Overview

The Depot facility (http://depot.edina.ac.uk) is based on E-Prints software and is OAI-compliant. Like other UK repositories, its contents will be harvested and searched through the Intute Repository Search project. It offers a redirect service, nicknamed UK Repository Junction, to ensure that content that comes within the remit of an extant repository is correctly placed there instead of in the Depot.

Additionally, as IRs are created, the Depot will offer a transfer service for content deposited by authors based at those universities, to help populate the new IRs. The Depot will therefore act as a ‘keepsafe’ until a repository of choice becomes available for deposited scholarly content. In this way, the Depot will avoid competing with extant and emerging IRs while bridging gaps in the overall repository landscape and encouraging more open access deposits.

About Repository Junction

At reception, on the Depot homepage, there is necessary facility to establish the identity of the potential depositor and what is being brought for deposit. This also provides the opportunity for the Depot to operate a re-direct service whereby those from universities that already have a suitable repository are automatically linked to the home page for that institutional repository.

Similarly, if the potential depositor has something other than an eprint, links to a range of appropriate repositories and archives will be on offer. This first part of the operation of the Depot we have nicked-named Repository Junction; it uses OpenDOAR as an information source.

Ingest Service

The main objective of the Depot is ingest of post-prints into its repository. Here the intention is to expose that content under Open Access, via use of OAI-PMH, to other search facilities, such as Intute. Acting as a ‘host’, the Depot will have a stated ‘take down and put back’ policy, and should operate as a trusted repository, where persistence is desired as a quality of the object and of references made to the object, even – or perhaps especially – as the repository function might not persist.

Background

In 2006 JISC funded the EDINA national data centre (University of Edinburgh) and SHERPA (University of Nottingham) to work together to scope provision for a short to medium term repository service to take deposit of peer-reviewed research outputs from any UK academic author without access to an IR at their own university. Under the name of Prospero, a draft scoping paper with implementation recommendations was produced: http://edina.ac.uk/projects/prospero/ScopingReport.pdf

In 2007 the partners were asked by JISC to provide the proposed facility for deposit of postprints and to work with other JISC RepositoryNet partners on promotion and advocacy to would-be depositors and institutions considering setting up their own IRs. RepositoryNet refers collectively to the supporting services of the Repository and Preservation Programme:

- the Depot
- Intute Search
- Repositories Support Project (RSP)
- Repositories Research Team (RRT)
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