

Draft Sustainability Plan for Dryad Repository

Neil Beagrie and Julia Chruszcz
Charles Beagrie Limited

Dryad Consortium Meeting
British Library Dec 2009

Overview

- Background
- External Sources

- Costs and Revenues
- General Questions

- Break
- Discussion of Key Points

Background

May 2009 Consortium Meeting:

“The [board] charged the Dryad project staff with developing a business model that would identify the value-added benefit of the repository to different parties (depositors, users of archived data, journals, publishers, societies, funding organizations, etc), the costs of operation, and a mix of potential sources of revenue.”

Sustainability Plan

- The aim of this working document is to set a framework to develop the plan
- Our work began on 20 October 2009 and ends May 2010
- Your input at an early stage
- A dynamic document –regular review by members and further development

Ongoing additional work

- Assessment and sampling by the Dryad project team of supplementary data in partner journals
- An independent consultancy on cost models for Dryad by Lorraine Eakin
- 10 interviews (mid-December – February 2010) by Charles Beagrie Ltd with publishers/journals

External Sources

- Other Archive Repositories
 - Archaeology Data Service
 - KCL Centre for e-Research
 - DSpace
- Institutional Support and Embedding
- Use of Students and Volunteers
- Activity Models for Archives
- Publishers and Journals

Handover to Julia

Cost modelling – why?

- Crucial to understand full costs of operation:
 - To estimate revenues required
 - To id activity that is expensive to assess potential efficiencies or alternatives
 - To have control
 - To plan ahead and inform future strategy
- A stepping stone to sustainability

Activity Based Cost Model

- Early point in Dryads development
- Mapping activity and costs - building upon pilot work with journals
- Detail and refinement based upon:
 - Breakdown and analysis of curation tasks
 - Materials (formats, volumes, quantity of metadata and documentation)
 - Curation levels (experience as repository matures)

The baseline

Based on assumptions and caveats

- Lower estimate for data p.a. ingest
- Minimum curation level
- No peer review of supplementary data [by Dryad]
- Inclusion of fund for hardware/system replacement (2015)
- First Year [No inflation]
- Estimates not actual for staff rates

Consideration

- Minimum staffing level including skills to be viable
- Impact of increasing data volumes ingested from increasing number of papers processed
- Impact of curation level applied
- Long term digital preservation

Repository Benefits

- Many groups that potentially benefit
- Core stakeholders: journals; societies; publishers
- Quantifiable or qualitative benefits?
- Weighting influences revenue decisions
- Target reports to illustrate benefit

Potential Revenue

- Current development via significant grants
- Similar to other repository initiatives
- Difference – partner engagement
- Clear collection policy
- Mixed funding model to spread risk
- Nature of organisation can influence funding

Revenue options

Rated HIGH:

- In-kind contributions (host & participants)
- Subscriptions (Societies and Publishers)
- Fees (Journals)
- Grants (Research funders)

Key stakeholders and influences on Dryad

Revenue options

Rated MEDIUM:

- Charging model for large data packages

Development of a charging policy

Revenue options

Rated LOW:

- Angel donors (organisations or benefactors)
- Advertising or sponsorship (advertisers & sponsors)

Maximise revenue

- Clarity of purpose and aims of Dryad
- Good communication and involvement with stakeholders
- Transparent approach
- Easy to understand charging policy
- Maintain goodwill
- Reliable and professional – trusted repository building critical mass of data

Questions?

Break

Discussion of Key Points