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Background

- Pilot Site Licensing Initiative 1996-98
  - focus primarily on print
- National Electronic Site Licensing Initiative (NESLI) 1999-2002
  - encouraged move to e-only access
- JISC Journal Negotiations 2003+
Why Libraries want to move to e-only

- Convenience (24/7)
- Potential space savings
- Improved access to a greater number of titles
- Increasing needs and expectations of users
Issues

- Few journals are solely in digital form at this stage
  - but parallel print/electronic can only be regarded as interim
- What guarantees do libraries have when they licence access to material they don’t own?
Developed collaboratively between libraries and publishers

Since 1999 has included clauses relating to continued access following termination of licence

Assumes ‘perpetual access’ to material paid for
Model Licence Archiving Clauses

- Clause 2.2.2 provides three options:
  - Online from publishers server
  - Archival copy delivered to Licensee
  - Archival copy delivered to central facility operated on behalf of UK HE

- Most publishers have signed up to these clauses so far
JISC E-Publications Consultancy

- Scoping requirements for implementing the Model Licence clauses
  <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=project_epub_archiving>
- Part of JISC Continuing Access and Digital Preservation Strategy 2002-2005
  <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=pres_continuing>
Archiving by the Publisher

- Publishers have never taken on a preservation role
- They are subject to volatile market forces
- Libraries expressed concerns at leaving this role to publishers
- Difficult to ensure that signing up to clauses is more than a symbolic gesture
Archiving by the individual library (the Licensee)

- “Archival copy” tends to be CD-ROM
- Libraries want a national solution
- Need reliable and trusted service
Central Archiving Service

1. Clearly needed but doesn’t yet exist
   1. What should it look like?
   2. How should it operate?
   3. How would it be funded?
Workshop

- 17th February 2003.
- 26 invited delegates.
- Explored a range of organisational and business models and legal issues.
- Overriding assumption: The status quo needs to improve.
Key Legal Issues

- Currently, contracts are between publishers and individual HEI’s.
- Greater protection is needed.
  - Particularly when deals are not renewed and only CD-ROM’s can be provided OR where the renewal contract overrides the access obligations
- Tracking rights management across time is extremely complex.
Organisational Options

- Need a centrally co-ordinated service but distributed delivery.
- Need to focus on UK needs but have an international dimension.
  - Content is not just UK
  - Models for dealing with e-journals are being developed
- Service *must* develop as a collaboration between libraries and publishers.
Next Steps

- Steering Group of library/publisher representatives.
- Tasked with planning and advocacy for a centrally co-ordinated service, operating on a not-for-profit basis.
- Will need to decide priorities for preservation.
Selection By Demand?

- c. 4,500 journal titles were licensed in NESLI deals in 2002.
- 17 publishers.
- 81% from 5 publishers.
  - may be least vulnerable category for preservation?
Selection by national boundaries?

- Legal Deposit legislation is anticipated in the U.K.
- Publisher/library agreements, e.g. KB/Elsevier; DDB/SpringerLINK.
Other related developments

- LOCKSS/JSTOR
- OCLC Digital Archive
- PubMedCentral
- NDIIPP
- Institutional repositories
Challenges

- UK service will need to ensure all licensed content is safe.
- Need to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.
- Not everyone needs to do everything but someone needs to do something!
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