

*To improve  
the quality of research  
conducted in developing  
countries to help advance  
higher education, inform  
public policy decisions,  
and prepare  
tomorrow's  
leaders.*

BEYOND  
THE 2015  
HORIZON



*Research4Life is a collaborative initiative based on a public-private partnership. Research4Life aims to improve the quality of research conducted in developing countries to help advance higher education, inform public policy decisions, and prepare tomorrow's leaders. Through a group of thematic web portals, Research4Life provides free or low-cost online access to a rich set of online scientific published literature, including subscription-based and open access information resources, in topical areas supporting the improvement of quality of life for the benefit of university, research, and policy institutions in more than 100 low-income countries. It also supports the effective use of these research materials among academics, students, and government personnel by providing training in information literacy skills, and promoting local authorship to help researchers in developing countries to participate in the achievements of the global scientific community.*

The image features a solid blue background. In the upper left quadrant, there is a complex, abstract graphic composed of several thin, white, overlapping lines that form a series of interconnected, rounded shapes, resembling a stylized leaf or a modern logo. The lines are smooth and fluid, creating a sense of movement and depth.

BEYOND  
THE 2015  
HORIZON



© WHO collection

## The development environment



***Scientific research is critical to advance higher education, improve the work of development practitioners & inform public policy decisions.***

and much scientific research conducted in developing countries reflects this. Researchers, policy-makers, clinicians, students and teachers working in developing countries have historically suffered from a lack of access to up-to-date scientific literature, essential for furthering studies, discovering evidence, sharing findings, teaching, practice, and public policy. Frequently the scholarly materials available in developing country institutions are insufficient and outdated. Where available, Internet access has helped bring content and communications into developing countries, including the most current and relevant scholarly journals. Subscription-based journals remain the most important source of high-quality scientific information for the research community, yet

**Scientific research in developing countries:**

Scientific research is critical to advance higher education, improve the work of development practitioners, inform public policy decisions, and prepare tomorrow's leaders. However, the world's poorest countries are too often left out of the global scientific community,

most libraries and research organizations in low-income countries do not have the budgets to pay for important peer-reviewed journals, a resource fundamental to the work undertaken in these very institutions. The Research4Life initiative is helping to address this problem by providing free or low-cost access to subscription information resources and a portal for scientific literature access to publicly-funded institutions in the world's poorest countries.

**The higher education environment in developing countries:**

Many see higher education as a critical frontline to improve the development environment in low and middle income countries, where tomorrow's leaders in the public and private sectors are trained and new ideas are advanced. Education is the crossroads where people interact with their peers around the world, especially in the age of the Internet. New opportunities for international collaboration are available. And there is growing recognition of what developing country researchers have to offer to their peers in other countries (so called "south-to-south" and "south-to-north" exchange). Improving the quality of and capacity for rigorous local research is a key aspect of improving higher education opportunities in developing countries.



© WHO / Stephenie Hollyman

## The Research4Life Offer

Currently, Research4Life comprises four programmes:

HINARI – the programme for Access to Research in Health ([www.who.int/hinari](http://www.who.int/hinari)) led by the World Health Organization (WHO) was launched in January 2002, and includes 8,100 biomedical and related social science information resources from 150 publisher partners.

AGORA – the Access to Global Online Research in Agriculture programme ([www.aginternetwork.org](http://www.aginternetwork.org)) led by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) was launched in October 2003, and includes more than 2,500 agriculture, food, fisheries and related sciences information resources from more than 75 publishers.

OARE – the Online Access to Research in the Environment programme ([www.oaresciences.org](http://www.oaresciences.org)) led by the United Nations Environment Programme was launched in October 2006, and includes 3,900 journals and other resources in environmental science literature from more than 75 publishers.

ARDI – the Access to Research for Development and Innovation programme (<http://www.wipo.int/ardi>) led by the

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was launched in July 2009, and includes 200 journals and other resources on innovation from more than 12 publishers.

Most of the world's leading scientific journal publishers participate in the programmes, and the total value of access to the three collections is estimated to be in excess of US\$ 7,000,000 per year – a resource which had previously been confined mainly to institutions with the ability to pay.

Other Research4Life programmes may be adopted in the future as thematic areas with appropriate partnership support emerge.

For all three programmes, most countries with a GNI per capita at or less than \$1,600 (Group A Countries) are entitled to access the scientific resources for free. Most countries with a GNI per capita between \$1,600 and \$4,700 (Group B Countries) are entitled to access the journals if they pay \$1,000 per institution per year for access. These Group B funds are collected and used by the UN agencies for outreach activities related to training and promotion. Research4Life will review and change these eligibility criteria as the contextual environment evolves.

# The Research4Life Partnership

## Research4Life Governance Structures and Mechanisms:

The Research4Life partnership currently comprises the following core partner organizations:

**Content Providers:** Individual Publishers (of varying types and levels of engagement beyond content contribution), International Association of Scientific Technical and Medical (STM) Publishers

**Programme Coordinators:** FAO, UNEP, WHO, and WIPO.

**University Partners:** Cornell University (Mann Library), Yale University (University Library and School of Forestry and Environmental Studies)

**Training:** Information Training and Outreach Center for Africa (ITOCA), "Librarians without Borders" (®/Medical Library Association, USA)

**Service and Technical:** Microsoft Corporation, National Library of Medicine (US), Swets Information Services, Ex Libris

**Funding:** Carnegie Corporation; Department for International Development (UK); the Elsevier Foundation; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; the Rockefeller Foundation.

The extensive roster of Research4Life beneficiaries comprises education, research, and government/policy and service institutions from the public sector and civil society in developing countries across the world.

There are no formal or contractual relationships between any of the groups of partners involved in Research4Life. Governance is as simple and as efficiently structured as possible, with progress monitored and future developments agreed collegially at partner meetings. The highest level structure is the annual **General Partners Meeting**, with appropriate representation of all types of stakeholders, as well as user groups. This is the governing and authoritative body of Research4Life, and decisions on major policy issues are taken at these meetings. The Meeting designates temporary teams to address particular strategic and tactical issues. In addition to the General Partners Meeting, a small **Executive Council** representing the major contributing partners makes ongoing operational decisions between General Partners Meetings. This Executive Council oversees the implementation of decisions made by the General Partners Meeting and can make operational decisions within guidelines agreed by that Meeting. The publisher partners designate a representative to undertake the role of **Publisher Liaison** in Research4Life. This person, representing all the publishers with involvement in any of the programmes, is an ex officio member of the Executive Council and the Group B Revenue and Finance Team. The role is currently funded by and under the supervision of the International Association of STM Publishers.

## Delivery And Operations

Each of the four Research4Life programmes has its own mix of partners and resources for support of its activities. The partners in each programme provide sufficient inputs from their own staff to handle registrations and user support, the programme websites, and general inquiries. The nature of the unique subject matter covered by each programme necessitates specialized approaches to selecting content, subject categorization, and other relevant activities. In addition, each programme is organically embedded in its sponsoring UN agency (FAO, UNEP, WHO and WIPO), and they have a strong mandates from their member countries to make the necessary resources available.

The programmes have unity of vision and approach in many aspects, such as the guidelines for publisher engagement, in the standardized offerings such as the list of eligible countries, and are gradually creating a shared systems architecture for user access to content (authentication, search, and web platforms), and administration.

Several **Teams**, which are assigned particular responsibilities by the Executive Council, convene as required and report back to the Council. These may be permanent or temporary and at present include: Authentication, Search, Group B Revenue and Finance, Public Relations and Marketing, Usage Statistics, Training, and Fundraising.

In summary, the operational functions and tasks for the Research4Life programmes that are

distributed amongst the partners are:

- user administration, communication, and support;
- technical systems and services (development and maintenance of authentication, registration and helpdesk platform, portal software systems, unified search platform, usage statistics collecting, link resolution, and IT infrastructure);
- content acquisition and management for the Research4Life programmes (identification of new publications, negotiation with publishers, and bibliographic management);
- advocacy, public relations, marketing and communication, and training;
- finance and accounting;
- resource mobilization;
- monitoring and evaluation.

Some of these are not best served by the current decentralized and in-kind contributions of partners, and alternative means of operations and delivery will be explored for some these activities. The areas mostly likely to be targeted for a more coordinated approach, perhaps through a Programme Office, would be: (a) advocacy, public relations, marketing and communication; and (b) technical systems and services.

## Financing

The financial outlook of the programmes reflects Research4Life's first two Strategic Objectives. The first comprises the core activities that allow the information content of the programmes to be made available to eligible organizations. The second comprises the outreach and added value services.

### Core partners' contributions/costs:

The total annual value of the resources employed by the various partners on the core activities of Research4Life is around \$2.9 million per annum (2010 Infrastructure Review), as shown in Table 1. The partners are pledged to continue these inputs for the foreseeable future. The UN agencies (WHO, FAO, UNEP and WIPO) are reasonably confident that their budgets are basically secure. The International Association of STM Publishers, which has borne the cost of coordinating the publishers' input into the programmes, has indicated its long term support of the programmes.

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Publishers                                     | 573              |
| WHO  | 642              |
| FAO  | 270              |
| UNEP   | 230              |
| WIPO   | 180              |
| Yale University                                | 210              |
| Cornell University<br>- Mann Library           | 126 <sup>1</sup> |
| International Association<br>of STM Publishers | 185              |
| Microsoft                                      | 510              |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>2936</b>      |

**Table 1:** Estimated annual value of resources employed by partners on Research4Life (\$000) from the 2010 Infrastructure Review

### Expanding the programmes' reach:

The second Strategic Objective has considerable potential costs associated with it, and funding is not assured by the partners' themselves. The Research4Life partners have identified priority activities in the Strategic Plan such as for outreach including communications and training, technical developments, and advocacy. In general, the partners' own activities in these areas can be scaled up or down according to the resources that are available. However,

there is one principal cost centre for which the partners are anxious to ensure funding for the foreseeable future, namely ITOCA, which conducts a considerable outreach programme in Africa. There are no similar collaborating organizations in regions other than Africa, and arrangements elsewhere are more ad-hoc.

The one reasonably reliable source of revenue to cover these costs is the Band 2 revenues as mentioned above, which the publishers have agreed can be used for outreach and other related activities. This revenue amounted to around \$250,000 per annum in 2009 and 2010, with the majority derived from HINARI. Band 2 revenues are being used to partially support ITOCA's activities in Africa, as well as outreach and training activities in other regions. In relation to the findings of the 2010 Reviews, the Research4Life partners are reconsidering the terms for access and eligibility under Band 2, including the process of revenue collection, and there may be some impact on the level of income from Band 2.

However, substantially larger sums have been raised from external sources of funding, but such sources are transitory and to a certain extent unpredictable. Contributions have been made to the programmes by organizations such as the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), and charitable foundations (see below). The partners will continue to make efforts to raise funding from such sources to fulfil requirements, and they will leverage in-kind contributions through other partnerships.

## The 2010 Reviews

Close collaboration has distinguished the Research4Life programmes since the earliest days of HINARI in 2000. During 2006 two independent reviews looked at how HINARI and AGORA<sup>2</sup> were working, both for the users and for the participating organizations. As a result of these reviews, the partners decided to continue these programmes in line with the time span of the UN's eight Millennium

Development Goals, due for implementation by 2015.

In 2010 HINARI, AGORA and now OARE were reviewed again: a user experience review was conducted by Edmond Gaible of the Natoma Group, while an infrastructure review was conducted by Mark Ware Consulting, as it had been in 2006. The 2010 reviews were commissioned to identify successes, impacts, and challenges for the future of Research4Life. At the General Partners' Meeting in mid-2010,

<sup>1</sup> This figure includes project funds provided to ITOCA

<sup>2</sup> OARE was launched in October 2006 after the HINARI-AGORA reviews were finalized.



the stakeholders authorized the preparation of a revision of the Strategic Plan developed in 2007. This reworked Strategic Plan defines the partners' roadmap for the next 10 years that will build on the successes so far and address the main challenges. The broad aims are to reinforce Research4Life's positive impacts, to establish a secure institutional and financial base for more efficient operations and sustained programme development, and to retain the informality and altruistic enthusiasm that have been the essential ingredients of success for the initiative to date.

## Key findings

### *User Experience Review*

The review's first and key finding was that Research4Life has proved an effective and highly valued provider of access to research publications in subscribing institutions; indeed it is the primary means of access to research publications in developing countries today.

As might be expected in a situation where so much is being provided so rapidly in an environment where previously so little was available, a number of social, administrative, and technical challenges have been identified. Resolution of these challenges will allow an even greater leverage of Research4Life's potential to contribute to a transformation of developing country economies and community well-being, as envisaged in the UN's millennium development goals. The key findings were as follows:

- Realization of the programme's full potential impact is impeded by a lack of awareness of Research4Life within some subscribing institutions, compounded by limited interactions among users, institutional contact points, and programme personnel.
- The effectiveness of the help desks operated by the three programmes could be increased.
- Many institutions in the 42 more developed Band 2 countries find even the heavily discounted fee of \$1,000 unaffordable, even though it is a "discount" of more than 99%.
- Some institutions encounter problems accessing full text through Research4Life, and the technology architecture which underpins that access is not always clear to navigate. In particular, country exclusions by publishers can create confusion.

### *Infrastructure Review*

The review highlighted that Research4Life has established a much greater degree of organisational and strategic structure since 2005. In particular it has brought in new partners, extended AGORA to cover 42 Band 2 countries, launched OARE, expanded all three programmes in terms of content, registrations and usage, brought in Microsoft as its core technology partner, and established a process of technology development. The key findings were as follows:

- There is a demand for some "shared language" describing the goals, objectives and strategy of the programmes, together with a simple development plan (or "roadmap")
- Primary motivations of private sector partners remain grounded in a sense of corporate social responsibility but long-term market development strategies are beginning to evolve amongst some private sector partners.
- Eligibility criteria, publisher-specific country exclusions and transitions within and beyond the programmes have become significant strategic issues to resolve.
- There is support for adding additional programmes to the Research4Life portfolio.
- There is scope for improvements in the marketing and communication of the Research4Life programmes and for speedier implementation of the technology development strategy.
- There is scope for improvement in the collection of usage statistics and the development of a broader range of performance and impact measures
- There is a case for a more systematic review of systems and procedures and in particular a greater integration of the back-end systems and data which support the operation of the programmes.

Approaches have been developed or are under development to address these findings, and these have been embedded in the strategic objectives and goals that follow, forming the core of this strategy document.

## Risks To Be Addressed

The Research4Life partners have identified some risks that may affect the delivery of the programmes. Employing activities to mitigate these risks will be a key component of this overall strategy plan.

### Pace of Progress

- The partnership may not be able to achieve a workable approach to developing and responding to technological and service improvements that satisfies partners that desire more rapid changes to achieve better outcomes and that keeps less involved partners engaged and informed.

### Development and Finance

- The benefits of the programmes for many users and beneficiary institutions may continue to be restricted due to insufficient capacity in several areas (e.g. access to computers and/or the internet, information literacy) etc, thus diluting and slowing the development of an information culture that can become self-sustaining.
- All partner organizations' ability to deliver quality services through the programmes may be restricted due to financial constraints arising from the current world-wide economic climate, which is of particular concern where it affects those partners supporting the core staff working directly on the programme.
- The programmes' effectiveness may be reduced due to insufficient stable permanent funding for ongoing communications support, technology development, and significant expansion of user training.

### Content and Services

- Enhancements to the programmes' services may be hampered unless adequate technology planning and a dedicated position for technical oversight of the supporting architecture are put in place.
- Some content providers may withdraw entirely from the partnership, or reduce their content offering if flexible offering options are not introduced to accommodate market realities as the global environment matures.
- Changes in journal publishing models may have an impact on the need for the programmes.

- Growth in content offered and the number of transactions required in support of beneficiary

institutions may overwhelm the capacity of existing Research4Life programme staff.

### Partnership

- Personnel turnover within partner organizations may create gaps in commitment or enthusiasm levels from the mix of individuals involved.
- Tensions may arise between partners adhering to a solely altruistic vision and others with multiple goals that include market development.
- Individual partner organizations may develop new strategic directions that do not include a strong engagement in a development initiative of this nature.
- A shift from dependence on individual investment and voluntary enthusiasm to a larger and more formal organization may not run smoothly in parallel with a growth in stable funding and central shared staffing.
- Expansion in the number of Research4Life programmes may overwhelm the capacity of existing partners to absorb and provide knowledge transfer.



# Research4Life Strategic Plan

**Our Vision:** *In a world that is increasingly digital, the partners participating in Research4Life seek to enhance research by connecting academics, researchers and policy makers in low and middle income countries with online research and scholarly information. The goal of this initiative is to improve the basic quality of life and achieve sustainable development in these countries.*

**Mission:** *To provide and support access to research and scholarly information for those in the world least able to afford it.*

## Strategic Objective I:

### *Assuring the programmes' delivery (with core resources)*

*direct link-resolution to full text between different resources; and (v) offering self-service usage statistics to interested parties.*

## GOAL A

**Seamless, uninterrupted access to expanding collections of research information.**

### **A.1 Ensure current and future technology architecture, including engagement of new technology partners.**

*Priority activities include: (i) ensuring authentication of valid users through access control with option(s) other than IP addresses; (ii) facilitating monitoring of usage; (iii) clearly presenting publisher-specific access restrictions; (iv) optimizing bandwidth usage, and (v) offering access to content via mobile devices or for offline use.*

### **A.2 Ensure adequate robustness and flexibility in a shared portal architecture to enable efficient user interaction and content management.**

*Priority activities include (i) improving 'intelligent' resource identification and navigational tools; (ii) improving the processes for downloading articles; (iii) improving search results to accurately reflect access within specific countries and clarity in correctly representing full text availability; (iv) enabling*

### **A.3 Streamline the user support processes and tools.**

*Priority activities include (i) streamlining registration process; (ii) achieving rapid response to access difficulties; (iii) expediting the tracking and follow-up of inactive institutions; and (iv) offering easy access to self-help and training resources.*

### **A.4 Manage expansion of content and delivery means (new information resource formats, languages, and types) available through Research4Life's subject programmes.**

*Priority activities include (i) taking care to tailor any expansion to the capacity to incorporate it without straining Research4Life's architecture, staffing or organization structure; (ii) expanding into new subject areas with care for the partnership capacity; (iii) populating the bibliographic details of the underlying databases of the technology architecture in the most efficient manner to reduce backlogs in publisher queries and new additions.*

### **A.5 Identify and implement options for enhanced transparency of content availability, greater flexibility in eligibility for access, and provide transitional access<sup>3</sup> in countries with the need for continued support.**

## GOAL B

**Measurement of performance and impact of the Research4Life programmes.**

**B.1 Measure and report on various ongoing key metrics of the performance and impact from users' and partners' perspectives.**

*The priority activity is to collect an evidence-base including: (i) citation data to*

*measure changes in journal article publishing in eligible countries comprising baseline and time-series data from the initiation of the programmes; and (ii) formal and informal narratives about use/impact of the programmes, mobilizing the experiential knowledge of users.*

**B.2 Conduct User Experience, Infrastructure, and Literature Impact Reviews in 2015.**

## Strategic Objective II:

*Expanding the programmes' reach and overcoming barriers to use*

*(e.g. statistics on amount of users and usage, announcements of new partners etc); and (ii) preparing a regular*

*communication interface for the programme partners (e.g. an Extranet), for ease of publishing executive status summaries, user statistics/data, listserv and bulletin board.*

## GOAL C

**Widespread recognition of Research4Life amongst all stakeholders by effective marketing, publicity and promotion.**

**C.1 Present Research4Life as an umbrella brand, and ensure continued visibility of associated brands/ identities for the programmes (i.e. HINARI, AGORA, OARE, and ARDI)**

*Priority activities include: (i) providing a toolkit for promotion and marketing (logos, etc) for partners to use and localize for their own efforts; (ii) developing incentives to encourage eligible institutions to promote Research4Life (e.g. Organizing a competition for Research4Life subscribers on the theme of promoting the Programmes); (iii) conducting market research on Research4Life users to enable targeting of outreach and marketing; and (iv) developing capacity for bulk e-mailing of news and announcements.*

**C.2 Share information with existing partners about the current status of the Research4Life programmes.**

*Priority activities include: (i) providing news announcements on Research4Life developments*

**C.3 Promote Research4Life and its programmes through a variety of channels<sup>4</sup>.**

*Priority activities include: (i) promoting directly to intermediaries (librarians) and to users (scientists, academics and development practitioners) in eligible countries so that institutions activate their access and increase their use, and also promote Research4Life themselves to their own colleagues; (ii) advocating to policy makers and government officials in eligible countries so that they (a) increase their support to research and higher education, and (b) increase quality and reduce cost of internet connectivity; (iii) reaching out to 'developed world' librarians and scientists, university faculty and development practitioners to gather support; (iv) communicating with the media for the purpose of increasing their coverage, including in eligible countries; and (v) interacting with the donor community to secure funding support.*

<sup>4</sup> Channels include: websites of publisher partners, editorial features and branding in Research4Life journals, e-newsletters, communities/forums of partners and users, press releases, conference sessions and exhibitions, videos, articles, posters and leaflets (in multiple languages).

## GOAL D

**Trusted education and support services that promote information literacy, improve research outcomes, and enhance information use in higher education and research settings.**

### **D.1 Mobilize user communities (i.e. librarians, academics, researchers, practitioners, policy makers) within eligible countries.**

*Priority activities include: (i) forming new communities of practice or supporting existing ones that mobilize the collective knowledge base of experiences on aspects such as training methodologies; (ii) providing a base for advocacy, using multiple approaches; such as (iii) establishing virtual community spaces through which individuals can interact by email or on the web; (iv) offering conferences and face-to-face events as a secondary (physical) dimension; and (v) providing training and learning resources on development of user communities and networks by country, region, language, and subject.*

### **D.2 Promote the development of a culture of information use in eligible countries and increase users' capacities to benefit from content made available through Research4Life.**

*Priority activities include (i) launching advocacy initiatives to reach out to 'teachers' (formal*

*or informal mentors), to government officials and to resource managers in the public sector; (ii) facilitating direct links and collaboration between institutions and individuals to connect and influence policy and practice on information use; (iii) supporting influential 'champions' for Research4Life at national and/or regional level who guide and facilitate Research4Life activities in countries (trainers, evaluators, coordinators).*

### **D.3 Develop the means to support Research4Life training in the broader context of institutional and individual information literacy through educational institutions and other settings.**

*Priority activities include: (i) expanding training and learning resources on aspects of information literacy (e.g. IMARK), including user guides for the Research4Life programmes, that can be incorporated into the medical, agricultural and environmental curriculum of educational institutions; and (ii) providing compelling evidence for policymakers, demonstrating that information literacy contributes to institutional goals, including case studies, anecdotal evidence, and good practice guidelines on how Research4Life specifically, and information literacy more generally, can help institutions conduct better research and produce more publications.*

## Strategic Objective III: Adding value to the programmes through external partnerships

### GOAL E

Leveraged partnerships at the international and national level, and with organizations with shared interests.

**E.1 Proactively seek new partners that can make contributions of various types to Research4Life (e.g. content, communications, ICT, training, outreach, administrative, bibliometric analysis, etc).**

*Priority activities include: (i) performing gap analyses to establish where new partners are required; (ii) ensuring that new partnerships reflect the priorities in the revised strategic plan; and (iii) developing a set of criteria and clear expectations to guide the process of engaging new potential partners.*

**E.2 Develop strategies to work with governments at all appropriate levels, in an effort to raise awareness about access to research information.**

**E.3 Integrate the Research4Life programmes into the activities in eligible countries of UN**

**agencies, thematic networks, development assistance agencies, telecommunications commissions, and bandwidth consortia.**

*Priority activities include: (i) acquiring support for advocacy, funding, training and capacity building, and (ii) developing support for IT infrastructure for Research4Life.*

**E.4 Engage strategically with key international players<sup>5</sup> with shared interests in relation to literature access and capacity development.**

*Priority activities include: (i) exploring opportunities and incentives for collaboration (e.g. on training, outreach, transition models, information literacy, user research, authorship skills, local publishing development, etc); (ii) examining the benefits that would accrue; and (iii) working together to develop a more holistic and synergistic view of a shared development mission.*

<sup>5</sup> Key players include: Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Co-operation (CTA), Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL), International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), International Network for Availability of Scientific Publications (INASP), etc.

# APPENDIX 1

## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF RESEARCH4LIFE 2010 REVIEWS

### USER EXPERIENCE REVIEW

| <b>A. Achievements</b>   |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Findings</b>  | <b>Recommendations</b>  |
| <p>1. Research4Life is an effective and highly valued provider of access to research publications in subscribing institutions; Research4Life can reliably be characterized as the primary means of access to research publications in developing countries today.</p>  |   |
| <b>B. Challenges</b>   |   |
| <b>Findings</b>  | <b>Recommendations</b>  |
| <p>2. Communication and awareness</p> <p>i) Lack of awareness within subscribing institutions and generally compounded by limited means of interaction among users, institutional points-of-contact and Research4Life personnel—impedes realization of the programme’s full potential impact.</p> <p>ii) Training-of-Trainer and other training measures very possibly contribute to increases in relevant search and information skills among library personnel. They are not, as currently implemented, cost effective means of building awareness.</p> <p>iii) Help Desks operated by the three Research4Life programmes are effective when these services are engaged by users; however their contribution to Research4Life use in subscribing institutions is limited by low levels of awareness among institutional points of contact.</p> | <p>a) Improve search optimization for Research4Life websites</p> <p>b) Develop capacity for bulk emailings</p> <p>c) Provide localizable resources for outreach</p> <p>d) Develop incentives for outreach</p> <p>e) Develop social-network structures using existing platforms</p> <p>f) Develop an Research4Life communications and collaboration platform</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Access and Eligibility Issues</p> <p>i) Problematic access to the full text of research articles is the single most critical challenge cited by users of all three Research4Life programmes.</p> <p>ii) Band 2, in which institutions in higher-GNI (Gross National Income) countries are required to pay subscription fees, places a burden on some participating institutions and on Research4Life programmes. Some institutions in these countries receive unequivocally improved access to research information; others cannot afford even the minimal fee required.</p> | <p>a) Publish clear policies on full-text access and exclusions</p> <p>b) Improve the accuracy of search results in relation to full-text availability</p> <p>c) Undertake, at publishers' expense, a study to determine the costs (in terms of lost revenues) and benefits (such as increased access to research information) of country-wide free-access programmes in Band 1 countries, such as Vietnam, where users currently confront significant exclusions. Publishers should then review and revise Band 1 restrictions and exclusions.</p> <p>d) Review and revise Band 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Link Band 2 status to a "basket" of indicators</li> <li>▪ Centralize Band 2 administration</li> <li>▪ Shift Band 2 from institutional payments to national payments</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

## INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW

| <b>A. Achievements</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| Findings  | Recommendations  |
| <p>4. Since the 2006 review, Research4Life has brought in new partners, launched AGORA Band 2 and OARE, expanded all three programmes in terms of content, registrations and usage, brought in a new technology partner, and established a process of technology development.</p> |  |
| <p>5. Research4Life has established a greater degree of organisational and strategic structure</p>  |  |
| <b>B. Challenges</b>  |  |
| Findings  | Recommendations  |
| <p>6. Research4Life Strategy<br/>Many partners would like to have some "shared language" describing the goals, objectives and strategy of the programmes, together with a simple development plan (or "roadmap")</p>  | <p>Develop a simple shared statement of objectives and strategy, using the previous strategic plan ("Path to 2015" (PT15) and reports of strategy meetings in 2009 and 2010) as its starting points, and also needs a shorter version (i.e. one page) that can be easily grasped and shared with other interested parties.</p> |
| <p>7. User Experience<br/>Logins to AGORA and OARE appear to have slowed or even stopped over the last 12 months.</p>   | <p>Reconfirm PT15 Objective C2, to seek feedback from users on the nature and scope of the programme services that, amongst other issues, would identify reasons for non-use</p>   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>8. Publisher Strategies</p> <p>i) Partners primary motivations remain CSR based but long-term market development strategies are beginning to evolve</p> <p>ii) Eligibility Exclusions, and Transitions are major strategic issues to be resolved. No unanimity on the value of country exclusions – do they help maximise participation or threaten the programmes?</p> | <p>Assess the risks and possible impact on Research4Life by the evolving market development strategies.</p> <p>Address Eligibility, Exclusions and Transitions and resolve promptly</p>   |
| <p>9. Programme Expansion</p> <p>Adding additional programmes is supported by publishers but would be difficult to support with current technology, systems, and staff levels</p>  | <p>a) Avoid diverting resources from the existing programmes into programme expansion, which should be supported by commensurate expansion in resources.</p> <p>b) Only add new programmes once the technology infrastructure and systems are robust and functioning effectively</p> <p>Any expansion to a new programme should comply with the Memorandum of Understanding between UN agencies</p>   |
| <p>10. Performance and Metrics</p> <p>Research4Life needs a broader range of performance and impact measures. PT15 objectives in this area have mostly not been achieved. In addition there are continuing shortcomings in the statistics that are collected.</p>  | <p>Reconfirm PT15 Objective C1, to develop a range of performance and impact measures, and fill the gaps in the existing measures.</p>  |
| <p>11. Technology</p> <p>Research4Life has established a strong technology development process -authentication, search, CRM, and website redevelopment – but the pace of innovation and implementation has been unduly slow.</p>   | <p>a) Find ways, whether through increased resources or improved organisation and management, for Research4Life to accelerate the technology innovation and implementation cycle.</p> <p>b) Per the internal strategy meeting of 2009, prioritise the improvement of search capabilities and the implementation of cross-programme search.</p>  |
| <p>12. Marketing and Communications</p> <p>Alongside the technology infrastructure, marketing and communications is the area with the biggest opportunity for improvement. Key issues: lack of resources and the difficulty of managing communications and marketing through an informal volunteer organisation.</p>   | <p>a) Find additional resources for this area.</p> <p>b) Implement systems for regular contact with institutions, follow-up for new registrations and for lapsed, etc.</p> <p>c) Provide tools for librarians to promote and support use, including access to institution level usage statistics.</p> <p>d) Encourage and support the development of end-user online networks</p> <p>e) Reconfirm targets set out in PT15, especially re. Goal D (Marketing, publicity, promotion)</p> <p>f) Reconfirm PT15 Objective C3, to collect an evidence-base of narratives about use/impact of programmes.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>13. Training and outreach<br/>Key issues are resourcing, and defining the limits of direct responsibility or involvement and what should be Research4Life's role in partnering and supporting other efforts.</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Expand the availability of online training resources.</li> <li>b) Create a tiered structure of training, to include face-to-face delivery, delivery via web conferencing systems, online training resources, computer-based (offline) training, and other self-help systems (e.g. user forums).</li> <li>c) Where other organisations are better placed to broker/manage training and outreach (e.g. authorship training), work alongside or partner with them rather than recreating their capabilities.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>14. Systems and procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) There is a case for a more systematic review of systems and procedures.</li> <li>ii) Review interviews revealed little support for a shared secretariat, but a degree of cautious support for some additional formality provided it were limited to clarifying arrangements, responsibilities, and mission.</li> <li>iii) More effective management of the programmes would be facilitated by better metrics and information systems.</li> <li>iv) The case for greater integration of the programmes in terms of systems and data is well supported.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Review systems and procedures with a view to simplification and greater efficiency.</li> <li>b) Agree targets for elimination of current backlogs in registrations, publisher queries and new journals additions.</li> <li>c) Reconfirm PT15 Objective C1, to develop a range of performance and impact measures, and fill the gaps in the existing measures.</li> <li>d) Reconfirm the desirability of cross-programme integration in terms of systems and data. In particular, confirm the earlier recommendations for a single cross-programme registration process.</li> </ul> |
| <p>15. Resources and Funding<br/>There is support for mobilising additional resources behind the Research4Life programmes. Shortcomings in the present operation could be fixed with relatively small additional resources. Not being seen to address the larger opportunity in this way may also risk reducing support from existing and potential partners.</p>  | <p>Accelerate efforts to mobilise additional resources, whether internally (i.e. from the partners' own resources) or externally.</p>  |



<http://www.research4life.org/>



<http://www.who.int/hinari/en/>



<http://www.aginternetwork.org/en/>



<http://www.oaresciences.org/en/>



<http://www.wipo.int/ardi/en/>