

# Reports on briefing sessions and workshops held at the 28th UKSG Annual Conference

## Licensing electronic journals across multiple sites/countries

*Michael H Christensen, Novo Nordisk A/S, Denmark*

The purpose of this workshop was to share the corporate experience of Novo Nordisk in negotiating licences that cover sites in many countries. This experience was primarily of interest to universities, many of whom also face multi-site negotiations with publishers, but the three workshops were also attended by a number of publishers as well as other non-academic information professionals. This mix of backgrounds and experiences proved fruitful in the discussions.

Michael's introduction each day was relatively long but there were several points that he felt needed to be made, beginning with some facts about Novo Nordisk (a Danish-based multinational pharmaceutical company with sites in over 50 countries and with a total of approx. 25,000 employees.) Ten years ago, when the company first started working with electronic journals, everyone was a novice – publishers, agents and customers alike. It has been a learning-by-doing experience at Novo Nordisk and over the years Michael believes they have perfected their technique in dealing with publishers. Today there is company-wide access to over 7,000 journals and over 300,000 articles a year are downloaded.

However, negotiations are not just a matter of technique (and this was Michael's second point), because they are not carried out in a void. To the negotiating table he brings Novo Nordisk's strategy as well as their philosophy – and they have had an e-only strategy since 1999. Furthermore, their strategy and philosophy is to give equal access to information resources wherever one is within the company. Negotiations with publishers are based on communication and mutual respect. The publishers have a product that the company wants (but not at any price) and it is in the company's interest that they keep on producing this product.

In the same sense negotiations are a continuing process of communication between publisher and customer.

Michael also mentioned PDR – the Pharma Documentation Ring – which is an association of research-based pharmaceutical companies of which Novo Nordisk is a part. PDR is an interest group representing 22 of the world's biggest pharmaceutical companies. They share experiences, and the aim is jointly to assess new and existing information products and services and provide a platform for the information industry. The PDR has among other things been instrumental in creating a standard licence for pharmaceutical companies.

Being a multinational company many discussions with publishers over the years have concerned how to get away from a rigid counting of sites. The solution adopted by Novo Nordisk (and a number of other pharmaceutical companies around the world) has been a move towards usage-based subscription models. This was the main point of discussion at each workshop.

A usage-based model typically consists of a set of core subscriptions with prepaid access to the rest of the publisher's (non-subscribed) content. Novo Nordisk have found this model very useful, because it gives great flexibility without tying up funds in journals that are not being used. A usage-based model would also be a way out of the much criticized big deals – or so Michael had thought! But most academic librarians at the workshops were not enthusiastic, because usage-based means that you cannot accurately predict costs. This is true but only to a certain extent because most licences have a built-in price cap to ensure that we do not end up paying two or three times for the same journal.

Publishers would have trouble predicting revenue if more and more customers adopted usage-based models – especially smaller publishers. But then again a publisher would have to offer a certain number of journals before a usage-based

model would even be feasible. At least one publisher attending could see the advantage from an editorial point of view of monitoring usage data more closely. Learning what type of article was being read more could lead to a higher rejection rate for articles.

They were three interesting days and there is not the space here to recount all that was discussed during the workshops. Michael would like to thank all those who attended and contributed to the workshop, and the UKSG for the opportunity to present the views of a corporate library.

### **Improving communication in the serials chain**

*Terry Bucknell, University of Liverpool and  
Jo Connolly, Swets Information Services*

The aim of this workshop was to encourage an open and constructive discussion about the communication issues and frustrations that face us in our work as we fulfil our roles in the serials chain. In order to facilitate debate, the attendees were initially split into three groups: librarians, publishers and intermediaries, and were asked to come up with a list of communication problems experienced in their day-to-day work.

Similar issues were raised across the three workshops, but they were not the same as those raised in a similar workshop at the UKSG Conference two years ago. This gives us hope that sessions such as these really do make a difference. In an ever-changing industry we are constantly faced with problems, but we are solution driven.

Almost without exception, the focus was on e-access, but a common theme linked the problems: communication breaks down when people don't pass information on, or when people don't receive the information they need. People are the problem!

To ensure the sessions had useful outcomes, the groups were then mixed up and asked to come up with ideas for solutions based on their own experiences, best practice or just an ideal world scenario. Attendees were asked to think about the underlying causes of the problems rather than just their symptoms. Each group then provided feedback to the workshop, giving other attendees ideas to take away with them and if possible implement within their own organizations.

A common suggestion was the use of interoperable systems and the development of, and

adherence to, standards to allow much communication to happen automatically. For example, if a publisher changed the expected date of publication of an issue in their system, that information could be automatically cascaded to subscription agents' systems and then in turn to library management systems. That would then save lots of claims being sent for the issue not being received in time.

This seems a tall order, but the COUNTER project has shown that publishers, librarians and intermediaries can collaborate to solve seemingly intractable problems through the use of agreed standards. The presence of briefing sessions on ONIX for Serials and RSS feeds at this conference suggests that increased standardization and automated communications are indeed on the horizon.

### **The librarian's view of pricing models**

*Helen Henderson, Information Power Ltd and  
Hugh Look, Rightscom Ltd*

Please note that the report from the workshop is included in the paper in this issue entitled 'Business models for e-journals: reconciling library and publisher requirements?.'

### **Making the most of your journals through library portals/gateways**

*Ruth Stubbings, Loughborough University*

A brief survey showed that only a few institutions attending the workshops had a commercial library portal. They were broken down as follows: one home grown portal, five MetaLib (Ex Libris), one ZPORTAL (Fretwell-Downing), two ENCompass (Endeavor), one TDNet and one Millennium Access Plus (Innovative Interfaces). Several libraries were considering purchasing a portal and three were at the tendering stage. The rest of the institutions present were not investigating the purchase of a portal and most felt that their library web pages acted as a gateway to resources.

Discussions surrounded why a library portal might be beneficial. In general it was felt that they would:

- aid readers in their resource discovery
- assist readers in providing a standardized search interface and encourage wider searching of databases through the federated/cross-searching function

- allow readers to personalize their searching by providing a list of favourite databases, control over number of hits displayed, saved searches, saved references, etc.

Other issues raised, and conclusions reached, were:

- Authentication was considered an important issue and participants would like to see portals help break down barriers to resources. There was a strong preference for single sign-on. Provision of off-campus access was seen as essential, so that distance learners were not disenfranchised.
- Affordable price was seen to be vital for take-up, both in terms of upfront costs of purchase, but also of hidden costs of staff time spent on maintenance.
- Queries were raised regarding the skills needed to set up and maintain a portal. It was felt that technical, subject and cataloguing expertise would be beneficial.
- The ability to customize a portal was seen as essential. It was agreed that commercial portals should be customizable so that the service could be branded as an institution's service, use appropriate terminology and meet searching needs of an institution.
- Ease of use and speed of the service were considered to be important, both in terms of administration and searching for readers. It was felt that a portal should be transparent and easy to search.

### Managing change

*Beryl Morris, Hudson Rivers*

Managing change is an increasingly important element of our work, regardless of our sector or employer. The aims of this workshop were to provide an overview of the process, together with tried and tested ideas on managing change effectively.

#### *What happens during change?*

In the sessions some of the changes experienced within the group were discussed. These included moves and mergers, restructuring, introducing new systems and developing and launching new services. The feelings arising out of change included anxiety and apprehension, but also excitement and anticipation.

#### *Taking people with you*

Colin Carnall's<sup>1</sup> model of change was used in the workshop to explore what happens during change. Carnall identifies five stages:

1. Denial
2. Anger and blame
3. Apathy/passive acceptance
4. Experimentation
5. Integration.

His model provides a useful framework for managing the change process and also explains why resistance is natural and can be helpful to us – within reason!

#### *Strategies for managing change and harnessing resistance include:*

- Communication
  - explaining why change is happening as well as what and when things will happen
  - providing opportunities for people to ask questions and clarify their concerns
- Helping people to develop their skills and confidence in line with the changing needs
  - This includes developing a training plan, giving people time to consolidate their learning and using a range of approaches including courses, mentoring and 1:1 support.
- Accepting that productivity can slip and maintaining the quality of what we do
  - This can include providing guidelines and templates to help people to get things right as well as reminding people of agreed standards.
- Finding support and maintaining your own equilibrium

Managing change can be draining and often feels like things get worse before they get better. Finding sources of support for ourselves is important as well as making sure we recharge the batteries on a regular basis.

The workshop concluded with looking at a series of questions to ascertain likely sources of resistance, a checklist for keeping ourselves sane during the process and a list of sources of further information and support.

<sup>1</sup> Carnall, C., *Managing change in organizations* (4th ed.), 2003, Pearson Education

### **COUNTER statistics from two perspectives: the consortium and the single library**

*Louise Jones, University of Leicester and  
Jim Self, Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA) consortium*

Last year's UKSG COUNTER statistics workshop highlighted the need for consortial COUNTER statistics, hence this workshop. The University of Leicester and VIVA are both COUNTER test sites, and the aim was to share experience of using COUNTER statistics, and feed back participants' views to COUNTER.

We began with a brief history of COUNTER as an organization for publishers, aggregators and librarians with the aim of producing credible, consistent publisher-/vendor-generated statistics. The first Code of Practice for journal reports and databases was published in 2003, and participants agreed it had been very successful; it has been widely adopted, with 60% coverage of citations in Science Citation Index.

The draft Code of Practice Release 2, to be finalized in April 2005, was discussed and met with approval. One proposal is to include additional columns in the reports to indicate the publisher and platform of a database or journal, and to modify Journal Report 1 to break down the 'Year to Date' figure by HTML and PDF request totals.

A key revision is a more detailed specification for consortium level reporting. Jim Self outlined VIVA's work with COUNTER. The proposal is that publishers/vendors will provide aggregated reports for a consortium as well as individual reports for each institution. It was felt that consortia will require Journal Report 1 and Database Report 1.

Participants shared experiences of using COUNTER statistics. Inevitable teething problems were being overcome. Improved signposting, with a publisher/vendor link and contact on the COUNTER web site were suggested, as well as a COUNTER discussion list. The need for a better mechanism for reporting problems to COUNTER was highlighted. Participants welcomed the more prescriptive approach in Release 2 that should help with issues of merging data. Longer-term issues were raised, including the possible impact of federated searching, OpenURL linking and push technologies. Knowing who was using electronic resources would be helpful, and there was speculation that Shibboleth may provide a way forward.

Overwhelmingly, COUNTER statistics had been used to convey good news on increased usage, and

justify continuing subscriptions. COUNTER statistics had also enabled libraries and publishers to experiment with new usage-based costing models. At one university the internal auditor had used COUNTER statistics to undertake a 'value for money' analysis. This provoked general agreement that a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures needs to be used.

The workshop finished with planned COUNTER developments. Of most significance is the requirement for formal auditing for publishers/vendors. COUNTER has also released a draft Code of Practice for e-books. Finally, participants were urged to encourage their organizations to become COUNTER members. More information at: <http://www.projectcounter.org>

### **Shibboleth: the next generation of access management**

*John Paschoud, LSE Library and  
Terry Morrow, JISC Consultant*

The Shibboleth briefing session attracted almost capacity audiences on each of the three days of the conference. Shibboleth is one of the key technologies which will help provide more secure access to licensed online content, particularly for the user communities of academic libraries, whilst enabling potential future licences to cover more tightly-focused groups (such as only staff and students in a particular university department) and at the same time protecting user anonymity. Participants included most of the nationalities attending the conference, with publishers ('Service Providers' in Shibboleth terminology) and libraries ('Identity Providers') well represented.

Explaining the deep inner workings of Internet security mechanisms to mainly non-technical information professionals could be a significant challenge, and John Paschoud presented this as a range of 'need-to-know' options, from the executive ("by magic!") to the underlying message flows, illustrating in passing "the middleware implementer's dilemma" – when it's all working, the end-user barely notices; but when it goes wrong, everything stops working. The legal and business case was also made for the serials trading community to adopt such a distributed architecture in which end-user authentication and access authorization are devolved to the party most competent to handle each.

Terry Morrow concluded the briefing by outlining the current UK Core Middleware programmes, funded principally by the JISC, of technology and infrastructure development projects. These will implement a plan to progress the UK academic community (and its suppliers) from the current and largely centralized Athens access management service (which has proved to be a unique national advantage during its useful lifetime) to an access management infrastructure based on Shibboleth, and include resources and services that are being established to support both libraries and publishers.

### **Institutional repositories in practice**

*Bill Hubbard, University of Nottingham*

Bill Hubbard gave briefing sessions entitled 'Institutional repositories in practice – a view from SHERPA' to around 60 people over three days. These briefings looked at the current state of play in the continuing development of institutional repositories (IRs), drawing on experience from the SHERPA (Securing a Hybrid Environment for Research Preservation and Access) project. The sessions looked at a definition of an IR as a broader concept than just a store of research materials and examined the ways that such a repository can be used within institutions.

The issues involved in establishing an archive, both technical and cultural, were reviewed and the importance of integration into institutional structures and systems was stressed. The SHERPA project has identified a number of key concerns – and responses – which arise during this process. Academic uptake and the reasons for the slow pace of academic adoption were discussed. Policy development has been identified as a major driver in the academic use of repositories. Various policy initiatives were reviewed, both internal to institutions at departmental or institutional levels, as well as in the broader context with policy adoption by funding agencies or national bodies.

The current distribution of IRs in the UK was reviewed, which showed how far repositories have grown in the last 18 months; SHERPA alone represents 20 institutional repositories. The global view is equally encouraging, with repository initiatives in Africa, India, Australia and China as well as Europe and the USA.

The briefing concluded with a look at the future of repositories – in particular the expansion of

repository holdings with different content-types: data-sets, learning objects, multimedia objects, etc. This expansion will bring new technical challenges, but also raise new cultural issues with the expansion of repository use into different communities and different processes.

### **Do we have a deal? Issues for librarians and publishers in e-journals negotiations**

*Carolyn Alderson and Albert Prior, Content Complete Ltd*

Over 40 delegates opted to join this briefing session on each of the three days it was held. The aim of the session was to consider some of the key issues in the dialogue between libraries and publishers in the area of e-journals.

Some time was spent setting the scene and reviewing how the environment has developed over the past few years, with a move to accessing, rather than owning content. We considered the investment by publishers in creating delivery platforms, reference linking and in providing a range of functionalities, etc. On the library side, budgets have been severely eroded, whilst a growing amount of electronic resources are increasingly demanded by end-users. In purchasing e-journals, libraries are therefore seeking best value for money, to stretch their budgets to the full, and to achieve efficiencies and save time. Publishers aim to increase revenues and profitability (or at least maintain them) as well as to increase visibility of their name and brand, and to attract articles, etc. It is around this dynamic that a need for a negotiated agreement has developed.

In negotiating agreements with publishers, there are a number of key areas that libraries indicate are problematic for them. These include:

- annual price increases
- the wide range of different pricing models
- lower prices when moving to online-only
- licensing access rather than owning content
- the need for cancellations in big deals
- getting accurate data from publishers on titles and holdings.

Other issues that regularly form part of the negotiations include:

- the extent of back-files accessible in agreements
- perpetual access – i.e. access to journals after cancellation or termination of agreements

- how the content may be used, e.g. ILL, course packs, etc.
- availability of COUNTER-compliant usage data
- ability to add the library's 'branding' to the delivery of journal articles.

E-journal usage metrics increasingly feature as part of negotiations – libraries utilizing data to highlight zero/little used titles, and publishers using the data as the basis for their pricing.

The session sparked a number of comments and questions from participants. These included, for example, a publisher acting on behalf of many societies indicating the challenges this can create when setting pricing models; a librarian proposing compensation from publishers when access to content was not available; the lack of flexibility in publishers' systems (e.g. if an order is placed in mid year, why is it necessary to pay for content back to January); publishers' need to maintain revenues that therefore mean 'no cancellation' clauses; the apparent demand from librarians for simplicity in pricing models, but conversely their wish also for flexibility and choice.

Participants were also offered brief pointers on how to plan and prepare for negotiations.

### **E-books: the big issues**

*Hazel Woodward, Cranfield University*

The main themes covered in this briefing session were: the e-book landscape in the 21st century; libraries and library consortia; economic models and value for money; and discovery tools and metadata.

The e-book landscape is certainly changing. Sales are increasing and various important players are showing an interest – notably Amazon and Google. Google in particular has a number of e-book projects including working with OCLC to provide access to WorldCat records and, more recently, massive digitization projects with leading research libraries around the world. Recent JISC projects have highlighted that libraries are keen to move into e-book acquisition but that there are still hurdles to be overcome in terms of suitable content, affordable pricing models and critical mass. Single publisher deals on a subscription basis are not popular whereas multi-publisher subject collections are. An economic model for e-textbooks is urgently required which is fair to both publishers and libraries. The session examined the growing interest of library consortia across the world in

acquiring e-book content. In terms of demonstrating value for money, the new COUNTER Code of Practice for E-Books was welcomed.

Finding out about e-books can be a daunting task. Traditional booksellers have been slow in entering the market as have database suppliers. Many of the best sites for finding out about e-books are not created by traditional stakeholders. Sites such as Project Gutenberg, the Oxford Text Archive and Digital Book Index are just some examples. Emphasis was placed on the importance of good e-book metadata for both publishers and libraries. The recent JISC project to develop a test bed system to support e-book cataloguing was highlighted.

The session concluded with a brief round-up of the big issues:

- New players in the e-book marketplace
- Market showing signs of growth and renewed interest from libraries and consortia
- Traditional database suppliers need to be more 'nimble' to facilitate resource discovery and access
- Multi-publisher subject collections required by libraries – flexible purchasing models required
- Need for libraries to acquire a critical mass of e-book titles
- Marketing and promotion of e-books in libraries still challenging
- E-learning and blended learning are hot topics in universities (HEFCE/JISC making £41 million available for e-learning)
- Consortia interest in e-books growing rapidly. (Major feature on the Poznan ICOLC programme September 2005)
- Publishers need to work on producing standardized metadata.

### **Marketing the library**

*Zuzana Helinsky, ZH Consulting*

This briefing session revolved around how to market the library better and more proactively both to the academic community as a whole (external marketing) and to one's own university hierarchy (internal marketing).

The session examined why we need marketing for the library, as it was agreed that marketing (both internal and external) is important. It was felt necessary because of growing competition, and the need to justify our existence. However, it brought difficulties as librarians do not have a long tradition of marketing their products and services.

They need to become more proactive in this area.

The question: "Why should librarians do it?" was posed. The answer at the workshops was: "Who else has the knowledge and could do it for us? Nobody, so librarians have to do the marketing."

Another big question was how to market the library in one's own environment, and various tools and methodologies were considered. It was agreed that there are a great many different strategies to choose from and that marketing is not a concrete science, rather a philosophy (Philip Kotler). For that reason we needed to view a variety of theories and just choose one which suits the library environment.

In the end, participants chose a simple strategy for marketing, and were able to find some examples from daily library life for everything. This was done in four steps:

1. **Analysis**, which is a tool for auditing an organization and its environment. Before starting the marketing process, analysis should help 'marketers' to focus on key issues.

*Example of analysis:*

**SWOT** – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.

2. **Strategies**, which help with the study of market shares and market growth.

*Example of strategy:*

#### **Boston Matrix**

- *Dogs* – products/services with a low share of a low growth market. Consider getting rid of these products in order to find time for new services.
- *Cash Cows* – products/services with a high share of a slow growth market. They are good for the time being.
- *Problem children* – products/services which consume resources and generate little in return.
- *Stars* – products/services with high market growth that are easy to maintain. Keep, and build, your stars.

3. **Realization (Do it)**: There are different ways to make things happen, but we must be more proactive and also try to involve more staff.
4. **Feedback** is very important and should not be forgotten. It is where we learn from our mistakes.

The session also covered internal marketing, which obeys the same rules and has a similar structure to external marketing. It was noted that this type of

marketing is usually forgotten or not given the greatest priority. Yet, without internal marketing it does not matter how good our external marketing is.

### **Do you copy? Developments in licensed digitization of UK Higher and Further Education Institutions – what you need to know**

*Laurence Bebbington, University of Nottingham*

Copyright law restricts how educational institutions can exploit copyright works even for non-commercial educational purposes. In this session, current issues and developments were examined. For some time UK universities have sought a licence to allow blanket scanning of copyright works in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in order to support learning, teaching and research in ways that reflect changing educational needs and practices. A provisional agreement has been reached between Universities UK and the Copyright Licensing Agency for an HE blanket scanning licence that will permit the scanning of printed copyright works (e.g. periodical articles, book chapters, etc.) for placing on secure intranets to support teaching and learning in HEIs.

Although subject to final agreement (expected in June) the basic shape of the licence is clear. The main provisions will include terms and conditions governing:

- scanning of limited extracts from a single printed source (i.e. up to 5% of a publication or one complete chapter, article, etc.)
- labelling and identification of scanned items placed on an intranet
- keeping of records for all items scanned
- limited disembedding of images from literary works (e.g. photographs from books)
- scanning by authorized staff only
- quality control restrictions.

Universities will have the option to sign up to this three-year trial licence from August 2005. A provisional cost of 50p per FTE student has been quoted. HEIs will have to consider a number of important issues in order to take full advantage of the licence including:

- training for staff who may be authorized to scan materials
- cost of equipment – quality control issues may mean that only certain types of scanner and scanning processes may be acceptable

- issues surrounding secure access to intranets
- changes to patterns of use in distributing photocopies and photocopied extracts under the photocopying licence, etc.
- FTE cost of the licence.

Universities will also have to look at other issues (e.g. the extent of the licensed repertoire) to assess the full value of the licence in particular cases.

Nevertheless, should this licence become available it will be a welcome development in promoting access to learning materials in HEIs.

### Digital preservation projects and services

*Maggie Jones, Digital Preservation Coalition*

The briefing session used the seminal Task Force on Digital Archiving Report<sup>1</sup> as a benchmark to consider what has happened in the ensuing ten-year period. Digital materials had been produced and preserved for decades, particularly in the social sciences, but the Task Force report presaged an age in which digital materials, and therefore digital preservation, would permeate all organizations and institutions, including many who did not regard themselves as playing a digital preservation role and who may initially have regarded digital materials as fairly peripheral to their needs.

Looking at the wider context reveals an astonishing rate of growth in Internet users and Internet hosts between 1995 and 2005, from 16,000,000 Internet users in 1995, to 817,000,000 in 2005.<sup>2</sup> In the same period, Internet hosts have grown from 9,472,000 Internet hosts to 317,646,084.<sup>3</sup> It is reasonable to assume that this trend will continue, which brings with it both an increasing dependence on the Internet for sources of information and an increasing imperative to find cost-effective means of ensuring they continue to be accessible.

Other changes since the Task Force include terminology: digital preservation/digital curation/digital asset management all tend to be used in preference to digital archiving, since the latter term can imply simply storing digital materials. We also have new terms, such as 'link rot' and 'citation decay' which graphically illustrate the ease with which online material can simply disappear.

Trends towards greater collaboration between and across sectors, and between and across geographic boundaries, are illustrated by the UK Web Archiving Consortium<sup>4</sup> and the International

Internet Preservation Consortium.<sup>5</sup> These bring together libraries and archives, and national libraries and the Internet Archive, respectively, in a collaborative environment in which each partner can learn from the others while building up experience and expertise.

Development of services to take care of particular genres of digital materials, such as e-journals, has also occurred in the past few years. Two very different approaches, LOCKSS,<sup>6</sup> and Ithaka's Portico<sup>7</sup> both offer solutions to the thorny issue of licensing access to e-journals and thereby losing control over the longer-term access. Both services will become operational during the latter half of 2005.

In the meantime, eleven JISC-funded projects aimed at embedding digital preservation and asset management within institutions will deliver a range of practical outcomes.<sup>8</sup> National bodies, such as the Digital Curation Centre,<sup>9</sup> a consortium funded by JISC and e-Science Core Programme, will undertake research and develop services and tools in support of the digital curation community, while the Digital Preservation Coalition,<sup>10</sup> a membership organization, undertakes a range of advocacy and awareness-raising activities.

In summary, while much more needs to be done, a great deal has happened in the ten-year period since the Task Force report was published. National and international partnerships have emerged, research has been and continues to be undertaken, and services and tools are emerging.

<sup>1</sup> *Preserving Digital Information: Report of the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information*. May 1996.

<http://www.rlg.org/ArchTF/tfadi.index.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Source: Internet World Stats:

<http://www.Internetworldstats.com/stats.htm>

<sup>3</sup> Source: Internet Systems Consortium Domain Survey:

<http://www.isc.org/index.pl!/ops/ds/>

<sup>4</sup> UK Web Archiving Consortium:

<http://www.webarchive.org.uk/>

<sup>5</sup> International Internet Preservation Consortium:

<http://netpreserve.org/about/index.php>

<sup>6</sup> LOCKSS

<http://lockss.stanford.edu/>

<sup>7</sup> Ithaka:

<http://www.ithaka.org/about/mission.htm>

<sup>8</sup> Supporting institutional digital preservation and asset management:

[http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=digital\\_pres\\_pr\\_271004](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=digital_pres_pr_271004)

<sup>9</sup> Further information can be found on the DCC website:  
<http://www.dcc.ac.uk>

<sup>10</sup> Further information can be found on the DPC website:  
<http://www.dpconline.org>

### **A dynamic environment – the JISC response**

*Lorraine Estelle, Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC)*

In this briefing session the role of the JISC and NESLi2 were examined in light of the dynamic and changing business environment for scholarly publishing.

The mission statement of the JISC Collections Team is: 'To negotiate for, and, where appropriate, to license, quality assured electronic materials that will provide the JISC community with a range of resources to support education and research.' One focus of activity of the past year has been the licensing of resources that provide the educational community with 24/7, desk-top access to digitized images of rare and inaccessible material such as journal back-files and books.

Another area of JISC activity is in scoping and realizing the vision of the Common Information Environment. JISC has taken the decision to implement Shibboleth technology as the next generation authentication and authorization system. JISC is also exploring different types of repositories, including institutional repositories and the funding of JORUM National Learning Materials Repository.

The NESLi2 scheme continues to be an important focus of JISC Collections activity. NESLi2 provides a single body to undertake electronic journal negotiations on behalf of the whole higher and further education community and the research councils. The NESLi2 scheme is steered by the JISC Journals Working Group, the members of which represent higher and further education.

The JISC has prepared a guide to the NESLi2 model licence, which is used as a basis for all agreements negotiated by the NESLi2 Negotiating Agent. This guide, available from the NESLi2 web site, explains the meaning of terms such as 'Authorised User' and 'Walk-In User'. Perhaps more importantly it explains how material from online resources can be used in education.

In 2004 the JISC Journals Working Group commissioned two studies that would provide the group and the NESLi2 Negotiating Agent with information about the usage of journals in the UK

and about existing and emerging business models for journals. Reports from both of these studies are now published and they can be accessed from the NESLi2 web site at <http://www.nesli2.ac.uk/>

### **Providing and using news feeds: how RSS can help**

*Brian Kelly, UKOLN*

*In this briefing session Brian Kelly took delegates through the development of RSS: initially the abbreviation for Rich Site Summary – but see penultimate paragraph for the full, up-to-date story!*

*Background* The need for web providers to disseminate news had been recognized for some time. An early pioneer was the BBC which provided several mechanisms for reading news services, including scrolling news tickers and software for embedding news within third party web sites.

Such approaches made use of proprietary solutions. This meant that anyone wishing to develop similar systems had to develop their own file format and delivery mechanisms. This would require unnecessary duplication of effort by the service providers and require users to install software for each provider.

*RSS – a simple lightweight solution* RSS was developed as a simple lightweight news syndication format. RSS was initially developed as a syndication format for the My.Netscape portal – allowing service providers to enable their content to be embedded in personalized portals. The success of RSS was helped by the adoption of the format by the blogging community, who saw the potential of RSS as a means of syndicating blog articles within other blogs and allowing blog articles to be read by a variety of applications.

*Viewing and creating RSS* Although initially used to integrate third party content into a web page, we quickly saw the development of desktop RSS viewers which can display RSS feeds in scrolling tickertapes, pop-up alerts, etc.

There are several approaches to creating RSS. Simple RSS editors are available, including web-based editors and stand-alone applications. RSS can also be created directly from Content Management Systems or from other backend systems. RSS can be transformed from other formats, such as converting HTML to RSS or RSS to HTML. Creation of RSS files is normally carried out by the

service provider, but third party services and tools exist which can be used to create RSS feeds.

*RSS grows up* RSS is now a very popular format which can be used in a wider range of applications. RSS is being used to receive news of dynamic searches, to read e-mail, to keep track of parcels, etc. One new area is 'podcasting', which can allow audio files, such as radio shows, to be automatically copied to MP3 players when new files are released.

One area of uncertainty with RSS is its name! Although initially standing for Rich Site Summary, RSS was then adopted by the semantic web

community who coined the term RDF Site Summary to refer to RSS 1.0. However, critics argued this was too complex and developed a simpler alternative known as Really Simple Syndication or RSS 2.0.

It is too soon to say which form of RSS will win – the extensibility of RSS 1.0 or the simplicity provided by RSS 2.0. Fortunately, many RSS tools support both versions. If you wish to make use of RSS the best advice would be to ensure that you can create either format from your Content Management System.