

**Wisconsin Public Library Consortium  
Digital Archives Backup Steering Committee Notes  
December 13, 2022, at 2:00 pm  
via zoom**

**ATTENDEES:** Joshua Klingbeil (WVLS), Matt Murphy (MPL/MCFLS), Nate Pflager (WRLS), Emily Pfothenhauer (RW/WiLS), Vicki Teal Lovely (SCLS), Margie Verhelst (MCLS)

**ABSENT:** Scott Prater (UW-Madison),

**Project Managers:** Melody Clark (WiLS)

**1. Call to Order**

Chair J. Klingbeil called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm

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

There were no additions to the agenda.

**3. Approval of minutes – [September 27, 2022](#)**

N. Pflager moved to accept the minutes. M. Verhelst seconded. The minutes were approved.

**4. Discussion and Action Items**

**a. Discussion and possible action: 2023 Chair**

It was asked if there were any volunteers from the floor.

N. Pflager moved to nominate J. Klingbeil. Klingbeil accepted the nomination. V. Teal Lovely seconded. Motion passed.

**b. Discussion and possible action: Test Load Update**

A successful test drive of some tools (DART to bag data and S3 browser to move the data into the Dell system) has been completed.

E. Pfothenhauer noted that S. Prater and T. Ramski at SCLS have tested the tools, which have worked well. They have worked with A. Hoks at SCLS to move the bags into the system. T. Ramski is working on generating more bags and is documenting the process. File formats will be included in the documentation.

**c. Discussion and possible action: Service Model**

SCLS, LEAN, and RW have been working through some technical implementation components in the [Service Model Document](#).

The group was asked the following:

- How will deposits be handled for libraries that don't actively work with their system on digital initiatives? (i.e. Madison Public Library/SCLS, or La Crosse

Public Library/WRLS) What about deposits for libraries if their system is not using the service? (i.e. Mineral Point Public Library/SWLS)

- It was noted that not all systems are using the service.
- N. Pflager noted that it may depend on how long it takes to actually do this process.
- M. Murphy agreed that the time it takes to do this work could have an impact on the decision. Milwaukee PL has a contract with MCFLS so MPL does this work and if there are other county libraries that want to load information, MPL would be the one doing the work.
- It was agreed that the system should be the starting point for now.
- Any concerns with this decentralized approach, where each participant is responsible for getting their data into and out of the system and for monitoring it while it's there? (see CONTENT SELECTION, page 2)
  - M. Murphy noted that having it be the submitter's responsibility and a single point of entry makes the most sense.
  - It was noted the "depositor" would be the library system.
  - N. Pflager noted it might be a higher bar for those that aren't libraries.
  - J. Klingbeil noted that the decentralized approach makes sense, but when we're putting in place an eligibility framework in this approach, every depositor's subject to interpretation may be different. Additionally, information will be put essentially into a vault; what are the use cases where that scenario might be meaningful? Who would see things or call attention to them if it is not appropriate and eligible?
  - E. Pfothauer noted that if something like that came up, it could be up to this committee or WPLC to provide some guidance around that eligibility if it was outside of scope.
  - J. Klingbeil noted that with a decentralized approach, there would not be anything in place to prevent a group from uploading ineligible materials.
  - N. Pflager noted that it is a training opportunity for the signee at the beginning of the agreement to let them know what is eligible.
  - V. Teal Lovely would like the SCLS administrators to review this as well.
- It was noted to review and comment on the document by January 13, 2023.

**d. Discussion and possible action: Budget**

At the last meeting, the [budget](#) was discussed, and it was determined that the next steps are to talk with host site system directors to discuss how they would like to account for staff time on this project. This happened, and the group decided that at this time, they would not charge any fees for site management, as they want to keep costs down at this time. At some point down the road, this will be a possibility.

The system administrators noted that they need to do this for themselves and that if it is used for other systems, it's difficult to suss out a cost for others as they are already doing it for themselves. It is an already capitalized project.

**e. Discussion and possible action: 5-Year Plan**

A workgroup of committee members has been meeting to discuss the [5-Year plan](#). The workgroup has met several times over the last few months.

A timeline for project sustainability was also added in table format. The system admins for the project have reviewed it. This includes budget actions, and over the next five years, budgets and fee creation are included. It was noted that LSTA will be pursued as well as the next state budget. It was also noted that 2024 may be the first year that systems may need to pay fees.

This plan is still in draft form and is a work in progress.

**f. Discussion and possible action: Update on Addendum to MOU**

The Committee received an update on the [Addendum to the MOU](#). This was approved by the WPLC Board. The group can move forward with having the systems sign.

**5. Next Meeting Date**

The Committee will determine meeting dates for 2023 in March, June, September, and December.

Project managers will send out a poll to schedule the meetings.

Meeting ended at 3:01 pm.