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1. The validation workflow

The validation process on the Iris platform consists of verifying the data entered by authors before they are shown publicly on the Iris Unipa Institutional Repository (www.iris.unipa.it). This is a process aimed at ensuring the quality of the data shown, both to maximise its dissemination and impact and to optimise its use for internal assessment campaigns and ones outside the University.

The validation workflow takes place through departmental grouping and comprises two stages:

- The first (WF1), which consists of a technical control managed by the librarian identified from the members of the working group (set up under Article 6 of the University Regulation for the Deposit of Publications in the Institutional Repository and for Open Access to Scientific Literature), includes: a check on the type identified by the author, the correctness and completeness of the metadata entered (year, authors, volume, issue, identifier codes, etc.) and the choice of option for dissemination of the file or files uploaded.

- The second (WF2) is a final validation, managed by the Directors of Department and/or their representatives, which will determine the publication of the product card on the Iris public portal (www.iris.unipa.it) and the sending of the metadata and the pdf to the authors’ LoginMiur personal pages.

It is possible to “refuse the product in both stages, justifying the choice.

2. Products desktop in departmental view

Once the self-archiving process has been completed by the authors, the persons involved and assigned to carrying out the validation workflow are alerted by an automatically generated email.

At the same time, in the Department products desktop (Desktop prodotti / My DSpace), the data summarising the product will be visible in a box called “Incarichi disponibili” (Available tasks).
The “My tasks” box gathers together all the products that the authorised user (librarian and Director) has taken on without completing the process.

NB: If one of the persons (librarian and Director) involved in the validation does not complete his/her task, the product will be directed to that box (personal and distinct for the individual librarian and the Director) and will no longer be available to any other departmental validators (librarians and the Director’s representatives). It is therefore highly recommended to finish the validation once the product has been taken on or, alternatively send it to the pool (See section 6 Other buttons).

The “Bitstream da validare” (Bitstream to be validated) box gathers together the products that have annexed files to validate. You can intervene very quickly from here.

The “Riconoscimenti da validare” (Identification to be approved) box gathers together all the products in the departmental collection with regard to which the authors affiliated with the department request acknowledgement. This must be managed by the Director of the Department. Non-acknowledgement of the author usually generates duplicates.

You can deduce what step the product is in from the “Stato del lavoro” (Workflow status) column:

- **da validare (step 1)** (to be validated (step 1)): the product must undergo technical control (WF1) by the librarian;
- **da validare (step 2)** (to be validated (step 2)): the product must undergo final validation (WF2) by the Director of the department and/or his/her representative.

If you click on the wheel in the “Azioni” (Actions) column, you can “Accettare l’incarico” (accept the task).
3. Validation workflow, step 1 (WF1)

This part of the workflow comprises a technical assessment of the scientific products and is carried out by the librarian(s) assigned to the individual department. It is a very important moment where:

- verification is made that the product actually belongs to the type chosen;
- one goes ahead with verifying/amending/supplementing the product’s descriptive metadata;
- the correct access mode for the annex is selected and is in line with both the editorial policies and the choice of the individual author regarding adherence to the University Regulation for the Deposit of Publications in the Institutional Repository and for Open Access to Scientific Literature

Once the controls regarding the metadata have been carried out, the pdf is then validated and the workflow product is sent to validation step 2, typically carried out by the Director of the Department and/or his/her representative.

**NB:** authorisation for the possibility of both steps being managed by the reference librarian, subject to the proxy being granted by the Director of the department, a format of which is available – ANNEX 1.

The librarian takes on the products in the department desktop that are marked by the workflow status

If you click on the wheel in the “Azioni” (Actions) column, you can go ahead and accept the task.

At this point, you have a view of:

1) the set of all the metadata in the product card (by way of example, see the figure shown below):

Support for research and dissemination of scientific knowledge Section
Piazza Sant’Antonino, 1 – 90134 Palermo
serviziricerca@unipa.it
http://www.unipa.it/biblioteche/
2) the summary table for the self-archived file(s) with their characteristics

3) a set of buttons from where you can carry out some operations on the product card (See section 6 Other buttons).

4. Validation workflow, step 1 (WF1): method

This activity is carried out by the reference librarian who, after inspecting the metadata in the summary and examining the pdf, must ALWAYS carry out the following steps:

4.1 First Step WF1: click on the “Modifica metadati” (Edit metadata) button

When you enter the product card and scroll through the descriptive screens, you can:

- Make any corrections and/or additions (e.g. correction of the product type – for which See section 4.1.2 Change product type - entering DOI, volume, issue, etc.). A more detailed analysis of the metadata allows a more precise correction and/or addition.
- Have important information on the choice made by the author regarding adherence to the University Policy for open access and the editorial clauses signed:
The author must make his/her choice regarding Adherence to the University Policy on open access during the self-archiving workflow.

The author must therefore select one of the items in the agreement with the publisher field and/or fill in the related self-certification.

It appears appropriate to recall some passages in the University Regulation for the Deposit of Publications in the Institutional Repository and for Open Access to Scientific Literature, and in particular Article 7, sub-paragraph 4, “During the online self-archiving process, the researcher is explicitly required to decide whether he/she wants to join the University’s OA policy. In case of a refusal to agree on the OA policy, the author will nevertheless be subject to deposit the metadata and files of his/her publications in the repository. The files uploaded on to the repository will not be accessible to the public, except for the provisions of subparagraph 5 here below.” And sections 4 and 5 of Article 8, which specify: “4. If the author, in the act of self-archiving his/her scientific works, refuses to join the OA policy, access to the files uploaded on to the repository will be restricted, so that only the descriptive metadata will be shown to the public. In such a case, the full-text version of the contribution, nevertheless, shall always be available to the author/s. The files may also be handled by a few authorized people (system administrator, members of the Working group), exclusively for those administration and conservation purposes, including internal and national research assessment procedures, for which author/s explicitly allow their use. 5. If the author joins the OA policy, members in the Working group will operate the validation process, that is:

a) where the research paper has originally been published in OA mode, the publisher’s digital version will always be accessible;
b) when the publisher is listed in Sherpa-ROMEO or similar directories, members in the Working group will comply with the individual publisher’s policy on copyright and OA self-archiving as
indicated for each journal (publisher’s final version, post-print, pre-print);
c) if the publisher is not listed in Sherpa-ROMEO or similar directories, the research offices and the librarians will comply with the terms of existing contracts with the publisher, that the author must disclose to University when self-archiving the contribution.”

- Select the access policy for the file – Load
The access policy for the file will be the default at this stage, “Solo gestori archivio” (Administrator). It will be the task of the librarian, based on the editorial agreements signed by the author, on consultation of the reference databases (Sherpa Romeo, OA@unito.it) and on whether the author has chosen to adhere to the Regulations, to proceed, by clicking the “Modifica” (Edit) button, with selecting the access policy for the file (OA (open access), Solo gestori archivio (Administrators), Embargo).

NB: if the author has clicked on “NON aderisco alla policy” (I DECLINE the policy) the possibility of making modifications on the access policy will be inhibited. It should also be specified that if the author declines the policy, he/she will not be obliged to provide information on the terms of his/her agreement with the publisher and will be able to select the item “Non ho aderito alla policy open access dell’Ateneo” (I have declined the University’s open access policy) in the field called “Accordo con l’editore” (Agreement with publisher) on the menu.

If you click on the “Modifica” (Edit) button, you can proceed to select the policy from the drop-down menu and save it:
Particular attention must be paid in this stage to:

- Checking the consistency of the selected file “Tipologia” (Type) with the uploaded pdf (remember that the possible entries are: Pre-print, Post-print, Versione editorial (Publisher’s version), Altro material (Other material), Tesi di dottorato (Doctoral thesis), Contratto con l’editore (Contract with the publisher)).

- Any content in the “note” (notes) field (e.g. request for embargo or exception See section 4.1.1 Notes on embargoes).

- The choice made for sending the file to the Lecturer Site (LoginMiur).
NB: If the author has entered the file for the contract with the publisher in pdf format, the selection for sending to the Lecturer Site (Login MIUR) must be Invio Sito Docente = NO.

You then proceed with verifying the data entered and conclude.

4.1.1 Notes on embargoes

As provided for by Article 11 of the Regulations, the author has the possibility of requesting an embargo during the self-archiving workflow, if this cannot be detected from the publication itself, by filling in a box dedicated to this, which is positioned in the “Carica” (Upload) step (i.e. the one reserved for uploading the pdf). As an aid to the compilation, operating instructions (see ANNEX 2) have been prepared.

The validator reads any request of the author in the summary area containing the information in the notes field in the “file” column, as shown in the figure below.

If the librarian must manage the policy with an embargo, with a click on the “Modifica” (Edit) button
(See section 4.1 First step: click on the Edit metadata button) he/she selects the related item in the drop-down menu. This will make a calendar appear in which he/she must select the date for the end of the embargo.

4.1.2 Change of product type

The product type is always visible in the descriptive screens, at the top of the page, as shown in the figure.

If, from the controls made, the librarian finds an error in choice of product type selected, he/she can:

- proceed with making the change of type, if he/she has any information to add or there are no additions needed (in this case he/she must inform the data controller via OTRS)
- or, where the author must intervene, the librarian will proceed with refusing the entry and communicate the reasons for this via the appropriate box.
4.2 Second Step WF1: click on the “Disseminazione files” (Files dissemination) button

If you click on the “Disseminazione files” (Files dissemination) button, you can go ahead and validate the full-text. This indicates that the access policy for the file (Open Access, Solo gestori archivio (Administrators), Embargo) has been checked and correctly selected.

If you click on the button, one or two summary tables open and, in both cases, move the cursor onto the item “Validato” (validated, definitive) in the “Info validazione” (Validation info) column and click on “Salva” (Save).

NB: If the author has entered the file for the contract with the publisher in pdf format, the selection in the “Info validazione” (Validation Info) column for sending to the Lecturer Site (Login MIUR) must be “Non validato” (Not validated). This will prevent the file from being displayed on the public portal.
At this point, you return to the card view, including the summary string for the file. To continue, you must click on the “esegui l’incarico” (Execute task) button at the top of the card, as shown in the figure.

Only in the case of extreme necessity, where the validation of the card is complex and requires in-depth investigation, can you select “Non validato” (Not validated) and continue with the validation of the metadata, in effect advancing the product validation workflow to step 2. The Director of the Department may equally proceed with the product metadata, which will be shown on the public portal. The pdf will have a different fate and will remain blacked out on the public portal until the librarian has validated it. The product will only be put forward again for validation if the librarian has to intervene on the pdf dissemination options (selection other than default, Solo gestori archivio (Administrators)).

NB: In this case, it is essential that the librarian bears in mind the necessity to return to the product to validate the file and its dissemination.

4.3 Third Step WF1: click on the “Approva” (Approve) button

Once the technical control on the metadata has been carried out and the pdf has been validated, the librarian can go ahead with approving the product. When you click on the “Approva” (Approve) button, the settings for the dissemination of the card must be chosen. In this case, the librarian MUST select the item “Scheda non visibile” (Item not visible) and click on the green Approva (Approve) button.
The product is thus transferred to WF2 and processed for final entry in the archive and sending to Login Miur (Lecturer Site).
5. Validation workflow, step 2 (WF2)

Once WF1 is completed, the product returns to the departmental products desktop and is identified by the workflow status (to be validated (STEP 2)).

This stage of the workflow is the responsibility of the Director of the Department or his/her representative who has the task of proceeding with the final validation of the product, which is thus shown on the public portal of the Institutional Repository of the University of Palermo and sent to the authors’ LoginMiur personal pages.

If you click on the wheel in the “Azioni” (Actions) column, you can go ahead and accept the task.

At this point, you have a view of:

1) the set of all the metadata in the product card (already checked, corrected and supplemented in WF1):

2) the summary table for the file or files with the related characteristics (including the validation info for the pdf)

3) a set of buttons (See section 6 Other buttons) from where you can perform some operations
on the product card.

Once the necessary checks have been made, the Director of the Department or his/her representative proceeds by clicking the green Approva (Approve) button and selecting the “Scheda visibile” (Item visible) dissemination option.

At this point, the product will be assigned a lasting identifier hand (10447/XXXXXX).

After approval, the product will be published on the public portal and sent to LoginMiur.

The Director will normally manage the products with pdfs validated by the librarian (i.e. marked in the file information summary string by the green “Validated” tick – as shown in the figure). In this case, it is a product, the access policy of which has been checked and selected.

Only in extreme cases, where the librarian has come up against controversial situations or ones that are not easily resolved, will the Director find the item Non validato (Not validated) as Info validazione (Validation Info).

If needs be, the Director may in any case go ahead with approving the product, of which only the metadata will be shown on the public portal.
On the other hand, the sending of the metadata and pdf to LoginMiur is released by validation.

If the Director of the Department or his/her representative does not intend to accept to
product definitively, he/she can click on the (reject) button, justifying the choice by filling in appropriate box.

6. Other buttons
There are also the following buttons on the summary page from which you proceed with approving or refusing the validation of a product

(after): Allows you to temporarily suspend the activity. The product will remain a task of the user who made that choice can be found in the “My tasks” box.

NB: The product will not be visible to the other users enabled for departmental management.

(return task to pool): Allows you send the activity back to the “Incarichi disponibili” (Items to be validated)” box so that another user can carry out the operation.
WORKFLOW GRAPHICS
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Workflow Step 1

The librarian receives an email notifying the end of self-archiving

The librarian accepts the task marked by workflow status "Step 1" from the list of "Available tasks"

Displays metadata summary

Displays the PDF checking that it corresponds to the type chosen by the author (publisher's version, pre-print, post-print)

Clicks on edit metadata

Scrolls the descriptive screens making any corrections/additions (vol., issue, bibliographic codes, DOI, etc.)

Checks the author's choice regarding adherence to the regulations

Checks the terms of the contract with the publisher

Selects the correct access policy (for the file corresponding to the contract with the publisher selects "Administrators" and for transfer to LoginMIUR "No")

Clicks on "Files dissemination"

Once all the checks have been carried out and finalised, moves the selection onto "Validated" (for the file corresponding to the contract with the publisher moves the selection onto "Not validated")

Clicks on "Approva" (Approve) leaving the dissemination option selection on "Card NOT visible"

The product is sent to WF2 (it is not shown in the public catalogue and is not sent to LoginMIUR)
Validation workflow, Step 2

The Director of Department or his/her representative accepts the task marked by workflow status "Step 2" from the list of "Available tasks" in the products desktop.

Performs the controls on the product card.

Checks that the validation info files are on "Validated".

Approves choosing "Card visible" as dissemination option.

Publication on public portal and allocation of handle.

Sending to LoginMIUR.

End of workflow.
ANNEX 1 – FORM FOR GRANTING PROXY FOR RESEARCH PRODUCT VALIDATION WF2

To the Coordinators of the Working Group for the management of the Institutional Repository and open access

To the manager of the Research Records and Relations with CINECA OU

To the Librarian .................................................................

Re: Validation workflow for research products in Iris Unipa - Granting of WF2 Proxy

The undersigned Prof. .................................................., Director pro tempore of the Department ................................................................., Director pro tempore of the Department grants the librarian ................................................................. proxy, assigned with Decree of the Rector 1661/2018 prot. no. 42128 of 08.06.2018 as amended for the above-mentioned Department, to carry out the activities linked to WF2 of the research product validation workflow in Iris Unipa.

Palermo,

Signature
ANNEX 2

Instructions for the embargo of research products

The embargo is a period of time after the publication of a scientific contribution during which full-text access to the file archived in the repository is restricted by University only for purposes of official research evaluation and/or for other administrative and managing purposes.

The embargo can be applied for in specific circumstances (e.g.: dissertation subject to agreements with publishers and/or external research financers; public/national security reasons; privacy or sensitive data; a patent in course of publication).

The embargo, if it is not mentioned in the research product itself, must be communicated by the author to the Working Group in order to check the correct policy for access in the Institutional Repository.

Except specific agreements in place with publishers and/or external research financers, the embargo period will range from six to twelve months (which may be extended until twenty-four months under exceptional reasons), then the contribution will be openly accessible in the repository.