

- Speaker 1: [00:00](#) Well, I, I guess it's about time to start and I've got to say, I'm really surprised by the number of people here, um, particularly because we are going to be writing up the round tables already and hoping sincerely that the writeup is going to be a little more coherent than the report I give today. Um, I am reporting on, you know, six hours roughly of intense, poorly digested at this point. Um, uh, discussion. Um, uh, that took place on Sunday afternoon and Monday morning. Uh, the, um, the roundtables frequently get, um, you know, oversubscribed and we, we keep them to about 15, uh, institutions in order to have a conversational kind of a situation. Um, for this one on revisiting institutional repositories. We were kind of stunned when we got, um, 51, I believe, institutions that wanted to participate and we scheduled an extra round table for some of the folks who came in early.
- Speaker 1: [01:30](#) Um, and we did that Sunday, uh, late afternoon. But, uh, even so we had to turn quite a number of folks away. Uh, so I thought it would be, since there was a lot of interest, I would, um, uh, schedule a breakout session to just try and summarize some of what I heard. And, um, if you're interested in perspectives on this, by the way, this morning at the, um, first slot, there was an excellent, uh, panel, um, on this topic of revisiting repositories. I caught part of it, um, most if not all of the institutions represented on that panel were also part of the round table. And we have also, we've got video of that panel discussion. So that may be another useful resource if you're interested in this. So what I'm going to try and do in the next 45 minutes or so, um, is to, um, kind of highlight the, the big themes as I heard it.
- Speaker 1: [02:47](#) And I mean this was a very rich discussion and there were lots of finer points or, or particular institutional issues, um, uh, many of which I hope we can capture in the written report. But I want to just give you the, the, the sort of big themes here and I'm happy to field questions. I'll, I'll make sure I leave at least 15 minutes or so for questions at the end. And I would say, um, for, for baffling reasons, um, there are a number of people who participated in the round table here, um, probably because they're real curious to hear what the other round table said. Uh, and, and when I, when I feel the Q and a, I would invite them to also jump in if they want to. Um, uh, make comments on any of the questions. So let me begin. And, um, so, so one very big theme that came up as people try and look at, um, what they're doing in the repository area is they're struggling with the scope of the repository.

Speaker 1: [04:10](#) And in particular they're trying to figure out how did Easton tangle a set of, um, demands for what really our digital collection management platforms from the things we more traditionally think about as repositories. And let me give you some examples. So many, many of the institutions represented have large quantities of material that resulted out of various kinds of digitization programs. Uh, some of them had newspaper digitization programs. Some of them had captured large image or photographic collections. Some had been digitizing special collections material. And they're there. There's a kid, you know, there there's a consistent need for platforms where you can store, cure, aid, annotate and discover these kinds of materials. Um, this is rather different than the kind of environment where when one thinks primarily of taking in contributions from the campus community and returning the contributions at about the same granularity that they are placed in the repository.

Speaker 1: [05:52](#) Um, it would be a very unusual situation, for example, at least in my experience with repositories, to have someone come to the repository manager and say, I'm retiring. I have a collection of architectural photographs which I'd like to place in the repository so that other faculty might draw on them. Um, and to say, and I want to just, excuse me, I want to submit each one as a separate entity and putting all the metadata for it. And I hope that the discovery mechanism on your repository is good enough to work with that sort of thing. Um, that's kind of an edge case for a repository as distinct from, you know, here's a manuscript I want to put in there, or here's a video I want to put in there. Um, most libraries have a lot of materials of the digital collections type. In many cases they've generated them themselves, um, and um, have invested significantly in the curation of those materials.

Speaker 1: [07:09](#) Um, so many institutions now are really struggling with what, how do we, how do we articulate the distinction? Do we try and get one platform that can do both or do we, um, do we try and go to separate platforms? Uh, this is a hard problem and it's a problem that is kind of baked into the situations that are in place at many institutions going back to the da going who, particularly if those institutions started in let's say the early two thousands, uh, where there was a very limited choice of software platforms to deal with digital collection management. And in fact, some of them kind of edged into repositories by extending what started life as a digital collections platform. Um, now there's a lot of different alternatives for this kind of curatorial work around collect, you know, um, collections, archives, space, um, Omeka, uh, all kinds of platforms for that.

Speaker 1: [08:33](#) So one fundamental challenge that a lot of the institutions were grappling with is as we go forward, how do we make the distinction, do we make the distinction, what platforms do we want for each of those needs? And are they really separate needs or are they common needs? Closely related to that. One of the things that I heard again and again and again at the uh, was um, our institution actually has five different platforms that have aspects of being an institutional repository and it's getting very expensive to operate five or six of these platforms. And we are having a lot of trouble explaining either to ourselves or to our user community what's likely to be found in any specific one of these silos. Um, some of, some of the institutions are trying to rationalize the number of platforms and shifting collections from one place to another.

Speaker 1: [09:46](#) Really good poster child is a ETD. Um, most institutions moved into [inaudible] and Mount them locally and they did that pretty early. So they've got some history now and they're trying to figure out, you know, what's the most sensible place to put these? Are they really like a curated collection or do they actually make more sense as a repository sort of a thing? Um, interesting question and it just kind of illustrates the problem here. Um, in this case where many institutions are facing this multiplicity of platforms, we're also starting to, I'm here thinking about, Oh, if I really have to have all these platforms and nobody can quite understand the distinction between them, do I also need some kind of cross platform discovery tool for our users? And what kind of headaches does that generate? Can, can I put my repository kinds of things? Can I represent what's in there in my broader discovery system that I have in place? So that's emerging as an issue and um, uh, [inaudible] there, there subsidiary problems there by the way, which I'll just note and which we didn't talk about very much, but Mmm.

Speaker 1: [11:20](#) If you're running a significant repository system, I believe many institutions now have rediscovered the need for authority control. If it's gonna, if the repository system is going to look decent. And unfortunately, the things you want to authority control in the repository system are your own faculty. And if they work primarily in journal oriented fields, for instance, they may not be in any of your authority control mechanisms. Um, uh, so people scratch their heads about this sort of thing too. Um, okay. Moving on. Um, uh, one further note on this multiplicity of platform thing. Um, it's not just the kind of the nature of the collection and the way it's presented. There's a second thread here about media types. There are some institutions that have been invested quite heavily in, um,

recorded sound or video types of material and getting that into digital form and, uh, preserving that.

Speaker 1: [12:38](#)

If you're doing that at scale, it is often not a good fit with many of the common place repository platforms. So you actually see, um, uh, institutions that have additional platforms that are media types specific for sound recorded a sound or, um, a V material. Uh, that at least in my judgment is unlikely to go away real soon. Um, uh, although one can always hope and there's a, there's a question of, you know, kind of degree here if, if you're talking, uh, we use, you know, a modest number of videos and the idea is just, okay, you put a video in his a file, you pull it out as a file and the user downloads a copy and figures out what to do with it locally. You can accommodate a modest amount of that in almost any repository platform. I think, um, if you, if you want to stream it and things like that, life starts getting a lot more complicated quickly.

Speaker 1: [13:51](#)

Um, that takes us over to another issue that, um, really re connected to the scope of the repository. Um, most of the institutions who were represented at the round table, um, we're doing some kind of publishing activity as well. They were either supporting, um, say OJS journals, um, uh, that their faculty or others were running. Um, some of them were working with the university presses and now we're looking at situations where they were collaborating with the university press to uh, digitize and make available back runs of out of print monographs, uh, that were unlikely to come back into print. Um, they need a place to put those too. And with the OJS journals, um, they feel that they have a archive or preservation responsibility in some cases for the OJS turtles that they host, do those go in the repository? Are these curated digital collections or are these yet another kind of thing that needs to be maintained long term?

Speaker 1: [15:23](#)

And this question echoed in other places about, well, there seemed to be these large classes of things we have some archival or preservation responsibility or obligation to, um, how do these relate to a repository? Um, you know, you're almost seeing a figure of speech now about, Oh, this should go in the repository. And um, you know, there's a question whether you literally translate that to, Oh, does she go in the institutional repository? Or whether you take this at kind of a higher level and say, well, the institution working through the, um, instrumentality of its library ought to take longterm care of this and preserve it. Uh, university archives are a great example and increasingly, uh, not uniformly, but increasingly, um, UNIV at least some parts of the work of university archives are being

done in the library. Some cases archives are part of the library and there's a piece of that, the archival function that's kind of a records management thing.

Speaker 1: [16:44](#) But there's another piece that really, you know, increasingly makes sense to have right on the investments and expertise that the library has already developed in longterm digital curation. So where do you put university archival materials that you're going to keep permanently, or at least for the quite longterm? Are these things that actually go in the institutional repository? Are these things for which there, you know, we need to think about what platform we're going to preserve them on. And maybe these come with very different access apparatus and discovery apparatus. Then the kind of traditional things you deal with in an institutional repository setting.

Speaker 1: [17:37](#) Okay. Another even bigger and more complicated, um, uh, scope question and relationship question, which is, which really was, um, at least in one of the two round table discussions, uh, one of the core kinds of things that the participants kept coming back to. And that's a research data management and whether research how research data management related to an IRR, um, in particular, um, we saw very, very different models about does D D do research data sets being kept for the longterm, actually live in the same IRR that's holding other kinds of material or do they belong in some other data specific, um, uh, uh, repository and preservation environment? Um, it seems fairly clear that at least in many disciplines there are disciplinary repositories that are going to play very significant roles. Um, and that certainly not all data is going to be preserved at the institutional level.

Speaker 1: [19:00](#) Um, at the same time, it's clear that there is a long tail of data in all disciplines, which is going to need to Viv at the institutional level, um, for longterm preservation. And the, the key questions here are things like our, um, our traditional repository five forms well equipped to handle these or do we really need a different place to put them? Um, really great and poorly understood question. Um, again, it's a little bit like the video problem when you look at current technology. Uh, if you're just handling fairly small, fairly straightforward things like, um, Excel spreadsheets of very common, uh, way of, um, managing research data. Yeah, you could probably put them in any platform and you'd do okay. Um, if you're really talking much larger data and more complicated data, uh, you may need something more specialized. Um, so people don't understand this problem and are struggling about how to deal with it.

- Speaker 1: [20:17](#) There's an organizational issue by the way that comes along with it, which is that, um, most of the institutions we're making investments in building up teams of research, data management, um, specialists who work with faculty. And, um, how do those relate to the folks who run the repository? Uh, when can I ask similar questions about scholarly communications programs at many libraries, um, uh, often, but not all. Well, there are a significant number of cases where the repository is part of scholarly communications, which tends to give the repository by the way a certain, um, set of biases about what it's doing and what its priorities are. Um, which may be quite different than those of the research data operation or the university archives or things like that. And you really, you heard that very clearly in some of the perspectives. Um, uh, there are organizational questions here about where the repository fits in the spectrum of services, um, which you know, are, are emerging as a significant Schafer of the repository. Um,
- Speaker 2: [21:55](#) [inaudible]
- Speaker 1: [21:55](#) I guess, um,
- Speaker 1: [21:59](#) one other area in the positioning kind of thing that I should discuss before I move on to this next collection of the issues that emerged is the relationships between, um, uh, research information systems and repositories. Um, now this is, this is really interesting because you know, at one level you can think of a lot of what research information systems are doing as faculty bibliography. And clearly to the extent that, uh, faculty are depositing into a repository that should feed into, um, the, uh, the research information system. Similarly, the material and the research information system. And sometimes this is the side there is or is separate from in a problematic way. Faculty accomplishment tracking by the way, the, the kinds of, um, things that faculty, uh, uh, fill out every year. Um, as part of the tenure and promotion process, uh, these should serve almost as a guide for material that the, um, the uh, repository might want to go.
- Speaker 1: [23:31](#) Accessioning. Uh, there's, there's a really interesting school of thought that is starting to surface, which says that, well, really a Chris might be much of a repository, might serve much of the function of an institutional repository in the sense that you could use it to spend the published literature as well as the things represented in the repository. And you could actually use it to provide access to faculty work in the published literature to the extent that it was either open or, um, that, uh, whoever was coming through the Kris to look at the faculty work. Um, uh, had

licensed access to it and you actually see, you know, systems like pure from Elsevier starting to make a case for that. But you also see now some arrangements that some institutions are experimenting with some of the big publishers where the big publishers will essentially push bibliographic data for authors back to the institution so that they could put it in there, Chris along with pointers to the articles themselves.

Speaker 1: [25:14](#)

So the institution doesn't get the full text back for storage locally and access to the full text is still controlled and determined by whatever arrangements the publisher has made on those articles via an embargo, be it, you know, immediate open access as Serbia permanently, you know, controlled access. Uh, that's a really interesting model. Um, and uh, it's one that people are, are thinking about and again, it, it, it, it, CRE, it, um, you know, begins to frame some of these questions about what problem are we trying to solve with the institutional repository. Now, um, this takes me to the second big, um, collection of issues. And then I have just a couple of other, um, really interesting points that came up that I'll talk about that don't fit in this. Um, what problem are we trying to solve? So there is one school of thought which I will fess up that I have been a very strong advocate of ever since. Um, I first wrote about this area which says that, you know, the priority is to capture,

Speaker 1: [26:45](#)

um, uh, material out of the institutional community and the priority is to capture the material that is at greatest risk of going on store video or being lost. Uh, I actually, um, I actually still really believe that, but there are others who say that the primary purpose or a primary purpose is to capture a record of the institution's scholarly output. And typically they place an intense emphasis when they say that on as appearing in the journal literature and for some of the scholarly communications driven, um, repositories. That's the goal or seems to be the goal. And it's mostly not working very well. Um, uh, because of, um, the way that the access mandates have turned out, uh, from the publishers in the U S uh, if you go and look at other nations like the UK, there's a whole nother, there's a very different set of obligations and incentives, um, that are, um, put upon faculty, uh, which leads to a very high level of compliance in terms of putting things in your repository.

Speaker 1: [28:20](#)

Um, not the case here. Typically, uh, the best kinds of of, you know, coverage reports are in the 60% kind of coverage. And typically those are only achieved by cutting deals and paying big publishers to provide material to help populate the repository. Um, uh, which, you know, you can do. Um, one thing I would just note is when you start looking at these publisher, um, uh,

repository or publisher Chris relationships, one of the things that strikes me about this, um, and we didn't get into the implications of this, but it's a, it's an observation that came to me fairly strongly as I was trying to put these notes together, is that, um, this really favors concentration of publishers and, and of publisher platforms because setting up the interfaces to take those feeds, contractually negotiating the arrangement, lot of transactional overhead for that. Um, so what that means is you'll do it typically with a couple of publishers that give you the biggest bang for the buck in terms of, um, setting up the, the interfaces, um, uh, or what you might do. I mean, an, uh, an interesting variation of this is some of the platform providers might offer it. So for example, out of fun, um, which serves as a platform for a whole lot of midsize publishers might figure out how to do this. And then say, any publisher that hosts on us can get this as a, you know, extra benefit that they can offer. Um, but there is a, there is a way in which these kinds of arrangements will potentially, um, further, uh, um, further encourage consolidation, um, which is worth thinking about.

Speaker 1: [30:38](#)

Okay. So anyway, I was talking about journal articles and coverage of journal articles. Now this takes us to the very vexed issue of open access and, um, what does open access agendas at institutions have to do with the institutional repository? And this was a really interesting conversation. Um, it was one that threaded its way through both of the round tables in various guises. Um, uh, the participants were really very mixed in terms of whether they had some kind of open access policy at their institution. Some did, some didn't. Whether the policy had any teeth at all into it or it was just sort of a, it would be nice to make your things open access. Um, uh, and um,

Speaker 1: [31:48](#)

there was a question that was beautifully framed, uh, by one of the participants, which said, if an institution has an open access policy, to what extent is there a, particularly if it comes out of the faculty, uh, to what extent is there an obligation for the libraries to invest to make that policy happen? There's a big difference between simply having a policy on the books and making a genuine institutional investment to do something with the policy. You can see that in many, many, many areas of higher ed and government and other kinds of places. I mean just saying, Oh, we have a policy that says this, that's the, isn't really meaningful in most in many cases. Um, what's meaningful is when we, they, when an institution says, yeah, and we're serious about this and we're going to put some resources behind trying to make it happen.

Speaker 1: [32:55](#) And, um, there's a considerable disconnect there. Uh, and it's one that libraries need to think about, but other people need to think about too, like provosts and faculty senates. Um, the money to do this isn't just going to appear. It's going to happen because someone chooses to put resources into it. And in many cases, most cases, perhaps if institutions are going to do this, it's going to be money that is either reprogrammed from somewhere else or new money into the library's budget. Um, so I think, I think recognizing squarely that policy question is, is a very important thing to do. Um, and really having it surface that, um, that clearly, uh, was very, very helpful. But what do you, so, so what is it, what is the connection here? Um, open issue, uh, every institution had a different answer. Um, the only thing that I could really add to this is that there's a huge difference between taking a position as a institutional library and saying we would welcome and happily accept

Speaker 1: [34:34](#) publications either in author final draft or if you can do it legally, um, published version from our faculty for inclusion in the repository and saying, we're going to actually invest in making an organized campaign to go and get this material and bring it in. Uh, whether it's through paying publishers to push it back to us or whether it's having somebody chase down faculty based on the material in their Kris, um, and trees or faculty tenure and promotion entries, um, to and badgering them to get this material in a huge difference between those two scenarios. Um, I think it's, um, pretty darn hard to imagine any rational reason not to say

Speaker 1: [35:34](#) it's your material is welcome. Um, I think that the question of how much resource to put into chasing it down is really an open one. It's one that institutions have found very, very different answers to. But I would say if there was one kind of trend I picked up in, in the various conversations, uh, it was that institutions were probably more willing to say we're going to actively chase it down five years ago than they are today for a bunch of reasons. One reason is the way the public access mandates have turned out, the funder mandates in the United States. Another reason is that they figured out how hard it is. Um, it is an unbelievable mess to figure out whether you can pull things back from the publisher legally in when it take copies. Um, authors frequently don't keep apparently, um, their final author versions, um, and, uh, they're fairly, um, uh, how shall we put it, um, casual about downloading copies from the publisher and, you know, if they want to put a link to their published work on their website, uh, just parking their copy there.

Speaker 1: [37:07](#) But there's a big difference between this happening on a kind of a random, you know, faculty member basis and, uh, most of the publishers frankly turn a blind eye to it. Um, uh, rather than going and being really unpleasant to their authors on a transactional basis. Um, there's a big difference between that and gathering it up into an institutionally sanctioned repository. Um, so, uh, it's turned out to be quite labor intensive to go after these materials, um, uh, uh, for, from the faculty in a systematic way. Okay. So I would say those are the biggest themes that I heard, um, across the two repositories. As I say, there were many, many, many nuanced points. And, um, I, I guess I just want to mention a few of them, um, before I open up for question. Uh, the first is about platforms. Now I talked about the multiplicity of platforms, uh, that are currently in place in the management and, and cost issues that that prevents, uh, people are starting to do repository migrations and, um, that's turning out to be a very variable process depending on what you're dealing with, how careful you want to preserve the metadata.

Speaker 1: [38:49](#) And also whether what you're doing is a sort of a migration of things that are repository like things or whether what you're really trying to do is disentangle your digital collections and move them to a new platform, which often means replicating specialized retrieval tools and navigational tools and things like that. Um, one really interesting, um, uh, um, experience by the way, that, um, one of the participants shared, which I loved was they said when they get somebody who shows up and says, I have all this stuff, I want a repository, they actually do a mockup and say, well, this is what it'll look like. You're good with that. And, um, they say that's avoided unending grief because really what many of the people who come to them want is they want a curated digital collection with some specialized discovery, uh, apparatus and maybe, you know, some geo location on it or something like that.

Speaker 1: [40:02](#) Um, uh, and, and you know, they have to tell them, well, gee, you know, somebody's going to have to spend some serious investments making this happen compared to, you know, simply putting a static object into a repository. Um, so I thought that was a, that was a really interesting observation. A tremendous number of, of institutions are staking a lot of hope on hydro fedora mixes. Um, they are also in many cases pretty worried about the amount of technical staff that it's taking to make that happen. Um, and worried about what kind of people commitment it's going to take longer term to keep that working. Uh, there's been fairly limited experience so far and actually migrating into these environments. Um, uh, but clearly that's,

that's an environment that, um, you know, is, is gaining Mindshare. It's hard to tell whether it's that they're so unhappy with what they've got now or uh, you know, and, and something else has got to be better or, or exactly what some of the drivers are.

Speaker 1: [41:21](#) Um, it's also clear that some of the folks who are using some of the earlier platforms are in a very difficult place right now. Like, um, there are a number of institutions with, um, fairly prehistoric versions of D space, uh, that have been extensively locally customized, um, in part because the space back then, um, didn't give you a lot of flexibility to do various things without going in and customizing the code. And they are facing now, you know, Nat really nasty migration problems even to migrate to a current version of the platform they're on. I mean, this is, this is not a new story. You know, this, this has happened in all kinds of systems, but repositories have been around long enough now that, um, why did institutions have got themselves into exactly this kind of bind in many cases. Um, the other really interesting set of, um, issues.

Speaker 1: [42:31](#) I think I'll mention two more issues, not just one was how development was being handled on some of these open source platforms and whether, whether development agendas and strategies were really effectively being driven by the strategic needs of the institutions or whether they were being driven heavily by the, you know, kind of interests of the developers and a very technical kind of agenda. Um, I'm a little too far away from these projects to really voice much of an opinion on that. But, um, this was certainly an issue that emerged and um, uh, it's a question we should be asking ourselves. It's very easy in these kinds of community source projects to get captured by the agenda of the frontline developers, um, which can quickly, you know, um, diverge from the priorities, the, the more strategic priorities. It becomes much more about the technology and less about the, the problem you're trying to solve. The other question that I think was beautifully framed, um, particularly in the second round table was whether we've been too insular here.

Speaker 1: [44:16](#) Let me explain what I mean by that. So we framed the repository as well. It's kind of a library and archives thing. Um, you know, that the library who worries about, and particularly as we've started talking about research, data management, the library is starting to get terribly nervous because it's clear that's going to be a new important and very resource intensive service. And they can't do it out of their existing budget without really stopping to do stopping doing something else that they've

got a strong constituency for and a strong mandate to do. Um, so, you know, we're now hearing conversations at many institutions about, well, longterm, you know, it's going to the research data management is going to be expensive and the institution needs to figure out how to fund it. And this is a conversation, an unpleasant conversation that involves it, it involves the academic departments and involves the vice provost of research. It involves the provost. Um, all kinds of folks get into this. Um, and

Speaker 1: [45:41](#)

the point here is that it's being positioned as a or or I think some of the wiser institutions are trying to position it not as a library problem but as an institutional problem, a new institutional problem that is arising from the changing nature of scholarly practice and it's one the institution needs to step up to now the library may be one of the primary instrumentalities for the institution to address it, but it is a new institutional problem the institution owns and less fun. Now you can use the phrase was used about enterprise repositories and thinking in terms of enterprise repositories and how they connect with other enterprise systems. We aren't thinking mostly about repositories in that way, but in particular depending about on how you position your repository activities relative to your research data management activities. Um, there is a certain case to be made for um,

Speaker 1: [47:02](#)

trying to move towards the idea of an enterprise repository. And that may include things that you don't always keep in the really long term. It may include other kinds of assets. Somebody actually asked the unthinkable question about wall. You know, there actually is a whole world of digital asset management systems out there and in fact, many institutions have invested in them, not in the library but elsewhere to manage other kinds of resources. And the libraries have sort of gone into denial about this and said, we don't even want to think about those. Those don't come out of a, you know, kind of a library systems world. Uh, so they can't possibly be appropriate for the material we store. The unthinkable question was actually raised about maybe we ought to take a look at some of these and figure out where these fit into the landscape rather than just saying, Oh, that's, you know, another world and we don't deal in that world. And maybe thinking about how to move to enterprise level repositories needs to encompass that question as well. Fascinating issue. Um, and uh, uh, really I think one that bears some careful thinking about. Um, uh, last thing I'll just mention, um, is

Speaker 1: [48:44](#) I heard quite a bit of mention of open educational resources as something that was gaining a lot more interest and a lot more importance at many institutions. And I just want to share one insight into the reasoning here. So there are some repository like activities that we've been doing for a while that generated quick demonstrably all kind of wins. For example, um, [inaudible] which gave much greater visibility to dissertations coming out of an institution. And by making them broadly available was a, a clear service both of the institution and to the students that was graduating. Very popular by enlarge with everybody. Good idea. Um, clear when the whole journal article thing, not so much hassle for faculty, um, all tied up with mandates and policies, lot of work. Um, generally, you know, at best and mixed blessing. And when people look at the repository, if that's the agenda, they say, well, if that's the agenda, you're doing a lousy job of it cause you know, we feel you're maybe capturing a third of the faculty output.

Speaker 1: [50:11](#) Why are you, you know, useless. Um, why are you asking for a lot of money for this? Now, the other one that is a real easy win is open educational resources because as you've heard, if you've been following of the sessions here for the last couple of years or reading, I'm reading other higher education press and reportage institutions are beginning to document sizeable, tangible, measurable savings to their students. We have saved our students three quarters of \$1 million a year. Well that's a pretty good thing and it's popular in every circle and um, it's a, it's a fairly easy win. And so there, the one obvious thing that is starting to move on to the repository agenda is, um, you know, this is something that at genuinely adds measurable value fairly quickly to the institution and its activities and its community. Um, we need to support it. So that was, that was clearly a thread that we were hearing as well.

Speaker 1: [51:27](#) Okay. Enough out of me. I know that that was kind of a rambling summary there. There's a whole lot of material and it needs more boiling down, but I hope I've at least given you, um, you know, some of the, some of the major threads of the discussion and, and some of the key topics that were emerging. I think what I'll do before I invite questions is, uh, I'll just offer those who were at one of the round tables, the opportunity to jump in and say that I horribly misrepresented what was going on or something. Any tapers. I see actual nods. Okay. I'm good. Thank you. Cause I was, I was kind of nervous about doing this. I haven't had a lot of time to, you know, just sit back and reflect since the round table. Okay. Questions about what we heard or anything else related to this that I can try and feel? Yes. Um, thank you all for coming. I hope this was helpful.

Speaker 2:

[52:40](#)

[inaudible].