

Meeting Agendas & Minutes

- [March 19, 2018](#)
 - [January 23, 2018](#)
 - [September 26, 2017](#)
 - [July 25, 2017](#)
 - [May 23, 2017](#)
 - [April 25, 2017](#)
 - [February 28, 2017](#)
 - [November 21, 2016](#)
 - [September 26, 2016](#)
 - [June 27, 2016](#)
 - [April 25, 2016](#)
 - [February 22, 2016](#)
 - [November 24, 2015](#)
 - [October 26, 2015](#)
 - [September 28, 2015](#)
 - [July 27, 2015](#)
 - [April 30, 2015](#)
 - [March 19, 2015](#)
 - [January 26, 2015](#)
 - [November 17, 2014](#)
 - [October 27, 2014](#)
 - [September 22, 2014](#)
 - [August 25, 2014](#)
 - [June 30, 2014](#)
 - [April 22, 2014](#)
 - [February 6, 2014](#)
 - [January 6, 2014](#)
-

March 19, 2018

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#) (15 min)
- [Final discussion / close out work of the Repository Principles Working Group](#) (15 minutes)
- Discussion: Repository Executive group future projects and priorities (30 minutes)

Announcements and Updates

- Welcome to Peter Hook, Law Library
- Gail: eCommons upgrading to DSpace 6.2 over spring break
 - Configurable health checks
 - Changing how they assign handles for versions
 - Bug fixes / security issues
- Michelle: RFP for local preservation storage
 - Starting over with specifications
- Gail: EZID closing so exploring options for issuing DOIs
- Jim: DC@ILR Uploaded 2000th federal document!

Final discussion / close out work of the Repository Principles Working Group

- Finished update of last two sections, based on group feedback
 - Updates to the document
 - Encourage feedback as part of use - make the paragraph on how to comment a call-out box.
 - Repo-Exec Chair responsible for bringing update schedule to group - maybe X sections for each year with a small group reviewing each
 - Marketing? Erin met with Zsuzsa - opt in for subgroup
 - Audience: Internal (R&O, email, Library Forum?, LEG (ask Dean/Oya) etc), some larger outreach also (eg. Open Repositories)
 - Still to do: create PDF for eCommons
-

January 23, 2018

Agenda

- [Updates and Announcements](#)
- [Review final two Repository Principles Sections](#)
- Create plan for how to use / market principles document

Updates and Announcements

- OR: bpress to Samvera review submitted to LEG; LEG wants to review resources and costs due to other large projects like Folio, Scholars, CULAR, etc. Not on agenda yet, so timeframe is likely next couple of months.
 1. Jim in contact with Penn, who is doing a repo service evaluation and looking at how they want to proceed. Jim shared our review with them. Also met with Sarah Sweeny from Northeastern and their migration out of bpress.
 2. DK wondering about collaboration potential?
 3. GS reminder that Samvera development is progressing; important to remember that collaboration has costs as well
 4. OR SPARC and COAR have an effort to energize international community for community supported infrastructure for IRs. In those discussions, it seems to be DSpace comes up most prevalent
 5. DK: biggest barriers are a mix of end-user and manager features - is there an opportunity to enumerate which features are important in the repository community for repos as a whole, not necessarily to bpress
 6. Share the Hyrax evaluation with with Repo Exec group (to keep internal) Gail.

Review final two Repository Principles Sections

- Assessment of Impact (Jim lead)
 - OR: section is nice - succinct and inclusive. End user in this context is student, faculty, staff, but is there another section on impact of service providers we rely on (eg. library liaisons; for example Mann is a "user" of ecommons, sort of as an intermediary). Maybe it's already being done, but may be worth a sentence noting that a user might be someone who is direct depositing, or one that's an intermediary.
 - SK: maybe link to Gail's confluence document in the footer as an example of different user populations
 - KW: patron data - is it really legally restricted, or just ethically?
 - KW: impact stories - aren't we tracking use? Do we mean here personally identifiable use, or individual patron use?
- Outreach (Sarah lead)
 - GS: Use of phrase "service owner" - is a defined term in ITSM rules - be sure we link to OUR definition, especially if it's different than this.
 - GS: Add social media to delivery mechanisms, include reference to media coordinator
 - GS: Outreach partners may also be audiences
 - OR: How about groups outside the library, such as Center for Teaching Excellence, Acad Tech and other service providers who are in the research / teaching space. Maybe keep them generic / focus on functions because names keep changing
 - KW: Under delivery mechanisms, include things that might take more authority (Cornell Chronicle, UL email, Communications from senior library leadership)

Create plan for how to use / market principles document

1. Jim/Erin are reviewing in the next month for consistency
2. Will make a PDF version and put in eCommons
3. Please come with ideas (eg. present highlights x forum, put links to it from x, y and z locations, etc...)
 - a. Erin and Jim have submitted a proposal to Open Repositories (Accepted)
 - b. Career Development Week/Days?
 - c. Mann Dig Repo Steering Group
 - d. Liaisons
 - e. Gail and Unit Libraries - confusion about library landscape in repositories, and they are willing to work in collaboration with that work
 - f. How about reaching out to CD Exec or Vis Resources Working Group - would love to see it advertised in some groups like RND, MWG, but also CDEExec and other groups who might not *think* it's relevant to them, but is written in an accessible way so might also be useful to them
 - g. Outside engagement - Samvera service list, DLF list, IR Manager List,
 - h. Need to be sure we emphasize how to keep it alive!!
 - i. Push through ALA, ACRLESP for institutions who don't have IR's!
 - j. DK: CNI proposal? April in San Diego, with Feb 5 deadline
 - k. OR: Could share with Ivies Plus
 - l. SK: Could we somehow partner with Cornell Press to try to access Library Schools? Or other way to circulate to iSchools?
 - m. OR: Blog on DSPS, Tweet about it

September 26, 2017

Agenda

- [Review Access: Discovery and Delivery section of Repository Principles Document](#)
- [Review Service Planning section of Repository Principles Document](#)

Access: Discovery and Delivery Section (Erin/Jenn)

- "Good job"!
- From mediating access section, consider adding link or info about infrastructure
- Some redundancy - eg needs assessment, user community sections
 - Acknowledged that we have it; have decided to address it once we have all docs complete
- Intro talks about discovery and delivery but text then jumps to three other items - just to consider for presentation
- There are a few more links that might be useful to add, even if redundant would be useful to have them whenever a linkable service or group is mentioned

Service Planning (Jim/Sarah)

- Really a "pull it together" section because it pulls from lots of other existing content
- In needs assessment section, there is "extant service" that is slightly different from how later in the document there is a concept of an "extant system"
- Circular presentation of roles with "Service Sponsor" in roles section

- Content selector - aren't we trying to get these to be IN CUL?? Not always...

Additional comments:

- Should we add a glossary, that might include roles and other definitions? Has been discussed and will reconsider when pulling whole document together.
- Remaining sections all underway
 - Infrastructure and Interoperability (Chris and Michelle)
 - Outreach (Library A&C Office)
 - Assessment (Library A&C Office)
 - Documentation (Erin and Dianne)
- Hope to wrap up project for presentation to group and sponsors by end of year; present to CUL at large in Jan/Feb.

July 25, 2017

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#)
- [Repository Principles subgroup update](#)
- [HathiTrust release project presentation for Charleston Conference](#)

Announcements and Updates (all)

- (Gail) eCommons upgrade to 6.1, but time TBD
- (Gail) DLXS collections moving to eCommons
- (Gail) Scholarly Comm team talking to units not served by bpress about their use/lack of use of eCommons
 - Sending anything appropriate to Haiti there to be preserved
 - For content that has structural requirements will go into Hyrax
 - Collection brand requirements would have portal pages built for them with catalog metadata
 - Working with Collection Development (Kizer) to work through what collections need what
- (Jenn) Getting ready to take content from A&S grants into Hyrax
- (Gail) eCommons exploring a change-management workflow with help of Chris Manly and Michelle
- (Jenn) with google going away, will index eCommons into solar with digital collections to allow display in a bento box of ecommons items
- (Jim) ILR has two inquiries about journal support - will let us know how it progresses
 - One from another publisher - faculty member wants to transfer from another bpress instance
 - One not yet published digitally
 - Their license has 5 instances they can use for publishing, so no added costs
 - Would run like ILR Review and library would not get involved unless really needed

Repository Principles working group update (Jim, Wendy, Sarah)

- Content under development
 - Service Planning
 - Access
- Content recently added to wiki
 - Metadata
- 2-4 more sections to go
- Formatting questions
 - Accordions
 - Danger of the expand macro going away in confluence is real
 - No strong opinions, generally printed, so accordions don't help
 - Terse TOC's
 - If we like the terse headings, why are we asking the questions in the first place?
 - Other suggestions
 - Footer - release vs update
 - Add last reviewed date - check how CUL does other policies

Summary of ongoing work on HathiTrust release project, including proposal for concurrent session at Charleston Conference (Nov 6-10) (Sarah)

May 23, 2017

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#)
- [Discuss presentation of repositories in the discovery layer](#)
- [Present Metadata principles document / get feedback from group at large](#)

Announcements and Updates

- Trip to Bentley for Michelle's group to look at Archivemata is upcoming
- Mann has finished phase 1 of sending Hathi Trust 1700 documents

Discuss presentation of repositories in the discovery layer

- Item level representation in the discovery layer would be preferred

- Will need to work with individual repo managers to discuss capabilities
- Repos that can be harvested via OAI-PMH or APIs would be the ones to incorporate

Present Metadata principles document / get feedback from group at large

- Refer to box document for feedback
- Please email additional comments

April 25, 2017

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#)
- [Repository Principles Subgroup Work Discussion](#)

Announcements and Updates

- Michelle updated us on the IT work on setup of Preservation Storage Service. They're looking for letters of intent to present with charter to Dave Lifka for approval.
- Mann submitted set of items to Haithi for full text sharing.
- Reminder of two Scholarly Communications working groups that are currently active:
 - One team gathering information on use of eCommons.
 - Another team is looking into what and University-wide Open Access policy would mean for the library and how to model for how to make a OAP policy requiring local submission work.
- CULAR maxed out at 16TB last fall so looking for a different storage model and have been able to find a solution.

Repository Principles Subgroup Work Discussion

- Review of Preservation section – let us know what you think!
 - GS: Section on content steward - maybe make this clear that stewards may also be from outside the library
- Review of online content <https://confluence.cornell.edu/display/culpublic/Cornell+University+Library+Repository+Principles+and+Strategies>
 - Could we put it on eCommons? Theoretically yes... but ideally would like also to have the ability to have comments/feedback on the document.
 - Could add to the landing page a link to a place for people to provide feedback (eg Google form, or box document)
 - Move things there annually or when a new version is needed.
 - Confluence CAN support commenting (even online), so that's a benefit of that.
 - Add a note to the top of the page encouraging people to add comments inline and how to do that.
 - Make sure we have contact info for every section
 - What's the relationship b/w this doc and the CUL policy documents?
 - Sharepoint site has policies - section on both private and public
 - Somewhere else on staff web that might be appropriate
 - Add dates to documents - created, reviewed, next review due
 - Maybe do both eCommons and Confluence - link back and forth between the two in both the online and print versions. Consider a table with changes by people, when and change-log
 - Look into Expand Macro for confluence - maybe we could use that
 - MP: is any of the curation content in the preservation document duplicative to the intro curation document
 - For long document, can also create a page with two column and put a TOC in the left to aid in navigation.
 - GS: Re Rights Management - much of it would be interesting public-facing info, could it live elsewhere and be pointed to from this document

February 28, 2017

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#)
- [Repository Principles Updates](#)
- [Mann Digitization Workflow Discussion](#)

Announcements and Updates

- eCommons is Testing Dspace 6, with 7 not too far away
- Two Scholarly Communication working group activities
- Foster more productive relations b/w eCommons and unit libraries who use them - understanding workflows and needs
 - Open Access Policy at Cornell - what would the library do if we adopted this at a university

Repository Principles Updates

- Reviewed group charge and status update - next documents on deck are preservation and metadata
- Reviewed the draft of the Rights Management Section of the Repository Principles Document
 - What isn't in this document that you think should be addressed?
 - Maybe present in terms of audience?
 - Is there anything in this document you think is superfluous or inappropriate?
 - Maybe too much overhead - present as what's a minimum?

- On self-submission repos, much of this document is not applicable
- At law, like eCommons, responsibility is fully on the shoulders of the submitter.
- At HLM, they do a little more to help determine copyright status and get permission, sometimes even ask publishers for permission, but generally don't have to do this.
- Mann does have to address these issues with BHL and Haiti so really good for them.
- Add something if/when and Open Access Policy is passed at Cornell?
- What's the easiest way for you to engage with the Repository Principles document? Please consider both format and location.
 - Have so far considered public confluence site.
 - More visuals along with the text
 - Libguide?
 - PDF Attachment for visuals
 - Tie into org charts for providing context
 - What is "public"? Can we point to it from StaffWeb?
 - Is there any concerns about too much traffic to copyright@cornell.edu it might generate if public? General feeling was "no"
- We are considering including "checklists" to each section – would people find this useful? Should those remain part of the topical sections, or be pulled together into an appendix or other document?
- Thinking about outreach: how should we let people outside this group know about this document?
- Thinking about maintenance: what is a sustainable schedule for review and updating of this material?
 - Yes, needs to be done!
- Remaining sections that might be included in this document are listed below. How should we prioritize these?
 - Security/Infrastructure (1 vote)
 - Service planning (1 vote)
 - Discovery/Delivery/Access
 - Outreach

Mann Digitization Workflow Discussion

- Reviewed Sarah Kennedy's digitization workflow chart from Mann - she will incorporate feedback and thanks the group for their input

November 21, 2016

Agenda

- [Announcements and Updates](#)
- [Agriknowledge Demo and Update](#)

Announcements and Updates

- New Repo-Exec Member: Sarah Kennedy from Mann - Collection Development & Digital Collections Librarian
- New CUL employee: Jasmine Burns - Visual Resources Metadata Librarian started today
- Hydra community user experience group distributed testing on 7.2 which is what Mann will be using - looking for 3-5 testers from each institution. Cornell looking for volunteers - contact Jenn. Looking for Staff - repo technicians, managers, archivists etc.
- Repo Principles Subgroup - Rights management subgroup and metadata sections work underway
- arXiv sustainable management grant (see Oya's DSPS blog post), and Gail putting more time on that. Chloe McClaren will be picking up time /effort for eCommons
- In area of Digital Scholarship: finding new homes for DPubs content, and documenting local code changes for eCommons

Agriknowledge Demo and Update (Lynette Rayle)

- <https://agriknowledge.org/>
- Wanted ability to do search and browse by controlled vocabularies and by particular collections.
- Search in background is Blacklight
- Controlled vocabularies are represented in the facets
- Previously, metadata team had to add documents by hand - complex and time consuming, but Sufia now provides user interface to meet metadata needs
 - Can add metadata in bulk to a batch of files
 - Can pull in keywords from externally controlled vocabularies
- Have metadata tips
- Currently based over Sufia 6, so use same metadata for all documents
 - Sufia 7 has concept of a work type, so different metadata can show up based on type
- Sufia 6 also has no workflow built in - 7 has configurable, mediated workflow built in
- In 7, can assign roles (editors, publishers, reviewers) with automated transfer between states expected to have PR with that functionality
 - Multiple work types is already available in 7
- Workflow states are available
- Q: Batch upload by spreadsheet? In progress from CSV using bags technology
- Sufia 7 upgrade for Agriknowledge - not sure when it's happening, but is part of the new contract which has been granted. ESMIS project currently being built ON 7 is a priority before an Agriknowledge transition

September 26, 2016

Agenda

- [Repository Principles Subgroup Work Discussion](#)
- [Announcements](#)

Repository Principles Discussion

- Four Over-arching Principles as shared in Jim's email "define" what a repository is in this context. Key point is that a repository isn't a "thing", it's a "service".
- Audience for the document? A: Not defined originally, but writing it for repository service managers.
- There may be cases where the repo doesn't exist yet and this document would be useful, so perhaps a wider audience?
- Think about this in terms of projects, which may begin before the repository exists.
- The current definition may be a little broad, including things like digital content. Would push to include the definition in the actual document
- Can see utility in sharing this more widely - could be a help in flushing out job descriptions, etc.
- Found very useful for work with Extension, esp for those creating repos but don't even know it. Liked the idea of "ecosystem"
- Wordsmithing suggestion: current draft flips back and forth between "setup" and "maintenance" and while content useful to both, maybe separate them for clarity?
- Include a section with definitions, eg. "curation"
- Echo need for definition of what a repository IS (perhaps rather than what it isn't?), at least in the context of this document
- Would this document be a place where we could include examples/references, and link to the inventory work already done?
- Document about policy development for data (<https://www.coar-repositories.org/files/guide.pdf>)
- Suggestion: Include table of contents!
- Suggestion: Be sure to point to this group as a resource
- There is, at times in CUL, a belief that we can make a new repo that can handle things better than what's already existing. Can we use this document to encourage conversations to help make these decisions?
 - That conversation needs to include cost - is it worth the cost to get the added features.
 - The role of LibExec is also to also encourage these conversations, and have the transparency that will make things seem less top-down.
- Question about "roles" in creating the document. Roles are parsed out in this document, but know that they're not always as clear as it makes them seem here.
- Idea: make a document that lays out roles for each of our existing repositories?
- We often focus on what the repo does, rather than what we hope it aspires to... trying to change that mentality will help with the discussion of when it's better to merge/expand rather than start a new one from scratch.
- Suggestion: So far we're not talking about creating much documentation - be sure that's included!
- Additional sections to create as the subgroup continues its work: Service Planning/Sustainability - curation - preservation - metadata - security and rights management - assessment - outreach - security - interoperability - infrastructure and maintenance - discovery - inject - documentation
- Subgroup wants to be thinking of this as a living document. Will put out calls for help on each section.

Announcements:

- Gail: eCommons: grad school migration to ProQuest is happening, and the first batch will be January. Including eCommons license visible during submission, addressing embargos, DOIs upon request, FERPA release storage, collection coordinator workflows.
- Simeon: ORCID - ORCID update: Met with identity man people at Cornell about what it means to roll ORCID into institution ID management system. Outcome is to encourage faculty to use the institutional login now available in ORCID. Could eventually potentially add a feature that would link ORCID ID with Cornell ID. If all that happens, it might (again eventually) be that when someone logs in to eCommons, eCommons would know their ORCID
 - How would it work when you're submitting on behalf of someone else?
 - DSpace would need some modeling to get ORCID's to be associated with the work
 - There is an effort being led by metadata services to look at managing identities across repositories, so this issue is really across the board, not just with DSpace!
- Michelle: ICPSR data fair (webinar) this week in Mann Mon-Thur 12-4. Topics include ICPSR, their Open Data Portal, DDI
- Jeff: Work continuing on CUGIR using GeoBlacklight and GeoServer under that. Data will be available as a web service,

June 27, 2016

Agenda

- [Announcements](#)
- [Repository Inventory Subgroup Update](#)
- [Repository Policy/Strategies Subgroup Update](#)
- [Hydra Evaluation Subgroup Update](#)

Announcements

- (Oya) arXiv 25th Anniversary August this year
 - "arXiv at 25" sustainability initiative
 - User survey - result available this Wednesday
 - ~90% happy with the service
 - Not about the features, more about stability
 - Direct costs currently at about \$850,000 annually
 - Gift Campaign up now on site - goal of raising \$2million for infrastructure improvements
 - 190 member libraries at this time
- (Dean) 2-day Cornell IT Security Summit happening tomorrow and Wed
 - Security risk analysis and mitigation efforts - will affect our systems too (eg especially legacy systems like GloPad)
- (Michael) July 18th Sarah Kennedy new staff member coming to Mann, with Repository (CALS) efforts at Mann.
- (Oya) Working with Ives+ to create a private network to preserve our content in Archivelt, using [LOCKSS](#)

Repository Inventory Subgroup Update (Michelle and Jenn)

- Draft of document added to Wiki working space
- Removed "Luna", "Locale", "Cornell Domain"
 - Re "Cornell Domain" - not a repository that we need to make decisions about preservation, resources dedicated, policy for non-cornell domains, etc.
 - Consider separating Archivet into the separate collections because they're handled differently
 - Maybe for the purposes of this document, we keep it, but it's possibly something that can be addressed elsewhere in the work of RepoExec
 - Ultimately, consider this inventory as a place to start thinking about how we're handling policy, assessing how we're handling our accessioned assets.
 - Archivet + Cornell Domain - maybe the efforts to address these question is the work of the policy group?
- Added new Fedora Repos, separated by Fedora3 vs Fedora4 infrastructure, plus others
 - How do these all relate to the digital registry and other work of Michelle's group's efforts for digital curation management? Digital Curation Services will explore ways to bring the registry, DCAPS production practices, and the survey into closer alignment.
- Metrics
 - Number of "things" and "aggregate size" to give a rough picture of how big the bag is.
 - Archivet has additional issues for these metrics (seeds, vs files, vs sites etc)
- Preservation
 - Valuable feature would be to use identifiers to connect systems, so descriptors re-worked to address things via that coordination

Repository Policy/Strategies Subgroup Update

- (Jim) Erin Faulder and Jim DelRosso leading
- Met once as whole group, another meeting of chairs
- Set membership, started with high-level principles, but want detailed, useful information included
- First round of ideas out to the subgroup for feedback

Hydra Evaluation Subgroup Update

1. Created features for all user stories
2. Set aside all features that are exclusive to repositories other than eCommons (for example readership maps and cover page creation (bepress), or ties to secondary preservation systems for storage replication (CULAR)). There were also a few features that are not currently done in eCommons, but have been stated as a priority for CUL, so remain in the evaluation (eg. ORCID integration).
3. Evaluated all features against current state of Hydra/Sufia development, marking them as
 - a. Green (~60%): Can currently be handled, with minimal customization anticipated
 - b. Yellow (~30%): Sufia can do these to some extent or differently than described in the feature(s). Additional development needed to implement this feature
 - c. Red (~10%): Not yet underway in the Hydra community; would require significant development to implement
4. Also addressed Policy Issues, Migration Issues (including metadata design) and Maintenance issues
5. Possible stumbling blocks / some of the major hurdles include:
 - a. OAI-PMH
 - b. Issues around mediated deposit
 - c. Mapping of communities and collections
 - d. Batch handling
 - e. Versioning - not surfaced in Sufia (not currently a high priority in community)
6. There was a DSpace -> Hydra migration discussion/conf call 6/22 (there are other institutions work on this, none very far along).

From Lynette:

- Multi-part works are part of Sufia 7
- Multiple-part work types work is going on too
- Lynette has a list of 7 things she thinks will need significant work, but 4 are actively being worked on in Sufia Community
 - Not addressed: batch editing, reporting,
 - Worked on: admin features, mediated workflow, work types, configurable metadata (only for whole site, not for work type, or by collection)

From Dean:

- DSpace/eCommons is not necessarily high on the list of things to move (in terms of urgency due to problems with current system). Gail noted that DSpace upgrades expected within the next year will change to a new programming language, which might require staffing changes, and therefore might be a logical time to transition.

From Oya:

- Remember to think about and address in evaluation: "What does it mean, why should we be doing it?"

April 25, 2016

Agenda

- [Announcements](#)
- [Strategies discussion](#)

Announcements

- Introductions, including new members: Michelle Edwards (CISER Data Librarian) and Erin Faulder (Digital Archivist at RMC)
- (Jason) Funded: IMLS Grant for National Forum for Addressing Local Shareable Authorities
- (Michelle P) Hathi expanding access to groups with print disabilities, all copyright materials, regardless of print holdings
- (Oya) COAR (Conf for Open Access Repositories) meeting - partnering with SPARK - international body looking into repositories. Working group on "next generation IRs", led by Herbert Van de Sompel from Los Alamos.
 - Four main focus areas (draft):
 - Develop global interoperability through web-friendly repository technologies and architectures. The current reliance on OAI-PMH is not optimal for discovery and interoperability. Future repositories and repository networks should rely less on "passive" aggregation and develop services based on "active" dissemination (like peer-to-peer architectures).
 - Develop/improve repository functionality related with publication and quality assessment, defining a model for an overlay layer on top of repositories. This overlay layer will use standardized, open peer-review to add value to the network of repositories.
 - Improve repository workflows. This will include better ingest mechanisms and broadening the functionalities of repositories to support the full lifecycle of research.
 - Define and adopt reliable and interoperable usage and impact metrics and tools for repository content.
 - Recommends watching talk by Anurag Acharya from Google at Open Repositories 2015 (https://media.dlib.indiana.edu/media_objects/avalon:16122)
 - More information about the COAR effort will be posted to: <https://www.coar-repositories.org/activities/advocacy-leadership/working-group-next-generation-repositories/>
- (Wendy) Funded: SLOAN grant for creation of pilot Data Curation Network (<https://sites.google.com/site/datacurationnetwork/>)

Strategies Discussion The Strategies Evaluation Subgroup looked at all notes and feedback from November 2015's strategies brainstorming session. Four ideas surfaced, and were presented to the Repository Executive Group in a survey to get feedback on interest in those topics, and people's willingness to participate if the subgroup(s) was formed. The four suggested groups are:

1. Preservation Policy Group

a. Task: Update the CUL Digital Preservation Policy Framework (<http://hdl.handle.net/1813/11230>)

b. Description: The current framework is in need of updating in order to be a helpful guide for CUL going forward. This subgroup will build on the earlier work by

- reviewing the 2004 framework with key stakeholders, noting where updates are most needed
- working with stakeholders to survey existing departmental policies relating to digital preservation
- updating the policy framework to address identified gaps, and coordinate areas of policy development for CUL.

c. Additional Comments: An updated policy framework will likely include placeholders for the development of new and separate policies, the adoption of less formal departmental policies, etc.. (The overall framework might ideally coordinate separate policies roles and responsibilities, what constitutes "preservation", "depths" of preservation, digitization and preservation priorities, etc.)

2. Repository Principles Group. Task: Develop a set of principles to decision-making and priority-setting for Cornell's repository environment, and advocate for adoption of the principles by CUL.

b. Notes: Examples of similar or previous statements and other background material include:

- Ohio State University Libraries' Digital Initiatives Program Guiding Principles (https://library.osu.edu/documents/SDIWG/di_principles_v2.pdf)
- CUL Digital Preservation Policy Framework (<http://hdl.handle.net/1813/11230>). While focused on preservation, some of the structure and content might be useful.
- 2013 CUL white paper on repository roles and strategies: <http://staffweb.library.cornell.edu/system/files/CULIRWhitePaper.pdf> might contain some useful information.

3. Repository Promotion Group

a. Task: Develop a plan to promote existing repositories and their use to relevant stakeholders.

b. Notes: Potential targets for this outreach include:

- Content creators at Cornell such as faculty and grad students, whose publications could be disseminated through repositories.
- Researchers and scholars who would find the content in the repositories useful to their work.
- Liaisons and reference librarians who could both refer users to the content within the repositories, and enlist content creators.

c. Additional Comments: This group may also explore collaboration with other units within CUL, such as the Scholarly Communication Working Group, the Liaison Steering Committee and the Library Communication Department.

4. Repository White Paper Review Group

a. Task: Review the 2013 CUL white paper on repository roles and strategies (<http://staffweb.library.cornell.edu/system/files/CULIRWhitePaper.pdf>) and propose possible follow ups.

Survey results show that development of a set of "repository principles" for CUL is most interesting to the most people. Discussion:

- Group should consider anything from D&A process that might inform these principles
- How to maintain and put in practice??
 - Creating it is a process, but really need to consider how it can be promoted, how to give it broad ownership, how to keep it alive
- Make sure it's something that's USED.
- Make it a strategy document, informed by best principles, so it might be implementable
- More than principles that we lobby for, but more that we make it a strategy that has the authority to move it forward.
- Use this to give agency to RepoExec. Authority is essential - without it, it may be "just another document"
- Work might provide best practices also - a practical aspect
- What stakeholders need to be represented?
 - Metadata Services
 - Repository Managers
 - If preservation is included, Archives should be involved.
 - Consider thinking in terms of streams by which objects get into our current repositories
 - People who work with the users - liaison, promotion, why our repositories are valuable
 - 3-5 month group size

- Make it more iterative - bring to larger group more often
 - First goals, then principles, then maybe strategies
 - Report back early and often
- Moving forward: Will put out call for participation so group can get started.

February 22, 2016

Agenda

- Guest Speakers
 - [Hannah Marshall. Pictor to Shared Shelf Migration](#)
 - [Mira Basara. Luna to Shared Shelf Migration](#)

Summary Minutes

Pictor Migration Background:

- Pictor was a local Access database that was moved into ArtStore's Shared Shelf
- Shared Shelf has been the go-to tool for images - except for the faculty collection, which had been in Pictor (prev maint by KVRRC).
- Pictor was in Access - cataloged locally, periodically, approximately every 6 months, exported to Artstore, who would flatten the database, then load and publish
- Shared Shelf is web-based, cuts out turn-around process, more control over the publishing process, reduced publishing time.

Process:

- Project overseen by 4 different librarians and many students, so data were messy.
- Had to map their Pictor database to the SS cataloging tool.
- Has been great for streamlining the student training process.

Notes about working with Artstor

- Web-based is very convenient
- Users benefit from discovery environment
- Integrates with controlled vocabularies
- Can now use hydra-based discovery and delivery options
- More flexible delivery in terms of faceting, searching
- More sophisticated viewers b/c it's stored at Artstor but we're pulling it in and delivering using IIIF

Process and current status

- Some data might not have been transferred with batch upload, but no information about the images lost
- Turn-around now, excluding actual digitization, could be as short as two weeks
- Backlog issue that was resolved?
 - When Hannah started, she was cataloging images full time to get through a ~5000 image backlog.
 - New cataloging in Pictor was not happening, but Shared Shelf cataloging tool was not ready for use. Despite this, build up only 1000 images during the process, and now have another term-hire metadata librarian to process those.
- Metadata refreshes nightly, so changes reflected within 24h.

Luna Migration

Luna brought by Johnson Museum to Cornell 1998. Luna limitations:

- One browser link for each collection, so no cross-collection search
- First installation had four clients, and each held on different servers
- Used to have to export Pictor database to Luna
- Museum collection cataloged in TMS (oraclebased museum system), difficult to publish in Luna
- 24 collections with unique schema
- Luna didn't support bulk data update
- Did create VRA customized model
- Luna moved to MySQL, while all their other databases were in Oracle, which made for very difficult upgrades

Luna advantages lost:

- Annotations, but primarily used only for Johnson collection and they were willing to give up
- Group presentations, but again 90% were with one Johnson collection, which was not moved
- PDF book reader support lost so for images, can't zoom in
 - Now upload page by page of book, and whole PDF also
- Luna had more granular user permissions
- Luna had mobile device support, Artstore doesn't support
- Luna customer support was better

Process:

- 2005 three collections sent as pilot to Artstore
- 2009 CUL development partnership with Artstore, worked to develop cataloging tool
 - Artstore has great options for varying level of access for how you publish collections

- Migration from Luna to Artstore started in 2009, but really stepped up in 2015 because of security issues
- Contacted users to inform of migration (helped download and save groups etc)
- Resource migration
 - Some collections moved to eMuseum, which did have some issues b/c not all images initially transferred
- Metadata migration
 - Relational databases had to be flattened to a spreadsheet
 - Luna exported XML, but not useful
- Luna test server was finally shut down last week
- Work Underway still to preserve original metadata
- Goal is to shut down Luna production server by Spring 2016

Lessons learned:

- Technical reason for movement is helpful!
- MOU with A&S in 2009 had two year transition from Luna to Artstore, but still... inertia was hard to overcome and transition never as easy as it looks!

Question: Plan to evaluate how people are using / are they satisfied?

- Already known issue: ArtStore does not support very granular analytics



November 24, 2015

Agenda

- [Announcements and updates](#)
- [DSPS reorganization update](#)
- [Discussion of 2015 strategies](#)

Summary Minutes

Announcements and updates (Wendy): Watch for emails to plan/confirm time for 2016 meetings **DSPS reorganization update** (Oya): Shared highlights of the ongoing reorganization plan for DSPS, including new positions of "Director of Digitization and Conservation" (Tre Berney), "Director of Digital Curation



Services" (Michelle Paolillo) and "Director of Scholarly Communication" (Gail Steinhart).

Broke into smaller groups to discuss strategies previously presented for RepoExec in 2015. Each group discussed how we've done so far employing that strategy, if it was still needed/appropriate, and then brainstormed specific ideas on how we could potentially further that effort. A small group of volunteers will tally all ideas, and present at a future meeting a prioritized list of efforts for the group to focus on in 2016.

Discussion of 2015 strategies

October 26, 2015

Agenda

- [Hydra/Sufia Development Update](#)
- [Digital Collections Portal Development Update](#)
- [Announcements and updates from group](#)

Summary Minutes



2015-10-26 over...w of hydra.pptx

Hydra/Sufia Update (Lynette Rayle)
Colt)<http://digital-stg.library.cornell.edu/>

Digital Collections Portal Development Update (Jenn

- Working in Hydra
- Currently for content in places like DLXS, Fedora, Kaltura, Shared Shelf
 - Law and SEAV have separate access portals
- Immediate needs
 - Contain contextual sites
 - Replace DLXS
 - Addressing those collections that are going "through" shared shelf
- Question: is there any plan to work with GeoBlacklight to allow geospatial searching (Stanford - Earthworks)
 - Darcy might also be looking into GeoBlacklight
- Needed: defining scope of what collections are in this portal
- Some collections need customized access points

Additional Discussion:

- What are the arguments against or for using Digital Portal for eCommons?
 - User interfaces.
 - What about using the portal to present eCommons content (not moving it over... using it instead as a discovery tool)?
- This might be a good place to help pull the content into the catalog?
- UBC Open Collections work (<https://open.library.ubc.ca/>)
- Digital Portal effort might be a good use case for the "customized" collections that some of the CCE needs
- Relationship between portal and registry of digital collections?

Announcements and updates (all) Oya: Cornell meeting on campus' open access policy happening today. Wendy: Tentative plan to have guest speaker come to Cornell: Ben Fino-Radin, Digital Repository Manager at MoMA. Would be co-"sponsored" by RepoExec and Metadata Working Group; date TBD, possibly January.

September 28, 2015

Agenda

- [Announcements and updates from group](#)
- [IR Subgroup Update](#)
- [AV Streaming Group Updates](#)

Summary Minutes

Announcements and updates (all)

- Jim: Hotel school moved to new website so all publications content now in Scholarly Commons

IR Subgroup Update (Jim DeRosso, with Wendy Kozlowski, Michelle Paolillo, David Ruddy and Simeon Warner)

- Charge: Determine what features the future Hydra implementation will require to meet the needs of service providers and users currently using DSpace or Digital Commons.
- Method:
 - Started with User Stories generated by last SubGroup and built features from them.
 - Used JIRA and organized them by "Feature Category" and made "Issues" for each feature.
 - Built relationships between User stores and Features, User Stories and User Stories and Features and Features.
 - Prioritized the features - Critical, Major, Minor
- Feedback:
 - Question: User stories supposed to represent all IR content? Ans: No, just eCommons and bePress.

- Question: Meant to inform the development a single repository, or multiple? Ans: working under the assumption of "repository framework". Informed by LEG saying we're moving with Hydra.
- Suggestion: Scope - maybe explicitly state this?
- Comment: Document might be a good framework to judge/build more generally, and characterizing our need
- Question: Have we compared this to current development? Ans: not yet, but that's supposed to be our next step.
- Comment: This should be a live, growing document and needs to be added to as repo development progresses.
- Comment: One thought was that if something like this is used going forward, "critical" would be "minimal viable product" - if we had those items, would be feel good about the system?
- Question: Assessment against Hydra is next, but have we compared them against bePress and eCommons current capabilities? Ans: not systematically, but user stories spun directly out of user stories.
- Comment: One way to reality check the priorities would be that the things we can do now in our repositories is marked as "critical" in this list (or at least evaluate that) - would help with buy-in of a new system.
- Comment: What is prioritized in this document is the features, not the user stories. It might be possible for those to be "calculated" and perhaps it would be a useful exercise.
- Comment: We might use this idea of "MVP" - a system you can migrate other content to, or would we be "stuck" in this new system just like we currently are?
 - Comment: We'd need to be confident that development will go beyond the MVP stage.
 - Comment: If we use critical functionalities as MVP, but we might already be in good shape. (128 - might be too lofty)
 - Comment: If we're deciding on what the critical elements are going live, make sure we don't take a step backwards. Example 1.2.7 should be critical.
 - Comment: Need to launch from a perspective that you need to launch from a point that someone would want to continue development.
- Comment: This dovetails with Digital portal work - couldn't one day these all coalesce and merge - do we really need more than one repository - some might have more branding and some less.
- Comment: Someday the distinction (branding) might be less, but might be driven by the systems we're currently using or available at the time
- Comment: Seems to be a lot of overlap with the delivery and discovery side, but not so much on the deposit side (WRT Digital Portal)
 - Comment: Shared Shelf and Kaltura also include a cataloging workflow... maybe this should be done in phases?
- Comment: WRT brandability, customability - maybe some of these could be broken down - comparison with AV group deciding on what content pushed to eCommons and what to Digital Portal?
- Moving Forward:
 - New Subgroup Activity: Compare this list of features with current development of Hydra/Sufia
 - New Subgroup Activity: Begin thinking about roadmap and budget for development
 - Other considerations:
 - Consider commonalities of current image portal work with our work... what's implicit vs what current requirements are?
 - Check Hydra wiki for that document.
 - Do we make a recommendation that we start to consider not just eCommons but digital portal content too?? (Will need further discussion).

AV Streaming Group Update (Danielle Mericle)

- Closing in on recommendations
- Policy document will be disseminated widely.
- Not represented in current version of report - cheat sheet that Peter H and Danielle and others created for people to know how to preserve specific content.
- Reviewed content types
 1. Licensed content
 2. Collection Development - possible integration with this work and the IR development here.
 3. Self-Submission content
- Next phases
 1. Approval from RepoExec
 2. Disseminate policies
 3. Shift content where needed
 4. Preservation plan

July 27, 2015

Agenda

- [Announcements and updates from group](#)
- [SHARE update and CHORUS introduction](#)
- [eCommons upgrade update](#)
- [IR subgroup update](#)
- [Discussion: facilitating "communication"](#)

Summary Minutes

Announcements and updates (all)

- Danielle:
 - Hydra group will present to CUL soon. Exploratory work on integrating some of the collections (Shared Shelf, Kaltura, DLXS) has been successful. Ideally will have unified front end for digital collections (in Blacklight to dovetail with D&A) that allows robust search. Continuing to work on incorporating/supporting contextual pages for each collection.
 - We are not working on the Johnson Museum collections; they're going with eMuseum, which they will support.
 - Luna is being deaccessioned.

- Dean: We are an IIR founding sponsor. Jenn: working within housecode for making this work. Need to push back on ArtStor, since they're still indemoon it.
- Gail: working with Zsuzsa to get stories out about <http://blogs.cornell.edu/publicaccesshelp/>. This is in support of new funding requirements.

SHARE update and CHORUS introduction (Gail Steinhart and Wendy Kozlowski)

- Gail attended f2f meeting of SHARE working group (<http://www.share-research.org/>)
- SHARE was planned to be a federated search engine on research outputs that are federally funded, and it still is, but IRShaven't contributed as much as anticipated.
- SHARE Notify puts out a constant stream of (sometimes messy) data from CrossRef, arXiv, IRs. Plan to develop curatorial systems to provide clean data to the registry.
- SHARE working groups
 - moving data from campus to SHARE (and possibly back again?)
 - another looking at providing information to funding agencies
 - Gail isona working group looking at interoperability with VIVO
- There's a group (IRIS) looking at using data to demonstrate the impact of research on the university. IRIS may tackle the stories around the data, while SHARE tackles the data.
- Wendy talked about CHORUS (<http://www.chorusaccess.org/>)
 - Strictly related to publications response; not handling data.
 - Over 100 publishers participate, have built another data store using CrossRef metadata, and author-supplied funder metadata.
 - This will then be searchable, but they're only using metadata, not supplying the publications themselves.
 - Questions about whether CHORUS is actually "free", or will costs be passed along to libraries via subscriptions, licensing etc.
- Gail: there was questions in SHARE about rights to metadata. In order to participate, you need to put your metadata under the CC0 licenses. Questions about whether abstracts are copyrighted. Peter indicated they might pull back on that requirement; we may only need to assert that the metadata is sharable.

eCommons upgrade update (David Ruddy)

- DSpace upgrade happened the July 13th
 - v1.8 to 5.2
 - continuing to work on small improvements and bugs
- Improved features include:
 - responsive front end (thank you Melissa), better search capability, eEmbeddable AV viewer, versioning for datasets
- Moved to a new URL. (ecommons.cornell.edu)
- Talking to Weill about their desired repository solution, which may be eCommons - details yet to be worked out
 - Discussion about "What is eCommons?" Is it a set of specific services? Is there policy integrity? Weill may want more autonomy. RepoExec is an appropriate group to address that question.
- Evan @RMC: patrons are using it, having some trouble with phrased searching. Asking for specific issues, so they can be sent along to eCommons admins

IR subgroup update (Jim DelRosso)

- Bepress recommendation to LEG was to not accept offer
- Working in JIRA but will create output useful to larger group for review and feedback
- Starting with User Stories to create features needed in Hydra/Sufia-based system, but also need to consider infrastructure, sustainability, etc.

Discussion: facilitating "communication" (all)

- Group will share agendas ahead of meeting, minutes will be posted to public Wiki, both will be announced on CU-LIB.
- Will accept agenda item requests via email to Wendy, and also create a spot on the Wiki for this
- Wendy raised the questions of sharing minutes/agenda
- Wendy: do we need to broader communications?
- Dean: Schedule broader presentations for specific topics
 - Use forums such as R&O and Metadata Working Group

June 22, 2015

Agenda

1. **IR subgroup update:** It has been a very interesting month for the IR subgroup, as events of the last several weeks have led to alterations in our original mission and timeline. Specifically, bepress put forth an offer for a campus-wide Digital Commons contract, and LEG weighed in on strategies for system evaluation and the CUL's move to Hydra. Discussion will focus not just on these events, but where the subgroup is headed for the next months.
2. **Member updates:** An opportunity will be given for committee members to communicate what they've been working on.

Summary

- The IR subgroup will be focusing their attention on identifying functional and resource requirements for Hydra development, since CUL is committed to that development.
- Potential challenges were discussed, along with the history of the development to date, including Blacklight. Timelines were discussed, with three years being put forth as the time needed to develop a system to handle new repository projects. Migration would likely take longer, to ensure that extant user needs were being effectively met. The importance of how this would interact with the larger discovery environment was discussed. When thinking about costs and timelines, plans must include migration, implementation, oversight, assessment, not just development.
- CALS-CHE is not at the moment going to be a Hydra/Sufia pilot, but AgriKnowledge is. Development there is proceeding well.
- The need for increased communication, as well as staff support and buy-in, was mentioned. This communication should not only focus on why we've chosen this path, but how we're going to be proceeding.

- The need was expressed for service agreements covering new repository services, covering development, maintenance, and ongoing tech support.
- Overall, the importance of stakeholder involvement throughout development and implementation was stressed.
- An offer has been made by the press for a CUL-wide contract, which has impacted the work of the IR group. The group talked about the formation of a second subgroup to specifically address the question of consideration of the press as a "bridge" IR for new collections that need a home before Hydra is ready to take on new content. Interested parties should reach out to Jim and/or Wendy.

April 30, 2015

Agenda

1. Report back from meeting with LEG
2. Report back on user stories progress
3. Updates from committee members
4. Continued discussion of ongoing strategies for RepoExec

March 19, 2015

Agenda

1. General updates and announcements
2. eCommons & Weill (David Ruddy)
3. RepoExec evaluation and discussion (Oya Rieger)

January 26, 2015

"I am happy to report that the subgroup dedicated to producing user stories for IR-style digital repositories has completed a draft of said stories for your perusal. I'd like to thank Wendy, Jenn, Simeon, Jeff, Mark, and David for all their hard work on this! The project could not have happened without them. As the report describes, we collected stories from a variety of sources and worked them down to a list of 115. Anyone who wants to see the full list -- which was around 240 -- can contact me.

I welcome any and all feedback, and in fact plan to make this the main item on our agenda for January 26. I will note that it's possible that a few duplicate stories slip through, so letting me know if you see those will be a great help. Thanks should be directed to the team, requests for changes and/or complaints to me."

-- Jim DelRosso, Chair

SUMMARY

Updates:

- ARTstor/Shared Shelf is putting together an IIIF (International Image Interoperability Framework) shared interface which will allow Cornell users to better assemble and deliver collections.
- The Mann/Sufia-Hydra pilot is proceeding, with a focus on TEEAL and Agri Knowledge. Communication with the broader developer community is identifying which areas will require internal development, and where we can leverage work done by external developers to meet our needs.
- Also on the Mann front, Cooperative Extension patrons are contacting Mann to be involved in the CALS-CHE repository work. The repository committee is currently looking at moving material from Locale to eCommons, and EBSCO has contacted them about accessing at least the metadata from the CHLA collections.
- Work continues on migrating Law collections into HathiTrust. Unfortunately, the first collection looked at encountered copyright difficulties which will likely prevent migration, so work has begun on a collection of trial pamphlets. Later, the sprint structure for this work will be formalized.
- Collective bargaining agreements digitized through a NHPRC grant have begun being uploaded to DigitalCommons@ILR, and reports from the Center for Hospitality Research have been added to the Scholarly Commons at SHA.
- A task force is being formed to work with stakeholders on the process of decommissioning Luna.
- A small group has also been formed to handle the upgrade of eCommons to DSpace 4.8 or 5.0.
- Steven Folsom's digital scholarship fellowship is proceeding well. There was a particular discussion of an application in the Hydra family.

Digital repository user stories

There was a discussion of the digital repository user stories document (see attached), which was prepared by Jenn Colt, Jim DelRosso, Wendy Kozlowski, Jeff Piestrak, David Ruddy, Simeon Warner, and Mark Williams. The next steps for this process will be preparing versions of the user stories list -- likely in Access or Excel -- that can be used to evaluate DSpace, Sufia-Hydra, and Digital Commons, determining who is best positioned to perform those evaluations, and setting up a timeline for those evaluations.

November 17, 2014

1. Chris Manly will talk to us about security issues surrounding repositories at Cornell.
2. David Ruddy will give us an update on eCommons
3. Discussion of how collections are prioritized for Hydra
4. Report on the RepoExec presentation at R&O
5. Report on the activities of the IR subgroup

SUMMARY Chris Manly spoke about security issues surrounding repositories at Cornell

Chris noted that security has been on his mind lately due to a number of incidents, and that the landscape of digital security has been changing (and not in Cornell's favor). Higher education used to be a vector for attacks, while now we -- and our faculty -- are increasingly the targets of those attacks. This needs to be a factor while we discuss both our existing systems, and as we pursue new solutions; this is true whether the systems are licensed, open source, or entirely home grown.

David Ruddy gave an update on eCommons (*see attached slides*)

Usage of eCommons is trending upward in recent years, as content is added at a baseline rate of about 2,000-3,000 items per year. They've been working from well-developed policies for the last five years, with commitment to preservation playing a key role. Work is currently being done to upgrade to a new version of DSpace, and the eCommons team welcomes feedback on what new features should be implemented. Discussion included the eCommons vision document from 2008, and whether to revisit workflows and staffing.

Danielle Mericle led a discussion of how collections are prioritized for Hydra migration

The Southeast Asia migration was chosen based on the specific requirements of that collection, while the current focus on collections from the Law School will allow us to evaluate leveraging Hydra and HathiTrust in tandem. The results of that pilot will help determine which questions need to be answered next, which will in turn facilitate the decision on what to focus on after that. There was some discussion of specific collections, as well as specific features.

Jim DelRosso reported on his RepoExec presentation at R&O (*see attached slides*)

The presentation discussed the background of RepoExec, our activities to date, our current activities, and our future plans. It was a good opportunity to speak to liaisons, who play an increasing role in scholarly communications discussions; it also raised the point of librarians and staff who want to be able to direct patrons to our repository content as part of a reference interaction. The forum expressed a desire to see the user stories that come out of the IR subgroup, and Gail noted that R&O participants are a great source for more user stories regarding repositories.

Jim DelRosso gave a short update on the activities of the IR subgroup

The subgroup is currently bringing all the user stories into a consistent format, reaching out to more stakeholders to get more stories, and working on organizing those stories in a way that will make them usable for evaluating various repository solutions and practices.

October 27, 2014

Agenda

1. Jean Pajerek will talk about Law's implementation of Selected Works
2. Mary Ochs will update everyone on the work of the CHE-CALS Sufia-Hydra pilot group
3. Jim DelRosso will give an update on what the digital repository user needs subgroup is working on

September 22, 2014

Agenda

1. **Report from the Mann Repositories Group:** Mann Library has been making strides in establishing a digital repository; Mary Ochs and others from Mann will share with RepoExec what they're working on and where they're at with it.
2. **Report from the Hydra Pilot Group:** Similarly, the Hydra pilot group has successfully migrated the Southeast Asia Visions Collection from DLXS to Hydra, and developments there have are highly relevant to the work RepoExec is doing. Danielle Mericle will report on their work.
3. **Discussion of content subgroups:** Attached please find the current draft of the content subgroup responsibilities. The first two items of discussion will inform what our subgroups will focus on, so I hope to wrap up with designating those areas of focus, and approve the description of responsibilities. Interested people can then volunteer via email.

August 25, 2014

Agenda

1. Oya and Dean will not be in attendance.
2. We will be discussing the purpose of RepoExec: not just the charge, but also what's been accomplished thus far, and where we need to go next.
3. While the functionality team will discuss what we've been working on, it will be in the context of the aforementioned discussion of purpose.

June 30, 2014

Agenda

1. **Ohio State University Library Digital Initiatives Program:** Gail brought this to our attention, and it seems very relevant to our committee's work. The Ohio State University Library created a Strategic Digital Initiatives Working Group to tackle a similar set of issues to those we're facing, and that group's work has resulted into a poster and a set of guiding principles (detailed [here](#) and [here](#)). We'll start our meeting by the OSUL work, as well as what areas are relevant to the work of RepoExec. (See also CUL's somewhat older Operating Principles for Digital Assets as a potential point of comparison.)
 2. **Repository Functionality Working Group:** This subgroup -- consisting of Danielle, Wendy, Michelle, Melissa, and Jim -- will discuss the progress we've made on constructing a framework for describing CUL repositories. We'll also have some questions for the committee as a whole.
 3. **Talking shop:** The remaining time will be dedicated to committee members describing their current projects.
-

April 22, 2014

Agenda

1. **Repository Functionality Working Group:** The group met earlier this week, and put together a plan of action for the coming weeks/months. We'll present that plan to the full committee for feedback.
2. **What we're working on:** Jean Pajerek, Melissa Wallace, and Michelle Paolillo will speak about the repository-related projects they're currently engaged in.
3. **Open floor:** With the time remaining, the floor will be opened for general feedback and questions, or for other committee members to report on their current projects.

SUMMARY

Repository Functionality Working Group:

This is a group of volunteers who will be building on the work done by the Repository Inventory Group earlier in the year. It consists of Oya, Michelle, Danielle, Wendy, Melissa, and Jim.

The group met last week, and decided to focus on a system of tags to describe the repository systems described in the inventory along the lines of content type, discoverability, workflow, software types, etc. Some of this information will be drawn from the Inventory, some will need to be collected. This information will be used to identify gaps and redundancies within the repository landscape. Long-term, this group's work will lay the foundation for the continuing development of RepoExec's role and charge, and help us stay on top of new projects within CUL.

RepoExec as a whole provided strong feedback on the group's plan, but in terms of how it could better achieve its goals and what tasks it should potentially leave for subsequent working groups.

Current projects:

Jean Pajerek talked about the Law Libraries efforts to add the Law School's journals into Scholarship@Cornell Law, the Law Library's digital repository. Law is using an automated process designed by Duke, with Dan Blackaby overseeing. Law is also looking at digitizing and uploading theses from the 19th century.

Melissa Wallace spoke about the HYDRApilot involving the Southeast Asia Visions collection: 491 books currently housed in DLXS. Much of the functionality has been replicated in HYDRA, and results have so far been encouraging. She also discussed the creation of digital collections of materials from the Experimental Television Center, which involves content being added to Kaltura and delivered through Shared Shelf.

Michelle Paolillo discussed the current state of CULAR, the Cornell University Library Archival Repository (see attached document). She discussed her role as project manager, and the role of the steering committee. Key items of note are that CULAR is a dark archive, format agnostic, and dedicated to preservation. A number of collections have already been added to CULAR.

Next steps:

Jim DeRosso will find times for the next Functionality Working Group meeting, and the next meeting of RepoExec as a whole. The next RepoExec meeting will include a report from the Functionality Team, and more reports from members on their current projects.

February 6, 2014

Agenda

1. **RepoInventory:** I've attached a copy of the current version. Wendy, Michelle, Jason, and Jim will discuss our methodology, as well as the grey areas that remain. We will also answer questions that you may have about the survey.
 2. **Next steps:** The survey is meant to be a jumping off point for further exploration and recommendation, and that's where I'd like to focus our energies tomorrow. I think splitting into working groups to focus on areas such as preservation, access/discoverability, service commitments, etc., will be the best way to spend the next couple of months. It's my hope that we can determine what those groups will be, and have at least an informal sense of their charges, by the end of the meeting. As with the survey, the actual lineups can be determined via email.
-

January 6, 2014

Agenda

1. Answer discussion questions (round robin)

- What experiences have you had that led you to accept your spot on RepoExec?
- What groups of stakeholders do you feel you can best represent on RepoExec?
- What do you believe RepoExec's highest priority should be in our first year? What should we have to show for our work at year's end?

2. Determine highest priority items for the coming year 3. Determine small work groups for priority items

SUMMARY

Round robin

In addition to the introductions, several priorities came up multiple times:

- Resolving the multiplicity of repositories, and the difficulties it brings to discovery and navigation
- CUL's commitment to repositories, with regards to preservation, discovery, access, collection
- An internal survey of repository systems, both at CUL and Cornell in general
- An external survey of peer institutions
- Upgrading our current repository structure(s)
- Effective communication
- Budget issues

Discussion of priorities

We discussed the role and agency of this group, as well as how the priorities discussed above interrelated. The internal survey was cited as both something which could be accomplished quickly, and as a prerequisite for resolving other priorities.

Action items for next meeting

- Members interested in volunteering to work on the internal assessment will contact Jim
 - Draft internal assessment will be sent to RepoExec for feedback *prior* to the next meeting
 - Revised internal assessment to be presented at the next RepoExec meeting; used to determine next steps
-