

Summary of University Librarian's Working Group meeting
Wednesday, May 3, 2012 (during ARL Membership Meeting, Chicago)

Rick Luce, Emory
Winston Tabb, Johns Hopkins
Pat Steele, Maryland
Diane Walker, Notre Dame
Sarah Michalak, North Carolina

Susan Nutter, North Carolina State
Suzanne Thorin, Syracuse
Karin Wittenborg, Virginia
Martha Sites, Virginia
Donna Tolson, Virginia

1. Update from UVa - Martha Sites introduced Donna Tolson who will be interim project manager until a Project Director can be hired.
2. Establish working group: [*Proposed from April 4th Baltimore meeting*: 3 directors, 1 content representative, 1 technical representative, project director. No directors from UVa to emphasize consortial effort behind APTrust]
 - Pat Steele, Winston Tabb, and Suzanne Thorin volunteered to serve on the working group. Greg Raschke from NCState will serve as the ingest representative, and Greg Jansen from UNC will be the technical representative. Donna Tolson from UVa will join the working group as project manager. Short discussion of need for other expertise (i.e. IP/rights); general agreement that this can be added later if needed.
 - ULs will focus on setting priorities and making policy for the emerging structure and services. They will vet requests for membership and help with marketing and communications during the "launch" phase. For instance, the group will clarify the differences and relationships between APTrust and DuraSpace, Hathi, DPN, etc.
 - Technical and ingest representatives will be liaisons to their counterparts at UVa, bring expertise on policy and priority decisions, and keep the broader technical and ingest communities informed about and connected to the developing infrastructure.
 - The project manager will "staff" the effort, taking care of business functions, meetings, communications, and other types of project oversight.
3. Review invoicing agreement

Group reviewed draft agreement and had no suggestions for changes. The biggest concern is getting invoiced quickly so that they can pay with this year's funds. Donna promised to get invoices out ASAP, and to send electronic versions of finalized agreement.

4. Clarify/endorse proposed value proposition:

Proposed: APTrust is a consortium committed to the creation and management of a Fedora-based repository that will aggregate academic content for long-term preservation. Solutions will be based on respected open-



source technologies that are scalable, sustainable, and reliable. Participating institutions will have access to disaster recovery services that do not currently exist, and the consortium will work together to determine the shape of future services. Community benefits will be extended by librarians and technologists who will leverage individual expertise and best practices as they align around solutions for the common good. Ultimately, APTrust will enable academic libraries to protect the scholarship produced by the academy, a value that will transcend us all.

Revised: The Academic Preservation Trust (APTrust) consortium is committed to the creation and management of a preservation repository that will aggregate academic and research content from many institutions. Solutions will be based on respected open-source technologies that are scalable, sustainable, and provide audit functionality. As part of a national strategy for long-term preservation, the APTrust repository will serve as a replicating node for the Digital Preservation Network (DPN). At the local level, APTrust will provide a preservation environment for participating members, including disaster recovery services. By leveraging the expertise and resources of multiple institutions, APTrust will realize economies of scale and increase value for all members. The consortium will work together to determine the shape of future services and best practices as they align around solutions for the common good. Ultimately, APTrust will enable academic libraries to protect the scholarship produced by the academy, a value that will transcend us all.

5. Discuss content strategy: Is there a coordinated content strategy that will add value to the aggregated repository?

Martha: Encouraged group to provide overall guidance on content strategy. Content liaison group that met in April plans to research other systems, develop use cases and prototype packets, etc. What do ULs want to achieve with aggregated repository? ULs: Preservation is first priority. Member institutions have differing content to ingest (manuscripts, rich media, etc.) and don't want work to bog down around format issues. As long as any content type can be ingested and managed in "blob" form, ULs are not concerned about content access decisions at this point. Far more concerned about technological stability of repository. If critical mass of material is ingested, that will drive future work to ensure maximum services around that type of content. Q: Do we need a content group at this point? A: We need basic metadata policies for ingest, may need an access strategy group for the future. Decision to rename content rep as *ingest* rep, and to focus on *ingest* issues – *content* issues will be more relevant when we are ready to start talking about access issues.

6. Clarify development goals of launch phase (UVa), and discuss priorities for future development

- First phase is about setting up trusted repository
- Distinguish disaster recovery (DR) preservation (Phase 1) from DR access services (Phase 2)
- Add coordinated collection development to Phase 2

Next steps:

- Donna will send out meeting notes, revise value proposition, and get invoices and agreement letters sent.
- Working group will determine how and when to meet in future. Immediate issues: 1) notify tech & ingest reps of selection, 2) announce working group participants to broader community, and change in emphasis from content to ingest issues, 3) communication strategy, 4) membership policy.