

## Draft of Questions for the Fall 2017 Review of APTrust

This version is based on questions developed Fall 2017 Member Meeting at the University of Maryland, then edited for clarity and consistency by APTrust staff. The results of this discussion are included in a survey draft that the governing board will consider on November 1.

**Numbers do not reflect priority order.**

---

**Our goal in refining this draft is not to answer these questions (yet) but to ensure that the questions are the most important to answer now in APTrust's development.**

**PLEASE ADD YOUR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THIS LIST VIA COMMENTS**

---

1. What are the current biggest impediments to institutions depositing content in APTrust's preservation repository? Subquestion - APTrust does not currently allow personally sensitive or restricted information, and is working on adding encryption and a security plan before opening the repository to this data. Is this currently preventing you from adding content that needs to be in the preservation repository?
2. How important are increasing security, providing encryption for sensitive data, and executing regular security audits to a preservation repository such as APTrust?
3. What factors are the most important for your institution's continued membership in APTrust?
4. Should APTrust develop a roadmap with planned delivery schedules for interoperability with tools that institutions use in their preservation strategies and workflows? If yes, with which tools is interoperability most desirable?
5. In addition to the tool announced by APTrust staff at the Fall 2017 member meeting, should APTrust develop additional means of making deposit of materials into APTrust easier?
6. How can APTrust best help its members make cases for the human and financial costs associated with preservation of digital scholarly, research, and cultural heritage materials?
7. How can APTrust help achieve better integration with other major collaborative efforts on related matters, such as Samvera, Fedora, Islandora, the National Digital Stewardship Alliance, or the Software Preservation Network?
8. Should APTrust pursue cooperative multi-service pricing packages with other services that might be combined with APTrust in comprehensive preservation strategies by institutions?
9. Should APTrust move toward providing (or developing partner relationships for) access services as well as "dark" preservation, and if so develop metadata and rights-statement requirements for content that is deposited for access? Should these services be opt-in?
10. Should APTrust develop means of aggregating similar deposited content from different depositors so that research can be conducted using it (similar to the HathiTrust Research Center approach)?

11. Should APTrust expand its services to include a broader spectrum of preservation-related actions, such as indexing content, validating formats, providing derivatives, and migrating formats?
12. Should APTrust formalize its routine and ongoing evaluations of preservation-storage platforms and similar preservation issues for better transparency and better value to its members and the preservation community?
13. Should APTrust support encryption of deposited content for various institutional needs?
14. How should APTrust pursue the next phase of its compliance with trusted digital repository requirements?
15. Should APTrust expand its membership categories (for example, to include consortia or to include subscribing entities that do not participate in APTrust ongoing development and governance)?
16. Should APTrust recruit new members?