

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium
Digital Archives Backup Workgroup Notes
October 7, 2025, 10:00 am**

ATTENDEES: Keetra Schultz (WLS), Alison Hoffman (MLS), Andrew Hoks (SCLS), Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Scott Prater (UW-Madison), Tamara Ramski (SCLS), Emily Rogers (WVLS)

ABSENT: Kristen Whitson (RW/WiLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS)

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

Meeting Started at 10:01 am

1. Review Agenda – Changes or additions

There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

2. Discussion Items

a. Discussion: APTrust

With this group's approval, a pilot with APTrust has been underway. [An update](#) on the pilot and loading dock workflow was given. S. Prater shared that the pilot is currently running and will end on October 31st.

T. Ramski asked if materials need to be retrieved, does RW have direct access? Yes, RW does.

There were several questions for the group:

- What should the decision-making structure look like once APTrust membership begins (e.g., oversight by Tech Steering vs. Board vs. a dedicated subcommittee)?
 - J. Klingbeil noted the model for governing has already been templated by the WPLC, so they will most likely do something similar and asked if the membership oversight would be different than this group. It was agreed that it will most likely be the same membership and folks agreed that this group could morph into a new oversight/operations committee, no longer tied to the Archive backup.
 - Would there be other stakeholders that need to be involved is a question for the Technology Steering Committee. J. Klingbeil will draft a governance need statement for the proposal.
- Are the chosen tools (Cyberduck, Rclone Browser, Vultr, Backblaze B2) sustainable for both contributors and staff? Do you know of others you'd recommend instead?
 - No other recommendations were suggested. J. Klingbeil noted that WVLS and (maybe) SCLS may have virtual storage (Vultr VM) if the costs of the virtual component become too high.
- What metrics or checkpoints do we want to use to evaluate success in the first year of APTrust membership?
 - S. Prater noted that they will do some test runs first to verify uploads and content.

- Do we want to define criteria for re-evaluating APTrust membership in 3–5 years?
 - Over time, quantified participation will be a key metric for the project. It would be best to determine this one year into the project.
- What other information might this group need in order to recommend signing on with APTrust?
 - It was noted that the participation agreements would need to be updated.
 - The ability to retrieve data should be verified, and the group will need to do due diligence of testing recovery processes.
 - It was asked if this included Winnefox's collection. *(At the time of the meeting, the group was told it does not, but after the meeting, it was determined that Winnefox's collection was included in the APTrust cost estimates.)*
 - What was the total TB that this cost was based on? 4 or 5 TB. It was shared that \$20,000 per year for sustaining membership for 10 TB, but S. Prater will follow up for clarification.
 - It was noted that APTrust and most cloud digital preservation providers' cost models are most advantageous for small (1-6TB) data sets.
 - It was shared that a missing piece for the proposal is the inclusion of cost for additional, new, project costs.
 - The proposal should include what 10TB means in relation to the current size of collections for participating systems and if that allows for any growth.
 - The proposal should outline participants in the project.
- Does this group want an update *before* the December 2, 2025 Tech Steering Committee meeting, so that your recommendation can be included at that meeting?
 - The group rescheduled their meeting for November 18th. A proposal will be drafted by project managers and the group will review and discuss at that meeting before it goes to the Technology Steering Committee for their December 2nd meeting.

3. Next Meeting Dates

The next meeting was moved to November 18th at 9:00 am so the group can review and edit the proposal before it goes to the Technology Steering Committee at their December 2nd meeting.

Meeting Ended at: 11:03 am