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1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

The participants were welcomed by Ms Lisa Raymond. She explained that the MBLWHOI Library serves a number of laboratories in Woods Hole.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

2.1 Adoption of the agenda

The Group reviewed and adopted the agenda and timetable for the meeting with one addition on communication strategy. It was agreed that this would be discussed under agenda item 6.6.

2.2 Introduction of the participants

Regrettably three members of the Group were unable to attend: Mr Marc Goovaerts, Ms Andrea Cristiani (representing ODINCARSA) and Ms Kateryna Kulakakova (representing ODINECET). It was recalled that there were now two outgoing Co-Chairs of the Steering Group: Ms Pauline Simpson and Mr Marc Goovaerts, and two incoming Co-Chairs: Ms Arame Keita and Ms Jennifer Walton. It was noted that Webex sessions were planned with Mr Goovaerts, Ms Cristiani and Ms Kulakova. A WebEx session was also planned with Ms Imma Subirats. Dr Claudia Delgado (IODE training coordinator) would also join the meeting by Webex.

2.3 Designation of Chair for the meeting

The meeting designated Ms Pauline Simpson as Chair for the meeting.

3. REVIEW OF THE 2012-2013 ACTION PLAN

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Pauline Simpson. Text highlighted in yellow indicates additions made by the SG during the current Session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DELIVERABLE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>REPORTED PROGRESS JAN 2013 (March 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OceanDocs Policy document</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
<td>The draft version is ready</td>
<td>Recommend that IODE, the different Odins and the institutes, which are partners in OceanDocs adopt an Open Access policy by signing the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (<a href="http://oa.mpg.de/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung/">http://oa.mpg.de/berlin-prozess/berliner-erklarung/</a>)</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG-III will consider whether the document needs revision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Copyright guidelines</th>
<th>Pauline Simpson</th>
<th>Feb 2012</th>
<th>Final review by the Steering Group</th>
<th>Completed: these are added as an annex to the Policy document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Copyright guidelines</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pauline Simpson</strong></td>
<td><strong>Feb 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final review by the Steering Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Completed: these are added as an annex to the Policy document</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3.1.** | **Documentation:** The existing documents will be collected in Dropbox:  
  - OceanDocs material (ppt – pdf - …) will be revised  
  - External material (links – websites) | **Steering Group coordinated by Marc Goovaerts** | **Mar 2012** | **Pauline Simpson created a Dropbox directory and invited the OceanDocs Steering Group. This is a temporary solution (see next action)** | **DropBox created and in use**  
  - The Group requested the Secretariat to check with Marc Goovaerts if he wants to continue the management of the Dropbox content or whether Ms Simpson will take this on. Ms Simpson was requested to add Peter Pissierssens, Adi Kakodkar, Jennifer Walton, Arame Keita to the Dropbox folder.  
  It was noted that final versions of working documents should be published publicly. |
| **3.2.** | **The general documentation will be available through OD. The necessary links will be created on the interface.**  
  Internal documents will be submitted in a new collection in OceanDocs.  
  External material will be included in OceanTeacher. | **Marc Goovaerts and Denys Slipetskyy** | **May 2012** | **Recommend that the Oceandocs resources will be available through OceanTeacher linked to specific training courses.** | **The Steering group decided that all technical and user guide documentation should be made available through OceanTeacher and with links to these pages from the IODE web site (Global Activities – OceanDocs). In addition there should be links to user guides from the OceanDocs web site. It was noted that the user documentation for OceanDocs should be improved.**  
  Technical docs: to OceanTeacher DL  
  User guides: to OceanTeacher DL with links from...**
| 3.3 | Translation of the main internal documents about policy and copyright in French and Spanish | Saïda Messaoudi and Andrea Cristiani | May 2012 | Translations will be reviewed. Translations in other languages will be the responsibility of the requesting partners. | SPANISH VERSION COMPLETED

| 3.4 | Technical documentation and training material (English version) is available through the AIMS AgriOcean DSpace pages (http://aims.fao.org/tools/agriocean-dspace). The documents will be updated where necessary | Steering Group | May 2012 | Translations in other languages, if requested, will be the responsibility of the requesting partners. | No requests were received. Action closed |

| 4. | Request IODE/OceanTeacher to organize a training course on repositories with a focus on OceanDocs during 2012 | Steering Group | Jan 2012 | IODE/OceanTeacher has scheduled a course in Nov. 2012 | COMPLETED Rescheduled for April 2013 |

| 5.1 | Creation of a communication strategy document | ODIN representatives (*) + Linda Pikula (Lead) | Jun 2012 | Now agreed Jun | No draft up to Sep 2013
From Sep 2013 waiting for Future of OceanDocs |
| 5.3. | Delivery of a Progress Report to the Steering Group Meeting | ODIN representatives (*) | Jan 2014 | Or one month before the next steering group meeting |
| 5.4. | Creation of Odin teams | ODIN representatives (*) | Mar 2012 | The Odin representatives will create a team of 2-3 information managers to work out the different tasks on the Odin level: Introduction of QA, development of policy material, technical support, |

COMPLETED
ODINCARSA - Report on ODINCARSA activities for 2012 were sent to GEMIM Chair 18 Dec. 2012. This report includes OceanDocs progress.
ODINAFRICA – report to be sent by 21 Jan 2013
ODIN-PIMRIS is yet to be part of OceanDocs – but are working towards it. We have been promoting ‘Open Access’ (at the University of the South Pacific & regional members) since returning from the OceanDocs SG meeting in early 2012 and will test ‘DSpace’ in one of our island countries (ODIN-PIMRIS member) this year. If successful, we might migrate all others from ‘Greenstone’ to ‘DSpace’ in the near future.

DONE
Reports were provided by ODIN coordinators during the steering group meeting.

ODINCARSA team: Regional Coordinator and OceanDocs admin: Andrea Cristiani
OceanDocs Validation team: Gabriela Silvoni (Argentina sub-communities and collections), Enma Fonseca and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.5.</th>
<th>Describing the different operational architectures in support of OceanDocs</th>
<th>ODIN representatives (*) + Marc Goovaerts</th>
<th>Now June 2013</th>
<th>Marc Goovaerts, ready in Feb 2012 for the policy document</th>
<th>ODINAFRICA - OceanDocs-Africa team is composed of 3 IM: Arame Keita (Senegal), James Macharia (Kenya) &amp; Saida Messaoudi (Tunisia).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.6. | Quality control of the OceanDocs submitted deposits | ODIN Teams | (On going) | |}
<p>| 5.7. | Preparation of material for Information sessions on Open Access, repositories and OceanDocs | ODIN Teams | Minimal 1x/year: e.g. Open Access week | Recommend to create basic advocacy material (logo, powerpoint template, flyer) Budget request: 5000$ | ODINAFRICA - On going: (Tunisia) My |
| 5.8. | Preparation of institute policies on Open Access for Odins and institutes: to be proposed to Odins | ODIN representatives (*) | on going | Implementation and specification of the OceanDocs policy on the regional and local | ODINAFRICA - On going: (Tunisia) My |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and institutes</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>institute policy will be ready by the next week &amp; will be communicated to all the researchers of INSTM, then proposed to Odinafrica group.</td>
<td>ONGOING – also to be included in communication strategy – see new work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Survey for every participating Odin about:</td>
<td>ODIN representatives (*)</td>
<td>ODINAFRICA – not yet done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- local/regional repository and Open Access options in addition to OceanDocs and Aquatic Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pauline has circulated some sample OA/IR surveys to use in the creation of the survey (March 2013) Likely to use EIFL with questions greatly reduced and edited. NOT DONE – to be included in communication strategy – see new work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Defining the volume of historical material and annual production of scientific publications in institutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Availability of an Open Access and repository policy on the different levels (institutes – countries – Odin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012</td>
<td>Steering group will participate in the review phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 2012</td>
<td>Steering Group will participate in the finalization phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Technical developments on OceanDocs (AgriOcean Dspace):</td>
<td></td>
<td>IODE XXII is requested to support the technical development of the OceanDocs network (meetings, travel, internship, software development etc) – Budget request: 4000$膏/year during the next session. done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Finalization of the batch import module for Agris AP (for ASFA partners)</td>
<td>Denys Slipetskyy</td>
<td>Feb 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Survey for a new release of AgriOcean Dspace</td>
<td>Marc Goovaerts</td>
<td>Jun 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Already proposed functionalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Batch Import: ASFA version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Authority control:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Thesaurus plug-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Authors (OceanExpert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Copyright license selection tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Duplication control tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Harvesting possibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>New release AgriOcean Dspace</td>
<td>Marc Goovaerts, Adi Naik Kakodkar</td>
<td>Oct 2012, Now March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.</td>
<td>Evaluation of the metadata structure of AgriOcean Dspace</td>
<td>Steering Group, Lisa Raymond</td>
<td>April 2012, Nov 15 March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>OceanDocs–Aquatic Commons: cooperation</td>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>On going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data Sets (policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Crosswalks (incl. ASFA batch import)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of Linked Open Data - VOA3R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AVANO support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing documentation and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.</td>
<td>Intermediate Report on cooperation progress</td>
<td>Andrea Cristiani</td>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.</td>
<td>Report to Steering Group on cooperation achieved</td>
<td>Andrea Cristiani</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3.</td>
<td>Standardization of metadata between OceanDocs and Aquatic Commons: Agreement on a common core</td>
<td>Hardy Schwamm, Lisa Raymond</td>
<td>Sep 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.</td>
<td>Cooperation between IODE &amp; IAMSLIC on training on repository development (OceanTeacher)</td>
<td>Linda Pikula</td>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.</td>
<td>Intersessional Steering Group meeting (Virtual)</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson, Marc Goovaerts</td>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3.</td>
<td>Annual Odin meetings (virtual): Every Odin organizes its own OceanDocs meeting</td>
<td>ODIN representatives</td>
<td>Every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERABLE</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>DUE</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Marc Goorvaerts, Denys Slipetsky</td>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odinafrica has had live meeting on OceanDocs and other.</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>(October 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEANDOCS ACTION PLAN NEW ITEMS ADDED 01 MARCH 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERABLE</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>DUE</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Adii Naik Kokadkar, Marc Goorvaerts, Denys Slipetsky, Thembani Malapela</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Mr Adi Naik Kakodkar to arrange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Adii Naik Kokadkar, Denys Slipetsky</td>
<td>asap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson, ODIN Representatives from each</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Adii Naik Kokadkar</td>
<td>asap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. OCEANDOCS USE

#### 4.1 OceanDocs usage statistics

This agenda item was presented by Mr Aditya Kakodkar. It was noted that the DSpace (AgriOcean DSpace as used for OceanDocs) statistics are difficult to use as they include robot visits (eg Google, …) which distort the total visits. In addition it was not known what period the AgriOcean DSpace built-in statistics cover. Based upon the statistics from Google Analytics about 75,000 views/year were recorded. The largest number of users was recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10. 6 | A Trial harvest of IBSS records using OAI would be carried out | Aditi Naik Kokadkar, Marc Goorvaerts, Denys Slipetsky | End April 2013 | NOT DONE  
See new work plan |
| 11 | List of all courses that included OceanDocs training since 2008, be compiled.       | Marc Goorvaerts, ODIN Representatives | June 2013 | NOT done  
To be done by Claudia Delgado with assistance from Linda (end of June) |
| 12 | OceanDocs Editorial Guidelines to be created  
Aquatic Commons Editorial Guidelines document send to Andrea | Andrea Cristiani, Pauline Simpson | | Not done – see new work plan |
| 13 | Submit the SG-OceanDocs proposed budget 2013-2015 to the IODEXXII for approval. | Marc Goovaerts, Pauline Simpson | March 2013 | Completed |
| 14 | Evaluation Survey of OD functionality and interface to be carried out | Pauline Simpson | Sep 2013 | Completed |
| 15 | Identification of new members for SG-OD Co-Chairs & Steering Group | Co-Chairs & Steering Group | A number of new members will need to be recruited and helped to gain experience to take on future lead roles. | Katerina Kulakova has been nominated by Olga Akimova as the ODINECET Representative on SG-OD (Denys is Technical Dev)  
Pauline will contact Olga to find out who new tech support is  
Arame Keita and Jen Walton to be Co-Chairs 2014 - 2016 |
in Latin America. The Group regretted that the statistics could not provide trends from year to year. Overall the Group noted that the built-in statistics in AgriOcean DSpace do not provide the required analytic tools. The Group expressed disappointment over the available statistics in terms of deposits and use.

Mr Kakodkar reported that the statistics within DSpace can be improved. He will work on this in the framework of the Clearing House project, which is also using DSpace (version 4.0 with JSPUI).

**4.2 Use of DSpace and AgriOcean DSpace by Member States**

It was noted that OceanDocs Central ([http://www.oceandocs.org](http://www.oceandocs.org)) (the meeting agreed to call the OceanDocs repository hosted by the IOC Project Office for IODE in Oostende the “OceanDocs Central” repository) deposits are also negatively affected by previous depositors establishing their own institutional repositories. Kenya is an excellent example: in OceanDocs Central they have deposited 93 documents, while in their institutional online repository ([http://41.215.122.106/dspace/](http://41.215.122.106/dspace/)) they deposited 2538 documents. Assuming that other libraries/institutions proceed the same way usage statistics for the OceanDocs Central ([http://www.oceandocs.org](http://www.oceandocs.org)) will further decline. This will make it increasingly difficult to justify the continued funding/resourcing of the OceanDocs Central. It was noted that it was considered to establish a harvester that will harvest all institutional DSpace servers (that agree to be considered as member of the OceanDocs family) but this has not yet been established.

The meeting was informed that INCOIS will establish a repository to provide access to publications resulting from the International Indian Ocean Expedition 2 as well as historical documents from IIOE-1. They consider using DSpace (or AOD) as IOC/IODE is using it.

In addition the ODINWESTPAC planning meeting (Tianjin, 4-7 March 2014) decided to provide training to enable the establishment of e-repositories in the WESTPAC region. They agreed to use the OceanDocs Central as a starting point.

The SPINCAM project ([http://www.spincamnet.net/](http://www.spincamnet.net/)) will organize an e-repository (based on OceanDocs) course in May 2014. It is planned to create a community in OceanDocs Central (as well as sub-communities for each of the participating countries).

The meeting noted that currently the following institutions, collaborating with IODE OceanDocs, have established DSpace/AOD repositories:

**AgriOcean DSpace**
- CEEMAR (Ukraine for ODINECET) ([http://www.ceemar.org/dspace/](http://www.ceemar.org/dspace/))
- IBSS (Ukraine) ([http://repository.ibss.org.ua/dspace/](http://repository.ibss.org.ua/dspace/))
- KMFRI (Kenya) ([http://41.215.122.106/dspace](http://41.215.122.106/dspace))

**DSpace**
- NIO India ([http://drs.nio.org/drs/](http://drs.nio.org/drs/))

The meeting then considered scenarios for continuing support for DSpace/AOD without requiring full support from the IODE Secretariat. It was noted that when considering other models, direct administrator access to the Oostende server cannot be provided. This restricts the options.

The scenarios have been identified in order to reduce the workload of Mr Aditya Naik Kakodkar taking into account his other responsibilities and priorities set by IODE.
### Scenario 1: status quo (support of both Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs by the Oostende Office)

**Pro**
- IODE is known for OceanDocs Expertise at Oostende office for DSpace/AOD and Eprints
- Extensive use of DSpace in Member States

**Con**
- Adi’s workload: less time for other priorities

**Reality check**
- This scenario is realistic if additional IT support is made available. Estimated staff time required: 2 months/year (cost=approx. $20K)

### Scenario 2: outsourcing to a commercial company

**Example:** WHOI MBL pays approx. $4500/year for the maintenance of their DSpace setup. The server is hosted by WHOI MBL. This includes 30h hours of tech support. Each additional hour @$150. The initial setup cost was approx. $10,000

**Pro**
- Limited cost
- Guaranteed expertise/limited liability of IOC/IODE
- Reduction of Adi’s workload

**Con**
- Cost
- Loss of expertise
- Security concerns (uncertain if this will be allowed)
- No support for member states’ repositories

**Reality check**
- This should be further investigated in terms of costing. A mixed solution could be considered (new setup by contractor, maintenance by Project Office)
  (@mire: atmire.com)

### Scenario 3: outsourcing of Aquatic Commons

**Pro**
- Limited cost
- Reduction of Adi’s workload

**Con**
- Cost and who will pay
- Undermining of IAMSLIC/IODE relationship/partnership

**Reality check**
- Not recommended due uncertain source of funding (IODE cannot justify funding non-IODE activity)

### Scenario 4: delegate responsibility for the hosting and maintenance of the OceanDocs Central to an existing AOD host

**Pro**
- Reduction of Adi’s workload
- No cost
- Sharing of responsibility for IODE products/services by Member States: shared ownership
- While countries may be willing to have IOC host their content they may not be willing to have another country host their content
- Proof of concept of IODE capacity development

**Con**
- Loss of expertise by IODE project office
- Continuity/sustainability not assured
- Possible loss of visibility/ownership by IODE
- Cost?

**Reality check**
- Continuity is not assured but the scenario can be discussed with candidate institutions

### Scenario 5: set up individual repositories for each ODIN (to replace those currently included in OceanDocs) and shut down the OceanDocs Central

**Pro**
- Reduction of Adi’s workload
- No cost
- Sharing of responsibility for IODE products/services by Member States: shared ownership
- Proof of concept of IODE capacity development

**Con**
- Loss of expertise by IODE project office
- Continuity/sustainability not assured
- Possible loss of visibility/ownership by IODE
- Possibly loss of coordination and overall integrity of the network
- Cost?

**Reality check**
- Continuity is not assured at the ODIN level. OceanDocs will lose its identity.

### Scenario 6: stop hosting Aquatic Commons at the Oostende Office

**Pro**
- Reduction of Adi’s workload
- No cost

**Con**
- Undermining of IAMSLIC/IODE relationship/partnership

**Reality check**
- Not preferable
Scenario 7: stop hosting OceanDocs (AOD) at the Oostende Office and migrate content to Aquatic Commons

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**
  - No cost
- **Loss of expertise by IODE project office**
  - Need to migrate other services/products like Clearing House to AC
- **Benefit of content management mechanism of IAMSLIC**
  - Loss of coordinating role by IOC with potential negative impact on Member States due to lack of expertise sharing platform; Loss of community
- **No need to deposit twice depending on freshwater/marine**
  - Loss of IODE product (less visibility as part of Aquatic Commons + management by IAMSLIC)
- **To be further discussed**

Scenario 8: stop hosting AC at the Oostende Office and migrate AC to OceanDocs (AOD)

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**
  - No cost
- **Benefit of content management mechanism of IAMSLIC**
  - Unlikely for IAMSLIC to agree
- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**
  - Unlikely

Scenario 9: convert AC into DSpace 4

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**
  - No cost
- **Unlikely for IAMSLIC to agree**
  - Unlikely

Scenario 10: phase out OceanDocs Central repository as repository; Run harvester as rebranded OceanDocs+ (includes Aquatic Commons)

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**
  - The OceanDocs brand will live on and provide a global and unique portal to ocean (and aquatic) research output
  - It is likely that institutions that currently use OceanDocs Central will gradually start hosting their own repositories and this will strongly reduce the need for the service.
- **Lack of training for institutions to set up e-repository (although this could be arranged with IAMSLIC and OceanTeacher)**
  - Need to identify best harvester and need to test
- **Benefit of content management mechanism of IAMSLIC**
  - The “disappearance” of the OceanDocs central will need to be explained to the IODE MIM community so it is not perceived as a loss.
  - Feasibility is high

It was noted that, even if the OceanDocs Central continues to exist it may need to change into a portal that serves a harvested collection (from the national and regional repositories).

### 4.3 OceanDocs 2014 survey results

This agenda item was presented by Dr Claudia Delgado by Webex. She recalled that the survey, which was carried out in February 2014, had been prepared in English, French, Spanish and Russian. 86 had responded to the English, 29 to the French, 40 to the Spanish and 13 to the Russian survey. The conclusions from the survey’s 30 questions were as follows:

1. The majority of the respondents find OceanDocs well presented but it is suggested to change the font/change the design and to make the home page less “busy”.
2. The majority of the respondents’ use OceanDocs only occasionally (over 50%).
3. As what concerns the use of the pre-set search fields, Author, Title and Subject are the most frequently used/relevant. Sponsor and Identifier are seldom or never used.
4. A majority of the users (65%) find that Help text is useful, i.e., provides enough information.

5. However, some improvements could be useful and would be considered for inclusion in OceanDocs Central future development.

6. Search fields such as Journal Title and Year are suggested.

7. The use of georeferenced entries, type of object, etc. is suggested.

8. 68% of the respondents consider it is easy to find a document on OceanDocs.

9. After a search, the majority of the respondents would like to have access to the full text on the first results (short display) screen.

10. Bibliographic citation and Depositor are both considered important to be displayed in the full record. Only 20% of the respondents would like to see the full record details in a different order (e.g., using a more logical order, while ASFA terms, Publisher and Series should be moved to the end).

11. Issue Date and Title are the most used Sort options. The most relevant sort options to be added would be Journal Title, Document Type.

12. Around 70% of the respondents deposited no more than 50 documents on OceanDocs.

13. Most respondents who did/do not upload documents on OceanDocs were not aware of such possibility or do not know how to do it. Respondents also report language problems or lack of digitized document.

14. Over 80% of the respondents are satisfied with the requirements to deposit on OceanDocs.

15. Most respondents refer to the slow response and lack of intuitiveness of the OceanDocs site as the main difficulties while using the website.

16. The majority of the respondents consider that the Help section in English is sufficient; however, one needs to consider that the majority of the respondents filled the English version of the survey.

17. The majority of the respondents (> 60%) consider the Help section explanatory or very explanatory. Furthermore, most of the comments on question 18 refer they do not have further suggestions.

18. The majority of the respondents do not use the Export function. This may explain the neutral response regarding the user-friendliness of the tool, as well as the need to export to Microsoft Excel.

19. The most requested export formats to be added are ASCII, XML and Endnote.

20. The majority of the respondents consider it easy to download a document from OceanDocs.

21. The majority of the respondents do not use the RSS feed (>60%) or do not know how to use it (>20%).
22. Most respondents noted that they are not able to compare with other e-repositories. Some noted that comparing is not straightforward. The respondents who did provide a comparison consider that OceanDocs is on average at the same level as other repositories. The question was not intuitive but of the few real comparisons Aquatic Commons was highlighted as a better repository.

The meeting wondered why several countries in ODINs deposit so few publications. Ms Keita reported that institutions had reported a variety of reasons: (i) they have too few documents to deposit; (ii) there is no scanner available; (iii) there is insufficient staff available; (iv) the expertise is not available; (v) internet connectivity is still a problem; (vi) copyright is an issue. In most countries there is interest in collaborating in OceanDocs.

**The meeting requested** Ms Keita to urge ASFA National Partners that are in the same institution as the ODINAFRICA partner centres, to collaborate in OceanDocs if they are not doing so yet (through ASFA). **Similarly the meeting requested** Ms Cristiani to urge ASFA national partners in Latin America to collaborate in OceanDocs.

**The meeting requested** Mr Kakodkar to analyze the OceanDocs database and prepare an analysis of the number of records deposited by each country/institutions by year. This will enable to see trends by year and by institution. Poor performing institutions can then be contacted to discuss remedial action.

5. **OCEANDOCS: DSPACE VS EPRINTS**

5.1 **Introduction**

This agenda was introduced by Ms Imma Subirats. In her presentation she focused on EPrints. She explained that her experience with EPrints was limited to administration and end user in the context of library science. She focused on e-LIS as a use case.

EPrints development is fully managed by the University of Southampton, UK. The community of practice is smaller than the one of DSpace. EPrints is GPL (general public license). The community of developers in the context of EPrints is smaller as compared to DSpace. The fact that EPrints is fully maintained by one institution has allowed for consistence in development because they have a business model where clients ask for features. So development is based on demand. The stable release now is 3.3.12, released in 2013. It is written in Perl and it is available for various platforms. Website: [http://eprints.org](http://eprints.org)

Functionalities:
- manage full text and metadata
- easy full text upload
- easy to install
- development centralized by the University of Southampton
- works “Out of the box”

It is not possible to make relationships between records. Every record in EPrints is related to a full-text document. This is a problem in some cases because we would like to make relationships between different language versions or between papers of a conference. The use of authority files is another issue. Marc Goovaerts at UHasselt have developed a plugin for SKOS vocab. FAO is working with EPrints to let this work in EPrints. These are the 2 weak point of EPrints. But EPrints also some strong aspects: EPrints has set up a “bazaar” so
you can install elements adding on to the software and without help of a technician. A bit like installing apps. E-Prints works very well in context of subject domain digital repositories and much better than DSpace. So, for subject repositories EPrints works very well. FAO had to migrate e-LIS from a different system. Initially they worked with EPrints, then for organizational reasons they moved to DSpace but they then moved back to EPrints. e-LIS was established in 2003. It is a repository for library science. e-LIS supports many languages. URL: [http://eprints.rclis.org/](http://eprints.rclis.org/) e-LIS has admin board. There is also editorial board (50 people from 30+ countries). e-LIS was migrated to University of London Computer Centre (ULCC) who host the system for free. Editors only approve documents at the national level. Countries are divided by language. E.g. in Switzerland we have an editor for French and one for German papers. The e-LIS interface is in English only. It is not clear whether the interface can be provided in multiple languages. But abstracts can be in multiple languages. Authors from various regions have different behaviour so we need to help them how to deposit documents.

![Figure 1: e-LIS homepage](image)

Users can create an account. It is possible to see the latest additions. Only the header and footer have been modified. The layout is standard. Once an author has created an account he/she can access the page of their own submissions, add an item etc. The submission process has 4 steps. This works the same way as AgriOcean DSpace. Type of document (e.g. conference paper), description, upload document, deposit agreement.

In e-LIS a pilot service was added: a database maintained by authors, to maintaining the way they want to be cited (the author field). OceanDocs Central could do the same with OceanExpert. Reference was made to Iralis ([www.iralis.org](http://www.iralis.org)) which is a registry of authors. This is used in E-LIS. It allows individuals to define how they want to be cited in a reference. This is also linked to the exit system ([http://www.directorioexit.info/](http://www.directorioexit.info/))

EPrints also provides statistics that will show e.g. how many records were deposited by country, subject etc. This is good because the administrator can see these directly. But this is also a disadvantage: users cannot access this information.

EPrints provides very clear administrator information. This is important especially of staff resources for the management of the repository is limited.
EPrints has some pages that are created dynamically (eg search, browser) but you can also create static pages.

Ms Subirats then demonstrated a deposit.

DSpace was seen as a system in which, once a document has been deposited, it is definitive and cannot be replaced. For e-LIS this was a problem as errors can be made. EPrints is more flexible.

Ms Simpson noted that there is an EPrints forum where users can suggest features. Important for us and AC is that the editor community needs to be expanded and each editor needs to be given areas of responsibilities for eg an organization. Note that e-LIS is using version 3.3.8.

5.2 Comparison of EPrints and DSpace

This agenda item was introduced by Mr Aditya Kakodkar.

Eprints overview:
- First release: 2000
- Developed by university of Southampton
- Outcome of 1999 Santa Fe Meeting (OAI-PMH)
- Version 3 Launched in 2007

DSpace overview:
- First release: 2002
- Joint venture between MIT and HP Labs
- DSpace foundation in 2007 to provide support
- DuraSpace in 2009: DSpace foundation + Fedora commons
- DuraSpace now provides leadership and guidance
- Version 4 released in December, 2013

Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eprintsd</th>
<th>Dspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses Apache</td>
<td>Apache - Tomcat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perl and MySQL</td>
<td>Java and PostgreSQL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linux, Solaris, Mac, Windows</td>
<td>Oracle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Interface widgets</td>
<td>JSPUI and XMLUI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perl and XML config</td>
<td>OAI-PMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTML and CSS</td>
<td>URI’s with Handle Server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual support</td>
<td>Faceted search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item based submission</td>
<td>Apache Soir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive engine</td>
<td>Multilingual Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAI-PMH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: comparison technology framework Eprints-DSpace

DSpace: Faceted search allows drilling down in search results.
Setup of Eprints and DSpace at the IODE Project Office:

Figure 3: setup of Eprints and DSpace at the IODE project office

Front end structure of Eprints

- Basic
- Browse: Year, Subject, Author and Division
- Simple and advance search
- List of latest articles
- Possibility to add custom views
- Possibility to add HTML pages
- Edit some HTML from admin interface
- Build front end static pages after each change

Figure 4: standard frontend Eprints

Front end DSpace (JSPUI) (the alternative is XML)

- Basic
- Browse by Issue Date, Author, Subject and Title
- Communities and collections
- Possibility of editing frontend news and sidebar from the admin interface
- Faceted search
- Statistics for each community and collection
**Admin interface: Eprints**

- Search Items, issues, users and history
- Get server status (version, database, items, users)
- Manage users, indexer, plugins, regenerate abstracts and views
- Manage storage, metadata fields and update database
- Manage deposits
- Edit Profile
- Review deposits

**Admin interface DSpace**

- Batch import and batch edit items
- Advance user authorization management based on community and collections and user groups
- Metadata and bitstream registry
- Separate Admin tools for community and collections
- Export or migrate collection
- Export metadata
- View full Dublin core metadata
- View/edit/discard submissions

**Figure 7: DSpace admin interface JSPUI**

**Installation procedure EPrints**
- Comparatively simple
- Apache, Perl, MySQL and Linux
- Download and configure Eprints3 package
- Install package
- Configure Apache
- Create archive with epadmin script

**Installation procedure DSpace**
- Advance installation and Server setup
- Apache-Tomcat adds Complexity
- APJ protocol+ Apache + Tomcat + PostgreSQL and Linux + JRE
- Build from source with Apache Maven
- Install the package with Apache Ant
- Create Admin account
- Install and configure handle server
- Copy files to webroot and configure cronjobs

**Handle server**
- Built into Dspace
- Eprint has basic support using template handles
- Need to get a prefix from Handle system
- Open ports 8000 and 2641
- Configure handle server with repo details
- Send configuration file to handle systems
- Start handle server
User Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eprints</th>
<th>Dspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users can register</td>
<td>User can register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search users on various</td>
<td>Community/collection based user management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fields</td>
<td>Create user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign roles</td>
<td>Authorization policies for collection,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communities and items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit / destroy users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: user management in Eprints and DSpace

Statistics functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eprints</th>
<th>Dspace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRStats (extension)</td>
<td>Inbuilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works with basic views</td>
<td>Statistics for each collection/community and the entire repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with custom fields</td>
<td>Total views + monthly views for the last 7 months + countries and cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for a period of time</td>
<td>Highest searched item and search terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary data, Simple +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: statistics features in Eprints and DSpace

Support and Documentation

Dspace is supported by its vast community through Duraspace: [http://www.dspace.org/community](http://www.dspace.org/community)

Eprints is supported through their wiki [http://wiki.eprints.org/w/Main_Page](http://wiki.eprints.org/w/Main_Page)

Conclusions

Mr Kakodkar noted that he would choose DSpace if he had to make a choice starting from scratch because of the ability to create communities and collections. DSpace is a structure oriented repository management system, where each collection is a repository in itself. This is particularly important if different regional/ODIN/country based structure of OceanDocs has to be maintained. Whereas, EPrints is more a “theme/one-subject” based repository system and a fixed structure cannot be defined. An EPrints setup will require multiple repositories for maintaining regional/ODIN/country based structure. Other participants disagreed with this.

Mr Pissierssens noted that the EPrints user interface is very user friendly and clearly shows the centralized development structure of Eprints which is very user focused while DSpace is more developer oriented.

The meeting noted that the statistics capabilities of AgriOceanDSpace are not satisfactory (as currently available in OceanDocs)
The meeting noted that exporting of metadata in OceanDocs does not export the accession date which makes reporting of deposits by centre and by year impossible. In this regard it was noted that EPrints has more powerful export features (choice of export format).

In terms of depositing a DSpace administrator has to assign a depositor to a community/collection. The depositor cannot choose this.

### 5.3 MBL WHOI critique: WHOAS and OceanDocs implementation

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Lisa Raymond and Ms Jennifer Walton. The Woods Hole Open Access Server (WHOAS) was envisioned as an institutional repository for text based documents, as well as data in multiple formats. The entire WHOI theses collection has been added and technical reports are being added as time and funds allow. The Library is also scanning reports on demand. The threshold for metadata was intentionally kept low to facilitate self-deposit by researchers. While not optimized, the flexibility of DSpace customization such as attaching DOIs, and ability to accept multiple file formats were factors in choosing that specific platform.

The WHOAS repository was created in the early days of online institutional repositories, as a result, the project evolved to meet the community needs. Over time it was recognized that the institutions did not have adequate programming support, so an outside vendor, Longsight, was hired to oversee the technical aspects of WHOAS and has been contracted for programming improvements when needed. As deposit evolved as the responsibility of library staff, a basic level of authority control could be added to the workflow. While not embracing the mechanics of deposit, researchers began to see the potential of WHOAS for non-text based files. The library staff became involved in projects to develop citation models to ensure proper credit of the non-text based intellectual work. The DOI again emerged as a method of tracking data provenance, and attribution. Assigning a DOI facilitates linking between article and data set records within WHOAS and also through external publisher sites, such as Elsevier. The success of the library in developing WHOAS lead to collaboration between WHOAS and NSF funded Biological and Chemical Oceanography Data Management Office (BCO-DMO). The library also foresaw the need for versioning which lead to its incorporation in to the latest DSpace update. The library continues to identify improvements to WHOAS such as the incorporation of ORCID and collaboration with linked open data through NSF Earthcube.

### 5.4 OceanDocs user experience

For each of the regions the coordinator was invited to make a presentation on progress.

#### 5.4.1 Africa

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Arame Keita. She reported that there are 20 national collections in Africa: Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, DR Congo, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mauritis (information manager has left), Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Senegal, Seychelles, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo and Tunisia with one institution by country. There have been 1 training course of trainers, 2 regional training courses and some have participated in OceanTeacher training courses on e-repositories. Regional coordination of Oceandocs-Africa have been assured by Ms Saida Messaoudi. New members are being added to the editorial team which had been set up. Technical support is sourced from local expertise and from Marc Goovaerts. Between January 2012 and March 2014 an additional 431 records were added to OceanDocs from Africa. This is a low progress (only 200 records per year). In terms of institutional repositories: 18 are developed offline (they need to be harvested when they go online) and 2 are online (Kenya: [http://41.215.122.106/dspace](http://41.215.122.106/dspace) and Senegal [http://193.190.8.15/dpm/](http://193.190.8.15/dpm/) hosted by UHasselt). While no precise data are available on the number of records entered in the offline repositories this is possibly a high number.
The meeting recommended that the records that are currently offline should be added to the OceanDocs Central on a regular basis. As soon as the institution can come online the records can be “repatriated” and the collection in OceanDocs central.

Ms Keita then reported on AFRILIB (http://afrilib.odinafrica.org/): Library catalogues developed at the institutional level are available over the WWW as well as locally. In the past there have been problems with aggregation of the records. The harvester function of AODSpace should solve this problem. The harvesting can take place weekly. It is noted that AFRILIB does NOT contain full-text documents but only the metadata as it is intended as a library catalogue (it is based on the records created in Inmagic, the previous catalogue software).

The meeting discussed whether it is appropriate to separate records with full-text document from those without full-text, as is done now, as this forces users to search two systems. It was suggested that the institutions could continue using this two-tier approach provided that a central portal that harvests both system can provide searching both resources at the same time.

Ms Keita noted that limited and changes in human resources are a problem in Africa. Also language remains a problem (although this is mostly addressed by Ms Keita as she is bilingual). Limited document production in the institutions limits the deposits. In addition the institutions are not familiar with copyright. Finally the limited availability of scanners remains a problem. Technical issues include limited internet connectivity and IT support. In terms of management there are long delays in validation of submissions and problems with uploading of full-text documents.

The meeting recommended that a project management structure needs to be established to coordinate and oversee the implementation and further development of repositories at the national and regional level.

Ms Keita ended with a few suggested activities in the future:

Strategies to increase the number of records, conduct outreach activities and new developments

- Open Access week: OA week is held in October of every year, then, it is one way to engage in a large organization. This could be used to sensitize stakeholders/researchers/community on the use and benefits of open access activities.
The ODINAFRICA website should create a webpage on Open Access. Links on open access week to be added to MIM webpages.

Explored further with potential partners for proposal development:

- Scanning projects with ASFA – EIFL.
- Volunteers to draft the proposal of the projects: Violet Ohimain (Nigeria), Arame Keita (Senegal), James Macharia (Kenya), Ann Maria Alfredo (Mozambique), Elfath Etaib (Sudan).
- Local marine information managers to support the development of AFREMAS (http://www.marinespecies.org/afremas/) within – OceanDocs\Docs Africa as starting point.
- Developing a collection of publications in PDF format on marine related species in country or region
- The AfreMas – collection in OceanDocs will use item mapper in OceanDocs. AFRILIB metadata can also be used to AfreMas.

The meeting, while welcoming these developments, called for improved coordination between the African group and the SG-OceanDocs as several of the above mentioned initiatives do not seem to be documented.

5.4.2 Latin America

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Andrea Cristiani (by WebEx). She explained that in Latin America there are now 23 institutions in 9 countries.

Cuba is currently the country with the highest number of deposits, followed by Colombia.
Comments from the region

- Some Latin American submitters are of the opinion that a central organizational structure is not good for the management of the repository because it restricts OceanDocs future development.

- Migration to Aquatic Commons (AC) is seen as a feasible option for some submitters, despite some of its disadvantages. What needs to be discussed is how the work of participating centres would be carried out, and what would be the role of people that are in charge of submitting and validating documents in OceanDocs.

- Others are of the opinion that keeping the actual OceanDocs as a separate repository has more advantages, either as a central repository or as a federated network.

- In the case of changing platform for the deposit of documents, it is important to consider that the IT support must be available and efficient.

- Some submitters agree that OceanDocs needs its own project and its own budget. “Relating our repository to another project [AC] that already has its own objectives would leave OceanDocs in a second place”.

- Some LA submitters expressed their concern for the repository sustainability in the long term, mostly related to institutions that don’t have any other option that depositing in a centralized repository like OceanDocs.

- From the Cuban perspective, OceanDocs is a very useful tool, and it is now going through a stage of increasing visibility amongst users. Researchers have won experience in the use of the repository and they see it now as an important option for the digital archive of their publications.

- Two LA countries are discussing Open Access laws in their Congresses: Mexico and Brazil.

- Two countries had passed laws on Open Access in 2013: Peru and Argentina. Argentinian Congress passed the law about Open Access in December last year.

- Publications that are product of research made with public funds have to be available Open Access and institutions have to secure the means to do so.
Conclusions

- OceanDocs Latin American participating institutions have different realities, which are expressed in different needs and also different expectations of what they can get from OceanDocs.

- LA diversity makes more difficult the strategic planning of a repository to serve the needs of all.

- LA is giving more importance to Open Access: legal framework is becoming available in the legislation of some countries. Most probably others will follow the example.

- Present situation is more favourable to Open Access projects that it has been in the past.

Ms Simpson referred to the project starting in Cuba in cooperation with Flanders (Marc Goovaerts). So OceanDocs will lose some of its big depositors. So she asked when the majority in Latin America will install its own servers. Ms Cristiani expected this to happen within the next two years. Ms Simpson asked whether Latin America could support its own regional repository rather than depending on the OceanDocs central.

Ms Cristiani noted that the opinions on the direction to take were very mixed so there is no clear advice on the way forward.

Ms Simpson asked whether the number of deposits was representative for the scientific production in the region. 4 countries seem to be growing in terms of deposits whereas many were lingering at the bottom. Chile has many ocean activities but the main publications are deposited in a regional repository (Scielo: http://www.scielo.cl for Chile or the regional version http://www.scielo.org ) so this is a competitor of OceanDocs to some extent.

Ms Cristiani noted that it is important to avoid duplicate efforts when people have to input the same information in several systems. So simple ways to import/export will be useful. Ms Simpson asked whether people have to enter their records in library catalogues. A harvester could assist. Ms Simpson asked for examples so we could test a harvester solution. The meeting asked if Ms Cristiani could coordinate such a test. She suggested Alexandra Smith (Chile) to execute the test (eg export from Scielo). Ms Simpson asked for a contact with Scielo. This may be Ms Smith or a more general contact in Scielo.

Mr Kakodkar asked how Ms Cristiani obtained the country statistics. Ms Cristiani answered that this was obtained from annual OceanDocs reports.

Ms Cristiani further reported that four countries have great interest in continuation with OceanDocs while others are less interested. In Uruguay at the University the top management changes every four years. In recent years one was in favour of open access while another was not. The current policy is that the University will create its own repository (Colibri). This will probably lead to a stop in OceanDocs deposits by the IIP (Fisheries Research Institute), which is part of the University. OceanDocs Central may be able to harvest the marine collection in the new repository. It is planned to start the repository this year.

Mr Pissierssens asked whether it would be possible to explain to the University management that it would be important to harvest the marine collection as a sub-collection of the University collection. Ms Cristiani agreed to discuss this further with the University.

5.4.3 Eastern Europe

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Ekaterina Kulakova. She started with a brief presentation on CEEMAR. The Odessa Branch and YugNIRO have deposited most of the records. Uploads/year have increased at YugNIRO with a peak in 2013. Unfortunately the DSpace software does not provide annual statistics by institution. VNIRO has implemented
its own DSpace repository called RuFIR (http://dspace.vniro.ru). Most downloads are monographs.

The meeting asked a few questions: the name of the Polish repository (which will be hosted by the National Marine Fisheries Institute (MIR, Gdynia)) is not known and it is not yet online. It is also not known if they are acknowledging IODE (in other words whether they consider themselves as part of the OceanDocs group).

Ms Kulakova then proceeded with a presentation on the IBSS e-repository. She reported that the number of visits to the repository has increased substantially after September 2013. Most users are Ukrainian, followed by Russia. IBSS serials are the most popular downloads.

There are still large volumes of documents that need to be added to the IBSS repository.

Ms Simpson inquired about the rare books proposal that had been submitted (unsuccessfully) to Elsevier. Ms Kulakova reported that the hope to obtain funding still exists. Ms Pikula inquired if support had been sought from other sources. Ms Kulakova confirmed she had received an ASFA grant to digitize YugNIRO reports.

The meeting noted that the platform seems to be of lesser importance. What is important is the human resources available to build the repository as well as technical support available. Mr Kakodkar noted that a lot of community spirit exists within Aquatic Commons. This is not so much the case within the OceanDocs group.

Ms Kulakova favours the creation of a harvester to link all OceanDocs repositories.

**The meeting recommended** that one or more mailing lists should be established to promote communication and collaboration between OceanDocs input centres and “nodes”. This could also act as a group helpdesk.

### 5.5 Aquatic Commons

This agenda item was introduced by Ms Pauline Simpson. The Aquatic Commons is a thematic digital repository covering the natural marine, estuarine /brackish and fresh water environments. It includes all aspects of the science, technology, management and conservation of these environments, their organisms and resources, and the economic, sociological and legal aspects.

It aims to provide visibility, usage and impact through global access to digital publication from worldwide marine and freshwater organizations that do not have access to an institutional repository of their own.

Depositors include IAMSLIC members, IAMSLIC members on behalf of organizations, Aquatic & Marine science related organizations, and individual researchers.

From the outset AC has focused on encouraging the deposit of legacy collections and grey literature although of course welcomes current research articles.

Mrs Simpson stressed that all repository software now offer similar functionality and opportunities to customize and enhance functionality. She highlighted some areas where Aquatic Commons(AC) (EPrints) and OceanDocs (OD) (AgriOceanDSpace) differ in their approaches:

- Registration: AC has an open registration process; OD is a closed process, where registration has to be followed by the Administrator allocating the user to a Community/Communities and Collection/s before the user can begin to deposit.

- Document Types: In AC an initial selection defines the metadata profile; in OD document type is a two step process with the non mutually exclusive options then defining the metadata profile.
Metadata fields: whilst there are a similar number of fields some differences: AC field presentation is more user friendly with specific field help text; OD has five occurrences of Language fields but does provide License metadata fields which has not been implemented in AC.

- Vocabularies: AC offers only 22 broad subject categories (mandatory) and free keywords, relying on being able to search metadata and full text; OD offers ASFA terms (mandatory) and AGROVOC and free keywords.

- Export: OD offers only one export format (CSV); AC offers 15 export formats

- Statistics: detailed statistics are offered on the public interface in AC but in OD only the administrator can generate a limited range. Both provide individual record statistics on the interface.

- Advanced Search: is offered very differently, in AC every metadata field can be included in a search, OD offers only author, title, subject, keyword, abstract, series, sponsor, identifier, language.

- Sort options on Search results: very limited in OD, good in AC.

- Display of search results: in AC as complete formatted citations with full text link alongside; in OD, Title, Journal title, Author, Type, Issue Date

She ended by noting that EPrints offers an “OAI Harvester” plug-in.

5.6 AgriOcean DSpace

This agenda item was introduced by Marc Goovaerts. In the past with OceanDocs we focused on open access. It is also important to think about scientific communication: the information should be re-usable. This is an element that GE-MIM and SG-OceanDocs should think about. We may want to make the metadata richer (eg in biodiversity) then we need to describe a new standard. In OceanDocs we had a few partners who set up repositories not following standards. So if we want to create a platform where information is re-usable then we need to create the necessary standards. This should then apply to a larger community than the IODE community. We then need to consider what standard to use for metadata but more importantly authority control (identifying authors, vocabularies, etc). So the question is then how to implement these standards and how to make this possible in existing repositories. In the software used by OceanDocs we could include some tools but is this the best way? In some cases existing repositories may need to be enriched. So where to get the support to get these tools? It is not a discussion about software but about the goals we want to reach and then to see what tools are needed. That is the basic question: e.g. do you want to link information in OceanExpert to OceanDocs? Then the question is what systems are needed.

In the past we started customizing DSpace for OceanDocs, later there was interest from FAO and we worked on that line. We are continuing to work on this. There will be an AgriOceanDSpace 2.0 which will be more a collection of plug-in tools integrated with DSpace. The ontology plug-in is also in development for EPrints. We did not want to repeat the error of the previous development where we were dependent on DSpace and where new features were embedded in DSpace. Now we separate plug-ins so it is easier to keep in line with the new versions of DSpace.

So we need to look at standards and how to define metadata uniquely as much as possible if we want to have rich metadata. Where do we do this? Either in the original repository or in a different environment. How do we do this? During the training in Cuba we considered this. We need to find ways to work in a semi-automatic way but this is also a development of extra tools. Where do we do this? Either in the original repository or in a different environment when reusing the metadata.
So far we worked with Denys Slipetskyy on the development of AgriOcean DSpace but as he has left IBSS his involvement will probably reduce. We will continue to work on DSpace at UHasselt. Also in Cuba work is using DSpace but in a network context. If there are specific requests from IOC/IODE then Hasselt University or the Cuban group can bring solutions because UHasselt and the Cuban group will be have the same issues most of the time. In the past we always had a support based on a volunteer basis. This will still be the case but on top of that we also can rely on the developments in Hasselt and Cuba.

The main question is which goals OceanDocs wants to achieve, simply Open Access or also reuse of the information in a network, in projects or any other broader context.

Ms Pikula asked whether open access is a problem in Cuba. Mr Goovaerts answered that there is a policy of open source and open access.

Ms Simpson asked whether Mr Goovaerts could list the features that are available in AOD. Is any of the customization already a feature in DSpace4? Or are they plug-ins?

The additional functionalities of the previous version are developed as separate modules that are now integrated in DSpace. Two plugins have been developed: the ontology plug-in and the category-based submission module. At this time EPrints is integrating the ontology plugin too.

Mr Goovaerts answered that the import functionality in DSpace4 will be used for the batch import module for Agris, RIS and other formats (instead of the own development). Right now the import functionality can only be used by the administrator. We want this to be available to the user. Another tool in DSpace4 is the “embargo possibility”. This is now included in DSpace. Mr Goovaerts noted that the new AOD will be plug-in based.

Ms Simpson requested a document that describes the customization: what modifications/developments have been made to make AOD from DSpace. Ms Simpson asked who is responsible for defining requirements of AOD 2.0. Mr Goovaerts answered that to make upgrades it was necessary to have a modular approach, which was prepared now for DSpace version 4. On top of that, FAO identified the need for ontologies. If there are other requests then it will be easier to work on these as the new functions are plug-ins. So AOD 2.0 can now grow.

Ms Simpson requested whether support for AOD to local instances (eg Africa) will be available from Mr Goovaerts. Mr Goovaerts, referring to AFRILIB, noted that only 4-5 will host a local online instance. For the others the scale of information available is too small. Locally they can use Zotero or EndNote. Large institutions will look at “real” library systems. So the 4-5 institutions that have the capacity will be provided with support by UHasselt.

Mr Pissierssens requested whether there should be coordination/communication on the further development of AFRILIB in Africa. Mr Goovaerts assumed that this was happening through Mr Odido and Ms Keita. Mr Pissierssens noted that little information had been provided to Oostende, despite the fact that Oostende hosts AFRILIB.

Mr Goovaerts promised to send all information to Ms Keita and Oostende. He noted further that there are still a number of institutions in Africa that have not managed to install AOD. Mr Goovaerts said he would be able to start working on AFRILIB and AOD as from April.

Ms Keita said that a proposal for a technical meeting had been discussed to be held in IODE project office in Oostend, Belgium in April 2014 (involving Mr Kakodkar and Mr Goovaerts). Mr Odido had said that it was not necessary to organize a physical meeting and could be replaced by a webex meeting.

Ms Simpson noted that a lot of the development work will now be done in the Cuba project but how will OceanDocs benefit from these developments? Mr Goovaerts noted that one of
the needed tools in Cuba was improved statistics, an example where the needs in Cuba are similar to the ones of IODE. The developments in Cuba will become visible early 2015. In the mean time it will be good to identify needs for OceanDocs.

Mr Pissiers sens noted that there is currently no coordination mechanism between FAO and IOC/IODE regarding AOD.

It was noted that the partners in OceanDocs in Cuba are not partners in the Cuba-UHasselt project. So there won’t be a need to migrate records to a Cuban server.

Ms Keita inquired about harvesting. Mr Goovaerts stated that he would work on this in April under AOD 2.0.

Ms Keita inquired about Afremas. Mr Goovaerts responded that this had been discussed this week at the OBIS course in Oostende this week. Mr Goovaerts suggested that relevant records be moved into a separate collection in OceanDocs and Afremas can then use the metadata. It will be necessary also to take into account specific vocabularies. It was noted that an Afremas collection had already been created (http://www.oceandocs.org/handle/1834/5156).

5.7 SWOT Exercise and Conclusions

The meeting considered the 10 scenarios identified previously under agenda item 4.2 and amended these as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1: status quo (support of both Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs by the Oostende Office)</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Reality check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IODE is known for OceanDocs</td>
<td>Adi’s workload: less time for other priorities</td>
<td>This scenario is realistic if additional IT support is made available. Estimated staff time required: 2 months/year (cost=approx. $20K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise at Oostende office for DSpace/AOD and Eprints</td>
<td>Extensive use of DSpace in Member States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting noted that this solution may be technically and financially feasible but it must be noted that OceanDocs Central will be gradually de-populated due to the establishment of institutional repositories that are currently using OceanDocs Central.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 2: outsourcing to a commercial company</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Reality check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>This should be further investigated in terms of costing. A mixed solution could be considered (new setup by contractor, maintenance by Project Office) (@mire: atmire.com)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed expertise/limited liability of IOC/IODE</td>
<td>Loss of expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Adi’s workload</td>
<td>Security concerns (uncertain if this will be allowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support for member states’ repositories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting noted that this solution will solve the staff time issue at the IODE project office but the costing may be the limiting factor. The meeting noted that this option could be further investigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 3: outsourcing of Aquatic Commons</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Reality check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited cost</td>
<td>Cost and who will pay</td>
<td>Not recommended due uncertain source of funding (IODE cannot justify funding non-IODE activity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Adi’s workload</td>
<td>Undermining of IAMSLIC/IODE relationship/partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scenario was discounted.
Scenario 4: delegate responsibility for the hosting and maintenance of the OceanDocs Central to an existing AOD host

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**: No cost
- **Sharing of responsibility for IODE products/services by Member States: shared ownership**: Proof of concept of IODE capacity development
- **Loss of expertise by IODE project office**: Continuity/sustainability not assured
- **Possible loss of visibility/ownership by IODE**: While countries may be willing to have IOC host their content they may not be willing to have another country host their content
- **Cost?**: Continuity is not assured but the scenario can be discussed with candidate institutions

The meeting noted that while countries may be willing to have IOC host their content they may not be willing to have another country host their content. This scenario was therefore discounted.

Scenario 5: set up individual repositories for each ODIN (to replace those currently included in OceanDocs) and shut down the OceanDocs Central

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**: No cost
- **Sharing of responsibility for IODE products/services by Member States: shared ownership**: Proof of concept of IODE capacity development
- **Loss of expertise by IODE project office**: Continuity/sustainability not assured
- **Possible loss of visibility/ownership by IODE**: Possibly loss of coordination and overall integrity of the network
- **Cost?**: Continuity is not assured at the ODIN level. OceanDocs will lose its identity.

The meeting noted that while countries may be willing to have IOC host their content they may not be willing to have another country host their content. In addition ODINs do not exist in all geographic regions or are not functioning effectively. This scenario was therefore discounted.

Scenario 6: stop hosting Aquatic Commons at the Oostende Office

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**: No cost
- **Undermining of IAMSLIC/IODE relationship/partnership**: Not preferable

The meeting considered that the relationship between IAMSLIC and IOC/IODE which has taken a long time to develop is important to maintain. The meeting decided to discount this scenario.

Scenario 7: (a) stop serving OceanDocs (AOD) at the Oostende Office and migrate content to Aquatic Commons

- **Reduction of Adi’s workload**: No cost
- **Benefit of content management mechanism of IAMSLIC**: Need to migrate other services/products like Clearing House to AC
- **Loss of coordinating role by IOC with potential negative impact on Member States due to lack of expertise sharing platform; Loss of community**: Loss of IODE product (less visibility as part of Aquatic Commons + management by IAMSLIC)
- **To be further discussed**: To be further discussed

(b) This will imply that all IODE e-repositories will be developed using EPrints.

The meeting noted that choosing this scenario would need to be further investigated as it is not known whether importing of OceanDocs (AOD) records into AC is straightforward (see also scenario 10). In addition it is not clear whether IAMSLIC will agree with the migration. In
addition the brand name OceanDocs may be lost. Also the editorial process/workflow for “OceanDocs” records would need to be adjusted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 8: stop hosting AC at the Oostende Office and migrate AC to OceanDocs (AOD)</th>
<th>Reduction of Adi’s workload</th>
<th>Unlikely for IAMSLIC to agree</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting decided to discount this scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 9: convert AC into DSpace 4</th>
<th>Reduction of Adi’s workload</th>
<th>Unlikely for IAMSLIC to agree</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting decided that this scenario could be further discussed with IAMSLIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 10: phase out OceanDocs Central repository as repository; Run harvester as rebranded OceanDocs+ (includes Aquatic Commons)</th>
<th>Reduction of Adi’s workload</th>
<th>Lack of training for institutions to set up e-repository (although this could be arranged with IAMSLIC and OceanTeacher)</th>
<th>The “disappearance” of the OceanDocs central will need to be explained to the IODE MIM community so it is not perceived as a loss. Feasibility is high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The OceanDocs brand will live on and provide a global and unique portal to ocean (and aquatic) research output</td>
<td>Need to identify best harvester and need to test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that institutions that currently use OceanDocs Central will gradually start hosting their own repositories and this will strongly reduce the need for the service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: institutions that were using OceanDocs Central to host their records and cannot self-host may use Aquatic Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting agreed unanimously that scenario 10 is the most appropriate to progress and other scenarios will not be pursued.

6. FUTURE OF OCEANDOCS

6.1 Strategic vision

The meeting agreed on the following medium-term (5 years) strategic vision statement:

“OceanDocs will evolve from a centralized e-repository in which Member States can create their collections, to a distributed network of institutional repositories, operating in accordance with international standards (eg metadata, exchange standards, controlled vocabularies,… ) that will be harvested to provide a global discovery and retrieval service for ocean (and aquatic) research output.”

6.2 Implementation Plan

It was recalled that the choice of scenario 10 as the strategic vision was based upon (i) reducing staff time required to manage e-repositories; (ii) e-repositories (DSpace/AOD) maintained by Member States and related expertise; (iii) improving functionality of the OceanDocs e-repository; (iv) adopt a strategy for the long-term efficacy of IODE e-repositor(y)(ies).

The meeting had further considered that over the next few years it is likely that many of the institutions that currently deposit records in the OceanDocs Central will gradually host their own repositories and thus migrate content away from the OceanDocs Central. This will make OceanDocs Central redundant eventually.
The meeting recognized the value of a central service allowing the discovery of materials across a large group of e-repositories. For this reason the meeting also agreed to proceed with the development of a harvester.

The meeting noted however that there will probably always remain a small group of institutions who do not have the capability of hosting their own repository, and that these should not be ignored in the overall plan. In this regard cooperation with IAMSLIC’s Aquatic Commons was recommended.

The meeting recognized that the new vision would require continued training, outreach and communication. In this regard reference was made to the OceanTeacher Global Academy and IAMSLIC.

6.3 Software Platform decision

6.3.1 Software for the e-repository

The meeting decided that OceanDocs Central should migrate from AOD 1.0 to DSpace 4.0 as soon as possible. This will include the following steps:

1. Set up DSpace 4.0 instance
2. The ontology plugin is not yet available (to be further investigated: submitted to DSpace by Marc Goovaerts)
3. Category-based submissions appear to be possible in DS4 (see https://wiki.duraspace.org/display/DSDOC4x/Submission+User+Interface)
4. Authority control for journals seems to be possible through “authority control of metadata values” (see https://wiki.duraspace.org/display/DSDOC4x/Authority+Control+of+Metadata+Values#AuthorityControlOfMetadataValues-Howtoinvokeacontrolledvocabularyfrominput-forms.xml).

The meeting recommended the use of ASFA and AGRIS journal lists. Possibly the ISSN field is populated through these lists.

5. Additional metadata fields will need to be added and some customization done to accommodate the current AOD 1.0 structure
6. Import all collections from OceanDocs AOD into OceanDocs DS4

Mr Kakodkar estimated that steps 1-6 will take a few weeks.

7. Customization of look and feel (user interface for depositing, browsing and searching, exporting, importing)
   - Requirement: access to full text directly from search result (list of documents) or browse

The meeting estimated that step 7 will take an initial few weeks. Documentation will need to be prepared. User interaction will be essential and a feedback mechanism should be placed on the DS4 interface.

The meeting recommended Mr Kakodkar to regularly consult with Mr Goovaerts et al regarding the availability of the planned DS4 plugins (AOD 2.0) so they can be tested and installed.

The meeting further recommended that the linking of OceanDocs DS4 and OceanExpert be implemented as soon as possible. In this regard it was recalled that a unique author identifier field should be added possibly allowing OceanExpert to be the authority list (providing picklist to select author). It was further recommended to enable providing an ORCID, ResearcherID or OceanExpert identity.
6.3.2 Software for the harvester

The meeting noted that harvesting functionality is available for both DSpace 4.0 and Eprints 3.3.12. However there has been no opportunity yet to test and compare these. The meeting requested Mr Kakodkar to test and compare the two software for their harvesting capability.

6.3.3 Choice of Software for other IODE e-repositories

The meeting noted that the test site for the IODE/JCOMM Clearing House Service for Data/Information Management Practices (http://clearinghouse.iode.org) has been developed using DSpace 4.0. The meeting requested that Mr Kakodkar sets up an EPrints 3.3.12 server to compare functionality between DSpace 4.0 and Eprints 3.3.12.

The meeting agreed to defer a decision on the choice of software for the Clearing House and other e-repositories developed under IODE until the results of the comparison are available, taking into account the requirement to reduce the number of software being supported.

The meeting requested that the EPrints version should be available by end of May. The meeting decided that the members of the Steering Group will then review and comment on the two systems by the end of June.

The meeting noted that OceanDocs will not be the only IOC (or IODE) repository system, as already demonstrated by the Clearing House repository. Other repositories may be developed. It is recommended however that IOC programmes that wish to develop a repository discuss their plans with the Project Manager (and IODE Secretariat) to ensure that no additional software applications need to be maintain by the IODE Project Office.

6.4 OceanDocs Management

The meeting recognized that OceanDocs has been developed and maintained for many years by Mr Marc Goovaerts (free of charge) and the meeting expressed its great appreciation to Mr Goovaerts. The meeting had been informed by Mr Goovaerts that he would not be in a position to continue his current level of involvement due to other responsibilities. This had been a “wakeup call” for the Steering Group to review and revise its strategy regarding OceanDocs. Already in 2013 the IODE Project Office in Oostende had requested Mr Goovaerts to share his OceanDocs expertise with Mr Kakodkar to ensure that the system could be fully managed and maintained by the Project Office. Mr Goovaerts agreed that Mr Kakodkar would take full responsibility for OceanDocs central support as from 2014. Mr Goovaerts kindly agreed to continue support for AOD and AFRILIB in Africa, taking into account that the Project Office does not have AOD and AFRILIB expertise (except for hosting the AFRILIB server).

6.5 Project management

The meeting recognized that so far OceanDocs was not managed the same way as other IODE projects as the development and maintenance were carried out by Marc Goovaerts mainly, rather than through a project management team. The meeting decided that this needed to be changed taking into account the new situation of Mr Goovaerts and the revised strategic vision.

6.5.1 The IODE Steering Group for OceanDocs

The meeting recalled that until now the OceanDocs project had been governed solely by the Steering Group when it had its first Session (after being established through
Recommendation IODE-XXI.6 (March 2011)). Taking into account that the Group can meet only once a year the meeting felt however that a more day-to-day management of the project is required and therefore recommended that a Project Manager be designated, as well as a technical manager.

The meeting called to maintain a realistic size for the Steering Group but emphasized the need for balanced representation of all regions. The Steering Group requested that meetings should be held every year if possible, or at least once every two years in person and once virtually (by Webex).

6.5.2 Technical manager

The meeting stressed that dedicated technical support is essential to ensure the success and sustainability of the project. The meeting noted with appreciation that Mr Kakodkar will now take over the technical development and maintenance from Mr Goovaerts and thanked Mr Goovaerts for the services rendered. The meeting requested the Project Manager (see below) to express the Group's appreciation for his dedication.

6.5.3 Project Manager

As indicated above the meeting decided that the project required a Project Manager to assure the day-to-day management and development of the project. The meeting designated Ms Pauline Simpson as Project Manager and thanked her for her dedication to the project. The Project Manager could identify a small project team to assist with the project implementation. The Project Manager will submit a report to each Session of the Steering Group.

6.5.4 Content administration

While the meeting noted the need for a formalized editing and quality management team in the case of a centralized e-repository (eg Aquatic Commons) the meeting noted that the new strategic vision would build on the editorial arrangements already in place for OceanDocs Central whereby each ODIN designates an editor (ODINAFRICA: Ms Saida Messaoudi, Ms Arame Ndiaye Keita; Mr James Macharia; ODINCARSA: Ms Gabriela Silvoni, Ms Andrea Cristiani, Ms Enma Fonseca). Self-hosting repositories (eg CEEMAR, IBSS, …) have made their own arrangements and designated editors.

6.6 Communication

It was recalled that a Communication Strategy had been identified as a requirement during the first Session of the Steering Group in 2012 but had not been completed. The meeting agreed that the Communication Strategy should be completed urgently taking into account the importance of the Communication Strategy to the new strategic vision.

The meeting recommended that mailing lists should be established by the Project Office in Oostende to promote communication and sharing of expertise.
7. RECOMMENDED FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The meeting recalled that an Afremas sub-community (under Africa) had been created in OceanDocs. It was noted that some discussions had been held between Marc Goovaerts and Mr Ward Appeltans on this subject. Mr Appeltans had reported back to the meeting as follows:

He stated that there was interest for OceanDocs to host documents related to Marine Biodiversity.

1. It would be good if we can come up with a defined short list of standard keywords.

2. Can WoRMS be used as a species vocabulary when entering new documents. If documents can be linked to the WoRMS LSID, then we could link species pages in OBIS with OceanDocs. WoRMS has a webservice that can be used for that, or if the internet is too slow one can download a monthly version of the WoRMS database.

The meeting requested the Project Manager (Ms Simpson) to further discuss this matter with Mr Appeltans and Mr Goovaerts.

8. WORK PLAN FOR 2014-2017

8.1 Action sheet 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>OceanDocs Policy Document to be revised</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>Add Peter Pissierssens, Adi Kakodkar, Jennifer Walton, Arame Keita to the Dropbox folder which will store working documents until they are finalised and can be made publically available.</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adi Kakodkar/ Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>All technical and user guide documentation should be made available through OceanTeacher and with links to these pages from the IODE web site (Global Activities – OceanDocs). In addition there should be links to user guides from the OceanDocs web site. It was noted that the user documentation for OceanDocs should be improved. Technical docs: to OceanTeacher DL User guides: to OceanTeacher DL with links from OceanDocs site and IODE web site People responsible: (i) Tech documentation: Adi Kakodkar; (ii) Deposit/editor documentation: Pauline Simpson Note: content cannot be added to OceanTeacher DL, MIM heading until re-categorization has been done. The meeting recommended that the CMS for OceanTeacher DL should allow categorization and re-categorization.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linda Pikula/ Aida Sogaray/ Andrea Cristiani/ Arame Keita/ Delia Esquer/ Enma Fonseca</td>
<td>Creation of a Communication Strategy document (cont. of Jan 2012 action) To be completed urgently taking into account the importance of the Communication Strategy to the new strategic vision. One or more mailing lists should be established to promote communication and collaboration between OceanDocs input centres and “nodes”. This could also act as a group helpdesk.</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ODINs and</td>
<td>Preparation of material for Information sessions on Open Access, Communication Strategy team</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>ODINs and Communication Strategy team</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Cristiana</td>
<td>Quality control of OceanDocs deposits: editorial guidelines to be written</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adi Kakodkar</td>
<td>Feedback mechanism to be implemented on OceanDocs interface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lisa Raymond + SG</td>
<td>Standardization of metadata between OceanDocs and Aquatic Commons: Agreement on a common core: comparison exercise (action from Jan 2012)</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Claudia Delgado</td>
<td>List of all courses that included OceanDocs training since 2008, be compiled.</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Pikula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adi Kakokhar</td>
<td>OceanDocs statistics to be improved. He will work on this in the framework of the Clearing House project, which is also using DSpace (version 4.0 with JSPUI).</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Arame Keita</td>
<td>ODINs to urge ASFA National Partners that are in the same institution as the ODINAFRICA partner centres, to collaborate in OceanDocs if they are not doing so yet (through ASFA). Similarly to urge ASFA national partners in Latin America to collaborate in OceanDocs.</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrea Cristiani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Adi Kakokhar</td>
<td>To analyze the OceanDocs database and prepare an analysis of the number of records deposited by each country/institutions by year. This will enable to see trends by year and by institution. Poor performing institutions can then be contacted to discuss remedial action.</td>
<td>Next SG-OceanDocs and IODE-XXIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Arame Keita</td>
<td>Records that are currently offline within ODINAFRICA local AOD should be added to the OceanDocs Central on a regular basis. As soon as the institution can come online the records can be “repatriated” and the collection in OceanDocs central.</td>
<td>As from January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adi Kakokhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Andrea Cristiani</td>
<td>Test to export records from Scielo repository to OceanDocs. Meeting asked if Ms Cristiani could coordinate such a test. She suggested Alexandra Smith (Chile) to execute the test (eg export from Scielo). Ms Simpson asked for a contact with Scielo. This may be Ms Smith or a more general contact in Scielo.</td>
<td>As from January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>IODE Secretariat</td>
<td>Mailing lists should be established by the Project Office in Oostende to promote communication and sharing of expertise.</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Adi Kakokhar</td>
<td>Mr Kakodkar to regularly consult with Mr Goovaerts et al regarding the availability of the planned DS4 plugins (AOD 2.0) so they can be tested and installed.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marc Goovaerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Adi Kakokhar</td>
<td>Linking of OceanDocs DS4 and OceanExpert be implemented as soon as possible. In this regard it was recalled that a unique author identifier field should be added possibly allowing OceanExpert to be the authority list (providing picklist to select author). It was further recommended to enable providing an ORCID, ResearcherID or OceanExpert identity.</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Adi Kakodkar</td>
<td>Test set up to test and compare the capability of DSpace and EPrints Harvesters</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Adi Kakodkar</td>
<td>Using Clearing House repository set up an EPrints 3.3.12 server to compare functionality between DSpace 4.0 and EPrints 3.3.12. Clearing House EPrints version should be available by end of May. <strong>The meeting decided</strong> that the members of the Steering Group will then review and comment on the two systems by the end of June.</td>
<td>May/June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>Steering Group meetings should be held every year if possible, or at least once every two years in person and once virtually (by Webex). A virtual meeting (4th Session) should be organized in Jan 2015 (prior to IODE-XXIII), taking into account that no funds will be available to have a face-to-face meeting during that year and the need to report to IODE-XXIII.</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>Project Manager to express the Group's appreciation for Mr Goovaerts dedication and huge contribution to OceanDocs.</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>The Project Manager (Ms Simpson) to further discuss this matter (Afremas) with Mr Appeltans and Mr Goovaerts.</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson</td>
<td>Ms Pauline Simpson to organize the next face-to-face Session of the Group (5th Session) in Cayman Islands in 2016.</td>
<td>Tbd 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Adi Kakodkar</td>
<td>The meeting decided that OceanDocs Central should migrate from AOD 1.0 to DSpace 4.0 as soon as possible.</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.2 Work Plan 2014-2015

Whilst the OceanDocs Central product has been in existence since 2007, the new strategic vision adopted by the OceanDocs Steering Group Session III, March 2014 requires the setting up of some alternate testbeds for review, prior to making some fundamental decisions regarding the software platform for IODE e-repositories. The second quarter of 2014 will be concerned with upgrading OceanDocs Central to DSpace 4.0 and enhancing that profile with available plugins. To offer a comparison between DSpace and EPrints the Clearing House repository will be set up as a second instance using an EPrints platform. At the same time the work plan will be further defined and the new vision for OceanDocs will be documented as a revised Policy Document.

The year 2014-2015 includes the following targets:
- Invite members to take responsibility for specific actions
- Revision of the OceanDocs Policy Document
- Setup the Clearing House Repository using EPrints software
- Upgrade OceanDocs to DSpace 4.0 (OceanDocs DS4) with available plugins
- Training on OceanDocs DS4
- Transition from AOD to OceanDocs DS4
- Creation of the OceanDocs Communication Strategy
- Implementation of communication strategy and creation of advocacy materials
- Engagement with stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pauline Simpson (P)</td>
<td>Define responsibilities for action items/work plan with small project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Work plan - definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>All parties concerned</td>
<td>Clearing House: Review/compare both installations and make a decision on software platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OD Team, JCOMM and ICES?</td>
<td>ClearingHouse customization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A &amp; P &amp; stakeholders</td>
<td>CH:User/Technical Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A &amp; P</td>
<td>Upgrade OD from AOD 1.0 to DSpace 4.0 with plugins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,</td>
<td>A &amp; P</td>
<td>OD DSpace customization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A &amp; P</td>
<td>OBIS/Afremas requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SG-OD</td>
<td>Review of OceanDocs DSpace customization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES: CH:Tech = CH:User/Technical Documentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11, 14</td>
<td>Implementation of ODDS4 community requested customizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 6</td>
<td>ODDS4: Create User Documentation/guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Training ODDS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Transition from AOD to ODDS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UID OE/OD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Harvester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Consultation with Marc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SG virtual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A &amp; P ++ Help Desk/ Help Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>P ++ Review the Content Management Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 17</td>
<td>Define Communication Strategy circulate to SG-OD for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SG-OD Communication Strategy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>P ++ Advocacy Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P/ODINS ++ Identify and engage ODDS4 stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The meeting decided that the budget allocation of $3,000 which had been allocated for AOD support (in 2014 and 2015) will now be used for software (e.g. plug-ins), consultant services. It was noted that these funds need to be used by the end of December 2014 and December 2015 respectively.

9. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION

The Group decided that a virtual meeting (4th Session) should be organized in 2015 (prior to IODE-XXIII), taking into account that no funds will be available to have a face-to-face meeting during that year and the need to report to IODE-XXIII.

The Group accepted the invitation by Ms Pauline Simpson to organize the next face-to-face Session of the Group (5th Session) in Cayman Islands in 2016.

10. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The Group reviewed the draft summary report of the Session and adopted it.

11. CLOSING OF THE MEETING

The Group expressed great appreciation to Ms Jennifer Walton and Ms Lisa Raymond for the excellent assistance before and arrangements during the meeting.

The Steering Group welcomed Ms Pauline Simpson as Project Manager, and thanked the outgoing Co-Chairs Ms Pauline Simpson and Mr Marc Goovaerts for their commitment to OceanDocs. The Group further welcomed Ms Jennifer Walton and Ms Arame Ndiaye Keita as incoming Co-Chairs and looked forward to their active role in the further development of OceanDocs.

Ms Linda Pikula, as Chair GE-MIM, noted that OceanDocs is an important product of IODE and helps in our capacity building efforts as well as the delivery of marine information and data (through data publishing).

The meeting was closed on Friday 21 March 2014 at 10h55.
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OCEANDOCS EVALUATION SURVEY 2013 (English version)

OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)

We are contacting you today to ask for feedback about your experiences when using the OceanDocs Digital Repository http://www.oceandocs.net/.

The following survey will take no more than 10 minutes to complete. It was designed to help us understand what we can do to improve our OceanDocs repository service.

We appreciate your participation and wish to thank you in advance for your input and time.

Begin Survey by clicking NEXT

Section 1

1. The OceanDocs website is well presented (design, colour, arrangement, etc)

   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

   Please provide suggestions on how it can be improved

Section 2

2. How often do you search OceanDocs?

   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Monthly
   - Occasionally
   - Never

   Other (please specify)
## OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)

### 3. How often do you use the following preset SEARCH fields? Please respond to all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Highly used</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Rarely used</th>
<th>Never used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. The HELP text for SEARCH provides enough information on search fields to know which category to search in. e.g. does TITLE search fields include JOURNAL title. Does SUBJECT include geographical terms?

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

**Comments**

### 5. What other SEARCH options would you suggest?

- [ ] Year
- [ ] Journal Title
- [ ] ISSN
- [ ] ISBN
- [ ] Other (please specify)

### 6. To find a specific document in OceanDocs is easy

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

**Other (please specify)**

**Comments**
**OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)**

### Section 3

**7. After a SEARCH, what other details would you like to see displayed on the first results screen?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different order of metadata display</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Citation for every document type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to full text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 4

**8. What other details would you like to see displayed in the full record?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Very relevant</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Highly irrelevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic citation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. Would you like to see the full record details displayed in a different order?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don't know

Please provide suggestions on how it can be improved.

### Section 5

**10. How much do you use the present SORT options? Please respond to all.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Highly used</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Rarely Used</th>
<th>Never Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. What other SORT options would be helpful? Please respond to all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Very relevant</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Irrelevant</th>
<th>Highly relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6

12. How many records have you deposited in OceanDocs?

- 1-10
- 11-50
- 51-100
- 101-500
- 501-1000
- >1000

13. What problems prevent you from depositing in OceanDocs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was not aware that this is possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know how to do it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not understand the differences in document types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are missing metadata fields in some document types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No auto-complete in Authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The order of the metadata fields is not logical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The help text is not detailed enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):
# OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)

## 14. When depositing was there any requirement you did not like?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please provide suggestions on how depositing can be improved

## Section 7

## 15. What difficulties do you experience when trying to navigate/move around all the OceanDocs screens?
- [ ] Slow response
- [ ] Not intuitive
- [ ] Design is not helpful
- [ ] Language
- [ ] Terminology

Please provide suggestions on changes that would help solve your problems

## Section 8

## 16. Only the OceanDocs interface is translated but not the HELP text. Is that sufficient?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don’t know
- [ ] Other (please specify)

## Section 9
OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)

17. How explanatory are the HELP sections?
- Very relevant
- Relevant
- Neutral
- Irrelevant
- Highly irrelevant

18. What questions that you have on using/depositing in OceanDocs are not answered on the INTERFACE or in the HELP sections?

Section 10

19. How many times have you used the EXPORT function?
- Often
- Very Little
- Never

20. The EXPORT function is easy to use
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

21. Exporting to Microsoft Excel is all I require
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
### OceanDocs Evaluation Survey 2013 (English)

**22. What other EXPORT formats would you like to see offered in OceanDocs?**

- [ ] ASCII
- [ ] BIBTEX
- [ ] Dublin Core
- [ ] EndNote
- [ ] HTML Citation
- [ ] JSON
- [ ] METS
- [ ] OBJECT IDS
- [ ] RDF
- [ ] REFER
- [ ] Reference Manager
- [ ] XML

Other (please specify): 

### Section 11

**23. Downloading a full text document from OceanDocs is easy?**

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

Other (please specify): 

### Section 12

**24. Do you use the RSS feed functionality to take records dynamically to your own website?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Do not know how to

Other (please specify): 

### Section 13
25. Please provide details of any other changes that would help you to use OceanDocs better.

Section 14

26. How do other repositories compare with OceanDocs? Please enter the repository name against your rating.

27. Repository A
   - Much better
   - Better
   - The same
   - Worse
   - Much Worse

   Repository A name:

28. Repository B
   - Much better
   - Better
   - The same
   - Worse
   - Much Worse

   Repository B name:

29. Repository C
   - Much better
   - Better
   - The same
   - Worse
   - Much Worse

   Repository C name:
30. Please provide examples supporting your comparison.

31. We appreciate your participation and wish to thank you in advance for your input and time.