

Librarians & Publishers- Why we contacted them

- To tell them about the general nature of the project
- To seek their views on the concept of receiving and holding NESLi2 journals data in a central UK HE archive on behalf of NESLi2 institutions
- ..and on the proposed registry of rights
- To seek their cooperation in arranging an initial exchange of sample journals data between publishers and librarians, in order to compare archival rights
- To invite them to participate in this meeting: to give views; discuss the project; consider the value of a pilot ; agree on how to take things forward.

Which publishers and libraries?

■ Publishers

- Elsevier
- Institute of Physics Publishing
- Oxford University Press
- Royal Society of Chemistry
- SAGE
- Springer
- Wiley-Blackwell

■ Libraries

- University of Aberdeen
- University of Cardiff
- Edge Hill University
- Glasgow University
- University of Hertfordshire
- UCL

Sample data

- The aim of the exchange of data is to see whether publishers and librarians agree on which titles are eligible for post-termination access and the periods
- To get a feel for the potential size and complexity of the proposed registry based on a small sample
- Subscribed and 'unsubscribed' titles (eg 'Big Deal' titles)
- We asked for only 2008 and 2009 data to make the exercise easily manageable
- Based on 2 or 3 publishers' journals per library

Status of receipt of data

	Elsevier	IoPP	OUP data received	RSC data received	SAGE	Springer	W-B
Glasgow data received	X			X			
UCL data received		X				X	
Cardiff data received			X				X
Aberdeen data received	X					X	X
Hertfordshire	X			X	X		
Edge Hill data received			X		X		

The Archival Rights Registry

- Data content still to be considered, but will include:
 - List of publishers in NESLi2 agreements
 - List of institutions participating in NESLi2 agreements
 - Titles list per publisher that shows individual institutions that have subscribed to/had access to, indicating archival rights per institution
 - Periods of archival rights per institution

Further information on the registry and archive will be presented in the next presentation

Feedback / comments from libraries on the proposed initiative

- Libraries welcome the initiative and willing to compare data with publishers
- The registry could potentially be of more interest than the archive
- Creating and running an archive could be a massive project
- Potential problems with titles changes, transfers, mergers
- Challenges in reaching agreement with publishers on rights
- The registry would be very useful for reassurance of actual rights
- It would give comfort to libraries moving to online-only
- How does this affect LOCKSS and Portico?
- Keeping the registry up to date would be a major task.
- How would the archive and registry be funded?
- What would be the 'start' date of content in the archive?
- Would the archive eventually include non-NESLi2 titles?
- ERMs could help in provision of lists of eligible titles

Feedback /comments from publishers on the proposed initiative

- Publishers broadly sympathetic to the initiative and willing to compare sample data with libraries
- Some publishers already routinely providing data for local loading. For others a new concept
- Would the 'default' post termination access still be via publishers' sites?
- Would the archive be permanently 'open' or only a 'dark archive'?
- What would be the format requirements for content and metadata?
- How would authentication be handled in the archive (ie access only by subscribers)?
- Could archive usage data be provided to publishers?
- There may be a cost for providing the data
- What would be the 'start' date of journal content?
- Complex to build and maintain
- Movement of titles amongst publishers will be a challenge

Next steps

- Complete the data comparison exercise and summarise findings
- Obtain the agreement of all parties to allow this data to be provided to EDINA for the purposes of creating a demonstrator of the proposed registry