

JISC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Project Document Cover Sheet

PROGRESS REPORT

Project

Project Acronym	VERSIONS	Project ID	
Project Title	Versions of Eprints – user Requirements Study and Investigation of the Need for Standards		
Start Date	July 2005	End Date	February 2007
Lead Institution	London School of Economics and Political Science		
Project Director	Jean Sykes, Librarian & Director of IT Services, LSE		
Project Manager & contact details	Frances Shipsey British Library of Political and Economic Science, London School of Economics and Political Science, 10 Portugal Street, London WC2A 2HD. Tel: +44(0)20 7955 6915; Fax: +44(0)20 7955 7454; Email: f.m.shipsey@lse.ac.uk		
Partner Institutions	Nereus Project Consortium (www.nereus4economics.info)		
Project Web URL	www.lse.ac.uk/versions		
Programme Name (and number)	Digital Repositories Programme		
Programme Manager	Neil Jacobs		

Document

Document Title	Progress Report		
Reporting Period	February to July 2006		
Author(s) & project role	Frances Shipsey, Project Manager		
Date	16 August 2006	Filename	VERSIONS Project Progress Report Jul06 v0c.doc
URL	<i>if document is posted on project web site</i>		
Access	✓ Project and JISC internal		General dissemination

Document History

Version	Date	Comments
0a	11 August 2006	Draft version sent to Programme Manager on 14 August 2006
0b	14 August 2006	Draft version sent to Project Director for comment
0c	16 August 2006	Final draft version sent to VERSIONS Project Steering Committee for approval

Overview of Project

Grant Statement

Please confirm that the project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant and the JISC Terms and Conditions attached to it.

Note any changes to the original award, including any extensions or alterations granted.

The project is being conducted under the terms agreed with JISC in the letter of grant dated 13 May 2005 and in subsequently-agreed adjustments reported in the Progress Report for January 2006.

A further one month no-cost extension to the Project was agreed with the Programme Manager by email on 16 August 2006, so that the Project end date was adjusted from January 2007 to February 2007.

2. Aims and Objectives

Explain any changes to the original aims/objectives outlined in the project plan.

List the targets set for this reporting period and explain if they have been met.

There are no changes to the original aims and objectives outlined in the project plan.

Targets set for this reporting period were as follows:

Target	Status
WP1: Project meetings	Met
WP1: Project telephone conference calls	Met
WP2: Interim findings report based on interviews	
WP2: Develop questionnaire in light of interview findings and publications list analysis	Met
WP2: Publicise and launch online questionnaire	Met
WP2: Develop scenarios from interviews	Met
WP2: Analyse results (of online surveys) including free text comments	
WP2: Report on findings of user study	
WP3: Analysis of proportion of papers available in full text	Met
WP3: Project Team and Nereus EO partners provide further information about provenance and reasons for non-availability	Met
WP3: Consolidation of list and cross-tabulation with ROMEO listing	Met
WP3: Analysis of findings	Met
WP3: Report on findings of publications list analysis	
WP4: Literature review	
WP4: Guidelines for versions	
WP5: Workshop of stakeholders and report	Met

3. Overall Approach

Explain any changes to the overall approach outlined in the project plan.

No changes have been made to the overall approach since the previous progress report.

4. Project Outputs

Summarise progress during the reporting period and milestones/deliverables achieved. Please provide links to outputs where these are available online.

Progress during the reporting period has been steady though some activities have taken much longer than anticipated, notably the design of two questionnaires and the investigation of full text availability of Economists Online authors in six of the project partners' repositories.

The following deliverables were completed during the reporting period:

WP2: the VERSIONS questionnaires were made available through a webpage on the VERSIONS Project website: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/surveys.html>

WP2: questions used in the surveys have been made available to Bristol Online Surveys (BOS) academic subscribers as examples of surveys produced using the survey software: www.survey.bris.ac.uk. The Project is grateful for the help of the BOS Support Team in facilitating this.

WP2: Scenarios were written and made available via the Project website and on the Digital Repositories Programme wiki: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/scenarios.htm> and [http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/Scenarios and use cases](http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/Scenarios_and_use_cases)

WP5: An evaluation workshop was held at LSE in May 2006. The event gathered feedback from key stakeholders such as repository software developers, metadata experts and librarians/repository managers on the survey design and on the current thinking of the project regarding possible solutions to version identification in repositories. The notes of the workshop are available at: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/deliverables.html>

5. Project Outcomes

Summarise achievement against objectives, list outcomes and findings to date, and any interim conclusions.

How do you see the project developing? Has progress changed the project in any way, and are there implications for the programme?

What lessons have been learned that could be passed on to other projects or applied elsewhere?

Through the completion of the interviews with researchers in February 2006 and the design and launch of the online survey which was conducted from May to July, the Project has made progress with finding out researchers' requirements and current practices, though the results are still to be fully analysed and reported:

- understanding of different versions – a survey question on terminology used by researchers themselves to describe different revisions they make to papers and questions on the ways in which researchers manage and store their own revisions of their work have revealed useful information about researchers' understanding of this process
- attitudes towards secure storage and open access availability of papers at different stages in the lifecycle –
- variations in requirements depending on specific stakeholder roles, eg journal editor, head of department – this should be capable of analysis as responses were received from 67 heads of department or research unit, 39 journal editors, 25 working paper series editors and 34 officers of learned society or research association
- existing repository use by researchers (both institutional and subject repositories) – survey questions showed that 33% of respondents have an institutional repository, 43% do not and 24% do not know. Of the 33% who were aware of their institution having a repository, 59% had placed papers in the repository. When asked whether researchers would place a copy of a final author version of their journal articles in a repository if invited to by their institution in future, 81% replied Yes.

- Current practices among academic researchers in retention of their own authors' versions – several questions in the survey were relevant here: responses to one question suggested that 91% of respondents do keep their final accepted versions of journal articles permanently. Researchers were also asked to describe how they manage their own files when revising their work and to say whether they are satisfied with their own systems – this was a popular question and should provide some useful tips for researchers for inclusion in the toolkit

Contact with both the RIVER Scoping Study (led by Rightscom) and the JISC Eprints Application Profile Working Group (led by Julie Allinson, UKOLN and Andy Powell, Eduserv) has been very useful and has helped to crystallise the Project's tentative thinking about hierarchical representation and linking of bibliographic records in order to manage different versions. The Eprints Application Profile Working Group's work on incorporating ideas from FRBR has taken this thinking forward very effectively.

It is looking likely that the Eprints Application Profile will therefore deal with some of the issues relating to representation of versions in bibliographic records and that through the Eprints Application Profile Working Group's Deployment Plan, the Group's recommendations will be implemented initially by three of the open source repository software development communities. This development may mean that for several of the proposed guidelines and standards from the VERSIONS Project it will be appropriate simply to refer to work of the Eprints Application Profile Working Group.

6. Stakeholder Analysis

Summarise the project's engagement with stakeholders including users.

6.1 Project Partners

The Project has engaged with immediate project partners at Project Module meetings held as part of the Nereus Consortium meetings as follows:

May 2006, Oxford

In addition there was one telephone conference call held between partners during April 2006.

The jiscmail mailing lists set up for communications with project partners have been used to maintain contact. A monthly informal update has also been sent to Project partners and this are also made available on the Project website News page: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/news.html>

6.2 JISC

The Project has been represented at the following JISC meeting:

JISC 2nd Digital Repositories Programme Meeting, Warwick, 27-28 March 2006

6.3 Other Digital Repositories Projects and Studies

The VERSIONS Project Manager along with one other LSE Library colleague were partners in the Scoping Study on Repository Version Identification (RIVER), commissioned by the JISC Scholarly Communications Group, led by Rightscom, with Oxford University Computing Services also as partners. This study was carried out from January to March 2006. There was a workshop held in Oxford in February 2006, at which the VERSIONS Project was represented. Scenarios from the VERSIONS Project were shared with the RIVER team. The final report is at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/RIVER%20Final%20Report.pdf

The Project Manager joined the JISC Dublin Core Eprints Application Profile Working Group as a member during June-August 2006. She attended a Kick-Off Meeting, London, 5 June 2006 and contributed to the email discussion about the draft application profile thereafter. Early results from the VERSIONS online survey were shared with the Working Group.

6.4 Users

The project has engaged with users during the reporting period by means of the online survey. Responses were received from 464 academic researchers in 41 countries.

6.5 Other

The project engaged with stakeholders such as librarians, other university personnel and publishers by means of a separate online questionnaire. This attracted 133 responses from over 20 countries. Around half of the respondents to this survey were librarians/IT staff directly engaged with repositories. Others included researchers, university senior management, publishers, repository software developers, data or computing centre managers.

The Project also hosted a workshop during May with invited participants from stakeholder groups such as the library and repository software communities.

The Library of LSE is represented on the Journal Article Versions Review Group of the NISO/ALPSP Working Group on Versions of Journal Articles by the Library's Information Services Manager. The VERSIONS Project Manager reviewed and discussed with the Information Services Manager draft documents produced by the NISO/ALPSP Group during March/April, prior to the Information Service Manager's response to the Working Group.

7. Risk Analysis

Summarise any problems that have occurred and any mitigating actions taken.

There is nothing to report under this heading.

8. Standards

Note any changes in the standards to be used and the reasons.

There is nothing to report under this heading.

9. Technical Development

Note any changes in the development approach or technologies to be used and the reasons.

There is nothing to report under this heading.

10. Intellectual Property Rights

Summarise progress clearing any third-party rights.

There is nothing to report under this heading.

Project Resources

11. Project Partners

Explain any changes to the institutional project partners or subcontractors, and any impacts this has/will have on the project or schedule.

What other institutions or organisations are you or do you plan to collaborate with?

There are no changes to report under this heading.

12. Project Management

Note any changes in project staff or their roles since the last report. Briefly explain any problems or gaps with staffing and the effect this has had on the project schedule.

There have been no changes in project staff or their roles since the last report.

13. Programme Support

Summarise contact with/influence of the programme, e.g. with the programme manager, support team, or programme-related activities.

What further support would you like from the programme, e.g. guidance, workshops, etc?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the programme?

The Project has continued to have contact with the Programme Manager and the Support Officer by email during the reporting period and has found the support to be very helpful.

Attendance at JISC meetings and other contact with the Digital Repositories Programme are noted above in Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

14. Relationships with other projects activities

Please provide a diagrammatic representation of your project's relationships with other significant activities, such as other projects (JISC-funded or otherwise), in the UK and beyond.

This is attached as Appendix B.

15. Budget

Use the [budget template](#) to report expenditure against and attach as Appendix A. Explain the reasons for any significant overspend or underspend.

Expenditure during the reporting period is attached as Appendix A.

Detailed Project Planning

16. Workpackages

Report progress against plan, noting key activities during the reporting period. Explain why any targets haven't been met.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Progress against plan (key activities in the current reporting period are in bold). Targets which are incomplete and overdue are in *italics*.

Objective	Due date	Completion date	Comments including changes to plan needed and reasons
WP1: Project plan	September 2005	January 2006	
WP1: Project website	September 2005	September 2005	
WP1: Recruit Project Officer	July 2005	July 2005 and again in December 2005	
WP1: Write progress report for JISC	January 2006	February 2006	
WP1: Write progress report for JISC	July 2006	August 2006	
WP1: Project meetings	Throughout the project	July, October 2005, January 2006, May 2006	There is no July 2006 Project Meeting planned because the Nereus Consortium agreed not to meet in July. A progress report and financial report were approved by the VERSIONS Steering Committee in Oxford, May 2006
WP1: Project meetings – telephone conference	Throughout the project	August, November 2005, April 2006	
WP2: Objectives for study and questioning route for interviews	October 2005	October 2005	
WP2: Arrange and conduct interviews	January 2006	February 2006	Last remaining interviews conducted during February
WP2: Write up interview notes	January 2006	February 2006	Last remaining interview notes written up during February
<i>WP2: Interim findings report</i>	<i>February 2006</i>		<i>This target has not been met because the Project Manager turned to design of the online surveys in order to ensure that the online survey elements of the Work</i>

			<i>Package did not drop too far behind schedule. Need to re-schedule this target for September 2006</i>
WP2: Develop questionnaire in light of interview findings and publications list analysis	February 2006	May 2006	Draft questions went through several iterations and were piloted before launching the survey. This activity took longer than anticipated.
WP2: Launch and publicise online questionnaire	March 2006	May-July 2006	This activity went according to plan, though it took place later than originally scheduled because the survey design took longer than anticipated.
WP2: Develop scenarios from interviews	February 2006	March 2006	Scenarios written and place on Project website and DRP wiki
<i>WP2: Analyse results (of online survey) including free text comments</i>	<i>May 2006</i>		<i>This target has not been met because the survey itself took place later than planned and was open until July. This activity will be carried out during August 2006.</i>
<i>WP2: Report on findings of user study</i>	<i>July 2006</i>		<i>This target has not been met because the survey itself took place later than planned and was open until July. This activity will be carried out during September and October 2006.</i>
WP3: Define criteria and request publication lists from Nereus Economists Online partners	January 2006	April 2006	
WP3: Analysis of proportion of papers available in full text	February 2006	May 2006	This part of the analysis was undertaken from February through May.
WP3: Project Team and Nereus EO partners provide further information about provenance and reasons for non-availability	February 2006	June 2006	This part of the analysis was largely undertaken by the Project Officer. Non-availability of full text was not discoverable through this exercise, as previously reported.
WP3: Consolidation of list and cross-tabulation with ROMEIO listing	March 2006	June 2006	
WP3: Analysis of findings	February 2006	July 2006	Tables produced from the data, exploring availability of different versions (author final, publisher PDF) and cross-referring these by institution, country, date of publication (pre or post 1998), and ROMEIO permission.
<i>WP3: Report on findings of publications list analysis</i>	<i>March 2006</i>		<i>Analysis conducted so far forms part of a draft report. This target should be met by September 2006.</i>
WP4: Make contact with	September 2006	Ongoing	A preliminary list of stakeholders has been prepared and informal contacts

stakeholders			made as the opportunity arose; feedback has been sought from stakeholders via the questionnaire and the Project workshop; links with stakeholders have been created through participation in other activities such as the Eprints Application Profile Working Group
WP4: Literature review	March 2006		<i>Literature searches have been carried out and references assembled and noted. Compilation of the review is now underway but not yet complete. This target will need to be re-scheduled for November 2006.</i>
WP4: Draft guidelines	July 2006		<i>Target has not been met because of delays in completion of WP2 and WP3 on which this depends. This target needs to be re-scheduled for October and November 2006.</i>
WP5: Maintain project website	December 2006	Ongoing	The Project website has been updated periodically with new deliverables, dissemination activities and monthly informal updates. The website has been moved to a more secure location, while maintaining the public address: www.lse.ac.uk/versions
WP5: Establish mailing lists	October 2005	October 2005	
WP5: Presentations and/or papers at relevant workshops and conferences	January 2007	Ongoing	See Section 19 for details
WP5: Publish articles in appropriate journals and newsletters	January 2007	Ongoing	See Section 19 for details
WP5: Organise and report on evaluation workshop	June 2006	July 2006	Workshop was held on 10 May 2006. Notes added to Project website in July.

Next reporting period:

Objective	Due date	Changes to plan needed
WP1: Project meetings	January 2007	Ongoing
WP1: Project meetings – telephone conference	January 2007	Ongoing
WP1: Form alliances with standards bodies and stakeholders	December 2006	Ongoing
WP1: Write completion report for JISC	January 2007	Extension of target date to February 2007
WP1: Write final report for JISC	January 2007	Extension of target date to February 2007
WP2: Interim findings report	February 2006	Extension of target date to September 2006
WP2: Analyse results (of online	May 2006	Extension of target date to August 2006

survey) including free text comments		
WP2: Report on findings of user study	July 2006	Extension of target date to October 2006
WP3: Report on findings of publications list analysis	March 2006	Extension of target date to September 2006
WP4: Literature review	March 2006	Extension of target date to November 2006
WP4: Draft guidelines	July 2006	Extension of target date to November 2006
WP4: Toolkit of guidelines	October 2006	Extension of target date to December 2006
WP4: Toolkit of guidelines on the website	October 2006	Extension of target date to December 2006
WP4: Propose standards to JISC	November 2006	Extension of target date to January 2007
WP5: Maintain project website	December 2006	Continue until end of project in February 2007
WP5: Presentations and/or papers at relevant workshops and conferences	January 2007	Ongoing
WP5: Publish articles in appropriate journals and newsletters	January 2007	Ongoing
WP5: Present results internally to LSE and Nereus partners	January 2007	Ongoing
WP5: Produce presentation materials for re-use by JISC community	October 2006	Extension of target date to January 2007
WP5: Evaluate draft toolkit	October 2006	Extension of target date to December 2006
WP5: Evaluate published toolkit	December 2006	Extension of target date to February 2007

17. Evaluation Plan

Report progress against plan, and note any evaluation results during the reporting period.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Identify, as far as is possible, the measurable outcomes from the project that might reasonably be evaluated one year after the end of the project, along with the metrics that could be used to do this.

Current reporting period:

- Survey of user requirements : size of sample and range of respondents. The number of responses to the user requirements survey was 597 in total, broken down between the two separate questionnaires as follows:

Researcher questionnaire	
Total responses	464
Break down by role	
Professor:	24%
Lecturer / Associate Professor:	33%
Post doctoral research staff:	15%
Student (PhD or other research degree):	23%
Contract/freelance researcher:	5%
Break down by subject	
Economics	75%
Accounting and Finance	3%
Business and Management Studies	6%
Physics	3%
Other	13%
Break down by country	
Austria	7%
Belgium	3%
Czech Republic	4%
France	6%
Germany	11%
Italy	5%
Netherlands	9%
Spain	5%
United Kingdom	17%
United States	12%
Other	11%
Stakeholder questionnaire	
Total responses	133
Break down by role	
Library staff - directly involved with repository:	36%
Library / IT staff - technical repository support	10%
Library staff - not directly involved with repository:	7%
University senior management	5%
Research funder or quality agency:	2%
Publisher or publishers' organisation	5%
Repository software community:	5%

Library / IT standards development - metadata, OAI:	2%
Library / IT consultant:	1%
Other (Researchers and students)	20%
Other (Miscellaneous)	7%
Break down by repository software experience	<i>Note: respondents could select more than one system</i>
No direct knowledge of any system	49
ARNO	5
CDSWare	3
Digital Commons	7
DigiTool	3
DSpace	39
Eprints	32
Fedora	11
Opus	2
VITAL (Fedora)	5
Other	10

The number of respondents to the questionnaires was felt to be satisfactory. The response to the researcher questionnaire was overwhelmingly received from the target disciplines of economics and related subjects. The response from European researchers was very strong. The respondents to the stakeholder questionnaire were from a range of library and IT backgrounds, with a slightly higher than expected number of responses received from researchers. There was a good spread of responses from stakeholders with knowledge of different repository software systems.

- Publications list analysis: Completeness of data supplied

The key question in evaluating this activity was the availability of data. Reasonably full data was available from the partners about the publications details of their economists participating in the Economists Online Project. Only two partners were able to provide full details about provenance of full text where available. For the other partners' publications lists details of full text availability and provenance of full text was gathered by the Project Officer by means of individual inspection of the items. In view of the scale of this task a decision was taken to concentrate on journal articles, which allowed a full set of data to be assembled for these items. From a total of over 7,000 bibliographic items, 3,118 journal articles were scrutinised in more detail, according to version of the article used, date of publication, publisher permission on self-archiving, and country in which the researcher was based. It was not possible as part of this exercise to assess the reasons for non-availability of full text. However it was considered that the user survey would address this issue in more general terms and questions were included in the survey accordingly.

- Results of user requirements survey and publications list analysis: Consensus about way forward
An evaluation workshop held in May provided useful feedback on the survey design and on possible ways forward for version identification. Evaluation of the results of the survey and publications list analysis will need to be carried forward into the next reporting period.

Next reporting period:

The draft toolkit of guidelines is due to be evaluated by stakeholders for potential usefulness and quality. This will be done by circulating the draft toolkit through appropriate mailing lists and within the VERSIONS Consortium institutions and inviting feedback.

The toolkit of guidelines once published will be evaluated via email, telephone and online survey to evaluate awareness and satisfaction.

One year after the end of the project:

Measurable outcomes that could be evaluated one year after the end of the project could include:

- Awareness among the JISC community of the importance of version management and identification in relation to digital repositories – awareness of the issue by librarians and IT staff could be evaluated by assessing which institutions have developed a policy on versions of papers held in their repositories.
- Researchers' awareness of issues relating to versions and usefulness of the VERSIONS toolkit could be evaluated by monitoring page visits to the web version of the toolkit and/or by survey to assess awareness of the issues.
- Take up of this issue by stakeholders could be evaluated by assessing which repository software packages have incorporated version identification and version management features into their systems.

18. Quality Assurance Plan

Report progress against plan, describe the QA procedures put in place, and any QA results during the reporting period.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Current reporting period:

- The online questionnaire for the user requirements study was given a pilot testing as follows: Project team and LSE Library colleagues; DRP Programme Manager; LSE economics researcher. The questionnaire design was discussed in detail during earlier iterations with VERSIONS Consortium partners by email and at a telephone conference call in April 2006. The Project team also sought feedback on the final survey design from participants at the Evaluation Workshop in May. Their comments will be taken into account when analysing the results.
- The notes of the Evaluation Workshop were circulated to participants for comment before being placed on the Project website.
- The collection of scenarios was circulated to VERSIONS Consortium partners for comment before being placed on the Project website and DRP wiki.

Next reporting period:

- The interim findings report on the interviews will be reviewed by VERSIONS Consortium partners
- The full findings report will be subject to peer review
- The publications lists analysis will be subject to peer review and review by VERSIONS Consortium partners
- The literature review will be subject to peer review
- The guidelines on versions will be subject to peer review
- The toolkit will be subject to peer review and evaluation

19. Dissemination Plan

Report progress against plan, noting dissemination done, whether you feel it was successful, and any publicity the project received during the reporting period.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Current reporting period:

Dissemination about the Project during the reporting period has included:

Written items:

- Louise Allsop. 'VERSIONS (Versions of Eprints - user Requirements Study and Investigation Of the Need for Standards)'. In Brief article in *D-Lib Magazine* (July/August 2006), 12 (7-8), In Brief. doi:10.1045/july2006-inbrief. <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july06/07inbrief.html#ALLSOP>
- Project website, ongoing
- Two brief items in LSE internal publications: *LSE Briefing*, May 2006 and *News and Views*, June 2006 to publicise the surveys and raise awareness about the Project
- Publicity for the VERSIONS online survey – this constituted important dissemination about the aims of the project both to the repositories community and to researchers. The survey was publicised through the major digital repositories and OAI channels as well as to economics researchers via several key mailing lists and websites, eg Social Science Research Network (SSRN) Economics Research Network | Announcements | Other Announcements (posted 27 May 2006 and will remain for six months): <http://www.ssrn.com/ern/index.html>. The survey was picked up and mentioned by Peter Suber in *Open Access News*, for which the Project is grateful: http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2006_05_28_fosblogarchive.html

Presentations:

- Frances Shipsey. Presentation to CAB International staff on *Versions of eprints: understanding researchers' needs*, Wallingford, 8 Feb 2006
- Frances Shipsey. Short presentation to Legal and Policy Issues Cluster Session, JISC 2nd Digital Repositories Programme Meeting, Warwick, 28 Mar 2006
- Frances Shipsey Presentation to SHERPA-LEAP SHERPA Liaison Meeting, University College London, 29 Mar 2006.

Next reporting period:

The Project will aim to disseminate information about the Project through further written articles and the project website. In addition the following presentations and paper are planned:

- Frances Shipsey. *Versions of academic papers and open access: attitudes and current practice among economics researchers*. Presentation at Open Scholarship 2006: New Challenges for Open Access Repositories, The University of Glasgow, 18-20 October 2006
- Frances Shipsey. Presentation and paper at 2nd International Digital Curation Conference, Digital Data Curation in Practice, 21-22 November 2006, Hilton Glasgow Hotel, Glasgow
- Louise Allsop. Introduction to the VERSIONS Project. *ALISS Quarterly* (forthcoming)

For details of past and future presentations see: www.lse.ac.uk/library/versions/dissemination.html

20. Exit/Sustainability Plan

Report progress against plan, noting any issues related to archiving, preservation, maintenance, supporting documentation, etc.

List objectives for the next reporting period, note if any changes to plan are needed, and explain why.

Current reporting period:

The Project website was maintained and updated during the reporting period. The site was moved over to LSE's main web server as this was felt to be more secure than the Library server on which it was originally located.

The Project cooperated with the UK Web Archiving Consortium (UKWAC) to give permission for archiving of the Project website at: <http://www.webarchive.org.uk/index.html>.

Next reporting period:

There is nothing to report under this heading for the coming reporting period

Appendix A. Project Budget for July 2005 to July 2006

Template for Progress Reports and Final Report

Appendix B. Relationships with other projects

