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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