CRL Print Archives Network

Meeting with Consortium Partners

Friday March 26, 2010

Meeting Summary

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

Summary of Actions

Meeting participants took the following actions:

- Supported CRL's recommendations about print archives metadata: 1) to use current OCLC capabilities (where possible) to support print archiving requirements, 2) to explore development of an interim specialized holdings analysis database, and 3) to encourage OCLC to develop features to support print archiving

- Preferred a service agreement based on multilateral services among all participants

- Requested further exploration with cost estimates for two funding model alternatives: 1) share central costs among participants, and 2) share central costs with some subsidy for archive providers

Meeting details

I.   Review of February meeting

Lizanne Payne summarized the outcomes of the previous web meeting on February 22, 2010. She also reported that she had developed a preliminary spreadsheet to show the combined print archive holdings of CRL, Orbis-Cascade, Five Colleges, PALCI, and TRLN based on spreadsheet data provided by those consortia. The combined holdings file is located on the CRL Print Archives wiki at http://workspace.crl.edu/display/pan/Print+Archive+Holdings+Data

II.   Followup on plans for a print archives metadata system

Lizanne Payne outlined CRL's suggested approach to implementing metadata system for a network-level print archives system:

- Use current OCLC capabilities to support print archiving to the extent possible

- Develop a specialized database for more detailed comparison of print archive holdings at the volume/year level

- Continue to encourage OCLC to develop features to support print archives (e.g. communal LHR or similar)

There was general agreement that this plan should be pursued. There was some discussion about how to communicate interest from the print archiving community to OCLC. Dan Iddings (PALCI) mentioned that Nancy Eaton (retiring Dean of Libraries at Penn State) will serve as a consultant to OCLC beginning in summer 2010 and could be an important liaison for this effort. Brian Schottlaender (UC San Diego, WEST) reported that he and John Helmer (Orbis Cascade Alliance) will mention this issue at the April meeting of OCLC Global Council.

III.   Options for a CRL print archiving business model

Lizanne Payne outlined three components of a business model (service agreement, governance, funding model), and suggested focusing discussion on the first and third in the interest of time.

Service Agreement

The background materials and slide presentation outlined proposed roles of participating consortia and of CRL.

Proposed roles of consortia:
- Adopt the baseline service agreement
- Archive materials according to agreements and standards
- Provide access to print archives for other participants
- Contribute materials to the collective print archives.

Proposed roles of CRL:
- Forum to define archiving priorities and standards
- Holdings analysis and systems (if necessary)
- Track usage
- Monitor service agreements and conditions
- Manage compensation among consortia
- Develop messaging documents
- Facilitate grant proposals

There was support for these roles in general, but no specific discussion of the details. Lizanne raised a question about the scope of consortial relationships under this plan: would the participants expect a multilateral agreement with all consortia (each participant provides access for all other participants), or

would consortia expect to select specific other archives to which they would subscribe? Comments favored a multilateral relationship. Peggy Seiden (Swarthmore College, PALCI) expressed the view (supported by others) that a multilateral relationship would be simpler to administer and would advance the progress of print archiving the most.

Kathy Scardellato (Ontario Council of University Libraries, OCUL) wondered if agreements between Canadian and American consortia would be a problem. She and others expressed the opinion that there would not be a problem providing access, especially since much access would take the form of digital delivery.

Lizanne Payne noted that an assumption behind CRL's proposal has been that the relationship would be between CRL and other consortia, not between CRL and consortium member libraries. George Machovec (Colorado Alliance) and others agreed that was the best approach, noting that consortia are organized in various ways and are best prepared to handle the liaison with their library members on this issue. George Machovec also asked how CRL would handle the case of consortium members who are not CRL members and suggested a consortium-level membership category. Bernie Reilly agreed that a new set of relationships would be defined to facilitate this service agreement.

Lizanne Payne outlined the two funding model alternatives which were being presented:
- Alternative 1: Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula.
- Alternative 2: Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula and also give a financial credit to archive providers and (possibly) to those who contribute additional materials

She emphasized that the components of "central costs" and the funding formula both need to be defined.

The following points were raised during discussion:
- The fewer transaction costs, the better (Brian Schottlaender)
- Choice of alternatives depends on how much money, what costs are included (George Machovec)
- Some costs like validation will be extensive at the beginning but then may decline (Ivy Anderson, California Digital Library)
- Cost-sharing could be handled differently at the CRL level vs the regional level, i.e. at CRL level perhaps share only the central costs, at the regional consortium level include provider compensation such as for validation (Lizanne Payne, CRL)
- The business model is likely to evolve over time, should provide for changing the funding model in the future (Brian Schottlaender) and should include explicit time horizons (Bernie Reilly)
- Provosts at the large institutions which are likely to provide the print archives may want financial incentives to participate, growing concern about providing uncompensated resources for others (Mark Sandler, CIC)
- Could CRL provide cost estimates to know the scope involved (Peggy Seiden, PALCI)

Action

For the next meeting, CRL will prepare two additional sets of information:

- cost estimates for the various activities and services associated with print archiving
- more detailed descriptions of the two funding models using the cost estimates

Consortium representatives attending the ICOLC meeting in Chicago in April will attempt to get together, but a web meeting will also be scheduled for shortly after ICOLC in late April or early May.

Attachment A

Participants in CRL Print Archives Web meeting
03/26/2010

ASERL: John Burger (jburger@aserl.org)

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

Colorado Alliance: George Machovec (george@coalliance.org)

GWLA: Joni Blake (joni@gwla.org)

LLMC: Kathleen Richman (kathleenr@llmc.com)

LYRASIS: Tim Cherubini (timothy.cherubini@lyrasis.org)

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

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

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

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

USAIN: Joy Paulson (jp243@cornell.edu)

WEST: Brian Schottlaender (becs@ucsd.edu), Ivy Anderson (ivy.anderson@ucop.edu)

For the Center for Research Libraries (CRL):

      Lizanne Payne (lpayne@crl.edu)
      Bernie Reilly (breilly@crl.edu)
      Melissa Trevvett (mtrevvett@crl.edu)