Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
January 14, 2000
10 am – 3 pm
UC Irvine, Mesa Office Building, President's Conference Room

<u>Members present:</u>   Chandler, Christ, Cowan, Dolgonas, Hartford, Hay, Henry, Lucier, McCredie, Pantelia, Peete, Pryatel, Sharrow, Tiffney Werner, Zelmanowitz.

<u>Members absent:</u>   Clark, Copeland, Stead, Varian.

<u>Staff:</u>   Lawrence.

<u>Guests:</u>   Phyllis Mirsky, UCSD; Kevin Guthrie, JSTOR, Inc.

1. Welcome and Introductions: Review of Meeting Objectives

Christ convened at 10:05. Members and guests introduced themselves. Lucier requested an addition to the agenda, a brief report on the Governor's Budget. The meeting objectives were reviewed.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Take actions to initiate and oversee continuous strategic planning for Universitywide library collection management.
    - Action program for archiving of print copies of journals available in both print and digital formats.
    - Establishment of SLASIAC Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning.
2. Review and discuss current developments and issues in authentication and wide-area networking, and take actions as required.
3. Review and comment on the CDL Update, with particular attention to the UC K-12 Internet Initiative.
4. Review and discuss current Scholarly Communication activities, with particular attention to emerging UC strategy to address copyright issues.

---

2. Managing the Shared Print/Digital Archival Collection

Background materials:

- Joseph Branin, *et al.*, *The Changing Nature of Collection Management in Research Libraries,* 12/8/99.
- Vernon N. Kisling, Jr., *et al.*, *Last Copy Depository: Cooperative Collection Management Centers in the Electronic Age*, Creating New Strategies for Cooperative Collection Development Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, November 12-14, 1999.

a. Guest presentation/discussion: Kevin Guthrie, President, JSTOR, Inc.

Background materials: JSTOR information packet

In his presentation, Kevin Guthrie, President of JSTOR, Inc., reviewed the origins of the JSTOR project. JSTOR arose from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's interest in helping the scholarly community to take advantage of information technology to address persistent issues in scholarly communication and research library service. JSTOR, a nonprofit corporation established by the Mellon Foundation, has as its mission to develop a trusted archive of complete backfiles of core scholarly journal literature. In pursuing this objective, JSTOR takes a broad perspective that attempts to balance the needs and interests of scholars, publishers, and libraries. Guthrie described characteristics of the JSTOR membership, the current and planned JSTOR collection, and the key elements of the organization's business model. The presentation and subsequent discussion then focused on some characteristics of the concepts of "archiving" and "archival collections," and the challenges and opportunities arising from the introduction of archival collections in digital form.

b. Resolution on archiving of print copies of journals available in both print and digital formats (Discussion/ACTION)

Background materials: **Resolution A:** Archivingof Print Copies of Journals Available in Both Print and Digital Formats

Lucier introduced the topic by pointing out that the University of California was uniquely positioned to explore the archiving issues raised in Guthrie's presentation.

- The size of the institution and its library collections, the existence of a well-grounded digital library strategy, the high degree of collaboration that already exists among the UC libraries, and existence of the two Regional Library Facilities all make UC an ideal testbed for experimentation in strategies for archiving in the print/digital environment.
- The pressure of competition for scarce capital dollars motivates the University to move forward in grappling with these issues.

These unique advantages have been noted by the Mellon Foundation, which has expressed interest in the possibility of providing financial support for the proposed experiments.

Tiffney suggested changes in the wording of the resolution to address faculty perceptions, emphasize the experimental nature of the proposal, and clarify faculty consultation in selection of titles for the experiment. He also drew the Committee's attention to forms of material for which digital equivalents might not adequately serve research needs (e.g., botany texts with detailed line drawings), and urged consideration of differences in disciplinary needs and nature

of the materials in selection of titles for experimentation. In light of this discussion, Cowan suggested that the Committee might wish to revisit the traditional understanding of adequate/acceptable access to library collections; this will be placed on the Spring agenda. Guthrie reported on JSTOR's difficulties in assembling complete, high quality, undamaged runs of backfiles from participating libraries, and volunteered to share its experience and data with UC.

SLASIAC members who represent UCOL, the University Librarians, Academic Council, and the Council of Vice Chancellors stated that, with the modifications discussed above, their groups would support the proposed action. **ACTION: SLASIAC endorsed Resolution A subject to their review of the proposed modifications.**

c. Resolution on continuous strategic planning for Universitywide collection management (Discussion/ACTION).

Background materials: **Resolution B:** Continuous StrategicPlanning for Universitywide Library Collection Management.

Lucier introduced the discussion by alluding to previous discussions about the two existing Regional Library Boards and the increasing importance of addressing collection management issues on a Universitywide, rather than narrowly regional, basis. The proposed Standing Committee on Universitywide Library Collection Management Planning will complement, rather than replace, the Regional Boards, but it can be expected that the significant policy and planning discussions related to storage and collection management will migrate to the new Standing Committee.

In view of the importance of these issues for faculty, Tiffney suggested that a member of UCOL be included in the permanent membership of the new committee, and that the committee's work be added as a recurring item to the agenda of the annual joint meeting of University Librarians and UCOL. Peete suggested that the meaning of "collection management," and therefore the responsibility of the new committee, could be misconstrued to encompass collection development functions as well as management of collections, and urged that the language be revised to clarify this ambiguity.

ACTION: SLASIAC endorsed Resolution B subject to their review of the proposed modifications. The Committee agreed that no further consultations would be needed to put the proposed committee in place.

Added Item: Governor's Budget (Information)

Lucier reported that the University's request for new State funds for libraries was included in its entirety in the Governor's Budget for 2000-01. The request is for $7.5 million in additional permanent funds: $4 million for campus library collections and $1 million for expanded resource sharing within the proposed budget partnership agreement, and $2.5 million for continued expansion of the California Digital Library, an increase above the level anticipated in the partnership. The details of the request are set forth in the Libraries chapter of the University's 2000-01 Budget for Current Operations <http://budget.ucop.edu/budget/200001/8/lib.html>).

3. California Digital Library

a. January release (Update). Lucier reported on the latest semi-annual release of the CDL software and on the growth of the CDL collection. At this time, the CDL licenses over 5,000 journals.

b. MELVYL system redesign (Update). Following up on the discussion of this topic at the September meeting, Lucier reported that the "RFP" process described in the background document was well underway. A broadly representative advisory committee drawn from all campus libraries has been formed, and this group is consulting and holding meetings with various campus constituencies, including the faculty. Lucier and other members of the CDL staff have participated in several of these meetings. The objective of this process is to develop a complete set of functional specifications for a system that might replace or upgrade the existing MELVYL hardware/software configuration. However, there is no commitment to or timeline for such an acquisition, and the current system could be retained until proven commercial alternatives are available with sufficient functionality to fully satisfy faculty needs.

c. Shared Cataloging initiative (Update). The shared cataloging capability described in the background paper will create cataloging records for materials in the CDL collection that can be added to campus catalogs as well as the MELVYL union catalog. This development is notable because it was a grassroots collaborative initiative by the campuses. It represents a major step forward in UC library collaboration, and the campus libraries deserve acclaim for taking it.

d. UC K-12 Internet Initiative (Update/Discussion). The proposal to develop a digital library service for public high schools was developed on short notice as part of a larger K-12 networking proposal requested by the Governor. Funding for this initiative was not included in the UC portion of the Governor's Budget, but we understand that a funding reserve may have been set aside for this purpose elsewhere in the budget, and discussions are expected to continue.

4. Technological Infrastructure Support.

b. Wide-Area Networking (CalREN 2) (Discussion).

McCredie provided an overview of the Internet-2 initiative and its California component, embodied in the Corporation for Education Network Initiatives in California (CENIC) and the developing CalREN-2 network.

a. Authentication (Discussion).

McCredie presented an excellent tutorial on the topics of authentication and authorization in networks and the various alternatives for implementing these functions (passwords, physical security and identification devices, etc.). He described the operation of a public key certificate system and summarized the advantages and disadvantages of a public-key infrastructure for authentication and authorization. Dolgonas then described the University's Common Authentication Project (CAP) (<http://www.ucop.edu/irc/auth/>). A contract has been awarded to VeriSign to provide technology support for the program, which has moved into the test phase with about 100 certificate users at each campus. At a cost of approximately $5 per user, full implementation of a UC PKI will cost about $1-1.5 million per year. The PKI offers a potentially useful means to authenticate and authorize users for access to digital library materials, and is a promising solution to the vexing problem of providing access for authorized off-site users (e.g., faculty and students from their homes or while traveling). However, this solution will be useful only to the extent that external vendors and licensors, who host much of the libraries' licensed digital content, implement systems that can make use of our digital certificates ("certificate-aware" systems). Within the University, the UC Benefits system (bencom) is certificate-aware, and the California Digital Library has tested PKI with a small number of publishers in an experiment sponsored by the Digital Library Federation, but it remains unclear whether PKI will become a widely-adopted technology in the broader marketplace or how quickly this will occur.

Dolgonas distributed for discussion a draft resolution entitled *Library PKI Endorsement* for the Committee's consideration. It was the Committee's view that some opportunity for review and discussion would be required before it could act on the proposed resolution. Lucier also expressed the view that, in view of the uncertain prospects for widespread commercial diffusion of PKI technology, it was important to provide our faculty with an interim solution, such as proxy servers, and that the resolution should address such a provision. **It was agreed that Lucier, in consultation with Dolgonas, would revise the draft resolution for consideration at the March meeting.**

5. Scholarly Communication

a. Copyright issues (Update/Discussion)
b. LANL preprint server (Update)
c. SPARC award for support of eScholarship (Update)

- *Community Building for* eScholarship*: Scholar-led Innovation in Scholarly Communication*, Proposal and Application Outline, Abstract.

Lucier reported that Provost King is moving forward on the Tanner Committee's recommendation to appoint a standing committee on copyright. The committee will be broadly based and include representatives of the Academic Senate and other faculty. Several members of the Tanner Committee will serve on the new group, and there will be some overlap with the SLASIAC membership to ensure communication and coordination in areas of mutual interest. The CDL has implemented a mirror site for the LANL preprint server, and discussions are underway for a phased transfer of responsibility from LANL to UC. With the startup funding provided by the President and additional support provided by the SPARC grant described in the background material, the *eScholarship* program is in the process of recruiting a director, developing the LANL technology, and holding discussion with a number of faculty groups on promising scholarly communication initiatives.

6. Future meetings

The date and location of the next meeting were confirmed: Tuesday, March 28 at the Berkeley campus.

As indicated above, the draft resolution on authentication will be brought to the committee at that time. Cowan's proposed item on the meaning of "adequate access," discussed above, will also be included, as will the discussions on the CDL's Government Information Initiative and digitization planning indicated on the updated SLASIAC work plan. Tiffney suggested a future discussion of budgetary planning for libraries, and requested data on the percent of UC operating budgets allocated to libraries in relation to comparison institutions. Ensuing discussion suggested that such data must be interpreted with caution, owing to institutional differences in methods of financing libraries, particularly the role of endowments. Christ emphasized that such discussions should encompass multi-source strategies, and not focus solely on State funds. Lucier reminded the group that the University is in the first year of a carefully-developed multi-year budget plan for libraries (as set forth in the Regents' Budgets), and urged that this plan be allowed to play out. At the appropriate time, it would be important for SLASIAC to give attention to budget strategies to follow after the current plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.