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I. Project Goals and Overview of Current Initiatives

At a meeting at ALA Midwinter 2010, CRL proposed to work with partner consortia to support emergence of a cooperative system for archiving print journals, newspapers, and government documents in North America, building on existing regional and domain-based initiatives. The goal of the project is to foster long-term preservation and accessibility of research materials important to the scholarly community, while systematically and significantly reducing costs.

CRL proposed to bring together two parallel streams of existing activity:

- Regional archiving projects organized around publisher content or library-selected titles
- Domain-based archiving and digitization programs organized around materials serving broad fields of study

CRL has invited consortia with active print archiving projects to work together on a planning project to develop the relationships and infrastructure necessary for a large-scale multi-consortial print archives network. The virtual meeting scheduled for February 22, 2010 is the first step in that planning process.

Print archive categories

Print archiving projects may be categorized in several ways:

1. Time period: Retrospective vs. prospective

Almost all of the current print archiving initiatives focus on archiving retrospective holdings, e.g. historical legacy volumes or materials which occupy significant space in campus libraries. The University of California Prospective Shared Print project is the only current project which proactively archives future issues of print journals.

2. Archiving activity: Built vs. de facto

In a “built archive”, multiple libraries identify specific titles or categories of materials to preserve under a written retention and access agreement. Often the archiving agreement involves proactive consolidation and validation of journal holdings to create complete runs.

In a “de facto archive”, libraries apply a written retention and access agreement to materials already stored or shelved, without selecting specific titles or content. This usually applies to materials in a library storage facility, where materials are selected for storage by library-specific criteria rather than a proactive choice to archive.

Note: in some cases multiple libraries share a storage facility without coordinating the materials stored and without adopting an explicit retention agreement. These operations are considered “storage” arrangements rather than “archives”. Their holdings may potentially become de facto archives with the addition of a written retention and access agreement.
3. Selection method: by publisher, title, or domain

For built archives, the most common selection method is by publisher, usually based on the existence of digital versions or a digital repository. In some cases, cooperating libraries identify specific titles for archiving based on collections overlap or uniqueness (and other factors), without regard to publisher.

In a few cases, selection is based on a particular domain or discipline, such as LLMC’s law materials and USAIN’s agriculture archive.

Content of current built archives

Most current print archiving projects are retrospective built archives of journals based on publisher selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Type</th>
<th>Consortium &amp; Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>Center for Research Libraries JSTOR archive</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>ASERL Cooperative Virtual Storage Project</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>CIC Shared Print initiative</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>Five Colleges (MA) Depository Archive Agreement</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>American Chemical Society, American Physical Society, APA Journals, Institute of Physics, JSTOR, and Project Muse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>GWLA Distributed Print Archive</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>Orbis-Cascade Alliance Distributed Print Repository</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>American Chemical Society, JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>PALCI Distributed Journal Archive</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>American Chemical Society, Institute of Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>University of California JSTOR Archive</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Publisher</td>
<td>Western North Carolina Library Network JSTOR archive</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Title (Library-Selected)</td>
<td>OCUL Thunder Bay Agreement</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Title (Library-Selected)</td>
<td>TRLN Single Copy Policy</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Title list available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>CIC Shared Print program</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domain-based archiving initiatives

In partnership with the Law Libraries Microfilm Consortium (LLMC) and the U.S. Agricultural Information Network (USAIN), CRL has submitted a proposal to the IMLS National Leadership Grant Program for “Cooperative Print Archiving by Discipline: Developing an Infrastructure to Sustain Scholarly Resources” in the fields of law and agriculture. If funded, CRL and its partner organizations will assemble an information base of archived holdings, document baseline archiving conditions and access services provided, and create consensus on expanding the archives and services to additional content and participants.

Prospective archiving

CRL and the University of California (UC) had offered a proposal to transfer ongoing development of UC’s shared print archive of over 4,600 licensed e-journal titles to CRL beginning in 2010. This proposal attracted a strong core of support among CRL libraries. However, the number of positive responses received by the response date was not sufficient to cover the cost of implementing the project as it is currently designed. In addition, there was concern at that time that UC's future shared print holdings may be impacted by journal reduction targets established for 2010 as a result of the economic downturn. CRL and UC are evaluating the responses and determining next steps, which may include considering how to incorporate this project into the larger context of broader national print archiving efforts that are underway. One possibility may be to link the prospective archives to retrospective archives for the same publisher content, to create a complete backfile with ongoing future archiving. This approach could provide a compelling value proposition for libraries.
III. Proposal for a prototype multi-consortial print archive

Proposal

CRL proposes to design a prototype networked project 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)

It is important to note that these archives are not necessarily complete individually or in the aggregate. Other “de facto” or “title-by-title” projects also have archived some of these titles and should be incorporated into the project. The listing of consortium names above is not intended to limit participation to those organizations.

The goal of the prototype project is to work out the relationships, agreements, technologies, and costs on a manageable scale while continuing to plan for a large-scale North American or multi-national network. The critical path is to define the necessary infrastructure such that, once defined, new content, new formats, and new participants could be added with relative ease.

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

- A common database of archive holdings (lightweight mechanism hosted or arranged by CRL)
- Service agreement(s) between archiving consortia, other consortia, and CRL
- An access/delivery mechanism among participants (RAPID or similar)
- A business model identifying cost factors and cost-sharing principles, with estimated costs and benefits for participants of varying characteristics.

The deliverable of the prototype project would be a plan and design for a multi-consortial print archives network. Ideally the project would also include some data prototyping, if it can be accomplished at little or no direct cost. The plan could serve as the basis for a proposal to funding agencies.

The proposed timeframe for the project is March through September 2010.

Action requested

Endorse proposed prototype as a framework for near-term planning
IV. Service agreements

Commonalities

Attachment C describes the detailed terms and conditions for a variety of consortial print archiving initiatives in North America. A comparison of the formal built archive projects shows certain common features among those with written service agreements. Some agreements were derived from the CRL Distributed Print Archive Agreement first developed in 2003.

- Legal agreement between the parties: a separate document specifying the archiving and access/delivery services to be provided, signed by the participating organizations.

- Term of agreement, or retention period: an explicit statement of the period of time for which archives and services will be maintained. Time periods among these examples include 7 years, 10 years, 25 years, and “perpetual”.

- Ownership: a statement of which organization will own the physical materials once archived. In most cases the original owner retains ownership.

- Recall and/or exit terms: description of terms for removing materials from the archive, either by the original owner or upon dissolution of the archive.

- Condition and completeness validation: description of the level of assessment to be performed (if any)

- Disclosure: description of where and how archival metadata are to be recorded. The current initiatives typically specify that the archival status is to be added to the local catalog and consortial catalog (if applicable). Most agreements provide little or no specific detail about how the disclosure metadata is to be handled, although in some cases this is spelled out in other documents or procedure manuals.

- Access/delivery: identification of user categories (members, nonmembers, patrons) who may request access and types of access provided (onsite, physical loan, digital delivery). The details vary by archive, but each agreement specifies the nature of access/delivery provided.

- Cost: description of cost or cost-sharing to provide archiving services. The vast majority of these agreements do not mention any additional cost or cost-sharing for providing archiving services and delivery. Most likely this is because the print archiving initiative is supported by an existing consortium with an existing cost-sharing model, or, for distributed archives such as Orbis-Cascade, PALCI, and TRLN, assumes that many participants will incur costs which will be more or less equitable across the group.
Proposed baseline features

For purposes of discussion, the following proposal outlines suggested baseline features of a multi-consortial print archiving agreement administered by CRL:

- Form of agreement: Written legal agreement or MOU between CRL and participating consortium acting on behalf of some or all of its members

- Term of agreement or retention period: 25 years with automatic review every 10 years

- Ownership: Remains with original owner

- Recall/exit terms: Offer material to other participating libraries or consortia

- Access and delivery:
  - Access will be provided to libraries which are members of participating consortia, and to CRL libraries [other details TBD]
  - Request and delivery mechanism: TBD

- Business model principles:
  - Infrastructure costs will be calculated and shared among participants according to a formula to be developed
  - Costs may include partial support for archive space and building operations, information base and systems, administration

Action requested

Adopt baseline features as initial working assumptions, refine further over the course of the project
V. Print archives metadata

One of the most important success factors for a large-scale print archives network will be a system and metadata to support archiving decisions and access: to display archive status, support consolidation of holdings, and facilitate local deaccessioning. Most existing print archives projects rely on locally-maintained spreadsheets, but a large-scale print archives project would benefit from a more robust system for disclosing and comparing archive holdings. At the same time, it will be important to minimize costs by developing a lightweight infrastructure.

Data sets

Several categories of metadata will be necessary:

- Archive registry (e.g. consortium or institution, description, services, archiving conditions)
- Archived holdings (e.g. title-level bibliographic data, detailed volume holdings, gaps, condition)
- External decision-support data (e.g. related digital repositories, optimal copies definition)

Below is a representation of the primary print archives data sets and the relationships among them.
System options for print archives metadata

There is no single system which currently supports all the requirements of a Print Archive Holdings Database, but several systems or databases provide some of the necessary features:

- OCLC WorldCat
- OCLC-Hathi Trust database
- Ulrich’s Serials Analysis System
- RAPID
- Ithaka “What to Withdraw” decision support tool

More information about each of these is given below.

Action requested

If possible, identify most promising directions for holdings metadata system(s). All will require further exploration and cost estimates.

OCLC WorldCat

583 tag

OCLC and the Library of Congress have proposed extensions to the 583 Action Note (often used for preservation actions) to record print archiving commitments for both monographs and serials. CONSER recently endorsed a proposal to store preservation data in the 583 action note in a communal local holdings record, rather than in the bibliographic record. This would make it easier to see at a glance all the institutions that have taken preservation actions or made preservation commitments to a particular title. OCLC Programs is supporting a project with UCLA, Penn State, and NYU to test the feasibility of creating local holdings records containing print archiving commitments with automated batch-loads to WorldCat. This work is expected to be complete by June 2010. (For further information, see http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/PreservationActions.pdf.)

Advantages: Ubiquitous worldwide access to WorldCat, existing user base in technical services, could support existing related systems such as ILL systems, OCLC Collection Analysis Service, other APIs.

Disadvantages: 583 tag valid at title level, less reliable for volume level unless communal LHR process proves workable

049 tag (holdings symbol)

Some print archives or repositories (UC regional library facilities) provide a 4-character holdings symbol in the 049 tag to indicate that this title is held in the storage facility.

Advantages: A quick-and-dirty method to identify stored/archived materials at a very general level.
Disadvantages: Less useful for journals. Needs a method to map individual holdings symbols to global print archives registry.

**OCLC – Hathi Trust database**

OCLC has created a database and data mining system to compare holdings from the HathiTrust digital repository and the WorldCat database. This is a special-purpose database created for the Mellon-funded Cloud Library project, but potentially could serve as the basis for a print archives database especially to support decisions based on existence of digital copies. (For further information, see [http://vre2.upei.ca/access2009/tennant](http://vre2.upei.ca/access2009/tennant))

Advantages: Compares individual libraries’ WorldCat holdings against electronic full-text titles in the HathiTrust, to identify “archivable” titles based on existence of digital repository.

Disadvantages: Valid for title-level data. May not be supported by OCLC upon completion of the Cloud Library project.

**Ulrich’s Serials Analysis System**

Ulrich’s maintains a database of over 300,000 serial records, with an XML Data Service product which could be used as the base for a specialized print archives database. These records already include non-MARC data such as peer-reviewed status and links to corresponding digital versions, and could be enhanced to include related print archives data. (For further information, see [http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb/analysis/default.asp?navPage=4&](http://www.ulrichsweb.com/ulrichsweb/analysis/default.asp?navPage=4&))

Advantages: A broad scope of coverage and detailed information about a vast number of serials.

Disadvantages: Probably would require central purchase and maintenance of Ulrich’s data. Includes summary holdings (publication range) only.

**RAPID**

The RAPID system maintains journal holdings data to support ILL. RAPID is known for its customized processing of library holdings data to normalize holdings records. While RAPID is a contender for ILL support of the print archives network, its database may also be a source for archiving disclosure and decision support. (For further information, see [http://rapidill.org/PublicContent/AboutRapid.aspx#t12](http://rapidill.org/PublicContent/AboutRapid.aspx#t12))

Advantages: Validated journal holdings data, experience with custom algorithms to normalize data.

Disadvantages: Designed to work with journal date ranges (years) rather than physical volumes.

**Ithaka What to Withdraw Decision Support Tool**

Ithaka has developed a prototype decision support tool to operationalize some of the principles outlined in their paper “What to Withdraw”. This tool is a spreadsheet which includes data on JSTOR titles with
built-in queries to allow libraries to define custom thresholds for fields such as “number of copies” and “image density”. (For further information, see http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/what-to-withdraw/print-collections-decision-support-tool)

Advantages: Incorporates external non-MARC factors into the print archiving decision

Disadvantages: Currently limited to JSTOR titles. Lightweight spreadsheet system so far.
VI. Next Steps

Assuming endorsement of the proposed pilot project, CRL proposes to work closely with staff of the participating consortia to:

1. Develop MOUs to specify service agreements and commitments

2. Specify requirements for systems and tools needed to support holdings disclosure and decision support

3. Identify cost elements and develop cost estimates

4. Develop business model(s) which recognize both regional and national relationships

CRL would like to schedule monthly conference/Web meetings with the larger consortial partner group to report progress and continue planning. Working with this group, CRL also aims to identify opportunities for external funding to support implementation of a national-level agreement and services.
Attachment A

Expected Participants in Web meeting
02/22/2010

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

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

Colorado Alliance: Michael Levine-Clark (michael.levine-clark@du.edu), George Machovec (george@coalliance.org)

Five Colleges (MA): Jay Schafer (jschafer@library.umass.edu)

GWLA: Joni Blake (joni@gwla.org)

JURA, University of Hong Kong: Tony Ferguson (ferguson@hkucc.hku.hk)

LLMC: Kathleen Richman (kathleen.richman@llmc.com)

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

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

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

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

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

USAIN: Joy Paulson (jp243@cornell.edu)

WEST: 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)
Attachment B
Information Base: Project Registry and Project Wiki

Project registry

CRL has developed a preliminary registry of print archiving projects on its website at http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/

The registry includes a brief narrative summary of existing consortial archiving projects, grouped in these categories:

- CRL-administered projects
- North American projects
- International projects.

Clearinghouse for shared practices

CRL has established a space for the Print Archives Network on its Confluence wiki at http://workspace.crl.edu. This space will provide a place for participating institutional representatives and CRL staff to share information about practices, collections, costs, and services, and to make key decisions about the collaborative print archiving program. Participant user IDs and passwords have been established and will be sent separately.

The Print Archives wiki currently is organized into the following categories:

- Documents
- Meetings
- Members
- Messaging to the community
- Service agreements
- Systems and data for holdings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium or Institution</th>
<th>Center for Research Libraries</th>
<th>Five Colleges (MA)</th>
<th>Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)</th>
<th>Orbis-Cascade Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project or Policy Title</td>
<td>JSTOR Print Archive Project</td>
<td>Depository Policy (for members)</td>
<td>Affiliate Member agreement (for nonmembers)</td>
<td>Thunder Bay Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distributed Print Repository Member Institution Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>CRL Libraries</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts and Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges</td>
<td>Middletown, CTW Consortium, Boston Library Consortium, Bowdoin College</td>
<td>OCUL members, Individual Alliance members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing body</td>
<td>CRL</td>
<td>Five College Librarians Council</td>
<td>Five College Librarians Council</td>
<td>OCUL members, Orbis-Cascade Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal agreement</td>
<td>no policy</td>
<td>no policy</td>
<td>no policy</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of agreement</td>
<td>not specified, permanent is implied</td>
<td>7 years (2 year renewals)</td>
<td>not specified, permanent is implied</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Transfers to CRL</td>
<td>Transfers to consortium, except for UMass volumes</td>
<td>Transfers to consortium</td>
<td>Original owner, library of Record (original owner, or new library if transferred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>permanent is implied</td>
<td>permanent is implied</td>
<td>permanent is implied</td>
<td>permanent is implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for archiving</td>
<td>cost-sharing via member fees</td>
<td>cost-sharing via member fees</td>
<td>$1,000 to $3,000 annually</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit terms</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>U Mass volumes returned to them, equitable distribution of other volumes to the 4 colleges</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Return to original owner, to another Orbis member, or to Orbis storage facility (future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Archive Type</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
<td>Bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials archived</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Little-used periodicals and books</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Academic journals and other research materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective/Prospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
<td>As selected by member libraries. Specific consolidation underway for JSTOR</td>
<td>Journals published by ACS, Legacy Archives, American Physical Society, APA, Journals, Institute of Physics, JSTOR, and Project Muse,</td>
<td>Individual titles nominated by libraries, JSTOR and American Chemical Society titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication allowed</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition assessment</td>
<td>yes (by donor)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content validation</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>Archived status recorded (local)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>Local catalog</td>
<td>local catalog (no details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived status recorded (union)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>Scholars Portal</td>
<td>Orbis Summit (no details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived status recorded (national)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td>Archive location</td>
<td>CRL facility</td>
<td>Amherst College Library Depository</td>
<td>Member library -- open or closed stacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental conditions</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Recommended, not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelving requirements</td>
<td>CRL actual (high-density)</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Can be open or closed stacks with any of these conditions: closed stacks with paging; stored in a physically separate location; anti-theft devices; locked in a vault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for audit</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repair/replacement</td>
<td>if lost or damaged during circulation, borrowing library must repair/replace</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Holding library shall use reasonable efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recalls</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>no provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deselection by archive</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>none except Exit Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision for counting volumes</td>
<td>no ownership transfer</td>
<td>Original owner may count volumes</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>CRL members, nonmembers</td>
<td>Five Colleges members, Affiliate members, LL, general public</td>
<td>Alliance members, others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery modes</td>
<td>Print volume</td>
<td>Periodic: Onsite and document delivery only. Books and Serials: Onsite or delivery to PC library for reserve use. For general public: onsite use only.</td>
<td>Separate existing policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request system</td>
<td>LL (various)</td>
<td>For returnables: PC library system. Others not specified</td>
<td>Document delivery, by email and on-demand volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access/delivery fees</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>only for LL</td>
<td>included in subscription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- CRL Libraries: Center for Research Libraries
- Five College Librarians: Five Colleges
- OCUL: Ontario Council of University Libraries
- Orbis-Cascade Alliance
- JSTOR: Journal Storage and Retrieval
- Ill: Interlibrary Loan
- CRL: Center for Research Libraries
- OCUL: Ontario Council of University Libraries
- CRL Print Archives: Center for Research Libraries Print Archive
- Thunder Bay Agreement: Agreement for the Thunder Bay region
- Depository Policy: Policy for Depository
- Affiliate Member agreement: Agreement for Affiliate Members
- Member institution: Agreement for Member Institutions
- bub: Bulk (library-selected) paper
- Retrospective: Print Retrospective
- Prospective: Print Prospective
- Service: Service Provider
- Revision: Revision Information
- Access: Access Information
- Delivery modes: Modes of Delivery
- Request system: Request System
- Access/delivery fees: Fees for Access/delivery

**Governance:**
- Participants: University of Massachusetts and Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges.
- Governing body: Five College Librarians Council
- Legal agreement: No policy

**Term of agreement:**
- Not specified; permanent is implied.
- 7 years (2 year renewals) for transfers to consortium.

**Ownership:**
- Transfers to CRL
- Transfers to consortium, except for UMass volumes

**Retention:**
- Permanent is implied.
- Permanent is implied.

**Compensation for archiving:**
- Cost-sharing via member fees
- $1,000 to $3,000 annually

**Exit terms:**
- Not specified
- U Mass volumes returned to them, equitable distribution of other volumes to the 4 colleges

**Selection:**
- Archive Type: Bulk
- Materials archived: Journals
- Retrospective/Prospective: Retrospective
- Selection criteria: JSTOR
- Duplication allowed: No
- Condition assessment: Yes (by donor)

**Disclosure:**
- Archived status recorded (local): Not mentioned
- Archived status recorded (union): Not mentioned
- Archived status recorded (national): Not mentioned

**Collection Management:**
- Archive location: CRL facility
- Environmental conditions: Not specified
- Shelving requirements: CRL actual (high-density)
- Provision for audit: Not specified
- Repair/replacement: If lost or damaged during circulation, borrowing library must repair/replace
- Recalls: Not specified
- Deletion by archive: Not specified
- Provision for counting volumes: No ownership transfer
- Access: CRL members, nonmembers
- Delivery modes: Print volume
- Request system: LL (various)
- Access/delivery fees: No

**Notes:**
- CRL Print Archives Network Meeting
- 2/22/2010
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consortium or Institution</th>
<th>PALCI</th>
<th>TRLN</th>
<th>U of California</th>
<th>U of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project or Policy Title</td>
<td>Distributed STM Print Serials Archive Project</td>
<td>Single Copy Program Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities</td>
<td>JSTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Specific members of PALCI</td>
<td>TRLN members: Duke, UNC-Chapel Hill, North Carolina State, North Carolina Central</td>
<td>University of California libraries</td>
<td>University of California libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing body</td>
<td>PALCI</td>
<td>TRLN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal agreement</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no (policy)</td>
<td>no (policy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of agreement</td>
<td>10 years (through 12/2019)</td>
<td>Indefinite, &quot;until terminated&quot;</td>
<td>permanent, reviewed after 5 years (2011)</td>
<td>permanent, reviewed after 5 years (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Library of Record (original owner, or new library if transferred)</td>
<td>Original owner</td>
<td>Original owner</td>
<td>Original owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>10 years (same as term)</td>
<td>&quot;To the extent practicable, access shall be...perpetual&quot;</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for archiving</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit terms</td>
<td>a good faith effort to place materials with another PALCI member</td>
<td>not specified (see recalls)</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Type</td>
<td>Built</td>
<td>Built (library selection)</td>
<td>De facto</td>
<td>De facto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials archived</td>
<td>Academic STM journals</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective/Prospective</td>
<td>Retrospective, through 2000</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>Retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria</td>
<td>Individual journals published by American Chemical Society, American Physical Society, American Institute of Physics</td>
<td>Individual titles nominated by Libraries</td>
<td>Transferred by libraries</td>
<td>Transferred by libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication allowed</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>Does not interfere with other campus or facility based non-duplication policies</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition assessment</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content validation</td>
<td>number, issue, volume</td>
<td>yes, &quot;completeness of content&quot;</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived status recorded (local)</td>
<td>Local catalog (no details)</td>
<td>Local catalog (no details)</td>
<td>local catalog (no details)</td>
<td>local catalog (no details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived status recorded (union)</td>
<td>PALCI website</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>UC Melvyl (no details)</td>
<td>UC Melvyl (no details)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived status recorded (national)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive location</td>
<td>Member library -- open or closed stacks in the &quot;best environmental and physical conditions the Member library can reasonably offer&quot;.</td>
<td>Libraries shall cooperate in selecting the storage facilities...Accessible campus library shelving is in an acceptable storage location.</td>
<td>UC Regional Library Facilities (RLFs)</td>
<td>UC Regional Library Facilities (RLFs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conditions</td>
<td>not specified &quot;best available&quot;</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>RLF actual</td>
<td>RLF actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelving requirements</td>
<td>not specified &quot;best available&quot;</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>RLF actual (high-density)</td>
<td>RLF actual (high-density)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for audit</td>
<td>Inventory of materials may be requested</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair/replacement</td>
<td>Holding library shall use reasonable efforts</td>
<td>Owning library shall use reasonable efforts</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalls</td>
<td>no provision</td>
<td>If approved in writing by &quot;an authorized representative&quot;</td>
<td>Allowed, persistence remains, must be returned to RLF if not wanted</td>
<td>Allowed, persistence remains, must be returned to RLF if not wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deselection by archive</td>
<td>none except Exit Terms</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for counting volumes</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User categories identified</td>
<td>PALCI members, others</td>
<td>TRLN members</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery modes</td>
<td>Light archive: per library's policies (PALCI policy being developed). Dark archive: will not circulate outside the library, nor can they be lent.</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request system</td>
<td>policies and procedures being developed</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
<td>separate existing policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/delivery fees</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>see MOU concerning TRLN Interlibrary and Document Delivery services</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>