

Information Generation & Management

Volume 4 Issue 2

ISSN 3082-5067 (Online)



2025

Assessment of Open Access Policies in Institutional Repositories of Selected University Libraries in Southeast Asia

Luis Ezra Cruz and Bob Cauilan

De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Authors retain copyright for their article content, while the Association of Special Libraries of the Philippines and Information Generation & Management holds copyright for the publication's design and layout.



Received 23 August 2025; Received in revised form 24 October 2025; Accepted 9 November 2025

Published online

Cruz, L., & Cauilan, B. (2025). Assessment of open access policies in institutional repositories of selected university libraries in Southeast Asia. *Information Generation & Management*, 4(2), 166-194. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18105250>.

Assessment of Open Access Policies in Institutional Repositories of Selected University Libraries in Southeast Asia¹

Luis Ezra Cruz and Bob Cauilan

De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines

Corresponding author: luis.cruz@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract

Statement of the Problem. Institutional Repositories (IRs) are vital infrastructures for scholarly communication, enhancing research visibility and promoting equitable knowledge access. In Southeast Asia, policy standardization remains varied despite increasing adoption of open access (OA) policies driven by regional and international initiatives. This study aims to assess the OA policies governing IRs in selected university libraries across the region and to identify gaps and areas for improvement.

Methods. This study employs a qualitative content analysis approach and systematically examines publicly available OA policy documents from eight AUNILo member institutions. The thematic coding framework focuses on key components such as copyright and licensing, self-archiving mandates, embargo periods, access restrictions, metadata, preservation, and policy clarity.

Results. Findings highlight strengths in documentation for some institutions, while others demonstrate reliance on informal practices or limited accessible policies. The analysis reveals variations across components such as licensing, mandates, and preservation, reflecting the broader inconsistency in OA policy development within the region.

Originality. The study offers recommendations for policy harmonization and capacity building, contributing to more consistent and effective open access practices within the region's academic landscape. It provides a systematic examination of OA policy documents across AUNILo member institutions, addressing an area where comprehensive comparative analysis remains limited.

Keywords: Open access; Institutional repositories; Policy assessment; Southeast Asia; University libraries; Content analysis

¹Presented at the 6th Conference on Library and Information Studies, July 3-4, 2025

Introduction

Institutional repositories (IRs) have emerged as critical infrastructures in academic institutions for the collection, preservation, and dissemination of scholarly outputs. IRs are essential for managing, preserving, and maintaining the digital assets and intellectual output of institutions, including faculty research, electronic theses and dissertations, departmental reports, and digital heritage collections (Drakes, 2004). Likewise, IRs facilitate the dissemination of academic production, including scientific articles, reports, datasets, and other research outputs, making them accessible to a broader audience (Woutersen-Windhouver et al., 2020). As platforms that facilitate open access (OA) to research, IRs contribute significantly to enhancing institutional visibility, increasing citation impact, and promoting equitable access to knowledge (Sheikh & Richardson, 2023).

Given their role in advancing scholarly communication, the governance of IRs, particularly through formal open access policies, has become a subject of growing importance (Mahroofa, 2015). Open access policies define the parameters within which research outputs are submitted, accessed, reused, and preserved. Key components often include provisions related to copyright ownership, licensing, self-archiving rights, embargo periods, access restrictions, metadata requirements, and long-term digital preservation strategies. Clear, comprehensive, and well-communicated policies ensure not only legal and ethical compliance but also facilitate consistent repository practices that support both institutional goals and researcher needs (Roy et al., 2023). Effective governance structures and policies are crucial for the successful implementation and management of IRs. These policies ensure that IRs can provide reliable, long-term access to digital resources, which is essential for their trustworthiness and sustainability (Adam & Kiran, 2021; Biesenbender et al., 2019). Likewise, open access policies play a pivotal role in enhancing the visibility and accessibility of scholarly outputs. These policies help in aligning the IRs with the broader goals of open science and transparency (Johnson & Dubinsky, 2022; Pontika, 2019). IRs, governed by robust open access policies, contribute to the democratization of knowledge by making research outputs freely accessible to a global audience. This enhances the visibility and impact of research, fostering collaboration and innovation (van Wyk & Mostert, 2011). The role of IRs in preserving institutional memory and supporting the long-term accessibility of digital scholarship underscores their importance in the academic landscape (Bashir et al., 2022).

In Southeast Asia, the adoption of institutional repositories by university libraries has been steadily increasing, driven by regional and international efforts to promote open access and research visibility (Farida, et al., 2015). Initiatives such as the ASEAN University Network Inter-Library Online (AUNILO), the ASEAN Citation Index, and national-level policies have encouraged institutions to develop and maintain repositories. Established in 2003, the ASEAN University Network Inter-Library Online (AUNILO) serves as a consortium of academic and research libraries across Southeast Asia. It aims to promote collaborative collection development, staff training,

resource sharing, and the adoption of digital and open access initiatives among member universities (AUNILo, 2025). Through projects such as the AUNILo Portal and regional repository directories, the network has supported interoperability and knowledge exchange within ASEAN institutions. Similarly, the ASEAN Citation Index (ACI), launched in 2014, enhances the visibility of regional research by indexing journals published in ASEAN countries and encouraging adherence to international publishing standards (ASEAN Citation Index, 2023). Several national-level policies have also advanced the open access movement—for instance, The Malaysia Open Science Platform (MOSP), the Philippines' Department of Science and Technology policy mandating deposit in HERDIN and PCHRD databases, and Indonesia's National Scientific Repository policy (RIN) promoting open data and research visibility. Despite these regional and national efforts, studies (Farida et al., 2015; Roy et al., 2023; Sheikh & Richardson, 2023) highlight continuing disparities in the structure, implementation, and enforcement of institutional policies. Such inconsistencies point to the uneven policy landscape and the need for regional harmonization.

This study seeks to assess the open access policies of institutional repositories from selected university libraries in Southeast Asia. Through a structured content analysis and comparative evaluation of publicly available policy documents, the study aims to identify key strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement. The findings are intended to support efforts toward policy harmonization and capacity building among Southeast Asian academic institutions engaged in open access initiatives.

Research Objectives

This study aims to assess the open access policies of institutional repositories from selected university libraries in Southeast Asia through structured content analysis and comparative evaluation. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. Analyze the content and structure of open access policies in institutional repositories of selected university libraries in Southeast Asia.
2. Identify key policy components, including copyright provisions, licensing frameworks, self-archiving mandates, embargo periods, and access restrictions.
3. Examine the clarity, accessibility, and comprehensiveness of open access policy documentation presented on institutional websites.
4. Provide recommendations for enhancing open access policies and practices in the region.

Limitations and Significance of the Study

This study is limited by its exclusive focus on institutional repositories from selected university libraries that are members of the ASEAN University Network Inter-Library Online (AUNILo). While this provided a regionally coherent sample, it may not fully capture the diversity of open access policies and repository practices across all academic institutions in Southeast Asia. The analysis was also restricted to publicly accessible policy documents available on institutional and repository websites; internal policies, unpublished procedures, and informal practices were not included.

Consequently, the findings may not reflect the full range of governance mechanisms in place, particularly for institutions with underdeveloped or undocumented policy frameworks.

Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable insights into the current landscape of open access policy implementation in Southeast Asian academic libraries. By identifying thematic patterns, strengths, and policy gaps across institutions, the research offers a comparative foundation for policy harmonization and regional capacity-building. The findings can inform institutional leaders, repository administrators, and policy makers seeking to align their repositories with international best practices in open access, digital preservation, and scholarly communication. Furthermore, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on open access in the Global South, highlighting local adaptations and constraints that shape institutional policy decisions.

Review of Related Literature

Institutional repositories (IRs) emerged as a response to the increasing demand for access to scholarly outputs and the need for universities to assert stewardship over their intellectual assets. Lynch (2003) described IRs not simply as digital storage systems but as “a set of services” that support the management and dissemination of digital scholarly materials, making IRs a strategic component of scholarly communication. As repositories matured over the decades, research shifted from technical implementation concerns to governance and policy structures, with scholars arguing that IR effectiveness depends largely on the clarity and comprehensiveness of the institutional open access (OA) policy rather than on the platform used for storage (Pinfield, 2015).

The global OA movement formally began with the Budapest Open Access Initiative (2002), which provided the earliest and most influential definition of open access, emphasizing the removal of price and permission barriers to scholarly literature. Since then, the concept of openness has expanded. The UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science (2021) broadened open access into a larger ecosystem of equitable participation, transparency, research sharing, and preservation accountability. While these frameworks articulate why openness matters, operational tools such as OpenDOAR and SHERPA/RoMEO, managed by Jisc (2024), serve as practical guides for institutions on what publishers permit for deposit, what versions may be used (pre-print, post-print, or publisher’s PDF), and what license restrictions apply. These resources help ensure legal and ethical compliance, making them necessary components in policy implementation.

Empirical studies demonstrate that the existence of a repository is insufficient without explicit policy direction. Xia (2007) found that repositories with clearly defined self-archiving instructions and mediated deposit workflows display higher full-text availability. In a follow-up study, Xia et al., (2011) observed that author-led deposits often produce inconsistent metadata and incomplete submissions, whereas librarian-mediated deposits lead to improved metadata quality and reliability. These findings were supported by Pinfield et al. (2017), who reported that even in research-intensive institutions with OA mandates, deposit compliance remains low when monitoring and enforcement mechanisms are weak, leading to gaps between policy intent and actual practice. Policy quality also affects the trustworthiness of repositories. The

Confederation of Open Access Repositories (COAR) published a community framework in 2020 outlining essential components of a robust repository policy, including copyright guidance, licensing terms, preservation commitments, and clear withdrawal procedures. This aligns with CoreTrustSeal's (2023) requirements for trustworthy digital repositories, which emphasize sustainability planning, metadata transparency, access rights, and documented preservation strategies. These frameworks converge around the idea that repository policies must move beyond access statements and explicitly articulate responsibilities and long-term preservation approaches.

Within Southeast Asia, policy-driven repository development is gaining momentum. Malaysia's Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation released the Malaysia Open Science Platform (MOSTI, 2023), defining policy expectations for data-sharing, repository interoperability, and open access. In the Philippines, the Philippine Council for Health Research and Development (2022) mandated the deposit of government-funded research outputs into HERDIN Plus, a national repository that centralizes scholarly health research. Meanwhile, Indonesia's Badan Riset dan Inovasi Nasional manages Repositori Ilmiah Nasional (BRIN, 2023), which consolidates institutional outputs and enforces metadata and access standardization across participating universities. These efforts show that the region is transitioning from institution-based repositories toward national-level and regional OA ecosystems.

Despite the growing infrastructure supporting OA, there remains limited scholarly assessment of the actual content and completeness of institutional OA policies, especially in Southeast Asia. Much of the earlier literature focused on measuring OA awareness, advocating repository adoption, or examining faculty deposit behavior. Few studies analyze whether written policies meet international expectations, articulate copyright and licensing rights, explain preservation commitments, or define takedown and succession procedures. The gap identified in the literature suggests a need for systematic evaluation of IR policy maturity using international benchmarks. This study addresses this gap by examining and comparing OA policy statements of institutional repositories in selected Southeast Asian university libraries.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative content analysis approach to examine the open access (OA) policies of institutional repositories (IRs) maintained by selected university libraries in Southeast Asia. Content analysis is appropriate for systematically examining policy documents to identify thematic patterns, policy components, and areas of variation or inconsistency (Baxter, 2009). AUNILo member institutions were purposively selected because the network represents the most established consortium of academic libraries in Southeast Asia and provides a consistent baseline for policy evaluation. Limiting the scope to AUNILo members also ensured comparability in terms of collaboration, documentation, and policy development. While institutions outside the network may also maintain institutional repositories, this study focused on AUNILo members to maintain coherence in the regional framework and to reflect a shared commitment to open access initiatives.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to identify AUNILo member libraries that met the following criteria: 1) the institution was listed as an active AUNILo member as of February 2025, 2) its institutional repository was publicly accessible

online, and 3) the repository contained an identifiable open access policy or equivalent foundational documentation, such as submission guidelines or terms of use. As of February 2025, AUNILO had 23 active member institutions. Of these, only eight maintained publicly accessible institutional repositories with identifiable open access policies (Table 1), while fifteen were excluded due to inactive, restricted, or undocumented repositories. Future research may include non-member universities to capture a broader range of practices and policy variations.

Table 1. List of Institutions and IRs

Institution	Country	Institutional Repository	Primary IR URL
Chulalongkorn University	Thailand	Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR)	https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th
National University of Singapore	Singapore	ScholarBank@NUS	https://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/
Singapore Management University	Singapore	InK (Institutional Knowledge at SMU)	http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/
Universitas Indonesia	Indonesia	Scholar Hub Universitas Indonesia	https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/
University of Malaya	Malaysia	UM Research Repository	https://eprints.um.edu.my/
University of the Philippines, Diliman	Philippines	Digital Archives @ UP Diliman (DA@UPD)	https://digitalarchives.upd.edu.ph/
Universiti Putra Malaysia	Malaysia	Universiti Putra Malaysia Institutional Repository	http://psasir.upm.edu.my/
Universiti Sains Malaysia	Malaysia	Universiti Sains Malaysia Institutional Repository	http://eprints.usm.my/

Relevant repository documents were located through manual review of institutional websites and subsequently downloaded for qualitative analysis. The collected documents were then analyzed using a pre-defined thematic coding framework. This framework guided the systematic analysis of the policy documents, categorizing information into key areas: Copyright and Licensing, Self-Archiving and Submission

Guidelines, Embargoes and Access Restrictions, Metadata and Preservation Provisions, and Clarity and Accessibility. The thematic coding framework was developed based on established open access benchmarks, including the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) (2002), the SHERPA/RoMEO database of publisher self-archiving policies, the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR), and UNESCO's 2021 Recommendation on Open Science. These sources collectively informed the coding categories on copyright and licensing, self-archiving, embargo periods, metadata standards, and digital preservation practices.

The coding and subsequent analysis were performed using Taguette, an open-source qualitative research tool specifically designed for qualitative textual analysis (Rampin & Rampin, 2021). Its selection was based on its user-friendly interface and robust support for qualitative data analysis, particularly its features for manual tagging and clustering of key themes. A cross-case comparison was then conducted to identify overarching trends, pinpoint inconsistencies, and highlight significant policy gaps across the participating institutions. To ensure the rigor and consistency of the analysis, two independent coders undertook the coding process. Both coders were professional librarians with experience in digital repository management and qualitative content analysis. Before the full coding process, they reviewed and discussed the coding framework to align interpretations and ensure consistent application of codes across all documents. An initial pilot coding phase was conducted on a subset of the documents, during which discrepancies in coding were thoroughly discussed and resolved through consensus. This facilitated the refinement of the coding scheme and ensured consistent application of the thematic framework. This iterative process ensured strong inter-coder agreement, thereby enhancing the reliability and objectivity of the data interpretation across the full dataset.

During the document retrieval phase, several challenges were encountered that necessitated specific methodological considerations. The analysis was strictly confined to publicly accessible policy documents available on institutional and repository websites. Consequently, challenges included the identification of incomplete, outdated, or implicitly communicated policies rather than explicit, dedicated open access policy documents. These were addressed by prioritizing the most current and comprehensive publicly available versions. In instances where a dedicated open access policy was absent, relevant foundational documentation, such as repository terms of use or submission guidelines, was utilized to extract pertinent information. Such limitations in policy accessibility and clarity were carefully noted and have been integrated into the discussion of the findings.

Recognizing the inherent potential for bias in qualitative research, particularly in manual document collection and data analysis, several measures were rigorously implemented to ensure the objectivity and trustworthiness of the study's findings. In the data analysis process, the potential for researcher interpretation bias was addressed through multiple strategies. The use of a pre-defined thematic coding framework provided a structured and consistent lens for analyzing the policy documents, preventing arbitrary interpretations. Furthermore, the involvement of two independent coders, coupled with regular inter-coder reliability checks and consensus-building discussions on identified discrepancies, significantly enhanced the objectivity of the coding process. This collaborative approach ensured that the thematic categories were applied consistently and interpretations were systematically

validated, thereby reinforcing the overall rigor and impartiality of the qualitative content analysis.

Results

This section presents a detailed overview of each selected university, with particular focus on their institutional repositories and associated open access policy components. A thematic content analysis was conducted on all publicly available open access policy documents. The findings are summarized in Table 2, which outlines the institutional repository profiles and the corresponding key elements of their open access policies.

Institutional and Repository Profile and Relevant Open Access Policies

1. Chulalongkorn University

Chulalongkorn University's institutional repository, the Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR) (<https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th>), serves as the main platform for collecting and providing access to the university's scholarly outputs, including theses, research reports, academic projects, textbooks, and journal articles. It supports study and research for both internal and external users while presenting the university's academic contributions to a wider community. The repository is administered by the Office of Academic Resources (OAR) and is publicly accessible without registration. Although recently migrated to the Chula Digiverse platform, the present study refers to content from CUIR.

CUIR's open access framework is described through policies on the OAR website. These include statements on workflow, preservation, collection development, file formats, author guidelines, licensing, user rights, metadata, and citation. Copyright is governed by the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license, which permits citation and non-commercial use but prohibits adaptations. The choice of license indicates an effort to promote access while maintaining control over reuse. Submissions are generally mediated, with staff responsible for digitization, preservation, metadata creation, and deposit. For journals under Chula Digiverse, submission requirements specify format, citation style, originality, and copyright compliance, although embargo policies are not clearly stated. Access is limited to educational purposes, and commercial use is not permitted. The repository also restricts excessive downloading, including bulk or automated activity, with violations resulting in account termination. Such measures demonstrate institutional concern about large-scale unauthorized copying despite the open access orientation. Metadata creation and preservation are handled by repository staff in accordance with established guidelines. Long-term sustainability is supported through funding from the OAR and the university, which ensures continuity of staffing, technology, and preservation services. Current initiatives focus on strengthening the digital preservation system to maintain accessibility over time.

2. National University of Singapore (NUS)

The National University of Singapore operates the institutional repository ScholarBank@NUS, which provides open access to the university's research outputs (<https://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg>). Managed by the NUS Libraries, it serves as the central archive for journal articles, theses, dissertations, and other scholarly works. Faculty are strongly encouraged to deposit publications, particularly those produced through publicly funded research, in accordance with the university's Open Access Policy. The policy requires accepted versions of articles to be deposited within six months of publication, subject to publisher copyright conditions.

The repository supports Creative Commons licensing, giving authors flexibility in assigning usage rights. Where publishers impose embargoes, metadata remain accessible to ensure visibility, with full text made available once restrictions expire. ScholarBank@NUS is designed for interoperability, enabling harvesting by international discovery services and increasing global reach.

Digital preservation practices include the assignment of persistent identifiers and compliance with international standards. The repository integrates with ORCID to strengthen research attribution and author visibility. In addition to technical measures, the university conducts regular outreach through workshops and consultations to guide faculty on copyright, licensing, and open access compliance. ScholarBank@NUS demonstrates a mature institutional framework for open access, combining policy enforcement with strong preservation and visibility mechanisms.

3. Singapore Management University (SMU)

Singapore Management University (SMU) launched its institutional repository, InK (Institutional Knowledge at SMU) (<https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/>), in 2010. The repository was established to acquire, organize, and provide access to the research and scholarly works of the SMU community, with the goals of preserving digital versions of scholarship, increasing the global visibility of research, and demonstrating the university's commitment to open access principles. InK contains a wide array of scholarly outputs, including journal articles, conference proceedings, books, book chapters, reports, working papers, dissertations, and theses. It also curates a distinctive University Heritage Collection that features oral history interviews, image galleries, annual reports, and press releases. Hosted on the Digital Commons platform, InK has expanded significantly over time, growing from over 8,000 records (including 600 full-text items) in 2010 to 32,000 items (including 16,000 full-text items) by the end of 2022, with a cumulative total of 6.7 million downloads. The repository complies with the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH) and is registered with both the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR) and the Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR), which enhances interoperability and discoverability.

SMU's Open Access Policy was formally approved in October 2013 and updated in 2019 (Singapore Management University, 2019). The policy grants the university permission and license to make faculty and postgraduate student publications available for open dissemination. Its overarching objective is to provide global access to SMU's scholarly research output in order to promote the university and its researchers, increase citations and research impact, and strengthen institutional

reputation. The policy is explicitly linked to SMU's Intellectual Property Policy, demonstrating a coordinated approach to managing scholarly output within the broader legal and administrative framework of the university. The adoption of this policy in 2013, which predated Singaporean funding mandates introduced from 2016 onward, highlights SMU's proactive and early commitment to open access rather than a purely reactive response to external requirements.

In terms of copyright and licensing, faculty and students are required to provide an electronic copy of their publications to the Library, consistent with both the Intellectual Property Policy and the Open Access Policy. Authors are encouraged to consult SHERPA/ROMEO or their publishing agreements to determine which version of their work can be deposited. The policy covers preprints, postprints (author's final version), and published versions, depending on licensing conditions. The Library plays an active mediating role by consulting with faculty, conducting copyright checks, and managing the deposit process. Guidance and support are provided to researchers throughout submission, reflecting the university's promotion of the green open access route through self-archiving. While the institutional policy does not prescribe detailed embargo terms, compliance with national funding mandates requires that funded publications be made publicly available no later than 12 months after publication. Authors may select from different levels of access within InK, including global open access to the full text, restricted access within the SMU domain, or access limited to abstracts only. In addition to access, InK also functions as a long-term platform for metadata management, preservation, and dissemination of SMU's intellectual output

4. Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM)

Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) hosts the Universiti Putra Malaysia Institutional Repository, also known as PSAS IR or UPMIR (<http://psasir.upm.edu.my/>). It serves as a digital archive and central repository for the university's scholarly and scientific output. The collection covers a wide range of materials, including Master's and PhD theses (with limited access), Master's and PhD project reports, journal articles, journals and bulletins, conference papers, books, book chapters, monographs, UPM news, newspaper articles, patents, and inaugural lectures. The repository is managed by Perpustakaan Sultan Abdul Samad and offers basic, advanced, and browsing search functionalities. UPMIR operates on the EPrints platform.

The metadata policy allows free access and reuse of metadata for non-commercial purposes with proper attribution, while commercial reuse requires permission. Full-text access is mixed, with some materials openly accessible and others restricted or embargoed. Single copies may be used for personal research, study, or educational purposes, provided bibliographic details, a URL, and the original copyright statement are included, and the content remains unchanged. Commercial sale of full items is prohibited without authorization. The repository emphasizes that it functions as an archive rather than a publisher, reinforcing its role as a storage and preservation system.

Submission and self-archiving guidelines are not detailed, but the "controlled access" policy for theses and other works functions as an effective limitation. While embargoes are not formally specified, restrictions on certain content suggest a hybrid access model balancing openness and control. Preservation provisions are explicit and

comprehensive. Items are retained indefinitely, with measures in place to maintain readability and accessibility, supported by regular backups. The policy allows withdrawal only for valid reasons, including publisher rules, copyright violations, plagiarism, legal requirements, national security concerns, or falsified research. Withdrawn items are removed from public view but not deleted; their identifiers and URLs remain as tombstone citations, which are retained records indicating that an item has been withdrawn while preserving its metadata reference to maintain the integrity of the scholarly record. Although withdrawn metadata is no longer searchable, the repository allows updated versions of items to be deposited, with persistent URLs pointing to the latest version. Finally, a continuity clause specifies that if PSAS IR is closed, its content will be transferred to another appropriate archive, ensuring long-term preservation.

5. Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM)

Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) manages Repository@USM (<http://eprints.usm.my/>), an institutional repository that enhances the interoperability, accessibility, and visibility of scholarly materials by providing free global access for research and learning. Its contents include open access journal articles, books, theses abstracts, examination papers, research reports, photographs, and other academic resources. Full-text theses and exam papers require a USM email login. The repository is managed by the USM Library, which actively promotes open access as digital, online, and free-of-charge access to information with minimal copyright restrictions. The Library recognizes three types of open access: Green (self-archiving of pre-prints or post-prints in repositories), Gold (publishing in open access journals, often with Article Processing Charges), and Hybrid (paying for open access within subscription journals, described as “double-dipping”). Repository@USM provides terms of use, submission policies, and guidelines for contributors.

Copyright and licensing policies state that materials are generally accessible only to authorized USM Library users. Theses and academic exercises are restricted to study or research purposes, and users must provide proper attribution. Unauthorized copying, manipulation, or distribution is prohibited. Submission guidelines emphasize compliance with publisher copyright policies, with SHERPA/RoMEO recommended for permission checking. The policy differentiates between pre-prints, post-prints, and publisher PDFs, generally disallowing publisher-produced PDFs unless explicit permission is obtained. Eligible deposit types include journal articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, monographs, and theses/dissertations, in either preprint or postprint form. Depositors must be USM-affiliated faculty, staff, students, or project staff, with at least one USM author. Submissions may be made by email or via the online system, which requires eligibility checks, conversion to acceptable formats, and deposit of the publication. Embargo periods are not explicitly defined. Full-text access remains restricted to authorized USM users, but metadata is openly available. Repository@USM maintains interoperability with multiple index systems and search engines to ensure preservation and discoverability.

6. Universitas Indonesia (UI)

Universitas Indonesia (UI) maintains its institutional repository, Scholar Hub Universitas Indonesia (<https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/>), which preserves and provides access to the university's research output. It hosts a wide range of academic materials, including working papers, published articles, conference papers, presentations, senior theses, and other works not formally published elsewhere. The repository is managed by the Directorate of Administration, Data, and Product Management of Research and Innovation (DADPPRI UI) and is publicly accessible with multiple search and browse functions by collections, disciplines, and authors, as well as notification services. The platform operates on the Digital Commons system.

UI's open access policies are diverse and evolving, reflecting flexibility across journals hosted in Scholar Hub. The Journal of Strategic and Global Studies follows an open access model under the Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) 4.0 license, which allows authors to reuse and distribute their work without embargo, including for commercial purposes, provided proper acknowledgment is given. The International Journal of Islamic Law (IJIL) provides immediate open access under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license, enabling free use and distribution while recognizing author credit. The International Finance and Public Review (IFPR) takes a different approach, requiring authors to assign copyright to UI Scholar Hub but permitting broad personal-use exceptions, such as reposting on non-commercial institutional repositories. These varied licensing models demonstrate the university's overarching commitment to open access while accommodating disciplinary practices, publisher agreements, and institutional priorities. However, such diversity may result in inconsistencies in user rights if policies are not clearly communicated.

In terms of self-archiving and submission, the Journal of Strategic and Global Studies explicitly encourages authors to post their work online, including in institutional repositories or personal websites, before and during submission. For IFPR, authors must provide electronic versions of their work in high-quality PDF or other convertible formats. The Scholar Hub FAQs contain practical submission guidelines covering issues such as scanning older papers, formatting abstracts, including special characters, handling multi-part files, and managing previously published working papers. Both the Journal of Strategic and Global Studies and IJIL emphasize immediate open access, ensuring broad dissemination of scholarship.

Scholar Hub also incorporates preservation and accessibility measures. Although the UIII Repository is mentioned as committed to long-term preservation, Scholar Hub itself explicitly states its role in maintaining research outputs. Its accessibility statement highlights support for tagged PDFs, searchable text, and Optical Character Recognition (OCR). The repository further provides extensive About and FAQ sections to guide users through submission and revision processes. Journal-specific policies complement these resources by clarifying individual requirements and practices, thereby enhancing transparency and usability.

7. University of Malaya (UM)

The University of Malaya (UM) operates two institutional repositories: the UM Research Repository (<https://eprints.um.edu.my/>), which archives both published and unpublished research outputs of UM researchers, and the Students' Repository (<https://studentsrepo.um.edu.my/>), established in 2010 to house academic exercises, dissertations, and theses. Both are managed by the Digital Scholarship and Information Commons and are largely open access, with restrictions applied only in cases of embargo or copyright. Deposits are handled by repository staff, while general users access documents without registration. Both repositories support OAI standards, facilitating broader discovery through services such as OAIster.

UM's open access framework is outlined in repository policies that address metadata, content, submission, and preservation. The postgraduate policy requires theses and research reports to be made publicly available, defining open access as digital content freely accessible online for reading, downloading, distribution, and linking without financial, legal, or technical barriers beyond internet access. Reuse is restricted only to safeguard author attribution and the integrity of the work, reflecting the principles of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (2002). Copyright guidelines allow users to make single copies of full items for personal, educational, or not-for-profit use with attribution, while commercial use requires formal permission. Responsibility for copyright compliance rests with the depositor, consistent with the repository's positioning as an archive rather than a publisher.

All postgraduate candidates are required to submit an electronic copy of their thesis or research report, with faculties transmitting files to the Library for upload. For the UM Research Repository, deposit rights are limited to academic staff, registered students, employees, and authorized agents, and submissions must be limited to one's own work with accompanying bibliographic metadata. Content is not vetted for accuracy or authenticity. Although the UM Research Repository notes that it has "no embargo policy defined," the postgraduate policy allows temporary restrictions to safeguard commercially viable research prior to patenting or publication, suggesting an exception not formally classified as embargo. Metadata is openly reusable for non-commercial purposes with attribution. The repositories commit to long-term access through regular backups, though no explicit retention period is specified, indicating a preservation strategy that lacks the formal structure of institutions with certified frameworks. Items may be withdrawn in cases such as copyright infringement or falsified data, but removal is discouraged. Withdrawn items remain inaccessible yet retrievable via retained URLs, while metadata is suppressed from searches. Updated versions can be deposited, with persistent URLs pointing to the latest version. No closure policy is specified. Overall, the repositories' policies are detailed and systematically articulated, though certain areas, such as embargo and digital preservation, remain less fully developed.

8. University of the Philippines, Diliman (UPD)

The University of the Philippines Diliman (UPD) manages its institutional repository, the Digital Archives @ UP Diliman (DA@UPD) (<https://digitalarchives.upd.edu.ph/>), which serves as the digital records and memory of the campus and permanent records

of the UP System. Its mission is to identify, acquire, preserve, and provide access to digital assets that support the university’s teaching, research, and extension functions. The University Library operates DA@UPD under the oversight of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (OVCAA), extending the University Archives’ mandate to document institutional history. The repository holds Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs), UPIANA/UP publications, faculty and REPS works, special and regular publications, permanent records, and personal papers of notable faculty, executives, and alumni. Public access is available, but uploads are generally limited to ETDs. DA@UPD is governed by a permanent IR & ETD Policy (University of the Philippines Diliman, 2025b), subject to triennial review, with a central aim of expanding access to scholarly output.

Copyright remains with creators unless otherwise specified, and commercial use requires prior permission from the University. Licensing rests with creators unless the University assumes ownership. Content is acquired through submission, harvesting, transfer, donation, licensing, or purchase, and must comply with the collection development policies of the Library and Archives. Contributors include students, faculty, staff, alumni, and academic or administrative units, all responsible for meeting submission requirements. Graduating students must deposit approved ETDs, which are reviewed by library staff. Embargoes of one year, renewable annually, may be requested for works intended for publication or containing patentable or confidential material. During an embargo, only metadata is visible, and embargo renewal rests with contributors; otherwise, the work becomes open access. Access is limited to members of the UP community, with on-campus use via DilNet and off-campus use requiring DilNet login. Exceptions to access restrictions are guided by university policy. Users may reproduce ETDs but must respect copyright and avoid plagiarism, with violations subject to university sanctions.

The University emphasizes long-term digital preservation and access, with the University Library maintaining content in accordance with international standards and reliable infrastructure. Should the Library cease to exist, all holdings remain permanently with the University. Metadata is organized following established digital preservation and archiving standards to ensure interoperability and research use. The IR & ETD Policy is comprehensive, detailing scope, responsibilities, submission procedures, access terms, copyright, preservation, and withdrawal. Its clarity strengthens both transparency and usability for contributors and users.

Table 2. Institutional Repository Profiles and Open Access Policy Components

Institution	Institutional Repository	Platform	Key Open Access Policy Aspects
Chulalongkorn University	Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR)	Not explicitly stated	Uses Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license.

Institution	Institutional Repository	Platform	Key Open Access Policy Aspects
National University of Singapore	ScholarBank@NUS	Not explicitly stated	Advocates Green Open Access, no general self-archiving mandate. Recommends Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) for NUS-funded research. Facilitates compliance with funder mandates (NRF, A*STAR, NMRC).
Singapore Management University	InK (Institutional Knowledge at SMU)	Digital Commons	Formal Open Access Policy approved October 2013, updated 2019. Grants SMU permission/license for open dissemination. Linked to SMU's Intellectual Property Policy. Actively promotes a green open access route, encouraging self-archiving.
Universiti Putra Malaysia	Universiti Putra Malaysia Institutional Repository (PSAS IR or UPMIR)	EPrints	Detailed policies for metadata, data, content, and preservation. Metadata open for non-commercial reuse with attribution. Data policy: access to some full items is controlled. Single copies for non-commercial use with attribution. Commercial sale requires permission.
Universiti Sains Malaysia	Repository@USM	Not explicitly stated	USM Library promotes open access (digital, online, free-of-charge, largely free of copyright/licensing restrictions). Distinguishes Green, Gold, Hybrid OA. "Term of Use" for Repository@USM. Authors ensure

Institution	Institutional Repository	Platform	Key Open Access Policy Aspects
Universitas Indonesia	Scholar Hub Universitas Indonesia	Digital Commons	conformance to publisher copyright. Aims to preserve and provide access to all university research. Journals within Scholar Hub show varied licensing: Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) 4.0 , Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) , or copyright assignment with personal-use exceptions.
University of Malaya	UM Research Repository, Students' Repository	EPrints	"Repository Policies" cover metadata, data, content, submission, and preservation. Postgraduate policy mandates public access to works. Data policy permits single copies for non-commercial use with attribution. Copyright violations are depositor's responsibility.
University of the Philippines, Diliman	Digital Archives @ UP Diliman (DA@UPD)	Not explicitly stated	Comprehensive "IR & ETD Policy". Copyright and intellectual property generally remain with creators unless specified. Adheres to Philippine IP laws. Licensing is creator's responsibility.

Discussion

This section synthesizes the findings from the individual institutional profiles, and discusses commonalities, variations, strengths, and areas for improvement across the selected Southeast Asian universities.

Copyright and Licensing Provisions

A review of copyright and licensing provisions across the selected institutions shows both shared practices and key differences. A common arrangement involves authors keeping the copyright while granting the institution a license to disseminate and preserve their work. This model, found at UPD and UM, is typical of green open access. It allows authors to maintain control over their work and supports wider self-archiving by minimizing legal barriers (Pontika, 2019). In contrast, some institutions or affiliated journals require authors to transfer copyright to the repository or publisher. However, these cases often include clear personal-use rights for authors. For example, UI's journals include similar terms. UI's Scholar Hub enables broader reuse by applying licenses such as CC BY and CC BY-SA.

The use of Creative Commons licenses is growing in the region. CUIR requires the use of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) license, while NUS recommends CC BY-NC 4.0 for research funded by the university. These licenses often restrict commercial use and modification, which helps institutions prevent unauthorized redistribution or repurposing (Mahroofa, 2015; Sheikh & Richardson, 2023). This approach also aims to guard institutional intellectual property against commercial use without prior agreement and to preserve the form and content of scholarly outputs. However, these restrictions may limit opportunities for transformative reuse of research materials. At USM, authors are encouraged to consult publisher policies through tools like SHERPA/RoMEO before submitting to the repository. This practice helps ensure that deposits comply with copyright terms and publisher agreements (Adam & Kiran, 2021; Bashir et al., 2022).

Archiving Mandates and Submission Guidelines

Self-archiving mandates and submission guidelines across the institutions indicate a clear differentiation between types of scholarly output. A consistent requirement is the mandatory submission of postgraduate theses and dissertations. Both UPD and UM require submission of these works, highlighting the role of student research in institutional memory. This practice is commonly found in repositories aiming to capture student output at scale (Roy et al., 2023). By contrast, faculty publications are often governed by more flexible policies. Institutions such as SMU and USM typically encourage or facilitate submissions rather than enforce a uniform mandate. NUS, for example, explicitly states that it does not implement a general self-archiving requirement for open access.

Library staff frequently play a key role in managing the submission process. At SMU, USM, and CUIR, librarians support researchers by conducting copyright checks and assisting with uploads, thereby easing the administrative burden and promoting better compliance (Johnson & Dubinsky, 2022). While some institutions allow self-upload (e.g., NUS, USM), others rely more heavily on librarian-mediated deposits (e.g., CUIR).

Embargo Periods and Access Restrictions

Embargo periods and access restrictions reflect continuing attempts to reconcile open access with intellectual property protection, commercialization, and data security. A recurring influence is funder mandates, particularly the 12-month embargo on publicly funded research (Biesenbender et al., 2019), applied at both SMU and NUS, which aligns with international agency requirements. Access conditions vary by content type, with theses and dissertations frequently subject to special restrictions. At UPM, only the abstract, Chapter 1, and references are accessible, while USM requires institutional login for full texts through its Closed Access Repository. Several institutions permit delayed or restricted access for works with commercial potential, pending intellectual property registration, or containing confidential material, as seen at UM and UPD.

Some repositories impose strict download controls. At CUIR, accounts may be suspended for excessive downloading or automated extraction, reflecting concerns about unauthorized data use (Sheikh & Richardson, 2023). Such measures, often presented under the framework of open access yet limiting in practice, are evident across multiple institutions. Embargoes, authentication requirements, and usage monitoring operate alongside public commitments to open dissemination. These practices are shaped by legal, commercial, and technological constraints, including funder obligations, publisher agreements, and growing concern about large-scale data scraping for machine learning without attribution.

Policies on embargoes are inconsistently defined and applied. UPD allows a renewable one-year embargo, while UM's repository lists no official policy despite postgraduate guidelines permitting delays for intellectual property reasons. Such internal inconsistencies create uncertainty and highlight the need for unified frameworks (Roy et al., 2023). Differences in repository access policies are also striking. UI Scholar Hub journals offer full open access, whereas USM's Repository@USM, though labeled "open access," limits use to institutional users. Its "Terms of Use" specify availability only to authorized USM Library members, contradicting claims of global accessibility. These discrepancies between institutional messaging and actual practice call for urgent policy review to ensure transparency and consistency.

Table 3. Thematic Comparative Analysis of Institutional Open Access Policies

Theme	Chulalongkorn University (CUIR)	National University of Singapore (ScholarBank@NUS)	Singapore Management University (SMU @InK)	Universitas Indonesia (UI Scholar)	Universiti Malaya (ePrints@UM)	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM IR)	Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM IR)	University of the Philippines Diliman (<i>Digital Archives @ UP Diliman</i>)
Copyright and Licensing Provisions	Applies Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 license to deposited works; rights generally retained by authors	Recommends Creative Commons licensing (e.g., CC BY-NC 4.0), especially for grant-funded outputs; authors retain copyright unless otherwise stated	Authors retain copyright; no formal license mandate; uses Digital Commons terms of use as default	Accepts a range of Creative Commons licenses (e.g., CC BY, CC BY-SA); authors and journals determine copyright terms	Authors generally retain copyright; licensing decisions are flexible; no centralized license requirement	Authors retain rights; repository enables open dissemination with flexible access controls	No explicit repository-wide copyright license; access to full-text may be limited to university community despite open access claims	Authors retain copyright; non-exclusive distribution license granted to the university; comprehensive copyright information available
Self-Archiving Mandates and Submission Guidelines	Submission is librarian-mediated; clear guidelines on acceptable versions (preprint/postprint); faculty and	No institutional self-archiving mandate, but submission is encouraged; authors may deposit published or accepted	Submission encouraged but not required; repository supports voluntary self-archiving;	Self-archiving primarily applies to journal articles; repository includes	Postgraduate thesis deposit is mandatory; repository accepts a range of content types;	Thesis deposit required for graduate students; submission and metadata guidelines are	Submission is encouraged but not mandated; repository staff may mediate	ETD deposit is mandatory; library provides strong guidance; deposits are often

Theme	Chulalongkorn University (CUIR)	National University of Singapore (ScholarBank@NUS)	Singapore Management University (SMU @InK)	Universitas Indonesia (UI Scholar)	Universiti Malaya (ePrints@UM)	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM IR)	Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM IR)	University of the Philippines Diliman (<i>Digital Archives @ UP Diliman</i>)
	graduate works prioritized	versions; repository team offers support	assistance provided by library staff	detailed submission and versioning guidelines	submission process is library-mediated	clearly provided	deposits; versioning policies exist but are inconsistently applied	mediated; repository includes both journal and grey literature content
Embargo Periods and Access Restrictions	Repository imposes strict monitoring and access control; embargoes may apply for sensitive or unpublished data	Standard 12-month embargo policy for outputs resulting from funded research; access may be delayed to comply with publisher or funder requirements	Standard embargo period is 12 months; aligned with publisher or funder policies; access managed post-review	Majority of content is open access; embargoes are less frequently used or emphasized	Embargoes permitted for commercial or sensitive material; full access to theses may be restricted	12-month embargoes are standard; extensions allowed; partial content may be publicly available during embargo	Repository claims open access but access to many full texts is restricted to USM affiliates; terms of use contradict open access principles	1-year renewable embargo permitted for ETDs and some journals; embargo status is clearly labeled in repository records

Theme	Chulalongkorn University (CUIR)	National University of Singapore (ScholarBank@NUS)	Singapore Management University (SMU @InK)	Universitas Indonesia (UI Scholar)	Universiti Malaya (ePrints@UM)	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM IR)	Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM IR)	University of the Philippines Diliman (<i>Digital Archives @ UP Diliman</i>)
Metadata and Preservation Strategies	Repository allows open reuse of metadata; uses EPrints software; standard preservation practices apply	Promotes use of open formats; metadata standards (Dublin Core) applied; preservation strategies align with institutional IT policies	Uses Digital Commons; metadata harvesting supported; relies on vendor-hosted preservation infrastructure	Uses Digital Commons; standard preservation features embedded; metadata clearly structured for harvesting	Uses EPrints; preservation includes backups, basic content migration; less detail on long-term curation strategies	Employs strong digital preservation strategy; includes tombstone citations, file format policies, and plans for database migration	Uses EPrints platform; employs typical preservation mechanisms like backup, but lacks long-term preservation policy clarity	Advanced preservation protocols including persistent identifiers, regular backups, and strong digital curation standards; uses both Tuklas and OJS platforms
Clarity, Accessibility, and Comprehensiveness of Documentation	Provides concise policy summaries on the repository; download restrictions clearly articulated;	Access policies and copyright terms are available; documentation is understandable but	Open Access Policy is clear, well-structured, and prominently displayed; repository	Includes FAQs, author guidelines, and accessibility statements; documentation is fairly	Documentation is moderately detailed and easy to locate; submission and copyright	Strong policy documentation, particularly for ETD submissions; guidelines for metadata and	Documentation on terms of use is contradictory; repository purpose and actual access	Clear, detailed policy statements covering copyright, licensing, access, and

Theme	Chulalongkorn University (CUIR)	National University of Singapore (ScholarBank@NUS)	Singapore Management University (SMU @InK)	Universitas Indonesia (UI Scholar)	Universiti Malaya (ePrints@UM)	Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM IR)	Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM IR)	University of the Philippines Diliman (<i>Digital Archives @ UP Diliman</i>)
	navigation is straightforward	not extensive; clear user instructions	interface supports user comprehension	accessible and readable	guidelines are included	access are available	controls are misaligned	preservation; repository documentation is user-friendly and comprehensive

Metadata and Preservation Strategies

The surveyed institutions recognize the importance of metadata and long-term preservation. Metadata is generally open and reusable for non-commercial purposes with attribution, as seen at UM and UPM, supporting broader visibility through harvesting and indexing (Woutersen-Windhouver et al., 2020). Most institutions commit to ongoing access through measures like regular backups, with platforms such as Digital Commons (SMU, UI) and EPrints (UM, UPM) ensuring baseline preservation and interoperability via OAI-PMH (Farida et al., 2015; Pontika, 2019).

Preservation policies vary in detail and maturity. UPM and UPD present structured strategies: UPM mandates indefinite retention, withdrawal with ‘tombstone’ citations, and data transfer if the repository closes; UPD assigns preservation responsibility and ensures custody under international standards. In contrast, UM provides no defined retention period, only a general intent to maintain access, suggesting a less formal approach. NUS emphasizes open file formats to address obsolescence risks, showing awareness of technical challenges.

Institutions with clearer, structured policies are better prepared to preserve digital assets over time (Bashir et al., 2022). Others, relying on broad or informal guidelines, risk difficulties in maintaining long-term accessibility and integrity. These disparities highlight the need for regional collaboration to strengthen preservation capacity and establish shared best practices.

Clarity, Accessibility, and Comprehensiveness of Documentation

The structure and quality of open access policy documentation vary across the surveyed institutions. These differences affect how contributors and users understand submission procedures, access conditions, and copyright provisions. Most repositories include an “About” or “Policy” section, but their level of detail and organization differs. The University of the Philippines Diliman (UPD), Singapore Management University (SMU), and Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) have clear and well-organized policies that define responsibilities, outline submission and access processes, and specify copyright and preservation terms (Budapest Open Access Initiative, 2002; Johnson & Dubinsky, 2022).

Other institutions show incomplete or inconsistent documentation. In some cases, information is scattered across several webpages or documents, making it difficult for users to locate or interpret policies (Roy et al., 2023). Contradictory statements also occur; for example, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) describes its repository as open access but limits full-text access to institutional users, which can reduce user confidence. Some repositories, such as Universitas Indonesia’s (UI) Scholar Hub, include FAQ and accessibility pages that clarify submission and access processes and support inclusive use. While most institutions recognize the importance of making policies visible, the level of clarity and consistency remains uneven. Greater standardization and clearer documentation would help users understand open access procedures and strengthen trust in repository management.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The review of open access policies across selected institutional repositories in Southeast Asia indicates significant variation in implementation, shaped by institutional priorities, available resources, and external factors such as funder requirements and publisher restrictions. Although most institutions demonstrate support for open access, the degree and form of implementation differ widely. One recurring approach is the effort to balance openness with control over intellectual property. Licensing choices such as CC BY-NC and CC BY-NC-ND, as well as copyright assignment models with broad personal-use exceptions, are common. These arrangements promote access and citation while limiting commercial use and modification. While such restrictions may protect institutional interests, they also reduce opportunities for creative reuse and the full benefits of more permissive licensing. Another key observation is the stronger enforcement of deposit mandates for postgraduate theses and dissertations, compared to the more flexible or optional approach toward faculty publications. This strategy may be intended to avoid resistance from faculty but can result in uneven repository content. The role of library staff is central in this context. Their involvement in guiding authors through submission, rights management, and publisher compliance is essential, especially where institutional policies place responsibility for legal compliance on researchers. Preservation strategies also vary in maturity. Most institutions rely on standard repository platforms with baseline preservation features and general commitments to long-term access. However, only a few have developed detailed policies that include specific retention periods, formal withdrawal procedures, and contingency planning for system shutdowns. The absence of these elements in many repositories raises concerns about the sustainability and reliability of long-term digital preservation. Finally, inconsistencies in policy documentation remain a major concern. Contradictory access statements, fragmented information across web pages, and the use of outdated or inactive links reduce transparency and may confuse users. Clear, consolidated, and accessible policy documentation is essential to support informed participation, promote trust, and ensure that institutional repositories function effectively as open access infrastructures. A notable observation emerging from the analysis is the presence of pseudo-open-access mechanisms across several repositories. These include the imposition of authentication requirements, restrictive download limits, and prolonged embargoes that effectively constrain public access despite open access claims. While such measures are often justified as safeguards for intellectual property or data security, they undermine the core principle of unrestricted access that defines open access. Addressing these inconsistencies through clearer policy articulation and community-driven guidelines is essential to ensure that open access within Southeast Asia remains genuinely open in practice as well as in policy.

Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations are put forth for enhancing open access policies and practices in the region:

1. Develop and implement a unified institutional open access policy. Institutions should consolidate policies across all repository types: research, theses, data, and affiliated journals, into a single, cohesive framework. This policy should explicitly

define positions on copyright ownership, licensing terms, access conditions, and embargo periods for all scholarly outputs.

2. Standardize and improve policy documentation and accessibility. Institutions must ensure that policy documents are clearly written, comprehensive, and prominently displayed on institutional and repository websites. These should include consistent definitions of key terms such as “open access,” “embargo,” and “version of record,” and must comply with international web accessibility standards.

3. Adopt phased self-archiving mandates with structured support. Institutions should introduce or expand faculty self-archiving mandates in a phased manner, potentially linked to internal research funding or evaluation. This should be supported by library-led services that guide researchers through copyright compliance and assist with deposit workflows.

4. Strengthen digital preservation infrastructure and policies. Institutions should explicitly define retention periods, formalize withdrawal and migration procedures, and establish disaster recovery and closure protocols. Adopting international standards such as CoreTrustSeal or OAIS and conducting regular audits will enhance preservation reliability.

5. Promote use of more open Creative Commons licenses. Where allowed by institutional and funder policies, authors should be encouraged to adopt more permissive licenses such as CC BY. Repositories should provide clear guidance on license options and explain their implications for both authors and users.

6. Integrate research data management and responsible sharing policies. Institutional repositories should formally include research data in their scope, with clear policies on submission, metadata standards, retention, and access. Proportionate technical safeguards should be implemented to prevent misuse without undermining legitimate open access.

Addressing these gaps will enable Southeast Asian universities to improve the effectiveness of their institutional repositories, align more closely with open access principles, and participate more fully in global scholarly communication.

Author Declaration on the Use of AI Tools

Artificial intelligence tools, specifically Grammarly and ChatGPT, were used solely for grammar checking and final proofreading of this manuscript. All data analysis, interpretation, and scholarly writing were conducted by the authors. The use of AI did not involve the generation of original content, data analysis, or conceptual framing of the study.

References

- Adam, A., & Kiran, K. (2021). Exploring information literacy practices in institutional repositories. *Library Management*, 42(6/7), 395–410. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-11-2020-0155>
- ASEAN Citation Index (ACI). (2023). *Why ACI*. Retrieved October 24, 2025, from https://asean-cites.org/view?slug=why_aci
- ASEAN University Network Inter-Library Online (AUNILO). (2025). *About AUNILO*. ASEAN University Network. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://aunilo.net/about/>
- Bashir, H., Mahmood, K., & Shafique, F. (2022). Sustainability of digital repositories in academic libraries: A developing country perspective. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1–16. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6797/>
- Baxter, J. (2009). Content analysis. In L. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 112–115). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n65>
- Biesenbender, S., Peters, I., & Vowinkel, J. (2019). Tracking open access policy implementation in research organizations: A theoretical framework. *Publications*, 7(3), 60. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7030060>
- Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2002). *Read the declaration*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read/>
- Campbell, L., & Jeffery, K. (2024). Using UX testing to optimize discoverability of non-traditional resources. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 19(4), 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip30594>
- Chulalongkorn University. (2025). *Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR)*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th/>
- Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository. (2025). *About CUIR*. Chulalongkorn University. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th/dspace/sidebar/about.html>
- Confederation of Open Access Repositories. (2020). *COAR community framework for good practices in repositories*. <https://coar-repositories.org/coar-community-framework-for-good-practices-in-repositories/>
- CoreTrustSeal. (2023). *Trustworthy data repository requirements: 2023–2025*. <https://www.coretrustseal.org/why-certification/requirements/>
- Creative Commons. (2022). *About CC licenses*. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

- Drakes, M. A. (2004). Digital preservation policy for the institutional repository. *Library Review*, 53(8), 442–448. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530410553704>
- Farida, I., Tjakraatmadja, J. H., Firman, A., & Basuki, S. (2015). A conceptual model of open access institutional repository in Indonesia academic libraries: Viewed from knowledge management perspective. *Library Management*, 36(1), 168–181. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-03-2014-0038>
- Jisc. (2024). *Open Policy Finder / SHERPA services*. <https://openpolicyfinder.jisc.ac.uk/>
- Johnson, B., & Dubinsky, E. (2022). Open science and institutional repositories: Synergies and strategies. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 53(2), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.53.2.89>
- Lynch, C. A. (2003). Institutional repositories: Essential infrastructure for scholarship in the digital age. *ARL: A Bimonthly Report*, 226, 1–7. <https://www.cni.org/wp-content/uploads/2003/02/arl-br-226-Lynch-IRs-2003.pdf>
- Mahroofa, M. M. (2015). Open access revolution: Is it a paradigm shift of scholarly publishing practices? A literature review of global scenario. *Journal of the University Librarians Association of Sri Lanka*, 19(1), 15–32. <https://doi.org/10.4038/jula.v19i1.7864>
- National University of Singapore. (2025). *ScholarBank @ NUS*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/>
- OpenDOAR. (n.d.). *Directory of Open Access Repositories*. Retrieved June 23, 2025, from <https://v2.opendoar.org/>
- Pinfield, S. (2015). Making open access work: The “state of the art” in providing open access to scholarly literature. *Online Information Review*, Vol. 39 No. 5 pp. 604–636, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-05-2015-0167>
- Pinfield, S., Salter, J., & Bath, P. A. (2017). A “gold-centric” implementation of open access: Hybrid journals, the “total cost of publication,” and policy development in the United Kingdom. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(9), 2248–2263. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23742>
- Pontika, N. (2019). Open science and open access: The dual role of institutional repositories. *Insights*, 32(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.451>
- Roy, B. K., Biswas, S. C., & Mukhopadhyay, P. (2023). Access policies in institutional digital repositories: Analysis of global trends. *International Journal of Information Science and Management*, 21(2), 245–269. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijism.2023.1977429.0>

- Sheikh, A., & Richardson, J. (2023). Open access movement in the scholarly world: Pathways for libraries in developing countries. *Journal of Information Science*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515231202758>
- SHERPA/RoMEO. (n.d.). *Publisher copyright policies & self-archiving*. Retrieved June 23, 2025, from <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/>
- Singapore Management University. (2019). *Open access policy*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://library.smu.edu.sg/sites/library.smu.edu.sg/files/library/pdf/OpenaccesspolicySMU20190228.pdf>
- Singapore Management University. (2025). *SMU Institutional Knowledge – InK*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <http://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/>
- Rampin, R., & Rampin, T. (2021). *Taguette: open-source qualitative research tool* (Version 1.2.2) [Computer software]. <https://www.taguette.org>
- Universitas Indonesia. (2025). *ScholarHub UI*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/>
- Universiti Malaya. (2025). *UM Eprints*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://eprints.um.edu.my/>
- Universiti Putra Malaysia. (2025). *PSAS Institutional Repository*. Perpustakaan Sultan Abdul Samad. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <http://psasir.upm.edu.my/>
- Universiti Sains Malaysia. (n.d.). *ePrints@USM: USM Institutional Repository*. Perpustakaan Hamzah Sendut, Universiti Sains Malaysia. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <http://eprints.usm.my/>
- University of the Philippines Diliman. (2025). *Digital Archives @ UP Diliman*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://digitalarchives.upd.edu.ph/>
- University of the Philippines Diliman. (2025b). *IR & ETD Policy, Digital Archives @ UP Diliman*. Retrieved May 13, 2025, from <https://digitalarchives.upd.edu.ph/policy>
- UNESCO. (2021). *UNESCO recommendation on open science*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379949>
- van Wyk, B., & Mostert, J. (2011). The role of institutional repositories in promoting open access to research output at South African universities: Opportunities and challenges. *The South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 77(2), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.7553/77-2-47>
- Woutersen-Windhouver, S., van der Graaf, M., & Dijk, E. M. (2020). Institutional repositories and the visibility of science in Latin America. *Data Science Journal*, 19, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5334/dsj-2020-010>

Xia, J. (2007). Assessment of self-archiving in institutional repositories: Across disciplines. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(6), 647–654.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2007.09.020>

Xia, J., Myers, R. L., & Wilhoite, S. K. (2011). Multiple open access availability and citation impact. *Journal of Information Science*, 37(1), 19–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551510389358>