Minutes

- Matt opened with a review of the agenda
- Matt then proceeded to very briefly review our current Development Phase timeline—see Revised Workplan on the project wiki:
- The group then started discussion of the Guidelines with a focus on clarifying the audience and identifying gaps
  - Matt opened by sharing Bob Horton’s (IMLS) comments and feedback that were supplied by email prior to the call
    - Bob stressed the importance of identifying our audience for the documents—might deter some groups with our level of communication
      - Right now we have a split between academic and technical audiences—need to think about this and how it affects the form(s) this document takes
  - Liz Bishoff (Bishoff Consulting) drew attention to the gap we have in addressing organizational issues related to digital newspapers (i.e., how have institutions made a commitment for long-term access of digital newspapers?)
    - Matt asked how Liz defined parameters for addressing organizational issues?
      - Liz pointed to policies, mandates and sustainability
    - Matt turned to Mark Phillips (UNT) to ask him how UNT’s well-evolved newspaper program has dealt with sustainability
      - Mark drew attention to the fact that newspapers became the basis for the Portal to Texas History and a broader set of content management—helps to leverage scale and decrease management costs
      - Mark did mention though that newspapers are their own grant-funded set of content, and those grants are diminishing—so there are still financial vulnerabilities that need to be anticipated and managed
    - The group discussed how NDNP’s high-standards have contributed to many institutions looking for ways to make their post-NDNP digitization more affordable—can’t afford to maintain the technical standards
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- Mark (UNT) confirmed that the last NDNP partners meeting were sharing strategies for how to deviate from the standards in the right places—metadata was a key area that institutions were revisiting
  - Several institutions have since deviated from those standards particularly at the level of metadata
    - Reel metadata often taken out
    - Batch metadata often taken out
  - Vendor relations were also highlighted at the last partners meeting—lots of low-quality vendors looking to step in
- Katherine Skinner (Educopia) inquired about the development of those standards and the group confirmed that they were largely developed LoC and iArchives outside of consultation with the first phase partners
  - Debra Thomas or Ray Murray at LoC would be the ones to talk to about this
- The discussion shifted toward addressing whether to break out digitized versus born-digital when addressing readiness issues
  - Bill Donovan (Boston College) suggested that perhaps you could treat them the same after ingest, but not before
  - Gail McMillan (VA Tech) stressed that with their born-digital content the early html and early pdf materials definitely have more preservation issues than the more standardized content typically associated with digitized content
  - Mark Phillips (UNT) said that the only born-digital stuff that really scared him from an obsolescence/preservation stand-point were early, early publisher production files—some of this stuff is very obscure software related content
    - Most other stuff could be normalized and then one just had to be sure to hold onto the original format
  - Mike Furlough (Penn State) weighed in to say that with born-digital materials there can be an IP concern – but this is more so related to the content and not the medium/format
  - Frederick Zarndt proposed a clean classification scheme for born-digital content—all agreed that this was a good description:
    - PDF/TIFFs (analogs or pre-prints)
    - Websites (databases, image files)
    - Newspaper publisher formats
      - NITF – xml-based (hNews, IPTC)
      - NewsML (IPTC)
- The discussion shifted to audience for the document
  - All agreed that the document would benefit from clearly defining digital preservation, digital curation, and lifecycle management
  - A glossary might be helpful
  - The group discussed the issue of scope-creep with respect to addressing publishers
    - Martin Halbert (UNT) reminded the group about interviews with Dallas Morning News and that they had a very corporate view toward archiving—simplified notions of preservation to back-up
      - Highlighted expressed concerns that large publishers had about handing their holdings off to public institutions
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- Mark Phillips (UNT) stressed that this might be typical of larger conglomerate newspapers but smaller presses were more than happy to hand their holdings off to historical societies and public libraries
- Mary Molinaro (UKY) & Liz Bishoff (Bishoff Consulting) echoed Mark’s points—public libraries and historical societies have been doing it for a long time
  - Oklahoma & UKY are good examples—press associations in those states were crucial
    - Can be hard in the absence of them—Texas as a good example
    - Mary Molinaro (UKY) mentioned that the KY Press Association argued that publishers were fighting a losing battle trying to monetize content that is laying out in peoples’ driveways
  - Mary Molinaro (UKY) also emphasized that we should not overly worry about what you can’t preserve with respect to this publisher content—gather what you can and do a good job w/preserving that
  - Frederick Zarndt (consultant) mentioned that the biggest concern that publishers face are IP risks
    - Katherine asked what entities could address that sort of risk—Mary Molinaro (UKY) mentioned her university legal team
    - Again—press associations are crucial to have at the table
  - Matt Schultz (MetaArchive) mentioned that discussions with university libraries has also exposed reluctance to wade into this territory of preserving publisher content—for reasons of mandate and legal risk
- The group concluded the discussion on audience by agreeing that the proper approach would be to gear the Guidelines toward libraries and archives and leave it at that—mention that there are other stakeholders like publishers, research faculty, etc.—but do not make them a primary audience.

- The group took a break from 3:15pm-3:30pm

- The group re-convened and held a discussion on the draft Preservation Readiness Plan
  - Bill Donovan (Boston College) mentioned that he had discussed the document internally and his team thought it was well-developed and would work just fine for use in the test exchange processes
  - David Minor (Chronopolis) mentioned that he thought it was very useful and something that they might use internally at Chronopolis as a template for data provider exchanges—almost like a simplified service agreement
  - Matt explained that the goal was that each content holder would get one of these documents in early November and there would be a brief round of touch-bases to review and clarify the activities and steps being put forward
  - Mark Phillips (UNT) recommended that we try to aim for one standard document that could work for each content holder across all three DDP sites.
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- Matt agreed to revisit the draft document and work with David and Mark to achieve this

- The group then turned to the Chronicles Development Plan
  - Matt provided a thorough overview of the document, in particular highlighting:
    - Upcoming sample data requests that would kick-off the second week in October—these will help the project team analyze collection structures and inclusive files to make better sense of preservation readiness steps for each content holder
    - Project team aiming for early November to provide content holders with individual Preservation Readiness Plans
    - Packaging and full-scale test exchanges aiming to begin early next year

- The meeting closed with everybody on the call agreeing to work with Matt to schedule monthly project calls for each of the three principal groups on the project—Chronicles Committee, Advisory Group, and Staff
  - Matt would confirm previous schedules and send out Doodle polls as needed.