Aquatic Commons Evaluation: four proposed business models (presented by the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Evaluation team, August 12, 2019)				
	1a. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository and upgrade to EPrints v3.4	**1b. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository but migrate to DSpace software.**	**2. Migrate content to the existing IODE OceanDocs repository but retain Aquatic Commons identity by having a separate DSpace community.**	**3. Create one new repository that is jointly managed by IAMSLIC, IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA with content merged from Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs**
Description	Aquatic Commons would remain as a separate repository managed by IAMSLIC and hosted by IODE. The EPrints software would be upgraded to version 3.4.	Aquatic Commons would remain as a separate repository managed by IAMSLIC and hosted by IODE. The repository would be migrated from the EPrints software to the DSpace software.	Aquatic Commons content would be migrated from its own repository that uses EPrints software to the IODE OceanDocs repository which uses DSpace. Aquatic Commons would exist as a separate DSpace community within OceanDocs and would be managed by IAMSLIC.	IAMSLIC, IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA would partner to create and jointly manage a new repository using DSpace software. Content from Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs would be migrated to the new repository and organized using DSpace communities for participating research institutions.
Governance	IAMSLIC retains complete control over the management and policies of Aquatic Commons.	IAMSLIC retains complete control over the management and policies of Aquatic Commons.	IAMSLIC retains some control over the management and policies of Aquatic Commons.	IAMSLIC works in cooperation with IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA on management and policies. Need to establish roles for each partner and a plan of action should one or more partners need to withdraw.
Scope	Aquatic Commons includes all aspects of the natural marine, estuarine/brackish and freshwater environments. OceanDocs focuses on marine research but from review of content its coverage is much broader. Two repositories is confusing.	Aquatic Commons includes all aspects of the natural marine, estuarine/brackish and freshwater environments. OceanDocs focuses on marine research but from review of content its coverage is much broader. Two repositories is confusing.	Aquatic Commons includes all aspects of the natural marine, estuarine/brackish and freshwater environments. OceanDocs focuses on marine research but from review of content its coverage is much broader. Both could be searched together through the one DSpace instance.	One repository that includes all aspects of the marine, estuarine/brackish and freshwater environments, including ocean research and fisheries.
Branding	Aquatic Commons maintains a separate identity.	Aquatic Commons maintains a separate identity.	Aquatic Commons would have its own landing page as a DSpace community with OceanDocs but would no longer have its own domain. It may be possible to embed DSpace content into an IAMSLIC webpage but this would likely require programming.	IAMSLIC would no longer have its own repository but would instead be identified as a partner.

Aquatic Commons Evaluation: four proposed business models (presented by the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Evaluation team, August 12, 2019)				
	1a. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository and upgrade to EPrints v3.4	**1b. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository but migrate to DSpace software.**	**2. Migrate content to the existing IODE OceanDocs repository but retain Aquatic Commons identity by having a separate DSpace community.**	**3. Create one new repository that is jointly managed by IAMSLIC, IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA with content merged from Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs**
Costs (migration, maintenance)	Upgrading to the new version of EPrints will only take about 4 full days to be operational but this is a costly model with respect to ongoing maintenance (e.g. server updates, software updates, monitoring, special requests).	This model will cost at least double that of model 1a due to initial installation and migration to DSpace as well as ongoing maintenance (e.g. server updates, software updates, monitoring, special requests).	Although content must be migrated to the DSpace installation at IODE, there are no installation costs, and maintenance costs (e.g. server updates, software updates, monitoring, special requests) would be shared.	This model would require an initial investment by all partners to set up the joint repository and migrate content from eprints to Dspace but future shared maintenance costs (e.g. server updates, software updates, monitoring, special requests) would be reduced. For this model, ASFA would consider providing ongoing financial support (subject to approval by the ASFA Board).
Software and technical Support	IODE maintains both the eprints installation for Aquatic Commons and DSpace installations for OceanDocs and OceanBestPractices requiring upgrades and developments to be done on two different types of software.	IODE already runs DSpace for OceanDocs and OceanBest Practices. Although migrating Aquatic Commons to a common piece of software may streamline the expertise required, it is still costly to maintain a separate DSpace installation.	IODE already runs DSpace for OceanDocs and OceanBest Practices which means Aquatic Commons would benefit from future upgrades and development. In addition, IAMSLIC has a strong DSpace community which would facilitate transition and use of the new software.	IODE could focus efforts on upgrading and maintaining one publications repository with possible integration from records in the ASFA index to full text in the DSpace repository.

Aquatic Commons Evaluation: four proposed business models (presented by the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Evaluation team, August 12, 2019)

	1a. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository and upgrade to EPrints v3.4	1b. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository but migrate to DSpace software.	2. Migrate content to the existing IODE OceanDocs repository but retain Aquatic Commons identity by having a separate DSpace community.	3. Create one new repository that is jointly managed by IAMSLIC, IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA with content merged from Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs
Effort by editors and/or repository administrators	Aquatic Commons is managed by a Board that focuses on content recruitment, training and policies, and an editorial team who reviews deposits. OceanDocs governance is through the standard IODE project structure with a Steering Group advising a Project Manager and Technical Manager on content recruitment, training, policies and technical development. Editorial review is lead by the Project Manager but increasingly editorial responsibilities are assigned to the organizations, so that they feel OceanDocs is their own institutional repository. Even so, at the higher level, this means that a small community of individuals are operating two similar repositories.	Aquatic Commons is managed by a Board that focuses on content recruitment, training and policies, and an editorial team who reviews deposits. OceanDocs governance is through the standard IODE project structure with a Steering Group advising a Project Manager and Technical Manager on content recruitment, training, policies, and technical development. Editorial review is lead by the Project Manager but increasingly editorial responsibilities are assigned to the organizations, so that they feel OceanDocs is their own institutional repository. Even so, at the higher level, this means that a small community of individuals are operating two similar repositories.	This model does not resolve the issue of duplication of effort unless the Aquatic Commons Board and OceanDocs Steering Committee work together on policy development, content recruitment, metadata, training, editorial work.	Leverage the strengths of its partners and reduce duplication of efforts on policy development, content recruitment, metadata, training, editorial work.
Effort by depositors	Depositors must decide where to submit publications. Some choose to deposit the same publication in both Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs, creating duplication of effort for themselves and editors. Other depositors base the decision on scope, depositing publications related to the marine environment in OceanDocs and those on other topics in Aquatic Commons, thus fragmenting an organization's work.	Depositors must decide where to submit publications. Some choose to deposit the same publication in both Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs, creating duplication of effort for themselves and editors. Other depositors base the decision on scope, depositing publications related to the marine environment in OceanDocs and those on other topics in Aquatic Commons, thus fragmenting an organization's work.	A depositor could deposit a publication into one DSpace community and map it to the second one if desired.	A depositor could deposit into one repository.

Aquatic Commons Evaluation: four proposed business models (presented by the IAMSLIC Aquatic Commons Evaluation team, August 12, 2019)				
	1a. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository and upgrade to EPrints v3.4	**1b. Maintain Aquatic Commons as a separate repository but migrate to DSpace software.**	**2. Migrate content to the existing IODE OceanDocs repository but retain Aquatic Commons identity by having a separate DSpace community.**	**3. Create one new repository that is jointly managed by IAMSLIC, IODE and possibly FAO-ASFA with content merged from Aquatic Commons and OceanDocs**
End users	Need to search two repositories.	Need to search two repositories.	Ability to search Aquatic Commons and other OceanDocs communities simultaneously.	One repository to search.