



CRL Print Archives Framework

Meeting with Consortium Partners

Tuesday May 11, 2010

AGENDA

- | | | |
|------|---|--------|
| I. | Review of March 26 meeting | Page 1 |
| II. | Update on Print Archives Registry and Related Systems | Page 1 |
| III. | Alternatives for CRL print archiving business model | Page 2 |

I. Review of March 26 Meeting

At the previous web meeting on March 26, 2010, 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

Progress has been made on several fronts related to systems and metadata to support print archiving.

- CRL has prepared some preliminary comparisons of print archives held by CRL, Orbis, PALCI, Five Colleges, and TRLN based on spreadsheets provided by these organizations. Each file includes one or more sheets containing aggregated records from those consortia, and pivot table reports grouping the records by ISSN to show which consortia have archived that title, and which holdings are covered. The files also compare these print archives to Portico digitally archived titles. These spreadsheet files are 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 the print archive holdings described above. A preliminary version of this database was demonstrated at the CRL Collections Council meeting on April 23. After completion of some further enhancements, the print archives registry and database will be made available online from the CRL website (expected by late May).
- CRL is working with Roger Schonfeld of Ithaka S+R to develop a plan for CRL and Ithaka to collaborate on a decision support system to support print archiving. The goal is to provide the data, analytical framework, and tools to support library and consortium decisions regarding preservation and disposition of print collections, incorporating CRL's print archive registry and Ithaka's "What to Withdraw" intellectual framework. The proposed collaboration is under review in both organizations.
- CRL assisted John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade Alliance) with preparation of a high-level overview of print archiving system requirements to propose to upper-level OCLC management.

Communication is underway with OCLC about future system development plans which may support print archiving (as well as other applications based on local holdings).

III. Proposal for a business model

At the previous meeting on March 26, participants requested further exploration with cost estimates for two funding model alternatives.

Alternative 1: Share central costs among participants

The proposed model includes:

- Divide the central costs for services provided by CRL 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 while providing some incentive to archive providers
- Disadvantages: incentive for archive providers to participate may be insufficient

Alternative 2: Share central costs with financial support for archives validation work

The proposed model includes:

- Divide the central costs for services provided by CRL 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

Possible cost-sharing formula (discussion draft)

1. 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)
2. Calculate the resulting scores as percentage of the total, to determine the percentage of shared costs to be supported by each participating consortium
3. For the validation payment model (alternative 2), budget a fixed number of volumes to be validated at different levels and pay a fixed per-volume subsidy
4. Consortia aggregate participation among their members to cover shared costs

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?

Action requested

- Comments and suggestions about alternative financial models (see attached)

CRL Print Archives Cost Model PLEASE NOTE: This is a DISCUSSION DRAFT, all values shown are ballpark estimates, need further analysis.

PROJECTED CRL COSTS (Budget)									
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		
Central costs (est)	\$ 275,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 112,500	\$ 68,750	\$ 906,250			
Proposed validation costs (based on annual budget)							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	
Validation total (est)	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 950,000			
Grand print archives total (central + validation)	\$ 465,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 415,000	\$ 302,500	\$ 258,750	\$ 1,856,250			

POSSIBLE COST-SHARING FORMULAS

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
Total			18.5	100%	\$ 275,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 112,500	\$ 68,750

POSSIBLE COST-SHARING FORMULAS

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 min=.5	%	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 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.									