

# JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

## Project Document Cover Sheet

### PROJECT REPORT: January 2006

#### Project

<b>Project Acronym</b>	RepoMMan	<b>Project ID</b>	
<b>Project Title</b>	Repositories, metadata and management		
<b>Start Date</b>	June 2005	<b>End Date</b>	May 2007
<b>Lead Institution</b>	University of Hull		
<b>Project Director</b>	Ian Dolphin		
<b>Project Manager &amp; contact details</b>	Richard Green r.green@hull.ac.uk		
<b>Partner Institutions</b>			
<b>Project Web URL</b>	www.hull.ac.uk/esig/repomman		
<b>Programme Name (and number)</b>	Digital Repositories Programme		
<b>Programme Manager</b>	Neil Jacobs		

#### Document

<b>Document Title</b>	Project report		
<b>Reporting Period</b>	June 2005 - January 2006		
<b>Author(s) &amp; project role</b>	Richard Green Project Manager		
<b>Date</b>	30/01/2006	<b>Filename</b>	mgt-rep-0601-v10.doc
<b>URL</b>			
<b>Access</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project and JISC internal	<input type="checkbox"/> General dissemination	

#### Document History

Version	Date	Comments
0.1	11/01/2006	Working version
1.0	30/01/2006	Submitted version

# RepoMMan Project

---

Project Management Report

June 2005 - January 2006

Richard Green

January 2006



## The RepoMMan Project

<b>Project Director:</b>	Ian Dolphin, Head of e-Strategy, University of Hull (i.dolphin@hull.ac.uk)
<b>Project Manager:</b>	Richard Green (r.green@hull.ac.uk)
<b>Technical Lead:</b>	Robert Sherratt (r.sherratt@hull.ac.uk)
<b>Repository Domain Specialist:</b>	Chris Awre (c.awre@hull.ac.uk)

The Repository Metadata and Management Project (RepoMMan) at the University of Hull is funded by the JISC Digital Repositories Programme. The project is being carried out by the University's e-Services Integration Group (e-SIG) within Academic Services.

## 1. Grant statement

The RepoMMan Project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions attached to it.

## 2. Aims and Objectives

The aims and objectives of the project remain as set out in the Project Plan dated August 2005.

The main targets for the period of this report were

2.1 to appoint a software developer for the project

2.1.1 In the event it took some time to advertise for and appoint a developer. Simon Lamb took up post on 05/09/2005; this somewhat delayed work with the BPEL engine, but not enough to be a cause of significant concern.

2.2 to document and evaluate the (WS)BPEL runtime environments available to the project

2.3 to select, deploy and become familiar with one of these BPEL environments

2.4 to plan and undertake interviews with potential research users of a repository

2.5 to report on the interviews

2.6 to plan and undertake a web-based survey of a wider group of research users

2.7 to report on the survey

2.8 to start work on evaluating the Fedora repository software

These targets have all been met within the period covered by this report.

## 3. Overall approach

There has been no significant change in our approach to the project, however we intend to somewhat repurpose one deliverable (R-D4) and this is discussed in the next section.

## 4. Project outputs

Project website

A project website was established during July and all public outputs from the project have been posted there.

D-D1 Documentation listing available BPEL runtime environments, evaluation criteria and evaluation results

This was published in September 2005 and attracted positive comment from a number of other organisations (particularly in the US) who were evaluating BPEL at the time.

R-D1 Criteria and toolkit for online survey

This document was published in September 2005.

R-D2 Criteria for researcher interviews

This document was published in September 2005.

#### D-D2 Deployment and documentation of BPEL runtime environment

A version of this document was completed in October 2005 but it has not been published. As it stands the document relates to the installation of the Active Endpoints ActiveWebflow software on a Windows platform. Eventually, when the project commissions a dedicated server to support its work this document will be amended and extended as necessary to reflect installation on a different platform (depending on the outcome of discussions this could be Solaris, Unix or Linux). It will subsequently be published.

#### D-D3 Familiarity with the BPEL authoring tool

This document was published in November 2005.

#### R-D3 Report on research user requirements survey

Following the survey, which took place during the month of October, this document was published in November 2005. The findings have also been circulated to a number of other JISC projects that had a specific interest in them.

#### R-D4 Report on research user requirements interviews

Following a number of face-to-face interviews with researchers at Hull during the autumn, this document was published in November 2005. The document is synthesised from full transcripts of the interviews which have not been published but which could be made available to JISC staff, if required. As the result of a discussion at a Fedora conference at the National Library of Wales, it became clear that we should interview a medical researcher in addition to those that we had chosen; medical researchers have some particular and unusual constraints on their work. This further interview took place during December, transcribed, and a revised version (v1.1) of R-D4 was published during January 2006.

#### D-D4 Iterative development of research use case

This is the final document that should have been produced during the reporting period and is the first deliverable from the 'Fedora evaluation' workpackage.

The installation of Fedora, and the initial work with it, was put back by the delay in appointing a software developer. Now that we are catching up with it a number of things have become apparent which were not obvious before detailed work was undertaken. The most notable of these is that the documentation available for Fedora on the project website is not an adequate basis on which to get a new installation up and running quickly, especially if that installation is to support digital objects using the Fedora 'collections' methodology.

The document planned for D-D4 was to have mapped our initial design thoughts against the available Fedora function calls. In the event, we are only now able to start this. We have decided to repurpose the document to take a much broader view of our work with Fedora than had originally been envisaged. In short, we intend - as the project moves forward - to write what amounts to a manual for the installation and deployment of Fedora which deals with all the issues that we encounter. This should make it easier for those who come after us to set up and start to use a Fedora installation and we hope that it will be a significant contribution to work within both the

JISC and Fedora communities. Obviously, this is a more ambitious undertaking than the original document and we do not now anticipate finishing it until the summer of 2006.

## 5 Project outcomes

The project is essentially running to timetable.

Our work thus far has attracted some significant attention, particularly in the US. We were invited to join the Fedora Workflow Development Group, an invitation which we accepted, and this will mean that we have direct contact and interaction with the team developing Fedora's own workflow tool. In addition, the Universities of California (Berkeley) and Stanford have expressed an interest in collaborative work.

The project is in regular contact with staff at the Fedora project and with some of the major users of Fedora, especially at OhioLINK (the Ohio Library and Information Network).

These contacts are providing valuable information and experience.

## 6 Stakeholder analysis

### 6.1 JISC

The RepoMMan project has been represented at the following JISC events:

July 2005	JISC Programme meeting, Cambridge
October 2005	JISC Digital repositories meeting, Glasgow
November 2005	JISC Use case training, Bath
December 2005	JISC e-learning conference, York
January 2006	JISC UML training, Edinburgh

### 6.2 Other 'Digital Repositories' projects

The project has had informal discussions with other DR projects at all of the events listed in 6.1. In addition, a more formal meeting has just taken place with the SPIRE project to discuss shared interests - particularly views on workflow and the use of Shibboleth.

### 6.3 The Fedora Community

As noted above, the project is in regular contact by e-mail with a number of key players in the Fedora community. In addition, the project has given a presentation at the Fedora Users' conference hosted by the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, in October 2005.

### 6.4 Potential users at the University of Hull

As noted elsewhere, a number of lengthy, face-to-face interviews have been held with research practitioners at the University of Hull in order to gain an understanding of the research process and to discuss how a digital repository might help in research work. In addition, a local working party has been set up with staff, primarily from Academic Services (including the Library, Records Management and Archives) in order that they can feed into the project and assist with planning for repository use post-project.

## 6.5 Potential users elsewhere

The project has undertaken an on-line survey with potential research users elsewhere.

## 7 Risk analysis

There is nothing to report under this heading except to note that the identified risks for work undertaken so far have not transpired.

## 8 Standards

There is nothing to report under this heading.

## 9 Technical development

There is nothing to report under this heading.

## 10 Intellectual property rights

There is nothing to report under this heading.

## 11 Project partners

There have been no changes to the project partners (none) or to the list of subcontractors.

As previously noted, a number of informal 'alliances' have been forged within the Digital Repositories Programme and some cooperative work is likely to take place with the Fedora development team, the University of California (Berkeley) and Stanford University in the US.

## 12 Project management

There have been no changes to the project staff.

The project's software developer, Simon Lamb, was not able to take up his post until the beginning of September 2005 - some three months after the start of work. This has somewhat delayed work on the 'development' side of the project but this delay is being caught up and should not have a significant impact in the long-term.

## 13 Programme support

As noted elsewhere, the project has been represented at a number of JISC activities and training events where a number of informal links have been forged with other DR projects.

Sarah Currier, our project support officer, made a site visit to the project on 13th January 2006.

## 14 Budget

The budget expenditure template is attached as Appendix A.

## 15 Workpackages

### Current reporting period

Workpackage D1: Development of three-tier workflow engine

As noted elsewhere, work on this workpackage is slightly behindhand due to the delay in appointing a software developer. This delay is being made up and it is anticipated that the workpackage will complete on time.

Deliverables

D-D1 Documentation listing available BPEL runtime environments, evaluation criteria and evaluation results.

Due: 09/2005 Published: 09/2005

D-D2 Deployment and documentation of BPEL runtime environment.

Due: 10/2005 Version 1 completed 10/2005

*Note that this document has not yet been published for reasons detailed in section 4.*

Workpackage R1: User requirements analysis

Deliverables

R-D1 Criteria and toolkit for survey

Due: 08/2005 Published: 09/2005

R-D2 Criteria and associated materials for research user interviews

Due: 09/2005 Published: 09/2005

R-D3 Report on research user requirements survey data

Due: 11/2005 Published: 11/2005

R-D4 Report on research user requirements interview data

Due: 01/2006 Published: 11/2005 Updated: 01/06

Workpackage D2: Investigation of tools to author BPEL process

Deliverables

D-D3 Selection of, and familiarity with, BPEL authoring tool

Due: 10/2005 Published: 11/2005

Workpackage D3: Fedora evaluation

Deliverables

D-D4 Iterative development of research user case

This deliverable has now been repurposed as explained in Section 4.

## Next reporting period

Workpackage D1: Development of three-tier workflow engine

### Objectives

- Develop integration mechanism between the Model View Controller and BPEL layers
- Program Java servlet interface
- Program Java portlet interface

Workpackage D3: Fedora evaluation

### Objectives

- Iterative development of software implementation based on research user requirements and development of developer documentation
- Evaluate experiences with, and write summative report covering the use of, Fedora during the first year. QA required on this document.

Workpackage R2: Feasibility and requirements study of the use of contextual metadata for the identified institutional use cases

### Objectives

- From the user requirements analysis, investigate the requirements, source of and feasibility of extracting personal metadata
- From the user requirements analysis, investigate the requirements, source of and feasibility of extracting research metadata

Workpackage D4: Workflow integration with institutional portal framework and collaborative environment

### Objective

- Integrate workflow engine into uPortal framework

## 16 Evaluation plan

The only entry in our evaluation plan for this reporting period addresses the issue of whether the on-line research user survey was a representative sample. Two criteria were identified: the size of the sample and the range of respondents.

The on-line survey was conducted during October and early November 2005. For the first two weeks of that time the survey was advertised only to staff at the University of Hull; following this period an announcement was made of the survey through a number of JISC mailing lists, on the project website and at a relevant conference at the National Library of Wales. In total 229 valid responses were received, 59 from the University of Hull and 170 from elsewhere. A very small number of facetious responses were removed from the data before processing.

Prior to the first question proper, respondents were asked to identify their general location and subject area.

	All	Hull	Other
England	78.6%	100.0%	71.2%
Scotland	13.5%	0.0%	18.2%
Wales	4.8%	0.0%	6.5%
N Ireland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
European Union	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%
USA/Can	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%
Australasia	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

96.9% of all responses were from the United Kingdom (though with a response from Northern Ireland notably absent). If the numbers from Hull are removed then 95.9% of all other respondents are from the UK.

The responses were analysed by research subject area:

	All	Hull	Other
Arts	12.7%	11.9%	12.9%
Maths and Computing	11.4%	18.6%	8.8%
Sciences	17.0%	23.7%	14.7%
Health and Medicine	17.5%	8.5%	20.6%
Social Sciences and Law	22.3%	27.1%	20.6%
Education	15.3%	5.1%	18.8%
Business and Management	3.9%	5.1%	3.5%

Overall there was a good spread of respondents across the subject groupings that we offered with only the Business and Management category having a much weaker response than the others. In the Hull analysis neither Health and Medicine nor Education have a particularly high response; whilst the University is involved in both these areas staff perhaps see themselves as practitioners rather than researchers. Hull's mathematics department were strong contributors in contrast to mathematicians elsewhere.

We are content that this is a representative sample for our purposes.

## 17 Quality assurance plan

No project outputs during this reporting period were listed for specific quality assurance.

During the next reporting period, the report on our experiences with Fedora in the project's first year will be subject to peer review.

## **18 Dissemination plan**

During the reporting period, a number of dissemination activities have been undertaken:

June 2005	Website established. Regular updates subsequently.
July 2005	Brief presentation at the JISC programme meeting in Cambridge
September 2005 - ongoing	Interaction with Fedora users' discussion list
September 2005	Short article in the "In brief" section of DLib magazine
October 2005	Presentation at the Fedora Users' conference, National Library of Wales

## **19 Exit/sustainability plan**

There are no issues within this section of the plan at the present time. The survey criteria and the interview criteria are already on the project website.

