arXiv Member Advisory Board Meeting Summary
September 13, 2016

1) Introductions
   a) For agenda, list of participants, and slides of introductory overviews by Oya, Jim, and Martin, please see:
   https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/September+13%2C+2016+Meeting+Agenda
   b) We welcome to new members: Takashi Hikihara, Tracey Clark, Alison Scott, Martin Köhler
   c) Issues/questions:
      i) arXiv's mirror site policy - as we consider eliminating some of the existing ones, we need to take into consideration geopolitical issues & need for distributed domains
      ii) arXiv's licensing terms need to be reconsidered as we are envisioning arXiv-NG:
      http://arxiv.org/help/license

2) Beyond 2013-2017 Business Plan: Planning for Next Business Cycle - with Raym Crow (Please refer to preliminary document sent via email)

   2018-2022 Annual Budget

- Recognize need for additional $150K/year simply to sustain the current baseline service
- Recognize need to surface and include previously unrecovered costs
- Proposal to restructure membership fees - overview:
  - Current structure doesn't equitably distribute cost and benefits of use of arXiv
  - Proposal indexes fees to use
- Proposal to restructure membership fees (2018-2022) - discussion:
  - Might expect some resistance to a new model - remember that it is a volunteer system as they are paying for an open access resources and institutions will not pay if the fees are too high
  - Scope of this planning activity is focused on current arXiv, not next-generation arXiv, which may have a different financial model. We'll need to run arXiv-NG for 1-2 years to understand the associated expenses
  - Model doesn't take into account interest of potential 501c3 contributors (with increased expenses), expansion to other domains, potential contributions from potential member institutions from underrepresented areas (i.e. China)
  - MAB urges careful, thorough and creative thinking about communication
  - This plan scoped for five years; discussed appropriate length for this planning cycle, especially given the uncertainties associated with the arXiv-NG planning process
  - Formula for calculating annual membership fees:
    - Fees based on percentages vs. tiers
    - Use vs. submission based statistics - pilot data indicates similarities

- - - Adding a lower feel (e.g., $500) for institutions below 200 and expand outreach to top 400
        - Possibility of basing the fee model on average use ranking for 2013-2016 as use is fluid and ranking changes each year (especially if we will have a higher fee for the top 10-15 organizations with heavy use)
    - Do more communication and outreach on financial model and plans:
        - Annual fees are likely to go up in 2017 (predictability is important for library budgets)
        - Why support arXiv? What are institutions getting out of it? Identify stakeholders and value propositions for each group
        - Shall we consider reaching out to scientists to increase their awareness of sustainability issues and libraries' role in supporting arXiv? For instance, including the deans/chairs of pertinent academic units in fund raising letters.

Decision: arXiv staff will develop a 2018-2022 budget proposal for MAB.

Support from Societies and Publishers

- Would like to expand lists of potential societies and publishers (heavily US, now)
- Significant overhead in developing and sustaining such a program, make sure revenue justifies effort - we need at least 20 societies to make program worthwhile
- Informal poll indicates support for creating a tier for societies that operate as nonprofit entities (not including commercial publishers)
- Informal poll on support for sponsorships for (not-for-profit) professional societies: strong majority supports. There should be no strings attached to these contributions.

Decision: arXiv staff will develop more refined proposal for MAB

Online Giving Campaign Discussion

- Suggestions on this year's campaign: we have not heard any accounts of pop-ups annoying users, target fundraising to more specific projects. Repeat campaigns require real effort to sustain.
- Online campaign is a useful way to remind scholars/users that arXiv costs money and that libraries support it (note that users from supporting institution IPs see banner that acknowledges support).
- Advance notice to let scientists know that we'll do online fund raising
- Crowdfunding & 3rd-party services (for targeted and more refined approaches)
- Making an effort to reach out to corporations with potential users - IBM, MS, etc.

3) SAB Update - Karen Vogtmann & Carol Hoover
- Structure of arXiv team. SAB very happy with recent changes. Also discussed Scientific Director position.
- Moderation issues: managing mods, tools for mods, hold list
- Uniform moderation standards across subject areas (CS is an outlier)
- Expansion to other subject areas. Have been approached for econometrics
- Development needs for current and future arXiv

- Fundraising, partnerships. Conversation with Cornell CIS Dean Greg Morrisett re: partnerships with CIS and other entities
- Actions and decisions regarding moderation standards across subject areas, author-curated links, submitting "old" papers to arXiv, daily freeze and release times, endorsement policy changes, and papers submitted to arXiv and another OA repository
- Executive session summary: very pleased with progress of past year
- SAB membership changes

Discussion of arXiv@25 review results and general open discussion
- Other -rXivs (bioRXiv, socrXiv, etc.) Cornell is in the process of seeking service-mark and now requiring that the new initiatives include the following statement on your website: *arXiv is a trademark of Cornell University, used under license. This license should not be understood to indicate endorsement of content on <name of repository> by Cornell University or arXiv.*
- Discussion of OA developments around the world

Executive Session Summary

- New management structure is much improved, but SD position still needs clarification on role. Who is the person who can/should represent arXiv to the scientific community?
- Should arXiv create a combined Executive Director/Scientific Director position with appropriate authority? ED/SD could still report to Program Director. Need someone to represent arXiv, travel, educate, communicate with both scientific and library community. Would need clear hierarchical and reporting structure.
- Become 501(c)3?
- Change of personnel is a good thing, but there are still quite a few partial FTE staff that need to be more full time, staffing is too piecemeal which could lead to gaps in knowledge or loss of knowledge.
- Could have arXiv MAB/SAB Chair or person independent of university act as ambassador?
- MAB strongly endorses Oya's contribution to arXiv. Oya's 0.3 FTE commitment represents a risk to arXiv, if it becomes necessary to transfer arXiv to another institution, since in reality more than 0.3 FTE is required for the responsibilities of the position.
- arXiv has not yet created a sophisticated enough budget model to accommodate variables like adding new subject categories, addressing variable costs (as opposed to fixed costs), additional fundraising efforts, etc.
- Jim's presentation and Raym's models need to come together to represent the full picture of arXiv in the future.
- Business case for arXiv not fully enough developed in terms of making a strong argument for institutions/individuals to support membership donations. Stakeholder/ownership case needs to be defined more clearly.

- Story around value to submitter as a donor is not fully defined. Need to fill that gap. What's in it for them, why should they donate?
- A more fully defined business case would help libraries make the case for spending community dollars for community good. Explain how arXiv helps libraries support open access.
- Is "membership" the best term or model? Confusing to some. With different terminology libraries might be able to use operating/public relations/marketing funds rather than materials funds. Offer options for increased funding support beyond tier model.
- Libraries should own the process of paper submission to participate in the full scholarly communication workflow.
- Need to be able to talk in language of those who are paying the bill – libraries – as well as the language of the author/submitter who is using the service, but is also a potential donor.
- Don't assume libraries are forever supporters of OA, be willing to continually communicate, educate, market. There is now a strong drive in many countries to support OA, and many of the efforts are currently focused in making breakthroughs in new areas (like social sciences and humanities). arXiv might be taken for granted as an established service, so that it is missing out on funds that could be directed to it. We should encourage the formation of arXiv consortia at national level.

Other Business:

- Jim Mullins will be asking Big 10 Academic Alliance to appoint a new MAB member for next year
- Terms coming to an end: Philip Kent, Eva Isaksson, Zhixiong Zhang
- Will need a new SAB representative to MAB