December 18, 2015

Attendees: Angela, Janet, Jillian, Katrina, Laurie, Meghan, Missy, Katy, Stephan, Tom, Nathan, Shannon, Liz, Terry, Chatham

Committee observations of symposium and other meetings—Handout from Tom and Liz sent under separate email

Committee member observations:

* We understands how things work in Ohio, but DPLA doesn’t understand how things work in Ohio, particularly how funding works, for example PLF. This is going to be a challenging communication.
* Challenge to figure out what will work for us and for DPLA.
* DPLA is challenged to bring on all these states by a deadline. They have a model and they’re trying to push us to that. For it to work for us, it has to work for us. We have to put it on a good foundation.
* We need to address Ohio funding in our application, discuss it future in the 3 year budget discussion below.
* We’re use to how it work in Ohio, have an outside read it, to make certain it makes sense to an outsider.
* A lot of people liked the symposium and what they were hearing. There was some concern from B, C, D they don’t see themselves in the pipeline. It’s going to be hard for them to contribute. Be mindful that we’re not just focusing on the A groups. We’re developing pathways for all organizations. We’re working on goals of everyone contributing, we just need to start somewhere. Missy and Tom are going to be talking, along with the outreach group are talking about how to initially do outreach to folks beyond the A group.
* It is on the Advocacy Groups radar to talk about what this will look like
* People are concerned about who locally is available to do the work, who will do the metadata at the organization, etc. How am I going to allocate the resources, liaise with the project.
* Potential challenges were time, resources, staff.
* People want to know what do you need metadata wise.
1. Technical Infrastructure decisions:  Nathan and Terry reported that Terry would together a Hydra stack based on Pennsylvania model implemented by Temple, harvest some metadata. Created a small virtual machine, will make it available for about 3 months, need to identify who and how will be using it. Then we can aggregate content from a handful of organizations. Can take a look at how to use it for proof of concept. Also will do a technical analysis of software to move to new version of Hydra/Fedora/Solar looks like it will relatively smooth. Should make migration easy. Won’t bring that up for this limited test, since we want to look at metadata sooner versus later. It will allow those who want to run it the opportunity to take a look at it. Likely to work with New York on this.

Talked with OCLC, Taylor Surface, about OCLC Gateway. They are interested in being a gateway to DPLA. We would be the portal for searching Ohio content. The licensing issue with metadata would have to be worked out, it’s not in a format that OCLC can work with. The OAI feed from Cincinnati needs work, CDM works, but others need work. OCLC’s focus is in getting metadata, but it would be work. Metadata licensing is an issue, this is an issue that DPLA has had, OCLC’s open license isn’t compatible with CC0.

Chatham asked about harvesting from OCLC. Once data goes into WorldCAT it’s no longer acceptable to DPLA. The general agreements that govern use of metadata for OCLC, there’s open content metadata, different than CC0 and requires attribution. There’s a question about what you’re sharing and from where. Pulling from OCLC need to get clarity. If pull from CDM don’t need permission. We have metadata that lives in Gateway and points back to here. If it enters into WorldCat then there are licensing issue. Angela also had conversations with OCLC, got stuck on same licensing issues. The idea isn’t built yet, it doesn’t work. It didn’t appear at the time that OCLC would build it on their own, they would want public funds to do it.

After some discussion, ask OCLC for a written proposal by February 1, 2016.

The software image could be ported to any platform.

Hope that Steering Committee or Metadata WG could identify a group to participate in the test. Don’t need a lot, hope that the Metadata WG could provide assistance. Set up a call with Katrina, Nathan, Terry and Meghan. Recommended that pull content from Steering Committee and/or metadata working group members. Probably have an update January.

Centralized vs. decentralized technical infrastructure:  Stephen discussed the issue of having multiple harvesting points. It was felt that we should go with the centralized harvesting. Technology is centralized, if there’s a problem with the metadata, then reach out to the sub-hub who will talk with the organization to resolve the issues. We will also look at the cost in terms of dollars, cost and resources to implement the distributed metadata approach.

Change term for sub-hub.

1. Talking points on the value to local organizations:  Missy, Shannon, and Gillian will develop key talking points on DPLA value, results of the symposium and how they can be involved in the next steps. Also develop branding on DPLA in Ohio project. Begin pushing things out in January. Have a draft to the Steering Committee prior to January call.

Document on: “What people need to discuss with their Board.” This would come out later, probably this spring.

1. Development of project budget:  There are two points to the funding model
* Draft of the preliminary 3 year budget: Tom, Liz and Missy will be drafting a 3 year budget that we’ll have for the January meeting. There will be a budget narrative in the final budget. We hope to have a draft budget prior to the January call. A lot of the significant costs disappear after the first three years. Need to understand what people get. People who are paying expect support.
* “It’s hard to get people to pay for something after it’s been free.”  It’s important to have tiers. Needs to be really clear what offering. Liz suggested that use the three years to consider what other services will offer, if you’re going beyond aggregation. Several noted that aggregation isn’t enough for the fee. There has to be something more compelling. Can we think of a value added service in the three year budget?
1. Leadership and Governance/Advisory structure:  Tom recommended that the Governance and Sustainability WG work on developing a light weight governance structure for the three year pilot/prototype lightweight.  This could include:
* An Advisory Committee that can address policy issues, made up of deans/directors/leaders from the different types of organizations, along with the Project Manager.
* Statewide working groups—specifically on metadata and community engagement that have multi-type representation.
* Possibly an executive committee of the Advisory Committee, made up of representatives of SLO, OhioLINK, OPLIN and Ohio History Connection, as well as the organization that would be responsible for community engagement/training, etc.
1. Project work:  Based on meetings and observations how do we move forward—Angela/Stephen/Missy introduction
	* Maintain the steering committee, state library will put together a project team. OPLIN reported that they can provide rack space at Central Ohio computing at no cost to the project. Board is very interested in putting more support into the project. CML is committed to the project, reviewing staffing and how to carve out support for the public library piece, depending on the structure that’s worked out. Willing to help with the staff position.
	* The first phase of DPLA is really a pilot/prototype, it’s not the final iteration, rather we’d be developing that during the first 3 years. We don’t have to have everything figured out for our application. We should still stay on the timeline, but the recommendations could include questions, rather than fully fleshed out plans.
	* White paper is too strong of a word for what we’re looking for. A proposal with questions. The prototype with recommendations, documentation and what learned. Don’t need fully fleshed out white paper.
	* The symposium was a great way to unearth issues. If working groups come up with way to address issues.
	* Governance needs how first 3 years will work for the pilot project/prototype, not what will exist forever.
2. Discussion of Symposium Evaluation—Send January 4. Send comments to Missy by morning of January 4.
3. Follow-up Survey—Survey will go out in early January.
4. Knight Foundation funding: Need to find out specifics on the funding.
5. Next call—January 22, 2016