Dear Colleagues,

Currently we have three subgroups working with the Cornell arXiv team on different aspects of arXiv: Fund raising, interoperability and public access mandates, and arXiv business model assessment. I've appended a brief summary of the ongoing planning work to keep you informed of their accomplishments and to invite your input. We welcome others to join these small working groups. The outcomes of this preliminary work will be further discussed during our September meeting.

Regards,

Oya

Fund Raising Subcommittee
Members: Jim Mullins (MAB/SAB liaison), Jenny Ross (SAB), Karen Vogtmann (SAB), Oya Rieger (coordinator)
-- Based on the input we gathered from SAB/MAB during last year's annual meeting, we are getting ready to pilot a Given button. The attached document offers a context, including an image that provides a visual frame of where the give button will appear on the arXiv homepage.
-- Working with Simeon Warner and Martin Lessmeister, Oya is coordinating the development of draft budgets (rough order of magnitude estimate) for the initiatives identified as Special Projects at:
https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/Revised+2015+arXiv+Roadmap+-+Draft+for+Review
We need such an estimate as we consider different fund raising strategies. Also, the Cornell team has started to work on a budget model that more realistically captures the expenses involved in running arXiv based on what we've learned during the last several years. This will form the basis for our next 5-year business plan and also will give us a better sense of the additional funding needs for the next couple of years. The current 5-year plan is available at:
https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/arXiv+Sustainability+Initiative?preview=/127116484/191234216/arXiv%20Business%20Model.pdf
-- Chris Myers had an initial meeting with a group of NSF program officers. It was useful and productive and there seemed to be quite a bit of enthusiasm for arXiv and interest in continuing discussions to identify suitable funding opportunities. We are in the process of planning the next steps.
-- Jenny suggested that we contact our local Congress person about getting federal funds in support of arXiv. [This needs to be done in consultation with Cornell's Government Relations.] Also work with Cornell's Foundation Relations to identify relevant foundations that we may want to approach for requesting funds. She also suggested that we explore if there are any collaboration opportunities with bioRxiv from the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory (http://www.biorxiv.org/)
-- As we conduct a Give button pilot, we are planning to invite publishers/societies (such as Elsevier, Wiley, Springer, AIP, APS, AMS, IOP) to support arXiv.
-- We would like to consider expanding next year's membership drive to organizations ranked 200+; however, we first need to assess feasibility and overhead associated with this process. The focus so far has been on the top 200-250 organizations with heavy use (use is measured by article downloads). This

is principally because the top 200 institutions account for about 75% of institutionally identifiable downloads. Last year, we raised approximately $341K through membership fees from 183 institutions and the total revenue, including Cornell and Simons Foundation direct contributions, was around $766,000.

-- Reassess the feasibility and value of incorporating arXiv as an independent non-profit organization (501C3) When we considered this option a few years ago, we concluded that this would increase our costs by 30-35% as arXiv will need to start paying for rent, utilities, legal protection, insurance, server arrangements, etc. We will reconsider this option again as we start working on a plan for 2018 and beyond

--Solicit ideas from MAB and SAB about potential funding programs to consider (foundations, national grants, etc.) Jenny's suggestions included Research Corp for Science Advancement, Murdock Foundation, Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, Howard Hughes, and Pew Charitable Trust.

-- Draft talking points about the unique value of arXiv and why it should be supported

Jenny's elevator pitch: For those interested in getting science to the public and other scientists in a timely manner: The arXiv is a place where the public can access directly the scientific research of science. Many articles are peer reviewed, but peer review can often take a year or more. Meanwhile, the information is not available. arXiv makes science available sooner. Other articles contain information that are too few, null results, or other types of data that do not "fit" into "stories" of publications, yet deserve and need to be out there in order to push scientific research forward. Why we should be funded by societies/society publications (i.e., APS): They allow direct submission from the arXiv to submit your manuscript.

IR Interoperability Subgroup
Members: Carol Hoover (MAB/SAB liaison), Tim Klassen (MAB), Simeon Warner, Oya Rieger (coordinator)
We started our work by gathering feedback from a few institutional repository (IR) managers to expand our understanding of requirements and expectations. We wanted to document the interoperability that member libraries would like to see, or the ways that their IRs currently interact with other large repositories. Attached is Simeon's draft report on interoperability features based on the input we have gathered thus far. It summarizes the emerging requirements and arXiv's current ability to fulfill such needs. Working with Lucie Burgess (the new MAB rep from Jisc), we had a conference call with a group of UK research libraries to discuss the new HEFCE requirements to expand our understanding of their needs and they are envisioning arXiv to support their requirements. You will see that the draft report has references to this set of requirements too. The Special Projects section of the arXiv roadmap includes a project in support of our IR interoperability goals.

Assessment Subgroup
Members: *Tim Klassen (MAB), Esther Tobschall (MAB), Oya Rieger (coordinator)*
As previously mentioned, one of the core themes in this year's annual meeting agenda will be the design of an assessment plan to evaluate our current business and governance model. This process is essential as we start considering the next 5-year business planning cycle (2018-2022). This process will begin with the identification of desired outcomes and success measures to gauge progress (for instance, dynamics of the governance model, level of financial support, enhancements to arXiv, improvements to moderation system, etc.). Cornell team will use this model to conduct a self-evaluation with input from the Simons Foundation, MAB, SAB, and other key partners such as users. After considering a number of tools such as the Balanced Score Card, SWOT Analysis, and Performance Prism, we've decided to pursue a hybrid approach and create a model based on the arXiv's principles, which offered a foundation for the current business and governance model:
https://confluence.cornell.edu/download/attachments/127116484/arXivPrinciplesMarch12.pdf

Oya Y. Rieger, Ph.D.
Associate University Librarian
Scholarly Resources & Preservation Services
arXiv Program Director
Cornell University Library