



## **NECOBELAC Project**

Project number: 230583

A network of collaboration between Europe  
and Latin American Caribbean (LAC) countries  
to spread know-how in scientific writing and provide the best tools  
to exploit open access information for the safeguard of public health

### **Deliverable – D 3.3**

**Advocacy materials for local customisation and use  
within LAC countries**

Due date of deliverable: **Month 12**  
Start date of the Project: 1<sup>st</sup> February **2009**

Organisation name of WP lead: UNOTT

## **NECOBELAC Partners**

- Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS) Italy (The project coordinator)
- Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC) Spain
- The University of Nottingham (UNOTT) United Kingdom
- Centro Latino Americano e do Caribe de Informação em Ciências da Saúde, Brasil, BIREME/PAHO/WHO
- Instituto de Salud Pública (ISP), Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia
- Universidade do Minho (UMINHO) Portugal
  - Key Perspectives Ltd. United Kingdom (subcontractor WP2)
  - Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia de Madrid (UNED) Spain (third party of WP4)

## Table of Content

SUMMARY.....	p.4
INTRODUCTION.....	p.5
Chapter 1: Considerations on the role of advocacy materials in catalysing change.....	p.7
Chapter 2: Selection and evaluation of advocacy materials for NECOBELAC.....	p.14
Chapter 3: Concluding Remarks.....	p.22
References.....	p.25

Appendix 1 – Log of evaluated advocacy materials

Appendix 2 – “Fifteen Common Concerns - and Clarifications” and “Quinze Preocupações Comuns – e Esclarecimentos”

Appendix 3 – “Making effective use of your repository” and Fazendo uso efetivo do seu repositório”

Appendix 4 – “Repository policy framework” and “*Framework da política do repositório*”

Appendix 5- “Promotion” and “Promoção”

Appendix 6 – Some programme content for RSP workshop (2010), *Communication Skills for Effective Advocacy*

Appendix 7 - *Manifesto Brasileiro de apoio ao Acesso Livre à Informação Científica*

## Summary

This Deliverable describes and illustrates the *Advocacy materials for local customisation and use within LAC countries*, building on Deliverable D.32, *Advocacy programme to help agents in LAC and European countries to develop Open Access repositories*.

This Deliverable draws on a large body of available resources, both directly and indirectly related to advocacy work in Open Access (OA) and OA IRs, as well as on some relevant theoretical literature, and, where possible, on first hand discussions with staff at the Centre for Research Communications (CRC) working on the SHERPA, Repository Support Project (RSP), RoMEO and JULIET projects, at the University of Nottingham. It is expected that this Deliverable and specifically, the advocacy material selected and evaluated herein, will serve as a portfolio for discussion and feedback not only with NECOBELAC Partners, but particularly with the participants in the NECOBELAC Training Programmes, who are working at the “grassroots” level, so to speak, of the IR and scientific writing and OA publishing initiatives in health-related areas in their respective national contexts.

It should be noted that the OA and OA IR scenario is extremely dynamic and still relatively new even in European countries: while the OA movement is around 10-years old, traditional research dissemination practices are *circa* 300 years old. For this reason, there has not yet been the opportunity to formally stand back and evaluate the effectiveness of advocacy materials and processes in the OA domain. To date, such assessments have been of an informal and heuristic nature, and based primarily on verbal and personal feedback from repository administrators and managers who have participated in activities promoted by, among others, SHERPA and the Repository Support Project, as well as in feedback from staff working on the abovementioned projects. Aspects of such assessments will be briefly discussed in the chapters that follow, in the context of a discussion of the efficacy of communication and advocacy campaigns in general.

This Deliverable presents and discusses work that is on-going and continuous in the context of work packages and related activities laid out in the NECOBELAC project.

## Introduction

The aim of this deliverable is to present and discuss some materials for local customisation and use within Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) countries for use in activities advocating the development, implementation and uptake of Open Access (OA) institutional repositories (hereafter, “IRs”) and OA publishing, specifically in the realm of public health research.

One of the central hypotheses that underpins the work of WP3 (*Cross-national advocacy infrastructure*) is that advocacy materials are inextricably dependent on the target audience for whom they are intended, the rationale evidently being that different audiences have different needs. Accumulated expertise in advocacy work developed in the context of SHERPA along with the Repository Support Project (RSP) at the Centre for Research Communications at University of Nottingham, confirms this. Some audiences (particularly those at conferences) might be heterogeneous in terms of audience members’ professional backgrounds and their respective experience and contact regarding OA issues. But when advocacy work is to be carried out in specific institutions, it is easier to target audiences of a specific make-up, e.g. university administrators and senior managers; researchers and academics; repository administrators and/or technical staff and librarians. As such, advocacy material should be “tailored” accordingly.

Another related factor to bear in mind when considering the elaboration of advocacy materials is that the OA movement is extremely dynamic and ever-growing, and as such, the term “Open Access” itself has undergone a rapid and global propagation. Even so, it is sometimes difficult to gauge what *concept* behind the term OA different stakeholders in the different countries will have, as many stakeholders have preconceptions of the issue. So, at the same time that it is crucial to dispel equivocal and sometimes malicious myths about OA and thereby seek to “standardise” certain understandings of it, we should be mindful of not hoisting a Eurocentric conception of it onto our target audiences and collaborators in the participating countries of Latin America and the Caribbean for risk of diminishing the more nuanced and cultural understandings of OA. Equally so, the fact that the OA movement – as with scholarly publishing in general – is a highly globalised and international movement

should not be minimised: the scientific community is a worldwide phenomenon and as such, respective “national” scientific communities are very much synchronised with international trends and developments affecting the global scientific community in their respective disciplines and in general.

Yet another principle underpinning this Deliverable is that the materials here presented and evaluated constitute, in the context of NECOBELAC, prototypes of advocacy materials. For we are entirely cognizant of the fact that those materials here suggested might only be an *approximation* of what is required locally, in a given cultural/ institutional context. As is well known, prototypes act as catalysts for discussion, and it is expected that they will (sometimes quite radically) be adapted and altered in accordance with local user requirements (ALAVI, 1984). It should also be underscored that all of these materials have been made available under a Creative Commons License<sup>1</sup>, precisely to facilitate re-use and adaptation in this way. Furthermore, and as will become evident (in Chapter 2), the rationale for the work underpinning this Deliverable was the selection and categorisation of these materials by type as well as by applicability to two main groups of advocacy initiatives, which will be further discussed.

Finally, the activities on which this Deliverable is based represent the start of on-going work that will greatly benefit from the continued feedback, assessment and input of all NECOBELAC Partners and participants.

---

<sup>1</sup> by-nc-sa/3.0 see <http://creativecommons.org/licenses>

# **Chapter 1: Considerations on the role of advocacy materials in catalysing change**

The aim of this chapter is to briefly delineate and discuss some premises underpinning notions regarding the role and contribution of advocacy materials in informing audiences with an end to fomenting change at both individual and institutional levels. It is hoped that an examination and brief review – presented in this chapter – of a very small set of the research literature on the subject will throw light on the role of advocacy in an area like OA and IRs, and at what stage in the OA and IR trajectory certain categories of advocacy initiatives might be more efficacious than others.

## **The concept of advocacy**

In the common-sense use of the term in the English language, advocacy means to espouse, recommend and plead for a certain position, argument or group, usually acting on behalf of that group. In the context of the proliferation of NGOs over the past couple of decades, the term advocacy has been used to connote a philanthropic pleading for the rights of often marginalised and/or abused groups, and so in this context, the term often goes hand-in-hand with promoting more equitable participation of such groups in decision-making processes that directly touch their lives. This often also entails “teaching leadership” to such participants. For example, the Advocacy and Leadership Center of the Institute for Sustainable Communities defines advocacy as:

“(…) a set of hands-on technical skills and practices needed to effectively press for change. It is also the foundation of active citizenship, a process through which ordinary people learn to participate in decision making at all levels.(…) Identifying priorities, crafting a strategy, stepping forward, taking action, and achieving results are critical steps to finding one's voice, making oneself heard, and shaping one's future. (..) *The Advocacy and Leadership Center is dedicated to unleashing the advocate in each of us*” (Institute for Sustainable Communities, 2010).

The concept of “advocacy coalition” and “trans-national advocacy coalition” is much-used these days, mainly due to the facility provided by the internet to connect actors that are geographically dispersed. Keck and Sikkink (1998, p. 217) define such advocacy coalitions as:

“...interactions, structured in terms of networks. Some involve economic actors and firms. Some are networks of scientists and experts whose professional ties and shared

causal ideas underpin their efforts to influence policy. Others are networks of activists, distinguishable largely by the centrality of principled ideas or values in motivating their formation.”

What is common to such conceptions of advocacy is the notion of bottom-up, grassroots approaches, sometimes involving capacity building and community activism, and even “acting on behalf” of other community members. Relevant for our very brief discussion here is that a broader approach to advocacy regards it as a set of activities that will encompass networking, community development and lobbying. Advocacy coalition participants seek to reframe issues, reconfigure current discourse, introducing new ideas, and in so doing, “attract attention and encourage action” (ibid).

It is relevant to here note that in the Latin-based languages like Portuguese, Spanish and Italian, the term “advocacy” has maintained its more legalist connotations of representing a client in a judiciary setting, the term “advogado” (Port.), “abogado” (Sp.) and “avvocato” (It.) meaning “lawyer”, “solicitor” or “barrister” in these languages. This fact could mean that it will be necessary to establish, after consultation with NECOBELAC Partners and Participants, what, in fact, would be the more appropriate translation for the term “advocacy” in those languages. In Brazilian Portuguese, for example, possible candidates would be “sensibilizar” ou “conscientizar”, if the option of the narrower “promover” were to be excluded.

### **Advocacy messages to bring about changes in behaviour**

Because it is by now well-recognised that the uptake of OA publishing options and the use of OA IRs requires, above all, a change in the behaviour of researchers from the scientific community in conjunction with supportive institutional normative procedures to be put in place, a brief overview of some of the issues around the efficacy of advocacy campaigns to do this is called for.

The domain of environmental sustainability could provide an illustrative comparison. In that domain, the basic premise is that without the participation of the general public, which presupposes their identification and engagement with the aims of sustainable development, it is unlikely that the goals of sustainable development will ever be attained. That is, apart from a “democratic” dimension to the argument, to encourage greater citizen participation, there is

also an instrumental dimension, the means by which to achieve the ends. The main mode of making citizens aware of their need to change their routine and daily behaviours has been through media communication channels, and sustainability indicators have been widely regarded as an efficacious communication tool to bring about such change:

“Sensitively constructed and chosen, communicative indicators are intended to educate the public by providing appropriate information. In doing so, it is hoped that they will engender a sense of social responsibility for the problems they measure. This, it is argued, will have two effects. First, it will encourage people to change their individual [...] behaviour [...] Second, such information will change people’s political responses, encouraging support for public policy to deal with the problems” (Macnaghten & Jacobs, 1997, p.7)<sup>2</sup>.

For example, the “Seattle salmon indicator”, which measures the quantity of salmon in rivers to indicate water quality, has been identified as being an accurate indicator that resonates with the public of the city of Seattle (Macnaghten & Jacobs, op.cit). Other examples of sustainability indicators would be those measuring air pollution or the “carbon footprint” of train journeys or food miles.

However, as the same authors observe, the mere provision of information to the target public is not necessarily enough to guarantee their engagement and identification with the issues divulged, even if they do seem to agree with the concepts communicated. That is, there is no linear cause-effect between communicating effectively a message and inducing behavioural change in its audience. Similarly, the anthropologist Mary Douglas has observed that perceptions of risk cannot be separated from the cultural context, so that exhortations to stop risky behaviour (e.g. smoking), based on technically rational arguments, often do not work if potentially more “positive” cultural constructions of smoking (e.g. that it can make you look more sophisticated; that it is a form of peer group bonding for certain age groups etc.) are not taken into consideration.

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that the authors of the quoted article (Macnaghten & Jacobs) do not entirely agree with the position that indicators in themselves are an efficient mode of communicating environmental problems to the general public in order to incite behavioural change. They go on to discuss potential problems surrounding public identification with indicators. However, in the less multifaceted domain of OA & IRs, in which there is a comparatively more homogenous audience of administrators and academics for, say, publication indicators, we believe that the content of their above-cited affirmation, remains relevant.

The fact that a mind change but not a behavioural change can take place after an informational intervention points to the limitations of what Verplanken and Wood (2006) denominate “downstream” information interventions, which operate on the level of the individual decision-maker, and do not take into consideration the “performance contexts and social structural factors that maintain habits” (*ibid*, 2006, p.91). These authors point out that the effectiveness of such individual-centred, informational campaigns is reduced even further when aimed at audiences who have “strong habits”, meaning automated and repeated habit performance, “cued” by the environment which nurtures and encourages that habit. The individual is almost impervious to new information because it jars with the expectations produced by the strong habit, and so new information would in turn, hamper the automated decision-making process. As the authors note:

“These expectations lead to a kind of tunnel vision that is evident in the following: People with strong habits expect prior experiences to repeat, and as a result, they do not easily detect minor changes in the performance environment. They also search less extensively for information about behavioral alternatives and for information about the performance context itself. In addition, their search tends to be biased toward confirming the habitual option. (...) When the target behavior is habitual, people’s intentions, desires, and judgments do not easily overcome the practiced response that is cued automatically by the environment.” (Verplanken & Wood, 2006, p. 92).

In the scenario evoked above, it is easy to visualise scientists and researchers, engrossed in their pressurised work routines, hardly noticing that they are being exhorted to change their publishing habits to OA and deposition in IRs, especially if their institutional environment is not providing them with the appropriate procedural cues to facilitate such a change.

### **Habit change and “upstream” advocacy activities**

If the institutional environment and demands work to induce, facilitate and even “fossilise” certain habits and practices, then it is possible, claim Verplanken & Wood (2006) that changes in that environment – in the “habit performance context” - might also facilitate change in the established habit behaviour. In that sense, “upstream” advocacy will be more effective. This type of advocacy intervention focuses

“...on the larger structural conditions in which people’s behaviors are embedded. Thus, upstream interventions may consist of economic incentives, legislation, or structural changes in the performance environment. These interventions aim to provide contexts and societal structures that promote and sustain desired behaviour” (*ibid*, p.95-6).

Again, the relevance of this scenario to advocacy in OA and IRs is evident: as mentioned at the outset, it has been heuristically observed that “information leaflets on their own don’t work, no matter how flashy they are”<sup>3</sup>. Advocacy work of the political networking and lobbying type – with the significant key players like university administrators, grant-awarding agency representatives, politicians – which aims to achieve more long-term and deep-seated structural changes institutionally and inter-institutionally, is increasingly regarded as the way forward in the OA publishing and IR domain.

To finalise this section, we present Verplanken & Wood’s (2006, p.96) schematisation of downstream and upstream advocacy interventions in relation to their efficacy in changing weak and strong habits. It could be argued that researcher-authors at the beginning of their careers have, with all respect, “weaker” publishing habits and will therefore be more “open” to downstream interventions, whereas more established researcher-authors have strong publishing habits.

Table 1. Effective policy interventions to change weak versus strong habits

Behaviour to be changed	Interventions <b>Downstream</b> of the Behaviour	Interventions <b>Upstream</b> of the Behaviour
Weakly or not habitual	<b>Information/education to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase self-efficacy</li> <li>• change beliefs/intentions</li> <li>• motivate self-control</li> <li>• form implementation intentions</li> </ul>	<b>Education</b> Economic incentives Legislation & regulation Environmental design Technology development Normative approaches
Strongly habitual	Downstream-plus-context-change	Economic incentives Legislation & regulation Environmental design Technology development Normative approaches

### **Institutional trust and “agency”**

Related to the efficacy of a message being able to cause its audience to act on it is the sense of “personal agency” that a given group has. That is, “people’s sense of their ability to change

<sup>3</sup> Paraphrase of personal communication with RSP staff member.

their situation or the wider world” (Macnaghten & Jacobs, 1997, p.10), and whether they feel they can influence outcomes, which in turn, is related to “their wider sense of trust (or mistrust) towards official institutions” (ibid, p.16). Although it could be affirmed that the scientific community is comparatively *autonomous* regarding their personal “agency” *vis a vis* their choices of where to publish and/or deposit their research outcomes<sup>4</sup>, this issue of trust is still relevant for assessing how trustworthy researcher-authors deem research-funding bodies or IR proponents to be, for example, when confronted with OA mandates. Once again, it will be relevant for NECOBELAC advocacy protagonists to gauge researchers’, IR managers’ and even institutional administrators’ perceived sense of agency and trust in the body promoting change if a degree of success it to be attained: “Action is regarded as efficacious only when people trust the institutions promoting the action” (ibid, p.21). The socio-historical (colonial) context of the emergence and evolution of STM culture and infrastructure in the LAC countries may also play a part here. For, on the one hand, while the scholarly publishing system and methods originating in the “developed” countries will be held in high regard by the scientific community “on the periphery” in the LAC countries and so therefore seen to be very worthy publishing outlets even if they are closed access, on the other, there have traditionally existed formidable barriers to inclusion in such outlets, most notable amongst these being linguistic barriers (Escobar & Costa, 2006; Salager-Meyer, 2008; Velho,1999 & 2004). Even so, local mandates to publish in OA channels might, to some LAC scientists, echo of centralised, “command and control” type policies that threaten to further confine their research outputs to the “periphery”. Hence the relevance of maintaining in sharp focus the globalised, universal nature of scientific writing and scholarly publishing in the context of OA initiatives, a factor that should be at the heart of most advocacy strategies.

### **From Downstream to Context-changing Upstream Advocacy**

It is not being claimed here that target audiences are impervious to “downstream” advocacy initiatives, but that given the context in which researcher-authors work, and that the institutional *status quo* can constitute a formidable barrier to change in that it facilitates the

---

<sup>4</sup> In the context of OA, such academic freedom explains the fact that scientists can choose to “ignore” the existence of OA publications and IRs, if they so wish.

continuation of old habits, such downstream initiatives on their own, despite being informative, will have limited impact. Verplanken & Wood (2006) claim that a combination of the two types of advocacy can be efficacious, even starting with the downstream type, and they cite the case of British chef, Jamie Oliver. Oliver's quest to imbue healthy eating habits into school mealtimes started with downstream, "direct action"-type and informative activities, on the frontline in state schools working with individuals. His mission ended, and notably didn't start with, recruiting the then-Prime Minister, Tony Blair's official, policy-framed backing to guarantee that his efforts take root in the UK's school dinners policy.

It is also relevant to note that actions considered routine by a given institution – e.g. publishing articles by academics – but that which have not yet had the time to become "strongly" habitual in certain groups in that institution (e.g. by new researchers, post-grads), will be more amenable to change by downstream advocacy initiatives.

To conclude, upstream advocacy programmes that have as their goal institutional context-changing actions will arguably be more efficacious in bringing about the desired "disruption" to strong and deep-seated publication habits, precisely because such programmes would seek to alter the institutional context "cues" that perpetuate old, or foster and support new habit formation. Downstream advocacy initiatives still have a place to inform and motivate individuals, who can then also potentially become "champions" for the cause, but the ultimate aim is for such initiatives to be expanded, with the aid of key decision-makers, into broader, more long-term upstream initiatives.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted here that in the technology assessment and technology innovation literature, the terms "upstream" & "downstream" are used in quite a different way. "Upstream" activities in technology innovation refer to the stages in which key decisions about technology innovation and development are taken, so that subsequent actions and decisions become "locked in" to a virtually predetermined and entrenched "technological trajectory". There have been calls for more user / public engagement in these stages precisely to counteract a posterior rejection of the innovation (as, say, in the case of GM food in Britain), "downstream", when it is "too late" to change the technology. See Lehoux et al. (2008) for a discussion of this related to healthcare innovation, and Kearnes et al. (2006) relating these concepts to nanotechnology in the UK.

## **Chapter 2: Selection and evaluation of advocacy materials for NECOBELAC**

As mentioned in Deliverable 3.2, *Advocacy programme to help agents in LAC and European countries to develop Open Access repositories*, advocacy materials in the OA and OA-IRs arena have to date, been devised predominantly in the form of:

- briefing papers
- leaflets
- posters and other printed materials
- wiki pages
- presentations
- video/podcasts

For the NECOBELAC project specifically, the NECOBELAC website and useful links to other related projects also constitutes advocacy material.

There exists much advocacy material available from a myriad of OA-related websites, such as the Repository Support Project, DRIVER and OASIS, which will be discussed below. It should also be mentioned that many useful advocacy “messages” for OA and IRs are to be found distributed throughout the substantial amount of academic literature on the subject, given that many academics inspired to write on the subject of OA and IRs are usually strong advocates for the area.

As well as the advocacy formats identified above, and given the observations made in the previous chapter regarding the limited effectiveness of printed/digital sources of influence, it cannot be denied that there is a fundamental role for face-to-face lobbying with “significant actors” such as Rectors, Pro-Vice Chancellors, university administrators and research managers, directors of research funding bodies and even governmental ministers responsible for STM portfolios. The relevance for this type of advocacy has been identified by many protagonists in the OA arena, chiefly because it is commonly recognised that the uptake of OA and IRs entails, above all, a culture change on an institutional level at the very least. Its relevance has also been underscored in informal conversations and meetings with Repository

Support Project and SHERPA staff, as well as from informal (email) communiqués with OA protagonists from Latin America.

This “lobbying” set of advocacy activities points to the highly probable need for the inclusion of role-playing and communication skills training in the suite of upstream advocacy activities. For example, the 30-3-30 (30 seconds, 3 minutes and 30 minutes) communications and marketing principle (Traverso, 2007) is potentially a highly useful accessory for use in OA-IR advocacy programmes. Recognising the need for this focus, the Repository Support Project team has recently devised and given a day workshop called *Communication Skills for Effective Advocacy* (see Appendix 6 for some of the themes covered in the workshop programme).

### **Overall breakdown of advocacy process in Open Access Adoption**

When confronted with the wide spectrum of advocacy materials already available, there is an evident need for adopting systematic criteria for their evaluation regarding their potential relevance to the needs of NECOBELAC. Evidently, such relevance criteria are also inextricably related to the phase of the OA & IRs Trajectory (see Table 2 below) a given country and/or region has reached. So that despite being well-devised, some high quality IR support material, that presupposes the existence of IRs, will be deemed to be of medium-to-low or low relevance for countries and regions in which the IR movement has not yet taken root.

What is here being denominated the *OA and IR Trajectory* can be schematically envisaged as a series of stages, in which at each given phase, a certain type of advocacy material will be more or less relevant (Table 1, below). One such schematisation of the hypothetical “Open Access and IR Trajectory”, in the context of NECOBELAC, might be as follows<sup>6</sup>:

---

<sup>6</sup> Adapted from: *Change4Life Evaluation* (2009), p.3

Table 2: Advocacy Phasing through the *Open Access and IR Trajectory*

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Phase 6
Advocacy Role	Network mobilisation	Reframing the publication issue in the context of Open Access	Personalising the OA (& IR) issue	Inspiring institutional stakeholders to change	Rooting new behaviours	Support as they change
Sample encapsulating message to be conveyed	<i>NECOBELAC has initiated its activities and you &amp;/or your organisation can be a part of it.</i>	<i>This isn't about by-passing peer review; it's about broadening free access to high-quality public health research.</i>	<i>I can improve my IF (impact factor) at the same time as I am contributing to the access &amp; preservation of my research.</i>	<i>Our university/ research institution's image and capacity can really be positively projected through the IR</i>	<i>Using the IR and OA journals is not incompatible with the academic routine &amp; also makes the research process socially accountable</i>	<i>OA and IR is making a difference so they need continued "soft" &amp; "hard" supporting infrastructure</i>

## Advocacy Materials Evaluation Approach

The schematisation above may help to identify at what phase a given country, region or institution is at, thereby aiding the selection for subsequent appropriate adaptation of OA-IR advocacy materials.

Thus, the material examined and evaluated to date was very simply logged in the following way:

TITLE

LOCATION

FORMAT

AUDIENCE

RELEVANCE [FOR LOCAL CUSTOMISATION]

EXCERPT [optional field]

OBSERVATIONS [optional field]

The first two fields are self-explanatory.

The **TYPE-FORMAT** field refers to the **type** of advocacy material and the **format** in which it is available, so the field will contain a pair of values, e.g. poster-PDF. Possible values for the **type** side of the pair in this field could therefore be: *pamphlet; webpage; poster; journal article; report; briefing paper; OA policy; map; media article; book; e-book; workshop programme; talk; tutorial; presentation; podcast; figure/diagram; graph/pie-chart*. For the **format** component of the pair, we could have: *html; shtml; PDF; Word file; txt file; multimedia file (which can include all audio and image file extensions); e-book; Powerpoint ; xls; printed*.

The **AUDIENCE** field refers to the stakeholder group that the material either implicitly or explicitly addresses; it may be that in some cases, a non-implied or stated stakeholder group should be included, and that should be signalled. Because the stakeholders and those intended to be positively affected by NECOBELAC's goals are wide and varied (namely: medical researchers, academics and practitioners, members of the public, librarians, repository

managers and administrators, university and research establishment administrators and managers, open access and toll-paying publishers), it was first necessary to identify each existing advocacy item's target audience. This is usually implied, but not explicit, in any type of "campaign" material, but is evidently of great importance when trying to ascertain the relevance of a given piece of advocacy material's relevance. It should be noted that, in the scenario in which advocacy material is being elaborated "from scratch", the target audience will inform the whole developmental process.

Possible values for this field: *Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users; Repository Administrators; Library & Support Staff; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies; Publishers; STM Research Policymakers & Funders; All stakeholder groups.*

The **RELEVANCE [FOR LOCAL CUSTOMISATION]** field refers to how relevant NECOBELAC partners assess the material in question to be to a given cultural context. That is, adaptation does not refer merely to translation, but also to the presence or absence of certain cultural nuances that would be seen to hamper communication in some way in a given context. Even so, that presence or absence would never preclude a more thorough adaptation of the material; existing advocacy material may merely provide an idea or point of departure for the confection of totally fresh and culturally embedded materials.

Possible values for this field: *HIGH; MEDIUM; LOW*

The **EXCERPT** field can contain paragraphs, sentences, figures or images extracted from the selected advocacy material, particularly if it is felt to be particularly illustrative of the material's central message and/or differential factor.

The **OBSERVATIONS** field can contain optional comments, but it has been decided to flag here, when possible, whether the material in question might be more relevant for "downstream" or "upstream" advocacy initiatives.

It is relevant to here observe that the point of *cultural differences* should perhaps not be overstated, given that we are speaking of a highly globalised and geopolitical "boundary-defying" phenomenon, namely scholarly publishing. Since its beginnings, scholarly publishing has always been an internationalised activity, right across its lifecycle, from

research development with inter-country researcher collaboration to the point of publication dissemination (e.g. non-English-speaking countries publishing English-language-only journals). This globalised dimension of the scholarly research and publication lifecycle has indisputably been accentuated in the age of the internet and is no different for the OA movement. The technical dimensions of OA and IRs, at the point of production and dissemination, are also arguably of an open, universal nature. Thus, it is probable that a substantial amount of the already-existing advocacy material is highly adaptable with minimal adjustments and ready for translation (e.g see Appendices 2,3,4,5), albeit with careful consideration of the terms to be used (see p.8 above for a brief discussion of the very term “advocacy”). This assertion is more readily applicable to the material aimed at Repository Administrators and Managers and Researchers and Authors.

Where the “cultural disconnection” is more likely to be present *vis a vis* the state-of-the-art of OA-IRs in European countries compared to that of Latin America and the Caribbean is regarding the question of embedding IR development and uptake (via self-archiving) in already-existing organisational routines and procedures, and wider policy initiatives like research-funder mandates. This assertion is made based on empirical evidence backed up with informal communiqués from actors in the Latin American context. As a rule, the academic community is more synchronised with global trends in scholarly publishing, whereas academic administrators and decision-makers in research-funding bodies, will be more answerable to national and regional policymaking processes and policymakers.

All things considered, it should be stressed to local NECOBELAC participants “on the frontline” that:

- a) given the ethos of the OA movement, most OA-IR advocacy material found on the web can be freely translated and/or adapted, provided that the original source is clearly attributed, and this fact is often explicitly stated;
- b) existing advocacy material was developed with specific audiences and cultural-institutional contexts in mind, and so are not automatically relevant;
- c) there is much more advocacy work done “in the interstices” of the physically available advocacy material; that is, advocacy for OA and IRs is, above all, political, because it is

ultimately aiming for change in the current scholarly publishing practices, enlarging these to include new forms of scholarly dissemination and discourse.

APPENDIX 1 contains the log of material and evaluation according to the fields and criteria outlined above.

Finally, when evaluating the *quality* of information for advocacy material found on websites, it is important to be mindful of the information quality check-list criteria. This has been addressed in two virtual tutorials: *Intute Virtual Training Suite*<sup>7</sup> and the subject-generic *Internet Detective*<sup>8</sup>. For example, the “Judge” tab present in the suite of subject-specific *Intute* tutorials usefully summarises this checklist with the categories “Who? What? When?” for checking the quality of content on any website or webpage.

To conclude this section, we present the Advocacy Phasing and Open Access and IR Trajectory figure, adding to it samples (cross-referenced to the log in APPENDIX 1) of possible advocacy materials more relevant to the phase.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Intute Virtual Training Suite*. Available at: <http://www.vts.intute.ac.uk/>; accessed 26 May, 2010.

<sup>8</sup> *Internet Detective* tutorial. Available at: (<http://www.vts.intute.ac.uk/detective/>); accessed 26 May, 2010.

Table 3: Advocacy Phasing through the *Open Access and IR Trajectory* including suggestions for potentially relevant advocacy material

	<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>Phase 2</b>	<b>Phase 3</b>	<b>Phase 4</b>	<b>Phase 5</b>	<b>Phase 6</b>
Advocacy Role	Network mobilisation	Reframing the publication issue in the context of OA <b>Downstream</b>	Personalising the OA (& IR) issue <b>Downstream</b>	Inspiring institutional stakeholders to change <b>Upstream</b>	Rooting new behaviours <b>Upstream</b>	Support as they change <b>Upstream</b>
Relevant Advocacy Materials & Sources related to target stakeholder audience. (Numbers refer to records of material evaluated in log, Appendix 1.)	NECOBELAC website, posters, booklets and T1s, T2s; <b>21</b>	<b>04</b> <b>05</b> <b>06</b> <b>13</b> <b>16</b> <b>17</b> <b>18</b> <b>21</b> <b>23</b>	<b>03</b> <b>04</b> <b>12</b> <b>13</b> <b>14</b> <b>15</b> <b>18</b> <b>20</b> <b>21</b>	<b>06</b> <b>09</b> <b>10</b> <b>11</b> <b>12</b> <b>17</b> <b>19</b> <b>21</b>	<b>01</b> <b>03</b> <b>05</b> <b>07</b> <b>08</b> <b>14</b> <b>22</b>	<b>01</b> <b>10</b> <b>19</b> <b>21</b>
Sample encapsulating message to be conveyed	<i>NECOBELAC has initiated its activities and you &amp;/or your organisation can be a part of it.</i>	<i>This isn't about by-passing peer review; it's about broadening free access to high-quality public health research.</i>	<i>I can improve my IF (impact factor) at the same time as I am contributing to the access &amp; preservation of my research.</i>	<i>Our university/ research institution's image and capacity can really be positively projected through the IR.</i>	<i>Using the IR and OA journals is not incompatible with the academic routine &amp; also makes the research process socially accountable.</i>	<i>OA and IR is making a difference so they need continued "soft" &amp; "hard" support infrastructure.</i>

## CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUDING REMARKS

The aim of this deliverable has been to build on the development of an advocacy programme to assist local agents in LAC and European countries to develop OA repositories – as outlined in the previous Deliverable 3.2 – by selecting and evaluating existing advocacy material as potential material for local customisation in NECOBELAC’s participating countries.

To this end, a brief discussion of the actual concept of advocacy was first presented (in Chapter 1), and the role of advocacy material in what are denominated, in accordance with the literature on the topic, as “downstream” and “upstream” advocacy initiatives. *Grosso modo*, “downstream” advocacy seeks to promote, inform and educate different audiences about new ideas and practices, whereas “upstream” initiatives would have more deep-seated institutional and policy change as their objectives. The two approaches are complementary, for to inspire institutional actors to change habits, they evidently need to be informed with the basic “facts” surrounding the issue, which are usually disseminated in “downstream” advocacy materials. Furthermore, for those actually carrying out the advocacy initiatives on the “frontline”, so to speak, “rehearsing” the messages and details of such downstream material can build up confidence through a stock of relevant information, in preparation for the more institutionally embedded and sometimes “lobbying-type”, upstream advocacy activities. For, as has also been detected in the literature, an exclusive concentration on downstream messages will probably not give rise to the desired effect, for such narrower “promotional” and “exhortative” messages often cannot capture the more relational, embedded and motivational dimensions of repeated habits such as those of publication. This more “promotional campaign” style of advocacy also runs the risk of missing the crucial point of audience trust in those promoting the message, as well as the audiences’ sense of “agency” which refers to their perception of their own political power to influence change.

A discussion of the selection and evaluation of some of the wealth of existing OA-IR advocacy materials was then presented in Chapter 2, along with the presentation of the organising criteria used for the systematisation of this material, as presented in Appendix 1. A

hypothetical *OA-IR Trajectory* schema was devised and presented, along with, in a second version, the inclusion of suggestions to the selected advocacy material collated in Appendix 1.

By dint of most of this material's informative nature – because they constitute complete, professional and high-quality items – it could be argued that “downstream” materials predominate. For it is inevitable that, to a certain extent, the “softer”, “upstream” type of advocacy material will be difficult to encapsulate in tangible and available products. However, it is hoped that this evaluation has begun to point to aspects and dimensions of some of the existing material that could be usefully tailored and adapted for upstream advocacy initiatives. For example, the OA and self-archiving mandates of high-profile prestige universities like Harvard and Oxford, and grant awarding bodies like the Wellcome Trust, could be presented or referred to in upstream advocacy meetings with Rectors, Vice-Chancellors and other such “influential” actors. Like it or not, given their colonial histories, along with the fact that many institutional and academic actors<sup>9</sup> from the LAC scientific community have studied at post-graduate level abroad, initiatives from such exemplary institutions will undoubtedly lend a lot of credibility to the cause. Equally so, it would be hoped that OA-IR mandates and policies from fellow Latin American and Caribbean universities and research institutes would serve as motivational inspiration to act.

Finally, it should be emphasised that the work here presented and discussed constitutes an initial conceptual framework for the collection and systematisation of advocacy materials that might be potentially customisable for the Latin American and Caribbean context of OA scientific writing and publishing and IRs against the background of the NECOBELAC project. That is, this work is on-going and continuous. More advocacy material will be sourced, analysed and added according to this structure throughout the duration of the NECOBELAC project.

We are cognizant of the fact that an evaluation of the advocacy process itself, in each national context, represents a future area of valuable work. The framework for evaluating advocacy interventions, proposed by Stead *et al.* (2002), which makes the distinction between

---

<sup>9</sup> And it is also worth noting here that many of the institutional decision makers in Latin American universities are in fact, active academics in the same university; there is much less of a preponderance of “career” academic administrators compared to Europe.

formative, outcome and process evaluation stages in advocacy work. Formative evaluation will concentrate on gauging how a particular issue is perceived by policymakers and audiences, and potential support for a new policy measure. Outcome evaluation will attempt to assess whether a particular advocacy intervention succeeded, while process evaluation will ideally help to explain *why* a given intervention succeeded or failed. Such evaluation of advocacy initiatives – be they downstream or upstream – represents a richly complex and on-going research agenda in itself.

## REFERENCES

- ALAVI, M. (1984), ``An assessment of the prototyping approach in information systems development". *Communications of the ACM*, v. 27,n. 6, pp. 556-63.
- CHANGE4LIFE (2009). "Change4Life Evaluation". Available at: [www.change4lifewm.org.uk/.../Change4Life\\_Evaluation - revised 16.11.09.doc](http://www.change4lifewm.org.uk/.../Change4Life_Evaluation_-_revised_16.11.09.doc). Accessed on: 25 May, 2010.
- CHAPMAN, J.; WAMEYO, A. (2001) *Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study*. Available at: <http://www.eldis.org/vfile/upload/1/document/0708/DOC21800.pdf>
- ESCOBAR, S.C.P.; DA COSTA, M.C. (2006). "Visibility of Latin American scientific publications: the example of Bolivia". *Journal of science communication*. v.5, n.2. Available at: <http://www.doaj.org/doaj?func=openurl&genre=journal&issn=18242049&volume=5&issue=2&date=2006>; Accessed on: 27 May, 2010.
- INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES (2010). Available at: [http://www.iscvt.org/what\\_we\\_do/advocacy\\_and\\_leadership\\_center/](http://www.iscvt.org/what_we_do/advocacy_and_leadership_center/); accessed 25 May, 2010.
- KEARNES, M. B.; MACNAGHTEN, P. M.; WILSON, J. (2006) 'Governing at the nanoscale: people, policies and emerging technologies.', London: Demos. Available at: <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/1288/1/1288.pdf>
- KECK, M; SIKKINK, K. (1998) "Activists beyond borders." p.217-228. Available at: <http://www.law.kyushu-u.ac.jp/programs/english/materials/spring2009/internationalawintodayworld/topic4-2.pdf>; accessed 25 May, 2010.
- LEHOUX, P.; WILLIAMS-JONES, B.; MILLER, F.; URBACH, D.; TAILLIEZ, S. (2008). "What leads to better health care innovation? Arguments for an integrated policy-oriented research agenda". *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*. v. 13, n. 4, 251–254.
- MACNAGHTEN, P.; JACOBS, M. (1997). "Public identification with sustainable development. Investigating cultural barriers to participation." *Global Environmental Change*, v.7, n.1, p.5-24.
- SALAGER-MEYER, F. (2008). "Scientific publishing in developing countries: Challenges for the future". *Journal of English for academic purposes*. v.7, n.2, p. 121-132
- STEAD, M.; HASTINGS, G.; EADIE, D. "The challenge of evaluating complex interventions: a framework for evaluating media advocacy." *Health education research. Theory and Practice*. v. 17, n.3, 351-364.
- TRAVERSO, D. (2007). "Spruce Up Marketing Materials with the 30-3-30 Rule". Available at: [http://www.makejustonecall.com/a\\_spruceup.html](http://www.makejustonecall.com/a_spruceup.html); accessed 26 May, 2010.

VELHO, L. (2004). *Science and technology in Latin America and the Caribbean: an overview*. The United Nations University Institute for New Technologies. Discussion paper series. #2004-4. Available at: <http://www.intech.unu.edu/publications/discussion-papers/2004-4.pdf>; Accessed 27 May, 2010.

VELHO, L. (1999). “Indicadores de C&T no Brasil: Antecedentes e estratégia.” Available at: [http://www2.riicyt.org/interior/normalizacion/IV\\_taller/velho.pdf](http://www2.riicyt.org/interior/normalizacion/IV_taller/velho.pdf); accessed 27 May, 2010.

VERPLANKEN, B.; WOOD, W. “Interventions to Break and Create Consumer Habits”. *Journal of public policy and marketing*. v.25, n.1, 90-103.

## APPENDIX 1 – Log of evaluated Advocacy Materials

<b>01. TITLE:</b> Paying for OA publication charges (Research Information Network – RIN, 2009)	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/paying-open-access-publication-charges">http://www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/research-funding-policy-and-guidance/paying-open-access-publication-charges</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	pamphlet-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies; Publishers;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Useful “Key recommendations” sections for what the different stakeholder groups should do (related to publication charges). Limited adaptability for some LAM countries where OA Journal publishing is well established (e.g. through SciELO National platforms), but these are mainly government subsidised, so the “author pays” model OA publications (e.g. those of SciELO).

<b>02. TITLE :</b> <i>Open Access &amp; The DRIVER vision</i> (project dissemination)	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.driver-support.eu/documents/OAandDRIVERVision.pdf">http://www.driver-support.eu/documents/OAandDRIVERVision.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	pamphlet-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>All stakeholder groups</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Language is simple, explanatory and succinct, and easily translatable.

<b>03. TITLE :</b> <i>Fifteen Common Concerns - and Clarifications</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/15concerns.html">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/15concerns.html</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> See Appendix 2 for translated (Portuguese) version

<b>04. TITLE :</b> JISC. <i>Opening up Access to Research Results – Q &amp; As</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/QandA-Doc-final.pdf">http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/QandA-Doc-final.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	pamphlet-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
EXCERPT [optional field]	<b>11. Do Open Access and repositories mean the demise of the scholarly journal as we know it?</b> <b>A.</b> No. Journals perform peer-review, which will still form the backbone of the scholarly communication system, along with other services such as editorial, layout and marketing. Journals are also entities in themselves. Each has its own character, represents a community and develops its own hallmark of quality which reveals the leading edge in a field. So it is unlikely that the scholarly journal will disappear. However, the way in which they are published and used is changing. Publishers are experimenting with new economic models of journal publishing, for example the author-pays model, or hybrid models in which authors can choose whether or not to pay for their papers to be Open Access. Some journals may fall by the wayside, but others will adapt. Already, many are adapting by allowing articles to be made available in a repository at the time they are published. The evidence from libraries and publishers shows that journal subscriptions or viability have not been affected.
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Of the 11 questions, 9 deal with IRs, and two with publishing in OA journals.

<b>05. TITLE :</b> Hubbard, B. <i>Publication and Deposition in an Eprint Repository</i>	
LOCATION	Available from list at: <a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/advice/advocacy.html">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/advice/advocacy.html</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	presentation-Powerpoint (11 slides)
AUDIENCE	<i>Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; Academics as authors/depositors</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> A good starter for the discussion with academics.that's really clear and succinct.

<b>06. TITLE :</b> <i>Who benefits from OA Repositories?</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/IBERdiagram1.pdf">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/IBERdiagram1.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	poster-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>All stakeholder groups.</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Highly didactic schematisation of IRs that could serve as a model for country-specific posters.

<b>07. TITLE :</b> Knight, G. <i>Report on a deposit licence for E-prints</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/D4-2_Report_on_a_deposit_licence_for_E-prints.pdf">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/D4-2_Report_on_a_deposit_licence_for_E-prints.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	report-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM-LOW</b>
EXCERPT [optional field]	“The majority of deposit licences cover four key topics: the ability of the depositor to legally deposit the e-print; the rights the depositor maintains over the deposited work; the permissions the repository gains to maintain the deposited work; and, conditions under which the repository can remove the eprint.”
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> It takes as its point of departure is that an IR is already in place.

<b>08. TITLE:</b> <i>Research Outputs and Funder Policies</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/Generic_Research_Outputs_Procedures.pdf">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/Generic_Research_Outputs_Procedures.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	OA policy-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies; Publishers;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
EXCERPT [optional field]	“This document provides guidance to academic staff at the [institutional name] on how to comply with policies on research outputs (published papers etc) recently adopted by the Wellcome Trust, BBSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC and PPARC.)”
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Guidelines for researchers depositing in an IR in compliance with the example research-funder mandates.

<b>09. TITLE:</b> PINFIELD, S. “What do universities want from publishing?”	
LOCATION	<a href="http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/139/1/alpsp_04.pdf">http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/139/1/alpsp_04.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	journal article-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>University Administrators; Publishers; Library &amp; Support Staff;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Opinion paper with really cogent and adaptable arguments in favour of OA and IRs. Extracts could be translated and used, particularly in arguing the case to university administrators.

<b>10. TITLE :</b> RSP. <i>Making a case for a repository.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.rsp.ac.uk/repos/justification">http://www.rsp.ac.uk/repos/justification</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Succinctly summarises the main arguments in favour and benefits of OA and IRs.

<b>11. TITLE:</b> OASIS. <i>Institutional Advantages from OA</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.openoasis.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=142&amp;Itemid=264">http://www.openoasis.org/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=142&amp;Itemid=264</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Very succinct and clear arguments for institutional administrators with graphics and statistics related to impact and usage.

<b>12. TITLE:</b> Harnad, S. & Brodie, T. (2004). Comparing the impact of open access vs non open access articles in the same journals. <i>D-Lib Magazine</i> , 10(6)	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june04/harnad/06harnad.html">http://www.dlib.org/dlib/june04/harnad/06harnad.html</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	journal article-html
AUDIENCE	Academics as authors/depositors; Library & Support Staff; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; Publishers;
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	Succinctly presents the impact arguments of OA publications. However the data would need updating.

<b>13. TITLE:</b> Dr. Walport, Wellcome Trust. How OA Publishing benefits scientists and people all over the world. (2008)	
LOCATION	<a href="http://vimeo.com/1865535">http://vimeo.com/1865535</a> Open Access Videos.
TYPE-FORMAT	video-multimedia file (1 minute)
AUDIENCE	<i>All stakeholder groups</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
EXCERPT	Taking the OA printout of the human genome as an example: “The scientists who worked on the publicly-funded human genome project realised that in order to maximise the impact of the genome sequence, it needed to be available to anyone who wanted it, anywhere in the world at any time....By publishing the results of the research that we fund in OA formats, it means that as many people as possible are able to have access to the literature without any hindrance at all, and that of course, will maximise the value of the outcomes of the research that we fund.”
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> BUT: subtitles would need to be added in Spanish and Portuguese, obviously, which could be technically complicated. Other short OA-advocating videos available at this webpage, with speakers from a variety of contexts, e.g. a graduate student, a school science teacher, a librarian, a patient.

<b>14. TITLE:</b> <i>Biomed Central Advocacy</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/libraries/advocacy">http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/libraries/advocacy</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users; Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Links and downloads of many marketing and campaign resources, and download and re production of them is encouraged. Posters, leaflets, email templates. But the focus is on promoting Biomed Central’s OA reputation.

<b>15. TITLE:</b> Create Change Canada. <i>Making change work for you.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.createchangecanada.ca/change/index.shtml">http://www.createchangecanada.ca/change/index.shtml</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-shtml
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
EXCERPT [optional field]	Modify any contracts you sign with publishers, ensuring your right to share your work, including posting on an open archive. To aid you in retaining selected rights SPARC and the Canadian Association of Research Libraries (CARL) has developed an easy-to-use <a href="#">Author Addendum</a> to the publisher's agreement. Use this to ensure you've retained a bundle of key rights to share your research article. <a href="#">[English / Français]</a>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Succinct arguments in favour of OA directed to academics.

<b>16. TITLE:</b> BioMedCentral. <i>(Mis)Leading Open Access Myths</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/about/advocacy12">http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/about/advocacy12</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Eleven widely disseminated negative myths on OA publishing, each with a paragraph response containing useful links and quotations.

<b>17. TITLE:</b> LEITE, F.C.L. <i>Como gerenciar e ampliar a visibilidade da informação científica brasileira: Repositórios institucionais de acesso aberto.</i> Brasília: IBICT, 2009.	
LOCATION	<a href="http://eprints.rclis.org/17190/1/RI_-_Fernando_Leite.pdf">http://eprints.rclis.org/17190/1/RI_-_Fernando_Leite.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	e-book-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>All stakeholder groups.</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Written in Brazilian Portuguese for a Brazilian and Latin American audience. Divided into two sections: the first contextualises RIs in the OA movement; the second is a guide for how to set up and IR, from the planning stage to the evaluation of IR use and impact.

<b>18. TITLE:</b> A SPARC / Science Commons White Paper. <i>Open Doors and Open Minds: What Faculty Authors Can Do to Ensure Open Access to Their Work Through Their Institution.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/opendoors_v1.pdf">http://www.arl.org/sparc/bm~doc/opendoors_v1.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	briefing paper-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	HIGH
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Parts (paragraphs) give very useful advice about how to practically go about bringing about policy change in an institution.

<b>19. TITLE:</b> RCAAP – Repositório Científico de Acesso Aberto de Portugal. <i>Alguns Exemplos.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://projecto.rcaap.pt/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=43&amp;Itemid=59&amp;lang=pt">http://projecto.rcaap.pt/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=43&amp;Itemid=59&amp;lang=pt</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	HIGH
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Page of links to self-archiving mandates from universities around the world (in Portuguese from Portugal).

<b>20. TITLE:</b> RCAAP – Repositório Científico de Acesso Aberto de Portugal. <i>Investigadores e Docentes.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://projecto.rcaap.pt/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=18&amp;Itemid=23&amp;lang=pt">http://projecto.rcaap.pt/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=18&amp;Itemid=23&amp;lang=pt</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Academics as researchers/users;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Information introducing OA and IRs to researchers and university teachers.

<b>21. TITLE:</b> Institute for Sustainable Communities. <i>Craft the campaign. Planning &amp; Implementing Powerful Advocacy Initiatives. And Speak to Inspire. Designing effective outreach strategies.</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://tools.iscvt.org/advocacy/craft_campaign/start">http://tools.iscvt.org/advocacy/craft_campaign/start</a> <a href="http://tools.iscvt.org/advocacy/speak_to_inspire/start">http://tools.iscvt.org/advocacy/speak_to_inspire/start</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	webpage-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream &amp; Upstream.</b> Website with useful resources (downloadable short, Word documents) on advocacy (in the context of community advocacy) with useful “campaign” and organisational analysis tips. <i>Not</i> an OA-IR focus.

<b>22. TITLE:</b> HARBORD, E. <i>Why self archive?</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/advice/advocacy.html">http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/advice/advocacy.html</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	presentation-Powerpoint
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream.</b> Takes as point of departure the existence of an IR.

<b>23. TITLE:</b> Leite, F.C.L. <i>Por que, para quem e como criar repositórios institucionais de acesso aberto à informação científica?</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://kuramoto.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/por-que-para-quem-e-como-criar-ri.pdf">http://kuramoto.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/por-que-para-quem-e-como-criar-ri.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	presentation-Powerpoint (90 slides)
AUDIENCE	<i>Repository Administrators; Library &amp; Support Staff; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream.</b> Very long (90 slides) but informative and didactic presentation. Written in Brazilian Portuguese, with many slides containing figures. Presumes no previous knowledge of the issues.

<b>24. TITLE:</b> Wellcome Trust. Conditions under which a grant is awarded.	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/stellent/groups/corporatesite/@sf_central_grants_admin/documents/web_document/wtx026668.pdf">http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/stellent/groups/corporatesite/@sf_central_grants_admin/documents/web_document/wtx026668.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	OA policy-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>MEDIUM</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream</b>

<b>25. TITLE:</b> <i>Manifesto Brasileiro de apoio ao Acesso Livre à Informação Científica</i>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://kuramoto.files.wordpress.com/2008/09/manifesto-sobre-o-acesso-livre-a-informacao-cientifica.pdf">http://kuramoto.files.wordpress.com/2008/09/manifesto-sobre-o-acesso-livre-a-informacao-cientifica.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	OA policy-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream</b>

<b>26. TITLE:</b> SciELO: una metodología para la publicación electrónica.	
LOCATION	<a href="http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/aci/v9s4/aci03100.pdf">http://scielo.sld.cu/pdf/aci/v9s4/aci03100.pdf</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	journal article-PDF
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Upstream</b>

<b>27. TITLE:</b> Acesso Aberto – Open Access - USP	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.acessoaberto.usp.br/">http://www.acessoaberto.usp.br/</a> <a href="http://www.malaria-world.org/">http://www.malaria-world.org/</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	website-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream</b>

<b>28. TITLE: Malaria World</b>	
LOCATION	<a href="http://www.malaria-world.org/">http://www.malaria-world.org/</a>
TYPE-FORMAT	website-html
AUDIENCE	<i>Academics as authors/depositors; Repository Administrators; University Administrators; Funding Agencies; National/Government Research Bodies;</i>
RELEVANCE	<b>HIGH</b>
OBSERVATIONS	<b>Downstream</b>

General Guides to OA-IR Advocacy Material

SHERPA guide to Advocacy. <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/guidance/advocacy.html#resources>

RSP Advocacy Resources <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/content/resources>

## APPENDIX 2

### **Fifteen Common Concerns - and Clarifications**

[Available at: <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/15concerns.html>]

*The rapid growth of institutional repositories and the possibilities they bring for enhanced dissemination and the use of published work has brought with it some uncertainties and misunderstandings. Listed below are some of the more common misunderstandings and some clarification of the issues.*

#### **That repositories should be used \*instead\* of publishing in journals**

On the contrary, authors should continue to publish in journals, whether traditional or Open Access. Repository use is supplementary to journal publication.

#### **That repository material will bypass peer-review.**

No - articles undergo peer-review through the normal journal publication process before mounting in the repository. Where some subject-disciplines use non-refereed pre-prints or working papers to develop their ideas, then repositories can support the practice for that discipline - but it is clearly labelled as such.

#### **That if articles are easily available, then plagiarism will be made easier**

In fact, plagiarism is diminished as a problem. It is far easier to detect if the original, date-stamped material is freely accessible to all, rather than being hidden in an obscure journal.

#### **That authors will be forced to give IPR to the University**

The use of institutional repositories is tied into a drive to give authors more control over their work and the way they want to use it, not less. This means Universities clarifying their IPR policies in favour of authors, and for authors to retain copyright on publication, rather than having to assign it to publishers and accept restrictions on re-using their materials in teaching, sharing with colleagues, etc

#### **That publishers do not allow material to be archived in this way**

Recently several big publishers - Springer, Elsevier and others, have adopted "repository-friendly" policies. Together with those publishers that have always allowed authors to mount their work on-line, such moves have meant that the standard database of publisher's policies (SHERPA/RoMEO list) now shows that 64% allow post-print archiving - a figure which rises to over 90% when considered by the number of journals, rather than by publishers.

#### **That authors of books and reference works will lose royalties**

None of this applies to work from which authors expect to make money. Authors writing text-books or articles on commission quite rightly do not want to give away their work. Institutional repository use is aimed at research information that authors want to be spread and read as widely as possible.

### **That commercially sensitive material or patentable inventions will be given away**

No-one is suggesting that such material be given away. If material is confidential or sensitive, then it is not put into a repository, in the same way that it would not be published in a journal. Repository use is for material that authors want to see disseminated, cited and made public.

### **That this is just aimed at computer scientists**

This is not just for any specialised discipline - any researcher in any field can use their institutional repository. SHERPA repositories currently include eprints on Romanticism, botany, sociology, pathology and Burmese linguistics.

### **What about version-control? Will there be one version in a repository and a different published version?**

Most deposited versions are the author's final version - the version after peer-review, after revision and checking - that is finally sent to the publisher for printing. Some publishers allow the use of the final PDF file which contains their layout and style of font - in which case the versions are identical. Otherwise, while the style of the font might be different, the text of the repository version is identical except for whatever minor copy-editing is done by the publisher after it leaves the author's hands.

### **That repository use will kill journals**

The available evidence suggests otherwise. The Physics community has been using a subject-based archive - arXiv - to hold their papers for over thirteen years, while also sending them to traditional journals: and yet Physics journals continue to be sold. arXiv now holds over 300,000 papers and takes in about 1/3 of the world's physics research. A recent survey asked the society publishers American Physical Society and the Institute of Physics the same question - "Has the use of arXiv made you loose subscriptions?"

Both replied "No."

The evidence shows that repository use does not kill journals and that repositories can exist as a stable, supplementary but highly advantageous form of dissemination.

### **The "Free Rider Problem"**

This is essentially a commercial concern: if research results are available for free, then some companies will be able to access and use the articles for their own commercial advantage without paying for it. This has been voiced as a concern by some publishers, who feel that commercial companies should pay the publishers for access. It has been observed as ironic that some publishers feel it is unfair if commercial companies make profits out of articles that are given to them for free.

Some publishers get a lot of their income from commercial subscriptions and it is of course completely natural that publishers be concerned about the stability of their business model and the level of their profit margins. However, companies acting as "free-riders" do not financially damage the academic or the research institution as producers of the research: indeed it could be argued that the greater availability and use of research could foster closer ties between industry and university researchers. Again, more rapid and wider dissemination of the latest research can only promote innovation, development and industrial growth.

### **That this is an imposition on academic authors**

Mounting an article on a repository does not require a heavy additional workload for authors. Given an electronic copy of the final text - the one that is finally sent to the publishers - the process is fairly straight forward. After registration with an institute's service the task basically consists of filling in an on-line form and hitting the "submit" button. Once an author has gone through the process for the first time, then it should take less than 10 minutes per eprint. Measured against the time it takes to get the funding, do the research and write the article, 10 minutes work is a minimal cost for the increased exposure and citation it gains.

### **"I have already got my material on my web-site - so I don't need to put it in a repository"**

Institutional repositories are based on a standard system from the Open Archives Initiative (OAI). Because the metadata - effectively the catalogue description - in OAI-compliant repositories is "harvested" by OAI search services, all such repositories can be searched through a single point. Since the only results of such a search come from academic repositories, an eprint is far easier to find and far more prominent than if it were accessed through an individual's non-OAI website. Even a normal Google or Google Scholar search favours OAI-repository material and normally ranks it higher than an individual's own website.

More than this, repositories are working to help material be preserved in the longer term. This brings the advantage that when academics move on, or their personal website changes, their eprints in a repository - and the links - will remain stable, readable and accessible.

### **A subject-based repository would be far better - why should eprints on chemistry be in the same repository as eprints on linguistics?**

To someone searching for a particular eprint, the fact it is on an institutional repository is irrelevant. The OAI system ties all the subject-based and institutional repositories together into one massive virtual archive. A search service will just find those articles that match the search, present the abstract of the eprint and the reader can view the full-text if required. The access point or the route by which the eprint is viewed, is independent of the place it is stored.

### **Are institutional repositories in competition with subject-based repositories or open-access journals?**

Institutional repositories do not clash with open-access journals; or with subject-based repositories like arXiv; or the economists repository, rePEc; or with personal web-pages; or with departmental web-pages, or wherever else an eprint can be mounted. One of the strengths of the Open Access movement is that different projects are not in competition with each other. When dissemination is the aim, then the more players the better.

## **Quinze Preocupações Comuns – e Esclarecimentos**

[Disponível em: <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/documents/15concerns.html>]

*O crescimento rápido dos repositórios institucionais e as possibilidades que trazem para a disseminação e uso aumentados dos trabalhos publicados traz no seu rasto algumas*

*incertezas e mal entendidos. Listados abaixo estão alguns dos mal-entendidos mais comuns e alguns esclarecimentos das questões.*

### **Que os repositórios deveriam ser usados no lugar das publicações em periódicos**

Ao contrário, os autores deveriam continuar publicando em revistas e periódicos, seja tradicional, seja de Acesso Aberto. O uso de repositórios suplementa a publicação em revistas acadêmicas.

### **Que o material de repositórios vai desviar da revisão por pares**

Não – os artigos são submetidos ao processo de revisão por pares que é o usual ao processo de publicação nas revistas tradicionais antes de depositar no repositório. No caso das disciplinas que já usam pre-prints não revisadas pelos pares ou “working papers” (*papers* ainda sob construção), os repositórios podem apoiar a prática já estabelecida nessa disciplina, e isto é claramente sinalizado.

### **Que se os artigos são facilmente disponíveis, então o plágio será mais fácil**

Não, pois de fato, o plágio como problema, fica diminuído. É muito mais fácil detectar se a versão original, datada seja livremente disponível a todos, ao invés de estar escondida numa revista obscura.

### **Que os autores serão forçados a ceder os direitos autorais à Universidade**

O uso dos repositórios institucionais é vinculado a um empurrão para dar aos autores mais controle sobre a sua obra e sobre o modo que querem usá-la, não menos controle. Isto significa que as Universidades terão que esclarecer suas políticas de direitos autorais em favor dos autores, e para os autores reter o copyright ao publicar, ao invés de ter que cede-lo aos editores e aceitar as restrições ao reutilizar seu próprio material no ensino, compartilhamento com colegas etc.

### **Que os editores não permitem que o material seja arquivado desta maneira**

Vários grandes editores - Springer, Elsevier e outros – tem adotado políticas que são “amigáveis a repositórios”. Junto com essas editoras que sempre permitiram aos autores colocar seus trabalhos on-line, tais posturas significam que a base de dados das normas e políticas dos editores (SHERPA/ROMEO list) hoje mostra que 64% dos editores permitem o arquivamento pós -publicação – uma cifra que cresce para mais que 90% quando considerado pelo número de revistas, ao invés do número de editores.

### **Que os autores de livros e obras de referência perderão os royalties**

Nada disto aplica às obras das quais os autores esperam ganhar dinheiro. É compreensível que os autores que escrevem livros-texto ou artigos encomendados não querem dar sua obra de graça. O uso dos repositórios institucionais tem como alvo a informação de pesquisa que os autores querem que seja disseminada e lida de forma o mais ampla possível

### **Que o material comercialmente sensível ou as invenções patenteáveis estarão entregues gratuitamente**

Ninguém sugere que tal material seja dado de graça. Se o material for confidencial ou sensível, então não será colocado num repositório, da mesma forma que não seria publicado

numa revista. O uso do repositório é para o material que os autores querem que seja disseminado, citado e disponível publicamente.

### **Que essa coisa de repositório é dirigida apenas aos cientistas de computação**

Não é apenas para uma disciplina especializada – qualquer pesquisador de qualquer campo de estudo pode usar seu repositório institucional. Os repositórios de SHERPA atualmente incluem *eprints* nas áreas de romanticismo, botânica, sociologia, patologia e lingüística birmanês.

### **E o controle de versões? Haverá uma versão no repositório e uma versão publicada diferente?**

A maior parte das versões depositadas são as versões finais do autor – a versão depois da revisão por pares, depois de revisão e checagem – que é finalmente enviada à editora para a impressão. Algumas editoras permitem o uso do arquivo PDF final que contem seu *layout* e estilo tipográfico – e nesse caso, as versões são idênticas. Em outro caso, mesmo que o estilo da fonte seja distinto, o texto da versão do repositório é idêntico exceto algumas pequenas mudanças de revisão que forem realizadas pela editora depois do autor entregá-la.

### **Que o uso do repositório vai acabar com as revistas**

A evidencia disponível sugere que isto não seja o caso. A comunidade de Física tem usado um arquivo baseado na disciplina – arXiv – para armazenar seus *papers* para mais que treze anos, ao mesmo tempo em que os submetem para as revistas tradicionais. Mesmo assim, as revistas na área de Física continuam sendo vendidas. O arXiv hoje contem mais que 300.000 *papers* e recebe em torno de um terço da pesquisa na física do mundo. Um enquete recente fez a mesma pergunta para a sociedade de editoras American Physical Society e o Institute of Physics "O uso do arXiv faz com que vocês percam as assinaturas?" Ambos responderam que não.

A evidencia demonstra que o uso do repositório não acaba com os periodicos e que os repositórios podem existir como uma forma de disseminação estável, suplementar e altamente vantajosa.

### **O problema do "Free Rider" (ganhador de graça)**

Este representa principalmente uma preocupação comercial: se os resultados de pesquisa ficam disponíveis de graça, então algumas empresas poderão acessar e usar esses artigos para sua própria vantagem comercial, sem pagar. Este representa uma preocupação articulada por algumas editoras, que sentem que as empresas comerciais deveriam pagar às editoras para acesso. Tem sido observado como irônico que algumas editoras sentem que seja injusto que as empresas comerciais fizeram lucro de artigos que foram originalmente entregues pelo autor de graça para a editora.

Algumas editoras tiram muito da sua renda das assinaturas comerciais e então é claro que seja inteiramente natural que as editoras estejam preocupadas sobre a estabilidade do modelo de negócios e do seu nível das margens de lucro. No entanto, as empresas agindo como "free-riders" não danificam financeiramente as instituições acadêmicas e de pesquisa como produtores da pesquisa: de fato, poderia ser argumentado que a maior disponibilidade e uso da pesquisa pode fomentar vínculos mais estreitos entre os pesquisadores das universidades e das empresas. A disseminação mais ampla e rápida da última pesquisa pode contribuir para a promoção de inovação, desenvolvimento e crescimento industrial.

### **Que este constitui uma imposição nos autores academicos**

Depositar um artigo num repositório não requer um cargo de trabalho a mais muito oneroso para os autores. Tendo em mãos uma versão eletrônica do texto final – aquela que foi finalmente enviada as editoras – o processo é relativamente fácil. Depois de se registrar com o serviço da instituição, a tarefa consiste em preencher um formulário online e teclar o botão “enviar”. Uma vez que um autor passou pelo processo pela primeira vez, então deve tomar menos que 10 minutos por eprint. Comparado com o tempo que leva para conseguir o apoio financeiro para a pesquisa, realiza-la e escrever o artigo, o esforço de 10 minutos representa um custo pequeno para a exposição e citação aumentadas que se ganha.

### **"Já tenho meus *papers* no meu website – então não preciso depositá-los num repositório".**

Os repositórios institucionais se baseiam num sistema padrão do Open Archives Initiative (OAI). Como os metadados – efetivamente a descrição catalográfica do item – nos repositórios em sintonia com o OAI são "colhidos" pelos serviços de busca OAI, todos esses repositórios podem ser pesquisados via um ponto único. Como os únicos resultados de tal tipo de busca são provenientes dos repositórios acadêmicos, um eprint é mais rápido e fácil a ser encontrado, e muito mais proeminente do que se fosse acessado apenas por meio de um website individual não-OAI. Até as buscas no Google e Google Acadêmico favorecem o material de repositórios-OAI e normalmente os ranqueiam mais altamente do que um website individual. Além do mais, os repositórios estão funcionando para ajudar que o material seja preservado no longo prazo. Este traz a vantagem de que quando os acadêmicos mudam de lugar, ou que seus sites pessoais mudarem, seus eprints num repositório – e os links para eles – ficarão estáveis, legíveis e acessíveis.

### **Um repositório baseado na disciplina seria muito melhor: por que colocar *eprints* da química no mesmo repositório que aqueles que tratam da lingüística?**

Para alguém procurando um *eprint* específico o fato que está presente num repositório institucional e irrelevante. O sistema OAI vincula todos os repositórios de disciplina e institucionais em um arquivo maciço e virtual. Um serviço de busca encontrará aqueles artigos que satisfaçam a expressão de busca, apresentar o resumo do *eprint* e o leitor pode ver o texto completo se quiser. O ponto de acesso ou a rota pelos quais o *eprint* for visto é independente do lugar onde está armazenado.

### **Os repositórios institucionais estão em competição com os repositórios baseados na disciplina ou com os periódicos de acesso aberto?**

Os repositórios institucionais não chocam com os periódicos de acesso aberto, e nem com aqueles baseadas na disciplina, como o arXiv; nem com o repositório dos economistas, rePEc; e nem com as páginas web pessoais; nem com as páginas web de departamentos, e tampouco com quaisquer lugar onde um *eprint* possa ser depositado. Uma força do movimento de acesso aberto é que os distintos projetos não competem entre si. Quando a disseminação for o alvo principal, então, quanto maior o número de participantes, melhor.



# Appendix 3 Making Effective Use of Your Repository

Available at: <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/pubs/briefinapapers-docs/technical-effective%20use.pdf>

## Overview

Repositories are both part of an institution's local information provision and part of the developing global open access information environment. This briefing paper discusses these contexts, helping the repository to serve the institution's business needs effectively.

## Global or local?

The global context is used here to mean systems outside of the institution, for example the world wide web. The local context is the systems within the institution. The boundaries between local and global, internal and external are of course artificial and these systems are not discrete. For example a researcher operates in both contexts.

## Use or effective use?

Effective use of a repository requires a thorough understanding of its purpose and potential for supporting the ongoing activities of the institution. For example, how does it contribute towards the institution's mission statement? What are its business drivers? What are its strategic plans? And how will the repository contribute to the institution's needs? The various uses of a repository can range from research management, research assessment, marketing, profile raising, and knowledge, information & data sharing, to facilitating research, promoting the careers of new researchers, industrial liaison, attracting students and asset management & preservation. All potential uses should be considered when determining how best to make use of the repository and maximise the investments made in establishing and maintaining it.

## Repositories in the local context

Institutions often host other systems that the repository can integrate with and perhaps draw content from to facilitate automatic metadata population, such as academic personnel registries. The repository may in turn offer services back to local systems. Examples of other local systems that repositories might utilise include:

- **Publications / bibliographic databases:** Many institutions maintain publication information without full-text. This information can be used to pre-populate a repository and repositories can replace these systems.
- **Management Information Systems:** Institutions maintain an administrative directory of personnel data and departmental information. This data can provide the community structure for the repository and be used to authenticate users. When such systems operate under the constraints of the Data Protection Act, re-use of such data must first be authorised.
- **Personal web pages and automated publication lists:** Some institutions generate publications web pages for their members on the basis of content in the publications database. Repositories can support this function. Consider whether full-texts and metadata are available from staff home pages and if they should link back to the repository in the first instance.
- **Virtual Learning Environment:** the repository could be used to store and manage learning resources referenced by the VLE. Courses may be archived from the VLE and shared via the repository.
- **Marketing Systems:** directed advertising on the repository pages can attract new PhD applicants and even new staff.

## Repositories in the global context

Increasingly methods of scholarly discovery are moving beyond traditional library systems and into the global context of the web. Most accesses are likely to be requests for full-text direct from third party services such as web search engines (for example, Google), specialist repository search services (for example, Intute Repository Search<sup>1</sup>, OAlster<sup>2</sup>), 'federated' search systems (for example, Metalib<sup>3</sup>) and OpenURL resolvers (for example SFX<sup>4</sup>). Machine-to-machine interfaces are vital for enabling global use.

To make effective use in the global context, consider the following in the first instance:

- **Search Engine Optimization / Sitemap protocol<sup>5</sup>:** To ensure your content is indexed by and accessible to search engines.

- **Registries of repositories:** Registering with OpenArchives<sup>6</sup> / OpenDOAR<sup>7</sup> / ROAR<sup>8</sup> ensures services are made aware of your repository, interfaces and content.
- **OAI-PMH<sup>9</sup>:** To ensure your content is available to data aggregators who may build services on the basis of harvested data.
- **RSS<sup>10</sup>/Atom Syndication Format<sup>11</sup>:** To ensure your repository can operate as part of Web 2.0.

No-one really knows what services might be built on top of an open access global corpus of scholarly research. It is therefore important that repositories remain flexible, that the data is accessible and, if necessary, can be migrated to new systems. Related or emerging standards in this area include OAI-ORE<sup>12</sup>, SWORD<sup>13</sup> and SRU/SRW<sup>14</sup>.

## Conclusion

Understanding the business drivers and purpose behind an institutional repository is a clear pre-requisite to effective use. Repository managers or administrators should clearly and comprehensively identify these as early as possible in the life of the repository. Having established the purpose of the repository, consider how the repository will make use of and support institutional systems, providing a flexible, sustainable repository system to meet the needs of the future. Furthermore, consider how it will interact with new and developing services in the web-based global information environment. These considerations and the actions that arise from them will be fundamental to gaining widespread institutional and academic support, maximising institutional investments in establishing and maintaining the repository, and contributing to development of both local and global networks of sustainable repositories.

**Fazendo uso efetivo do seu repositório** (Adaptado dos *briefing papers* do RSP – JISC Repository Net; disponível em: <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/pubs/briefingpapers-docs/technical-effective%20use.pdf>).

## Resumo

Os repositórios constituem parte dos serviços de provisão da informação de uma instituição além de parte do ambiente global de informação que esta em crescimento contínuo. Este *paper* aborda estes contextos, ajudando ao repositório servir efetivamente as necessidades de negócios da instituição.

### Global ou local?

O contexto global usado aqui para significar os sistemas fora da instituição, o world wide web, por exemplo. O contexto local se refere aos sistemas por dentro da instituição. As fronteiras entre o local e global, interno e externo, são evidentemente artificiais e estes sistemas não são separáveis. Um pesquisador, por exemplo, opera dentro de ambos os contextos.

### Uso ou uso efetivo?

O uso efetivo de um repositório requer uma compreensão completa do seu propósito e potencial para apoiar as atividades rotineiras da instituição. Por exemplo, como contribui o repositório para os objetivos de missão da instituição? Quais são as motivações de negócios de se ter um repositório? Quais são os planos estratégicos? Como contribuirá o repositório aos requisitos da instituição? Os usos variados de um repositório podem abranger desde a

gestão de pesquisa, avaliação da pesquisa, *marketing*, promoção do perfil da instituição, compartilhamento de conhecimento, informação e dados, facilitar a pesquisa, promover as carreiras de novos pesquisadores, interação universidade-empresa, atrair estudantes novos e preservação e gestão dos bens. Todos os usos potenciais deveriam ser considerados ao determinar como melhor fazer uso do repositório e maximar os investimentos em estabelecê-lo e mantê-lo.

### **Repositórios no contexto local**

As instituições frequentemente hospedam outros sistemas com os quais o repositório possa integrar e dos quais possa extrair conteúdo para facilitar a alimentação automática de metadados, tais como registros de dados curriculares dos acadêmicos. O repositório pode, por sua vez, devolver serviços de volta aos sistemas locais. Exemplos de outros sistemas locais que os repositórios possam utilizar incluem:

- Publicações / bases de dados bibliográficas: Muitas instituições mantem a informação sobre publicações sem texto-completo. Esta informação pode ser utilizada para pré-popular/alimentar o repositório e os repositórios podem substituir esses sistemas.
- Sistemas de informação gerencial (MISs): as instituições mantem um diretório

## APPENDIX 4

# Repository Policy Framework

Available at: <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/pubs/briefingpapers-docs/repoadmin-policyv2.pdf>

## Introduction

A comprehensive policy framework is a vital tool through which to establish the operational boundaries within which a repository will function. It supports day to day management of the repository whilst simultaneously taking the longer-term vision of future operational activities into account. Supportive and integrated policies are also indicative of an organisation's level of commitment and are essential if a repository is to be successfully embedded into the wider organisational framework.

## Benefits of a policy framework

A clear and visibly supported repository policy framework does more than simply provide abstract high-level support. It also:

- **Facilitates stakeholder understanding:** Responsibilities and lines of communication are clarified; processes are clearly defined; and equity, standardisation and consistency are promoted. These all contribute towards increased and easier use of the repository.
- **Helps with the planning and decision-making processes:** Risks are better understood and managed, IPR are easier to comply with, and the implications of dealing with different types of resources are exposed. These outcomes contribute towards ongoing and day-to-day management of the repository.
- **Ensures support for the repository:** The decision-making process is formalised and sign-off by senior management is facilitated. These engage senior management in supporting and contributing to the repository from a longer-term perspective.

To ensure the policy framework is comprehensive, repository managers should seek to integrate a number of policies into the wider organisational framework. These can be classified into two main streams: strategic, and operational.

## Strategic Policies

Policies for the repository do not exist in isolation. They need to be created in harmony with the wider strategic policies of the institution. An important first step is to find out about existing policies. It is likely that an institution will have **high-profile vision statements** and defined agendas in areas such as research, teaching, theses and intellectual property. Do not underestimate the usefulness of existing policies. They can help align and embed the repository in the institution. In contrast, if such policies do not exist then the repository can act as a catalyst for their creation.

One of the most powerful policies is a **mandate** that makes it compulsory for every relevant member of staff to ensure that their research outputs are deposited in the repository. Many funding councils are considering making deposit a condition of continued research funding and, internationally, consortia of institutions are in the process of ratifying their mandates. It could be argued that mandates are the single most effective way to ensure success.

## Operational Policies

Strategic policies are concerned with the bigger picture and their consideration will begin to inform the day-to-day operation of the repository. The details of day-to-day operations are defined by operational policies. Operational policies are essential tools for a wide variety of people involved in the practical aspects of running a repository.

Operational policy areas include:

- **Submission policies:** Who can deposit? What type of materials can they deposit and in what format? What level of moderation is required for checking deposits, if any?
- **Collection policies:** will the repository focus on a specific discipline, or will it reflect the entire academic output? What types of materials are sought? What metadata must be collected? What versions are acceptable? Should peer or quality reviews be implemented?
- **Preservation policies:** for how long will the repository aim to preserve deposits? Can this be guaranteed? What formats should be used for preservation purposes?
- **Usage policies:** what can end-users and services do with repository metadata and content? How should publishers restrictions or embargoes be managed? At what level should usage be permitted, e.g. on an item-by-item level? Is there a takedown policy to respond to copyright or other infringements?

---

## References & further information :

### **OpenDOAR Policies Tool**

<http://www.opendoar.org/tools/en/policies.php>

The *OpenDOAR* policies tool is a simple way for repository administrators to formulate and/or present their repository's policies. It provides a series of check boxes and pick lists for all key policy options.

### **Repositories Support Project**

<http://www.rsp.ac.uk/>

The Repositories Support Project (RSP) aims to co-ordinate and deliver good practice and practical advice to HEIs to enable the implementation, management and development of digital institutional repositories.

The *OpenDOAR* policies tool<sup>1</sup> from SHERPA is a valuable first step in developing common and machine readable policies to address these areas.

## Policies and Licencing

Some, but not all, policies will need formalising as **legal agreements**. Specifically this involves definition of a deposit license and a use license which users will need to agree to. Licenses are a useful tool through which to manage the risks associated with maintaining a repository.

## Conclusion

Policies that are both human- and machine-readable facilitate effective use of the repository on both a local and global scale. They help embed the repository in the wider organisation and contribute to managing the repository on a number of different levels. They are also living documents that must be revisited and evaluated on a regular basis to ensure they remain up to date and conform with changing organisational requirements. Further assistance on developing repository policies is available from the RSP.

## *Framework* da política do Repositório [Adaptado dos *briefing papers* do RSP – JISC Repository Net]

### Resumo

Planejar e manter um repositório envolve fazer, e responder a, pergunta de modo contínuo. Um *framework* da política fornece uma estrutura para definir e registrar as decisões resultando deste processo e assegura a consistência ao aplicá-las. Definir uma política é portanto um primeiro passo em estabelecer um repositório. Este breve artigo *briefing paper* identifica os benefícios de ter um *framework* abrangente da política e explora os tipos distintos tipos de políticas que aqueles envolvidos no repositório deveriam desenvolver.

### Introdução

Um *framework* esquema de política abrangente é uma ferramenta imprescindível pela qual se pode estabelecer as fronteiras operacionais dentro das quais um repositório funcionará. Apóia a gestão do dia-a-dia do repositório enquanto simultaneamente levando em consideração a visão de longo prazo das atividades operacionais futuras. As políticas integradas e sustentadoras também são indicativas do nível de apoio que a organização dá ao repositório, e são essenciais para que o repositório seja imbricado com sucesso na cultura e nas práticas mais amplas da organização.

### Os benefícios de um *framework* da política

Uma política de repositório que seja clara e visivelmente apoiada consegue mais de que apenas prover apoio abstrato de alto-nível. Também:

- Facilita a compreensão dos envolvidos (os *stakeholders*):  
As responsabilidades e linhas de comunicação ficam esclarecidas; os processos são

claramente definidos; e a equidade, padronização e a consistência são promovidas. Todos contribuem para o uso aumentado e facilitado do repositório.

- Ajuda com o planejamento e com os processos de tomada de decisão: Os riscos são melhores compreendidos e gerenciados, os direitos de propriedade intelectual (DPI) são mais facilmente cumpridos, e as implicações de lidar com tipos distintos de recursos ficam expostas. Estes resultados contribuem para a gestão do dia-a-dia do repositório.
- Assegura o apoio para o repositório: o processo de tomada de decisão se torna formalizado e aprovação final pela alta administração (sênior management) fica facilitada. Estes engajam a alta administração em apoiar e contribuir ao repositório de uma perspectiva de longo prazo.

Para assegurar que o *framework* de política seja abrangente, os gestores do repositório deveriam buscar integrar certas políticas no *framework* organizacional mais amplo. Estas podem ser classificadas em duas correntes principais: estratégicas e operacionais.

#### **As políticas estratégicas**

As políticas para o repositório não existem isoladamente. Precisam ser elaboradas em harmonia com as políticas estratégicas mais amplas da instituição. Um primeiro passo importante, assim, é de descobrir sobre as políticas existentes. É provável que uma instituição já terá afirmações de missão e pautas definidas em áreas como a pesquisa, ensino, teses e DPI. Não subestime a utilidade das políticas existentes. Podem ajudar alinhar e embutir o repositório na instituição. Em contraste, se tais políticas já não existem então o repositório pode agir como um catalisador para a sua criação.

Uma das políticas a mais poderosa é um **mandato** que faz com que fique compulsório para cada pesquisador assegurar que os resultados da sua pesquisa são depositados no repositório. Muitas das agências de fomento estão no processo de tornar o depósito uma condição do financiamento contínuo e, em termos internacionais, consórcio de instituições estão no processo de ratificarem seus mandatos. Poderia ser argumentado que os mandatos constituem a forma a mais efetiva de garantir o sucesso.

#### **As políticas operacionais**

As políticas estratégicas se preocupam com uma visão mais ampla e a sua consideração começará informar a operação diária do repositório. Os detalhes das operações diárias são definidos pelas políticas operacionais. Estas são ferramentas essenciais para uma grande variedade de pessoas envolvidas nos aspectos práticos de operar um repositório.

As áreas das políticas operacionais englobam:

- **As políticas de submissão:** quem pode depositar? Quais tipos de materiais podem depositar e em qual formato? Qual tipo de moderação/mediação é necessário para checar os depósitos, se necessário?
- **As políticas de colecionar:** o repositório focalizará numa disciplina específica ou refletirá os resultados de todas as áreas acadêmicas? Busca-se quais tipos de materiais? Quais metadados tem que ser colecionados? Quais versões são aceitáveis?

As versões revisadas por pares ou bastam as versões de alta qualidade a serem implementadas?

- **As políticas de preservação:** para quanto tempo o repositório visará preservar os depósitos? Isto pode ser garantido? Quais formatos deveriam ser utilizados para os propósitos de preservação?
- **As políticas de utilização:** que podem fazer os usuários finais com os conteúdos e metadados do repositório? Como podem ser gerenciados as restrições ou embargos dos editores? Em qual nível a utilização deve ser permitida, p.ex. num nível item por item? Existe uma política de remoção para atender a copyright ou outras infrações?

A ferramenta de políticas do *OpenDOAR* de SHERPA<sup>10</sup> representa um primeiro passo valioso para desenvolver políticas comuns e legíveis por computador para lidar com essas áreas.

### **Políticas e Licenciamento**

Algumas, mas nem todas, as políticas precisarão ser formalizadas em **acordos legais**. Especificamente este envolve a definição de uma licença de depósito e uma licença de uso sobre os quais os usuários terão que chegar a um acordo. As licenças são ferramentas úteis pelas quais se realiza a gestão dos riscos associados com o funcionamento de um repositório.

### **Conclusão**

Políticas que são legíveis por ambos seres humanos e os computadores facilitam o uso efetivo do repositório numa escala tanto local quanto global. Ajudam embutir o repositório na organização mais ampla e contribuem com a gestão do repositório em vários níveis. Também não deixam de ser documentos vivos que deveriam ser revisitados e avaliados de modo regular para assegurar que sejam mantidos atualizados e que conformem com os requisitos organizacionais que estão sempre em mudança. Mais auxílio para desenvolver as políticas de repositórios é disponível do Repositories Support Project (RSP – <http://www.rsp.ac.uk>), que visa coordenar e entregar a boa prática e conselhos práticos para as IESs sobre a implementação, gestão e desenvolvimento de repositórios institucionais digitais.

---

<sup>10</sup> *OpenDOAR* Policies Tool <http://www.opendoar.org/tools/en/policies.php> Esta ferramenta é uma forma simples para os administradores de repositórios formular e/ou apresentar as políticas do seu repositório. Fornece uma série de caixinhas de ticar para todas as opções principais das políticas.

## APPENDIX 5

(Available at: <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/pubs/briefingpapers-docs/repoadmin-promotion.pdf> )

# Promotion

## Core message

A core message or strapline is essential for promotion and this should reflect the repository's ethos and tangible advantages. This message should be incorporated into all promotional literature, every essential talk and be embraced by repository staff. There is a need to tailor aspects of your message to particular audiences so make them challenging, engaging and informative. Simple examples of a strapline are:

*Deposit in the repository and increase the visibility of your work*

*The success of the university is built upon its research — build a firm foundation today with UniRepoPrints*

*Think local, reach global.*

An expansion of this idea is to consider reducing the central message or unique selling point (USP) of your repository to just 25 words. It is a powerful focussing technique, and may well help you to identify or refine your core message, offering a snappy but accurate response to the chance encounter with a key academic staff member who asks 'So what does this repository do?'. For example:

*The repository collates, preserves and makes readily available to the global community the most valuable output of this institution — its research.*

## Building informed awareness

Each contact, briefing and event you organise helps to build an awareness of the repository, forming part of the overall promotional framework. Commonly repository managers will promote the intellectual benefits of the repository, but should not neglect the emotive aspects, such as personal reward. It is beneficial to address the issue of 'What's in it for me?' to stakeholders. Most audiences have limited time and attention. Potentially, all they will initially remember is the strapline.

## The marketing mix

For effective promotion it is best to adopt more than one approach, ensuring stakeholders hear about the service from as many different directions as possible. There is a need for bespoke adaptation to take account of each institution's particular social, political, strategic and operational environments. Some examples include the following:

### *Top down*

- Explore institutional requirement for deposit (mandates).  
Obtain supporting statements from the very highest level of the institution.
- Invite stakeholders to join repository steering groups to assist in exploring unique institutional challenges; influencing the strategic position of the repository.

Keep the Pro-VC for research (or similar) and key committees informed of developments and successes. This ensures the repository is embedded in the organisation.

### Bottom up

Locate **repository champions**. Enthusiastic early adopters can act as change agents, taking your messages out on a peer-to-peer basis.

- Demonstrate how new researchers can contribute, and gain a flying start to their careers. **Repository usage statistics** can provide powerful encouragement.

Engage students, especially graduates, by promoting the use of open access research material. In turn they will **influence** their peers and mentors.

Inform and **involve support staff**, ensuring they understand the importance of the repository to the institution's strategy.

### Events

Repository promotion is often conducted at an individual or small group level. Larger events can also make for effective promotion. It is important to reach out to as many members of the institutional community as possible. You may wish to enlist a head of service to approach senior staff directly. Events should be **informative, digestible** and wherever possible **tailored** to the attendees' professional interests. Repository team members should attend with the express purpose of engaging individuals. Capitalise on success by rapidly following up on leads and contacts generated.

### Time Resource

While institutions have noted that it has been possible to speak and interact with all departments in a matter of months, do not underestimate the time it will take to embed the repository in your institution. Promotion is an **ongoing effort**. New staff and priorities arise, and there will be a need to repeat much of the effort. Make use of other staff (e.g. liaison librarians) to spread the load. Equipped with your core message and backed by your experiences, they should be able to keep the repository message firmly on the agenda.

### Conclusion

**Keep talking.** Do not be afraid of repeating and reiterating. Find new contexts for and continually adapt your message. Ultimately you are working towards giving institutional repositories the same weight as other academic activities and priorities (e.g. examinations and applying for grants). The recently introduced research funder mandates [JULIET] should ensure the matter is at the forefront of the authors' minds. Now might be a good time to face the challenge of cultural change

**Promoção do repositório institucional** [Adaptado dos *briefing papers* do RSP – JISC Repository Net; disponível em: <http://www.rsp.ac.uk/pubs/briefingpapers-docs/repoadmin-promotion.pdf> ]

Resumo: Para embutir seu repositório com sucesso como parte da instituição requer **mudança cultural** significativa, incluindo a integração do depósito dentro dos fluxos de trabalho e procedimentos operacionais. A promoção representa uma das ferramentas mais poderosas para alcançar isto.

### **Mensagem central** (=core message)

Uma mensagem central, de cerne, e essencial para a promoção e deveria refletir o ethos e as vantagens tangíveis do repositório. Esta mensagem deveria ser incorporada em toda a literatura de promoção, cada conversa essencial e ser abraçada pelo pessoal do repositório. Há necessidade de adaptar aspectos da sua mensagem para audiências específicas, então faça-as desafiadoras, engajadoras além de informativas. Exemplos simples de tais mensagens centrais são:

- Deposite no repositório e aumente a visibilidade do seu trabalho.
- O sucesso da universidade esta construída encima da sua pesquisa – construa uma fundação segura hoje com UniRepoPrints.
- Pense localmente, alcance globalmente.

Uma expansão desta idéia e a de considerar condensar a mensagem central ou unique selling point USP do seu repositório em apenas 25 palavras. E uma técnica poderosa para focalizar, e pode ajudar em identificar ou refinar sua mensagem central, oferecendo uma resposta sucinta mas precisa num cenário de um encontro por acaso com um acadêmico que pergunta “E que faz esse repositório então?” Por exemplo:

O repositório arranja, preserva e disponibiliza à comunidade global o produto mais valioso desta instituição – a sua pesquisa.

### **Construindo uma consciência informada/sustentada**

Cada contato, informe ou evento que você organiza ajuda construir uma consciência do repositório, formando parte do *framework* geral de promoção. Comumente, os gestores de repositórios promoverão os **benefícios intelectuais** do repositório, mas não deveriam negligenciar os aspectos **emotivos**, como a premiação pessoal. Por isso, faz sentido tratar a questão do tipo “O que tudo isto tem para me beneficiar?” que possa vir dos envolvidos/afetados. A maioria das audiências tem tempo e atenção limitada. E possível que a única coisa que lembrem seja a mensagem central.

### **O mix de marketing**

Para a promoção efetiva e melhor adotar mais que uma abordagem, assegurando que os envolvidos/afetados ouçam do serviço do repositório tanto quanto possíveis as direções possíveis. Há necessidade de adaptação pessoalizada para levar em consideração as particularidades sociais, políticas, estratégicas e os ambientes operacionais de cada instituição. Alguns exemplos incluem os seguintes:

### *De cima para baixo*

- Explorar o requisito institucional para o depósito (mandatos);
- Obter afirmações de apoio do nível administrativo mais alto da instituição.
- Convidar os *stakeholders* participar em **comissões do repositório** para auxiliar na exploração dos desafios institucionais únicas assim influenciando a posição estratégica do repositório.
- Manter o Pro-Reitor de pesquisa (ou semelhante) e as comissões chaves informados sobre os sucessos e desdobramentos do projeto. Isto assegura que o repositório venha a ser embutido na organização.

### *De baixo para cima*

- Localizar **campeões do repositório**. São aquelas pessoas que adotam a prática de usar o repositório desde cedo e que são entusiastas em relação a ele. Por isso, podem agir como agentes de mudança, levando a mensagem central aos seus pares.
- Demonstrar como os novos pesquisadores podem contribuir, e inicializar (estrondosamente – *flying start*) com confiança a sua carreira. Os **indicadores de uso do repositório** podem constituir incitação ponderosa.
- Engajar os estudantes, especialmente os pós-graduandos, promovendo o uso de material de pesquisa de acesso aberto. Por sua vez, exercerão uma influência sobre os seus pares e mentores.
- Informar e **envolver o pessoal de serviços de apoio**, assegurando que entendam a importância do repositório em relação à estratégia da instituição.

## **Eventos**

A promoção de um repositório é frequentemente conduzida em nível individual ou em grupos pequenos. Os eventos maiores podem também constituir um meio efetivo de promoção. É importante alcançar o maior número possível dos integrantes da comunidade institucional. Os eventos deveriam ser **informativos, digestíveis** e quando possível **adaptados** aos interesses profissionais da audiência. Os integrantes do time do repositório deveriam participar do evento com o propósito explícito de engajar os indivíduos. Capitalize no sucesso do evento, dando um *feedback* e contatando os contatos feitos a partir do evento.

## **Recurso de tempo**

Enquanto as instituições notaram que é possível conversar e interagir com todos os departamentos em alguns meses, não subestimem o quanto de tempo demanda para embutir o repositório na sua instituição. A promoção constitui um esforço contínuo. Haverá novo pessoal, novas prioridades, e haverá necessidade de se repetir muito esforço já investido. Utilizem o pessoal (p.ex. bibliotecários) para compartilhar o cargo de trabalho. Equipados

com a mensagem central, e apoiados pelas experiências positivas já adquiridas, esse pessoal deveria poder manter a mensagem central acerca das vantagens do repositório firmemente na pauta de discussão.

## **Conclusão**

**Continue conversando.** Não tenha medo de repetir e reiterar. Encontre novos contextos para a mensagem e continuamente adaptá-la. A final das contas, sua meta é a de atribuir ao repositório institucional o mesmo peso que as outras atividades e prioridades acadêmicas (p.ex. pleiteando verba e bolsas, provas, defesas). Os mandatos recém-introduzidos de financiadores de pesquisas, em alguns países [veja JULIET<sup>11</sup>] deveriam assegurar que o assunto seja proeminente na consciência do pesquisador. Agora pode ser o tempo certo de enfrentar o desafio de mudança cultural.

---

<sup>11</sup> As políticas de acesso aberto das agências de fomento de pesquisa: [www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/](http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/juliet/)

## APPENDIX 6

### Communication Skills for Effective Advocacy - Repository Support Project Workshop (2010) Authors: Dominic Tate and Jacqueline Wickham

#### Objectives:

1. To explore ways repository managers can influence key people within their institutions
2. To review the communication channels that can be used to influence
3. To understand the nature of resistance and to explore how to manage it.
4. To identify the key objections to open access and repositories

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>TO COVER</b>	<b>RESOURCES</b>
<b>EFFECTIVE INFLUENCING</b>	Introduction to the four stages of effective influencing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What do you want?</li><li>- Who are you trying to influence?</li><li>- What power do you have?</li><li>- How to communicate the message</li></ul>	
<b>SOURCES OF POWER</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Outline the 8 sources of power</li><li>• Using power judiciously</li><li>• Exploring other perspectives</li><li>• Exercise to identify the sources of power repository managers have</li></ul>	Sources of influence handout
<b>COMMUNICATION CHANNELS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identifying appropriate channels of communication</li><li>• The difference between rich and lean forms of communication</li><li>• Paired exercise to develop a communication plan</li></ul>	Communication plan template
<b>MAKING A PITCH</b>	Putting influence into practice	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual exercise to prepare a short pitch to influence people to use the repository</li> <li>• Group exercise to practise delivering the pitch</li> </ul>	Preparing a pitch template
<b>UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGING RESISTANCE</b>	<p>However well we have made our pitch we still often meet resistance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does resistance present itself</li> <li>• The four stages to dealing with resistance constructively</li> <li>• Managing our own emotional response</li> </ul>	Managing resistance handout
<b>IDENTIFYING OBJECTIONS</b>	<p>Group work to identify the key objections to open access and repositories – groups to discuss and put each objection on a separate post it (20 mins)</p> <p>Feedback the objections and group them into themes</p>	Post its
<b>HANDLING THE OBJECTIONS</b>	Whole group discussion to explore the evidence that can be used to counter the key objections (this will be written up and circulated to the whole group)	
<b>PUTTING IT INTO PRACTICE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstration to show how to handle objections using facilitative questions and empirical evidence</li> <li>• Exercise in triads to practise handling objections</li> </ul>	<p>Role play</p> <p>Cards for the three roles – academic, advocate and observer</p>
<b>KEY LEARNING</b>	Each triad to discuss the key learning from the role play and to feedback to the main group one finding	
<b>PLENARY</b>		

## APPENDIX 7

### **Manifesto Brasileiro de apoio ao Acesso Livre à Informação Científica Contextualização**

[<http://kuramoto.files.wordpress.com/2008/09/manifesto-sobre-o-acesso-livre-a-informacao-cientifica.pdf>]

A informação científica é o insumo básico para o desenvolvimento científico e tecnológico de uma nação. Trata-se de um processo contínuo em que a informação científica contribui para o desenvolvimento científico, e este, por sua vez, gera novos conteúdos realimentando todo o processo.

No entanto, a comunidade científica enfrenta dificuldades no acesso à informação científica, se considerado o modelo tradicional de publicação científica.

Tradicionalmente, os artigos ou trabalhos científicos são publicados em revistas especializadas, e a forma de acesso a esses trabalhos dá-se mediante assinatura das publicações pelas bibliotecas ou pelo pesquisador.

Com o surgimento das novas tecnologias da informação e da comunicação, diversos paradigmas estão mudando. Isso porque essas tecnologias facilitam o acesso à informação científica, promovendo o surgimento de novas alternativas para a comunicação científica. A Open Archives Initiative (OAI) é um exemplo disso. Esta iniciativa estabelece, além de padrões de interoperabilidade, alguns princípios e ideais, como o uso de *software open source* e o acesso livre à informação. Surge, a partir dessa iniciativa, o **paradigma do acesso livre à informação**. A OAI constitui, portanto, um marco na área do tratamento e disseminação da informação em geral e na área da comunicação científica em especial. Essa iniciativa proporcionou a construção, implantação e manutenção de diversos repositórios de acesso livre, assim como o surgimento de diversas ferramentas de *software* para a construção e manutenção de repositórios, como o E-Prints, o Open Journal Systems (OJS), o DSPACE, entre outros.

O movimento de apoio aos *open archives* e ao acesso livre à informação surge em consequência das dificuldades encontradas pela comunidade científica mundial no acesso à informação científica. Concretizou-se, de fato, por meio de diversos manifestos, como as declarações de Bethesda, Budapeste e Berlim, além de manifestações de organizações não-governamentais e internacionais, como a Ifla e a OCDE, entre outras.

É importante observar que o paradigma do acesso livre à informação provocará otimização nos custos de registro e acesso à informação, além de promover maior rapidez no fluxo da informação científica e no desenvolvimento científico e tecnológico. Esse cenário aponta para a necessidade de o Brasil manifestar-se favoravelmente ao acesso livre à informação, promovendo, por conseguinte, o aumento significativo da visibilidade de suas pesquisas, de seus pesquisadores e de suas instituições. Para tanto, é necessário aderir ao movimento mundial e estabelecer uma **política nacional de acesso livre à informação científica**, mediante o apoio de toda a comunidade científica, com o envolvimento não apenas das suas organizações, mas, *obrigatoriamente*, dos pesquisadores e das agências de fomento.

O estabelecimento do acesso livre como um procedimento vantajoso requer o empenho ativo de todo e qualquer indivíduo que produza conhecimento científico ou seja, de todo detentor de patrimônio cultural.

## **Objetivos:**

- promover o registro da produção científica brasileira em consonância com o paradigma do acesso livre à informação;
- promover a disseminação da produção científica brasileira em consonância com o paradigma do acesso livre à informação;
- estabelecer uma política nacional de acesso livre à informação científica;
- buscar apoio da comunidade científica em prol do acesso livre à informação científica.

## **Paradigma do Acesso Livre à Informação**

O modelo que se preconiza para o acesso livre à informação e que nesse documento é denominado de Paradigma do Acesso Livre à Informação, baseia-se nos termos da **Declaração de Berlim**, na parte relativa à **\_Definição de uma contribuição em acesso livre...\_**, que é aqui reescrita conforme os dois itens abaixo:

I. Contribuições em acesso livre incluem resultados de pesquisas científicas originais, dados não processados, metadados, fontes originais, representações digitais de materiais pictóricos, gráficos e material acadêmico multimídia.

II. As contribuições em acesso livre devem satisfazer duas condições:

1. os(s) autor(es) e o(s) detentores dos direitos de tais contribuições concede(m) a todos os usuários:

- a. direito gratuito, irrevogável e irrestrito de acessá-las;
- b. licença para copiá-las, usá-las, distribuí-las, transmiti-las e exibi-las publicamente;
- c. licença para realizar e distribuir obras derivadas, em qualquer suporte digital para qualquer propósito responsável, em obediência à correta atribuição da autoria (as regras da comunidade continuarão a fornecer mecanismos para impor a atribuição e uso responsável dos trabalhos publicados, como acontece no presente) e com a garantia de fazer cópias;

2. Uma versão completa da obra e todos os materiais suplementares, incluindo uma cópia da licença, como acima definida, é depositada e, portanto, publicada em um formato eletrônico normalizado e apropriado em pelo menos um repositório que utilize normas técnicas adequadas (como as definições estabelecidas pelo modelo Open Archives) e que seja mantido por uma instituição acadêmica, sociedade científica, organismo governamental, ou outra organização estabelecida que pretenda promover o acesso livre, a distribuição irrestrita, a interoperabilidade e o arquivamento a longo prazo.

## **Recomendações à Comunidade Científica**

Torna-se necessário, nesse momento, o compromisso por parte da comunidade científica brasileira de apoiar o movimento mundial em favor do acesso livre à informação científica. Nesse sentido, os principais atores do sistema de comunicação científica, nomeadamente autores, editores, agências de fomento e as instituições acadêmicas, devem se comprometer a colaborar para que os resultados de pesquisas realizadas no país estejam disponíveis livremente para acesso. Para isso, portanto, de acordo com o que especifica a **Declaração de Berlim**, recomenda-se:

**A. É imperativo** que as **instituições acadêmicas** brasileiras se comprometam a:

1. criar repositórios institucionais e temáticos, observando o paradigma do acesso livre;
2. requerer que seus pesquisadores depositem uma cópia de todos os seus trabalhos publicados em pelo menos um repositório de acesso livre;

3. encorajar seus pesquisadores a publicar seus resultados de pesquisa em periódicos de acesso livre, onde houver um periódico apropriado para isso. Deve-se, além disso, prover o apoio necessário para que isso ocorra;
4. reconhecer a publicação em ambiente de acesso livre para efeito de avaliação e progressão acadêmica;
5. ter disponíveis, em ambiente de acesso livre, os periódicos editados pela instituição ou seus órgãos subordinados.

**B. É primordial** que os **pesquisadores** (autores):

1. contribuam para o incremento de conteúdos em repositórios institucionais ou temáticos, depositando o maior número possível de seus trabalhos, publicados ou não, inclusive *pré e post prints*, material de aula, quando for o caso, entre outros materiais.
2. depositar, obrigatoriamente, em um repositório de acesso livre publicações que envolvam resultados de pesquisas financiadas com recursos públicos.

**C. É necessário** que as **agências de fomento**:

1. reconheçam a publicação científica em repositórios de acesso livre para efeito de avaliação da produção científica dos pesquisadores e de concessão de auxílios e financiamentos para pesquisa ;
2. recomendem aos pesquisadores a quem concedem auxílio financeiro para suas pesquisas que depositem uma cópia dos resultados publicados em um repositório de acesso livre e/ou que publiquem prioritariamente em periódicos eletrônicos de acesso livre;
3. recomendem aos pesquisadores a quem concedem auxílio financeiro para participação em eventos que depositem uma cópia do seu trabalho em um repositório de acesso livre;
4. promovam e apoiem a construção e manutenção de repositórios institucionais e temáticos;
5. apoiem, prioritariamente, a edição de publicações científicas eletrônicas de acesso livre;
6. requerer que toda publicação científica financiada com recursos públicos tenham uma versão disponível eletronicamente em ambiente de acesso livre.

**D. É imprescindível** que as **editoras comerciais** de publicações científicas:

1. concordem em que os trabalhos por elas publicados com autoria de pesquisadores que obtiveram recursos públicos para suas pesquisas tenham uma cópia depositada em repositório de acesso livre;
2. tenham disponível uma versão eletrônica, em ambiente de acesso livre, das publicações impressas por elas editadas cuja autoria seja de pesquisadores que obtiveram recursos públicos para suas pesquisas.

**E. É recomendável** que **editoras não comerciais**:

1. tenham disponíveis uma versão eletrônica, em conformidade com o paradigma do acesso livre à informação, das publicações impressas por elas editadas;
2. adotem os padrões que estejam em conformidade com aqueles estabelecidos pela Open Archives Initiative (OAI)