



CRL Print Archives Framework

Meeting with Consortium Partners

Friday March 26, 2010

AGENDA

- | | | |
|------|--|--------|
| I. | Review of February meeting | Page 1 |
| II. | Followup on plans for a print archives metadata system | Page 1 |
| III. | Proposal for a CRL print archiving business model | Page 3 |

I. Review of February Meeting

At the previous web meeting on February 22, 2010, participants took the following actions:

- Supported CRL's proposal to design a prototype print archives framework 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.

II. Followup on plans for a print archives metadata system

At the previous meeting on February 22, participants expressed a preference for exploring OCLC WorldCat and related functions (especially the proposed "communal Local Holdings Record (LHR)") as a method for implementing a print archives metadata system.

CRL is continuing to encourage OCLC to develop features to support print archives. To continue with expeditious development of a large-scale print archives framework, it may be necessary to plan for an interim approach.

Interim approach using current OCLC capabilities

Some print archives functions could be supported by a combination of current OCLC capabilities which can be used by OCLC members without system development at OCLC.

- Advantages: Information about print archives easily available worldwide through WorldCat, promote global collaboration, minimize direct costs of developing a separate specialized system
- Disadvantages: Works best at title level; may require significant local efforts to maintain OCLC local holdings (assumes initial batch load to create LHRs); difficult to integrate external decision-support data such as presence in digital repository

Because the existing OCLC capabilities work best at the title level, it would be advantageous to define a multi-phase strategy:

- Phase 1: Identify archived titles with most complete runs to facilitate archiving and deselection at the title level
- Phase 2: Implement or support development of holdings-level analysis capabilities to identify gaps and overlaps at the volume/year level.

Functions and OCLC features

The following existing OCLC features could be combined to make available the necessary metadata for print archives. Please note: further analysis is underway to verify that these OCLC features would effectively support print archiving requirements. Verification is expected by mid-April.

1. Use OCLC Institution Symbols or Holding Library Codes to indicate print archive location at the title level in WorldCat bibliographic records.
2. Use Local Holding Records (LHRs) with 583 tags to indicate print archive status and details at the holdings level
3. Use WorldCat Registry or OCLC Group or OCLC Group Access Capability to define print archives registry to indicate archiving agreements and conditions.
4. Use WorldCat Collection Analysis for title-level overlap analysis among participating print archives and library collections.
5. Use OCLC Group Access Capability (GAC) to support access to print archives, by searching and link to ILL via WorldCat Resource Sharing.

Please see Attachment (page 6) for more details of how these features might be used.

A different specialized database may be needed to support a more detailed comparison of print archive holdings at the volume/year level, even if current OCLC features support most of the other functions. It is assumed that existing capabilities will support individual title inquiry, i.e. to see if and where a specific title is being archived.

The following additional comparisons will be important for collection analysis to support print archiving:

- Identify gaps (for serials) in the existing print archives: wants, desiderata, items needed to complete runs
- Identify overlaps between existing print archives and candidate materials proposed by participating libraries. Ideally this would be an automated match to report to the library which items should be contributed to print archive (to fill gaps) and which may be deaccessioned
- Identify overlaps or redundancy among existing print archives, to identify the number of already-archive copies which could be compared to “optimal copies”, copies which could be deaccessioned from archives if appropriate
- Assess library collections for potential archiving in the context of external criteria: compare to existing dark archives, digital repositories, optimal copies, image-intensity. Example: Ithaka What-To-Withdraw decision support tool for JSTOR.

Automated comparison of holdings is very difficult for any system because of the variations in syntax which libraries have used to record holdings in MARC records. A specialized database could be developed to facilitate the comparisons outlined above, even if much of the analysis remains manual.

III. Proposal for a business model

At the meeting on February 22, 2010 participants endorsed a CRL proposal to design a prototype print archives framework building on the overlap among currently-active built archives for four sets of publisher content:

- JSTOR (CRL, Five Colleges (MA), Orbis-Cascade, University of California, WNCLN)
- American Chemical Society (Five Colleges (MA), Orbis-Cascade, PALCI)
- American Physical Society (Five Colleges (MA), PALCI)
- American Institute of Physics (Five Colleges (MA), PALCI)

The goal of the prototype project is to work out the relationships, agreements, technologies, and costs in such a way that the structure could be scaled up to a North American or multi-national framework.

Working with consortial partners, CRL will develop plans and cost estimates to establish these infrastructure components:

- Service agreement(s) between archiving consortia, other consortia, and CRL
- A common system for disclosing, analyzing, and accessing archive holdings (lightweight mechanism)
- A business model identifying cost factors and cost-sharing principles, with estimated costs and benefits for participants of varying characteristics.

The following section proposes an initial outline for some aspects of a business model. Details about costs will be developed based on results of certain pending decisions, such as metadata/systems methodology and financial support model (see below).

Proposed services

Proposal: Two service agreements:

- A baseline MOU to define terms for consistent archiving and access/delivery services across participating consortia. There was some initial discussion of a baseline MOU at the meeting on February 22.
- A master service agreement to define the relationship between CRL and other participants.

The proposed master agreement would define how CRL and partner consortia would provide services.

CRL central support services:

- Work with partners to implement service agreements
- Convene forum to define archiving criteria, priorities, and standards

- Support holdings analysis, provide tools and staff to compare holdings
- Develop and maintain systems (as necessary, e.g. for specialized holdings analysis)
- Monitor adherence to service agreements (storage conditions and services)
- Track usage and other participation statistics
- Collect and distribute financial compensation among participants according to approved funding model
- Develop messaging documents to encourage support for print archiving efforts among administrators, faculty, and others in the academic community
- Develop or facilitate grant proposals to support print archiving initiatives

Partner consortium services:

- Adopt the baseline print archives agreement to define archiving services
- Archive materials according to agreements and standards
- Provide access to print archives for other participants. Alternatives for consideration:
 - 1) Multilateral agreement: All consortia provide access and delivery services from print archives to members of all consortia which execute the master agreement, including to CRL libraries
 - 2) Consortia selection: Each consortium subscribes to individual archives as desired (e.g. by publisher, by consortium project)
- Contribute materials to the collective print archives.

Governance

Proposal: Two governing bodies to provide oversight and coordination

- 1) CRL Print Archive Framework Board: representatives from participating consortia or archiving projects who will review and approve service agreements, budgets, and funding model
- 2) CRL Print Archive Framework Operations Council: representatives from participating consortia or archiving projects who will advise on services, supporting technologies, and standards

Financial Support Model

Proposed Principles

1. Minimize direct costs. Usage of the print archive is expected to be very low, and does not justify substantial investment in new infrastructure or services.
2. Share the central framework costs. Centralized or aggregated costs of the overall project should be shared proportionally among participants.
3. Simplify funding formula. In order to minimize the costs of administration, cost-sharing algorithm should require minimal calculation and negotiation.

Funding Model Alternatives

Alternative 1: Share central costs only

- Divide the central costs for services provided by CRL among participating consortia according to a formula . Components of “central costs” and funding formula both need to be defined.
- Allow archive providers to charge (or not) for access/delivery according to existing ILL policies
- Advantages: Simple to administer, no transaction accounting, minimizes participation costs
- Disadvantages: May provide less incentive for archive providers to participate

Alternative 2: Direct subsidy for archive providers and contributors

- Divide the central costs for services provided by CRL among participating consortia according to a formula (TBD).
- Give a financial credit to archive providers and those who contribute additional materials
- Advantages: Provides quantifiable support for archivers’ costs to archive; spreads archiving costs across a broader base; encourages longer-term commitment by archivers;
- Disadvantages: Requires additional transaction accounting; difficult to predict and budget, increases overall costs to be shared

Action requested

- Comments and suggestions about alternative financial models, identify new approaches
- Determine preference for which approach to explore further

Attachment

Details of Interim approach using current OCLC capabilities

1. Use OCLC Institution Symbols or Holding Library Codes to indicate print archive location at the title level in WorldCat bibliographic records. This would support the most basic functionality: to inquire about individual titles by ISSN, OCLC number, title, key word, etc) to determine archive status, location(s) and holdings. (Note: most print archives do not currently identify holdings in OCLC in this way, could be updated in batch mode with Set Holds.)
2. Use Local Holding Records (LHRs) with 583 tags to indicate print archive status at the holdings level
 - a. Generate and batch load Local Holding Records (LHRs) for already-archived materials
 - b. Create individual LHRs for volumes during future ingest to archive or storage facility. The LHR provides fields to record (or link to) Leader and fixed fields including lending policy for resource sharing, archive action, where archived, link to project registry
 - c. Alternative: Communal LHRs¹ (requires development by OCLC, timeframe unknown)

“A new OCLC symbol would be defined to represent network-level preservation data associated with a particular title. The symbol would be set on any bibliographic record associated with an LHR containing 583 fields from multiple institutions. “
3. Use WorldCat Registry or OCLC Group or OCLC Group Access Capability to define print archives registry. Each of these OCLC capabilities allows for defining institutional information which can be correlated to bibliographic and holdings data. Requires more analysis to determine which (if any) of these can serve as an effective “print archives registry” by adding additional information such as environmental conditions, services provided.
4. Use WorldCat Collection Analysis for overlap analysis among participating print archives and library collections. WorldCat Collection Analysis service can be used to compare title-level information, i.e. to compare which titles are preserved in which print archives.
5. Use OCLC Group Access Capability (GAC) to support access to print archives, by searching and link to ILL via WorldCat Resource Sharing. “Group Access Capability (GAC) organizations, ad hoc associations of libraries united by subject matter, geography or another attribute, can also use WorldCat Resource Sharing. All members have access to each other's bibliographic, locations and summary holdings records.” This would support searching and link to ILL via WorldCat Resource Sharing.

¹ “Preservation Actions, MARC 21 Field 583, and Communal Local Holdings Records in OCLC WorldCat”, white paper presented to CONSER, 2009. Available at <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/PreservationActions.pdf>