CYBER-INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING COMMITTEE (CISC)
Meeting Minutes – February 4, 2015

Present

Grace Agnew, Chair	Peter Konin	Chad Mills
Kalaivani Ananthan	Linda Langschied	Tibor Purger
Isaiah Beard	Yu-Hung Lin	Mary Beth Weber
John Brennan	Rhonda Marker	Krista White
Ron Jantz	Aletia Morgan	Darya Zvanarova (guest)

Excused
Caryn Radick

AUL Report
The upcoming February 11 CISC meeting has been switched to February 18. At that meeting we will focus upon the OLE implementation calendar. We will use the approach employed by Duke University as a guide. The first module will be Cataloging and then modules will be added so that by our July 2016 go live date multiple modules will be in place, operational, and stable. Marker mentioned talk at ALA mid-winter concerning the future relationship between Kuali and OLE. Agnew said the commitment from premier academic libraries and the amount of money already invested should mitigate any real concerns about OLE's future sustainability, regardless of Kuali's involvement.

Updates from ALA Mid-Winter Conference
Marker and Weber shared information they learned at the recent ALA mid-winter conference in Chicago.

Marker talked about a collaborative digitization interest group and Mountain West's geospatial discovery task force. She suggested they could be a good source for ideas and standards. She will share specifics with the appropriate people within the libraries. She also attended a Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) session on rights, "Getting It Right on Rights." Across DPLA's 8,000,000+ digital objects there are more than 26,000 different rights statements. Their aim is to develop one streamlined set of rights. Agnew and Marker said rights can be complicated and interpretation tends to be specific to each institution, particularly for formulating rights statements. This goal is may be more difficult to achieve than DPLA realizes.

Weber spoke about a CIC initiative, also concerning geospatial information. Rutgers chose not to participate in this project since it was Midwest centric and expensive.

Dark Archive for Journals – Metadata Application Profile and Workflows
Jantz and Lin reviewed their work on a dark archive for journals and the related creation of a metadata application profile. Jantz provided general background. He said there is no real archival process for resources that are external to RUcore. The goal is to provide a dark archive for them within RUcore, complete with DOI's and extensive metadata. A dark archive collection is distinguished from other RUcore collections in that the archival resources are disambiguated from the accessible resources which are offered on a platform suitable to user needs, but does not provide a complete archiving strategy. Dark archive resources will not be indexed for public discovery or publicly displayed. A dark archive content model for journals has been established on the RUcore development server. The journal will be exported from OJS and the relevant metadata (as outlined in the Metadata Application Profile) will be entered into WMS. He also noted the access copy of the journal will be disambiguated from RUcore.

Lin reviewed the Metadata Application Profile. He spoke about assumptions which guided its creation, including durable links to the access copy via a descriptive event and link in the abstract to the accessible copy for users who discover the metadata and want access to the information resource. . He also noted this particular dark archive is specifically for current and future archivists, to enable them to continue to preserve the resource, not for the end user. He then provided a detailed review of the application profile.

Since this dark archive is only for archivists (not the general public) the descriptive metadata concerns the Archival Information Package (AIP), not the intellectual content of the journal. An AIP consists of multiple data files that contain the digitized content of the archival item. It can include a readme file, software to render the resource, etc. The only place where the intellectual content (which is the heart of the AIP) is described is in the descriptive event. Superseded journals will also be kept in the AIP and contextually exposed via a descriptive event. Lin said Beard was primarily responsible for developing the technical metadata, which will also be bundled together for the AIP. The rights metadata is straightforward and documents primarily the collection owner/rights holder, since issues of public accessibility don't apply.

A discussion followed about journal policy decisions and how these could be documented for future users wanting access to the articles in a journal issue. Marker said these policy decisions are not issue specific, but rather cover all issues of a journal. It was decided these policies do not need to be archived with each issue. Instead, there should be a universal open access policy for all journals published by RUL and a broad policy statement within RUcore. Marker will go to CSC with the intention of developing an official open access policy for journals published by RUL, with which all future editors would need to comply.

Digital Object Master Formats
Beard provided a detailed overview of the current RUcore digital preservation standards, including an overview of technology changes across multiple file types which impact preservation efforts. Beard's motivation for this review was the Library of Congress' (LOC) recent release of similar standards. Our objective is to review our standards, compare them to LOC's, and modify where appropriate.

Beard began with a review of the current digital landscape, including the proliferation of new data collection tools, formats, and the expected impact these will have on RUcore. He spoke about the general characteristics which should apply to all archival master objects. He covered all relevant object types including sound, moving images, born digital documents, digital surrogate still images, born digital still images, and .pdf files and restrictions. He covered a wide range of topics for each object type: accepted file formats for preservation, presentation formats, future and new challenges, file specifications, and other considerations specific to individual objects types.

Agnew commended him on his thorough presentation. She said it was a good start to articulating revised RUcore digital preservation and presentation standards. She said RUcore will only accept as master file formats the file types supported by an international standards body. It should not be enough that a commercial producer declares a file format "open." They are governed by what is profitable rather than a policy and tradition of standards review and maintenance. She added we should track format changes for both master and access copy files in own records even if it does not impact the user experience. She asked Beard to present his findings in a table format that reflects how RUcore uses or will use the files at an upcoming CISC meeting. This table should provide the following information for all

object types: submit files accepted, master files maintained, presentation files transcoded to. This is needed to clearly understand how all these technological changes impact RUcore's workflow and pipeline. Additionally, she asked Beard to be prepared to propose how we can put these concepts into practice.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 18, 2015 at 10:00 in the Technical Services Building conference room.

Submitted by John Brennan
February 12, 2015