ABSTRACT
The assertion for the point/counterpoint session is: that the opportunity to develop digital scholar’s labs and provide expertise around linking data has arisen and that these new “eResearch business services” should be delivered by universities libraries. The rationale for the affirmative is that the skills and expertise already lie within staff in university libraries and this new service is an extension of current services in support of scholarship. The rationale for the negative is that this is new business entirely requiring radically different skill sets and expertise to support digital scholarship, and therefore a new service unit should be developed in the university. The basis for the debate and discussion is the emergence overseas in the USA of digital scholar’s labs and library innovation labs. The Scholars’ lab at University of Virginia [1], the MIT Media Lab [2], the Digital Scholarship Lab at University of Richmond [3], and the Harvard Library Innovation lab [4] are proffered in this session as leaders in the field of eResearch support. The labs are service points (both technological and human resource based) that assist academics to exploit resources and research infrastructure more effectively. The labs have emerged to support an increasing need for technical guidance and programming services, to support research project activities specifically. The labs have a strong focus on support for digital humanities research. The labs support eResearch more broadly to deliver general research infrastructure services more effectively and develop applications, in response to changing research needs. The hybrid scholars, librarians and technologists in these labs provide new services not delivered elsewhere in the university. One of those new services is the provision of support for linking data. The services in support of structuring and linking data range from advice around the use of controlled vocabularies (semantics) through to providing development support (technology) and licences (legal).

LIBRARY TRANSFORMATION
Transformation is apparent across the university library landscape in Australia. A notable proportion of that business change appears to have been around reconfiguring collection management practices and where funding has been secured, to step cautiously and steadily into the research data management space. These are big shifts in practice. If the signs of what is happening offshore are to be considered as an indication of what lies ahead for university libraries in Australia, there is significantly more change to come. What appears to lie ahead is an opportunity for universities to build into and exploit more effectively the knowledge and skill sets embedded in university libraries. These skills and this expertise could be built upon drawing from staff working as liaison librarians and the technical librarians working in university libraries.

ERESEARCH SUPPORT SERVICES
Support for research data seeking can sit readily alongside the services libraries deliver to scholars. A glance at subject guides on university library websites gives an indication that this oversight is falling into the brief of a liaison librarian to fulfil. Support for data literacy, like data seeking, can also be folded readily into current library business. The Australian National Data Service (ANDS) [5] funded “Seeding the Commons” projects have in the main been led and delivered by university library staff. The personal front for the ongoing service on a day-to-day basis, while resourced technically by collaborative effort with the research office and IT departments, appears to be university library staff. Broadly speaking, this is familiar service territory for library professionals. But data as a new type of research resource that requires library professionals to extend their knowledge and skills, to understand in depth how data emerges, what data is needed and is exploited, as a part of scholarly communication.

OPPORTUNITY
This paper asserts that the opportunity for the development of new services around structuring and linking data is open to university libraries because the working relationships, skills and expertise lies already within many of the staff working in those libraries. This assertion does not preclude the involvement of other staff in other agencies in the university. The underlying rationale for this assertion is business continuity. University libraries have been leaders in providing support for scholarly communication and that this position can be
maintained. The specialist knowledge of patterns of production and consumption of research resources and cultural patterns associated with diverse domains of research is what libraries provide for information so why is data any different? However, if that position is no longer tenable, and it is not university libraries that move into this untrammeled territory in support of scholarly communication and play a key role, as the support agency in universities, then whose role will it be? What is the impact be on the role and status of university libraries ongoing if support for digital scholarship lies outside of the library? What efficiency gains are there by working in concert and collaboratively? What risks are there if the support infrastructure is developed in an ad hoc manner? What are the risks if university libraries in particular don’t take the lead, or universities in general, don’t step strategically into this space?

WHAT NEXT?
On the proviso that this opportunity does exist for university libraries and that there may be gain by universities libraries acting in concert (to acknowledge shared needs, pool effort and resources). What are the next best steps to take? What roles could eResearch agencies play to help university libraries to exploit that opportunity effectively? Particularly in providing advice around controlled vocabularies and linking data. There is no library or lab in Australian universities offering these services. There are experts on staff in eResearch agencies that can liaise and work with colleagues in universities, but who and where do those experts sit? Where will this new business support going to emerge from and which agency with universities is best suited to provide support for structuring and linking data?

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
Some questions we could explore this assertion with the audience in this point/counterpoint session are:

- What are the business models of these labs and what and whose scholarship needs do they serve?
- How suitable are the business models of these labs for eResearch support here in Australia?
- What are library business models and how are they impacted by changed needs of eResearch and more particularly research data management?
- Why has support for linking data, most specifically, ended up in the hands of librarians in these labs overseas?
- What domain knowledge and skills are required to assist researchers wishing to link data?
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