Ohio DPLA Steering Committee Call

January 22, 2016

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

--Draft reports and timeline—handout (attached)—Tom/Liz

* Each working group will do a report following the outline example provided in the handout
* Legal and Sustainability groups are waiting to develop some of their recommendations and will work off of the recommendations from the Governance Working Group.
* Include in final report that we will be working to bring in the C’s. Don’t want to have people to feel left out.
* Timeline—Next meeting February 26th 2 hour meeting 11-1ET; Doodle poll for March meeting; Everyone, please put fourth Friday of the month through June for Steering meeting.

--Final report: Tom and Liz will prepare an outline of the final report. Nathan commented that we need to have some idea of the scope of content for the Ohio DPLA site in this document (although not necessarily a “hub collection policy”

--State Library update—Missy met with the State Librarian; talked with the HR person at the state library, would look to hire two staff, project manager and technology specialist. Would do an outside contract with an IT project manager for 1-2 years for software and programming and hire a library consultant to be the project manager and hire a software specialist to do the day to day IT work. Contract out the metadata specialist work to do the work. Will hire two full time at the state library under personnel ceiling and a state contract for an IT person. Metadata contractors would be the outreach people to work with metadata improvement with the community networks funded by LSTA grants.

--Technology WG update—Terry/Nathan/Meghan/Katrina

Proof of concept using the Temple/Penn State aggregator. It’s not fully working, they’re still in active development. The software that they’re using is old. The newer stack, the tool is being developed for the Penn specifications. Because it isn’t a mainstream flavor of a Hydra stack, support has to come from them, so they’re busy, figuring out issues and problems. It’s harvesting something and then failing. This is the challenge that anyone will have. The Hydra community is good for support, but there’s a high expectation that you know what you’re doing. There isn’t good documentation. Need to set realistic expectations. We don’t need a technologist, we need a programmer with right skills. If we can get the current stack working, can we use it for a year or two?

Lightweight profile tool with CDM or DSpace or BePress if haven’t done anything to it. Doesn’t capture thumbnails. Will still need skills to do harvesting profiling. Won’t have to recode into current Hydra. Might have to build the migration to the Hydra in a Box into Sustainability planning. Will need significant programming skills. Assumption to use the stack that there is someone that’s more than a system administrator. It is a dependency that we have to have. If go the Hydra path have to support it with the appropriate staff.

Alternative to Temple tool is an alternative tool—Repox, which is an aggregator. It’s not fun to use, people don’t like it, but it gets the job done. Use Repox in the short term and put effort into Hydra stack in the long term. Talk with New York, that’s what they are investigating now. Partner with New York on that approach. They would be a very good partner.

Talk about what’s needed if do Hydra, what’s needed if do a collaborative project.

Hard right now to recommend a technology stack because there’s so many different variables in terms of what is needed to support it. Repox requires more support for ingest.

OCLC is worried about being left out of the digital library space. If DPLA is successful in Hydra in the Box, OCLC could be left out. They have their own roadblocks, until they get their legal department to say they aren’t roadblocks.

If go with an OCLC solution it becomes only a financial issue, pushes all technology to them.

There are significant infrastructure requirements, who will support this in terms of technology match?

Are we getting on thin ice? Even if we collaborate Empire Network we might be able to move forward. More time consuming on ingest. Profiling the thumbnails appropriately is less of a sysops activity and more of a technologist, keep our eye on what DPLA is doing. Their goal is something like DSpace.

Might not have everything worked out by the March Working Group Report deadline, but will have more information by time of application.

Whoever takes this on, has to really get involved. The technology report needs to include if you take this path, pros and cons; if this path, pros/cons. There might be advantages to having one organization or another be the lead technology organization, in terms of where putting the technology stack.

Additional discussion of OCLC option: Limited pilot, outside of work we’re doing. They are looking at testing pulling data together. They’re willing to do work “on spec” (without charge) on some of these activities. We cannot go forward until they solve the licensing issue. License has to be so we can contribute content in a CC0 environment. Taylor is going to their attorneys. It’s a non-starter for now. Gwen thinks she can talk with Skip to get decision and sense of urgency to a higher level.

--Next steps (moved to next call, potentially in mid-March, see below):

* Community Engagement Centers Discussion
	+ Group discussion of potential roles and responsibilities of the Community Engagement Centers necessary to meet DPLA expectations
	+ Characteristics of an organizations that might take on this role in the initial 3 years
* Working group updates

--Next meeting

* Liz and Tom will do a Doodle poll for an additional meeting in mid-February that includes discussion of topics that weren’t covered today, including Community Engagement Centers Discussion, and any additional working group updates.