



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT –
ACADEMIC AND HEALTH AFFAIRS

RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION OFFICE
1111 Franklin Street, 5th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200
Web Site: www.ucop.edu/raohome/
Tel: (510) 987-9839
Fax: (510) 587-6090

July 9, 2009

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
140 East 62nd Street
New York, NY 10065
Attn: Donald J. Waters

We are pleased to present for your consideration the following described proposal:

Title: Heading West: Towards a Western Regional Storage Trust
Principal Investigator: Daniel Greenstein
Administration Unit: California Digital Library
Amount: \$69,189
Type of Request: New Grant
Period: October 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

Any award supporting the above described project must be issued in the University's corporate name, i.e., The Regents of the University of California. Please transmit any resulting award documents to me at the address set forth below. Checks in support of this proposal should be sent to: UCLA Remittance Center, Box 951432, 1125 Murphy Hall 405 Hilgard Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90095-9000 Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Lourdes G. DeMattos
Contract & Grant Officer
University of California
Office of the President
Research Administration Office
1111 Franklin St., 5th Fl.
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
(510) 987-9850

Enclosures

cc: Stephanie Lew

Daniel Greenstein, PI

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Scholarly Communications Program
Proposal Cover Sheet

Date of Submission July 9, 2009

Legal Name of Grantee Regents of the University of California

Proposed Project:

Project Title

Heading WEST: Toward a Western Regional Storage Trust

Request Amount \$69,189

Proposed Grant Term 9 months

Proposed Start Date 10/01/2009

Proposed End Date 6/30/2010

Internal Reference Number

Principal Investigator(s) and Title(s):

Name(s)

Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination at the University of California Office of the President

Address(es)

1111 Franklin St., 11th Flr
Oakland, CA 94607

Signature(s)

Financial Administrator for Grant:

Name

Lourdes DeMattoes, Contract & Grants Officer

Address

UCOP
Research Administration Office
1111 Franklin Street, 5th Floor, CA 94607

Signature

Heading WEST: Toward a Western Regional Storage Trust

A Proposal

To the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

Proposal Summary

The University of California Libraries, in collaboration with other research libraries in the Western Region of the United States, propose to organize a distributed, retrospective print repository service. Initially, the service would seek to consolidate and validate print journal backfiles at one or both of the UC Regional Library Facilities and to develop reciprocity protocols between and amongst various other repositories in the region. This proposal is for a planning grant to bring together library leaders in the Western Region to 1) design operating, governance, and business models to support cooperation among diverse partners, 2) establish standards for low-level validation and disclosure, and to 3) develop selection criteria incorporating risk management principles within the context of broader national and international efforts to ensure persistence of the scholarly record.

Timeline of the proposal: 9 months (October 2009 to June 2010)

Requested budget: \$69,189

About the Institution: The University of California Libraries and the California Digital Library

The University of California libraries comprise world-class collections and innovative services. More than 100 libraries on the 10 UC campuses plus the California Digital Library support the University's teaching and research. Collectively, the UC libraries make up the largest academic research library in the world, with more than 34 million volumes in their holdings and equally significant digital collections.

As an arm of systemwide library planning, the California Digital Library (CDL) supports the University of California libraries in their mission of providing access to the world's knowledge for the UC campuses and the communities they serve. In so doing, it directly supports UC's mission of teaching, research, and public service. The CDL also maintains its own distinctive programs emphasizing the development and management of digital collections, innovation in scholarly publishing, and the long-term preservation of digital information.

The UC libraries have worked in close collaboration for over a quarter century. An innovative service model takes advantage of the investments made by the ten UC campuses through collective action (e.g. through consortial content acquisitions and services) and the development of shared service units (e.g. central facilities such as the California Digital Library and two regional high-density storage facilities). Leveraging this shared capability, the libraries have taken an internationally recognized leadership role in dealing with the economic, cultural, organizational, and technical challenges that are fundamentally altering research, learning, and scholarly communications.

As part of the University of California libraries' strategic plan, *Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information* [\[PDF\]](#) released in June, 2004, the libraries adopted five core strategies for innovation. Among these were strategies for Collection Management and Coordination, Shared Services and Infrastructure, and Shared Facilities which underpin the current proposal to broaden the philosophy of information resource sharing from the ten campuses of the University of California to a constituency of libraries in the Western Region of the United States.

The work described in this proposal is an outgrowth of the UC libraries' long history of successful collaboration, innovation, and service to the University and the people of California. It leverages the University's substantial investments in shared facilities and collections and in its libraries and promises to accelerate the new directions summarized above in ways that will ensure they have an impact well beyond the University of California.

Background and Rationale

Research libraries increasingly strapped for space have looked to withdrawing and consolidating back runs of print journals as a cost-effective strategy for managing their physical collections. Shared retrospective journal archives are an ideal candidate for space reclamation for reasons that are well-known: large amounts of shelf space can be reclaimed with a relatively small number of titles, much of this material is now available in digitized versions that have become the primary means of access for many users, and many of these titles are widely held in libraries of all types. Nonetheless, little progress in collaborative print archiving has been made to date. Among the factors that have hampered such efforts are the absence of organizational structures, policies, business models, and incentives to create and sustain trusted relationships among consolidation partners. UC already has significant expertise in managing validated shared print journal archives. The UC Libraries operate and manage a dim archive¹ of JSTOR journals jointly funded by UC and JSTOR that is completely validated at the page level, assembled from journal runs held at UC with occasional contribution from external partners. Periodic audits by JSTOR of the validation work conducted at UC demonstrate a 99% or better rate of conformity with mandated validation practices. However, this level of validation is extremely costly. Other retrospective journal archive projects at the UC Libraries have piloted an approach to issue-level validation that can be sustained at significantly lower cost.

UC has also shown national leadership in the development of policies for collaborative collection management and is well known for its work in this area. The UC Libraries' Persistence Policy that governs the management of collections housed at the Regional Library Facilities ensures that individual UC campuses can withdraw local copies with confidence knowing that a stored copy can be relied upon for the long term. UC has also maintained a shared prospective print archive of its licensed journals since 2003 and is presently collaborating with CRL on a proposal to begin depositing this archive at CRL, with existing holdings housed and managed at UC's Southern Regional Library Facility.

A number of libraries in the California region have expressed interest in partnering with UC in the development of a shared retrospective journals repository. Other libraries outside the region considering participation in the joint UC-CRL prospective print journals archive have also expressed interest in a shared approach to retrospective journal archives. As academic and research libraries confront unprecedented budget and space challenges, the time for such a collaborative initiative has never been more propitious.

¹ The JSTOR archive has limited accessibility, stipulated by contractual agreement. Materials may be used within UC, are restricted to building use only and are revalidated upon return to the archive. The current proposal may or may not incorporate such access conditions on future built archives. The access policy will be one area for exploration among potential partners.

Project Description

This proposal seeks to develop a collaborative regional model for compiling and validating print backfiles of journals in the context of other national or network-level efforts. The University of California, at one or more of its Regional Library Facilities (RLFs), would function as a service center and trusted repository for validated journal backfiles developed jointly with and made available to regional (and potentially national) partners, allowing participating institutions to de-accession local copies with assurance that a trusted copy is archived and accessible under the terms and conditions of the partnership. The project would also explore the feasibility of reciprocal print journal archiving agreements among the regional partners to foster a distributed network of trust, expertise, and shared commitment. A distributed network may consist of the creation of a similar service in other storage facilities in the western region and/or in the distribution of titles for which the partners would agree to complete and validate the backfiles.

The proposal seeks support for an initial planning phase which will consist of identifying and bringing together specific academic and research libraries in the Western Region of the United States that would contribute to the development of the service center or centers. Once identified, the partners will meet in person twice and at intervening times via conference call to flesh out the terms of service. A consultant will be hired to complete specific components of the planning process, operational plan, and final report.

Key outcomes of the proposal will be a ***business model, selection criteria, validation standards, and network-level bibliographic disclosure.***

1. Business model. A critical component of the proposal will be to define a sustainable business model that includes diverse partners with different incentives for supporting or managing print journal backfiles. Three to six business models or scenarios will be developed for consideration. The final business model will include all of the following components:

A. Operating Plan. The operating plan will focus on methods for print consolidation as well as access and service expectations, and identify where this activity will take place. It will specify mechanisms for organizing and managing the deposit of holdings, validating them, recording and exposing bibliographic information, and providing access to the shared archives. UC Libraries have experimented with various centralized and decentralized approaches to consolidating backfiles which may inform this step. An access policy will be developed as part of the operating plan that addresses not only interlibrary loan and document delivery of archived holdings, but also access to the archive by third parties (e.g., digitization partners and non-participating libraries).

B. Financial model. The financial model will outline the startup and operating costs for a particular operating plan and specify how those costs are to be recovered. A financial model will be developed for each operating plan considered during the planning phase to facilitate informed decision-making by the project participants. The models will address all aspects of archive operation including the call for holdings, consolidation and validation, storage, bibliographic disclosure, and access and delivery options and will

include cost estimates for human resources, equipment, transportation, storage and overhead. The financial model will assume a ***ten-year service horizon and will be designed to achieve financial sustainability within five years***. Sustainability will be achieved when the archive is able to cover its ongoing operating costs through a combination of participation and service fees. Cost recovery may be achieved, for example, by establishing tiers of participation in the archive.

C. Governance Structure. The governance structure for the archive will describe the bodies responsible for making decisions at a strategic and operational level (e.g. a space-planning group, storage facility management group, and a selection group).

2. Memorandum of Understanding. The MOU will be prepared once a business model is selected. It will outline financial support, material contributions and operating policies (for access, persistence, and disclosure²). The MOU will also outline the terms of participation and provisions for continuity/dissolution of the partnership. The MOU will address legal and institutional policy issues affecting each institution's ability to participate in such an endeavor. The consultant will draft the MOU based on his or her experience with previous pilots for shared archiving and the outcomes of other print archiving efforts undertaken in the broader community (e.g., CRL, RLG, UK Research Reserve). CDL Shared Print can also advise in this area.

The business model and MOU will be developed in such a way as to make them portable and transparent and therefore transferrable from one region to another, such that other US regions can develop similar partnerships. Language will be used that is sufficiently generalized to allow other regions in the US to readily use the model and the MOU.

3. Selection criteria. The partner libraries will develop criteria for identifying print titles for the archiving service based on emerging risk management principles and informed by recent research in the optimal number of copies for network level retention.³ Risk management principles will assist the libraries in strategically positioning efforts within the context of broader regional, national, and international archiving efforts and in creating a framework for decision-making based on environmental criteria (e.g., duplication rates, electronic availability, accessibility of the backfile).

A. Print Holdings Analysis. To facilitate the development of selection criteria, member libraries will compare lists of current print subscriptions and retrospective holdings using the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System (and possibly the OCLC Collection Analysis Tool or OCLC Research assistance) to identify possible duplicates and to retrieve metadata about the journal publications to assist with decision-making. In cases in which titles with no electronic counterpart are considered, models would be explored for funneling this category into a digitization stream.

² Policies will be informed by last copy policy research conducted by RLG Research in 2008/2009

³ Schonfeld, Roger C. and Yano, Candace. Unpublished Ithaka study on Optimal Copies for network-level retention.

4. Reviewing and Refining Validation Standards. UC has already, in consultation with JSTOR, piloted a standard approach to lower (issue) level validation that can be economically applied to large-scale, centralized consolidation projects.⁴ We will propose this work to the project participants as a model for consideration with the goal of reaching agreement on an appropriate level of validation for the archive, further testing and refining our methods, and putting forward the resulting work as a formal standard or best practice.

5. Network-level disclosure. Transparency is an essential component of building a trusted archive, and is, in turn, facilitated by effective disclosure. The proposal will address two types of disclosure: disclosure in bibliographic records of completeness and condition information, and disclosure of higher-level information about collections and/or titles archived by the service for management purposes. The first type of disclosure (bibliographic) facilitates de-duplication efforts while the second type of disclosure (project-level) facilitates coordination with broader regional, national, and international archiving efforts. The library community is currently grappling with standards for bibliographic-level disclosure. This project will pilot **implementation of bibliographic level disclosure**⁵ and work with other national partners (such as CRL) to **define requirements for higher-level project/title-level disclosure.**

⁴ Heyer-Grey, B. et. Al. "Assembling a 'best copy' archival journal collection: case study of the University of California IEEE Project." Conference paper. Austin, Texas. American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference. June 14-17, 2009.

⁵ Participants will coordinate with current efforts to define 583 fields to record retention commitments.

Project Outline

The project will be organized in three segments: a planning phase, a design phase and service agreement phase. Documents will be prepared to support each phase. The final report will contain a business plan (including operating plan, financial model and governance structure), a proposed Memorandum of Understanding with institutional commitments, an initial title list, and supporting policies.

Oversight

The project will be overseen by a Steering Committee and supported by an Advisory Board.

The Steering Committee will consist of Dan Greenstein (CDL – ex officio), Brian Schottlaender (UCSD), Betsy Wilson (UW), Deb Carver (UO), John Helmer (Orbis-Cascade), Tom Leonard (UCB), Gary Strong (UCLA) and Ivy Anderson (CDL).

The project will seek to establish an advisory board of leading figures in the development of large-scale approaches to shared collection management to provide input on long-range strategic issues and help situate the work within a larger framework of related national and international efforts. Examples of the kind of individuals we would seek to involve are: Bernie Reilly (CRL), Ann Kenney (Cornell University), Kevin Guthrie or Roger Schonfeld (Ithaka), Constance Malpas (RLG Programs), Nicola Wright (UKRR), Abby Smith (Consultant).

Planning Phase

This phase includes the identification of potential partners in the Western Region of the United States, as well as preparation for the in-person meeting and the meeting.

Identification of Partners

Potential partners will be identified and specific individuals from each institution will be selected to participate in the in-person meetings. Institutional representatives will be chosen based on their role in their organization; we will seek individuals who have the authority to enter into a service level agreement and who have senior collection development/management responsibility. These may include library directors, heads of consortia, collection development officers, directors of regional library facilities, and shared print service managers.

The Steering Committee and UC will solicit initial participation and invite partners.

Meeting Preparation

This phase also includes the preparation of documents to facilitate guided discussions at the in-person meeting. The goal of the in-person meeting will be to achieve the following specific outcomes:

1. Exploration of risk management in the context of print journals and development of an initial set of guiding principles and selection criteria
2. Exploration of validation standards and discussion of expectations about quality, trust and the role of the regional built archive in the context of other regional and national archiving efforts
3. Commitment to participate in the development of a regional shared repository service
4. Selection of two or three business models for further refinement, based on the options prepared in advance and presented at the meeting
5. General consensus on an access policy, based on the models prepared in advance

Specific deliverables that will be developed during the planning phase include:

Document	When Prepared	Prepared by	Input from
1. Finalize the list of invitees: institutions and individuals	Prior to in-person meeting	Steering committee/UC	Steering committee
2. Business Models (3-6) including operating plan and financial model (high-level description)	Prior to in-person meeting	Consultant	Steering committee
3. Risk Management Presentation and List of Risk Characteristics for Print Journals	Prior to in-person meeting	CDL Shared Print Manager	
4. Draft Standards for Validation	Prior to in-person meeting	CDL Shared Print Manager	RLF Directors/Other storage facility directors
5. Access Scenarios (3-6) and service implications for each. A draft access policy for each business model.	Prior to in-person meeting	Consultant	
6. List of subgroups to work on the design phase and a refined list of potential institutional partners	At the in-person meeting	Consultant	Meeting participants

First In-Person Meeting

The first in-person meeting will include sessions that will inform the design of the Western Regional Storage Trust. To ensure that each session leads to specific outcomes, various documents will be prepared in advance of the meeting to outline service options and guide choices. For example, three to six business models will be prepared in advance based on data gathered from UC experience with print backfile consolidation and initial expressions of interest from potential partners. The discussion will focus on assessing institutional interest in each scenario and the incentives and motivations to participate in each. It is possible that the preferred scenarios may need some subsequent alteration but in general a consensus will be sought for three or fewer scenarios. The same approach will be taken for each of the other sessions – presentation of scenarios, discussion, general consensus. Sessions will include:

1. **Business model exploration.** Participants will consider the three to six business models that are prepared and distributed in advance of the in-person meeting. Each business model will include an operating plan, financial model, and governance structure.
2. **Risk management for print journals.** A brief list of risk characteristics and a presentation about relevant risk management principles for print journals will be prepared and presented at the first in-person meeting. These will serve as documents to facilitate discussion about overarching values/incentives among partners. This discussion will inform the development of guiding principles for selection. The discussion will focus on questions such as, *how can the selection criteria be designed to satisfy different institutional incentives so that each library finds continued value in the service over time? Which types of print backfiles are of most interest to which type of partner?*
3. **Standards for Validation and Preservation Expectations.** Standards will be presented in draft form to facilitate discussion among the partners about quality, expectations, trust and the role of the proposed regional service in the context of other regional and national archiving efforts.
4. **Draft Access Scenarios and Considerations.** Access scenarios and aspects to consider will be prepared in advance and presented to facilitate discussion. The discussion will focus on arriving at acceptable access policies for each preferred business model among invited libraries. Key aspects to discuss may include institutional mandates, access to the built archives by institutional members, non-members, commercial and not-for-profit entities and levels of access to the physical material (digital copies, photocopies, physical volumes, in-house use and circulation).

Design Phase

The design phase is intended to refine the business models, secure commitments from member libraries and develop selection criteria.

Teams

An outcome of the first in-person meeting will be to identify teams (from those present at the meeting or their designees) that can work on the design phase. The design phase will be a collaborative effort guided by the consultant and conducted via conference calls in small team efforts.

There will be a Membership Team, a Business Model and Standards Team, and a Selection Team. Likely participants would be:

- **Membership Team.** (Steering Committee, University Librarians)
- **Business Model and Standards Team.** (RLF directors, Collection Development Officers, CDL Shared Print Manager)
- **Selection Team.** (Collection Development Officers)

Activities

This phase includes three major activities:

1. **Securing commitments** from invited libraries and cultivating any additional libraries that may have been missed in the first meeting.
2. **Refining the business models** including the operation plans, financial models, governance structures, policies, and standards to support the service. Toward the end of the design phase, the business models will be resubmitted to the partners for consideration and election of one.
3. **Refining guiding principles and developing selection criteria.** The guiding principles for selection will be refined after the in-person discussion on this topic. In addition, during the design phase a project will be undertaken to analyze print titles and holdings (below). An outcome of this analysis will be the development of selection criteria and further refinement of the guiding principles.

Print Journal Analysis Project

As part of arriving at selection criteria for the journals, a project will be undertaken to analyze print holdings (at the title level) for duplication across institutions. The project will characterize types of journals based on risk management factors and existing holdings. Project participants

will be asked to prepare and submit lists of print journal titles and holdings to CDL. Participants will bear the costs of creating these lists. CDL will compile and analyze the lists with the aid of the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System. Project participants will be expected to perform significant work on developing selection criteria from the analyzed holdings.

Deliverables that will be developed during the design phase include:

Document	Team	Prepared by
1. Refined list of partner libraries and initial commitments	Membership Team	Consultant
2. Access policy	Membership Team	Consultant
3. Refined Business Model(s) including operating plan(s), financial model(s), and governance structure(s)	Business Model and Standards Team/ Membership Team	Consultant
4. Validation Standards	Business Model and Standards Team	CDL Shared Print Manager
5. Guiding principles for selection and selection criteria based on risk management principles	Selection Team	Consultant and/or CDL Shared Print Manager
6. Title list analysis and preparation of initial title list	Selection Team	CDL Shared Print Manager

Service Agreement Phase – Second In-Person Meeting

This last phase includes preparation for the in-person meeting and the meeting itself.

At this point, the partners may or may not have identified one preferred business model. So, part of the in-person meeting may be used to present the top three or so models and arrive at consensus for one of them.

Outcomes for this phase include securing institutional commitments to the Western Regional Storage Trust, approving a business model, approving policies and standards, and endorsing an initial title list.

Documents will be prepared prior to the meeting and the meeting will be used to approve them and formalize the MOU. The meeting will also be used to finalize the governing bodies and outline an election process.

Deliverables for the service agreement phase include:

Document	Prepared	Prepared by
1. One (or top three) Business Model(s) including operating plan(s), financial model(s), and governance structure(s)	Prior to in-person meeting	Consultant
2. MOU	Prior to in-person meeting	Consultant
3. Participants, Participation Levels, and Service Levels	Prior to in-person meeting	Consultant
4. Select one Business Model (if consensus not arrived at prior to the meeting)	In-person meeting	
5. Approve the MOU	In-person meeting	
6. Design election process for the governing bodies and nominate members	In-person meeting	
7. Assign human resources and overheads for the storage facilities, identify gaps, and outline hiring plan	In-person meeting	

Principal Investigators

The Principal Investigator will be Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination at the University of California Office of the President. Greenstein has been influential in the transformation of academic research libraries and the adoption of digital library technologies. Prior to March 2007, Greenstein served as university librarian for systemwide library planning and executive director of the California Digital Library.

Brian Schottlaender, the Audrey Geisel University Librarian at UC San Diego and current convener of the UC University Librarians Council, will serve as Co-Principal Investigator on the project. Schottlaender is well-known for his leadership in national collection management efforts and is a Past-President of the Association for Research Libraries.

The planning process will be managed by the California Digital Library in partnership with senior collection officers at the UC Libraries.

UC Principal Participants

California Digital Library	Ivy Anderson, Director of Collections; Emily Stambaugh, Shared Print Manager	Committed
UCLA	Gary Strong, University Librarian; Sharon Farb, AUL for Collections	Committed
UC-Northern Regional Library Facility	Scott Miller, Operations Manager	Committed
UC San Diego	Brian Schottlaender, University Librarian; Martha Hruska, AUL for Collections	Committed
UC-Southern Regional Library Facility	Colleen Carlton, RLF Director	Committed

Collaborators: Potential Partner Libraries

A number of libraries in the region have already expressed serious interest in participating in this project, and the planning effort will seek to identify additional libraries that wish to participate. One or two representatives from the following libraries or consortia will be invited (University Librarians, Consortium Directors, Heads of Collection Development), with the possible inclusion of others:

Arizona State University	To be invited	
California Institute of Technology	Expressed interest	Kimberly Douglas
California State University	To be invited	
Getty Library	Expressed interest	Susan Allen
Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA)	Expressed interest	Joni Blake?
Huntington Library	Expressed interest	
Occidental College	Expressed interest	Robert Kieft
Orbis-Cascade Alliance	To be invited	John Helmer
Oregon State University	To be invited	Karyle Butcher
SCELC	To be invited	Rick Burke
Stanford University	Expressed interest	Michael Keller, Assunta Pisani
University of Arizona	Expressed interest	Carla Stoffle, Steven Bosch
University of Oregon	To be invited	Deb Carver
University of Southern California	To be invited	Lynne Sipe
University of Washington	To be invited	Betsy Wilson
Washington State University	To be invited	Jay Starratt

Consultant

A consultant will be hired to develop and draft models and policies, organize meetings and conference calls, facilitate discussions, and finalize project deliverables..

The consultant will also prepare an initial draft of the final report to document these components and summarize the outcomes of the planning and design process.

The Appendix includes the candidate's professional biography.

Tools

A one-year subscription to the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System at the CDL will facilitate analysis and the development of selection criteria. The USAS has been used successfully by other library consortia to rationalize print journal holdings; it is used to format lists of titles uniformly and pull additional metadata about each title that is not readily available from library systems but is useful in defining selection criteria. The data in the USAS knowledge base is supplied by publishers on a periodic basis. Value-added data includes such things as publication years, Ulrich's subjects, peer reviewed/refereed indicators, publication type (trade, scholarly, etc), frequency, publication status (ceased, discontinued), title changes, format availability on the market, availability of value metrics (ISI impact factors) and more.

CDL may also use its existing subscription to the OCLC Collection Analysis tool and/or consult with OCLC Research for assistance with additional analysis and report development.

Length of Project and Timeline

The proposal is for a 9-month planning grant to begin in October 2009 and conclude in June 2010. Early in the planning process we expect to solidify buy-in for the Trust and identify a limited number of models for deeper exploration. The timeline may be adjusted as the project progresses. In particular, the timeline may be adjusted depending upon the number of models the partners want to see fleshed out at a high-level, how long it takes the consultant to prepare them and how many models need to be refined in the design phase for consideration at the second in-person meeting. Ultimately, at the second in-person meeting, we expect to arrive at consensus for one business model.

October - December 2009

- Hire Consultant (CDL)
- Identify and invite partners, brief exploration of models by phone (UC principals)
- Outline High-Level Business Models, Policy Aspects, Risk Management Aspects (consultant, CDL)
- Prepare background documents (consultant, CDL)

January 2010

- **In-Person Summit Meeting, Oakland, CA.** (2 days, approx 30 participants, consultant plans and facilitates)

February – May 2010 (conference calls, consultant facilitates)

- Identify working team members
- Explore commitment levels with partner institutions (UC principals)
- Refine business models – as many as participants want to see refined (consultant)
- Define governance models (consultant)
- Draft Access Policy(ies) (consultant)
- Selection criteria analysis (participating libraries, consultant): prepare print title lists, analyze holdings, draft principles and criteria and a future process for nominating titles and data collection.
- Identify initial list(s) of candidate titles that meet proposed criteria (participating libraries)
- Revise and vet Validation Standards (CDL)
- Identify network-level disclosure options; define bibliographic standards for disclosure; define requirements for title/collection level disclosure in the context of other national efforts to disclose archiving projects (e.g., CRL, RLG) (CDL).
- Draft and refine MOU (consultant)

June 2010

- **In-Person Summit Meeting, Oakland, CA.** (2 days, approx 30 participants, consultant plans and facilitates) Review and approve one business model, approve the MOU, secure financial commitments, approve selection criteria and initial set of candidate titles.
- Establish governing body and identify human resources (from participant libraries, storage facilities)

July – September 2010

- Final Report to Mellon Foundation (PI with CDL, consultant input)

Expected Outcomes and Benefits

The outcome of this project will be agreement among a set of regional partners on a detailed implementation framework for a long-term, distributed retrospective print repository. Initially, the focus will be on developing a journal archiving service, designed to transform through collaboration the manner in which legacy print journal collections are housed and managed. When implemented, the service will offer the following innovations and benefits:

1. Business model for regional partners to de-duplicate collections with reliable archive access.
2. Replicability. The standards and policies will be portable to other distributed regional repositories, with a potential for future reciprocal agreements.
3. Standards for issue-level validation.
4. Network exposure. In addition to title-level exposure of retention commitments via the proposed MARC 583 field, UC would seek to work with other national partners to identify and disclose comparable journal repository projects at a project / publisher level as a foundation for future collaboration on a national level.

More broadly, this project will provide significant benefits to the research library community at large:

1. Reduced cost of print collection management across a partnership of libraries. By archiving and servicing journals on a regional scale, participating libraries will significantly lower the cost of managing large serial collections.
2. Space reclamation and re-allocation. Availability of a trusted regional archive will allow participating libraries, and other libraries, to confidently de-accession journal holdings and re-allocate space to meet local needs.
3. Preservation of the scholarly record. Development of a coordinated persistent archive informed by risk management principles will aid national and international efforts to prevent important research resources from disappearing as libraries adapt to a more fully digital environment.

Long-Term Sustainability of the Results

Sustainability for this project can be thought of from the vantage point of the long-term persistence of the built archive, as well as from that of the long-term viability of the partnership itself.

Sustainability of the material in the archive will be achieved through the design of policies that ensure persistence. The UC Persistent Deposits Policy represents a model that can be adapted for the proposed service and among a broader set of libraries to ensure long-term commitment to archived materials.

The viability of the partnership will be achieved by involving partners in the higher education library community with diverse and interdependent characteristics (e.g., with different incentives for participation and differing capabilities in terms of expertise, space, collections, funds) and establishing a business model with a 10-year service horizon that meets a variety of needs. The business model will be designed to place the archive on a self-sustaining footing within five years of implementation through financial commitments and other reciprocal agreements among the partners.

Sustainability is also achieved when a particular model or standard is adopted by non-constituents and eventually becomes common practice in a broader community. To that end, the governing policies, memorandum of understanding and standards for validation will be designed for ease of use and portability to other libraries, partnerships, and archiving services.

Reporting to the Foundation

A final report will be prepared and submitted to the Mellon Foundation within three months following the end of the grant period. The report will be prepared according to the guidelines described in <http://msc.mellon.org/guidelines> , under Reporting Components and including a financial report following the Foundation's Financial Reporting Template. The narrative report will comment on expenditures.

Budget

The budget for the proposal includes support for two in-person meetings in Oakland (travel and local arrangements), the consultant's fee, a portion of the subscription cost to the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System and conference call expenses. The consultant's fee includes his/her travel costs to the in-person meetings and individual phone calls.

Other costs will be borne by the invited libraries and CDL. These include participation in working groups to evaluate and refine models and policies and costs to prepare and consolidate local title lists for analysis. CDL will also bear the cost a portion of the subscription to the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System.

<i>Travel, lodging, meals for meetings</i>	<i>2 two day in-person meetings, approx. 30 people</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>\$250 travel person/meeting, plane ticket costs may vary based on distance and carriers (\$15,000)</i><i>\$250 lodging person/meeting, hotel costs may vary based on availability, approx. \$125/night. (\$15,000)</i><i>\$25 person/day meals (\$3,000)</i>	\$ 33,000
<i>Software</i>	<i>Ulrich's Serials Analysis System, one year subscription. Initial quote: \$25,500 for CDL office only. Cost share Mellon study \$10,000, CDL \$15,500</i>	\$ 10,000
<i>Consultant Services</i>	<i>Consultant Fees: 38 hrs. / month, 9 months; est. \$75 hr</i>	\$ 25,650
<i>Conference Calls</i>	<i>Nine one-hour calls @ \$.023 per minute per port, 30 ports/call. (\$373)</i> <i>Twelve one-hour calls CDL and subgroups @ \$.023 per minute per port, 10 ports/call (\$166)</i> <i>(The number of ports per call may vary depending upon team structures.)</i>	\$ 539
Total		\$ 69,189

Budget Proposal
Heading West: Toward a Western Regional Storage Trust

Consulting Services

Lizanne Payne			
Services	Hourly Rate	Hour	Total Cost
Prep/Drafting/Communications	75	176	13,200
Meeting/Conf Calls	75	126	9,450
Final Report	75	40	3,000
		342	25,650

Software

One Year Subscription			
Name	Price	CDL Cost Share	Mellon Foundation
Ulrich's Serials Analysis System	25,500	15,500	10,000
			10,000

Travel/Meeting

#1 2 Day In-Person Meeting			
Categories	Price	Participant	Total Cost
Airfare	250	30	7,500
2 Nights Lodging	250	30	7,500
2 Days Meal Allowance	50	30	1,500
			16,500

#2 2 Day In-Person Meeting			
Categories	Price	Participant	Total Cost
Airfare	250	30	7,500
2 Nights Lodging	250	30	7,500
2 Days Meal Allowance	50	30	1,500
			16,500

Total: 33,000

Miscellaneous

Conference Calls	Number of Calls	*Port/Call	Total Cost
60 minute Conf calls @ \$.023 per minute	9	30	373
60 minute Conf calls @ \$.023 per minute	12	10	166
*number of ports per call may vary	21	40	539

Grand Total: \$ 69,189

Appendix: Consultant

Lizanne Payne

Lizanne Payne is Executive Director of the Washington Research Library Consortium (WRLC), which was established in 1987 to support the library and information services of its member institutions in Washington, DC: George Washington University, Georgetown University, American University, The Catholic University of America, Gallaudet University, George Mason University, Marymount University, and the University of the District of Columbia. Since joining WRLC in 1989, Ms. Payne has presided over the implementation and ongoing development of WRLC's shared digital library system and consortial lending service, and the construction and operation of a shared library storage facility which began operations in 1994 and is being expanded in 2009.

Ms. Payne has extensive experience in consortium management and governance. At WRLC, she has negotiated with high-level university administrators to implement multiple governance changes for the consortium, including a return to full membership for Georgetown University (2004); restructuring the Board of Directors to consist primarily of the chief academic officers instead of the university presidents (2006); and defining a tiered membership structure with a Sustaining Member category to reflect the substantial financial and operational support provided by the largest members (2007). She has developed and secured support for several major changes to the member cost-sharing formula in order to improve sustainability for the consortium while ensuring that members perceive the formula as equitable.

Ms. Payne has been active in the field of library consortia, especially in the area of shared library systems and storage depositories. For about 10 years she has been writing and speaking about the role of library depositories in collection management, including the keynote address at the first LAMA ALA preconference on library offsite storage in 1999; an invited presentation to the 2nd International Conference on Repository Libraries in 2004 in Kuopio, Finland; a paper on "Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America" commissioned by OCLC, Inc. in 2007; and active participation in OCLC's Cooperative Collection Management Trust (CCMT) and Shared Print Working Group in 2007 and 2008.

Ms. Payne has performed consulting engagements for other library consortia including:

The New York Art Resources Consortium (NYARC), for which she assisted the initial formation of the consortium and will conduct strategic planning meetings during 2009 - 2011 to assess progress and benefits, and develop funding strategies

The Center for Research Libraries (CRL), for which she prepared an assessment of the UK Research Reserve shared print program as a model for similar initiatives in North America (summer 2009)

Ms. Payne has over 25 years experience in library automation and information technology, including six years at OCLC, two years as co-founder and vice president of a library

automation start-up company, and earlier work in software development at the National Library of Medicine and as a consultant at the firm now known as KPMG LLP.

Ms. Payne is a graduate of Smith College and earned an M.L.S. from the University of Maryland, College of Library and Information Services, and an M.B.A. from The George Washington University.

Consultant Time

Hourly rate: \$75

months	conf calls	length (hours)	meetings	length (hours)	reports	CDL &/or subgroup calls
9	9	2	2	48	1	12

Total Hours:

126 hours in meetings / conf calls / CDL calls

176 22 hours prep / drafting / email communication time per conf call

40 hours for final report

342 Total hours: 38 hrs / month for 9 months

Total Cost:

\$25,650 one week / month for 9 mos. @ above hourly rate