

Use Case 7 – Publisher changes their ejournal platform

7.1 Use Case Description

Activity - A publisher decides to move all their journals to a new delivery platform. The library must identify all affected titles, and manage the move between platforms. Libraries are notified by email that URLs will be changing although existing URLs will be redirected to the new URLs for an indefinite period.

Actors - Library staff; Publisher; Link Resolver provider

Data involved - Journal catalogue records (specifically URLs); Link resolver algorithms and metadata

Data flow - Publisher informs customers, customers or publishers may notify 3rd parties such as link resolver providers. Where URLs are included in catalogue records there may be a delay between local catalogue updates and any downstream data aggregators such as Union catalogues.

Current Examples - In 2010 Wiley changed their ejournal platform; other examples of this type of activity through publisher decisions or takeovers are common

7.2 Motivation – What is the rationale?

Principles - For the library the principle is simply to keep up to date, accurate records of their access to ejournal in order to enable library members to access resources.

If changes were done via a centralised (e.g. national level) service, publishers would be able to communicate with fewer organisations, and be confident all their customers would receive up to date information. Libraries would be able to rely on centralised service to ensure ejournal links were updated in a timely manner.

Costs - Cost benefits of handling such updates via a centralised service would be significant as currently individual libraries may spend substantial amounts of staff resource updating and checking catalogue records.

Rationale for not doing it - Reliance on a centralised service leads to a single point of failure for many libraries. Existing business models may be affected resulting in a weaker market for some services (e.g. link resolver knowledge bases). Individual libraries may continue to update locally despite centralised service (e.g. if they feel they can do so more accurately, quicker, or simply wish to maintain control), so cost benefits are not realised.

7.3 Benefits – What is the business case?

Institution - No institutional level benefits beyond those outlined for the library service, researchers, teachers and students as outlined in this use case.

Library Service - More accurate and timely updates for changes to ejournal URLs while reducing local effort needed to maintain records in the library catalogue, link resolver, and other relevant systems. Fewer complaints from library members following outdated links.

Researchers - Links to ejournals continue to work ensuring they can use online resources without error.

Teachers - Links to ejournals continue to work ensuring they can use online resources without error.

Students - Links to ejournals continue to work ensuring they can use online resources without error.

Replicability - A centralised service could be used by any library with the right to do so.

Case for not doing it - May not trust centralised service, or simply believe that this can still be carried out more efficiently at a local level.

7.4 Consequences

What will happen? - Library saves time and money, publishers save time and money, library members have accurate links to ejournals

Potential Risks - Centralised service cannot keep records updated in a timely manner resulting in libraries opting out of service; Alternatively Libraries use centralised service for accurate information but still need to update local catalogue thus not realising the potential savings

Potential Opportunities - Once the relevant metadata has been centralised, a centralised link resolution service could be added, enabling libraries to outsource this activity.

Consequences of not doing it - Libraries and publishers continue to expend unnecessary effort ensuring records are updated.

7.5 Implementation

Mechanism - Centralised service may distribute relevant metadata via an automated service. Alternatively the centralised service could offer 'persistent links' to ejournals which they would simply redirect to the relevant updated URLs as required.

Inputs - N/A

Outputs - N/A

Standards and Protocols - In the case of a centralised service distributing metadata it is likely this would be done using MARC format. In the case of a centralised service providing 'persistent links' this may be done simply using HTTP and redirection, or using OpenURL

Existing systems - If local library catalogues continue to be updated, the LMS would need to be able to import MARC (or other) data from the centralised service.

Skills - Any skills required (e.g. updating of records in the LMS via an upload) are very likely to fall within the capabilities of library staff.

Challenges - If the mechanism was to update local catalogues using metadata from the centralised service, the major challenge would be to ensure the centralised metadata could be matched to existing catalogue records. This would be a major reason to look at the alternative mechanism of centrally provided persistent linking to e-journals.

7.6 Service Usage Models

Primary SUM - No existing SUM could be regarded as the primary SUM for this area

Related SUMs -

7.7 Costs

Setup - The major setup costs would be related to implementing the use of the centralised service either to match catalogue records to the centralised records, or to implement the centrally provided persistent links.

Ongoing - Low, subject to the regularity of records supply

Cost of not doing - No extra costs will be incurred by not doing it.