

## UK LOCKSS Alliance Steering Committee

**Morton Suite, National Railway Museum  
26<sup>th</sup> November 2012**

### Meeting Minutes

Present: Peter Burnhill (Chair, EDINA), Philip Adams (De Montfort University), Lisa Cardy (London School of Economics), Lorraine Estelle (JISC Collections), James Fisher (University of Warwick), Neil Grindley (JISC), Randy Kiefer (CLOCKSS Archive), William Nixon (University of Glasgow), Adam Rusbridge (EDINA), Liz Stevenson (University of Edinburgh)

#### Summary of Actions

- Finance working group to review revenue and expenditure and shape future finance requirements. (*Liz Stevenson, William Nixon, Adam Rusbridge*)
- Content and PLN working group to review institutional content, organisational models for PLNs, and resources (*William Nixon, James Fisher, Adam Rusbridge*)
- Marketing and Communication working group to review promotion and community engagement strategy, raising ongoing awareness of developments and getting attention and buy-in from appropriate stakeholders (*Lorraine Estelle, Lisa Cardy, Adam Rusbridge*)
- Randy Kiefer to discuss a technical roadmap with the LOCKSS Program at Stanford.
- EDINA and the LOCKSS Program are to further investigate and define a Consortial Managed Archive model for the UK community.
- To retain momentum, the next UKLA Steering Committee meeting will be held in February/March 2013.

#### Review of minutes from previous meeting

- William Nixon and James Fisher have been invited to join the UKLA Steering Committee, replacing Tony Kidd and Geoff Gilbert. A formal review of the UKLA strategy and Steering Committee structure will take place in 2013 to consider strategy beyond July 2013.
- EDINA was invited to participate on the TRANSFER working group in early 2012, and Adam Rusbridge has been a member since May 2012. The revised Code of Practice is due to be released for comment soon. The Keepers Registry may have a role in ensuring accuracy of Transfer's "Preservation Status" field.
- A joint UKLA and Keepers Registry promotional event was held at the UKSG Conference 2012. Articles describing recent developments and focusing on link resolver integration in particular were published over the summer in *DPC What's New* and *UKSG e-News*.

- The Keepers Registry is of interest to the UKLA community. The Keepers Registry team intend to invite the UKLA to be early adopters of the Holdings Comparison functionality.
- Conversations with Stanford regarding a development roadmap are ongoing. Ideally, maintenance would be Stanford's responsibility who have more ownership of the software development strategy and allocation of resources. Maintaining a realistic roadmap would be a challenge for UKLA without Stanford's involvement. Randy Kiefer will report this back to colleagues at Stanford.
- Cost information gathered from members has been used to outline the staff and financial resources required to support LOCKSS. Feedback indicates that there are typically three members of staff involved in each institution, with each staff member assigning a couple of hours per month to LOCKSS.
- Six news roundups have been released throughout 2012, and 50 institutions now regularly read these roundups. Lorraine Estelle noted that these could also be disseminated via the JISC Collections news feed.
- Neil Grindley has been briefed throughout 2012 and attended this meeting to engage with the UKLA Steering Committee regarding future planning.

## Finance and Reporting

- EDINA has now assigned three members of staff to the UK LOCKSS Alliance: Adam Rusbridge (0.5FTE), Neil Mayo (0.5FTE), and Richard Wincewicz (0.5FTE). UKLA Community Development Activities project funding runs until July 2013.
- A table summarising membership can be found in Appendix A. In the transition to 2012/13, two institutions discontinued their membership, with three leaving the previous year. There are currently 15 institutions participating in the UK LOCKSS Alliance. The total income in 2012/13 from subscriptions is £50,850. For each participating institution £1,000 goes to Stanford for development, so this year Stanford receive £15,000.
- Common reasons for departure include the cost of hardware and staff resourcing for IT administration and collection development. In several cases content coverage was mentioned and some institutions expressed a preference for a more centrally coordinated model.
- EDINA has noted that the LOCKSS approach requires two institutional capabilities: (1) to maintain hardware and the IT infrastructure, and (2) to maintain the collections.
- Two distinct motivations for participation are long-term preservation and short-term access backup. A key USP for the LOCKSS approach is the institutional control of content access provision.
- Peter Burnhill proposes a smaller group of members to explore expenditure. William Nixon, Liz Stevenson and Adam Rusbridge to review the budget and to look income and expenditure.

## Policy

### *Update on JARVIG, Neil Grindley, JISC*

- The JISC e-journal archiving implementation group (JARVIG, <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/preservation/jarvig.aspx>) met four times between January 2011 and January 2012. A summary draft plan is online at <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/preservation/JARVIGDRAFTplan1slide.pptx>. Neil Grindley notes that the international Keepers Network Committee on the plan currently doesn't exist but is felt to be a good idea.
- From 1<sup>st</sup> December JISC will become [new] Jisc and become a legal entity. During 2013 Jisc will work to refine its future strategy. The business review is ongoing and the next phase will involve six optimisation projects, looking at how to rationalise activity, get better join-up and avoid duplication.
- A proposed outcome of JARVIG was to recruit a consultant to look at the cost/benefits of different e-journal archiving services. This activity will now go ahead under the optimisation banner, and Neil Grindley will project manage the process. On the back of this, further JARVIG reporting is scheduled for April 2013.
- Since their initial involvement in the UK LOCKSS Pilot Programme, JISC has invested some £260K+ in LOCKSS. While there is desire to exploit this investment, the decline in the UKLA membership is not a positive indicator for Jisc. It will be hard to invest further funding alongside competing priorities from JARVIG.
- The group discussed implications. The Keepers Registry is positioned within JARVIG as a hub of activity and there may be an opportunity for UKLA to be a component of this activity. Phil Adams notes that 15 institutions reflects a significant buy-in if those institutions could work together to serve the wider community. For example, these institutions may have sufficient collections to cater for Inter Library Loan.
- Neil Grindley notes that the optimisation group will be looking at priorities as part of their review activity, and both a challenge and opportunity for the UKLA is to present a strong and a compelling case.
- Liz Stevenson notes that we need to more clearly communicate the benefits of LOCKSS. LOCKSS is part of a portfolio of digital preservation options. Why should an institution participate in multiple approaches? LOCKSS needs to clearly articulate its USP.
- Adam Rusbridge notes that institutions report two distinct motivations: post-cancellation access (of NESLi2 publishers) and preservation to prevent loss (smaller, at-risk content).
- Peter Burnhill notes that RLUK and SCONUL have increasing significance for Jisc and the UK HE community. UKLA should align with RLUK and the Sconul collection access group to assist with community engagement and advocacy.

*CLOCKSS Archive Briefing, Randy Kiefer, Executive Director of the CLOCKSS Archive*

- There are now 12 UK CLOCKSS members, where three overlap between CLOCKSS Archive and UK LOCKSS Alliance. In 2013, 10 RLUK members will be participating in CLOCKSS.
- CLOCKSS is an independent group but relies on the LOCKSS software and funding goes to the LOCKSS team at Stanford to address technical priorities. Randy's visit to the UK is to explore ways to cooperate with the UK LOCKSS Alliance more effectively and to get a sense from the UKLA and from EDINA about shared priorities and action.
- Randy is asked many times to differentiate Portico, CLOCKSS and LOCKSS, and he suggests that CLOCKSS is very publisher centric, C is Complete; LOCKSS is library centric, L is Local. The key differences are in governance, business models and technology. Portico and CLOCKSS rely on different technologies. They offer complementary coverage: in 2011, CLOCKSS had 33 publishers and the overlap with Portico was around 70%. CLOCKSS now works with 120 publishers and there is 35% overlap with Portico. Not all publishers will be in all archive services and so participating in multiple approaches has a positive impact: technology won't stay the same, competition is good, and prices are tempered. CLOCKSS is now working with publishers to preserve eBooks (including Springer and Palgrave Macmillan), and Randy notes that the processes for eBooks are the same as for eJournals.

*Review of current position of UKLA, Peter Burnhill*

- An overview of the scholarly communications landscape gives context, describing the publishing value chain (and open access) and the variety of services that support this (including SUNCAT, RepositoryNet, CrossRef etc). The priority discussed in this meeting is ease and continuity of access (in particular back content).
- The focus of the Keepers Registry is on long-term preservation. It has an international flavour, and to get US support work has been undertaken with Columbia, Cornell and Duke to look at the participation of the titles in their catalogues in archiving services. A low percentage of titles are participating in three or more initiatives. Peter suggests repeating this analysis with catalogue information from the UK LOCKSS Alliance.
- Revisiting the history of the UK LOCKSS Alliance, Peter notes that EDINA became involved when the project transitioned to service and from ownership of the DCC to EDINA. EDINA's role was to work out how this activity could be an ongoing concern and this was teased at for the first year of operation (08-09). The conclusion was to design and position the UK LOCKSS Alliance as a self-cooperative organisation of institutions interested in ensuring continuity of access to content, both scholarly journal content and for other collection types. A Steering Committee was established comprising a number of posts each with a specific role. Since then and assisted by JISC funding, EDINA has supported the UK LOCKSS Alliance community to assist its development and see where it wanted to go. EDINA has broadened its internal support by increasing the number of staff involved in LOCKSS. However, the declining membership is indicative of the community response to the current model.

- Identified through a series of interviews with current and former members, common challenges have related to staff resourcing for collection and hardware administration.
- There is an opportunity to revisit the collection principles and wider policies of the UK community and reassess what we are trying to achieve. One approach is a Consortium Managed Archive to retain the principles of the LOCKSS approach but removing the resource constraints that are causing problems. This is referred to as a 5\* approach with boxes at EDINA, Mimas and other locations. This architecture would provide a Private LOCKSS Network focused on scholarly content for the UK community.
- Lorraine Estelle notes that a key issue must be post-cancellation access - is this possible for a private LOCKSS box? Lisa Cardy notes that the cost must be affordable when compared to other service options. Peter Burnhill notes that a top priority for the UK tends to be participation of the NESLI2 publishers. Some of these have not participated in the Global LOCKSS Network due to concerns about the distribution of and lack of publisher control over content (see Appendix B). With the control that a Consortial Managed Archive model provides, we are more likely to have additional leverage to negotiate with these publishers.
- There is an additional opportunity for a Consortial Managed Archive to support Institutional Repositories e.g. theses and provide a preservation layer for both publisher and institutional content.
- Peter Burnhill notes that this is not yet a firm proposal, but that EDINA wanted to gauge interest from the UKLA Steering Committee. There was a consensus among members to explore this further.

### Collection Development

- Peter Burnhill asks if there was interest among the UKLA for the Keepers Registry. The group agreed that there was a role and in early 2013 similar work to the 2Cul group will be undertaken for the UK community. Randy Kiefer suggested that the Keepers Registry reported at different levels: publisher, title, then volume, providing high-level summaries and additional detail.
- Adam Rusbridge reports back on a survey regarding the introduction of a Private LOCKSS Network (PLN) for other types of institutional material, which resulted in a mixed response. While institutions are looking for affordable solutions to digital preservation, the full extent of assets requiring preservation remains largely unknown. To gain acceptance, the PLN model would need to demonstrate low-cost and sustainability. While there is preference for an architectural model where the content is stored at more than one geographical location, institutions were not enthusiastic about hosting and resourcing PLN machines within institutions.
- Adam Rusbridge notes the offer made by MetaArchive to the UK community to assist with PLN activity. The three models are: (1) a UK-specific PLN, which needs sufficient institutional support for a trial, (2) a collaborative membership of the MetaArchive, involving an annual fee of \$2500 from UKLA and institutional content deposited to a staging server hosted by EDINA, then harvested into the network, or (3) a one-time

membership offer in MetaArchive with a three-year term, involving an annual fee of \$2500 from UKLA, and a maximum of four institutions directly submitting content into the MetaArchive to seed activity. At the end of the three-year term it would be necessary to move to a more sustainable model.

- Further analysis is required to explore this. Adam Rusbridge notes that this could complement the earlier discussions about a 5\* approach. Peter Burnhill notes that from a UK RepositoryNet perspective this could offer a potential disaster recovery role for content of shared interest.
- A working group comprising William Nixon, James Fisher and Adam Rusbridge was agreed to explore next steps for PLN activity.

### Technical Infrastructure

- Adam Rusbridge notes that recent software developments have been well received. Link resolver functionality was released in January 2012 with support for Ex Libris SFX and Serials Solutions 360Link. Support for Innovative Interfaces WebBridge has been implemented and is being documented. Better promotion of this new functionality is needed as only a handful of institutions have completed integration.
- User interface enhancements are ongoing at EDINA, with a focus on interfaces for the collection and management of content. The planned schedule is to release an early (unsupported and beta) version of new interfaces early in 2013, with an accompanying webinar to get feedback and demonstrate progress.
- The conversation returned to the Consortial Managed Archive and it was agreed that a review was needed to ensure there were no unintended consequences of action. The intention is to achieve a lower cost of entry, ensure sufficient resilience, and provide suitable access to content. Costs must be explored further, in particular the impact that would result should costs increase. While publishers will need to be engaged in discussions, the model should be further refined before they are involved.
- Phil Adams noted that integration with Shibboleth had been mentioned in the latest news roundup. Adam Rusbridge noted that this was scheduled for completion by March 2014. It was acknowledged that this was a positive step in the maturation of LOCKSS.

### Promotion and Outreach

- RLUK and SCOUNL both have a role to play with respect to community engagement. It was agreed that better relationships and policy discussions with both should be arranged.
- Philip Adams suggested that e-journal preservation reporting might be a useful addition in the SCOUNL return, an annual set of statistics gathered across UK HE institutions looking at parameters such as expenditure, subscriptions etc. Lorraine Estelle was meeting with Ann Rossiter of SCOUNL and offered to bring LOCKSS and e-journal preservation activities to her attention.



- A working group involving Lorraine Estelle, Lisa Cardy and Adam Rusbridge will be established to discuss promotional ideas for LOCKSS, a communication strategy for the UK LOCKSS Alliance through its transition to a Consortial Managed Archive, and engagement with RLUK and SCONUL.

## Appendix A: Institutional Participation in the UK LOCKSS Alliance

| Institution                                    |   | Annual Fee | Pilot *           | 08/09     | 09/10     | 10/11     | 11/12     | 12/13     |
|------------------------------------------------|---|------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| De Montfort University                         | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| Kings College London                           | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| London School of Economics & Political Science | E | £1,800.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Glasgow                          | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Huddersfield                     | D | £2,250.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Warwick                          | C | £2,750.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of York                             | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| Newcastle University                           | B | £3,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |
| Durham University                              | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |
| University of Bristol                          | B | £3,750.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |
| University of Hull                             | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |
| University of Sussex                           | D | £2,250.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |
| University of Leicester                        | C | £2,750.00  | A                 | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |           |
| University of Sheffield                        | B | £3,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         | ✓         |           |           |           |
| Cardiff University                             | B | £3,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         |           |           |           |           |
| University of Liverpool                        | B | £3,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         |           |           |           |           |
| University of Wolverhampton                    | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 | ✓         |           |           |           |           |
| Oxford University **                           | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Birmingham                       | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Edinburgh                        | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of St Andrews                       | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Hertfordshire                    | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |           |
| Open University                                | A | £5,000.00  |                   |           |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| Royal Holloway, University of London           | E | £1,800.00  |                   |           |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| University of Salford                          | C | £2,750.00  |                   |           |           | ✓         | ✓         | ✓         |
| Natural History Museum                         | D | £2,250.00  |                   |           |           |           | ✓         | ✓         |
| Cambridge University Library                   | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Loughborough University                        | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| Middlesex University                           | C | £2,750.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| University College London Library Services     | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| University of East London                      | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| University of Exeter                           | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| University of Manchester                       | A | £5,000.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| University of Surrey                           | D | £2,250.00  | ✓                 |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>Total</b>                                   |   |            | <b>24+<br/>6A</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>15</b> |
|                                                |   |            |                   | £53,300   | £56,800   | £66,100   | £57,350   | £50,850   |



## Appendix B: Current NESLi2 Participation in Archiving Initiatives

| Publisher                                | SMP?                         | LOCKSS    | CLOCKSS   | Portico   | JISC<br>JournalArchives |          |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|----------|
| Annual Reviews                           |                              | Yes       |           | Yes       |                         |          |
| Berkeley Electronic Press                | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Duke University Press                    | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Edinburgh University Press               | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Geological Society of America            | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       |           |                         |          |
| Maney Publishing                         | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Oxford University Press                  |                              | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       | Yes                     |          |
| Royal Society of Chemistry               |                              | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       | Yes                     |          |
| SAGE Publications                        |                              | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Springer +Science & Business Media       |                              | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Taylor & Francis                         |                              | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       | Yes                     |          |
| Berg                                     | SMP                          | Yes       |           |           |                         |          |
| BMJ Group                                |                              | Yes       |           |           |                         |          |
| BioOne                                   | SMP                          | Yes       |           | Yes       |                         |          |
| Royal Society of Medicine Press          | SMP                          | Yes       | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| American Institute of Physics            |                              |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| American Society of Civil Engineers      | SMP                          |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Elsevier                                 |                              |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Expert Reviews                           | SMP                          |           | Yes       |           |                         |          |
| Future Medicine                          | SMP                          |           | Yes       |           | Yes                     |          |
| IOP Publishing                           |                              |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Nature Publishing Group                  |                              |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| Wiley Online Library                     |                              |           | Yes       | Yes       |                         |          |
| AAAS                                     |                              |           |           |           |                         |          |
| American Chemical Society                |                              |           |           | Yes       | Yes                     |          |
| Brill                                    | SMP                          |           | Yes       | Yes       | Yes                     |          |
| Cambridge University Press               |                              |           |           | Yes       |                         |          |
| Euclid Prime                             | SMP                          |           |           |           |                         |          |
| IMEchE                                   | SMP                          |           |           |           |                         |          |
| Independent Scholarly Publishers Group   | SMP                          |           |           |           |                         |          |
| IOS Press                                | SMP                          |           |           |           |                         |          |
| Journal of Visualized Experiments (JoVE) | SMP                          |           |           |           |                         |          |
| Karger                                   | SMP                          |           |           | Yes       |                         |          |
| Multi-Science Publishing                 | SMP                          |           | Yes       |           |                         |          |
| Walter de Gruyter                        | SMP                          |           |           | Yes       |                         |          |
| ICE Publishers                           |                              |           |           |           |                         |          |
|                                          | <b>36</b>                    | <b>20</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>23</b>               | <b>6</b> |
|                                          | <b>C/LOCKSS Combined: 23</b> |           |           |           |                         |          |