



# ***Collaborative Print Archives Framework***

***Planning Meeting #3  
May 11, 2010***



# ***Agenda***

- I. Review of March 26 meeting
- II. Update on Print Archives Registry and Related Systems
- III. Alternatives for CRL print archiving business model



# ***I. Review of March 26 meeting***

## ***Meeting Results***

- 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



## ***II. Update on Print Archives Registry and Related Systems***

- Comparison of print archives held by CRL, Orbis-Cascade Alliance, PALCI, Five Colleges (MA), TRLN, and Portico available at <http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/print-archive-projects-and-holdings>.
- Developing a prototype web-accessible database for interactive queries of print archive holdings (to be online by late May).
- Discussing collaboration with Ithaka S+R to incorporate What to Withdraw framework into the decision support system for print archiving
- Working with OCLC on future system development plans to support print archiving



### ***III. Alternatives for Business Model***

At the previous meeting, participants requested further exploration with cost estimates for two funding model alternatives:

- Share central costs among participants
- Share central costs with some subsidy for archive providers

Please note: The alternatives which follow both provide some support for archivers. They differ in that one provides direct subsidy for validation & processing work.



# ***Funding Model Alternative 1***

## ***Share Central Costs Among Participants***

- Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula.
- Give a financial credit or discount to archive providers as partial subsidy for space-related costs
- Advantages: Simple to administer, no transaction accounting, minimizes participation costs for all while providing some incentive to archive providers
- Disadvantages: Incentive for archive providers may be insufficient



## ***Funding Model Alternative 2: Share central costs with financial support for archives validation***

- Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula.
- Give a financial credit or discount to archive providers as partial subsidy for space-related costs
- Provide direct payments to subsidize effort required for archive validation and processing (review of completeness and condition)
- 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; increases overall costs to be shared



# DISCUSSION DRAFT Budget

PROJECTED CRL COSTS (Budget)							PLEASE NOTE: This is a DISCUSSION DRAFT, all values shown are ballpark estimates, need further analysis.		
Category	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total			
Program management & administration	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 87,500	\$ 43,750	\$ 656,250	proj manager, meetings, admin exp		
Print Archives Knowledge Base	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 250,000	programmer, server, software		
<b>Central costs (est)</b>	<b>\$ 275,000</b>	<b>\$ 225,000</b>	<b>\$ 225,000</b>	<b>\$ 112,500</b>	<b>\$ 68,750</b>	<b>\$ 906,250</b>			
<b>Proposed validation costs (based on annual budget)</b>								per vol	annual vols
Issue-level	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 7.00	10,000	
Volume-level	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 4.00	30,000	
<b>Validation total (est)</b>	<b>\$ 190,000</b>	<b>\$ 190,000</b>	<b>\$ 190,000</b>	<b>\$ 190,000</b>	<b>\$ 190,000</b>	<b>\$ 950,000</b>			
<b>Grand print archives total (central + validation)</b>	<b>\$ 465,000</b>	<b>\$ 415,000</b>	<b>\$ 415,000</b>	<b>\$ 302,500</b>	<b>\$ 258,750</b>	<b>\$ 1,856,250</b>			





# DISCUSSION DRAFT Alternative 1

## Alternative 1: Share central costs

**PLEASE NOTE: This is a DISCUSSION DRAFT, all values shown are estimates.**

**Participants are listed for illustration only, does not imply any agreement by these consortia.**

For each CRL participant, a SCORE will be calculated based on these characteristics

- Size of membership measured by aggregate FTE (range)
- Size of archive measured by number of titles (range)

Score = Size of institution minus size of archive. The resulting score must be at least .5 (i.e. each participating consortium must pay a minimum).

Subtracting points for the archive(s) provides a discount or cost reduction for those participants who maintain archives for the group.

All of the scores are added, and each member's score is calculated as a percent of the total to determine that member's cost-sharing percentage of the shared budget.

Possible Participating Consortia	Size 1 to 5	Archive size 1 to 3	Score min=.5	%	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
					\$ 275,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 112,500	\$ 68,750
ASERL	5	2	3	16%	\$ 44,595	\$ 36,486	\$ 36,486	\$ 18,243	\$ 11,149
CARLI	3	1	2	11%	\$ 29,730	\$ 24,324	\$ 24,324	\$ 12,162	\$ 7,432
CIC	5	2	3	16%	\$ 44,595	\$ 36,486	\$ 36,486	\$ 18,243	\$ 11,149
Colorado Alliance	2	1	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
Five Colleges (MA)	1	1	0.5	3%	\$ 7,432	\$ 6,081	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,041	\$ 1,858
GWLA	3	2	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
OCUL	2	1	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
OhioLink	2	1	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
Orbis-Cascade Alliance	5	3	2	11%	\$ 29,730	\$ 24,324	\$ 24,324	\$ 12,162	\$ 7,432
PALCI	3	2	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
SCELC	2	1	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
TRLN	2	1	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
UC	4	3	1	5%	\$ 14,865	\$ 12,162	\$ 12,162	\$ 6,081	\$ 3,716
<b>Total</b>			<b>18.5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 275,000</b>	<b>\$ 225,000</b>	<b>\$ 225,000</b>	<b>\$ 112,500</b>	<b>\$ 68,750</b>



# DISCUSSION DRAFT Alternative 2

## Alternative 2: Share central costs PLUS validation payments

**PLEASE NOTE: This is a DISCUSSION DRAFT, all values shown are guesstimates.**

**Participants are listed for illustration only, does not imply any agreement by these consortia.**

For each CRL participant, a SCORE will be calculated based on these characteristics

- Size of membership measured by aggregate FTE (range)
- Size of archive measured by number of titles (range)

Score = Size of institution minus size of archive. The resulting score must be at least .5 (i.e. each participating consortium must pay a minimum).

Subtracting points for the archive(s) provides a discount or cost reduction for those participants who maintain archives for the group.

All of the scores are added, and each member's score is calculated as a percent of the total to determine that member's cost-sharing percentage of the shared budget.

Please note: the estimates shown below do not reflect validation payments paid back to participating archive providers. For any such providers, the net costs of participation would be reduced by any payments for validation work. Details of how to manage and account for this through consortia would need to be determined.

Possible Participating Consortia	Size 1 to 5	Archive size 1 to 3	Score	%	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
			min=.5		\$ 465,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 302,500	\$ 258,750
ASERL	5	2	3	16%	\$ 75,405	\$ 67,297	\$ 67,297	\$ 49,054	\$ 41,959
CARLI	3	1	2	11%	\$ 50,270	\$ 44,865	\$ 44,865	\$ 32,703	\$ 27,973
CIC	5	2	3	16%	\$ 75,405	\$ 67,297	\$ 67,297	\$ 49,054	\$ 41,959
Colorado Alliance	2	1	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
Five Colleges (MA)	1	1	0.5	3%	\$ 12,568	\$ 11,216	\$ 11,216	\$ 8,176	\$ 6,993
GWLA	3	2	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
OCUL	2	1	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
OhioLink	2	1	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
Orbis-Cascade Alliance	5	3	2	11%	\$ 50,270	\$ 44,865	\$ 44,865	\$ 32,703	\$ 27,973
PALCI	3	2	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
SCELC	2	1	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
TRLN	2	1	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
UC	4	3	1	5%	\$ 25,135	\$ 22,432	\$ 22,432	\$ 16,351	\$ 13,986
Total			18.5	100%	\$ 465,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 302,500	\$ 258,750

**Gross amounts, before any rebate for validation work.**



## ***Action Item***

- Which financial model seems most viable?
  - Alternative 1: Share central costs inc discount for archive providers
  - Alternative 2: Share central costs with payment for validation to archive providers
  - Alternative 3: Other



# *Questions and Issues*

- Relationship to other initiatives (e.g. WEST):
  - print archives knowledge base benefits from highest centralization
  - what about compensation to archivers: local, regional, or central?
- Opportunities for grant funding: if grant funds available, how to apply them?
  - Compensation to archivers?
  - Support for local deselection?
  - Support for central costs?

