DigiZeitschriften, a German-language archive of scholarly journals, was created in 1997 with funding from the German Research Foundation. Since launching as an online service in 2005, DigiZeitschriften has implemented a sustainability model that includes a partnership of libraries contributing their time and expertise, and a financial model of institutional subscriptions that more than covers its operating costs. This case study will examine the decisions leading DigiZeitschriften to adopt this plan for sustainability, as well as the benefits and challenges inherent in a partnership of this kind.

Introduction

In the late 1990s, as libraries faced pressure regarding space and budgets, a group of library directors at several German research universities decided to work together with the support of the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, or DFG) to undertake a large-scale digitisation of back issues of scholarly journals, something no one library would be able to accomplish easily alone. The timing for this seemed right: in the US, JSTOR had launched its service, a digital archive of scholarly journals, in 1995, providing a useful example of how such a venture might function, and there was broad support for trying something similar in Germany.

The idea to create direct access to important research materials started after we learned about JSTOR’, according to Berndt Dugall, library director at the University of Frankfurt and one of the founding partners of DigiZeitschriften. ‘We carefully checked the collections and their business model…and we saw that in JSTOR the focus was very clearly on English-language materials...Therefore we thought it could be of interest to create a similar model, but with a focus on German-language research papers and materials.’ So, with nine founding library partners and funding from the DFG, planning began in 1997 to find a way to support libraries in times of ‘drastic budgetary and cost-saving measures’ while still providing access to significant scholarly content.

Today, DigiZeitschriften operates as a registered not-for-profit organisation, headquartered at the Göttingen State and University Library at the University of Göttingen, a leading research university established in 1734. First launched as a service in April 2005, DigiZeitschriften supports itself through institutional subscriptions sold to research libraries and institutes and through the contributions of its partner libraries. As of December 2008, DigiZeitschriften contained 3.5 million pages of content, making up 330,000 scholarly articles from 144 journals and 18 subject areas, including German language and literature, history, art, philosophy, mathematics and economics. At present, articles can be retrieved in PDF format by browsing or by searching keywords in metadata and tables of contents; an upgrade is planned for 2009 to allow full-text searching as well.

---

1 Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from staff members and other individuals knowledgeable or associated with DigiZeitschriften are drawn from interviews conducted as part of this case study between December 2008 and February 2009. A full list of interviewees is included in Appendix A.

Sustainability model

Goals and strategy

The sustainability model for DigiZeitschriften relies on subscription revenue combined with a very low cost structure, which is possible due to its partnerships with 14 member libraries and by its being housed at the Göttingen Library. In addition, the goals for growth of the resource are modest and are determined as a function of the surplus revenue generated each year. Ongoing digitisation to accommodate new issues of the journals already in the database (the ‘moving wall’) is completely covered by the subscription fee. If there are funds remaining once these costs have been covered, DigiZeitschriften’s board decides what to do with the surplus. In the past, surplus funds have been used to add new journals to the database or to make improvements to the site’s functionality. For major new digitisation work, additional outside grants can be sought.

In 2002, at the end of that first grant period, the partners arrived at the organisational structure still in place today. The Association for the Retrospective Digitisation of Scholarly Periodicals – Verein DigiZeitschriften e.V., or DigiZeitschriften – is a not-for-profit association run by its partners, which now include 14 member libraries throughout Germany. The product generates revenue through an institutional subscription strategy, based on a tiered pricing model. In addition, as new institutions subscribe, they are required to pay a one-time fee equal to three times their annual subscription rate. The partner libraries also pay for subscription but are exempt from this initial fee.

“The notion that DigiZeitschriften should be able to cover its direct costs and fund the expansion of the service was, in fact, explicit from the project’s earliest days.”

The notion that DigiZeitschriften should be able to cover its direct costs and fund the expansion of the service was, in fact, explicit from the project’s earliest days.
The 14 DigiZeitschriften member libraries are all SSG libraries, or Special Collections libraries, a designation given to 34 German research libraries that share responsibility for the development of collections in particular fields of scholarship. Library directors at these member institutions serve on the DigiZeitschriften board, which meets once a year to vote on measures brought to them by the board’s chairman, Norbert Lossau, who is also the library director at the University of Göttingen. The member libraries serve as content selectors, using staff at their institutions to identify the most important journals in their areas of expertise to add to the collection. Once the content has been selected and approved by the board, it is the responsibility of the administrative office, with support of the library that initiated the selection, to negotiate terms with rights-holding publishers.

**Costs**

The initial costs for starting up DigiZeitschriften were covered by a series of six grants from the DFG totalling €850,000, part of a larger programme of investment (about €4 million per year in total) in retroactive digitisation that the DFG was supporting at the time. These funds covered hardware and software as well as digitisation and administrative personnel.3

Today, the ongoing operational costs for DigiZeitschriften are €122,250 per year, which according to Dugall include ‘wages for the staff, hardware investments, software investments, storage facilities… and then when we know [how much money we need] for this…We see what money is available for including additional digitisation activities. When this is possible we try to enlarge our collection by including more journals.’ In addition, each year DigiZeitschriften must digitise another year’s worth of issues as a result of the ‘moving wall’, about 20,000 new pages each year.4 Library staff devote about two months of production time to digitising this content; the hours spent add up to the equivalent of approximately one full-time employee (FTE), and this time is paid for from the DigiZeitschriften budget. Direct costs each year must cover staff time of €83,000; royalties to publishers totalling €15,000; moving-wall digitisation of €20,000; and travel costs of €2,000. Other direct expenses for DigiZeitschriften include a small marketing budget of about €1,500 to €3,000 per year, which supports the creation of leaflets, posters and other collateral sales material to promote the service to academic institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Size tier</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 25,000</td>
<td>€4,500</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>€1,500</td>
<td>Over 15,000</td>
<td>€1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 – 25,000</td>
<td>€2,800</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>€950</td>
<td>Up to 15,000</td>
<td>€600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 – 15,000</td>
<td>€1,500</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>€500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>€600</td>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>€200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 All financial data were either supplied by project leaders or drawn from external sources cited in the text. For further detail on the financial data presented in this report, please see Appendix B: Summary of revenues and costs.

4 The ‘moving wall’ concept allows publishers to determine the delay between a publication’s original date of issue and when it can first appear as part of the DigiZeitschriften collection (an approach also used by JSTOR). In general, the ‘moving wall’ is between two to three years, though for some materials it may be as long as seven years post-publication.

The daily administration of DigiZeitschriften requires many different activities which are handled by just two individuals, each working part time.5 The primary administrator, Project Manager Caren Schweder, is responsible for everything from customer services and developing marketing copy, to coordinating the work of the partner libraries regarding new content, to assuring the invoicing and receipt of payments from the institutional subscribers. When significant new digitisation is needed — say, the integration of an entire back file of a journal new to the database — up to 25 temporary digitisation staff are hired on a per-project basis and brought in to accomplish this. Sometimes students are hired for this digitisation work, though often, more skilled workers, including librarians on staff, are assigned to work on the more complex elements such as metadata creation. Treating new digitisation on a per-project basis allows DigiZeitschriften to keep its regular operating costs quite low.

Finally, DigiZeitschriften must share revenue from its subscription income with the participating journal publishers holding copyright. This is done in two ways. When a journal is first digitised, DigiZeitschriften pays a one-time, 2-cents-per-page fee. Then, each year, DigiZeitschriften pays the publisher a percentage of its annual revenue (3% up until 2007, and 5% starting in 2008). Both types of payments are based on agreements negotiated at the founding of DigiZeitschriften among the German Publishers and Booksellers’ Association, the VG Wort (an author royalty collecting society) and DigiZeitschriften. All royalty payments are made directly to the VG Wort, which in turn distributes them to authors and publishers in a 20–80% author–publisher split for articles published in the last ten years, and an 80–20% split for those published more than ten years ago.

5 These two administrators account for 1.5 FTE; both are library employees whose salaries are paid from the DigiZeitschriften budget.
Revenues

Among the original publishers to offer content for DigiZeitschriften, Georg Siebeck of Mohr Siebeck remembers urging them to have a subscription to cover ongoing costs: as a means to insure income that would allow continuing development of the resource and provide a reliable revenue stream. Having 100 sponsors all over the world is a lot safer than having one sponsor. If he [goes away] the system breaks down…'

The revenue model of DigiZeitschriften follows an institutional subscription model, combined with a one-time initial fee equal to three times the subscribing institution’s annual fee. The pricing is based on the size of the institution, as summarised in the table below. The pricing for subscribers outside of Germany is lower, since it was assumed that there would be less demand for a German-language resource outside the country. In addition, prices for consortia are negotiated separately. As of late 2008, there are 192 institutional subscribers to DigiZeitschriften, 65% from Germany and 35% from other countries.

'The revenues from subscriptions, about €180,000 in 2008, along with the one-time fee paid by all new participants, more than cover the operating expenses of DigiZeitschriften.'

The revenues from subscriptions, about €180,000 in 2008, along with the one-time fee paid by all new participants, more than cover the operating expenses of DigiZeitschriften. The DigiZeitschriften governing board votes each year to determine how the surplus is to be spent in the following year. In the past it has been used to expand coverage by choosing new journals to digitise in existing fields, or to expand into new disciplines.

DigiZeitschriften’s goals for 2009 include adding 500,000 pages of new journal content, improving the functionality of the service by adding full-text search, and expanding DigiZeitschriften’s international customer base, particularly in Asia, Russia and Poland.

Key factors influencing the success of the sustainability model

Göttingen and the Digitisation Centre

DigiZeitschriften’s place within the Göttingen State and University Library is a key element of its sustainability model, allowing it to benefit from the scale of the larger institution. When digitisation work first began in 1997, it was done by commercial vendors; by 1998 the Digitisation Centre [DigitalisierungsZentrum, or GDZ] was established at Göttingen, and by 1999 digitisation was being done on site there. According to DigiZeitschriften Chairman Norbert Lossau, ‘The GDZ was one of the reasons to host DigiZeitschriften in Göttingen’.

DigiZeitschriften is but one of six or seven digitisation projects that the library has going at any given time, and accounts for only a small part of the centre’s workload, which in 2009 will include digitising an estimated three million pages. Among the benefits DigiZeitschriften enjoys are the ongoing software development and scanning expertise developed by staff at the Digitisation Centre, as well as its sophisticated hardware. This hardware includes a recently acquired ‘scan robot’, financed by the state ministry of Lower Saxony. According to Digitisation Manager Martin Liebetruth, this piece of equipment allows for a much smaller opening angle to scan fragile books, and it accomplishes this three times faster than is possible by hand on the flatbed scanners the library typically uses.

Although DigiZeitschriften does not contribute anything to the library or GDZ overheads, Lossau explains, ‘Our library sees the hosting of DigiZeitschriften as part of its mission to provide the widest possible access to scholarly content resources… It’s important to understand that, although we serve primarily our university, we serve with a number of services and service developments also the national and, in some areas, also the international community. The outreach of our library is recognised (also by the University Governing Board) to go far beyond the university, which justifies some of our own resources we spend on DigiZeitschriften.’

Governance

DigiZeitschriften has a board of three people: two deputies and the chairman, who is traditionally the library director of the State and University Library of Göttingen, the headquarters of DigiZeitschriften. The other 11 members constitute DigiZeitschriften’s General Assembly, which meets at the end of each year to vote on strategy and the next year’s budget, including any plans for upcoming digitisation or changes in policy. No one, not even the chairman, is paid for this work. Lossau, the current chairman, reports that the General Assembly meetings are rarely contentious, as the members are supportive of the board and ‘are all committed to the growth of the collection and have no personal agendas in this field.’

DigiZeitschriften’s leadership, specifically Lossau and Dugall, have been closely involved in the project from the start, Lossau as the head of digitisation at Göttingen from 1996–2001, as the programme got under way, and Dugall as one of the chief planners of the service. In preparation for the launch of the service, both travelled extensively in the US in 1997 and 1998, meeting with project teams at American universities involved in similar digitisation projects, including Michigan, Cornell and Stanford.

The long-standing relationships and streamlined nature of the management of DigiZeitschriften help to make decision-making relatively efficient. On the other hand, the project is run with no one single person in a full-time management role. Even Project Manager Caren Schweder wears many hats, from billing and invoicing, to library liaison, to marketing, promotion and sales.
Partnership model

The DigiZeitschriften model derives important benefits from its member libraries in the area of content development. The partner libraries are all considered Special Collections libraries. The DFG’s Special Collections Programme, begun in 1949, uses a decentralised subject plan to insure that at least one copy of every scholarly relevant publication is present in Germany and thus available through inter-library loan of the original or photocopies. Göttingen, for example, is the designated library for 17 special collections, including history and politics of Anglo-American cultures, theoretical mathematics, natural sciences, astronomy and English language and literature.

Selection criteria concerning which journals to include in DigiZeitschriften come from the specialists at each partner library, with the requirement that the journals digitised be the core publications in various fields, those which were frequently used and were of great research value, and with the expectation that DigiZeitschriften will include the most recent issues the publisher will allow. The initial list of journals was compiled by subject specialists at the cooperating libraries, and was subsequently assessed by 20 well-respected scholars in the fields being considered.

The coordination of the community was critical in making DigiZeitschriften a possibility. The initial plan for the resource was the idea of three librarians: Berndt Dugall, Elmar Mittler, former director of the Göttingen State and University Library, and Hermann Leskien of the Bavarian State Library. They devised the initial plan and then recruited six other librarians to join the project and help identify the core journals to include. Leaders of DigiZeitschriften feel that the project’s governance by a library partnership has had an impact on its success. As Dugall said, ‘We are still part of the library community. We are not seen as being providers from outside.’

Of course, that role is complicated by the fact that DigiZeitschriften does, indeed, count on the subscription fees from the library community. ‘We have two different types of relationships: one is partnering, and the other is that our library colleagues are our clients...which is an interesting model,’ explains Dugall. ‘We are ourselves our clients.’ Indeed, even the partner libraries who donate their staff time to content selection and to working with publishers are required to pay the annual subscription fee for access to DigiZeitschriften, though they are not charged the one-time fee that other institutional subscribers pay.

DigiZeitschriften’s other ‘partners’: participating publishers

In the early days, DigiZeitschriften’s founders promoted the service in face-to-face talks with publishers, leveraging personal contacts and making it clear to prospective publishers that all costs of digitisation would be covered for them by DigiZeitschriften, initially through the DFG funding it had secured, and beyond that, through the revenue to come from subscriptions to the service. ‘Because everyone was insecure on the publisher side, it was all due to personal commitment,’ explains Lossau, describing the pitch for participation: ‘Give us a chance to make some revenue...and you will have no risk.’

One of the earliest publishers to support DigiZeitschriften, Georg Siebeck of Mohr Siebeck, understood the appeal of letting the libraries take the lead on the project. ‘The library is concerned with those things that have been published. As publishers we are concerned with those things that are to be published.’ In addition, many of his journals are over 100 years old, ‘and we cannot sell these old copies. It is in the interest of a publisher who still publishes a journal that it be as visible as possible.’ Besides, ‘physical preservation was an issue – digitisation would help [libraries] do what they had always done [make content accessible to scholars] and would in no way hinder us.’

Intellectual property rights

Having worked out terms with the authors’ and artists’ guilds, VG Wort and VG Bild-Kunst, DigiZeitschriften could also assure publishers that authors’ rights would be protected, and the publishers would be remunerated for the content they provided. One further incentive proved very important as well. As had happened with JSTOR in the United States, DigiZeitschriften instituted a model of the ‘moving wall’ of content, describing the period of time that would elapse between the original publication of a new issue of a journal and the time when that issue would first appear in DigiZeitschriften. The appeal of the moving wall, often a period of two or three years, is to allow the publishers to protect the business models they have in place for subscriptions to the current issues of their journals.

Content selection

Although DigiZeitschriften’s leaders observed that commercial publishers, including Wiley and Elsevier, had already taken a strong position in the hard sciences, they felt there was still plenty of content to be aggregated. According to Dugall, ‘Our advantage at that time was that in Germany in the case of research materials, there was not a strong concentration in the research market. There were a lot of smaller publishers.’ So they went to look for those journals the large publishers were not already covering, and to identify the library collections with strengths in those subject areas. In some cases, they were just too late: When Dugall approached the German Society of Chemists, for example, he learned that they had already sold all their rights to Wiley. Other German publishers, like de Gruyter, chose not to participate, preferring instead to create their own platform.

But having the greatest volume of content is not as important to DigiZeitschriften as having the right content for its audience of researchers and scholars. Our objective is to support science [ie

---

6 For more information, follow the link for the Virtual Subject Libraries from the SUB Göttingen website, www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/index-e.html

7 Schweder, ‘DigiZeitschriften’, 184.
scholarship] and research,’ according to Dugall. ‘Therefore, we are not interested in covering as much as possible, but in making available the core journals in different disciplines. Whether we can achieve this goal mainly depends on the cooperation of publishers or copyright holders.’

Understanding users

As of late 2008, the DigiZeitschriften site records over 35,000 downloads of articles per month, up from 15,000 in 2006. While its end users are mainly faculty and students at subscribing institutions, DigiZeitschriften does not seek to communicate with them directly. Rather, its main contacts are the librarians at the subscribing institutions who in turn are expected to inform their patrons about the resource and respond to their needs.

‘Most activity for the end users is done by the libraries. We inform the library community and the research community about our...offers. It’s part of the library’s role on campus. Scholars go to the campus library catalogue, which alerts people that the article is available here, in electronic version,’ according to Dugall. The Electronic Journals Library (EZB) is a portal that university libraries use to allow researchers to see 12,000 digital journal titles, indicating which are available at that institution. Those institutions subscribing to DigiZeitschriften, for example, would see the listings for DigiZeitschriften content marked with an icon of a green traffic light, signalling that indeed the institution has full access to that content.

DigiZeitschriften leaders are starting to examine more closely where its traffic is coming from, though an initial analysis suggested, according to Lossau, that ‘only a very small percentage comes from Google, with a much higher percentage coming directly to DigiZeitschriften’. While this sounds counterintuitive, it may be the consequence of several restrictions that have kept DigiZeitschriften from building more traffic from search engines. First among them is that DigiZeitschriften is not permitted to allow search engines to crawl the full text of the first page of its articles. Publisher contracts prohibit it from allowing Google to index PDF files or display a full page or even a full-text excerpt.

‘On the other hand, not all publishers are necessarily as fearful as DigiZeitschriften believes.’

According to Lossau, ‘We have discussed this with publishers, but we simply have problems with the copyright situation in Germany.’ The original publisher contracts did not account for this, and as Dugall explains, ‘Perhaps it would have been possible to include this in the contract six to seven years ago, but at that time, we had no idea...that Google would be the dominant search engine five years later, [so] nobody had any idea that this question should be part of the agreement with publishers...When we mention we want to make the first page [available] in Google, I think then the fears and resentments against our activity would increase, so we have to live with the situation.’

On the other hand, not all publishers are necessarily as fearful as DigiZeitschriften believes. Publisher Georg Siebeck of Mohr Siebeck is quite supportive of the notion of displaying the first page of an article and having Google search the text, so long as it improves the visibility of the resource. He suggested that publisher support or fear about Google was more of ‘an ideological issue’. Almost all of his books are in Google, because he is convinced this will not harm the sales of the books. As another possible advertising idea, he suggested including advertisements in current journal issues announcing that the backfile of this particular journal is now also available electronically through DigiZeitschriften.

Benefits and challenges

As one of many projects situated at Göttingen, DigiZeitschriften strongly benefits from its affiliation with the Digitisation Centre in terms of the expertise available in functions such as metadata creation, and in the hardware in which the centre has invested, such as the flatbed and robot scanners.

DigiZeitschriften’s library partners share some of the burden of the staff time needed to accomplish important tasks of the operation, including content selection and publisher rights clearance. By being able to draw on the volunteered efforts of content specialists in the Special Collections libraries, DigiZeitschriften benefits from their expertise, while spreading the work and cost of content development across several institutions. In this way, the partnership operates as a kind of contributed content model.

DigiZeitschriften’s subscription model has generated sufficient revenue to cover its operating costs while continuing to allow some degree of ongoing digitisation beyond that required by the moving wall. Its current model addresses library mission goals regarding space and preservation issues while also providing access to these materials to the scholarly community.

And yet, while DigiZeitschriften sees itself as serving the library community, relatively little effort has been undertaken to anticipate or respond to the needs of its end users: the scholars, students and other library patrons who use it. DigiZeitschriften’s main stakeholders are its partners and other subscribing libraries, and up until now, this has been reflected in its priorities: to digitise quickly, while spending much less effort on user features such as full-text searching. In this respect it lags behind where many similar services are today.

DigiZeitschriften’s small core leadership team allows its leaders and administrator to make everyday operational decisions quickly. But at the same time, DigiZeitschriften’s board members are also library directors, with very demanding full-time jobs, and the lead administrator is responsible for a wide variety of functions. Without adequate staffing, it will likely be difficult to grow and improve the resource. For example, while there are plans for expanding the customer base in 2009, there is currently no dedicated sales staff on hand to accomplish this.

Issues of intellectual property rights, as protected in the early DigiZeitschriften publisher contracts, appear to have hindered DigiZeitschriften’s ability to optimise its exposure on the internet via the major search engines. While there seems to be support both from DigiZeitschriften leadership and from some publishers for DigiZeitschriften to allow search engines greater access to
content, agreements currently in place regarding publishers’ and authors’ rights remain an obstacle.

Broader implications for other projects

Partnerships among those with common goals can help to lower costs. The partner model used by DigiZeitschriften works well by drawing on the strengths of each Special Collection library. Having each partner volunteer time to accomplish the work of editorial selection and publisher solicitation also helps to keep project costs low.

Subscriptions are a worthwhile option when the content is highly valuable to customers with the ability to pay for it. DigiZeitschriften provides good value to libraries, particularly those in Germany or with strong German-language collections, helping them with practical issues of storage and preservation as well as allowing them to provide their patrons with easier access to back issues of older journals.

A good fit with a host institution can be a key aspect to sustainability. By establishing DigiZeitschriften at the Göttingen Library, both the project and the institution derive benefits that each values. The library is proud to have played a critical role in the creation of an important resource in the community, and at the same time, DigiZeitschriften strongly benefits from the expertise and equipment of the Göttingen Digitisation Centre, as well as the content hosting, preservation and office space that the library provides.

An active feedback loop with users helps a site stay current with evolving user expectations for online academic resources. This has been a challenge for DigiZeitschriften because it rarely interacts directly with the end users of the resource. Without a productive feedback loop or other means of gauging what researchers and scholars require of and like about DigiZeitschriften, the service risks losing its usefulness to the community, which could hinder its chances of maintaining and expanding its customer base.

Continued growth and innovation requires committed leadership and dedicated staff. DigiZeit has ambitious goals for the year ahead, from implementing full-text searching to adding new content areas and seeking additional subscribers in countries outside Germany. With only a small part-time office staff in place, the project may find it a challenge to meet all of its goals.

Appendix A: Interviewees

Berndt Dugall, Board Trustee and founding member of DigiZeitschriften and Director/Librarian, University Johann Christian Senckenberg, Frankfurt, 3 December 2008

Martin Liebetruth, Digitisation Manager, Göttingen State and University Library, 3 December 2008

Norbert Lossau, Chairman, DigiZeitschriften and Director, Göttingen State and University Library, 3 December 2008

Caren Schweder, Project Manager, DigiZeitschriften, 20 January 2009 and 17 February 2009

Georg Siebeck, Publisher, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany, 19 February 2009
**Appendix B: Summary of revenues and costs**

### DigiZeitschriften

#### Revenue Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approx. amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscription fees</td>
<td>€180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>€180,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budgeted Costs</th>
<th>Included in budget?</th>
<th>In-kind/volunteer contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1 PT project manager &amp; 1 PT administrative assistant</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content selection &amp; production</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; marketing</td>
<td>[part of project manager’s role]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total personnel costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-personnel costs</strong></td>
<td>Included in budget?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Office space provided by Göttingen State and University Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning, metadata, etc.</td>
<td>Temporary scanning technicians are hired to scan new journal issues as part of the moving wall each year</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>€20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting &amp; technology infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Supported by the Digitisation Centre at Göttingen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>Royalties paid to author rights’ society</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>€15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Travel costs for annual partner meeting; marketing materials</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>€4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total non-personnel costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>€39,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total budgeted costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>€122,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanatory note**

The information presented in this table is intended as a broad picture of revenues and costs associated with the project, not as a detailed financial report. The financial data, which are presented in the currency in which the project reported the information, were compiled as part of the interview process with project leaders and staff, and in some cases were supplemented with publicly available documents, such as annual reports. Project leaders were asked to review the information prior to publication. The column labelled ‘Included in budget?’ indicates whether or not the organisation includes that category of cost in its own definition of its budget. In many cases, the information was difficult for project leaders to provide because their institution does not record information in these categories, or because the project was combined with other projects in a larger department or unit. As a result, many of the figures are rounded or best estimates. Some leaders preferred not to offer figures at all, but suggested percentages instead. Frequently, certain types of costs are provided as in-kind contributions by the host institution. Although we did not attempt to place a value on these contributions, we felt it was important to highlight the significant role they play in many projects. Because of the variability in the way each institution estimated the various categories of revenues and costs, the information presented in the table is of limited value for detailed cross-project comparisons.