CRL Print Archives Network

Meeting with Consortium Partners

Tuesday May 11, 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:

Meeting details

I.   Review of March meeting

Lizanne Payne summarized the outcomes of the previous web meeting on March 26, 2010 at which 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

II.   Update on Print Archives Registry and Related Systems

Lizanne reported that progress has been made on several fronts related to systems and metadata to support print archiving.

- CRL has posted preliminary comparisons of print archives held by CRL, Orbis, PALCI, Five Colleges, and TRLN in the form of spreadsheet files available on the CRL website at http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/print-archive-projects-and-holdings.

- CRL is also developing a prototype web-accessible database to allow interactive queries of print archive holdings which is expected to be available by late May.

- CRL is working with Ithaka S+R to develop a plan for CRL and Ithaka to collaborate on a decision support system to support print archiving.

- CRL is communicating with OCLC management (along with representatives from Orbis-Cascade Alliance and the WEST project) to encourage development of OCLC services to support print archiving.

III.   Options for CRL print archiving business model

Lizanne outlined two possible options for a cost-sharing model to support a CRL print archives framework. She noted that both options include some financial support for archive providers: one in the form of a discount for housing archiving materials, the other with the archive discount plus a direct payment for validation services to ingest new archive materials.

Lizanne presented and described three sets of information in spreadsheet form:

- A draft budget for costs to support the print archives framework, including
  o Central expenses for program management, administration, print archives knowledge base system (including holdings comparison)

  o Funds to subsidize validation services at the issue- and volume-level

- Option 1: share the central expenses among participating consortia based on this formula:
  o Calculate a score for each participating consortium based on size (aggregate FTE of all members, as a range) reduced by size of archives being provided (number of titles, as a range)
  o Calculate the resulting scores as percentage of the total, to determine the percentage of central expenses to be supported by each participating consortium

- Option 2: share the central expenses as described above plus the costs to subsidize validation based on this formula
  o Calculate scores and percentages as described above
  o Prorate the total costs (central plus validation) based on the calculated percentages.

She emphasized that all of the estimates were for discussion purposes and the listing of possible consortial participants was for illustration only and did not represent a definitive set of participants. She

also noted that the spreadsheet for Alternative 2 (with validation) does not show the return of validation payments to participants, that is, the fees shown are examples of gross fees before reduction by validation payments.

Participants raised several questions about the budget and cost-sharing models:

- Will CRL's approach involve reconciling archiving priorities across multiple consortia which are already archiving? Yes, the plan would be to build on existing consortial initiatives and choices, but also for CRL to provide a forum for discussing and deciding community archiving priorities.

- Since issue-level validation may be more valuable to the community than volume-level validation, will the model give better financial support to archives which are issue-validated? This could be considered for incorporation in the model.

- Is validation important enough to the community to include explicit payment at increased cost? This is an important question. Several participants suggested that validation is very important to allow other libraries to deaccession local copies in reliance on archived copies.

- Is membership by consortia the right model or could CRL's print archives framework be structured to distribute costs across all CRL members? This approach is still under consideration, but part of the goal is to make print archives available to the largest population of libraries possible.

- How should consortia articulate the benefit that archive providers and consortia would receive from participation? The goal is to provide a mechanism for libraries and consortia to have access to and support the archives of other consortia and libraries, to rationalize archiving priorities and selection of titles to archive across the broadest possible base.

- Can CRL prepare a webinar for an audience of collection development staff to promote support for the effort? Yes, once more details of the proposed plan are completed.

- Could CRL serve as an archive provider, perhaps to house lowest-risk titles where one copy may be sufficient? CRL currently archives many low-risk materials, and will consider the possibility of expanding its scope.

There was a general sense that Alternative 2 had the most support, but also a sense that more work needed to be done to define the governance and relationship among the participants.

Lizanne mentioned that further consideration should also be given to two other issues:

- Relationship to other initiatives (e.g. WEST): where should costs be incurred for the print archives database (which benefits from highest degree of centralization) and for compensation to archivers?

- Opportunities for grant funding: if grant funds available, how to apply them?

Action

For the next meeting, CRL will prepare additional information:
- Further analysis of cost estimates, especially related to the print archives database base
- Governance and methods for selecting and prioritizing archive materials

Attachment A
Participants in CRL Print Archives Web meeting
05/11/2010

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

CIC: Kim Armstrong (karms2@staff.cic.net)

Colorado Alliance: 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)

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

OCUL: Kathy Scardellato (kathy.scardellato@ocul.on.ca), Catherine Davidson (cdavids@yorku.ca)

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

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

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

WEST: Ivy Anderson (ivy.anderson@ucop.edu), Emily Stambaugh (Emily.stambaugh.ucop.edu)

Absolute Backorder Services: Glenn Jaeger (jaeger@absolute-inc.com)

For the Center for Research Libraries (CRL):

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