

Questionnaire for effective exchange of metadata – current status of publishing houses

In 2011, important priorities were set in order to realise green publications in the open access movement in Germany. With financial support from the German Research Foundation (DFG), libraries negotiated Alliance Licenses with publishers that guarantee special open access rights:

Guidelines for the Purchase of Licences funded by the DFG, section B. Open-Access Rules Negotiated Open Access Rights: <https://www.nationallizenzen.de/open-access>

A new DFG project called DeepGreen aims to realise better usage of these rights. Together with publishers who offer Alliance Licenses and authorized libraries, the project group intends to develop a prototype of a nearly fully automated workflow that covers the delivery of data from the publishers, including the article full texts, as well as the process of loading data into the institutional repositories of licensees. An intermediate dark archive serves as a distribution platform.

The project group aims to become acquainted with publishers' processes for exchanging documents and metadata. For this purpose, we would like to ask you to complete the following questionnaire and take part in a campaign.

B6. 2.4. Are the metadata files deleted after a certain period of time?

** Please indicate the deleting frequencies in the comment field (e. g. after x days / by the next frequency of exchange / by another frequency / by an update file / by a batch deletion process / when storage capacity is exhausted / on demand, etc).*

Yes*

No

Teil C: Publication File Exchange

Questions regarding publication file (full text files such as article PDF, EPUB, html, etc.) exchange processes and workflows.

C1. Which method of file exchange (full text files such as PDFs, not metadata) or interface is used? *Multiple answers possible.*

Please tell us your currently used version of the protocol or standard in the field at the right (e. g. SWORD Version 1.0, OAI-PMH Version 2.0, SRU Version 1.2, etc.).

We also show an interest in knowing the URI of your interface(s) to conduct some technical tests. If you feel comfortable with this, please tell us the URI.

You can also e-mail us some test data packages, if you don't have an interface for file exchange yet. Please give us the e-mail address to pass it through the spam filter.

OAI-PMH. Please indicate your version:

WebDav.

SRU (Search/Retrieve via URL). Please indicate your version:

SWORD. Please indicate your version:

HTTP(S) manual retrieval via login-based web form (e. g. under an institutional member section on your website). Please specify the URI of the web form:

HTTP(S) server retrieval. Please specify its URI:

FTP server retrieval. Please specify its URI:

Teil D: Contact Details

Please give the name of a contact person in your organisation for any questions.

- D1. 3. Are there specific staff members who are responsible for the (meta)data files and exchange processes? (E. g. regular and accessible contact partners reporting information about any changes to the metadata or publication file exchange processes to recipients like us.)**

Yes. Please tell us their contact details or URI of their contact forms:

No. Please tell us your general contact details or URI of your FAQ, imprint or general contact form:

Teil E: Metadata Format

- E1. 4. How is the metadata formatted (filetype and metadata standard, if applicable)? *Multiple answers possible.***

In some cases, you will be asked separately to provide the version of the filetype or metadata standard.

Delimiter-separated values (e. g. TSV, TAB, CSV)

Text (e. g. TXT, ODT)

Spreadsheet (e. g. XLS, XLSX, ODS)

RIS

BibTeX

HTML

XML

additionally zipped (e. g. ZIP, TAR, GZ, Z, TAZ, TGZ)

Dublin Core

MARC

MARCXML

ONIX

NISO JATS or older NLM standards

METS

MODS

XMetaDissPlus

Crossref Schema

oaf (OpenAire Format)

E19. 4.3 Is your data hosted under a web domain which represents your provider name?

** If you feel comfortable with this, please tell us the URI of the web domain in the comment field.*

This question actually concerns whether it would be possible to draw inferences about the publisher from the web domain/server which transfers metadata and/or full texts or which is visited during the harvesting process.

Yes*

No*

E20. 4.4. Besides common metadata fields (article title, author, etc.), do you support the following data fields?

**Cf. for example NISO recommended Access License and Indicators :
A Recommended Practice of the
National Information Standards Organization.**

In some cases, you will be asked separately to specify your answers.

- a) Link to standard licence terms
- b) Link to negotiated Alliance Licence terms (e. g. shorter embargo period)
- c) Funder identifier (e. g. funder name, FundRef Identifier)
- d) Author identifier (e. g. ISNI, ORCID, ResearcherID, Scopus Author ID)
- e) Author affiliation (e. g. affiliation name, Ringgold Identifier)
- f) Standard embargo information (e. g. embargo start date, length, end date)
- g) Negotiated Alliance Licence embargos (e. g. embargo start date, shorter length, end date)
- h) Standard self-archivable version (e. g. preprint, postprint version)
- i) Negotiated Alliance Licence archivable version (e. g. postprint, publisher version)

Comments

Comments

F2. Do you have any wish regarding the questionnaire or just want to tell us something?



Thank you very much for your cooperation.