Legal Information Management, 25 (2025), pp. 116–119
© The Author(s), 2025. Published by British and Irish Association of Law Librarians
doi:10.1017/S1472669625100844

Navigating the Lexis+ UK Migration: Insights and Lessons Learned

Abstract: Between 2022 and 2024, LexisNexis migrated its customers with subscriptions to LexisLibrary and/or LexisPSL to the new Lexis+ UK platform. In order to assess the overall migration experience, identify challenges faced during the migration and suggest areas for improvement, the BIALL Supplier Liaison Group (SLG) conducted a survey in mid-2024 to gather feedback from members on their experiences of the project. During the summer of 2024, the SLG committee members analysed the results of the survey and put together the report, referenced in this article, that was circulated to BIALL members in October 2024. **Lauren Cummings**, **Ann O'Sullivan** and **Andrew Thatcher** wrote this piece based on the survey results, the report and the subsequent meeting with LexisNexis.
Keywords: surveys; BIALL (British and Irish Association of Law Librarians); legal databases; online databases

INTRODUCTION

LexisNexis migrated its customers with subscriptions to LexisLibrary and/or LexisPSL to the new Lexis+ UK platform between 2022 and 2024. This was a major undertaking for library, knowledge and information teams in legal settings, who had to ensure not only that users' access to the service was not interrupted, but also that deep links to content and user alerts were migrated correctly to enable a seamless transition. The BIALL Supplier Liaison Group (SLG) conducted a survey in mid-2024 to gather feedback from members on their experiences of the project.

Over 70 members participated in the survey, providing useful insights into their experiences working with LexisNexis and introducing the Lexis+ UK platform. The findings of the survey can inform any future discussions a firm may have with LexisNexis and how to approach the migration to new platforms from other suppliers.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

To gather feedback on members' experiences of the Lexis+ UK migration process the survey, circulated via SurveyMonkey, was launched on 30 May 2024 and closed on 28 June 2024. The survey comprised 23 questions designed to capture a broad range of insights, from practical challenges to overall impressions of the migration (see Annexe 1). The survey questions and response data can be found in the full survey report, which is available in the Member Resources area of the BIALL website.

In total, 70 responses were received. Of these, 65% of respondents worked in law firms, 18.5% in the academic sector, with the remainder working in barristers' chambers and the Inns of Court, the government sector, and professional bodies. To encourage openness, the survey was conducted anonymously.

DATE OF MIGRATION

Four questions in the survey provided data that allowed the SLG to explore the correlation between members' date of migration and the quality of their migration experience. An initial look at the survey would suggest that satisfaction with the migration reduced after September 2023, at which point the number of members reporting "Not really satisfied" or "Not satisfied at all" increased. However, LexisNexis ramped up the number of firms migrating in the later periods, meaning more people were reporting on their experiences in these times. While the number of not satisfied responses did increase, the number of satisfied responses still outmatched these.

The main difference in experience for those migrating in the later periods is related to three different areas. Firstly, Questions 5 and 6 explored whether members were satisfied with communications from LexisNexis throughout the migration and with how long issues took to be resolved. Respondents who migrated in the later periods reported that they found it difficult to communicate with a very busy LexisNexis team, and that it was taking more time to resolve issues. Several respondents reported that while communication from LexisNexis

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669625100844 Published online by Cambridge University Press

started strongly, it dropped in frequency and quality as the migration progressed.

Secondly, more issues with access to other LexisNexis products were reported in the later periods of the migration, as explored by Question 8. Respondents reported that their access to Nexis and/or Newsdesk was affected, while others experienced problems moving between the Lexis+ UK and the Lexis US platforms. LexisNexis had not resolved either of these issues at the time of writing the survey report.

Finally, responses to Question 10 show a clear swing in satisfaction with alerts migration, with a much-increased number of respondents reporting they were not satisfied in the later migration periods. Common issues reported were alerts not being migrated correctly and having to be recreated, and that the quality of alerts received dropped after the migration.

Overall, then, while no direct correlation was identified between the time members migrated and their satisfaction with the experience, there does appear to have been a slight breakdown in communications and problem solving in the later migration periods. This may have been due to the higher numbers of firms migrating at this time, leading to an overwhelmed LexisNexis team. It may therefore be advisable for vendors undertaking a similar migration to 'stagger' the process in the future, so that all customers have a similar experience and access to support.

CHANGING METHOD OF ACCESS

Question 7 asked if users had to change their method of access during the migration process, e.g. did users move from logins to Single Sign-On (SSO)? In analysing the responses to this question, the SLG explored whether the method of access to Lexis+ UK had an impact on the migration experience. Most respondents, who were primarily from law firms, reported no change to their access method during the migration. However, a smaller group indicated that they had made changes and provided further detail in the free-text comments. Interestingly, even respondents who had not changed their access method often used the comment field to describe discussions with LexisNexis about potential changes, concerns about retaining existing methods, and issues that arose during the migration.

Most of the data and feedback the SLG gathered regarding changing methods of access were from the free text field, and were analysed in relation to other answers each respondent had provided, including: the date during which their migration had occurred (Question 3); any issues accessing other integrated or separate LexisNexis and non-LexisNexis products (Question 8 and Question 13); the resolution of issues reported to LexisNexis after migration (Question 17); and any other comments respondents wanted to provide (Question 23). The most common change was a switch to SSO, typically from IP recognition (sometimes via VPN), individual logins, or the WAYF ('Where Are You From') protocol.

The SLG found no clear link between the timing of migration and reported issues, but the method of access itself appeared to be more relevant. SSO emerged as a key issue for both positive and negative feedback. Respondents who had implemented SSO reported issues such as broken deep links, repeated login prompts, compatibility problems between UK and international LexisNexis platforms, and difficulties with user account configuration. Some respondents had considered switching to SSO but ultimately did not, citing technical barriers, lack of a testing environment, or incompatibility with internal systems. Others expressed interest in adopting SSO in future, especially to simplify access and enhance compatibility with newer features on Lexis+ UK. Some respondents noted that the shift to SSO felt inevitable, as their existing method had become unsupported post-migration. Those who retained IP recognition or individual logins also reported challenges, including reduced access to personalisation features, administrative limitations, and platform functionality that no longer worked with their chosen method.

While only a small number of respondents had changed access method, the feedback suggests that ongoing support for non-SSO access methods may become more difficult over time, particularly as Lexis+ UK continues to evolve.

DEEP LINKS

Several of the free text responses mentioned issues with deep links because of the migration. This prompted the SLG to explore further and analyse the responses to Question 12, which asked if members were happy with the tools LexisNexis provided to transfer deep links (for example, links to books in catalogue records). Twenty respondents said they were not satisfied, while 40 were satisfied and 10 responded 'not applicable'. Respondents who were not satisfied were particularly frustrated with the communication from LexisNexis regarding deep links, and with the time their teams had to spend looking for and updating LexisNexis deep links across their content pages. Some respondents were planning to move to SSO and so were reluctant to update links that would have to be changed again later.

The further details provided in the text responses to Question 12 reveal inconsistencies in how deep links were handled during the migration process. Some respondents reported that they received a list of new links from LexisNexis to help them with the transition, but a few found that there were incorrect links in these lists, meaning they had to spend quite a lot of time testing and replacing links. Others had to manually replace the links themselves, were told that LexisNexis could not help with replacing deep links or felt that the instructions they received were not clear. This feedback suggests that deep links were not handled in a consistent way, leading to very different experiences for different customers.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669625100844 Published online by Cambridge University Press

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, most respondents were satisfied with the migration process. Where issues arose, LexisNexis generally took action quickly to resolve these, and respondents were pleased with the training offered. Most respondents were also satisfied with the communication from LexisNexis, but there were notable concerns about the quality and frequency of communication, particularly in the late 2023 and early 2024 periods. Transferring deep links was another area of particular concern.

Though we did not identify a direct correlation between the date at which respondents migrated and their overall satisfaction, the free text responses suggest that those who migrated later experienced more issues. It also appeared that service became more inconsistent in this later period, particularly regarding alert migrations. This may have been due to the higher volume of migrations happening in this period, leading to the LexisNexis team having to deal with many problems at the same time.

Vendors running a similar migration process in the future should consider staggering their customers' migrations in a deliberate manner, to ensure their teams are not overwhelmed by any problems that might arise. This would help to alleviate the communication issues experienced during the later Lexis+ UK migrations, providing a consistent approach and highlighting the support that is available for issues such as deep links and alert migration.

Members of the Committees of the Supplier Liaison Group and the Academic Special Interest Group met with representatives from LexisNexis in December 2024 to discuss the survey results and identify some key action points for 2025. Karen Waldron, Product Development Director at LexisNexis, kindly provided the SLG with the following quote, summarising LexisNexis' perspective:

"At LexisNexis, we are deeply grateful for the invaluable feedback from our customers. Prior to this upgrade, we took the time to consult with you regarding your previous experiences both with us and other suppliers and carefully considered the responses. We invested significant time in planning and in enhancing our resources in order to deliver a smooth product upgrade experience. While we acknowledge that unforeseen challenges can arise in any major initiative and we fully take the recommendations on board, we are pleased that the majority of customers were satisfied with the support provided. Your insights are crucial as we look to continuously improve, and we will apply these additional learnings to any future projects."

The SLG would like to thank all BIALL members who took the time to respond to the survey. Your input was invaluable, and we hope that you have found the survey report and this article useful and illuminating.

ANNEXE 1

SLG LexisNexis Migration survey questions

1. What sector do you work in?
2. Where are you located?
3. When did you migrate to Lexis+ UK?
4. Were you assigned a project manager for migration?
5. How satisfied were you with the communications from LexisNexis about the migration process for your organisation?
6. How satisfied were you with the time taken to resolve issues during migration?
7. As part of your migration did you have to change the way you access Lexis+ UK e.g. move from login to single sign on
8. Has the migration to Lexis+ UK resulted in issues accessing other Lexis Nexis services, either local or international?
9. If you had access to the journal admin function, was it automatically migrated?
10. Are you satisfied with how your alerts were migrated?
11. Are you satisfied with how your saved searches migrated?
12. Are you satisfied with the tools supplied by LexisNexis to transfer deep links?
13. Have you had any issues with non-LexisNexis products integrating with your Lexis+ UK platform? e.g. OneLog, Solcara Legal Search
14. Are you satisfied that you have access to the same content on Lexis+ UK (including any add ons) that you had on LexisLibrary and/or LexisPSL?
15. How satisfied are you with the search functionality on Lexis+ UK?
16. What is the feedback from your end users about the new platform?
17. Have issues reported to LexisNexis since migration been resolved?
18. How satisfied were you with the training delivered by the LexisNexis trainer?
19. For academic librarians only – do you support sector wide negotiations with LexisNexis?
20. For academic librarians only – do you support sector wide negotiations with LexisNexis if it was not through JISC?
21. For academic librarians only – do you support the insertion of a contract break clause as one of the criteria for negotiation with LexisNexis?
22. For academic librarians only – what criteria would you like included in sector wide negotiations if they were to happen?
23. Do you have any other comments or feedback for the LexisNexis and/or the SLG?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669625100844 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Biographies

Lauren Cummings joined the SLG Committee in July 2024. She is an Assistant Librarian at the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple.

Ann O'Sullivan joined the SLG Committee in July 2021 and took on the role of Chair in 2023 for three years. Ann is the Knowledge Services Manager at A&L Goodbody LLP (Dublin).

Andrew Thatcher joined the SLG Committee in July 2024. Andrew is a Knowledge Operations Specialist at Eversheds Sutherland.

Timonie Green joined the SLG Committee in July 2023 and currently serves as Vice Chair. She is the Library & Research Manager at Withers LLP.

Lily Rowe joined the SLG Committee in February 2024. She recently joined the Law Society as Assistant Librarian (Collections).

Kim McLachlan is a long-standing member of the SLG and a previous SLG Committee Chair. Kim is a Senior Information Manager at Macfarlanes LLP.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1472669625100844 Published online by Cambridge University Press