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I. Review of February 22 Meeting

Proposal for a Prototype Print Archives Network

A prototype print archives network building on the overlap among currently-active built archives for four sets of publisher content:

• JSTOR
• American Chemical Society
• American Physical Society
• American Institute of Physics

Build from existing consortial publisher-based archives, add corresponding content from other libraries/consortia
I. Review of February 22 meeting

Meeting Results

• 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.
## Very Preliminary Compilation of JSTOR Holdings

http://workspace.crl.edu/display/pan/Print+Archive+Holdings+Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSN</th>
<th>Title and Consortium and Holdings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0002-7294</td>
<td>+ American anthropologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002-7316</td>
<td>- American antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five Colls MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1935)-[63]-64 (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1935-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002-7359</td>
<td>+ The American art journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Followup on Plans for a Print Archives Metadata System

• Use current OCLC capabilities to support print archiving to the extent possible

• Develop a specialized database for more detailed comparison of print archive holdings at the volume/year level

• Continue to encourage OCLC to develop features to support print archives (e.g. communal LHR or similar)
Interim approach using current OCLC capabilities

• Bibliographic and holdings data
  • OCLC Institution Symbols or Holding Library Codes to show print archive location/status
  • Local Holding Records (LHRs) with 583 tags to show print archive status and details

• Print archives registry: WorldCat Registry or OCLC Group or OCLC Group Access Capability

• Discovery and access: OCLC Group Access Capability (GAC) for discovery, link to ILL via WorldCat Resource Sharing.

• Collection analysis: WorldCat Collection Analysis for title-level overlap analysis OR specialized print archives analysis system
System Options Building on Current OCLC Features

WorldCat

Group Access Catalog
- HLCs
- LHRs

Registry

Other source data
(Ulrich’s, JSTOR, Portico, local, others)

Ithaka
What to Withdraw

Archiving libraries/consortia

Specialized Collection Analysis System

The Center for Research Libraries
GLOBAL RESOURCES NETWORK
III. Options for a Business Model

• Service agreements
• Governance
• Funding Models
**Service Agreements**

**CRL services:**
- Forum to define archiving priorities and standards
- Holdings analysis and systems (if necessary)
- Track usage
- Monitor service agreements and conditions
- Manage compensation among consortia
- Develop messaging documents
- Facilitate grant proposals

**Partner consortium services:**
- Adopt the baseline service agreement
- Archive materials according to agreements and standards
- Provide access to print archives for other participants
- Contribute materials to the collective print archives.

**Question:**
Multilateral agreement? Consortia choose partners or content?
Principles of Financial Models

- 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.

- Share the central framework costs. Centralized or aggregated costs of the overall project should be shared proportionally among participants.

- Simplify funding formula. In order to minimize the costs of administration, cost-sharing algorithm should require minimal calculation and negotiation.
Funding Model Alternative 1
Share Central Project Costs Only

• Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula. (Components of “central costs” and funding formula both need to be defined.)

• Advantages: Simple to administer, no transaction accounting, minimizes participation costs

• Disadvantages: May provide less incentive for archive providers to participate
Funding Model Alternative 2: Share central costs plus a subsidy for archive providers

• Divide the central costs among participating consortia according to a formula (TBD).

• Give a financial credit to archive providers and (possibly) to 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 Item

- Which financial model seems most viable?
  - Alternative 1: Share central costs only
  - Alternative 2: Share central costs and subsidy to archive providers
  - Alternative 3: Other
Next Steps

• Complete systems and metadata plan
  – Procedures and standards for using OCLC features
  – Plans for collection analysis

• Further development of service agreements

• Develop preferred financial model
  – Estimate costs (much depends on technology decisions)
  – Develop cost-sharing formula