxy OAI-PMH harvesting service (celestial.eprints.org) that maintains the databases of OAI holdings upon which ROAR, Citebase and other services (such as the PRESERV project's preservation profiles) are built. Celestial has previously been used as an invisible part of the OAI infrastructure for these services, but the data that it holds is very valuable. Thus far, ROAR has relied on it to create the graphs of repository sizes, and now it has been extended to allow examination of these collections of deposits in ways not normally provided by the repositories themselves.

The report in figure 7 shows that on 19th October 2006, 8 records were added to the 'CSAIL Technical Reports' set in the MIT DSpace repository. It further shows that before the start of this year there were 213 items already deposited in this set, and that during this year 83 further items were added to the set, of which 8 were added on this specific day.

A Note on OAI sets

Most repositories provide a mechanism for showing subject hierarchies (such as Library of Congress) or the institution's organisational structure as a prominent part of the user interface. By contrast, the OAI-PMH protocol allows a repository to divide its total collection into named 'sets' that can be seen by software harvesters (OAI service providers). The meaning of this sets is not defined by the OAI protocol, and developers are free to interpret them as they wish. Particularly, individual items may appear in many sets, or in no sets. DSpace repositories tend to use sets to reflect their collections structure, while EPrints repositories may expose both the topical classifications and institutional structure. Other repositories simply maintain sets of 'published' or 'fulltext' deposits. Although sets are not a conclusive indication of the spread of deposit items, with some care in the interpretation they allow the stories behind deposit peaks and troughs to be investigated, helping to determine common practice in large repositories. For example, they reveal when a large peak (or repeated peaks) results from importing items into a single (or narrow range of) topic(s) or collection(s).








Using Deposit Measures to Understand Repositories

We applied the deposit criteria factor presented above to the twenty largest institutional repositories listed by ROAR to determine whether there is evidence of double-digit daily deposits which are spread across the whole institution. In doing so, we augmented the automated statistics provided by ROAR with a manual inspection of the repositories,

particularly their collections listings (or equivalent). Each repository is categorised against double digit daily deposits (DDDD Yes, No, Partial) and topical spread (SPREAD Yes, No, Partial, Unknown) criteria. The results are presented in the table below.

Location and Assessment	Deposit Graph	Comments
DSpace at Cambridge DDDD: N SPREAD: N		8 large, single collection deposits in May 2006 with around 25 small, infrequent deposits since. (e.g. on May 5 th 2006, 7856 items were deposited into the 'World Wide Molecular Matrix' collection and 1 item into the 'Anthropological Ancestors' collection. Since then the largest deposit was 30 th Jan 2007, with 23 items deposited into the 'Northern Skies, Southern Stars' collection.)
Wageningen University and Research Centre DDDD: Y SPREAD: Y		After initial high batch import to kickstart the repository, consistently high daily deposits (around 100). e.g. March 3 rd 2007, 106 records were deposited in 110 overlapping sets indicating a high thematic spread servicing the whole institution.
CERN Document Server DDDD: ? SPREAD: ?		The CERN document repository is unusual in two respects: firstly it is a mega/pseudo institution, with many contributors being visitors from other institutions. Secondly, it has a unique, centralised editorial process in which deposits are proactively acquired from other sources. These factors contribute to the unusual, falling profile.
University of Amsterdam: DARE DDDD: P SPREAD: P		Repository initiated with bulk deposit of 100K items on Mar 12 th 2006. Deposits only made on 50% of days. Next largest import is 13 th Feb 2007, when 2594 items are imported – of these items 4 are in the 'fulltext' set. <i>Hybrid topical spread is seen: the contents of the repository are spread between the major faculties, but days with medium deposits tend to have the bulk of the deposits from one faculty or department.</i>
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Document Server DDDD: Y SPREAD: N		Deposit frequency picks up after September 2006 (new academic year). A typical day Feb 2 nd February 2007 has 225 items deposited in a Newspaper Articles set and 2 deposited into a PhD Theses set. <i>Although the university consists of 12 faculties covering all the arts and sciences, the vast majority of content is located in collections of newspaper articles, photos and historic papers.</i>
University of Twente Repository		After kickstarting the repository with several thousand items in March 2006, the deposit activity

DDDD: N SPREAD: ?		appears to be slowing down with items deposited on only 1/3 days in 2007. Typical day: 23 rd Jan 2007, 11 journal articles in a variety of disciplines published in the 'full text' set. No 'classification' or topic list made available in Web pages.
Australian National University DDDD: N SPREAD: N		Periods of frequent deposits seen since repository launch although only 1/6 days have any deposit activity. Typical day: 1 st March 2007 – 62 records deposited in 4 ANU EPress publication collections. <i>Of the 14 communities, only 3 represent faculties or departments; others are special collections. Most communities have small numbers of items except 'Eprints' (eprints collection from previous repository, 2641 items) and 'ArtServe' (art and architecture photos, 39364 items).</i>
Terkko Document Space DDDD: Y SPREAD: P		Frequent deposits after repository startup, from Dec 2006. Typical day 22 nd Feb 2006, 7 items deposited in Published Articles set. Extreme day, 6 th March 2007, 1707 items deposited across 6 medicine and science database sets (plus 4 published papers). <i>This is a medical faculty repository and not an institutional repository.</i>
Nagoya University Academic Knowledge Factory DDDD: N SPREAD: ?		Sporadic deposits (two high volume) from April 2006 – November 2006. Dec 2006 – more frequent deposits. Typical day: 13 deposits in 2 sets. Although no English translation is given for the Japanese set names, there are 85 sets available. <i>This appears to be an interface to an institutional repository (4595 items) combined with other data sources.</i>
University of Tilburg DDDD: Y SPREAD: ?		Repository hidden by iPort front end (OCLC product). 73% records are in 'full text' set. No subject or organisational classification is exposed in the user interface.
University of Michigan: Deep Blue DDDD: N SPREAD: Y		Deposits on 122 days only with a very unsettled distribution. OAI sets represent collections but 'communities' represent organisational structure <i>ie</i> full range of topics. Collections are independent of communities. High percentage of full text. <i>Five of the eight faculties are well 'stocked' (Business&Economics 2646 through Science 13484).</i>
HAL – IN2P3 DDDD: P		This is an aggregate national collection that serves many research centres in France,

SPREAD: Y		consequently its overall deposit volume is really rather low.
University of Southampton: EPrints Soton DDDD: Y SPREAD: Y		Daily continuous medium-level deposits spread across the whole institution. Subject list and organisational structure list show that contents are spread between all the schools and topics
University of Adelaide Digital Library DDDD: P SPREAD: Y		104 days deposits over 9 months. No obvious pattern of deposit usage emerging. Deposits seem distributed across subjects and sets.
DSpace at MIT DDDD: N SPREAD: N		128 days active deposits in the year. The deposits seem to be made almost entirely from two sources: roughly monthly high-volume deposits of historic PhD/Masters/Bachelors theses (e.g. 391 theses on 21 st Feb 2007) plus more frequent, low-volume items archived from Open CourseWare (e.g. 15 of 19 deposits on 2 nd March 2007 and 26 of 28 on 2 nd February).
Ohio State University Knowledge Bank DDDD: N SPREAD: N		After a large deposit (>10k items) in summer 2006, little deposit activity has been seen. Most recent deposits (321) seem to be in the John Herrick archives, a local collection of documentation about University buildings. <i>Of the 34 communities, 32 have low deposits (average 52 items) while 'OSU International Symposium on Molecular Spectroscopy' contains 14715 abstracts for the 60 year history of a single symposium and 'Ohio Journal of Science' contains 103 years of material (6437 items) from that journal.</i>
University of Utrecht DDDD: Y SPREAD: Y		Medium volume, evenly distributed deposits over about 28 collections (two especially large collections are <i>Scheikunde</i> 3655 and <i>KEUR</i> with 3813).
Tsukuba Repository DDDD: N SPREAD: ?		Initial period of high-volume deposit (March – May 2006) plus a single isolated huge deposit (19 th October, almost 10k items). Only 20 infrequent medium-volume deposits since December 2006. <i>Sets and collections are mainly labelled in Japanese and therefore not analysed by this author.</i>
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska – Lincoln DDDD: Y		Continuous medium-volume deposits on a daily basis. Each day seems to have main bulk of deposits in a single set, indicating

SPREAD: ?		some kind of focused deposit program.
University of Groningen DDDD: P SPREAD: Y		Mainly regular medium-level deposits. Occasional high volume deposits. The collections span a wide range of the University's work and are broadly populated.

Of the above list, the thematic spread of five repositories could not be determined. Of the remaining fifteen, only three repositories show definite positive results against both criteria – Utrecht, Wageningen and Southampton – while three others (Terkko, HAL and Groningen) score positively on deposits and partially on scope (although note that two of those repositories are not genuinely ‘institutional’).

However, if we limit ourselves to the rate of deposits and revise the ‘top 20’ list to be based on the number of medium-volume deposit days (i.e. days with 10-90 deposits), rather than the gross number of records, then twelve of the large but less active repositories disappear and are replaced by smaller (but keener) repositories. Six of these replacements contain fewer than 5,000 records, but will hopefully grow quickly if their deposit behaviour stays constant.

BIG REPOSITORIES THAT DISAPPEAR FROM THE TOP 20:	SMALLER REPOSITORIES THAT ARE ADDED:
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Document Server	Caltech Authors – Main (USA)
Australian National University	Dspace @ University Library Nijmegen (NL)
DSpace at Cambridge	University of Groningen (NL)
DSpace at MIT	Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Digital Academic Repository van de Universiteit van Amsterdam (UvA-DARE)	NAL-IR (National Aerospace Laboratories, India)
Nagoya University Academic Knowledge Factory	Open Research Online (Open University, UK)
Ohio State University: Knowledge Bank	Queensland University of Technology (Australia)
Terkko Document Space	Repository Technical University Eindhoven (NL)
The University of Adelaide Digital Library: Home	ScholarsArchive@OSU (Oregon State University)
Tsukuba Repository (Tulips-R)	University of California eScholarship Repository (USA)
University of Michigan: Deep Blue	University of St.Gallen (Switzerland)
University of Twente Repository	University of Strathclyde (UK)

Of course, such metrics are still broad brush and do not differentiate between 10- and 90-items deposited per day. Neither do they distinguish *what* has been deposited – a full-text refereed journal article, a bibliographic record or a jpg image. The easiest distinction to make is whether a deposit is an empty metadata-only record, or whether it actually has associated data files, be they papers, images or bitstreams of any kind. This is a focus of Open Access, but important for any agenda (in cases where preservation is the imperative, for example, you can't preserve items that you don't have!)

This study has not addressed the issue of full texts, as too few tools exist to accurately assist with the task. This is a shortcoming of the OAI-PMH protocol, which does not provide a mechanism for declaring the data streams associated with an OAI record. The PRESERV Profile tool (run as a service on ROAR and built on Celestial's harvesting process) tries to determine this information by data-mining the repository abstracta though it currently only works for EPrints and DSpace repositories. However, it would appear that of the ‘top three’ repositories listed above, Utrecht and Wageningen both have very high proportions of full text documents, whereas Southampton is low-achieving in this respect (around 15%).

Because the OAI sets do not necessarily reflect the thematic or organisational distinctions made in the repository (if they exist), it was necessary to examine the user interface of each repository to determine how deposits were shared between the various collections or thematic areas. This usually meant examining top level table of contents pages which contained counts for each collection, but on occasions it was necessary to crawl the repository pages and calculate the totals with a script. Beyond that, it was frequently necessary to compare the list of collections with the University's list of faculties and schools to check the mapping between the repository structure and the University structure. In order to perform this analysis automatically it would be necessary to map a deposit item onto a collection or subject area automatically, and then to map that onto the University's structure. It would also be helpful to have an indication of the relative size of the University departments, to determine the expected relative size of different schools. Such a tool does not yet exist, but would be very useful for large-scale analyses of repository practice.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper attempts to start developing a workable metric for *a reasonable rate of ingest that is consistent with capturing the community's scientific and scholarly output*. Such a measure is needed both for evaluating the performance of a single repository and for comparing the effectiveness of various policies across many repositories by using analytical services such as ROAR or reviewing services such as OpenDOAR. Other services (thematic, rather than institutional) have been similarly analysed elsewhere (Carr, Hitchcock, Hall and Harnad 2000). This paper presents some criteria for judging the success of an institutional repository that are based on the generic requirements of repositories and are not specific to a particular agenda. The daily deposit rate is relatively easy to monitor, and gives some concrete insight into the running of a repository.

The fact that so few repositories scored high on the combined 'daily deposit volume and scope' measure indicates that the informal requirements are rather more difficult to achieve than expected. Even though the calculations that indicated an expected daily deposit rate of 50 items were relaxed significantly to allow a range from 10 to 99 items, it would appear that these should not be taken as widely achievable rate at this time.

As well as the level of daily deposits, further work should be undertaken to determine the most suitable form of a daily rate metric – in this study the 'number of active days per year' was taken, whereas a weighted combination of the number of days and size of each day's deposit may be more useful. Despite the need to perform such calculations with a minimum of human intervention, such a metric should also be tailored to reflect the size and circumstances of the institution so as to be fair enough to gain popular acceptance.

The twenty largest repositories listed above have a gross average daily deposit rate of 100 items per day – a figure that is inflated by high-volume batch deposits. However, even the lower estimated target of 50 items per day may still impose a significant resourcing problem on repository management. What degree of staff effort is required to handle such a level of activity from the combined faculty, and what are the implications for the editorial and quality oversight that are to be applied to the ingested resources? In the future, it is likely that a formidable suite of administration and quality management tools will need to be deployed to support a mature repository that is seriously engaged with its faculty.

Bibliography

Carr, L., Hitchcock, S., Hall, W. and Harnad, S. (2000) A usage based analysis of CoRR. ACM SIGDOC Journal of Computer Documentation 24(2) pp. 54-59

Davis, P.M. and Connolly M. J. L. (2007) Institutional Repositories: Evaluating the Reasons for Non-use of Cornell University's Installation of DSpace. D-Lib Magazine, March/April 2007 13(3/4). <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march07/davis/03davis.html>

Lynch, C. (2003) ARL Bimonthly Report 226, <http://www.arl.org/newsltr/226/ir.htm>

Xia, J. and Sun, L. (2007) Assessment of Self-Archiving in Institutional Repositories: Depositorship and Full-Text Availability, *Serials Review*, 33(1) pp 14-21.
doi:10.1016/j.serrev.2006.12.003