Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Digital Archives Backup Workgroup Notes
March 17, 2025, 1:00 pm
via zoom*

ATTENDEES: Keetra Baker (WLS), Alison Hoffman (MLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Scott Prater (UW-Madison), Tamara Ramski (SCLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), Kristen Whitson (RW/WiLS)

Project Managers: Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS)

1. **Review Agenda – Changes or additions**
    There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

2. **Discussion Items**
    a. **Onboarding Checkin (K. Whitson)**
        An [onboarding update](#) was provided before the meeting. The group was asked if there were any questions about the update.

        K. Whitson noted that she doesn't anticipate any changes in the amount of needed storage in the future.

        There has been a change of staff at WVLS and they may need to connect with K. Whitson.

    b. **Next Generation Backup Solution Process and Potential Cost (V. Teal Lovely and A. Hoks)**
        Host sites and users are in the exploration process of identifying the next generation solution. They would like to further discuss the digitized archives solution requirements.

        The Backup Collaboration Workgroup is beginning its exploration. Originally, the digital archives backup was tied together, but there is a general consensus that new solutions don't need to be pursued together. Right now the two backups are on two different servers with different configurations and prices. Initially, with the grant funds the costs were bundled together.

        J. Klingbeil noted that the current archive solution is an S3 container and there are a lot of solutions out there for that. We're still in a place where we are looking at the backup portion first and then alongside of that the raw storage for digital archiving.

        A. Hoks noted that currently there is a hurdle that everyone has to log into a VPN to access the solution and, as J. Klingbeil noted there are a lot of S3 options that are way easier and simpler.

        K. Whitson noted that the current solution might be a little over-engineered than what they need.

J. Klingbeil shared that going forward, they really have a better understanding that these two different services not only don't need to be tied together, they really don't want to be for the most part. The backup stuff is about other content. Keeping the backups separate will actually be easier in both cases than trying to find ways to keep them together.

S. Prater shared that in terms of the kind of the infrastructure and digital preservation practices we did set up the service in such a way that we can very easily swap out local storage with some service provider, cloud storage, or other local storage, as long as it's all S3 compliant, with a minimum fuss and bother and agrees they have a good path going forward.

c. **APTrust (K. Whitson)**
The group was introduced to APTrust as a digital archive storage option. An informational document was shared with the group. The document is a draft set of potential solutions. K. Whitson gave an overview of the document and of APTrust, noting that APTrust is a digital preservation repository that currently mostly has academic members. Several universities use APTrust for their digital preservation needs, but they are looking into expanding beyond universities. The Executive Director of APTrust is open to alternative pricing models or pricing for a consortium.

APTrust is S3 compliant. So all of the work that the committee has been doing on this project is not sunken cost. It's not wasted time or effort, all of the documentation and education will transfer over to a relationship with APTrust.

APTrust provides a lot of the services that the group has been talking about in terms of digital preservation. The initial membership cost is $20,000 a year and that comes with 10 terabytes of storage.

J. Klingbeil shared that to give a little bit of perspective, having priced out some two or three different strategies, $20,000 a year basically is less than it looked like they would be putting into their own strategy just for essentially the raw storage plus a mechanism to interface to the raw storage with two different services. This solution would be within the budget.

S. Prater noted that an attraction of APTrust's services is you only pay for what you consume and presumably our costs would only go up as the service becomes more popular and more needed, so price matches demand. With investment in a local storage box you need to plan ahead of time for what's going to be growth for five years and then pay for that upfront. APTrust's pay-as-you-go option is more attractive.

K. Whitson noted that the tool used to package up the files to put them into the server, Dart, is a product of APTrust.

There was consensus that this product is worth looking into further. K. Whitson and S. Prater will meet with APTrust and ask more questions. The group discussed potential questions to ask APTrust:

- It would be helpful to have an implementation timeline from APTrust. What does the typical onboarding look like? What is the time frame?
- Are the migration costs included in the initial $20,000 fee?
- Is AP Trust completely member-funded and supported? What is the fiscal backbone of that organization and might any of that be federally federal funding dependent?

The group discussed the changing nature of the workgroup and noted that in the future if the group does move forward with a different solution than the backup group the nature of this group may change and they may want to consider changing the name and focus to digital preservation.

Next Steps – Questions from the group will be taken to APTrust and the group will further discuss APTrust as a possible solution at their next meeting in June.

3. **Next Meeting Date**
   The next meeting is June 16, 2025, 1:00 pm

The meeting ended at: 3:01 pm