Annex A: Post Implementation Review: Libraries’ submission

Introducing the Libraries’ recommendations and the wider context

1. The UK Legal Deposit Libraries (LDLs) have made considerable progress and gained great experience in collecting and managing Non-Print Legal Deposit (NPLD) collections since the regulations were passed in 2013. This is demonstrated by the evidence presented in the main Post Implementation Review (PIR) report.

2. This initial period of implementation has coincided with the continual rapid development of digital technologies and their pervasive influence in all aspects of life. We have also learned a lot since 2013 about the evolution of research and information-seeking behaviours and changing user expectations of working with digital collections.

3. In assessing the extent to which the Regulations have achieved the original policy objectives, the Joint Committee on Legal Deposit (JCLD) are in agreement that they have succeeded in enabling sufficient progress on matters of ingest and preservation of NPLD content. However, the LDLs believe the Regulations were also intended to deliver improved access for researchers and users of NPLD content, a purpose which the publishers dispute. This submission therefore makes the case for a set of improvements to the Regulations which would future-proof them in the context of changing user expectations and behaviours, and the development of new tools and opportunities for innovative new research. These are proposals on which the LDLs and the publishers are not currently in agreement.

* The LDLs believe the Final Impact Assessment (FIA) in 2012 demonstrated an intended policy outcome that was broader than simply collecting and preserving. FIA paragraph 6 within the ‘rationale for intervention’ section refers to the aspiration ‘to maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge by assuring the conservation and protection of documentary inheritance.’ FIA paragraph 7 details a range of ‘external social benefits’ such as mental wellbeing, education, and local and national identity. FIA paragraph 9 refers to the importance of ‘information dissemination’ as a function of non-print works. These references clearly articulate that the initial policy intervention intended not just to collect and preserve content, but to facilitate access and derive added value benefits from it for users and researchers.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* The Libraries believe the recommendations they have put forward in this submission are true to the spirit of the original policy objectives, in particular the notion of ‘balancing the needs of libraries and researchers with the interests of publishers and rightsholders’.[[2]](#footnote-2) These recommendations are inspired by a desire to release maximum value from this digital content for users across the UK and beyond, and are framed throughout in a way that seeks to also protect the rights of content-owners.
* Legal deposit is a public service mandated by Government and with great social value; the Libraries therefore believe that user experience and value for money have to be considered alongside ingest and preservation figures in order to fully understand the impact of NPLD.

4. The policy objectives in the FIA clearly expressed the aspiration of the Legal Deposit Libraries that they would be able to respond to the evolution of digital legal deposit and offer improved access and discovery benefits to researchers. This aspiration was not shared by the Publishers at the time of introducing the 2013 Regulations and this point of disagreement remains in this 2018 Post Implementation Review:

* ‘Non-print depositing also enables Legal Deposit Libraries potentially to offer an improved service to researchers. For example, electronic indexing and searching methods may allow quicker access to deposited works (which would no longer need to be physically retrieved from an archive) and an increased ability to find relevant material without the need to sift through less useful information. Potentially, metadata can be interrogated across a large number of documents to allow research that would not be realistically possible on paper; for example it may be possible to search the archive to establish when a new phrase or word became more established in the English language.’ FIA 2012 p.19, para.89.

5. The libraries feel that, given the current parameters set out in the Regulations, most of the above benefits to researchers and scholars have not, and will not, be realised. Access to eBook and eJournal content is faster than access to their physical equivalents, because the material does not need to be retrieved, saving time for users and resource for the Libraries. However, the ability to use emerging digital technologies to search through the text and analyse large quantities of text simultaneously though the use of algorithms is not permitted under the Regulations. Similarly researchers are unable to conduct analysis to reveal trends and patterns within the archive over time, as this is also not allowed within the current Regulations.

6. Examples of the kind of research that has been refused include:

1. Developing new metrics for understanding the qualitative impact of scientific research compared to quantitative impact (as evidenced by citation counts and journal impact factors) by analysing wider media coverage of scientific innovation;
2. Making larger datasets available for machine translation learning, improving quality of translation for popular languages and making machine translation feasible for less frequently used languages; and
3. Veracity identification from online data, analysing social media rumour statements and the interactions they spark in response (with research showing that rumours that are later proven to be false tend to spark significantly larger numbers of denying statements in response).

7. All of the examples cited at paragraph 6 require access to the largest datasets possible, along with the ability to deploy new research tools to analyse them. The LDLs believe the case for their aspirations around improved access and discovery for researchers are becoming ever more pressing five years on from the introduction of the Regulations, and will continue to do so. Now is therefore the moment to give appropriate consideration to meaningful future-proofing of the Regulations.

8. On this basis, the Libraries are making the following recommendations for changes to the Regulations, over and above those included in the PIR:

* UK Web Archive: enable open access to the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive
* Copyright: Re-establish automatic links to evolving copyright legislation and the NPLD Regulations

# Changes to the public policy context since 2013

9. The wider public policy context provides further rationale for the proposed changes to the regulations which the Libraries are seeking. There has been rapid and significant social and technological change in the period since 2013 and this has created a very different policy environment for the operation of NPLD. The Government has set out high aspirations for digital culture and data/innovation, which the Libraries feel should apply to legal deposit content, with all normal protections for rightsholders retained. The Libraries’ recommendations for improvements to the regulations are fully in line with the policy objectives of the current Government, notably:

* Culture White Paper (2016) – which has a strong focus on increasing access to culture, and a recurring theme of ‘digital culture’, and includes a commitment ‘to make the UK one of the world’s leading countries for digitised public collections content’.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* UK Digital Strategy (2017) – in particular key commitments that public services should be world leading in serving citizens online, and to unlock the power of data in the UK economy and improve public confidence in its use.[[4]](#footnote-4)
* Industrial Strategy White Paper (2017) – which identifies ‘big data’ within one of its four grand challenges for the UK economy, aspiring to a ‘data-driven economy…that realises significant value from connected, large-scale data’.[[5]](#footnote-5)
* ‘Culture is Digital’ initiative currently being undertaken by DCMS,[[6]](#footnote-6) with a focus on themes including:
  + Access and participation: ‘How can digital content and distribution support new forms of engagement and attract more diverse audiences?’
  + Cultural infrastructure: ‘How can we position the UK as a world leader in digitised collections and digital cultural content?’
  + Cultural content and technology: ‘How can we encourage innovation between content and technology?’

10. These themes are particularly resonant with the potential use and value of the UK Web Archive, as a digital collection spanning over 470TB of content, with an as yet untapped potential to engage new audiences and facilitate innovative uses of cultural digital content.

11. As a result, the libraries believe that enacting the proposed improvements to the Regulations would not only support and enhance the delivery of the original policy objectives, but also ensure they are fit for purpose in the current policy context.

# Reasons for change: the Legal Deposit Libraries perspective

12. The JCLD, with representatives from the six Legal Deposit Libraries and the commercial publishing trade associations, has worked very collaboratively to develop agreed implementation strategies for the first phase of NPLD collecting. This strong partnership approach continues to shape the planning for the future phases of collecting. However, within JCLD there is disagreement on the overall scope of the objectives of legal deposit legislation.

13. Publishers consider the sole objective to be the preservation of non-print publications for future generations.

14. The Legal Deposit Libraries, given their public, research and educational purposes, have a duty to facilitate access to, and use of, the national collections by researchers as a primary objective alongside preservation. The Libraries believe the service improvements anticipated by the FIA (see paragraph 4) support our interpretation, as does the wider rationale for intervention (see paragraph 3).

15. This difference of opinion means the Libraries and Publishers have differing views about the extent to which some policy objectives have been achieved to date. The main difference of opinion concerns policy objective c, from paragraph 10 of the FIA: ‘To govern how the deposited copies may be used, balancing the needs of libraries and researchers with the interests of publishers and rightsholders’.

16. The rapid development in the methodologies employed within digital scholarship over the past 5 years means that user expectations of how they might use, analyse and extract results from large collections of digital content have evolved considerably since 2013. This is most apparent in the increasing use of large datasets as a means of research. This change is already recognised and reflected elsewhere in UK legislation, notably section 29A of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, as amended in 2014: An exception to copyright exists which allows researchers to make copies of any copyright material for the purpose of computational analysis if they already have the right to read the work (that is, they have ‘lawful access’ to the work). This exception only permits the making of copies for the purpose of text and data mining for non-commercial research.

17. The user expectation issue was evident as early as the launch of the UK Web Archive in December 2013, which attracted negative national media coverage noting the apparent contradiction of needing to visit a physical library to access digital content.[[7]](#footnote-7), [[8]](#footnote-8)

18. Researchers and research institutions, such as the Alan Turing Institute, who wish to work with the UK Web Archive data-set, believe their needs are not adequately taken into account in the NPLD Regulations and should be considered in this review.

19. Digital technologies have also transformed the ways in which people with a wide range of physical and neurological impairments can access and use information.

# 

# Recommendation 1: Open access to the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive

20. The LDLs propose that access to the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive of content harvested from the open web will be permitted online, outside the premises of the Legal Deposit Libraries, as an archival service available through the open web.

21. It is important to stress that the Libraries are seeking change **only** in relation to access to websites harvested from the open web. Access to all other NPLD collections such as eBooks, eJournals, digital maps and sheet music, as well as access to web content harvested from behind paywalls, would remain restricted to the premises of the Legal Deposit Libraries, in order to protect the rights of content-owners.

## Why is this change being recommended by the Libraries?

22. The Legal Deposit UK Web Archive collection is the largest shared collection across the Legal Deposit Libraries and a research collection of national and international importance.

23. It is an extremely valuable public record; all the more so in the context of ‘alternative facts’ debates and concerns around ‘fake news’, given the impermanence of information published on the web. One example is the removal by the official Leave campaign in the 2016 EU Referendum campaign of almost its entire website, shortly after the vote. The Legal Deposit UK Web Archive has statutory underpinning, is independent of Government, and aims to collect a comprehensive annual snapshot of the UK web domain. These characteristics make it a unique and vital tool with which to challenge false narratives, but this can only happen if it is properly accessible. In the interests of transparency and accountability, the right to use the UK Web Archive for this purpose should not be restricted to a relatively small and predominantly academic audience. The LDLs regard this as a fundamental part of their custodianship role for the nation, now and in future.

24. Several large-scale web archives currently harvest and re-publish much of the UK open web. This is not undertaken under any statutory basis, and the content is currently hosted on servers outside of the UK. The Libraries believe it adds public value to have public access to the UK Web Archive controlled under UK law and stewarded by UK public institutions.

25. Since 2013 the Legal Deposit Libraries have completed four annual domain crawls and the fifth is currently in progress (as of September 2017). In total the archive contains c.9–10 million websites, which consists of c.14billion ‘items’ (where an item is defined as a text file, an image or similar objects) and 470TB of data.

26. The 2013 NPLD Regulations make no distinction between this ‘open web’ content and other types of digital publication in terms of public access. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of websites are produced for open access purposes and without restrictive terms and conditions, creating an implied licence for onward open access to this content.

27. Current usage parameters mean that each ‘item’ can only be viewed by one person at a time, from a terminal on the premises of a Legal Deposit Library. These parameters prevent UK researchers from carrying out the kind of cutting-edge research envisaged by the Industrial Strategy and UK Digital Strategy, which would deploy tools such as text and data mining and ultimately artificial intelligence and machine learning to derive new knowledge and insight from this massive dataset.

28. The current parameters therefore raise significant questions of viability, including:

1. Current value for public money. The Legal Deposit UK Web Archive costs around £530,000 per year, but restrictions on use meant there were fewer than 2,500 uses in the year April 2016 to March 2017. This is a significant investment by the UK in digital collection management, but the current Regulations inhibit the value that users and society can derive from it.
2. Integrity of the collection. The current low rate of use reduces the exposure of the collection to users. This in turn seriously limits the identification and resolution of harvesting errors within it. Public feedback has been identified by The National Archives as a key component in their successful management of the openly available UK Government Web Archive.[[9]](#footnote-9) This was also cited as an issue in the Digital Preservation Coalition report on the current status of NPLD digital preservation.[[10]](#footnote-10)
3. Credibility. This is a national collection of the nation’s most contemporary cultural heritage, containing a wealth of potential that could be tapped by users across the UK. Following the implementation of the NPLD Regulations, the restrictions on access attracted negative press coverage.[[11]](#footnote-11), [[12]](#footnote-12) For example, the Telegraph’s coverage stated that ‘only a privileged few will be able to access the archive’.
4. Use of data analytic research tools. See paragraphs 5 – 7.

**Benefits from opening up access to the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive**

29. The Libraries believe that the benefits to the public and researchers would be better achieved if access to the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive were opened up. Benefits would include:

1. Allowing researchers to search the archive as a database and analyse the data using tools and software specially designed to support their research.
2. Allowing the public easier access to archived sites to verify content which is no longer current on the live web, increasing public accountability and transparency.
3. Supporting people in protecting their personal interests under data protection and privacy regulations.
4. Allowing publishers of UK websites to have the assurance that their content is being archived and made available openly under the auspices of UK legislation, and with pro-active stewardship by the Legal Deposit Libraries.

## 

## Could these benefits be achieved by permissions or voluntary agreement?

30. Because of the importance of making as much as possible of the harvested web openly available, the Libraries currently seek permission from website owners to make their content available openly. This permissions-based ‘opt-in’ system reveals the scale of the opportunity here. Of over 30,000 publishers approached to make their content available in this way, only 0.4% declined to give permission. However, the opt-in process is heavily resource-intensive and therefore opens up only a very small fraction of the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive to online users.

31. If the usage levels of the restricted Legal Deposit UK Web Archive are compared with usage of the much smaller, but open, permissions-cleared web archive, the vast discrepancy in their respective size versus usage levels can be seen (Table 1). This demonstrates the huge lost potential of the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive.

**Table 1. Comparison of usage and views of Legal deposit versus permission-cleared web archives**

Comparison of usage and views of Legal deposit versus permission-cleared web archives

32. Another useful point of comparison, the UK Government Web Archive (managed by The National Archives, and freely available under Open Government Licence) is used around 14.8m times a year despite comprising far fewer websites (just over 5,000).[[13]](#footnote-13)

## How can we protect publishers’ interests if this recommendation is accepted?

33. The Libraries are aware that this change in access policy needs to be carefully scoped and managed to protect the commercial interests of all website owners, including the UK publishing industry.

34. The Libraries recognise the need to ensure that the opening up of access to the UK Web Archive would not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work and would not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author.

35. This requirement can be fulfilled because:

* The vast majority of websites collected from the open web are produced for open access purposes and without restrictive terms and conditions, creating an implied licence for onward access.
* Websites owned by commercial publishers represent a small number of the overall websites archived (0.025% of website owners are commercial publishers).[[14]](#footnote-14) Therefore the Libraries could easily support an embargo allowing access only on the Library premises for these publishers.
* The UK Web Archive is not a ‘live’ site and instead constitutes an annual snapshot, without the full functionality and active links of the ‘live’ web. As such, it would not infringe on potential commercial opportunities around advertising and volume of traffic to individual sites that may be collected. The Libraries would propose to also ensure that users of an open Legal Deposit UK Web Archive are aware of the limitations of the archive and would direct users back to the live web for contemporary information.
* Additional controls would be developed to ensure the legitimate interests of the author are not infringed (see paragraph 36).

36. Publishers are also concerned about the potential lack of control in an open, online access regime compared with the tight control afforded when access is restricted to the premises of the Library. The Libraries would therefore also propose to introduce a requirement that JCLD collectively explore a set of controls that would enable users to access the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive remotely, while protecting content owners from unauthorised access.

****The Libraries propose that there be four levels of protection for commercial content:****

1. ****Open access would only be possible for web content which was openly available at the time it was harvested. Content from behind commercial pay-walls or which requires registration to access would be excluded from the open archive.****
2. ****The Libraries would operate an automatic exclusion for specific publishers as agreed by JCLD, e.g. members of the commercial trade publishing associations, news media industry etc., unless permission has been explicitly given to open their harvested web content.****
3. ****To further maintain a balance with the interests of publishers and rightsholders, there should be a voluntary opt-out system in operation for other website publishers so they can request that their complete sites are excluded from being opened up.****
4. ****In addition, the Libraries would offer a rapid notice and takedown service for specific pages/content. This would be covered by clear policy guidelines which would also incorporate general data protection regulations.****

37. The Publishers note that any such protection would need to be enshrined by law.

38. The Libraries believe the proposed change to open access for the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive would ensure the UK has a national web archiving service which greatly improves the standard of user experience while incorporating proportionate protections for publishers and website owners alongside this change. The Libraries believe this balance will ensure the long-term success of the Legal Deposit UK Web Archive.

# Recommendation 2: Re-establish automatic links to evolving Copyright legislation and regulations

39. The Libraries propose that Legal Deposit legislation and regulations are re-linked to evolving UK copyright legislation and regulations so that the beneficial balance between rightsholders and users is maintained.

40. The Libraries believe that users of NPLD content should benefit from the normal balance of rights enshrined in international and UK copyright legislation, particularly with regard to:

1. eventual expiry of copyright in born-digital materials
2. educational and public good exemptions

41. As a result of the current lack of alignment, users face inconsistency in access terms and conditions to library collections, depending on how each individual work they access has been ingested, notably in whether tools such as text and data mining can be applied. This also creates additional administrative requirements for LDLs in governing how users access material.

42. For Publishers any change to the current copyright status of digital legal deposit content is a sensitive issue. They feel very strongly that the existing restrictions, contained in the 2003 Legal Deposit Libraries Act and framed following several years of discussions, should be protected. Their main concerns are:

1. The removal of perpetual copyright from digital legal deposit content would give the Legal Deposit Libraries an unfair competitive advantage if they were to commercialise their archive after the expiry of copyright.
2. Current copyright exemptions would extend rights to text and data mining material in copyright for non-commercial research to digital legal deposit content. The publishers have argued that ‘*there are already many opportunities for text and data mining in the current marketplace’* and that such an extension could therefore undermine their commercial licensing of such digital functionality.

43. The Libraries believe that it is both more just and more efficient to maintain the normal balance of rights which copyright law is intended to maintain. As international and UK copyright law evolves in response to a fast-changing digital landscape, Publishers, Libraries and users of digital content will face many new challenges and opportunities in creating and using content. Re-aligning legal deposit law to copyright law seems the most effective way to safeguard the balance of rights for the long term.

44. It would also remove the requirement upon Government to update the legal deposit regulations in parallel with copyright law each time it is amended. The current separation creates inconsistency in access terms and conditions relating to library collections, with which users must comply. This creates an unnecessary administrative burden on the Libraries. It requires the Libraries to request regular updates to legal deposit regulations to ensure they remain concurrent with rights afforded to Library users in other regulations such as those governing equality and copyright.

45. The separation of legal deposit law and copyright law has already had unforeseen consequences for library users with a range of disabilities. The current range of disabilities covered in copyright law (and therefore requiring regulatory requirements for adjustments) is much broader than in the legal deposit regulations. This means that disabled users have fewer rights to access legal deposit content than other categories of library materials.

46. As Publishers and Libraries agree on this issue, this recommendation is covered fully in the Part 2: Post Implementation Review: Evidence Base.

47. Taken together, the Berne Convention and the Term Directive clearly create a period of exclusive rights, followed by the expiration of those rights under copyright law. The current UK legal deposit regulations envisage the works deposited with the UK Legal Deposit Libraries never entering the public domain. To the best of the Libraries’ knowledge, the UK is the only country that has separated legal deposit law from copyright law in the way that it has. This has created a legal grey area in terms of compliance with international copyright law, given that the Regulations relate to the use of copyright works which are regulated by international treaties.

## 

## Non-expiry of copyright

48. For the avoidance of doubt, the Libraries have no intention to commercially exploit legal deposit content. Their intention is to find ways to deal with the disproportionate burden on Legal Deposit Libraries, and address consequences for library users which have already arisen from the separation of legal deposit and copyright regulations. The Libraries expect more unintended consequences to arise in future as copyright law evolves to regulate an increasingly complex and rapidly evolving digital landscape. The Libraries believe that re-alignment with copyright law will ensure that publishers and rightsholders will continue to benefit from the protections afforded by the international copyright system, while resolving the unintended consequences created by the separation.

49. Expiry of copyright following a period of exclusive rights is an established principle. The intended policy purpose of having works enter the public domain is to support ongoing value creation from intellectual property, often by the publishing industry themselves. This was recently examined in some depth in a 2015 UK Government report on the role of out-of-copyright material in value chains for creative businesses.[[15]](#footnote-15)

## Educational and non-commercial research exemptions

50. The Libraries believe that the separation of legal deposit regulations from copyright law creates significant barriers to research. They believe this is entirely at odds with the UK Digital Strategy which commits to keeping the UK at the leading edge of new developments in data analytics. The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport reiterated its ambitions in the recent *Growing the artificial intelligence industry in the UK* report, published in October 2017. In order for the UK ‘to become the best place in the world for businesses developing and deploying AI to start, grow and thrive’, the report makes three key recommendations to ensure that the capability of AI can be improved, including ‘supporting text and data mining as a standard and essential tool for research’.[[16]](#footnote-16)

51. The JCLD Publishers are concerned that educational exemptions such as those which permit text and data mining for private study and non-commercial research purposes undermine their commercial licensing activities and therefore should not be applied to content they deposit under legal deposit. The Libraries believe that tools such as text and data mining ultimately enable researchers to explore themes that cut across a large scale aggregated dataset rather than exploiting a single publishers’ content. The unparalleled size of the UK Web Archive corpus of content offers a unique potential resource for researchers beyond that which could be offered by a publisher under licence. Fundamentally, publishers cannot themselves offer such rich and extensive datasets.

52. Whilst the Libraries acknowledge Publishers’ concerns about unauthorised commercial exploitation, they feel there is already adequate protection for deposited content within the 2003 Act and the 2013 regulations. The Legal Deposit Libraries 2003 Act does not allow remote online access or electronic copying and also restricts usage of an item to a single person as a time in each library. In the Libraries’ opinion, the right to text and data mine digital legal deposit content within the Libraries solely for non-commercial research and educational purposes would not undermine these protections. The Libraries believe these restrictions on use already mitigate the reduction in rights publishers’ face under legal deposit.

53. In addition, the inability to apply educational and non-commercial research exemptions to legal deposit digital content ultimately creates a system in which the incentives to collect digital versions as opposed to print versions are not as strong as they might be.

# Conclusion to the Libraries submission

54. The Libraries and Publishers have worked well together to support strong progress in the implementation of the 2013 NPLD Regulations. The Libraries echo the sentiment of the conclusion to the Publishers’ submission that the review has revealed differences of perspective in how the NPLD framework should respond to the challenges of increasingly rapid digital and technological change, while preserving our heritage for future generations.

55. Fundamentally, the Libraries believe that the changes they are proposing are foreshadowed by the original policy objectives, are sound proposals for ensuring more efficient and effective use of public resources, and position the UK to achieve its policy objectives around a digital and data-driven economy.

56, The Libraries are mindful of the current limitations on DCMS in its scope and capacity for enacting immediate legislative changes in response to the PIR process. However, given the effort that all members of JCLD have put into undertaking this Review, they believe it is essential that a clear articulation of the Government’s policy intentions is put forward in response to the arguments made throughout this process.

57. With this in mind, the Libraries are open to the concept of further public consultation on the issues of wider access to the UK Web Archive and the alignment of NPLD Regulations with UK copyright law, as suggested by the Publishers. However, they believe it is vital that any future consultation is framed around clear conclusions by DCMS from the current process, if it is to avoid being a re-run of current arguments. For the Libraries, they believe it would be appropriate to consult on how open access to the UK Web Archive could work in a way that protects the rights of publishers, and how better alignment with UK copyright law could be achieved. In both instances, the starting point is a clear recommendation from DCMS that JCLD should be working toward these ultimate objectives.
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