

Archiving E-Publications

DPC Forum, 12 March 2003

Maggie Jones

libmjj@leeds.ac.uk

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

NESLI/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

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

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