SOPAG Shared Print in Place Task Force Report

Appendices: Additional Recommendations

March 22, 2011

Contents

Prospective Initiatives

2. Develop principles for when to establish a shared print collection in place

Where we are now

An assumption of our charge is that there will not be enough room in the RLFs to house all shared and persistent collections, and that some of these collections will have to reside at the campuses. There may also be cases where it makes sense to develop print collections at a full service library rather than in a storage facility. The decision to develop or retain a shared print collection in an RLF or in a full service library may depend upon the desired outcomes and behaviors for a collection.

Implicit in the persistent and recommended shared print in place policies is the notion that decisions to collect collaboratively and depend upon collections held at another campus need to be agreed upon in advance by all or most campuses (even if only one or two campuses are actually developing the collection) such that non-archiving campuses can make explicit decisions about whether to duplicate or retain duplicates.

Campus libraries will be more willing to withdraw materials or avoid duplicate purchasing based on explicit initiatives to collect or retain on behalf of the system and subsequent application of preservation, retention and lending guarantees (codified in the "Persistence" and "shared print in place" policies.). Additional space can thus be created at the campus level, allowing libraries more space for new materials or repurposing projects.

There are various types of print collections that are more or less formally coordinated. Those that are coordinated systemwide have common behaviors, including all of the behaviors codified in the recommended shared print in place policies. Those that are not coordinated systemwide may have a wide variety of behaviors (or no explicit behaviors.) The types can be generally described as:

1. UC collections that now fall under the "Persistence Policy" are:

    -   Most unrestricted materials at the RLFs. Behaviors are codified for recall and withdrawal but not for disclosure or explicit retention periods.

2. UC collections that now fall under a Shared Print agreement and to which systemwide behaviors/policies are/would be applied are:

    -   Collections indexed on the Shared Print website with the "shared print" icon. These are explicitly approved by CDC and managed and coordinated by CDL Shared Print. Some are Shared Print held in place (e.g. UCM Springer Monographs Collection) and some are Shared Print held in storage (e.g. UC JSTOR collection, Shared Print for Licensed Content collections, EEBO Microform collection).
    -   Prospectively acquired print collections that the Shared Monographs Coordinating Group will organize with bibliographer groups. The initiative statement ensures the application of shared print policies and involves explicit approval by CDC prior to implementation.

3. UC collections that are coordinated by bibliographer groups, between individual campuses or between individual campuses and other universities.

- Collections indexed on the Shared Print website without the "shared print" icon (e.g. Last copy journal subscription agreements among some UC bibliographer groups)
- Informal or undocumented cooperative collection agreements

Where we want to be

UC Libraries want a set of principles for when to build or retain a print collection in a full service library (or set of libraries) and when to build or retain one in an RLF. Such principles might take into account the cost to store and manage the resources, risk factors for the resources, available space, anticipated systemwide use, "neutrality" of location, expectations of a full service library to provide content and services to cloud source services, etc.

- Maximize the number of shared print (in place or in RLF) collections at UC libraries to support CDC's vision of 21st Century collections.
- Increase the visibility and accessibility of shared print collections across UC, through network level disclosure of shared print commitments in union catalogs (e.g. NGM) and common behaviors
- Have in place a systemwide approach to easily identify retention commitments
- Undertake responsible de-accessioning of unwanted duplicates at the campus level based on explicitly agreed upon collecting responsibilities
- Make dynamic use of recovered collections space at campuses
- Provide incentives and support to campuses agreeing to house and maintain persistent, shared or last copies on a campus

Recommendation

In developing principles for when to create shared print in place collections, CDC/CDL Shared Print should consider: the benefits vs. the challenges of having such a collection on a campus; risk management factors (i.e., loss rates, electronic availability, ability to access from storage, etc.); costs to store in a full service library vs. storage facility; when to apply rolling wall behaviors to move materials from full service libraries to storage; and future strategic collection management decisions with extramural partners (e.g., ease of contribution of the shared collections to WEST, the Cloud, and other potential partners). Principles are needed for both prospective collection building and retrospective collections that may potentially be declared shared print in place.

Benefits (pros)

- Space avoidance at the RLFs
- Space savings on campuses that withdraw duplicate materials
- Clear guidelines for when and where to position a shared print collection

- Patrons at the holding campus (presumably the campus with the most interest in the collection) would have immediate, on-site access
- Potential for campuses to volunteer discrete local collections as shared print in place without having to move them to an RLF

Challenges (cons)

- Buy-in for shared prospective collecting of print materials is less certain than for the strongly stated preference of UC Bibliographers Groups for shared electronic materials. The number of participating campuses is likely to vary by proposal. Cooperative agreements (formal or informal) may be a more flexible and attractive alternative for some campuses.
- Buy-in for declaring collections Shared Print in Place retrospectively is less than certain. For unique collections, campus would likely preserve and retain anyway. Currently, there is little incentive for giving up ownership of an existing collection.
- Intershelving shared print materials into a library's regular collections may cause confusion, both to users and staff.
- Materials shelved on a campus are more vulnerable to theft, defacement, loss, and misshelving.
- Archival/preservation conditions are often less than optimal when shelved on campus.
- Potential political consequences of using campus or donor funds for UC purchases, particularly if they are shelved at another campus
- Higher cost-per-unit shelving on a campus than at an RLF

Timeline

March-May 2011	CDC, RLF Directors and CDL Shared Print develop principles for when to develop a shared print collection in place and when to develop one in an RLF. Include principles for when to move "in place" collections to storage.
June 2011	SOPAG review and endorsement
July 2011	UL review and endorsement

3. Develop principles for when to acquire, transfer, and withdraw microform materials

Where we are now

- UC has a long history of coordinated acquisition of microform sets under the auspices of the Shared Collection Acquisition Program (SCAP, formerly in collaboration with Stanford). These retrospectively acquired sets typically reside at a campus or an RLF, with print content guides or finding aids distributed to each campus.
- Over time, the acquisition of other microform materials has not been coordinated and as a result, there are multiple sets across the system. Many microform titles, particularly periodicals or newspapers, are ongoing in nature, with multiple open subscriptions across the system.
- Our local collections each developed over many years prior to the internet and the availability of content in an electronic format. While much valuable and unique primary source content may be available only in micro formats, many sets may no longer be needed to support current research needs or may no longer be needed in multiple copies across the system.
- Many microform titles are located at the RLFs, in addition to multiple titles held locally at the campuses.

Where we want to be

- UC will acquire microform content selectively and in closer collaboration with other campuses in order to avoid unintended duplication, achieve overall financial savings and make judicious use of valuable space.
- The microform collection footprint across UC will be much reduced.
- UC Bibliographer Groups play an important role in the collection development process and campus representatives will communicate local interest in acquiring a new microform set to their counterparts at other campuses.
- UC will not only continue to rely on CRL's collections acquired on our behalf, but will take a coordinated and pro-active role in shaping their acquisition of expensive microform sets through the annual CRL Purchase Proposal Program and the ongoing Demand Purchase Program to make the most of our collective memberships.

Recommendations

- Each campus should conduct a review of their microform holdings and develop local criteria for when a microform collection should be held on site instead of transferred to an RLF.
- Each campus should develop local criteria for when a microform collection should continue to be held on site, instead of relying on identical holdings at NRLF, SRLF, or both.
- Each campus should develop criteria for deselection of microform titles held at the campus, when identical holdings are on deposit at NRLF, SRLF, or both.
- Each campus should develop criteria for when to acquire a new microform set, in consort with review of CRL holdings and with communication with UC subject Bibliographer Groups.

- Each campus should develop new or modified access and reference services for shared microform collections that are stored off-site in order to connect users with the needed resources. The RLFs are not staffed to provide reference services or higher levels of access services to our users. Campuses should be prepared to continue to provide these services for shared microform collections, wherever those collections might be stored.

Benefits (pros)

- UC will continue to acquire valuable content produced in microform-only format to extend the collective depth of our research collections.
- Campuses will continue to build local collections of distinction in select subject areas.
- UC subject Bibliographer Groups will play a key role in the collaborative development of our prospective shared UC collective collection.
- Campuses will be able to reduce their overall microform collection footprint and repurpose reclaimed space.
- Campuses may identify opportunities for format migration to an electronic version, if content is not already available via CDL Tier 1 or locally licensed access.
- By transferring microform sets to an RLF, campuses will contribute to the de facto development of a UC shared microform collection.
- Campuses may transfer unique sets collectively acquired under SCAP to an RLF.
- Campuses may identify sets at the campus – and already on deposit at an RLF -- that are no longer needed to support local research needs and designate the duplicate campus set for withdrawal.

Challenges (cons)

- NRLF and SRLF have limited capacity for incoming deposits, and potential microform deposits must be factored within the existing annual allocations.
- Several campuses sending large numbers of microforms to the RLFs in 2011 could overwhelm the RLFs' processing capacity.

Extramural partners

- CRL

Transformative Potential

Campuses will collectively contribute to the development of a UC shared distributed microform collection, held at the RLFs or in place at a campus. In this way, we will collectively maintain access to valuable content in less-preferred formats that require mediated access. We have opportunities across the system to rethink the use of library space to meet the evolving needs of our users in an increasingly networked digital environment.

Dependencies, related recommendations or initiatives

The OCLC Cloud-sourcing report provides significant space saving and annual cost avoidance estimates that could be realized at ARL libraries if a robust shared print service provision for mass-digitized books were available today.

Timeline and Activities

Early 2011 - Campuses generate lists of microform serials and monographs and identify materials that should remain on site. Campuses deaccession titles, already on deposit at an RLF, from the local collections.

Spring 2011 – Campuses factor in microform deposits when the RLFs request anticipated deposit requests. A campus microform transfer (deposit) to an RLF may be part of 1) its annual deposit allocation; 2) an exceptional deposit (i.e. subject to accessioning fees); or 3) a shared collection (which may or may not be subject to accessioning fees).

Late 2011-2012 – UC campuses, under CDC guidance and with input from the Bibliographer Groups, better coordinate communication with CRL. Identify new microform sets and recommend for acquisition through the annual CRL Purchase Proposal Program. Promote active use by ILL of the ongoing Demand Purchase Program to make the most of our collective CRL membership.

4. Call for and implement shared print proposals for monographs

We endorse the recommendation of the Shared Monographs Planning Group report (October 11, 2010) and the subsequent Charge to the Shared Print Coordinating Group (SPCG) by CDC on December 13, 2010. The SPCG will work with the UC Bibliographer Groups and track progress toward implementation of Shared Print in Place programs across the campuses.

5. Blue ribbon task force to coordinate prospective acquisition of Federal Documents

Background & Recommendation

Currently, the Ithaka group is evaluating the Federal Depository Library Program and will be making recommendations to the GPO about how to rethink its depository program operations and requirements in the digital environment. Diminishing incentives to participate in the depository program and individual library space pressures are reducing the number of willing selective and full depository libraries and putting the program and its resultant access to the government record at risk. In the UC, the NGTS 2 Collection Services Task Force made a recommendation for managing retrospective print federal documents collaboratively and in ways consistent with, though not formally included in, the Western Regional Storage Trust. The CoUL did not endorse the proposal in its offered form and instead recommended that, "Rather than pursuing independently, [or] even at the systemwide level, UC should coordinate with and through ARL" (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uls/ngts/docs/CoUL_Priorities_Cover_2010.pdf).

The SPiP Task Force recommends that the UC take a middle-ground approach and focus on collaboratively managing *prospective* print federal government documents. Specifically, the task force recommends that the Council of University Librarians charge a blue ribbon task force to

1) develop a set of principles for acquiring (or choosing not to acquire) federal documents in print form on a prospective basis. The group would be asked to evaluate whether the recently approved CDC Principles for Developing Prospective Shared Print Journal Archives are sufficient/appropriate for this purpose

2) develop an agreement to distribute responsibilities for acquiring shared print in place across the system, based on the recommended principles. The agreement should leverage existing SPIP policies, to avoid reinventing policy statements.

3) develop approaches to providing specialized reference services for print only resources

4) develop a proposal for digitization of print only resources, if needed

5) review and recommend changes to existing selective depository agreements

6) consult with ARL periodically to ensure fit between UC's plans and ARL's recommendations

The work of this group would lay the foundation for the UC in responding to the future directions the FDLP takes, following the final Ithaka report, and could help determine a set of principles to guide any future coordinated action with our collective retrospective collections. This group could leverage the work of Ithaka, should be encouraged to review the ASERL project (http://www.aserl.org/projects/gov-

doc/gov-doc-intro.htm), and the Indiana Light Archive for Federal Documents initiative (http://bl-libg-doghill.ads.iu.edu/gpd-web/fdlp/ilitweb.html), to inform its decision-making and strategic planning.

The Blue Ribbon Task Force should be a small, nimble group comprised primarily of University Librarians, Government Documents bibliographers and the CDL Shared Print Manager with the ability to consult widely. An advisory board may also be helpful, possibly consisting of the State Librarian, ARL's Associate Executive Director for Federal Relations and Information, the Superintendent of Documents, HathiTrust's Director, CDL's Director of Curation Services and representatives from Ithaka, and the ASERL or Indiana initiatives. It will be important for the Task Force to be able to seek periodic approval for components of its deliverables, to facilitate consensus building and action. While a final report would be expected at the end of the period, some of the activities outlined above are envisioned as items for approval and immediate implementation, upon approval (e.g. the principles for acquiring, distribution of responsibilities, recommendations)

Where We are Now:

- In the past 10-20 years, many proposals have been put forward within UC to rethink and restrategize the way federal documents are managed; there is significant exhaustion around the topic and very little consensus about a way forward
- Ithaka has been retained by the GPO to make recommendations about the FDLP program and will be making recommendations that deal with retrospective and prospective federal document collections.
- Government documents are highly duplicative across the system.
- Campuses are reassessing their government documents holdings and are making decisions about what and how to collect prospectively, based on local needs and profiles.
- Currently, on some campuses, selection (and retention) decisions are based on assumptions about what other campuses will or will not select (or retain) – there is no coordinated effort to prospectively select unique titles.

Where We Want to Be:

- We want to leverage the space savings offered by collaborative decision making regarding the selection of government documents.

- We want to have transparent decision-making processes and selection criteria for prospective collections.
- We want campuses to have the flexibility to rely on assured collections and allow for local concentrations for unique content needs.

Benefits

- UC Libraries will have a clear set of guidelines and roles and responsibilities informing the acquisition of prospective print federal documents.
- UC Libraries will be able to use the prospective model to help address retrospective federal documents print management and retention issues.
- UC Libraries will have clear understandings and agreements about when not to acquire print prospectively.

Challenges

- The number of print federal documents produced by the GPO is diminishing and may represent too small a sample to allow the UCs to make projections about retrospective collections.
- Because of cataloging issues related to government documents, campuses may be reluctant to move toward shared print; the non-holding campuses would have to rely on NextGen Melvyl records to access information about federal documents holdings.

Timeline

April 2011   Appoint the Blue Ribbon Task Force (CoULs)

May-September 2011   Draft the principles for acquiring. Draft an agreement to distribute responsibilities. Vett with ACGs and Advisory group.

October 2011   Seek approval for principles and distribution of responsibilities from CoULs

Nov. 2011-Jan. 2012   Develop 3, 4, 5 and seek approval for each.

Retrospective Initiatives – Preservation and Access

6. Develop cloud-sourcing partnerships and services, initially for print monographs

As many research libraries and storage facilities in North America reach their physical capacity, the community must consider options for maintaining existing collections and developing future print collections. Monographs represent the largest cost in terms of physical space and operational maintenance, and, after journals, a secondary cost in terms of ongoing collection development expenses. The scale and scope of aggregate monographic collections suggest that a community approach is needed.[1]

While digitization and digital preservation services mature, the rights environment will continue to be dynamic for the long term similar to patterns observed in other industries (e.g. music); options for print collection management can and should incorporate digitized print as one component of a larger shared physical collection. Models for collaboration should include monographs from both categories from the outset (digitized print and print only resources.) OCLC Research, Rethinking Resource Sharing, HathiTrust[2] and other communities in the profession are actively developing new frameworks for print collection management.[3] Such frameworks acknowledge that future collection management models will likely include a new landscape of stewardship dependencies and resource distribution to support the printed scholarly record at a lower overall cost to the system.

Various strategic and technical components of this new landscape are under development, including:

- Explicitly disclosed retention commitments to support informed collection management decisions among diverse partners.

- Transparent policies to ensure predictable behaviors for shared resources

---

[1] Seventy (70) million books are held in off-site shelving among research libraries. 30-50% of Harvard, UCLA, UCB or Columbia's collections are off-site with no evidence of adverse effects on scholarship or institutional reputation. Malpas, Constance. "Change in emphasis: shared print environment." Presentation at the RLG Partnership Symposium "When the Books Leave the Building", Chicago, June 2010.

[2] It should be noted that at the time of this SOPAG report, HathiTrust has developed an initial business model to broker print management. This Cloud Sourcing recommendation and the Hathi proposal are complimentary. Some thought might be needed to determine whether Hathi is the appropriate entity to handle the cloud-sourced print business models, particularly if ongoing collection development costs and print delivery costs from shared storage facilities is included. Hathi's capacity to develop technical infrastructure to support print archiving and delivery could be a real asset to the community but would require some expansion of Hathi's service scope.

[3] A recent IMLS grant-funded initiative sponsored by Lyrasis brought library directors, collection officers, shared print experts, digital repositories and funding agencies together to outline a framework for monograph collection management in the future. Attendees are currently working with scholarly associations to engage faculty on the topic. "Collaborative Retention of Print Monographs" October, 2010. [http://www.lyrasis.org/Products-and-Services/Grants-and-Special-Projects/Collaborative-Print-Monograph-Retention.aspx]

- Ongoing certification of repositories (print and digital) to ensure trust.

- New business models to redistribute resources among libraries, granting agencies, and other external sources. Such models provide the financial support to steward print materials at a lower cost.

- New, extra- or supra-consortia organizational models administer and balance the needs of a federation of diverse libraries.

Where we are now

At present, with the right leadership, we are at a critical point where cloud-sourcing relationships can be forged to support a transformation in print monograph collection management and development.

The network of research libraries can benefit from and leverage the findings of several major research initiatives in the shared print community to support significant change in this area. And UC Libraries' are in a unique position to lead such an effort. UC Libraries' recent strategic planning around 21st Century Collections and Next Generation Technical Services provide the momentum and technical expertise for such change (culturally, technically and operationally). And the presence of dedicated shared print managers/directors at CDL and the RLFs provide the leadership capability to engage other institutions and facilities in new cloud-sourcing strategies. Certainly changes in monograph collecting and collection management can benefit from further research, but the community is urged to develop solutions immediately with the information at hand. Refinements can be made over time as we learn more.

The findings of the Cloud Sourcing Research Collections report are particularly important. Some selected findings from that report and others include:
- There is adequate duplication between the shared digital repository and large-scale print storage facilities to enable a great number of academic libraries to reconsider their local print management operations.[4]
- The combination of a relatively small number of potential shared print providers could achieve more than 70% coverage of the digitized book collection, suggesting that shared service may not require a very large network of providers.[5]
- Substantial capital and operational costs could be avoided if academic institutions outsourced management of duplicate print inventory to shared service providers[6] and sought delivery services that could adjust as distribution rights for digital surrogates become available.
- Academic library directors can have a positive and profound impact on the future of academic print collections by adopting and implementing a deliberate strategy to build and sustain regional print service centers that can reduce the total cost of library preservation and access.[7]

---

[4] Malpas, Constance. "Cloud-Sourcing Research Collections: Managing Print in the Mass-Digitized Library Environment." Research Report. OCLC Research, January 2011.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.

- Retention commitments and explicit disclosure of retention commitments in OCLC are an essential precursor for network-level transformation of library print collections. Such commitments must be expressed for a large body of content, with a reasonable number of copies in the network, to facilitate the pace and scale of change needed systemwide.[8]
- Existing and forthcoming research on optimal print copies to ensure preservation provide a framework for modeling risks for print journal preservation;[9] the relative "thinness" of print monograph holdings present some limits to the application of such modeling.
- The lowest cost option for storing and managing print books is the high density storage facility.[10] While circulation costs may increase as books are stored, such costs remain a small fraction of the total cost to store and can be addressed in a well-designed business and collections model. Furthermore, as storage facilities reach capacity and shift services internally, it is likely demands from the cloud can be satisfied and made sustainable with some minor adjustments.
- Existing shared print trust networks, which have been built largely around print journal backfiles (e.g. for WEST, PALCI, ASERL), have been able to avoid the development of enhanced access services, particularly physical delivery services, based on usage assumptions and service expectations that may not hold true for shared monographic collections.[11]
- Current user preferences for unmediated physical delivery of library materials and current explorations in the resource sharing community may suggest that a cloud-sourced service could include a very different relationship among storage facilities, client libraries and their users; it might be very useful to consider direct delivery services via the US Postal Service when digital surrogates are not available.
- Initial usage data for current imprints deposited to SRLF suggest that the RLFs may be able to sustain increased access demand. Further experimentation may be needed.

Within UC, several major initiatives have positioned the libraries to take a leadership role in developing a cloud-sourced collection service. They include:

- The SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force, particularly the action memoranda regarding Management of Existing Print Collections and Managing Collection Growth.[12]
- CDC's white paper "The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond"[13]

---

[8] Retention commitments disclosed in OCLC are a key component of the Western Regional Storage Trust and shared print initiatives.

[9] Yano, Candace et. al. "Optimizing the number of copies for print preservation of research journals." October, 2008.

[10] Courant, Paul and Buzzy Nielson. "On the cost of keeping a book." Chapter in The Idea of Order: Transforming Research Collections for 21st Century Scholarship. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources, June 2010. [http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub147/pub147.pdf]

[11] It should be noted that at the recent IMLS/Lyrasis workshop "Collaborative Retention of Print Monographs" there was little interest in principle in developing new forms of access services to support a new framework for print monograph management. Further exploration and strategic planning may be needed to assess whether transformation in monograph management can be achieved without also offering enhanced delivery services.

[12] Systemwide Library Planning Task Force. Action Memorandum 1: Management of Existing Print Collections. Draft Version 4. 1/18/11 and Action Memorandum 2: Managing Collection Growth. Draft version 6, 1/31/11. Available at [http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/taskforce/].

[13] UC Libraries' Collection Development Committee. "The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond." August, 2009. [http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/cdc/uc_collection_concept_paper_endorsed_ULs_2009.08.13.pdf]

- Next Generation Technical Service recommendations for systemwide collection service staff/expertise, activities, and centers.[14]
- The RLF Board and CDL Shared Print, both fairly unique roles in the library community, could serve as leadership group to cultivate relationships with other facilities.

Where we want to be

- Research libraries want to be able to manage existing print collections, particularly monographic collections, at the lowest possible cost and in ways that ensure preservation of the scholarly record but allow for a reduction in aggregate inventory.
- Research libraries want to be able to quickly deliver monographic content to the end user at any research library, in the format that can be most readily delivered in a dynamic rights environment.
- Research libraries want to federate a small number of shared stores to provision a broader number of research libraries and their users, given an appropriate business model.
- Research libraries want to leverage digital repositories to provide e-books, whenever rights permit delivery in that form. When rights do not permit or a digital version is not yet available, the libraries want to deliver shared print from the federated storage facilities.
- Research libraries want to eventually include shared print in place collections into the service structure initially developed for the federated storage facilities.
- Some research libraries want to depend upon (and support) collections that are held and managed elsewhere (e.g. "clients")
- Some research libraries want to continue to steward the scholarly record in print form (e.g. "contributing" libraries)
- A handful of storage facilities hold sufficient copies to satisfy the aggregate demand of a broader constituency of libraries (e.g. potential initial cloud-sourced collection "providers")
- The network of libraries want to be in a position to house fewer copies of print monographs but provide access to users when needed; users are increasingly less interested in the physical location of materials and more interested in the ability to delivery directly to their place of work or study in a timely manner and in the format that the library can currently deliver (in print or electronic form, rights permitting).

Recommendation

The task force recommends that UC Libraries lead an effort to develop a cloud-sourced monograph collection service. The recommendation is to engage the RLF Board, CDL Shared Print and an initial select group of shared storage facilities and "client" libraries in a strategic planning effort to define the scope of services and collections that would be included in the cloud and a business model to sustain

---

[14] Next Generation Technical Services' Enterprise Level Collection Management Services Task Force. Final report, revised and corrected, September 22, 2010. [http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/uls/ngts/docs/NGTS2_Enterprise_CS_Final_Report.pdf]

them. The "service(s)" might include collection services, access services, technical infrastructure and administrative support.

The planning phase would lead to a pilot implementation of cloud-sourced collections. If the pilot is deemed successful, the service would shift into a production phase and include more partners.

- Strategic Planning (9 months)

- Pilot Implementation (2 years)

- Production Implementation (2 years)

Strategic planning (9 months). Cultivate relationships with 4-5 storage facilities and their administrative bodies (specific libraries, consortia or governing boards) and 10-15 client libraries. Outline a vision for the print collections and services, define local and collective goals, describe the scope of collections offered, and service expectations. Estimate costs and identify sources of cost recovery. Define a business model to meet market demands for cloud-sourced print resources. Develop a governance structure; consider options for authorizing storage facility administrators to make some level of decisions.

> ### *Creating a vision print resources in a long-tail environment*
>
> During this phase, planning participants would outline a future vision for aggregated shared print repository holdings. The vision might include a position statement about the anticipated future value and use of the shared "store" in an environment of declining inventory and increasing discovery. The vision might clearly articulate whether stored monographic collections are envisioned as "perpetual low use" collections and/or the extent to which the service design could increase collection use for the benefit of users. Participants would consider whether increased use of the long tail would be viewed as a positive outcome. It will be important during the planning phase for partners to address these strategic questions (not as an academic exercise but with a goal of outlining a vision for the cloud service based on evidence).
>
> Users today expect unmediated delivery of content to their place of work or study, in whatever format is available and deliverable in the moment. To what extent can a smaller number of federated storage facilities in collaboration with large digital stores like HathiTrust deliver either format (print or electronic) in a dynamic rights environment to users of many research libraries? What business model is needed to sustain the ongoing development of the cloud collections and the delivery services? To what extent are users and other non-libraries willing/able to contribute to such a service?
>
> ### *Identify Collections and Estimate Network-Effects of the Cloud on Collection Management*
>
> Informed by the vision, planning participants would identify collections at a high level and estimate the likely effects a cloud-sourced collection service would have in the network of research libraries. This information gathering would support the development of an appropriate business and operational model:

- Identify cloud collections using broad selection parameters. The task force recommends including 1) digitized print monographs in Hathi and in storage and 2) non-digitized print monographs in storage. These two categories, with some refinement, would include print materials from all copyright dates/statuses. Later the service can expand to include shared print in place (i.e. held in full-service libraries.)
- Estimate changes in inventory across the network based on the existence of cloud-sourced collections
- Estimate passive and active future demand for cloud-sourced print resources as print inventories decline and discovery increases (passive demand) and as direct delivery services are included (active demand)
- Project future demand as digital distribution rights can be exercised (a rolling wall projection, passive demand).

Define Services and a Sustainable Business Model

- Explore service expectations with client libraries, placing emphasis on those services that provide longer-term value for many research libraries and that ensure the breadth of the aggregate collections
- Define the scope of services with client libraries (e.g. retention commitments, explicit/distinct disclosure of shared resources in OCLC, collection-development-for-the-cloud, and enhanced direct-delivery options for print in the absence of digital surrogates.)
- Develop a sustainable business model. Identify components of the service that require startup funding, those that can be contributed in kind and those that require ongoing funds and estimate costs and price points. Explore potential sources of funding and cost recovery (e.g. foundations, client libraries, library users).

  Consider a Netflix Model via courier service or USPS
  The task force recommends exploring a model like Netflix to deliver cloud-sourced monographs directly to users at diverse institutions via the US Postal Service (or other courier service to-be-researched), particularly when digital surrogates are not yet available in full-text.
  - Consider recovering some collections and delivery costs from users in exchange for direct delivery via mail carrier (a Netflix model via courier/USPS).
  - What scope of collections and enhanced access/delivery service would users find valuable and be willing to support in a cloud-sourcing arrangement?

Pilot Implementation (2 years). Implement the business model; develop and implement baseline services as well as administrative structure and culture for the cloud. Cultivate external funding and outsourcing arrangements for services. Define measures of success for the pilot phase.

Production Implementation (2 years). Cultivate additional library and storage facility partners. Define annual measures of success to ensure sustainability and continued development of the cloud-sourced collection service. Incorporate shared print in place collections and define service expectations for collections held outside of storage facilities.

Benefits

- Can provide the most significant opportunity for the reallocation of library space in the network of research libraries.[15]

- Ensures the ongoing stewardship of print monographs at the lowest possible cost to the network of research libraries.

- Can ensure and distribute responsibility for the ongoing development and breadth of print monograph collections if prospective collections are included.

- Secures resources for the ongoing support for shared print repositories from the network of libraries, external funding agencies and, potentially, from users or the broader academic enterprise.

Challenges

A cloud-source service and its members would likely face many cultural, political, and technical challenges. The initial phases of development would require substantial leadership to incubate the cloud.

Cultural and Political

- Justifying support for stewardship from afar (client libraries)
- Justifying contribution of content to the cloud and potential increased demand (providers)
- Monographs perceived as the core of a library, new models can be threatening
- Perception of empty shelves (deselecting libraries)
- Storage facilities are differently managed; facility directors may not have sufficient authority to engage their operation effectively in the cloud
- If current imprints are included, space in the storage facilities would need to be prioritized for that

Technical and Infrastructural

- Currently unaffiliated storage facilities (and their parent institutions), would need to develop collaborative operational capacity and policies to provide seamless service to the cloud
- Libraries may require technical/logistical support from other industries to develop direct delivery services and an appropriate business model

---

[15] In the Cloud-sourcing experiment, a single client institution (NYU) pared with a single print repository could potentially reclaim about 13,000 linear feet or the equivalent of about 200,000 volumes (p. 52) but a more significant opportunity could be achieved by entering into a partnership with multiple facilities.

Extramural Partners

Initial storage facilities might include UC's SRLF+NRLF, University of Florida, PASCAL, 5 Colleges of Massachusetts, WRLC and RECAP, possibly the Library of Congress. The planning group would include administrators responsible for the collections in them.

Initial client partners might be found through various existing and emerging trust networks including the Western Regional Storage Trust.

Funding agencies might include Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and CLIR.

Experts who might assist in an advisory capacity or more active role could be drawn from industry, the academic library community and the public library community. In particular, technology, market research and service design advisors might be found in Netflix, the US Postal Service, OCLC, HathiTrust and Portico.

Transformative Potential

A cloud-sourced collection service has the potential to be extremely transformative. The extent to which traditional and some very non-traditional library services are included in its design will determine how transformative the "cloud" can be. For example:

1. At a minimum, if the service includes some basic components (i.e. retention commitments, collection analysis services, an administrative structure for the cloud and a business model to sustain the retention commitments and analyses), it would profoundly change the way legacy collections are managed. This, in itself, would be a meritorious and transformative endeavor.
2. If deposits to storage of current monographic imprints are also included in the cloud sourced collections, prospective collection development could be radically altered. Research libraries would begin to develop collections-for-the-cloud with significantly reduced duplication and new incentives to maintain or increase the breadth of aggregate collections. The cloud would be much more attuned to aggregate demand in the research community and would make adjustments for optimal copies quite readily.
3. If direct delivery to users via the USPS (or courier service) and a platform to allow users to choose analog or digital delivery when a surrogate is available were also included, the cloud sourced collections would radically increase usage of long tail collections and transform resource sharing networks. Such a service is likely to be very popular and would allay fears of "disintermediation".

The task force recommends the incorporation of as many components as possible from the outset in order to appropriately calibrate and distribute costs.

Dependencies, related recommendations or initiatives

While this recommendation is not directly dependent on any others, it would be significantly advanced by the successful adoption of the **shared print policies** in this report as well as the recommendation to

disclose digitized print resources as shared print (thereby creating a substantial initial collection for the cloud service.)

Timeline and Activities

February 2011	SOPAG refer this recommendation to the convener of the RLF Board and Council of University Librarians for consideration
March –August 2011	Prepare a grant proposal for the Strategic Planning Phase. Identify a Principle Investigator. (PI, RLF Board, CDL Shared Print, and others, as appropriate)
September 2011-June 2012	Strategic Planning Phase for Cloud Sourced Collection Service
2012-2014	Pilot Implementation Phase
2015-2017	Production Implementation Phase

7. Campuses adopt practices of contributing holdings when called for by WEST or JSTOR

The Task Force recommends that campuses establish and adopt guidelines related to contributing to the JSTOR and the WEST archives, making contribution the default behavior. Criteria for abstaining from contribution should be devised and must justify the costs accrued if Shared Print/WEST needs to seek outside contributors. Campus contribution rejections should be shared with campus Collections AULs.

Where We Are Now

- Overall, UC Libraries are excellent contributors to the JSTOR archive.
- It is unclear how many of the digitized JSTOR titles are still being housed in campus physical collections.
- Campuses have unique operating structures that determine what to contribute to the JSTOR archive.
- We are contractually obligated to identify and fill holdings gaps for JSTOR. Costs of fulfilling our JSTOR responsibilities rise exponentially when a JSTOR request for a UC-held title is rejected by the campuses. The same will be true for WEST.
- It is unclear if locally-held JSTOR titles are being used consistently enough to justify holding onto print.
- There is increasing evidence that the RLFs can handle any anticipated increased borrowing activity for shared print titles.*

Where we want to be

- We want to have the lowest costs possible for construction and maintenance of our print archives.
- We want to ensure that the scholarly record is preserved and that access to the scholarly record is maintained.

- We want campuses to adopt a practice of reviewing the gaps list for the UC JSTOR Shared Print archive and offering to fill the gaps. UC is contractually obliged to fill the gaps, whether from UC campus holdings or elsewhere. Costs can be kept low if holdings are supplied from UC.
  http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/jstor/default.aspx

*JSTOR Ireland Collection – 50 journal titles, print only, deposited in JSTOR, 16 ILL requests were made from 3 journal titles in one year, all were filled. And, special accommodations were made to meet a campus reserve request.

Benefits

- Consistent contribution to JSTOR and concurrent divestment of print duplicates held locally, frees up space for shared print in place commitments for WEST and shared monograph retention commitments for the UC system.
- The archive is assured and the space issues are more consistently managed.
- Contributing UC copies to WEST and JSTOR ensure that UCs holdings will be archived and maintained.
- See recommendation #11 for ASF estimates : 88,000 ASF over 5 years if 8,000 journal families are ingested.
- Default contribution ensures that we are constructing and contributing to both print archives at the lowest possible cost.

Challenges

- Some campuses may be more willing to contribute to JSTOR than for WEST Bronze Archive titles because the benefit of space reclamation may be a stronger incentive than committing to store titles locally (in place) for WEST
- Conversely, some campuses may be more willing to contribute for WEST Bronze Archive titles if the desire to retain titles locally (in place) outweighs the need for space reclamation.
- Campuses may be unwilling to send WEST Gold and Silver Archive titles to the RLFs because the desire to keep copies immediately available on campus may be strong.

Extramural partners

- WEST partners
- JSTOR

Dependencies, related recommendations or initiatives

- Recommendation 9 "Deselect duplicate JSTOR print journal holdings systemwide"
- Recommendation 11 "Deselect duplicate print journal backfiles for Bronze Archives in the Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)"

8. Encourage libraries to disclose print resources that were/are mass digitized as shared print

Where we are now

- Research libraries are actively engaged in developing new frameworks for print monograph collection management; digitized print is recognized as an easy starting place for network level action. [16]
- Monographs are well represented in digitized print collections
- Digitized print collections represent a rich resource that UC and other research libraries want to sustain at a lower aggregate cost but currently have no mechanism (business model) to do so
- UC Libraries have not yet formulated a strategic position in the network of research libraries for digitized print
- Digitized print publications are not technically identified in ways that would facilitate their ready contribution to network-level partnerships (i.e. they are not transparently disclosed as shared resources with explicit retention commitments and collection management behaviors)
- Many research libraries have demonstrated a willingness to support shared print collections as a lower cost alternative to local collection development and management
- The rights environment for distribution of digital surrogates is dynamic; agile service models are needed to distribute one format or the other as rights change from year to year
- UC campuses originally involved in mass digitization may not have kept the print originals or may not wish to keep the originals

Where we want to be

- UC Libraries want to collectively manage print resources at the lowest possible cost
- UC Libraries want to create synergies between print collection management and digitization
- UC Libraries want to develop network-level partnerships around digitized print;
- UC Libraries want to be strategically positioned as providers and stewards of print and digital publications to a broader network of libraries and to receive compensation for such roles
- UC Libraries and CDL Shared Print want (need) to be able to "offer" certain identified print collections to network-level partnerships; digitized print collections represent ready collections for such purposes
- UC Libraries want a systemwide approach to identify and disclose retention commitments and seek to use simple selection methods and existing disclosure capabilities as much as possible

---

[16] See Lyrasis/IMLS sponsored planning workshop on the Collaborative Retention of Print Monographs [http://www.lyrasis.org/Products-and-Services/Grants-and-Special-Projects/Collaborative-Print-Monograph-Retention.aspx]. This SOPAG recommendation is consonant with workshop outcomes and compliments options currently being considered by the Hathi Trust Collections Committee.

Recommendation

Encourage libraries to disclose print resources that were/are mass digitized (large-scale digitized at libraries or RLFs) as shared print. Digitized print resources include monographs, journals and other print materials that were and/or continue to be digitized by the Google, Microsoft and Internet Archive projects. Special collections and other restricted materials are excluded from this recommendation. The goal would be to quickly identify and disclose a large body of print resources as shared resources in order to 1) strategically (and technically) prepare UC Libraries to contribute to extramural partnerships such as "cloud" partnerships, 2) ensure a retention commitment among UC Libraries and 3) facilitate collection management decisions about duplicates among UC Libraries.

This recommendation is a prerequisite to other recommendations (see dependencies section.)

Identification of shared print items

The task force recommends a flexible approach to identify a print copy in the system for each scanned item, beginning with RLF holdings and extending to campus holdings when RLF holdings are not available:

1) Designate a print copy in one of the RLFs. If an RLF copy is not available or not contributed,
2) Designate the print copy that was originally digitized at a campus as shared print (shared print in place). If the digitizing campus no longer holds or does not wish to contribute its copy,
3) Designate a copy at another campus. If no copies available,
4) Record missing print such that other extramural partners can make informed retention commitments

Selection process

The task force acknowledges that UC institutions involved in large scale digitization may or may not wish to retain the print originals.

To facilitate the routine identification and disclosure of digitized print, the task force recommends a simple selection process that would allow campuses to identify broad categories of materials that are planned for digitization (or have been digitized) as eligible for designation as shared print. The shared resources would be identified and disclosed in batch using semi-automated processes guided by campus preferences.

Policies and Behaviors

The print resources would be subject to the Shared Print in Place Policy if held on campus and the Persistence Policy if held in an RLF. The resources would be disclosed according to the Bibliographic Standards for Shared Print which includes disclosure in OCLC.

Example

A campus involved in digitization could indicate a willingness to retain print items that are digitized in the "Ls" (Education). Such resources would be disclosed in OCLC as shared print either retroactively (for items already digitized) or proactively (for items scheduled for digitization) and could be contributed to (and sustained by) extramural partnerships.

Benefits

Strategic Benefits

- Facilitates a systemwide approach to print collection management by strategically aligning mass digitization, shared print and campus collection decisions
- Creates a ready collection for contribution to extramural partnerships
- Rapidly prepares UC libraries and storage facilities to serve as *providers* and stewards of the scholarly record in cloud sourcing arrangements and to receive the benefits of such roles (i.e., compensation)
- Includes a broad, multi-disciplinary collection
- Positions UC's collections as a readily identifiable source for redigitization when needed

Space Benefits

- For every 1 million items declared as shared print, approximately 143,000-285,000 assignable square feet can be reallocated systemwide – or the equivalent of one information commons per campus. (assumes an average of 2-3 copies held systemwide and 7 volumes per ASF)

Challenges

- While digitized print is a likely first set of content to cultivate extramural partnerships, partners may derive more value from and want to see a broader suite of collections offered in the mid-to-long term. Sustainable business models would need to meet market needs for the mid-to-long term.
- Usage will need to be monitored as print inventory declines and digital access rights evolve.
- The rate of space reclamation is dependent on the rate of campus deselection of duplicates; monographs are more costly to deselect than journals.

Extramural partners

- This recommendation has the highest potential to cultivate extramural partners.
- Potential partners include small to mid-sized libraries that seek to depend on print collections held elsewhere.
- The Western Regional Storage Trust and/or a Cloud-Sourcing partnership might serve as organizing entities

Transformative potential

- Provides the greatest systemwide opportunity for reallocation of library and storage space in non-journal areas of the collections
- Creates a systemwide approach to collection management by aligning mass digitization and shared print
- Ensures systemwide stewardship of the print at the lowest possible cost (in storage, when available, and at campuses, when not in storage)
- Strategically positions UC as a provider of content in the research library community
- Greatest potential to cultivate extramural partners around print collections

Dependencies, Related Recommendations or Initiatives

This recommendation is dependent upon the adoption of the ***Shared Print in Place Policy, Common Access Policy, Bibliographic Service Standards for Shared Print***.

This recommendation is a prerequisite to the recommendation for ***cloud-sourcing partnerships and services;*** digitized print collections would be the initial collections contributed to the cloud.

Timeline and Activities (UC)

2011   Pilot project to identify 500,000 digitized print resources, disclose shared print commitments in batch, and provide reports to all campuses. Participants: selected digitizing campuses, RLFs, CDL Shared Print, Mass Digitization, Discovery and Delivery, and OCLC.

2012   Expand pilot to additional UC digitized print collections. Align the planning process for mass digitization and shared print disclosure.

2012   Campuses develop deselection strategies for duplicates.

Timeline and Activities (Extramurals and Grant Agencies)

2011   Planning grant to develop extramural partnership. Outline service expectations and develop a sustainable business model. Consider expanding on the WEST model. Participants: selected digitizing campuses, RLFs, CDL Shared Print, and selected WEST members.

2012   If the planning phase is successful, develop an implementation grant proposal.

Retrospective Initiatives – Deselection

9. Deselect Duplicate JSTOR Print Holdings Systemwide

The Task Force recommends that all campuses deselect duplicate JSTOR print holdings. Campuses can identify JSTOR available content and title coverage through the JSTOR web site. New titles are regularly added.

Campuses may identify duplicate volumes that should be *intentionally* retained *in order to support current local research needs.* The remaining volumes will be withdrawn according to established local policy.

Campuses are asked to keep statistics deselected based on the presence of JSTOR archives.

Benefits

- The JSTOR archive is a time-tested and well-assured successful archive; validation of titles is transparent.
- Portico has emerged as a trustworthy back-up system to the JSTOR archive and concerns about loss of access have decreased.
- WEST is working to ensure that any existing gaps in JSTOR are filled.
- Space savings on local campuses could be considerable and will make room for anticipated WEST Bronze archive commitments as well as any shared monograph commitments.

Challenges

- Campuses that have elected to retain JSTOR print holdings may continue to do so to meet actual or perceived local need.
- Campuses may not have the resources to deselect JSTOR print holdings (staffing shortages, etc.), or, may not view it as a priority.

Timeline and Activities

Begin withdrawing immediately.

Consult the gaps/wish list on the UC JSTOR Shared Print website and supply any missing holdings. [http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/jstor/default.aspx]

10. Campuses deselect print monographs held at campuses that are also housed at NRLF, SRLF, or both

Where we are now

Retrospective print resources are widely duplicated across the campuses and weeding activity at individual libraries is sporadic or inconsistent. Campus libraries are reaching capacity. The SOPAG Task Force on UC Collections Space Planning Report states that NRLF anticipates being full by November 2015, at current deposit rates, and that SRLF's space for standard print volumes will reach capacity by November 2011. On June 17, 2010, the University Librarians mandated a 36% campus reduction of RLF deposits and instituted a non-duplication policy for RLF deposits, effective immediately. While these measures will postpone the inevitable fill dates, it is evident that the current use of space is unsustainable.

Where we want to be

Campuses will have reduced their overall collections footprint of retrospective print holdings and make increased use of collective resources housed at the RLFs. Any remaining duplicated print holdings will be *intentionally* duplicated to support local research needs. Library collection space will be used more strategically to accommodate Shared Print in Place. Campus collection managers and selectors will take great pride in developing and curating our collective shared print in place collections and in identifying new frameworks for future collaboration.

Recommendations

- Each University Librarian, in consultation with the local CDC representative should establish a target percentage figure for the overall reduction of the print collections housed in various campus locations.
- CDL Shared Print Manager will obtain from OCLC lists of print volumes located at NRLF and SRLF, with OCLC numbers, and distribute to the campuses. The lists will be a "snapshot" of the RLF holdings at the time they are generated.
- Each campus will run their holdings of monographs that are held at the RLF, using the OCLC numbers as match points, and using the system tool to divide them by publication type as single-volume monographs, multi-volume monographs, and serials.
- Campuses may identify volumes that should be *intentionally* retained in order to support current local research needs. The remaining volumes will be withdrawn according to established local policy.
- Each campus may choose the date criteria for generating the lists, e.g. those with a publication date prior to 1980. Campuses may generate additional lists, if the volume counts fall below the established target.

Benefits (pros)

- Significant reduction of unintended duplicated print at the campus level
- Significant space gains that can accommodate future campus identified Shared Print in Place commitments.
- Significant space gains that may be repurposed for other uses.
- Significant cost avoidance in maintaining large on site print collections and which could be redirected to other purposes. Courant and Nielsen estimate the cost of maintaining a book in open stacks is $4.26 per year compared with $0.86 in a high density facility.

Challenges (cons)

- A clear and consistent message should be conveyed across the system to all internal librarians and staff about the dire impending space crisis.
- A clear and consistent message should be communicated across the system to our external users, especially faculty, to inform them of the gravity of the space situation. They should be reassured that they will continue to have access to print resources, regardless of where they are located.
- The UC libraries must convey a consistent and positive message that we are partners in the collaborative education enterprise and are actively pursuing our responsibility as stewards of UC assets, collections and space.

Timeline and Activities

Early 2011 -- CDL Shared Print Manager will obtain from OCLC a list of print volumes located at NRLF and SRLF, with OCLC numbers, and distribute to the campuses.

Summer 2011 – Campuses run local holdings of RLF duplicates for review and identification of essential titles to retain onsite, *intentionally* duplicated.

2012 – Campuses begin withdrawal of RLF duplicates according to established local policy.

11. Deselect print journal backfiles for Bronze Archives declared by WEST partners

Where we are now

- Some campuses need to rapidly divest physical holdings for building closures or renovations
- UC Libraries hold significant duplicate print copies of print journal backfiles for titles that are also available in e-journal packages and for which the publishers deposit journal content in Portico or CLOCKSS; such titles are generally considered at very low risk
- WEST plans to disclose print archives for most titles deposited in Portico or CLOCKSS in the first year (2011) to support institutions that need to rapidly divest of significant quantities of print
- UC Libraries tend to hold significant segments of each print run (for titles in Portico and CLOCKSS) in campus libraries (highest cost) while smaller portions may be held in the RLFs (lowest cost)
- CDC is working with PAG (and indirectly, CRL) to develop methodologies for routinely verifying deposited content and ensuring trust in third party digital preservation services (e.g. Portico)
- Campuses are deselecting print journal backfiles without retention guarantees (for campus holdings,) without transparent expression of retention guarantees (through disclosure), and without assurance of completeness of runs (in storage or held at campuses)

Where we want to be

- UC Libraries want to be able to divest of duplicate copies of print journal backfiles particularly for low risk titles such as those acquired and preserved digitally.
- UC Libraries want to use precious remaining storage (and library) space for higher risk titles
- UC Libraries are willing to depend on the archiving commitments of others in WEST in order to shift efforts to higher risk materials
- For low risk print journals, such as those also held digitally and deposited in Portico/CLOCKSS, UC Libraries want to leverage the WEST model to preserve the scholarly record and optimize campus and storage space
- Some UC Libraries need the ability to identify a large portion of their print collections that can be reasonably and safely deselected

Recommendation

The task force recommends that campuses and storage facilities deselect print journal backfiles for Bronze Archives as they are disclosed in OCLC. Specific campuses undergoing building closures or renovations are encouraged to deselect print holdings in this area first; the Bronze Archive Type is designed to support such needs. The Persistence Policy may need to be revised such that RLFs can deselect duplicates held elsewhere.

The Western Regional Storage Trust is a retrospective print journal repository service; responsibility for building and maintaining archives is distributed among participating members of the Trust. The WEST collections model incorporates risk management principles into the selection criteria for titles. The model provides a mechanism to balance the amount of effort spent on building archives: more effort is placed on higher risk titles, less effort on lower risk titles.

There are two title categories in WEST that have been aligned with the Bronze Archive Type:

1. Print titles available in publisher ejournal packages and digitally preserved (selected Portico and CLOCKSS titles)
2. Print titles available in publisher ejournal packages without digital preservation

Within each of these categories, titles are further selected based on their print duplication in the region. Unique(ish) titles are not included.

These categories of titles are generally at lower risk for loss of access or loss of content as libraries divest of print. Consequently, the print is candidate for minimal archiving effort. Bronze Archives are not validated for completeness or condition.

Furthermore, the archives for these titles may reside partially in a full service library and partially in a storage facility. Volumes are not necessarily moved to storage. Archive Holders (libraries or storage facilities) do have to meet minimum environmental conditions to serve in this role.

UC Libraries that serve as Archive Holders would disclose print volumes as Shared Print in Place and indicate the volumes are contributed to WEST. RLFs would disclose print volumes as shared print and similarly indicate the volumes are contributed to WEST.

It is possible and very likely that a disclosed archive will have gaps. Archive Holders simply disclose existing holdings in OCLC (local holdings records will be created).

WEST members are encouraged to review disclosed holdings and make informed decisions based on the information available. The Archive Holder may receive print volumes (at its discretion, as gifts) from other WEST members.

UC Libraries (and RLFs) are similarly encouraged to deselect duplicate holdings (and/or offer to fill in gaps).

ULs may need to review and revise the Persistence Policy to allow RLFs to

1. *deselect print holdings based on archives held elsewhere in WEST*
2. *deselect duplicate WEST print holdings in the RLFs*

WEST's archiving cycles typically run from March to April of the following year. The first archive cycle will begin March 2011 and end March 2012. Bronze Archives may be disclosed earlier in the cycle than other Archive Types.

While not a WEST requirement, member libraries are also encouraged to keep statistics of titles and volumes deselected based on the presence of a shared archive. WEST's Operations and Collections Council may issue some guidelines on this in the future; members are encouraged to follow existing guidelines for shared resources issued by statistical agencies (e.g. ARL).

Benefits

WEST plans to ingest approximately 8,000 journal families (275,000 print journal volumes) in a 5 year period creating the opportunity to recover the space occupied by potentially millions of duplicate volumes in the region. One-third of those volumes are Bronze Archives.

- An initial collection analysis for 13 WEST planning libraries indicated that by archiving approximately 300,000 volumes, participants could deselect 1 million duplicate volumes occupying approximately 88,000 assignable square feet. Many more libraries will participate in the implementation phase for WEST, so these figures can be consider minimums.

- In the context of UC, UC Libraries involved in the planning phase expect to archive approximately 150,000 volumes, making it possible to deselect more than 400,000 duplicate volumes in UC planning libraries, occupying approximately 38,000 assignable square feet. It is likely that more copies exist in the 10 campus libraries providing significantly greater opportunities for space reclamation, thereby extending the life of both the RLFs and existing library facilities.
- UC Libraries will contribute approximately $100,000 in annual membership fees and the RLFs will receive compensation from WEST members for archive creation services (approximately $600,000), providing a net benefit to UCs of more than $500,000.

12. Campuses and storage facilities adopt an annual practice of deselecting print Silver and Gold journal backfiles as they are declared and disclosed in WEST

Where we are now

- Campuses are deselecting print journal backfiles without retention guarantees (for campus holdings,) without transparent expression of retention guarantees (through disclosure), and without assurance of completeness of runs (in storage or held at campuses)
- Campuses are deselecting certain print journal backfiles and storing other backfiles absent coordination of optimal copies at the network level; lack of coordination may result in more stored copies than are necessary in the research library community, using precious remaining storage space; lack of coordination may also result in inadvertent loss of content or access to content within the region.
- UC Libraries have a very successful model for compiling print backfiles (UC JSTOR Shared Print project); the model can be affordably extended to handle many more titles, with modification to the validation level

Where we want to be

- UC Libraries want to leverage the WEST model to preserve the scholarly record and optimize campus and storage space
  - WEST has adopted a model for higher risk titles that incorporates many operational aspects of the UC JSTOR Shared Print model to ensure that a near complete backfile is verified (at a lower level), archived and disclosed in OCLC.
  - The WEST model includes retention guarantees, explicit disclosure of retention guarantees that are visible to the network, and validation of holdings for completeness, and in some cases, for condition.
  - WEST has adopted a collections model that incorporates aspects of the Optimal Copies framework; by participating in WEST, UC Libraries can contribute to and benefit from an emerging network of optimal copies when making collection management decisions.
- UC Libraries want to make informed collection management decisions on a routine basis for print journal backfiles ("Trust the trust")

Recommendation

The task force recommends that campuses and storage facilities adopt an annual practice of deselecting print journal backfiles for Silver and Gold Archives as they are declared and disclosed by WEST Archive Builders.

The Western Regional Storage Trust is a retrospective print journal repository service; responsibility for building and maintaining archives is distributed among participating members of the Trust. The WEST collections model incorporates risk management principles into the selection criteria for titles. The model provides a mechanism to balance the amount of effort spent on building archives: more effort is placed on higher risk titles, less effort on lower risk titles.

Particular members in the Trust (Archive Builders) are identified each year and agree to build archives for higher risk titles (Silver and Gold Archives) according to specific validation standards. Archive Builders proactively call for, validate, disclose and archive print holdings for a specific set of titles within a one year period (within a "validation cycle.) Once the validation cycle is complete and gaps have been filled to the extent possible, the archive and gaps are explicitly disclosed in OCLC using special Institution Symbols, Holdings Location Codes and 583 field entries. Several institutions are currently involved in a pilot project with OCLC to test methods for disclosing archiving commitments in WorldCat. The pilot will complete in June 2011, after which guidelines will be developed for disclosing WEST archives in WorldCat.

WEST members are encouraged to review their duplicate holdings each year and the disclosures in OCLC to make collection management decisions. UC Libraries and RLFs are encouraged to deselect duplicate print holdings (and offer any gaps to the WEST Archive Builder). UC's RLFs will serve as Archive Builders for certain titles. In the event that a UC Library holds volumes that are missing in a non-UC Archive Builder's run, the library is encouraged to contribute the missing volumes to the Archive Builder via a deselection/gift process.

WEST's archiving cycles typically run from March to April of the following year. The first archive cycle will begin March 2011 and end March 2012. Once the archives are disclosed in late Winter 2011/early Spring 2012, UC Libraries are encouraged to deselect duplicates. UC Libraries are encouraged to adopt a routine practice each year of reviewing disclosures and deselecting.

While not a WEST requirement, member libraries are also encouraged to keep statistics of titles and volumes deselected based on the presence of a shared archive. WEST's Operations and Collections Council may issue some guidelines on this in the future; members are encouraged to follow existing guidelines for shared resources issued by statistical agencies (e.g. ARL).

Benefits

WEST plans to ingest approximately 8,000 journal families (275,000 print journal volumes) in a 5 year period creating the opportunity to recover the space occupied by potentially millions of duplicate volumes in the region. Two thirds of those volumes will be archived at the Silver or Gold level.

- An initial collection analysis for 13 WEST planning libraries indicated that by archiving approximately 300,000 volumes, participants could deselect 1 million duplicate volumes occupying approximately 88,000 assignable square feet. Many more libraries will participate in the implementation phase for WEST, so these figures can be considered minimums.
- In the context of UC, UC Libraries involved in the planning phase expect to archive approximately 150,000 volumes, making it possible to deselect more than 400,000 duplicate volumes in UC planning libraries, occupying approximately 38,000 assignable square feet. It is likely that more copies exist in the 10 campus libraries providing significantly greater opportunities for space reclamation, thereby extending the life of both the RLFs and existing library facilities.
- UC Libraries will contribute approximately $100,000 in annual membership fees and the RLFs will receive compensation from WEST members for archive creation services (approximately $600,000), providing a net benefit to UCs of more than $500,000.

Table 1: Summary of WEST Archiving and Space Reclamation (13 WEST Planning Institutions)

Title Category	Estimated Years Published and Held in WEST	Estimated Volumes in WEST	# Volumes to Include In WEST Archive	# WEST Volumes to Deselect	Estimated Library and Storage Space Reclamation (ASF)
1- Digitally Preserved (Portico, Clockss) (Bronze)	697,199	611,578	117,718	493,861	42,106
2- Electronically available from publisher but not digitally preserved (Bronze)	28,304	24,828	6,318	18,510	1,481
3- Print only, selected full-text available electronically (Silver)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4- Print only, indexing and abstracting only (Gold)	252,975	221,908	94,007	127,901	10,232
5 - Print only, no electronic access points (Gold)	159,030	139,500	36,532	102,968	8,237
6 - JSTOR (complete UC JSTOR Shared Print backfiles –Platinum, contribute to an access archive for AS3+ collections - Silver)	434,530	381,167	47,466	333,701	26,696
Grand Total	1,572,038	1,378,981	302,041	1,076,940	88,752

Table 2: Summary of WEST Benefits to UC, UC Archiving & Space Reclamation (Planning Institutions: UCSD, UCLA UCB, NRLF, SRLF)

* The extent of duplication at all 10 campuses has not yet been analyzed. Opportunities for space reclamation are probably significantly higher.

Title Category	Est. Yrs. Published/ Held (UC)	Estimated UC Volumes	# UC Volumes to Include In WEST Archive	# UC Volumes to Deselect	Estimated UC Library and Storage Space Reclamation (ASF)*
1- Digitally Preserved (Portico, Clockss) (Bronze)	318,229	279,148	51,816	227,332	18,187
2- Electronically available from publisher but not digitally preserved (Bronze)	13,339	11,701	1,944	9,757	781
3- Print only, selected full-text available electronically (Silver)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
4- Print only, abstracting and indexing only (Gold)	156,028	136,867	66,968	58,743	4,699
5 - Print only, no electronic access points (Gold)	104,105	91,320	28,308	63,012	5,041
6 - JSTOR (complete UC JSTOR Shared Print backfiles - Platinum, contribute to an access archive for AS3+ collections - Silver)	122,326	107,304	1,720	76,762	9,786
Total for Five UC Planning Institutions	714,027	626,339	150,755	435,607	38,494

Challenges

- Deselection will likely occur at a different pace at each institution, depending upon local resources
- For UC, there will be some (minimal) cultural shift to include WEST holdings in periodic holdings reviews for deselection; such reviews could be coordinated locally with reviews of JSTOR holdings

Extramural partners

The Western Regional Storage Trust is a distributed retrospective print journal archiving service. More than fifty (50) research libraries are expected to participate in the Trust. This recommendation is made possible by the coordinated efforts of WEST members.

Transformative Potential

The Western Regional Storage Trust will not only transform the physical footprint of member libraries and storage facilities, but also serve as a model for other regional library networks.

Dependencies, related recommendations or initiatives

This recommendation is not dependent on any other but is related to the recommendations for 1) deselecting Bronze Archives and 2) adopting a general practice of contributing holdings for JSTOR and WEST.

Timeline and Activities

Until June 2011   WEST/OCLC Pilot to disclose shared archiving commitments in OCLC

June –December 2011   WEST Archive Holders and Builders create local holdings records and disclose holdings in WorldCat, some Silver and Gold archives may not be disclosed until later in the Spring.

April 2012   First WEST Archiving Cycle concludes

Spring 2012   Campuses review WEST disclosures for Silver and Gold Archives and make collection management decisions

13. Campuses adopt an annual practice of deselecting print duplicates as shared print in place resources are disclosed

Where we are now

- UC Libraries have not yet implemented a model to identify local retention commitments to shared print in place
- UC Libraries are reluctant to withdraw print duplicates without identification of regional retention commitments

Where we want to be

- Reduction of duplication within existing campus collections
- Add more years to the stack capacity of campus libraries
- Add capacity for campuses to facilitate repurposing of space
- Add capacity for campuses to accommodate Shared Print in Place
- Library space valued as "capital outlay avoided" through progressive downsizing of local print collections

Recommendation

The task force recommends a flexible approach for campuses to identify Shared Print in Place commitments. Various sources could be used for disclosure (e.g. WorldCat, assembled lists from UC Bibliographers Groups or the Shared Print Coordinating Group (SPCG), vendor visibility tools).

Campuses may identify duplicate volumes that should be *intentionally* retained in order to support current local research needs. The remaining volumes will be withdrawn according to established local policy.

Campuses are asked to keep statistics of titles and volumes deselected based on the presence of Shared Print in Place commitments.

Benefits (pros)

- Space recovery
- Cost avoidance
- Facilitate a redirection of library resources

Challenges (cons)

- Operating costs associated with verifying and processing duplication
- Elimination of duplicate copies imposes additional operating costs for intercampus delivery of materials to library users

- Reliability of the host library for SPiP
- Service impact on library users in the form of delivery delays
- Circulation and lending restrictions will need to be monitored to ensure that materials are readily available to library users

Transformative Potential

Transform the physical footprint of member libraries

Dependencies, related recommendations or initiatives

This recommendation is dependent upon the adoption of the **Shared Print in Place Policy, Common Access Policy,** and **Bibliographic Service Standards for Shared Print.**

Timeline and Activities

Summer 2011: The Shared Print Coordinating Group, CDC, and HOTS finalize infrastructure for adoption of SPiP

Winter 2012: Participating campuses identify and disclose shared print in place holdings in WorldCat and through lists distributed from UC Bibliographer Groups or SPCG

Summer 2012 and beyond: Campuses review disclosures and begin withdrawal according to established local policy