

UK LOCKSS Alliance
UK LOCKSS Alliance Members' Meeting
24th May 2012

Summary Report

A UK LOCKSS Alliance Members' Meeting was held on the 24th May 2012, at the National Railway Museum in York. The event was intended to provide current members with an update of recent activities, a forum to share information between member institutions, and an opportunity to discuss and plan activity for the period from now until 2013.

The full agenda and presentations are available online at: <http://www.lockssalliance.ac.uk/meetings-and-events/>. This summary report is intended to collect together key points and queries that were discussed during the event.

Participants noted a variety of motivations to attend.

- One noted that it is helpful to be forced to think about LOCKSS and the institutional e-journal preservation strategy.
- Several noted a desire to understand the current status of integration with link resolvers.
- There was interest in the Private LOCKSS Network activity.
- There was interest in the LOCKSS user interface enhancement activity.
- A couple of institutions noted that only with the release of functionality to integrate with link resolvers is the institution considering putting more effort into the LOCKSS system. Until now, the institution(s) have been struggling with staff resources.

Neil Mayo and Adam Rusbridge from EDINA delivered updates on the recent activities of the UK LOCKSS Alliance.

- A service review of the UK LOCKSS Alliance was undertaken in September 2011 and has provided EDINA with clear strategic direction for communication and development activity.

- A regular news roundup has been established, published on a six-week cycle. The roundup contains contributions from the development and support teams at EDINA and Stanford, and member contributions from the UK and international communities.
- The review highlighted the need for enhancements to the user interface. After discussion with Stanford University, EDINA has taken on a project management role for these and has produced a set of requirements and drafted a design proposal. The document has been distributed to the membership for comment and implementation will begin shortly.
- Functionality to integrate LOCKSS with link resolver systems has recently been released. This has been a key requirement for current and prospective members, and will be a useful promotional tool both for recruitment of members and for development of institutional support.
- Some questions arose from the discussion around link resolver integration:
 - o How frequently do Ex Libris collect updates from LOCKSS? Institutions currently receive weekly updates for SFX, so it would be helpful if this could be met.
 - o Will the Ex Libris integration continue to work with Alma?
 - o Integration with Innovative WebBridge is a priority for a number of UK institutions. When will this be made available?
- Membership of the UK LOCKSS Alliance has remained pretty much static over the last two years. Fees have not been increased, and a one- or two-year membership option is offered.

Update on the JARVIG Working Group

Philip Adams reported on the activities of the eJournal Archiving Implementation Group (<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/preservation/jarvig.aspx>). This working group was established to determine '*the most effective national e-journal archiving infrastructure for the UK HE sector.*'

- The perception of LOCKSS changed over the course of the working group. By the end, there was recognition that LOCKSS provided 'e-journal archiving on the cheap', and an emerging awareness that it combines both backup and preservation.

- The working group would like to see further evidence of fire drills to prove that the technology works, both in the event of title cancellation and when a whole publisher unavailable. Additional fire drills should be conducted to test contingencies such as limited network connectivity. Some questioned how best to simulate title cancellation, and whether it would be appropriate (and sensible) to ask publishers to help by for example temporarily refusing access to an IP range? A number of journals are no longer available from their original source and a better solution solution may be for the UKLA Support Service to circulate a list of these titles, which then provides the basis for real-world testing. Note that the other test scenario is with 'cancelled titles'.
- The Open Journal System (<http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ojs>) contains functionality to support preservation in LOCKSS 'out of the box'. The working group would like to see better use of OJS with LOCKSS. This should be promoted as a simple and effective preservation option. The workflow to arrange for preservation of OJS content should be simplified for community action.
- 'Kite marks' are being considered as a method of identifying and rewarding best practice.

Institutional Case Studies

Two institutional case studies were presented, from Lisa Cardy at London School of Economics and Philip Adams from De Montfort University.

- LSE have currently configured 17,500 AUs for preservation. These have been selected according to LSE's institutional e-journal preservation policy. Note that LSE do not use the "add all" approach but rather add only their entitled journals. Three library assistants are trained on and allocate some time to LOCKSS, and essentially these staff previously had a role in print checking.
- LSE have a wishlist for LOCKSS activity, but action is restricted either by staffing constraints or by lack of control over indirect reports (eg. IT staff). LSE would like to:
 - o Demonstrate integration of LOCKSS with their Serials Solutions implementation to academic liaisons
 - o Tidy up the journal configuration by removing failing AUs. One intention here is to make it easier to understand when something has failed with the LOCKSS system, and hence when to pay attention to the system.

- Confirmation for when content has been preserved would also be helpful. A monthly report summarising how many AUs have been added in the last month would help in justifying the system.
- At De Montfort University (DMU), the IT department weren't keen on the necessity of RAID for redundancy due to the up-front expense, and so this has not been implemented. Instead they reasoned that they would rather replace the disk after a catastrophe, and recollect AUs from the network, seeing the network as a 'backup' option.
- DMU have a collection policy, and so they select titles for preservation in order to conserve disk space.
- DMU's wishlist contains the following:
 - More in-library promotion of LOCKSS
 - Usage statistics to give insight into the institutional value
 - Training, awareness and visibility of LOCKSS to overcome the problems that result from staff turnover
 - Testing post-cancellation access
- There was some discussion around training sessions, and the idea of a roadshow / in-house training events was well received. Members are happy for these to be either institutional or regional.
- Authentication will be important for off-site access. Can Shibboleth be used to support this? Although EZProxy has been suggested as an alternative model to support off-site access, not all institutions use this. Case studies on link resolver integration (for example, from US colleagues) would be useful.
- The approach taken at DMU is to produce a report from LOCKSS ListTitles and then edit the list down to entitled journals before handing it on to librarians for them to make the actual collection choices. This would be better supported by:
 - An internal script to cross-reference the LOCKSS report (KBART) with an internal library-produced report.
 - Automatic removal of non-entitled items in LOCKSS, after using "add all" during configuration.
- DMU also have an interest in evaluating how 'green' LOCKSS is as a localised alternative to retrieving content from remote publishers.

Private LOCKSS Networks

Adam Rusbridge summarised the key conclusions and recommendations from a draft report assessing community interest in Private LOCKSS Networks.

- The draft report is going to be circulated online for comment. A number of useful suggestions were made at the workshop, namely to extend the report to include a case study on the model by which a Spanish consortia has joined the MetaArchive, and to include explicit information on costs, the type of staff needed, and what FTE allocation is expected.
- A consortial model looks attractive. This would involve a host box at EDINA to store content (where institutions FTP content into test box), and a PLN box at EDINA (used to participate in the MetaArchive network).
- There was still strong support for further activity around Private LOCKSS Networks. Adam Rusbridge is going to draft a short proposal describing next steps. It was noted that it would be useful to implement a pilot by early 2013, in order to demonstrate support and activity to support further funding requests.

Further points

- Information on e-Books was requested. What e-Books have been committed, and when will these be made available?
- It would be useful to be able to discover or report (a) when an AU has been collected, and (b) whether the AU is still available in the network for other users. This has equivalence to the print model.
- Some further points of clarification were requested:
 - The distinction between configured and collected content is considered unclear. It would be helpful if the UKLA Support Service could produce a blog post to explain this more effectively.
 - A glossary of LOCKSS terminology would be useful.
 - Further guidance on virtual machine setups is requested, as more institutions move to a model using virtual disk space.
- The UK LOCKSS Alliance has implemented a number of communication channels (email list, blog, twitter). Email remains the best way to keep people informed – the UKLA Support Service will use email to point people towards blog posts, and use twitter as reinforcement channel. The Youtube videos have been a useful addition.

- The discussion sessions identified statistics that might help clarify the role of LOCKSS in institutional policies:
 - Monthly or quarterly statistics showing the growth of an institution's collection and the progression of problem titles.
 - Statistics for items served internally from the LOCKSS box, for example a JR/1 report showing monthly requests for each title.
 - Automated reports, which include data such as AU finish date, time taken to collect.
 - Collection of UK statistics on the state of preservation of each journal within the LOCKSS network, which can inform Keepers.

- The Service Review discussion brought up some suggestions in the area of promotion:
 - The visibility of LOCKSS, and therefore people's awareness of it, has improved since integration with Link Resolvers, as users will now see the name and logo when searching for content in an OPAC.
 - Access to content means that LOCKSS can now more effectively be promoted as a library product, and that this promotion should be given priority over the year ahead.
 - It may be beneficial to talk to academics who are pledging to publishing exclusively in Open Access journals, and encourage them to make publishing to LOCKSS part of their commitment.
 - LOCKSS needs intermediaries to engage with learned societies and small publishers.

- The discussion of the persona document indicated that the division of responsibilities and the descriptions of roles accurately represented institutional experience, although it is still common for one person to have responsibilities that cut across the various roles.