



CRL Print Archives Network

Meeting with Consortium Partners

Monday February 22, 2010

Meeting Summary

Attendees: Please see attached list of participants. Participants attended via Web and conference call.

Summary of Actions

Meeting participants took the following actions:

- Supported CRL's proposal to design a prototype print archives network building on the overlap among currently-active built archives for four sets of publisher content: JSTOR, American Chemical Society, American Physical Society, and American Institute of Physics.
- Endorsed the proposed baseline features of a services agreement (MOU), with a few modifications.
- Recommended further exploration of using the OCLC WorldCat 583 Action Note with communal Local Holdings Records (LHRs) as a mechanism for disclosing print archiving commitments. Given questions about the timetable for implementation of this capability at OCLC, other options for creating a specialized print archives system should also be explored.

Meeting details

I. Project goals and overview of current initiatives

Lizanne Payne (Print Archives Program Manager, CRL) called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm (Central time). She outlined the agenda and summarized the goals of CRL's print archiving initiative as laid out at the ALA Midwinter meeting: to support the development of a network-level cooperative print archiving system by building on existing and planned regional and domain-based initiatives.

Ms. Payne reported that participants at the January 15 meeting had expressed support for CRL's proposed planning effort to take place January through September 2010, and that the current meeting (February 22) was the first step in the planning process.

Ms. Payne presented an outline of current print archiving initiatives, and described three sets of characteristics which describe these projects:

- Time period covered: retrospective vs prospective. She noted that almost all print archiving projects focus on the retrospective time period, with only the University of California's prospective e-journal archive planning to preserve future print journal issues.
- Archiving effort: "built" vs "de facto". Ms. Payne stated that some archives make a proactive selection of materials to archive, and actively complete and consolidate holdings, while in other cases, libraries may retroactively apply an archiving agreement to materials already stored based on a "de facto" selection.
- Selection method: by publisher, title or domain. Ms. Payne reported that the most common selection method for built archives is by publisher.

Ms. Payne called attention to the table of print archiving projects which was distributed, and stated that most current print archiving projects are retrospective built archives of journals based on publisher selection. Participants made a few corrections:

- PALCI archives include the American Physical Society, American Chemical Society, and American Institute of Physics. PALCI participating libraries have recently signed MOUs and the initiative is transitioning from the planning to operational stage.
- TRLN opt-in library-nominated titles include American Chemical Society titles but not JSTOR titles.

Tony Ferguson (University of Hong Kong) asked if these overlapping projects indicated too much duplication. He pointed out that it would be useful to know how these archived materials corresponded to digital repositories such as Portico and LOCKSS. Ms. Payne responded that most of these materials were chosen for archiving because they have an electronic equivalent and noted that she would document which of these archived print titles were represented in digital repositories.

The discussion segued into the next agenda item.

II. Proposal for a prototype multi-consortial print archive

Lizanne Payne outlined CRL's proposal to design a prototype print archives network building on the overlap among currently-active built archives for four sets of publisher content: JSTOR, American Chemical Society, American Physical Society, and American Institute of Physics. She noted that the goal of the project would be to work with the currently-archiving libraries, and others, to develop a plan and cost estimates for the infrastructure to link them.

Joy Paulson (Cornell University, USAIN) suggested that it would be important to know the physical condition of these archived materials as well as their completeness.

Peggy Seiden (Swarthmore College, PALCI) suggested that the study by OCLC Research which emphasized overlap and archiving of non-electronic journals should be considered. She described a situation in which they had nearly de-accessioned one of only two copies held of a title in the US, and she suggesting publicizing “at risk” journals.

Bernie Reilly (Center for Research Libraries) responded that a project to facilitate deaccessioning (i.e. of volumes with digital equivalent) could free library resources to support less widely-held non-digital materials.

Jay Schafer (University of Massachusetts) stated that libraries are facing a pressing need for space, and that priority should be given to archiving print materials with stable electronic access. Libraries are already focused on trying to preserve unique materials.

Ms. Payne noted that another reason for focusing on the existing publisher-oriented archives is to facilitate the archival selection process during the prototype or pilot project, so that attention could be focused on designing the related infrastructure.

George Machovec (Colorado Alliance) noted that this approach would work well and would allow for adding the de facto archives to augment the selected titles.

Mark Sandler (Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC)) reported that CIC has been considering whether to implement dark archives or light archives, and is likely to focus on providing accessible copies.

John Barnett (PALCI) reported that PALCI’s distributed archive will include both dark and light archives.

Dona Straley (OhioLINK) stated that, in discussions of consolidating archival holdings at the Ohio regional depositories, it was apparent that faculty were concerned about long-term availability and hence would be more comfortable with dark archives somewhere in the system.

Chris Loring (Smith College, Five Colleges, Inc) noted that there is a lot of overhead and expense associated with maintaining a dark archive. Jay Schafer (UMass) suggested that multiple redundant light archives might serve the need.

Melissa Trevvett (CRL) suggested that it would be important to define the characteristics of a dark archive: for example, in a dark archive must the materials be validated for completeness and condition?

Lizanne Payne noted that this would be an area for further discussion in the planning project. She asked for an indication of support for or concerns about CRL’s proposal for a prototype project.

John Burger (ASERL) asked if CRL would require financial support from participants at this time. Ms. Payne responded that the goal was to develop a plan and cost estimates over the next few months using only contributed staff time, including her time provided by CRL. She noted, however, that portions of the planning project may incur direct costs, such as for data manipulation. She indicated that any such costs would be discussed with the consortial planning group before proceeding to seek supporting

funds. Since Bernie was not present, Melissa Trevvett confirmed that Lizanne's response reflected CRL's approach.

George Machovec (Colorado Alliance) stated that the plan looked very good and would be a good start on developing a prototype national network. John Burger (ASERL) stated that he supported the proposal, as did John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade Alliance). Mona Coutts (Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN)) stated that she was supportive but wanted to make sure that the initiative did not create additional layers of complexity over existing consortial initiatives. Kathleen Richman (LLMC) stated that she was in full support and offered to provide assistance with the effort. Tony Ferguson (University of Hong Kong) indicated support and pointed to the Pacific Rim Digital Library Alliance as a possible model, noting that the costs of an integrated catalog/inventory of such archives could be reduced by relying upon harvesting software instead of some more labor intensive methodology.

Lizanne Payne asked for a "show of hands" using the Web meeting "raise hands" feature. Almost all participants raised hands. It was agreed that the sense of the meeting was to proceed with further planning for the proposed prototype network as described.

III. Service Agreements

Ms. Payne called attendees' attention to the comparison of existing service agreements among libraries with print archiving initiatives, and outlined the proposed baseline features of an agreement for the CRL consortial print archives network.

John Burger (ASERL) noted that ASERL is working on developing a service agreement, with similar components.

John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade) asked if the intention were to provide access to all participants even if they are not providing archives. Lizanne Payne responded that, yes, that is the working assumption but should be considered during further planning and possibly use the cost model to differentiate between archive providers and archive users.

Peggy Seiden (Swarthmore, PALCI) noted that when PALCI developed its service agreements, there was a certain amount of pushback from the archive providers over the required retention period. Dan Iddings (PALCI) reported that archive providers committed to retain materials for 10 years.

John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade) noted that the Orbis agreement is for 25 years with the option to renew. He asked for clarification of the purpose of the "review after X years" clause. Lizanne Payne explained that, for projects which have such a clause especially with a lengthy retention period, the idea is to provide an explicit earlier point where the agreement can be revisited to determine if the print archive is still useful, or if terms need to be changed.

There was general agreement that the "retention period" clause needed further consideration.

There was also some discussion of the proposed "ownership" clause ("ownership would remain with the original owner"). Orbis and PALCI reported that, under their agreements, ownership would transfer to

the new holding library if an original-owner transferred volumes to complete another library's run. It was agreed that the ownership clause should be omitted from the baseline service agreement, i.e. did not need to be stipulated.

IV. Print Archives Metadata

Lizanne Payne outlined some of the options for providing and maintaining metadata to describe archived materials. She called attention to a diagram provided with the meeting presentation, which shows two primary approaches:

- OCLC WorldCat 583 Action Note (with communal Local Holdings Records): a proposal by OCLC Research, endorsed by CONSER, which would require some programming changes by OCLC
- A specialized print archives database and system, using source data from other providers such as Ulrich's, JSTOR, Portico, local catalogs

Mona Coutts (TRLN) stated that she would favor the OCLC 583 option, and noted that the TRLN project currently enters a 5xx note indicating "single-copy" status but has aimed to support the 583 approach when available.

Lizanne Payne reported that a working group for the WEST project preferred the WorldCat option.

Tony Ferguson (University of Hong Kong) noted that potential participants in a global print archiving network already have OCLC WorldCat in common which would facilitate implementation.

Dan Iddings (PALCI) wondered if the OCLC Record Use policy would interfere with using WorldCat in this way. Ms. Payne noted this as an issue to be explored.

John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade) stated that he supports using the OCLC WorldCat 583 approach as the presumptive solution, and urged participants to work with OCLC to secure implementation.

Bernie Reilly (CRL) stated that the suggestion of alternative solutions was driven by a concern that OCLC may not be willing or able to implement the 583 support on a timetable to be useful for the print archiving initiatives. John Helmer, Joni Blake (GWLA), and others recommended that participants develop a detailed requirements specification, talking points, and timetable in order to encourage OCLC's development of this capability. Tony Ferguson stated that, as a member of the OCLC Board of Trustees, he would have opportunities to speak with OCLC management about the importance of this initiative.

It was suggested that WEST and this CRL-led project collaborate on the 583 issue.

It was agreed that Lizanne Payne along with other participants would explore and encourage development of the OCLC 583 approach as a first choice, with parallel exploration of creating a specialized print archives database as a second choice.

V. Next Steps

Lizanne Payne suggested that the next steps are to work closely with the consortia who have implemented the publisher-based archives outlined above, to develop further details of the prototype project. She also suggested scheduling monthly conference/Web meetings with the larger consortial partner group to report progress and continue planning. She will coordinate a date for a mid-March meeting.

Attachment A

Participants in CRL Print Archives Web meeting 02/22/2010

ASERL: John Burger (jburger@aserl.org), Cheryl Cole-Bennett (ccole-bennett@aserl.org)

CIC: Mark Sandler (msandler@staff.cic.net), Kim Armstrong (karms2@staff.cic.net)

Colorado Alliance: Michael Levine-Clark (michael.levine-clark@du.edu), George Machovec (george@coalliance.org)

Five Colleges (MA): Jay Schafer (jschafer@library.umass.edu), Chris Loring (cloring@smith.edu)

GWLA: Joni Blake (joni@gwla.org)

JURA, University of Hong Kong: Tony Ferguson (ferguson@hkucc.hku.hk)

LLMC: Kathleen Richman (kathleen.richman@llmc.com)

Lyris: Tim Cherubini (timothy.cherubini@lyris.org)

OCUL: Kathy Scardellato (kathy.scardellato@ocul.on.ca)

OhioLINK: Dona Straley (straley.1@osu.edu)

Orbis-Cascade Alliance: John Helmer (jhelmer@uoregon.edu)

PALCI: Dan Iddings (iddings@pitt.edu), John Barnett (barnett@palci.org), Peggy Seiden (pseiden1@swarthmore.edu)

Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN): Mona Coutts (mona@trln.org), Judy Ruttenger (judy@trln.org)

USAIN: Joy Paulson (jp243@cornell.edu)

For the Center for Research Libraries (CRL):

Lizanne Payne (lpayne@crl.edu)

Bernie Reilly (breilly@crl.edu)

Melissa Trevvett (mtrevvett@crl.edu)