

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium**  
**Digital Archives Backup Steering Committee Notes**  
**July 28, 2022, at 2:00 pm**  
**via zoom**

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

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

**1. Call to Order**

Chair J. Klingbeil called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM

**2. Review Agenda – Changes or additions**

There were no additions to the agenda

**3. Approval of minutes – [May 17, 2022](#)**

V. Teal Lovely Moved to accept the minutes. M. Verhelst Seconded. The minutes were approved.

**4. Updates from Previous Meetings**

**a. Discussion: RW Project Vision/Need Statement**

At the last meeting of the Committee, it was determined that Recollection Wisconsin representatives would create a vision/need statement that would outline the process, support, and commitment needed to move forward with the project. E. Pfothenhauer presented a [Statement of Need](#) and [potential next steps](#).

There was a question about the mention of CONTENT dm and the Milwaukee Public Library. It was noted that MPL is an example as it happens to be the biggest collection. Each system is still responsible for its preservation and storage even if they are not using CONTENT dm

The Next Steps document was reviewed. There is funding through the 2021 LSTA that went to IFLS. A portion of that went to RW for the loading dock and project management to work through these steps. There is RW project management capability to work on these steps.

V. Teal Lovely asked who the “who” is listed in the steps. It was noted it would be the group either making the decision or answering the questions.

J. Chamberlain asked if the high and mid-priority features outlined in the Need Statement are considerations embedded in the Next Steps document. It was noted that the intention is that steps one and two in the Next Steps document will address those.

E. Pfothenhauer asked how the group would like to be involved in developing this. V. Teal Lovely noted that the section assigned to the technical teams can gather

information and bring it back to this committee. V. Teal Lovely will work on scheduling meetings with the technical folks.

E. Pfothenauer suggested that some of these questions be answered over email and then RW will create a first draft for the committee to respond to at the next meeting.

J. Klingbeil pointed out that the archives backup project may involve services beyond Recollection Wisconsin content.

It was asked if the backup group has a service model set up yet or if it will be similar to the digital archive model. V. Teal Lovely thinks it will be different.

**Next Steps:** E. Pfothenauer will send out questions to the committee to start the outline of an initial service model. V. Teal Lovely will work with the technical group to work on defining and answering questions for section two in the Next Steps document.

## 5. New Business

### a. Update: Five-Year Project Plan

DPI requested that the backup committees create a five-year project plan to better understand the funding needs of the project. V. Teal Lovely presented a draft timeline for this project:

- July 20: present draft budget and plan for developing a five-year plan to WPLC Technology Backup Steering Committee (TBSC) Meeting
- July 28: present draft budget and plan for developing a five-year plan to WPLC Digital Archives Backup Collaboration Steering (DABCS) Committee
- August: Consult with Recollection Wisconsin and other stakeholders
- August 15: Update Technology Steering Committee
- August 17: Create a draft of five-year plan with Tech-a-Talka at the annual meeting
- Fall meeting dates - TBD Present plan to TBSC and DABCSC

V. Teal Lovely will put a plan together to create the plan that will continue to flesh out these milestones. It was noted that this plan is for both projects, the backup and the digitized materials backup.

E. Pfothenauer noted that another stakeholder may be the resource libraries as they may have additional government archives.

For the purposes of a five-year plan, it was asked if the group wants to consider other stakeholders. It could be added in the plan to include other stakeholders, for example in year three. S. Prater suggested having a check-in about additional stakeholders in year two and year four.

J. Klingbeil noted that the project is still in the design phase. While much progress has been made, the primary activities up until this point have revolved around identifying, purchasing, and configuring equipment. Now we are entering the service model design stage. In a typical business scenario, the service model would be developed early in the

process. However, in this project, we are still creating the service model by committee which presents its own challenges. We may want to limit the expansion of services until further on in the process when we can incorporate additional partners and stakeholders.

In addition, S. Prater noted that it is important to identify and highlight stakeholders or partners that can be used to test out the design. Those should be identified as soon as possible and be defined in the five-year plan.

**b. Discussion: Budget**

At the WPLC Technology Backup Committee meeting, the group reviewed the draft budget and determined a small group of volunteers would be created and meet to work more in-depth on the budget. The group would also like a representative from this Committee.

V. Teal Lovely presented a [draft budget](#) to the Committee.

It was asked if the costs that have been estimated are just for equipment and not staff time. It was noted that that is correct. S. Prater noted when developing the budget, the group may want to get input into what staff overhead will be as well as the staff time that will be needed for developing and managing a service.

There was also a question concerning sustainable funding. S. Prater noted that the majority of current funds have been through LSTA grants and noted that there is not much point to archiving unless you can make it an ongoing service, and asked what the considerations for sustainable funding are. V. Teal Lovely noted that was the impetus for the meeting with DPI where the five-year plan was requested. It was also noted that there could be potential sustainable funding from the state budget, but a request for that would not happen in the upcoming biennial budget as that is an in-depth process that requires lobbying.

It was noted that the cost per GB for the digitized material archives was missing from the budget but it worked out to be \$0.28

S. Prater and E. Pfotenhauer volunteered to work on the budget workgroup.

**6. Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the Committee will be on September 27, 2022, at 2:00 pm.

Meeting adjourned at 3:12 pm.