Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Digital Archives Backup Steering Committee Notes
May 17, 2022, at 1:00 pm
via zoom

ATTENDEES: Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Mick Petzold (Brown County/NFLS), Emily Pfotenhauer (RW/WiLS), Scott Prater (UW-Madison), Vick Teal Lovely (SCLS), Margie Verhelst (MCLS)

ABSENT: Nate Pflager (WRLS)

Project Managers: Melody Clark (WiLS)

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   The meeting was called to order at 1:04 pm and introductions were made.

2. **Discussion and Action: Nomination of Digital Archives Backup Steering Chair**
   This is the first meeting of the Digital Archives Backup Steering Committee. A chair for this body has not been designated and the group was asked to nominate and elect a chair.
   J. Klingbeil volunteered and the group agreed by consensus.

3. **Discussion: Committee Responsibilities, Meeting Frequency, and Orientation Packet**
   The creation of the WPLC Digital Archives 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, to develop overall project budget needs, and to develop a governance structure for the digital archives backup collaboration project.

   The group reviewed the [Digital Archives Backup Steering Committee Orientation Packet](#)

4. **Update: UW-Madison Collaboration**
   The aim of this collaboration is to have UW-Madison provide some infrastructure (a "loading dock") to receive digital files and perform initial preservation processing actions before they are moved to long-term storage. The Dell system does not have any of this functionality.

   Recollection Wisconsin representative, E. Pfotenhauer, provided an update on this collaboration. This is something RW has been exploring as the Dell system became available. The Dell system is just storage, essentially a bucket, or a place to put stuff, it doesn't provide baseline digital processing features that RW looks for, like file verification, etc. before going into storage. Similar to putting a physical archive doc in an acid-free box, digital archives require preparation for storage.

   In conversation with S. Prater and others at UW Madison, they have looked at Archivenatica, a suite of tools that can be used as a passthrough to prepare documents for storage. It was noted that exploring the tools first was breaking a bit of a cardinal rule, typically preservation is not about the tools, but first, the policy and plans and long-term commitments about how everything is going to be managed, maintained, and accessed. S. Prater noted that it would be best to understand the WPLC's long-term commitment to the management and support of digital archives storage. It would be best if a comprehensive plan was in place before moving

forward. It is important to think about what are the overall goals and commitments to doing this sustainably. Digital preservation is about making things accessible and retrievable by people in the future. In order to move forward, they need to get an institutional commitment that this is something the WPLC is serious about and will continually invest in, not necessarily a monetary commitment, but an assurance that the group is in it and will sustain and support the project.

The group was asked if there were any questions or thoughts about that? J. Klingbeil noted that initially when first discussing backups the discussion quickly turned to digital storage and retrievability. There is some confusion about what digital archiving is today. Their system's Initial thought about retaining and retrieval was for digitized records, and record retention, more so than digitized content and digitized content strategy. That really seems to be the primary value of this, that partnership with RW and UW-Madison.

S. Prater noted that the storage infrastructure and mirroring are necessary. What he wonders about is when the Dell system ages out, will it be replaced, and noted this is something that will happen repeatedly over time. They are not necessarily interested in the Dell system other than that it meets the minimum requirements. They are more interested in how WPLC will support the framework around any storage system.

Next steps:
There is funding earmarked from LSTA for the loading dock. Recollection Wisconsin representatives would like to get a bigger picture, long-range view before jumping into selecting tools, and would like this committee to invest some time in that planning process, including looking at what other states are doing, what the specific scope might be, taking a closer look at what types of content and an assessment of what the content is, where it is and what needs to be done to it to put into centralized storage.

E. Pfotenhauer and S. Prater will work on developing a document/vision statement that will outline the process, and support and commitment needed to move forward with the project. The document will then be shared with the committee.

5. **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 and discussed the grants. These grants cover both the backup and the digitization components. The cost for the RW portion is $70,950. The archive and dell portions were listed in the full/medium/minimum amounts of the grant request. The backup project already has five systems connected now and there will be more participating. It was noted that there are some systems that are participating in the backup only and there will be some that participate in the digital archives backup only as well as some that participate in both.

   The two LSTA grants received from DPI totaled $332,408. It was noted that DPI gave almost the full amount requested. The digitization piece and Dell residency portions are fully covered. The rest will go into the infrastructure.

It was also noted that no money since the beginning of these projects has been collected from systems. At some point, a budget will need to be created with ongoing system amounts.

It was asked if it was separate equipment for the digitization portion. V. Teal Lovely noted that yes, there are two servers.

6. **Discussion: Review of the original MOU**
   The Committee reviewed and discussed the [Backup and Digitization Storage MOU](#). This MOU is currently in place for systems participating in backup collaboration and/or digitization archives.

   This MOU is flexible and allows systems to pick the portion they want to participate in, backup or digitization, or both. The main purpose of creating the MOU was for the grant applications and to be able to start with the onboarding process.

   J. Klingbeil noted that the history that has led up to today includes activities that have already taken place. They happen to be bundled right now, but in the future, they may not be. The group does have to be mindful that there is a tether to the backup service side of things.

   It was asked where does digitization fit into this MOU? V. Teal Lovely noted it is digital content, natively digital or previously digitized content, in the MOU, and is included in the Archival Storage portion.

7. **Discussion: Budget**
   A new budget needs to be created. The WPLC Technology Backup Committee is also working to draft a budget. Once that is drafted it can be shared with this group and the digital archival process budget estimate can be added.

8. **Next Meeting Date**
   Project managers will send out a poll to establish the next dates, looking at July or September. It was noted that UW Madison will need several months to get a tool in place before onboarding a pilot library can take place.