



How well are they doing?

E-Journals are Forever?

British Library 26 April 2010



Cornell University



ICPSR
A PARTNER IN
SOCIAL SCIENCE
RESEARCH

INTER-UNIVERSITY
CONSORTIUM FOR
POLITICAL AND
SOCIAL RESEARCH




Overview

- Community Context
- Revisit 2006 Report
- Conclusion



Community Context



Trusted Digital Repository Model

6. Procedural Accountability (Certification)

1. Administrative Responsibility

2. Organizational Viability


Digital Archives Border

3. Financial Sustainability


4. Technological and Procedural Suitability

5. System Security

OAIS High Level Reference Model



Integrated Digital Preservation Matrix



Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Preservation and Access



LIFE Cost Model

$$L_T = C + Aq_T + I_T + M_T + BP_T + CP_T + Ac_T$$

L	=	Complete lifecycle cost over time 0 to T.
C	=	Creation
Aq	=	Acquisition
I	=	Ingest
M	=	Metadata Creation
BP	=	Bit-stream Preservation
CP	=	Content Preservation
Ac	=	Access

TRAC and Related

- TRAC 2007
- DRAMBORA
- nestor
- Ten Principles
- Data Seal of Approval
- ISO 2010






DPM Approach

- What's happening?
 - Continual DP community and beyond scan
- What's not?
 - Conduct gap analysis
- What should happen?
 - Build/share compliant models/framework

Revisit 2006 Report



Reviewed 12 Programs


- CISTI (Canada)
- CLOCKSS
- OCLC ECO
- OhioLINK EJC
- KB e-Depot (Holland)
- kopal/DDB(Germany)
- LANL-RL
- LOCKSS Alliance
- Ontario Scholars Portal
- PANDORA
- Portico
- PubMed Central




Seven Program Indicators

- Explicit mission and necessary mandate
- Necessary rights and responsibilities
- Content coverage
- Minimal set of services
- Access and triggers
- Organizational viability
- Network

Is Evidence of the Following Indicators in Place?



Publisher Overlap



Commitment to Standards

Standard or Practice	CSI	ECO	EJC	KB	KOP	LA	LANL	NLA	OSP	PMC	PORT
OAIS	•			•	•	•					•
Trusted Digital Repositories				P		•	P				•
PREMIS	•			P		P	P				•
OAI-PMH	•			P		•	•			•	•
JAI DTD (NLM)	•									•	•
Audit Checklist				P		P					•
Open source software	•				•	•	•	•			•
Open file formats					•	•	•		•	•	•
Nonproprietary storage media						•	•				•
Other				P	•						

Table 5. Responses to question: "Do you follow any of the following standards and best community practices for archiving?" (• = yes; P = plan to within six months)



For Libraries

2006

- Push publishers on archiving
- Transparent about what, how and why
- Join 1+ initiatives – press to meet needs
- Develop registry of archived publications
- Lobby programs to participate in networks

2010

- Systematically address small publishers



For Publishers

2006

- Join 1+ e-journal archiving programs
- Provide adequate information and data
- Extend liberal archiving rights in licenses

2010

- Transparent about what, where, how



For Archiving Programs

2006

- Provide evidence of minimal services (well managed collections)
- Transparent about what and how
- Assure appropriate rights
- Move toward public domain

2010

- Still: Develop interdependent network



Minimal Requirements

Well-managed collection status for all:

- Basic deposit information
- Minimal metadata for content
- Common or *normalized* file formats
- Controlled and known storage of content
- Multiple copies in at least 2 locations

Achieving this is everyone's concern



Conclusion



Implications: NSF Report Components

- Value – case for use
- Incentives – beneficiaries & owners
- Roles – responsibilities



Implications: NSF Scenarios

- Scholarly discourse
- Research data
- Commercially owned
- Collectively produced

Holistic, Balanced Approach

