

# Public Copy of 04/25/14

## Attendance

Date: 04/25/14

Note taker: *Kristine Ferry*

Attended: Robin Chandler, Sara Davidson, Kristine Ferry, Catherine Friedman, Todd Grappone, Lynne Grigsby, Gary Johnson, Xiaoli Li, Sue Chesley Perry, Adrian Petrisor (Chair)

Absent: *Patti, Michele, Eric*

Meeting Guest(s): *Names of any guests*

Readytalk call in number: 866.740.1260 access code: 8242075. We will also use the wiki, so please connect to [ww.readytalk.com](http://ww.readytalk.com)

## Agenda

1. Attendance call (Adrian, 1 min)
2. Approve public minutes from last meeting (Michele, 1 min)
3. Approve [bimonthly report to Coordinating Committee](#) (Patti sent via email)
4. Coordinating Committee Report (sent via email, Robin C., 10 minutes)
5. Metadata Policy Task Group update (XiaoLi, 5 min)
6. ILL RFP update (Kristine, 15 minutes)
7. Discuss SAG 3's request for AV Task Force review and membership nomination (Adrian, 10 minutes)
8. Discuss SAG 3's Request for Comment: [DRAFT Bibliographer/Collection Librarian Groups: Proposal for a New Structure](#) (Adrian, 10 minutes)
9. Updates from User's Council meeting?
10. Update from Shared Print Strategy Team (Catherine, 5 minutes)
11. [Review of items from previous meeting](#) (Adrian, 10 min)
12. Review today's action items (Kristine, 2 min)

## Notes

Item	Notes	Decision/Action
Approve notes from last meeting	Group should review a few days before we meet	
3. Approve <a href="#">bimonthly report to Coordinating Committee</a>	Discussed what kinds of items should go in the bimonthly report.	
4. Coordinating Committee Report	Robin updated us on CC's work.	
5. Metadata Policy Project Team update	Team will not be doing survey, but working on draft policy instead.	
6. ILL RFP update	Conference Call scheduled for bid scoring team. ILL Courier Ops Team working on project plan.	<b>DECIDED :</b> 1. If SAG 2 members have comments about courier expectations they should email them to Kristine by 5/2/14.
7. Discuss SAG 3's request for <a href="#">AV Task Force charge</a> review and membership nomination	Discussed document.	<b>DECIDED :</b>

To what extent is the group required to assess UC holdings (#2 in Charge)? It would be useful to have some boundaries on this task as this could be time intensive for both the group and those surveyed/interviewed.

**Additional comments:**

- A complete inventory is probably not necessary to move forward with a proof-of-concept project – the primary deliverable. (Sara)
- The name of the task force and most of the charge refer to the 'preservation' aspect, while the third bullet of the 'Charge' section mentions online and offline access. I suggest to include language that clarifies that preservation is the only responsibility of the task force (Adrian)
- We are asked to provide nominations for additional members of the task force, but I suggest that four members are enough for the task force. As mentioned in the 'Deliverables' section of the document, the "membership may evolve to a Project Team to carry out the project outlined"; I suggest that we will send nominations for the project team, which needs to be larger (Adrian) I agree for task force to keep it small and if there is a project team it has expanded membership. (Lynne)
- #2 of the charge – I think this needs more framing – an assessment of UC holdings could take months. What is really wanted? General idea of the scope of the problem? Number of items or number of categories? (Lynne)
- #3 of the charge: "systems and services" what does that mean? What is available at CDL? With or without development? (Lynne)
- What is the purpose and goal of this group? Are they focused on what type of media should be in a proof of concept project? Or the presentation (online?) of that content. I think this needs to be clearer in the charge – proof of concept of what? Digitization process? Presentation? Management? Multi campus project? (Lynne)
- When asking us for additional membership (not just this request) the skills/expertise of the existing members would be helpful. (Lynne)
- I don't see mention of the formats of the output files. Is this for this group or their work in consulting with stakeholders, etc. Or already defined by another group? Or varies by project selected? Just wondering. (Lynne)
- Header at the end of the document (above the names) should be "Task force" not "Project team". (Lynne)

1. SAG 2 members should put any comments they have on the document in the Notes section of meeting notes by 5/2/14  
<-----

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second bullet point should include prioritization based on format as well. (Todd)</li> <li>• Should we consider including the Film and Television Archive at UCLA? They have significant holdings as well as a great deal of analog preservation knowledge. (Todd)</li> <li>• Is analog to digital conversion the only form of AV preservation we would like to consider? (Todd)</li> <li>• The scope of a full AV Preservation Program would be enormous and extraordinarily costly. I am not sure the deliverables would be enough to articulate what's needed. Is the proposed pilot enough? Perhaps we should suggest taking a look at the IU (<a href="http://www.indiana.edu/~medpres/">http://www.indiana.edu/~medpres/</a>) project for Media Preservation and how they developed that program. (Todd)</li> <li>• UCLA currently has about 95TB of AV material in our digital library collection. We have a robust storage and streaming interface. We also have an AV preservation lab with conversion equipment. The taskforce should consider using the existing service at UCLA for the pilot. (Todd) I would like to expand this to a multi campus approach. UCB has the Media Resources Library which has technical support. Maybe there is a different way to support this than the standard create a new system at CDL? (Lynne)</li> <li>• UCSD also has an AV preservation lab with conversion equipment that could probably be leveraged; R. Smith is on proposed project team so he can further weigh-in on this (Eric)</li> <li>• Leverage work already completed by similar projects like the CAVPP, <a href="http://calpreservation.org/projects/audiovisual-preservation/">http://calpreservation.org/projects/audiovisual-preservation/</a> (Eric)</li> <li>• In the 6th bullet point reference was made to the management/access of ""born digital recordings in a variety of legacy digital formats". I think that the born digital discussion needs to happen, but the self-described focus of this task force was analog to digital conversion. So, to me, the born digital discussion seems out of place here unless it is incorporated as part of the focus/charge. However, that discussion might best be handled by a whole different task force. (Eric)</li> </ul>	
<p>8. Discuss SAG 3's Request for Comment: <a href="#">DRAFT Bibliographer/Collection Librarian Groups: Proposal for a New Structure</a></p>	<p>Discussed proposal: what is a lead contact versus a member; what happens to current bib groups; is SAG 2 involved in the workflow of these groups; are these groups CKGs or project teams; are there any formal reporting lines</p>	
<p>9. Updates from User's Council meeting?</p>	<p>Sarah provided us with an update from the meeting. Topics included: Worldcat Discovery; videos introducing concepts of licensing tiers; eScholarship; digital collection project</p>	

10. Update from Shared Print Strategy Team	A roadmap for 2014-2018 that includes the directions for shared print for the UCs has been created and sent to SAG 3.	
12. Review today's action items		<p><b>DECIDED :</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SAG 2 Ops Team liaisons should check in with their Ops Teams by sharing the Operations Team Overview document and having a discussion of how this will work for the liaison and the Ops Team. We will follow up on this at next SAG 2 meeting.</li> </ol>