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1. HIGHER EDUCATION IN SWITZERLAND

Official Higher Education Institutions

- 10 Cantonal Universities
  - German- and French-speaking, one Italian-speaking
- Two federal Institutes of Technology
  - ETH Zürich (ETHZ) - Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
  - École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) - Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne
- 7 Universities of Applied Sciences

Switzerland lies in the heart of Europe

- 8.2 million people
- 26 cantons
- Four official languages: German (66%), French (23%), Italian (9%), Rheto-Romanic (1%)

Image source: http://www.crus.ch/homenavigation/home.html
Since 2000
- Start-up financing of Swiss Confederation (€ 11 mio.)

Since 2006
- 100% financed by the members
  - Central office: 4 FTE
  - Acquisition of licenses: 2013 about € 22 mio.

Members 2014
- 60 libraries
  - All Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences
  - Libraries from non for profit institutions
1. PREPARATORY PROJECTS SINCE 2005

Project «E-Archiving»
(2005-2007, CSAL)

- Challenges regarding digital long-term preservation
- Accessibility of scientific and academic information

Pilot Project «Long-term preservation»
(2006-2009, ETH Zurich) Concept study
(2008, e-lib.ch)

- Development of a concept for reliable central long-term preservation of digital primary and secondary data
- Suggestions for developing national standards and guidelines on digital long-term preservation

Project «E-Depot»
(2008-2012, CSAL), final report

- Real test with Digitool and Elsevier data → result:
  - Evaluation of Portico, LOCKSS, CLOCKSS
  - Portico more expensive than LOCKSS / CLOCKSS, but broader coverage
  - Many of the «big» publishers participate in Portico
2. APPROACH REGARDING PORTICO AND LOCKSS

2012:
- Survey among Consortium members: 4
  - Portico
  - LOCKSS

2013:
- Negotiations with Portico and LOCKSS

2014:
- 6 libraries participating in Portico / 4 in LOCKSS
- Portico-Consortium joined by German library (Berlin)

- 06/2013: agreement with Portico
- 08/2013: agreement with LOCKSS
3. COMPARISON: PORTICO VS. LOCKSS

**Portico**

- **Holdings comparison** offered by Portico (between 51-58% of holdings in Swiss libraries preserved in Portico)
- Members can actively submit input as to which **publishers should be approached** by Portico
- Portico is responsible for the **archiving-process (migration)**
- **Price based on LME** (Library Materials Expenditure)
- ➔ 6 CSAL-members
- **Agreement for National Licences** will be considered

**Lockss**

- **Global or Private LOCKSS Network**
- Switzerland: Member of **Global LOCKSS Network** (GLN)
- **LOCKSS-Box** installed on local server (min. 6 TB) ➔ Know-How
- **Crawler** adds content ➔ What is actually available, what is only planned so far?
- ➔ 4 CSAL-members
- **Private LOCKSS Network** (PLN) being considered with National Licences
3. COMPARISON: PORTICO VS. LOCKSS II

- **Negotiations** with Portico easy and quick
- **Model agreement** for participation
- **Fast** reaction
- **Hardly any expenditure** material- or personell-wise, however slightly more expensive than LOCKSS, but good consortia discounts
- \( \rightarrow \) and at the end even cheaper than LOCKSS

- **Negotiations** with LOCKSS slightly slower
- **No existing model contract** from LOCKSS side. CSAL drew an agreement which was rejected by LOCKSS \( \rightarrow \) letter of intent
- **Investment in manpower** (technician & librarian):
  - Installation of box and maintenance/service
  - Loading and updating licenced journals takes a lot of time
Between 51-58% of holdings in Swiss libraries preserved in Portico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Library Entries</th>
<th>Unique Library Entries</th>
<th># of library titles in Portico</th>
<th># of library titles in Portico PCA</th>
<th>% of library holdings in Portico</th>
<th>% of library holdings in Portico PCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETH Zürich</td>
<td>15,573</td>
<td>15,573</td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>8,519</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universität Basel</td>
<td>48,978</td>
<td>20,368</td>
<td>10,546</td>
<td>9,390</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Gallen</td>
<td>27,995</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>7,482</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universität Zürich</td>
<td>18,487</td>
<td>18,472</td>
<td>10,798</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16,484 titles currently being preserved by Portico.
CONTENT PRESERVED IN PORTICO WITH PCA RIGHTS

- **E-books**
  - 87% with pca
  - 13% without pca

- **E-journals**
  - 88% with pca
  - 12% without pca
GLOBAL LIBRARY PARTICIPATION OF PORTICO

More than 900 libraries in 20 countries / more than 250 European institutions.
4. EXPERIENCES MADE BY ETH-LIBRARY

Why invest in digital preservation?

- Content is increasingly digital
- Local hosting is unrealistic for many libraries
- Fast technical development
- Libraries can’t depend on publishers alone
- Recognize the need!

Steps taken to internally act on decision

- Internal evaluation: holdings comparison
- Preliminary investigation (participating publishers, conditions)
- Groundwork by CSAL (negotiations with Portico / LOCKSS, work out conditions in contract)

Experiences with Portico / LOCKSS

- No trigger events for licenced content so far
- Participation in one of the following options as basic requirement for ETH-Bibliothek when negotiating new licences: Portico, LOCKSS, Local Hosting
5. CONCLUSION AND OPEN QUESTIONS

CSAL: **Contracts with both** Portico and LOCKSS for better (broader) coverage of content

How to **motivate libraries** (CSAL-members) to join Portico / LOCKSS? → long-term benefits!

**Data security:** Is there a mirror server in Europe?

Will **one option prevail** over the other or will both be able to catch on in the future?
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