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Broader Context

• JISC Continuing Access and Digital Preservation Strategy 2002-2005
  <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=pres_continuing>
Sets greater emphasis on development of production services.

Key initiatives include:
Development …of a national repository for the preservation of e-journals used by the community
Broader context, cont.

• Digital Preservation and Records Management Programme
  <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=programme_preservation>

  Funding a series of projects to support the JISC Strategy, including Archiving E-Publications
Archiving E-Publications

• Outline available from:
  <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=project_epub_archiving>
  - digest of reading
  - summary report of libraries survey
  - report of Workshop (forthcoming)
Background

- PSLI 1996-1998
  - Site licences with 4 publishers - focus on print
- NESLI 1999-2002
  - Encouraged a move by libraries towards electronic access
  - Encouraged publishers to permit print cancellations
  - JISC journal deals will continue this trend
e-journals - advantages

• Most commonly cited reasons for moving to e-only:
  – convenience (24/7 access)
  – potential space savings
  – improved access to a greater number of titles
  – increasing needs and expectations of users

• Publishers are increasingly investing in digital content
Issues

• Few journals are solely in digital form at this stage but parallel print/e-access can only be regarded as interim
• What guarantees do libraries have when they licence access to material they don’t own?
  – Concerns about continued access following termination of a licence are a major inhibiting factor for libraries wishing to move to e-only access
Nesli/Jisc Model Licence

- Developed collaboratively between publishers and libraries
- Since 1999 has included clauses relating to continued access to material already paid for following termination of licence
- Assumes the licence cost includes “perpetual access”
NESLI Deals for 2002

- > 4,000 journals licensed during 2002
- 81% of those titles come from 5 publishers
- Most publishers accepted the Model Licence, including archiving clauses
NESSLI/JISC Archiving Clauses

• Clause 2.2.2 provides three options:
  Following termination of licence, continued access to be delivered:
  – online from publishers server or third party
  – archival copy delivered to Licensee
  – archival copy delivered to a central archiving facility operated on behalf of HE
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Archiving by publishers

- Business model doesn’t include preservation for common good
- Publishers don’t necessarily hold all archival rights
- Vary greatly in size, business model, strategic directions
- Libraries have concerns about publishers taking on this role
Archiving by the Library

- The “archival copy” referred to in the licence tends to be CD-ROM
- Libraries do not want to undertake this role
- Random distribution of effort
- There is a strong sense of wanting to find a national solution offering a reliable service
Central Archiving Facility

• A central service is needed which would provide libraries with the assurance they need without undermining publishers business models
  • What should it look like?
  • How would it operate?
  • How would it be funded?
Workshop

• 26 invited delegates attended a Workshop on 17th February 2003
• Considered organisational options; related developments; legal issues; business models
• Assumed that the status quo needs to be improved
• Needed to decide on plan of action to move things forward
Key Legal Issues

• Currently contracts are with individual HEI’s
  – A central facility would need to negotiate new contracts with each publisher

• Greater protection is needed
  – particularly for cases where deals are not renewed and only CD ROMs can be provided or where renewal contract overrides access obligations in previous contracts
Business Models

- Assumed funding strategy would be combination of public funding and subscription fees
  - identified potential sources of funding
- Needs a very clear corporate objective
- Need to be able to test how scaleable a central service is
Organisational options

• Monolithic standalone facility only for U.K is not feasible
• Need to focus on U.K needs but have international dimension
• Need to have flexibility in service delivery but central co-ordination
Models outside U.K

• Publisher/library co-operation (Mellon projects)
  – New organisations will be necessary to act in the broad interests of the scholarly community and mediate the interest of libraries and publishers
  – LOCKSS and JSTOR are developing their archival solutions

• national library acting as official archive for publisher (KB/Elsevier agreement)

• OCLC Digital Archive
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Legal Deposit

• Anticipated legal deposit legislation may mean overlap between U.K e-journals preserved as part of LD and licenced to HEI’s
  – legal deposit has always included access restrictions
Major points of agreement

- Any solution *must* be an active collaboration between libraries and publishers (and possibly wider than this)
- Publishers’ servers are probably the best means of access in the short-medium term
- The option of providing an archival copy to individual libraries is not recommended
- Another entity needs to be established to ensure ongoing access
Next Steps

• Establish a Steering Group to undertake planning and advocacy for a centrally co-ordinated service.
  – The group should be under the auspices of PALS (Publishers and Libraries)
  – it should be supported by JISC, ALPSP, and PA
  – it should aim for a funding proposal by 2004
Issues to be resolved

• Funding and ongoing maintenance
• Determining the legal framework
• Deciding priorities for safekeeping
• Taking account of international dimension
The challenges

• To take account of the complexities – but not to delay action

• To establish a centrally co-ordinated services that can meet some immediate needs and develop incrementally