Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Technology Backup Steering Committee Notes
April 19, 2022, at 1:00 pm
via zoom*

ATTENDEES: Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Tony Kriskovich (NWLS), Kris Schwartz (IFLS), Clairellyn Sommersmith (WLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS)

ABSENT: Walter Leifeld (WRLS)

PROJECT MANAGERS: Jennifer Chamberlain (WiLS), Melody Clark (WiLS)

The meeting started at 1:02 pm.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   The group was welcomed and introductions were made. It was noted that the WPLC project managers are here to help facilitate the meetings and provide basic support.

2. **Discussion and Action: Nomination of Technology Backup Steering Chair**
   It was noted that this is the first meeting of the Tech Backup Steering Committee and a chair for this body has not been designated. The Committee was asked how they would like to proceed with nominating a chair. V. Teal Lovely is happy to serve as chair for the first year, with the hopes that someone else will pick up the chair position in future years – the committee agreed by consensus to select V. Teal Lovely as chair.

3. **Discussion: Committee Responsibilities, Meeting Frequency, and Orientation Packet**
   The creation of the WPLC Technology Backup Committee was proposed by the Technology Collaborations Steering Committee and approved by the WPLC Board in October of 2021. The purpose of the Committee is to provide project expertise, develop overall project budget needs, and provide a governance structure for the existing Backup Collaboration Project. An orientation packet was presented and the group reviewed the documents. V. Teal Lovely asked if this body reports directly to the Board or to the Technology Steering Committee. It was noted that this body, along with all steering committees, reports directly to the Board.

4. **Discussion: LSTA grants**
   The first grant, received in 2021, was for $133,475 for the 2020 LSTA grant cycle. This amount was 75% of the annual proposed amount. IFLS holds these funds. The second grant amount was issued in 2022 for the 2021 LSTA grant cycle. It is a continuation of the original grant. Note, that it lists $332,409 as the amount allocated, but they only issued an additional $198,933, which was the "minimum amount to be funded." IFLS is the fiscal agent for this grant.

   The Committee reviewed the Funding Request, LSTA Project Summary, and LSTA Budget. They discussed the grants and were asked to identify potential uses of the current funds.

   V. Teal Lovely reported that DPI reached out to her last year with the opportunity to apply for funding to support this project in its next stage. This funding proposal is centered on replacement costs for equipment and supporting host site costs for two locations. It also includes Dell support project time. The digital archives backup includes support from UW

Madison. The entire digitization project received LSTA funding with partial funding for the backup project.

In the current iteration of the budget, the onboarding budget has been increased from the original grant proposal amount because there is an identified need for more Dell support time.

DPI has been very supportive of this project. Clarification that this committee's purview is mainly on the backup project, even though the digitization backup project is inter-related. The latter can't exist without the former. Right now we have 7 participating/interested systems in the backup project. SCLS and LEAN (both as host sites) and Monarch (first pilot system outside of host sites) are currently backing things up on the system. Once Monarch is stable, the next system slated for onboarding is Winding Rivers. Covid slowed the project down, but in the last six months' work has really picked up. V. Teal Lovely shared there is a [Google document](#) that offers regular progress updates on the project.

The LEAN server is hosted offsite in the CVTC data park. The SCLS server is in their offices and will remain in SCLS when they move to their new office. The two host sites sync with each other.

C. Sommersmith asked about V. Teal Lovely and other IT staff time, will this be a part of this new budget? It was noted that that is something that will need to be discussed. The workload has been larger than expected. Sustainability planning is something that this committee will need to discuss.

LSTA is intended to get us going for 2021 and 2022, with systems putting aside money for ongoing maintenance and support.

5. **Discussion: Review of the original MOU**
   The Committee reviewed and discussed [the MOU](#). This MOU is currently in place for systems participating in backup collaboration and/or digitization archives. This MOU was used for anyone involved in either program. The most important part of this agreement is the Good Faith section which includes hold-harmless clauses. Newer interested systems have not signed this document, like MCFLS. There is also an agreement being drafted between LEAN and SCLS. It does not include governance language, rather it outlines the way in which the host sites work together and what's expected of each entity.

6. **Discussion and approval: Draft MOU for "Use of the Backup Platform"**
   The original backup collaboration partners have been working on a [new MOU](#) which will be in addition to the "original MOU" unless they can be integrated. The Committee reviewed the MOU and was asked to approve the new MOU for the Use of the Backup Platform.

   The next steps would be this body approving the MOU and bringing it to the WPLC board for approval. M. Clark asked a clarifying question: is the previous MOU for all participating members? What is the role of the second MOU? V. Teal Lovely explained that the second agreement includes more technical specifics, expectations, and responsibilities for the backup project specifically.

   C. Sommersmith asked if the original MOU could be morphed into a broader, umbrella MOU for participating in any WPLC technology collaborations by expanding the checkboxes to include

various projects. V. Teal Lovely thinks this might be a good approach. J. Klingbeil agrees a universal agreement for all technology collaborations makes sense.

J. Klingbeil is making a final review of the second MOU re: the use of the backup platform and agreement and will share revisions with the committee prior to the next scheduled committee meeting.

M. Clark noted that an umbrella agreement might work for other opt-in projects that the Technology Operations Committee is working on. She can bring the concept of an umbrella agreement to the Technology Steering Committee to discuss as well. M. Clark also suggested that this Committee could give an update at the June Board meeting.

7. **Discussion: Budget**
   It was noted that a new budget needs to be created. The Committee was asked to discuss a formula for ongoing costs, and consider forming a budget workgroup.

   A basic budget was drafted which includes using state aid allocations as a model, but this is still out of reach for most systems unless all systems are participating or we get help from the state. Another question is how we assess fees going forward. V. Teal Lovely asked if a workgroup of this group could meet outside of this committee to help create the budget. IT was agreed the whole committee should be working on the development of the budget. V. Teal Lovely with support from project managers will prepare a preliminary budget draft to share with the committee for deeper discussion at the next meeting.

8. **Next Meeting Date**
   The Committee will determine the next meeting date. M. Clark suggested sometime in July. The committee was fairly open during the month for a meeting. A meeting poll will be sent out to determine the meeting dates for the rest of the year.

The meeting ended at 2:15 pm.