

ERM Use Case - “Journal title moves between Publishers/ Publisher Changes Platform”

Developed with the University of East Anglia (8 February 2011)

Generic Description – UC12/UC13 - This use case is mainly focussed around UC12 ‘Journal title moves between publishers’ but encompasses UC13 ‘Publisher changes platform’ as broadly a subset of the same issues. In the use case on or more journal titles cease to be published by their current publisher and are taken up by a new publisher. Typically this can happen when two or more publishers merge, or when one publisher buys another publisher completely.

1 – Use Case Description – What happens?

Activity – The move of a title from one publisher to another (or from one platform to another) is driven entirely from outside the library, and the library must react once a move is announced. When a title moves publisher it can trigger a number of administrative changes covering licensing, archival access, price and access information. All of this information needs to be collected, recorded, and acted upon.

Volumes – The number of titles affected by any particular change is unpredictable. The acquisition of one publisher by another could affect a single title, or hundreds of titles. However, titles do change publishers frequently, and it is likely that several such changes will happen during a year.

Actors – Publishers; Subscription Agents; Knowledgebase Provider; Library Staff (Acquisitions/Technical Services, and Faculty Librarians where changes to local documentation or new documentation/training is required)

Data involved – KnowledgeBase metadata and holdings; Library catalogue records; Pricing information; Licensing information; Archival access information

Workflows – The library will become aware of a journal title (or set of titles) changing publisher. This can be through a number of routes. Typically the publisher will announce (by email, or through other means) that titles are moving to a new publisher, but the information may come from the publisher (e.g. Elsevier issue quarterly updates covering this); from mailing lists (either from other libraries, or from the publisher); or from a subscription agent.

Once it is established that a title is moving publishers, there are a range of questions/issues that the library will need to consider:

Will archival access stay with old publisher, move to new publisher, or be subject to another arrangement?

Will there be any change in cost associated with the move?

Does the move mean a new license agreement for the title?

Will the journal become part of an existing collection, or will any new setup be required

Has the KnowledgeBase (e.g. as part of the Link Resolver software) been updated or will it be updated at the appropriate time?

Do any updates need to be made to the library catalogue record for the journal to reflect the changes (i.e. publisher information and holdings)? N.B. Updated publisher information implies a completely new MARC catalogue record for the title with holdings information to be updated on both the old record and the new record.

Is new documentation or training required for the journal title and/or platform?
Are there any authentication issues related to the move?

Information concerning each of these issues will need to be recorded and then acted upon. It should also be noted that often the information regarding these factors may be made available at times significantly distant from the point at which the library needs to take action (a change may be announced in August, but the changes, e.g. to the KnowledgeBase do not need to be enacted until January when the transfer takes effect)

Current Examples – Elsevier regularly gains titles (or whole publishers and their catalogue), often affecting a single title at a time. Large scale mergers such as the merger of Wiley and Blackwell are less common but can affect large numbers of titles when they do occur.

2 – Motivation – What are the pain points?

What are the current problems – A change beyond the library's control creates a set of administrative changes that require significant time and effort to investigate, record and enact.

Efficiency assessment – The number of small pieces of information that need to be collected, the number of systems that need to be checked and updated, the lack of a single route for announcements regarding changes and the time delay between an announcement and the need to make changes in the system all lead to inefficiencies.

Economy assessment - Better efficiency would reduce costs. In some cases a change in publisher could lead to an unexpected price increase suggesting that there are some potential savings linked to cancellation decisions in these cases.

Effectiveness assessment - Not significant, although impact of incorrect information and broken links to resources can be a key factor in library user dissatisfaction

3 – Intended Benefits – What is the business case?

Library Service – Efficiency gains; 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.

Users – Links to resources continue to work no matter the publisher or platform for the resource.

Suppliers – Less enquiries - don't need to repeat query on the same points

4 – Consequences of doing it 'above campus'

The proposition – Common information held centrally (Knowledgebase Plus concept), with central point to communicate changes of publisher/platform and common information such as how archival access will be managed. While the detail of some of this will vary between institutions (e.g. the exact coverage of archival access) the terms will be the same (e.g. all archival access will stay with original publisher). This centralised information service could also store 'action' dates (a.k.a. 'Ticklers') which could be used as the basis

for reminders for later actions, especially if they could be imported into local systems in standardised formats (e.g. ical format to set calendar reminders)

What will happen? - Library saves time and money, publishers save time and money, library members have accurate links to ejournals without interruption as publishers/ platforms change. Libraries have early visibility of changes allowing time for issuing new documentation or creating training material where necessary.

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 systems 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

5 – Implementation Pointers

Mechanism – Shared data allows for provision of Authoritative, Consistent, Robust and Reliable data at a single point. Local decision making and workflows use this centralised information either for querying or for direct import into local systems.

Inputs & Outputs – Inputs would be a information relating to change of publisher to enable libraries to answer the questions outlined in the ‘Workflows’ above. Outputs would relate to ability to download data for updating local systems where necessary. Depending on demand this could include MARC records for the catalogue and reminders for action in ical format among other data.

Standards & Protocols – Depending on the exact nature of the information to be shared this could include ONIX-PL; MARC; ical

Existing systems – Spreadsheets; ‘Knowledgebase’ from Link Resolver; LMS

Staffing - No extra local staffing, aim to reduce local staff time spent on investigating and acting on relevant information

6 – Challenges & Costs – Direct and indirect

Set up and Transition – This will require a minimum of a database and query / reporting capability

Ongoing - if this is to be done properly, the ongoing cost lies in licensing the underlying Knowledge Base rather than in the software to support the processes.