

Appendix A
Three Models of Archival Agents

THREE MODELS OF ARCHIVAL AGENTS

	Scope of archival commitment	Users	Possession of content	Technical environment	Access	Interlibrary loan	Distribution of costs	Financial support	
1	De facto archival agent (e.g., OhioLink, CSIRO)	Made to the readers using the archive or to consortium members	Users are primarily bench scientists with information needs similar to those of other users of the publisher's online content	Perpetual license is the functional equivalent of subscriber ownership of content, but possession is governed by contract law (i.e., the license) rather than copyright law	Local load of content; rendering software identical to that ordinarily provided by the publisher	License imposes few restrictions for authorized Users; no online access allowed to others unless a separate archival agreement is reached (at which time the de facto archival agent may become a self-designated archival agent)	As a ScienceDirect OnSite licensee, may provide interlibrary loan services by creating paper output from online content	Costs borne by licensing library or distributed among consortium members	Costs may be supported, in part or whole, by state or other government funds
2	Self-designated archival agent (e.g., National Library of the Netherlands)	Made to readers or to libraries, generally within a given geo-political unit	Same as above, except that national libraries would likely have relatively few bench scientists working onsite	Same as above	Same as above	License imposes few restrictions as regards readers physically present at the archival agent's service sites; no online access allowed to libraries beyond the archival agent except, temporarily, in the case of service disasters the publisher is otherwise unable to handle	Same as above	Borne solely by the archival agent, which may be a government agency; copyright deposit laws may be relevant	Provided by archival agent as a matter of mission
3	Publisher-archival agent partnership (e.g., Yale/Elsevier partnership)	Made to the publishers and, through the publisher, to readers and libraries that do not benefit from the commitments made by other archival agents	Users are primarily not bench scientists but those pursuing the historical inquiries typically supported by archival services; ordinary users of the publisher's content that is no longer commercially viable are also supported by the archive	Same as above	Local load of content; metadata, storage technology, and rendering software may differ from that ordinarily provided by the publisher, given the different audience of users	License sets terms similar to those for self-designated archival agents for the commercially viable part of the publisher's content; few restrictions on access to the content that is not commercially viable; protection against service disasters is a possibility, but secondary, mission	Interlibrary loan for commercially viable content is not part of the agent's mission; few restrictions on access to the content that is no longer commercially viable	Borne by the archival agent; publisher may wish to subsidize archival activity	Archival agent, acting independently or with the publisher partner, may seek subscribers to its services; given the focus on content that is not commercially viable, subscriptions would be non-for-profit in nature

THREE MODELS OF ARCHIVAL AGENTS

NOTE 1: A library willing to negotiate a national site license could function for an entire nation in the manner of a consortial archival agent.

NOTE 2: The access column defines the scope of library operational security provided by each archival agency. For instance, the consortial archival agent ensures permanent online access to all of the publisher's content but only to consortial members, while the publisher-archival agent partnership ensures largely unrestricted permanent online access only to commercially non-viable content.

NOTE 3: The defining concern of the publisher-archival agent partnership, as distinguished from the two other kinds of archival agent, is to identify content that is not commercially viable. Such an agent seeks in this way to minimize conflicts between the commercial mission of the publisher and the preservation/access mission of the archival agent. No boundary between commercially viable and non-viable content has yet been identified. Such boundaries may in time be established by a "rule of thumb" (as has been done with JSTOR or proposed in the case of PubMed Central), or by invoking some set of yet-to-be specified "triggering events."

NOTE 4: Self-identified archival agents and publisher-archival agent partnerships might provide access to commercially viable content to libraries that once had licenses for that content and/or to libraries in developing countries to which publishers wish, as a matter of good public policy, to provide content for free or at steeply discounted prices.

NOTE 5: Should boundaries between commercially viable and non-viable content be established, consortial and self-identified archival agents may wish to reshape their services with regard to those boundaries, to provide some online access to readers beyond the boundaries of the consortium or physical site. If enough archival agents did this, it is not clear that the publisher-archival agent partnership would have a distinctive function.

NOTE 6: One reason for the maintenance of paper publications is our present inability to identify a boundary between commercially viable and non-viable content. The costs associated with these subscriptions therefore represent, in part, the preservation costs libraries bear. Put differently, the cost burdens of paper publication result, in part, from libraries' unwillingness to put their preservation mission at risk and from publishers' unwillingness to put their commercial mission at risk. This impasse exists because, for online information resources, libraries do not own any information carrier that can be preserved.