This update informs SAG3 of the work that has been done since the original FedDocArc report was accepted in September 2014, and requests SAG3’s endorsement of key directions which we hope to pass to the Council of University Librarians in December.

Implementation Team Charge and Appointments Underway
A smaller implementation team was to be formed by October to begin the initial phases of the FedDocArc project. There was confusion about who would be charging the new group. As Project Lead, I drafted the charge and am confirming the membership. This should be completed by end of December 2014. In the meantime, the original project team has been helping keep the recommendations moving forward.

Selective Housing Agreement (SHA)
CoUL left it to the project team to choose whether to use a SHA or MOU to document the persistence agreement. The project team opted for a SHA which is to be formally signed and filed with GPO as soon as possible. Jesse Silva drafted a SHA that follows the FDLP template. I seek SAG3 approval so we can formally ask each UL to sign it.

Metadata Comparison of RLF Records
With the assistance of library staff at UCB/NRLF and UCLA/SRLF we have begun gathering the records at the RLFs. From this set we will generate the sample to check the RLF shelves as well as the initial lists to determine duplication and adoption to the shared print archive. We will begin with monographs and hope to initiate that work before end of 2014.

Sampling of RLF Accuracy
The original report recommends sampling the relevant collections in the RLFs for a confirmation of the availability and condition of the items. Based on the number of federal gov docs at NRLF and SRLF we estimate the sample size of ~600 items. With the help of Jeff Loo and Charlotte Rubens, Erik Mitchell is leading a pilot sampling project at NRLF so we can better gauge how long such a shelf check would take. The goal is to see how accurately the RLF record statuses reflect the actual status of the items. We hope to have the first results to report in January 2015 and, assuming the staff time required is manageable, would finish the sampling at NRLF and SRLF early in the new year.

Google Sheet-fed Digitization Pilot
We still have much to do before we are ready to pull items from the RLFs to send to Google. To prepare for a steady flow to Google for sheet-fed digitization in spring 2015, we are piloting the approach with items from Berkeley since Berkeley has a current contract with Google and a regular shipment flow. Google provided us with a candidate list of Berkeley items not yet scanned, which we ran through the RLF tool to identify items already stored at an RLF. We will send 500 volumes (2 booktrucks)/month for the next year. Before that contract ends, we should be prepared to send items from the RLFs for digitization. Berkeley planned to support the pilot without a recharge but at CDL’s request has calculated the
costs for student employees to pull the items (~$5,000 for the pilot). It is not yet
determined if CDL will want to initiate this recharge for the pilot or not. Once we begin the
scanning from items at the RLFs, we will initiate the paperwork for the recharge.

**Proposed Disposition Process**

We need to finalize and formalize our process for withdrawal of unneeded duplicate print
copies. As part of the FDLP agreement, we are expected to offer those items to our regional
depository and other state depositories; it is likely that many will be desirable since the UC
collections are both broad and deep. Ensuring we have an efficient way to manage offers
and requests for the RLFs and for all our campuses is imperative. Kelly Smith chaired a
lightning team of GILS members and Tammy from CA State Library to explore options for
the disposition process, which we hope will be more streamlined that can handle a large-
scale collection review as we have envisioned. Their report describes why the disposition
process exists, which groups typically have roles, and what approaches for us might be.

The original project team reviewed that report with these comments:

- Option 2 is preferred by a majority of the lightning team and original project team. This would have the UC Libraries use open source software as developed by ASERL to manage a more programmatic approach. While it was suggested that we ask to use ASERL’s database, there is strong interest in creating a separate implementation that the UC Libraries (CDL or one of the UC campus libraries) host and manage. UC and ASERL have different depository system structures and different purposes for their systems. A separate system that allows us greater control over the mechanisms for prioritizing to CA State Library then other CA depositories, and emphasizes a streamlined approach toward disposition with pre-determined period of time for review before disposition. Erik Mitchell (UCB) and Emily Stambaugh (CDL) have offered to do initial investigation around the ASERL platform.

- Shipping costs are an issue. We might specify that the receiving library pay.

- CA State Library suggested that our assistance with shelf verification on their end would make our streamlined approach more acceptable. With all the financial commitments UCs have to create and sustain the FedDocArc, this may not be realistic, though Davis has expressed some interest in this idea.

- We prefer Google not return items that have been sheet-fed scanned. These items will be disbound, hence impractical for returning to shelves or giving user access. By not requiring these to be returned and offered in the disposition process we will save everyone needless work and costs.

- The recommendations related to HathiTrust access have already been taken to those national groups for discussion.
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