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Wednesday, 14 April 2010
10.00am - 3.45pm
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10:00 am
1. Welcome and introduction, apologies
2. Draft Minutes of the previous meeting and business arising LAAC/2010/1/1
3. Libraries Australia achievements: November-March LAAC/2010/1/2
4. Libraries Australia statistics LAAC/2010/1/3
5. Report from the National Library (oral)

11:00 am Morning Tea

FOR DISCUSSION
6. Resource Description & Access (RDA) - an update LAAC/2010/1/4
7. TAFE Libraries Subscription Model Update LAAC/2010/1/5
9. Report from the OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Council (oral)
10. Results of the WorldCat Resource Sharing survey LAAC/2010/1/7

12.30 pm Lunch
11. Trove – a progress report LAAC/2010/1/8
12. Reimagining Libraries Project 8 (Description and Cataloguing) LAAC/2010/1/9
13. Reimagining Libraries Project 7 (Collaborative Collecting) LAAC/2010/1/10
14. Reimagining Libraries Project 2 (Open Borders) LAAC/2010/1/11

FOR INFORMATION
15. Innovative Ideas Forum 2010 (oral)
17. Other business
18. Conclusion & Review of resolutions (if any)

3.45 pm Close of Meeting
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The meeting commenced at 10:00 a.m.

**Agenda Item 1**
**Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**

Ms Luther welcomed all present to the meeting. Apologies were received from Mr Rob Walls, Director of Database Services in the Libraries Australia team.

Mr Vic Elliot, University Librarian at the Australian National University and Australian representative on the OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Council, was welcomed as a new member of the Committee.

It was noted that this was the last meeting for Ms Luther, Mr Harris and Ms Quinn and their contribution to the Committee over a long period of time was acknowledged. Ms Luther’s work as the Chair of the Committee was also recognised.

**Agenda Item 2**
**Draft Minutes of the Previous Meeting and Business Arising (LAAC/2009/2/1)**

Ms Nelson clarified that the project referred to on page 14, paragraph 3 relates to e-records cataloguing only, not all cataloguing. A discrepancy in the record of attendance at the last meeting was also noted - Ms Nelson had not been included. Ms Gatenby advised that the training referred to in the minutes was for researchers who may be interested in using features of Libraries Australia such as COiNS. The NLA is interested in exploring software to support e-scholarship and will advise Petherick readers and other researchers of the features via newsletters.

Dr Cathro and Ms Campbell reported that most actions arising from the previous Committee meeting had all been completed or were underway. Ms Luther noted that the possibility of an Australian representative on the Research Libraries Group (RLG) Governance Board has not been raised at a Council of Australian University Libraries (CAUL) meeting to date.

Dr Cathro responded to a question about the future of the Open Library Environment (OLE) project and the NLA’s involvement in it.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 April 2009 be accepted.

**Agenda Item 3**
**Oral Report from the National Library: Director-General.**

Ms Fullerton reported that the NLA was successful in a budget bid for $800,000 from the federal government to prepare a business case for a new policy proposal to deal with the digital deluge across three Commonwealth organisations – NLA, National Archives and the National Film and Sound Archive. The work on the business case will be coordinated by Dr Cathro. Dr Cathro advised that if the bid was successful there would be a significant increase in digitisation activity at the NLA.

Ms Fullerton gave an update on the newspaper digitisation project at the National
Library. Very positive feedback has been received from academics and historians. Ms Gatenby informed the Committee that the Australian Women’s Weekly digitisation project is underway – scanning and OCRing will be completed by July 2010 and the content should be available by the end of 2010.

The Single Business Discovery Service has been officially named Trove. Discussions were held with the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the National Health & Medical Research Council (NHMRC) to investigate ways the NLA can work with them. Dr Cathro advised that the NHMRC wants to make sure that all research it funds is publicly accessible and easily discoverable via its own branded interface, if possible using Trove in the background. Public accessibility will become a condition for funding. Ms Fullerton added that the NLA wants to provide a safety net repository for research that cannot be archived elsewhere.

Ms Fullerton noted that discussions have been held with Dr Nicholas Gruen from the Government 2.0 Taskforce about ways of making government information accessible and commented on the cultural change that is required in some government agencies to enable this to happen.

Ms Fullerton noted the large increase in demand for and use of NLA services such as Copies Direct, document delivery and reference enquiries as a result of the sharing of records with WorldCat.

Ms Gatenby advised that the newspaper digitisation team has developed contributor guidelines for other libraries who want to contribute content to the newspaper digitisation program. It is anticipated that growth from 2011 will be largely through contributions from other organizations. The preferred model is libraries using the NLA’s infrastructure to ensure standards are met. ANPLAN (the Australian Newspaper Plan) is preparing to build a stronger relationship with public libraries to attract regional newspaper content for digitisation.

Ms Gatenby gave an update on Re-imagining Libraries’ Project 8 - improving access via Trove to Australian documentary heritage material, especially unique materials, through streamlined ways of processing and describing this material. The objectives of Project 8 closely match those of Libraries Australia in terms of gap filling, the need for which was demonstrated in the results of the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD) coverage survey. There was some discussion about the differing views of metadata which organisations have in terms of what discovery services such as Trove require. Dr Cathro explained the multiple contribution pathways that Trove will have, the different types of contributors and the process of getting items into Trove using the example of how collection summaries will be harvested and then used for discovery. Ms Campbell stated that the NLA is also supporting machine-to-machine interfaces such as the OAI Protocol for Metadata Harvesting and SRU, which are under development for Trove.

Dr Cathro reported on Re-imagining Libraries’ Project 10 which invites state and territory libraries’ contributions to Trove. Feedback was sought from all National & State Libraries Australasia (NSLA) libraries about Trove during the prototype phase and further discussions are needed to ascertain how they will promote Trove to their readers and how they can leverage off it in any of their own local discovery services.

Ms Nelson gave a report on Reimagining Libraries’ Project 7 which is looking at efficiencies for purchasing e-resources, storage of e-resources and reducing duplication of serials holdings. Ms Luther suggested it would be good to extend the conversation to university libraries about incomplete serials collections.
Two conclusions have been reached by this project team with regard to the NSLA consortium - its terms of reference should be reviewed to look at it becoming a more strategic group closely aligned to the “one library” agenda, and it needs to have a statement of principles about what a national collection is looking for in terms of the quality of those resources.

Ms Szunejko reported on Reimagining Libraries’ Project 4, Delivery. She commented on the challenges of working with different library systems. Ms Fullerton added that the project is trying to make sure users can discover resources; that libraries have good base collections and ways of very efficiently putting material in people's hands directly.

Ms Fullerton mentioned the other large project the NLA is involved in is Reimagining Libraries’ Project 3, Virtual Reference, which is examining how libraries can work together to provide this service. Ms Gatenby observed that a beneficial outcome of the projects would be that people can discover more easily what member libraries have in their collections and how they describe their holdings. However, a consequence of this that we need to take into account is that, based on experience to date of the NLA, increased exposure not only results in collections being used (a good thing) but in more interaction with the public who can want to clarify aspects of the materials being described and to query details in descriptions. This interaction has resource implications.

Ms Horn asked about communication strategies for informing libraries about all of the Reimagining Libraries’ Projects, for example libraries in the CAUL sector. She noted the benefits of bringing the sectors together with opportunities for dialogue. There was further discussion about how best to achieve this. It was noted that the Charles Sturt University seminar on 5th November would provide an avenue for this dialogue to occur.

There was further discussion about electronic resources, access and the cost of journals, and how the current system operates. Ms Fullerton noted that it would be best to move to a national core set of electronic resources which would be centrally funded, and the NSLA and CAUL sectors could also fund sets specific to their own constituencies.

Ms Gatenby reported that the release of Resource Description and Access (RDA) has been delayed until May 2010. The Library of Congress is planning an eight month trial in 2010. RDA may be implemented in early 2011. The NLA is considering how it can support a national RDA training program.

**ACTION:** Ms Gatenby will confirm with Committee members that the Newspaper Digitisation Project's contributor guidelines are on the NLA's website.

**Agenda Item 4**
**Libraries Australia Annual Report 2009**
**(LAAC/2009/2/2)**

Dr Cathro noted that the report was prepared by Ms Campbell with assistance from Mr Walls. Dr Cathro highlighted some of the key statistics. As of 31 October, there were 20 million bibliographic records in the ANBD. The Resource Sharing and Innovation Division Strategic Plan was released in July 2009 and will be revised twice a year.
Dr Cathro mentioned that the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information (CISTI) is now outsourcing its document delivery services to Infotrieve. He also advised that inter-operability testing of the ISO InterLibrary Loan (ILL) protocol is a hidden but valuable activity of the Libraries Australia team. A lot of testing is done to enable reliable interoperability. Document delivery requests grew by 3% in 2008-09 and continue to grow. Mr Strempel commented on the inclusion of some SWIFT consortium members in the list of libraries using the ISO ILL protocol and questioned why all Swift libraries are not interoperating with LADD.

The release of the new version of CBS for Libraries Australia Cataloguing in the first quarter of 2010 will provide the required software to receive data from local systems which have implemented SRU record update.

Ms Campbell advised that the third e-newsletter has been sent out and invited interested libraries to contribute items of content. The university visits program is now complete. Ms Luther commented on the importance of the visits and how much appreciated they were. Ms Campbell noted the increased use of ning by a core group of people to discuss issues with Libraries Australia workflows. Ms Campbell also advised the Committee of new marketing materials - eco bags and pens.

Libraries Australia has followed up with a range of libraries since the completion of the ANBD coverage survey. Some of the collections will be loaded to the ANBD early next year. It was noted that the Department of Environment (WA) maps file is an excellent contribution. Ms Campbell commented that the statistics on pp. 20 and 21 detailing holdings by institution have been included so that the results of the action plan arising from the coverage survey can be evaluated.

Ms Rajapatirana commented that the new bibliographic records and holdings as detailed in the coverage section of the report should be a separate paragraph as it is not part of the ANBD coverage survey information. She also advised that the duplicate detection program is currently running every night using ISBN as the match key.

Mr Strempel commented on the usage statistics and wondered if we were aware of reasons behind the changes in results. Ms Campbell advised that anecdotal evidence is sometimes available. There was further discussion about this, and how useful it would be to know how much is end-user searching. It was explained that Trove will allow the NLA to more cleanly separate search usage statistics for the free Libraries Australia service.

Ms Horn asked about the role of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee with regard to Trove and it was agreed to revisit the issue later in the meeting. She commended the inclusion of Register of Archives and Manuscripts (RAAM) into the ANBD/Trove. Ms Rajapatirana gave further details about the loading of RAAM.

**ACTION**: The Libraries Australia team to make corrections to the Annual Report.

**ACTION**: The Libraries Australia team to provide further information on significant movements in the annual statistics.

**ACTION**: Mr Strempel will raise the use of the ISO ILL protocol at the next SWIFT meeting.

The Committee noted the report.
Agenda Item 5
Libraries Australia Statistical Information
LAAC/2009/2/3

Dr Cathro advised that the results were in line with expectations. He commented that the data added had exceeded the targets set, and expenses were a little lower than target due to staffing vacancies in the second half of 2009.

The Committee noted the report.

Agenda Item 6
Libraries Australia Activity Report: July to October 2009

Dr Cathro advised that the next Libraries Australia Forum will be held on 20/10/2010, possibly in conjunction with a Trove contributors meeting.

Dr Cathro noted that Libraries Australia is now contributing authority data to the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF). Ms Rajapatirana gave an explanation of the VIAF Project and advised that the first quarterly upload had started. Dr Cathro commented on the growing importance of this data for cataloguers. Ms Rajapatirana confirmed that the Library of Congress name authorities are in the VIAF files.

There was further discussion about the closing of death dates and it was confirmed that Libraries Australia consults regularly with other libraries about this. Ms Szunejko questioned whether the arrangement with VIAF has any effect on Libraries Australia authorities and it was agreed that this should be considered.

Dr Cathro noted the forthcoming addition of 180,000 TOC records from the Library of Congress to the ANBD is a good example of the value provided by Libraries Australia for member libraries.

Ms Rajapatirana advised that the base load of OCLC numbers had been done and the project should be completed by late November 2009. Ms Rajapatirana explained the benefits of OCLC numbers - they will facilitate deep linking from WorldCat to local catalogues where no other identifier is present, and will provide an additional match key on data ingest.

Dr Cathro reported that preliminary discussions have been held with OCLC concerning the relationship between LADD and WorldCat Resource Sharing. Some issues have been identified and further information needs to be gathered. Ms Luther and Mr Taylor expressed concern about the increased demand on local collections this might cause. Dr Cathro asked if there were any other concerns and Ms Luther noted the importance of communication about this development. Dr Cathro sought confirmation that the Committee wanted Libraries Australia to explore the relationship between LADD and WorldCat Resource Sharing and it was given.

ACTION: An expert reference group to be set up to give feedback about any new arrangement between Libraries Australia and WorldCat Resource Sharing.

Dr Cathro noted the introduction of the copyright status button. He briefed the Committee on TeraText stability and performance issues, and the strategies that have been employed to counteract this problem.

Ms Campbell outlined the new Help Desk Reftracker system and advised that the
 LibrariesAustralia@nla.gov.au email address has been switched off. Contact is now made through the form at www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/contact/index.html, or via the long-standing toll free 1800 phone number.

Ms Campbell talked about the current Libraries Australia training arrangements, noting that CAVAL has ceased offering public training courses and now provides training courses only to CAVAL members. Discussions are underway with CAVAL about this and a trainers meeting will be held in April 2010 to talk about issues relating to training. The meeting will also provide trainers with an update on all Libraries Australia services. Demand for training across Australia has decreased significantly mainly due to cost. The possibility of developing an online LADD training course is being explored.

The Committee noted the report.

**Agenda Item 7**  
**Report on the first meeting of OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Conference**  
**LAAC/2009/2/4**

Ms Luther welcomed Mr Elliott as a full member of the Committee.

Mr Elliott attended the final meeting of the OCLC Member’s Council in Dublin, Ohio as well as the inaugural Asia Pacific Regional Council meeting in Beijing.

Key topics discussed at the OCLC Member’s Council meeting included the changes to the articles of incorporation and code of regulations allowing the transition from Members Council to Global Council; the new definition of OCLC membership which has subsequently been approved and the approved framework documents for the three regional councils – the Americas; Europe, the Middle East and Asia (EMEA); and Asia Pacific.

Since that meeting, the final report of the Members’ Council was released on 22 June 2009. It recommended that the proposed policy for use and transfer of WorldCat records be withdrawn and a new policy developed; that the social contract between OCLC and its members should be re-examined and articulated; and that the new policy to replace the proposed policy should be developed in a consultative and transparent process. There was some discussion about this and Mr Elliott confirmed the process for formulating the new policy and the timelines.

Mr Elliott noted that the highest percentage of inactive WorldCat members is in the Asia Pacific region. Ms Fullerton queried the definition of an inactive member and there was discussion about how this should be interpreted for Libraries Australia members. Dr Cathro noted that members of Libraries Australia are in a sense not members of OCLC in the way that most OCLC members are, but have attained that status through the national Libraries Australia agreement with WorldCat. It allows all members of Libraries Australia to access WorldCat in return for the provision of Libraries Australia holdings to WorldCat. Mr Elliott reminded the Committee that because of this arrangement, members of Libraries Australia are governing members of OCLC.

Mr Elliott advised that he would investigate whether inactive membership related particularly to Australia/New Zealand libraries. He explained that the main reason for wanting to find out about inactive members was for electoral purposes.
Ms Horn sought confirmation that within OCLC’s social contract the values underpinning the relationship between OCLC and its members were seen as important. Mr Elliott confirmed that it was on the agenda when the OCLC Board of Trustees and Chairs of regional councils met in September 2009.

Mr Elliott continued with the report on the Asia Pacific Regional Council meeting, highlighting some of the key issues including differential pricing and the perception that OCLC may be seen by some as having the same status as other vendors, which is a change from the cooperative model it originally promoted. A taskforce has been set up to look at cost sharing and differential pricing, and will report by April 2010 to the Global Council. It expects to identify best practice for globalising OCLC services.

Mr Elliott advised that he will chair the Asia Pacific Regional Council meetings from June 2010 until June 2011, and that one meeting could be held in Australia during 2010. There was some discussion about possible dates for the Regional Council meeting and attendees including presidents of public library associations.

**ACTION:** Mr Elliott to confirm the definition of the OCLC ‘inactive’ membership status.

**ACTION:** Mr Elliott to invite an OCLC person to visit Australia and to confirm appropriate attendance and formulation of the agenda.

The Committee noted the report.

**Agenda Item 8**
**Libraries Australia Subscription Model Update**
**LAAC 2009/2/5**

Dr Cathro advised that the TAFE and international agencies subscription models are still to be developed. University libraries will have their charges reviewed for July 2010 taking into consideration university budgets published by CAUL each year. Dr Cathro reminded the Committee that all new subscription arrangements have been transitioned over a number of years where appropriate, to reduce the impact on member libraries.

Dr Cathro suggested that other parameters could be used for charges as the current model still reflects historical 2003/04 distribution of subscriptions between sectors. Mr Taylor commented that to encourage maximum use of the service, the Libraries Australia team should not rely solely on data. Business models which are appropriate for each sector, taking into account hardship models for individual libraries if necessary, are important.

Ms Horn noted that the value proposition for each sector might be different, for example in terms of end-user value, and it was suggested that this may need to be re-examined in the context of Trove.

Ms Luther noted that it would be helpful to confirm the proportion of Libraries Australia revenue contributed by university subscriptions in line with usage as a way of helping them to understand why they pay what they pay. Dr Cathro drew the attention of the Committee to the Libraries Australia mission statement where the benefits of membership to Libraries Australia are clearly set out.

**ACTION:** The Libraries Australia team to re-examine the wording of the mission
statement to ensure all benefits are clearly articulated.

**ACTION:** Libraries Australia to review the CAUL sector’s subscription model when new CAUL budget data is available.

**Agenda Item 9**

**Report on the Libraries Australia Roadshows**

**LAAC/2009/2/6**

Ms Campbell summarised the impact of the Roadshows, which were well received. Costs were kept as low as possible by using free-of-charge venues, and various LAAC members were thanked for their role in supporting these arrangements. Feedback showed that Roadshow participants were not aware of some of the newer features of Libraries Australia.

Further discussion took place about the value of running regular Roadshows, the large cost of the Roadshows, the importance of meeting Libraries Australia staff face to face, the shortage of training currently being undertaken and the value of Libraries Australia staff attending user group meetings regularly.

Ms Szuniejko commended Libraries Australia staff who did the Roadshows. Ms Quinn acknowledged the good fortune of libraries in the ACT and the contribution of Libraries Australia staff attending ACT user group meetings.

Ms Horn questioned whether the audiences which need to hear about Trove are the same as the Roadshow audiences. The Committee decided to address this later in the meeting when Trove was to be discussed.

**ACTION:** Change the Roadshow report to read Deakin University, Geelong not Latrobe University on page 12.

The Committee noted the report.

**Agenda Item 10**

**Libraries Australia Forum 2009 (oral)**

Ms Campbell advised that there were 140 registrations for the Libraries Australia Forum 2009 on Friday 6 November. Confirmed guest speakers include Mr Jim Michalko - OCLC, Ms Janifer Gatenby – OCLC and Ms Margaret Allen from the State Library of WA. Ms Campbell will blog the whole day for the National Library’s Library Labs blog at blogs.nla.gov.au/labs/2009/11/ and the presentations will be made available at www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/aum/laf09/agenda.html.

The Committee noted the report.

**ACTION:** The Libraries Australia team to ensure the Forum presentations are publicly available.
Dr Cathro talked about Reimagining Libraries’ Project 2, Open Borders, which is seeking to address the low use of e-resources in the national, state, territory and public library sectors by improving article level discovery. The Open Borders project looked at making access easier and having a national collaborative framework. A survey showed almost all NSLA libraries have vendor-supplied solutions for managing their e-resources. However public libraries don’t all have this in place. Various options were considered and Dr Cathro outlined the current preferred scenario based on a set of partnerships between the National Library and selected e-resource vendors.

Mr Taylor commented that vendors are good at supplying their own data but are reluctant to supply their customers’ data because of privacy concerns. Ms Horn queried the legality of the proposed data sharing arrangement with vendors. Dr Cathro noted that any customer data would not be publicly available as it would only be used for relevance ranking.

Ms Quinn suggested that users should be able to choose not only the three libraries they are associated with but that relevance ranking should include the “best” article which satisfies the query, even if not subscribed to, with a connection to a feasible subscription service. Dr Cathro suggested this could be incorporated into a later stage of development.

Dr Cathro is currently meeting with vendors to discuss this proposal. Cengage Gale and RMIT Publishing have agreed to further meetings, and when these talks are completed, further vendors will be approached.

Dr Cathro explained that one of the main questions to be addressed is whether users who are not on site can be authenticated. He noted that it is in a user’s interest to register when using Trove because it will return them more relevant results.

Trove discussion

Dr Cathro gave an overview of Trove - the name, the new interface now live, and highlighted some of the capabilities it currently has. Users can login, register and add tags and comments. Planned features not available yet will be prioritised in a forthcoming planning workshop. The marketing strategy is under discussion. During 2010 some services such as Picture Australia will be decommissioned, but this won’t be done until all significant features are replicated in Trove.

Dr Cathro commented on discussions which have taken place about communities of contributors; it is proposed to set up two online fora – one for users and one for contributors.

Dr Cathro explained that because Trove uses a modified version of FRBR, there is scope for allowing the public to change the clustering of different versions of the same item. The general public will be allowed to change the Australian content indicator in stage 2 of Trove.

Ms Luther queried the marketing of the move from the free Libraries Australia search service to Trove. Ms Campbell explained that an advisory which outlines what will happen to the free service has been prepared. The search box for Libraries Australia
which many libraries have embedded on their website will appear automatically with the Trove brand. Ms Luther suggested putting an advisory on the Libraries Australia free search service home page immediately, to let people know about forthcoming changes. Ms Campbell noted that the home page of the subscription service will include this information too.

Ms Fullerton confirmed that the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee could act as an advisory committee for Trove. This prompted a discussion about the role of the Libraries Australia User Groups if the LAAC were to take on this broader remit. Mr Harris commented on the difficulty of engaging people in user group activities. Ms Szunejko suggested possible benefits for distinguishing between users and contributors, and concluded that this could be an opportunity to rethink the existing User Groups.

Ms Gatenby commented that it is important to be thinking about workflows which encourage libraries to contribute to both the ANBD and Trove. Dr Cathro suggested library contributions to Trove can be received via Libraries Australia.

Mr Taylor sought clarification about whether libraries whose research theses will reach Trove through harvesting by the Australian Research Online (ARO) service should also contribute the metadata to Libraries Australia.

**ACTION:** The Libraries Australia team to clarify its advice on contribution pathways.

**ACTION:** The LAAC to comment on Trove directions at its future meetings.

**ACTION:** The Libraries Australia team to put a note about the implications of Trove on the Libraries Australia free search service home page immediately.

The Committee noted the report.

**Agenda Item 12**
Libraries Australia Advisory Committee membership guidelines
LAAC/2009/2/8

Dr Cathro detailed the membership guidelines.

Ms Fullerton commented on the importance of flexibility in specific composition of the LAAC to ensure appropriate representation from all library sectors.

Mr Taylor expressed some concerns about the User Group meetings when there is no LAAC member from a particular state. He emphasised the importance of having many lines of communication.

The Committee noted the guidelines.

**Agenda Item 13**
Innovative Ideas Forum (oral)

Dr Cathro advised that the Innovative Ideas Forum will be held on 16 April 2010. Ms Luther commented on the limited publicity it has received in the past but Ms Fullerton explained that it usually books out immediately.
ACTION: The Libraries Australia team to confirm the date of the Forum doesn’t clash a CAUL meeting, and provide early notification of the Forum to specific groups of people.


Agenda Item 14
Article: Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want OCLC, April 2009
LAAC/2009/2/10

Dr Cathro outlined some of the Trove design decisions which are comparable to some of the findings mentioned in this article.

Mr Elliott expressed reservations about perceptions of quality, particularly in the academic environment, which led to discussion about the purpose of including some information such as Amazon book reviews in Trove. Mr Strempel suggested that they should be included for people to make their own choices. Ms Quinn observed that Amazon does include scholarly reviews which will be of interest to Australian researchers.

Ms Luther commended the inclusion of this paper in the LAAC papers.

Agenda Item 15
Any other business

The next LAAC meeting will be held in Canberra on 15 April 2010. The dates for the next CAUL meeting were confirmed as 25-26 March 2010.

Ms Fullerton sought nominations for the election of a new Chair for the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee. Ms Horn was duly elected as the new Chair.

Ms Campbell advised that the next OCLC Global Council meeting is to be held on 19–22 April 2010 in Dublin, Ohio.

Ms Fullerton sought suggestions for effecting more collaboration between NSLA and CAUL. Mr Taylor advised that he was aware that Serials Solutions have been talking to OCLC about including WorldCat records in its new Summon product, and it occurred to him that this could be an avenue for a presence for Libraries Australia, which led to further discussion about the serials market.

Dr Cathro expressed thanks on behalf of the LAAC to retiring members Ms Luther, Mr Harris and Ms Quinn and presented each of them with a small gift.

Agenda Item 16
Conclusion and Review of Resolutions (if any)

1. The Minutes of the meeting of 15 April 2009 were accepted.

The meeting closed at 4pm.
LIBRARIES AUSTRALIA ACHIEVEMENTS
NOVEMBER 2009 – MARCH 2010

Summary

This progress report summarises achievements since the last briefing provided at the Libraries Australian Annual Forum on 6 November 2009 in Hobart¹.

The key achievements have been:

- the replacement of the Libraries Australia free search service with Trove
- the hosting of the 2009 Annual Forum²
- development of a new subscription model for TAFE libraries
- completion of the loading of OCLC identifiers into the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD)
- the addition of Table of Contents (TOC) data from the Library of Congress to the ANBD
- the introduction of routine duplicate detection and removal
- the release of a new version of the Cataloguing Client WinIBW v3.3.8.5
- the replacement of the Help Desk software
- extension of deep linking to local catalogues from both Libraries Australia and Trove.

Libraries Australia Cataloguing Service

CBS 5.0

Version 5.0 of the CBS cataloguing software is currently in test mode. The main benefits of implementing CBS 5.0 are the CBS Job Manager module, which will allow

² Refer separate LAAC paper in this set for a summary of perceptions of the Annual Forum.
Libraries Australia staff to manage database maintenance tasks such as global updates, and two-way SRU (Search/Retrieval via URL) Record Update which will facilitate more timely reporting of changes from local systems.

**OCLC identifiers**

As part of the implementation of SRU Record Update, OCLC bibliographic record identifiers were added to most ANBD records in the Cataloguing (CBS) Database. The second part of the project was to add OCLC identifiers to the Search Database, which was completed in November. Their addition to the Search Database

- improves deep linking from WorldCat (especially to unique items that don’t contain ISBNs or ISSN), and
- provides an additional key for the matching of records.

Work has been done in tandem to accommodate OCLC identifiers when records are added to or exported from the ANBD.

The Libraries Australia Record Import Service (RIS) will support the upload of OCLC numbers from 1 April 2010. After that date OCLC numbers can be supplied in bibliographic and holdings records sent to Libraries Australia. The OCLC numbers will be used as supplementary match points in RIS if records are unable to match on ANBD control numbers and local system numbers.

To support the addition of these identifiers to members’ local library management systems, Libraries Australia is now offering ANBD number/OCLC Id concordance files. A file of OCLC identifiers from local systems can also be used as a match point in the Products module to identify records in the ANBD.

**SRU Record Update**

The SRU Record Update protocol between Libraries Australia and WorldCat was implemented in January 2009. Bibliographic record and holdings updates in Libraries Australia are transmitted to WorldCat within a few seconds. With the provision of two-way update in CBS version 5.0, records added in WorldCat by Australian libraries will also be transmitted to the ANBD.

The Libraries Australia team is encouraging members to ask their library management system vendors to support SRU Record Update, and is able to provide advice about the use of the protocol on request. OCLC is also developing an SRU synchronisation gateway for use with different library systems.

**Offline duplicate detection and resolution**

Automated duplicate detection (DDR) runs on the ANBD on a daily basis, using ISBNs and Library of Congress numbers as the match keys. A total of 239,622 duplicates have been removed through DDR so far.
NBD maintenance

From 1 July 2009 until 28 February 2010 Global Holdings Updates were performed for 65 libraries resulting in the updating, transfer or deletion of 1,722,665 holdings.

Table of Contents (TOC) data project

Previously the bulk of the 1.3 million ANBD records with TOC data were derived from a subscription to the Blackwells TOC service.

A project is underway to enrich ANBD records with Table of Contents (TOC) data derived from the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress was identified as the only major repository for deriving free Table of Contents data. The ANBD contained 352,000 records with links to the Library of Congress’ TOC data in field 856. 160,000 of these records already contain TOC data in field 505. The links in field 856 were used to retrieve the TOC data, which were then inserted into existing ANBD records. The method used to enhance the remaining records with TOC data harvested from the Library of Congress’s web site was to use the RIS matching and merging rules to match and merge TOC data with existing database records.

Harvesting of the TOC data from the Library of Congress began in December 2009, and to date 67,000 ANBD records have been enhanced with TOC data. About 100,000 additional records are still waiting to be enhanced with TOC data.

Authority upload project

In preparation for the upload of authority records via the Record Import Service, superseded control numbers were moved and the primary control number copied to an additional internal tag in 1.7 million authority records. Final testing is underway, and files of authority records from the National Library’s catalogue will be uploaded shortly.

Libraries Australia Record Import Service

161 organisations now contribute to the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD) using the Record Import Service (RIS) including four consortia providing contributions on behalf of 57 libraries. In total, 218 libraries contribute to the ANBD via the RIS. 34 additional libraries began using the RIS during the period 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010, and are listed in Appendix A.

Libraries Australia Document Delivery Service

728 libraries are registered to use the Libraries Australia Document Delivery Service (LADD). Thirty-three libraries joined LADD during the period from 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010 and are listed in Appendix B.
Seventy-six libraries are now using ISO ILL-compliant systems to interoperate with LADD. The following libraries began interoperating with LADD using the ISO ILL protocol:

- Mitchell Regional Library Service (VSLS)
- Melton Library and Information Service (VMLT)
- City of Greater Dandenong libraries (VDGV)
- West Gippsland Regional Library (VWGP)
- Yarra Libraries (VYML)
- Queensland Health Central Library (QDH) and
- Prince Charles Hospital Library (QPCH).

ISO ILL interoperability testing is currently underway with:

- UNILINC libraries (Aleph system)
- University of New England (NUNE) (Relais system)
- State Library of Victoria (VSL) (Relais system), and
- Defence Science and Technology Organisation libraries ((Relais system).

The inaugural LADD ISO ILL Partners Meeting was held in Hobart on 4 November, for libraries using their own ISO ILL-compliant ILL systems to interoperate with LADD.

Testing of a new version of VDX, 4.1.1, is underway and it is expected that VDX 4.1.1 will be implemented by mid-year. This version focuses on improvements to the user interface, including streamlined request entry and display screen layouts, and configurable ILL actions and work queues.


---

**Trove**

The National Library released the first full version of Trove on 4 December 2009\(^3\). The existing Libraries Australia free search service was rendered inactive on the same day. An advisory was provided to all Libraries Australia members and information placed on various websites.

---

\(^3\) Refer separate LAAC paper in this set for Trove usage statistics.
Deep linking and a green button

During 2009 the Libraries Australia team enabled a deep linking function between records in the ANBD and records in local catalogues. Further encouragement to implement this function was engendered in early 2010, resulting in more than two dozen new requests.

When enabled, the deep linking takes effect in both Libraries Australia and Trove.

More information about the benefits of deep linking is available in the February 2010 newsletter.¹

Memberships

There are 1,244 current members of Libraries Australia. The number of active user-ids has increased since last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User-ids</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contributing libraries</td>
<td>5,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-contributing libraries</td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total this year (last year)</td>
<td>7,119 (6,910)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between November 2009 and March 2010 there were 15 cancellations, including four due to library closures and four individual accounts. In the same timeframe, there were 29 new registrations, including for seven schools and six individuals.

By the end of February, 283 people had registered to use the Libraries Australia discussion space in ning.

Enquiries

In late October, the software used by the Libraries Australia help Desk to record enquiries was replaced with RefTracker. The version installed required a form to be used at all times, not a direct email address. This changeover is reflected in the following statistics.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>via Phone</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Webpage</td>
<td>1,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Email</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via Fax/Desk</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>2,549 enquiries</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these enquiries, 268 were regarding Trove. Many queries which are classified by
the sender as being about Trove are actually highlighting an issue in Libraries
Australia. One such example is concern about broken links, another is the lack of
currency of holdings. Members of the public are not sure whether their search
technique is at fault, or whether the link to a local catalogue is no longer working.5
The Trove team is investigating ways to ameliorate these issues in both Trove and
Libraries Australia.

Training courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/course</th>
<th># courses</th>
<th>#trainees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Client</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Del Online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc Del</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach activity

Libraries Australia staff Mary-Louise Weight, Laurel Paton and Electronic
Resources Australia (ERA) staff member Nikki Darby at the 2010 VALA Conference

---

5 Refer separate LAAC paper in this set for further discussion of the issues.
Libraries Australia launched a new eco-pen at the 2010 VALA conference.

It was distributed with 600 of the very popular ‘silk’ bags.

The other conference sponsored by Libraries Australia was

- **SWITCH: Public Libraries in a Changing Environment - 2009 NSW Public Libraries Conference & Exhibition**

The December 2009 and February 2010 eNewsletters were released.


Libraries Australia staff provided representatives for several User Group Meetings at:

- the State Library of New South Wales
- the State Library of Tasmania
- the National Library.

Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

Between November 2009 and February 2010, Libraries Australia welcomed four new members to its Advisory Committee (LAAC):

- Mr Vic Elliott, Director Scholarly Information Services and University Librarian, Australian National University, invited to join in his capacity as Asia Pacific delegate to the OCLC Global Council and Vice Chair and Chair-Elect of the OCLC Asia Pacific Regional Council
- Ms Ann Ritchie, Director Library Services in the Northern Territory Department of Health & Families, is a special libraries representative
- Ms Liz Burke, Director, Library Services, at Murdoch University, was nominated by the Council of Australian University Librarians to represent the Higher Education sector
- Ms Karen Hansen, Manager of Library Services at the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA), is a special libraries representative.

At its November 2009 LAAC meeting, the Committee also thanked and farewelled three long-serving representatives: Ms Linda Luther, who represented the Higher Education sector and served as the Chair of the LAAC for three years; and Ms Sherrey Quinn and Mr Lindsay Harris, both special libraries representatives.⁶

Recommendation

The Committee to note the report.

Contact: Debbie Campbell
Director Collaborative Services
dcampbel@nla.gov.au

March 2010

---

⁶ Further biographical details are provided in a recent Gateways article at nla.gov.au/pub/gateways/issues/103/story06.html.
Appendix A

The following libraries began using the Record Import Service during the period 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010:

- Academy Library, University of NSW@ADFA [ADFA]
- Alice Springs Public Library [XASPL]
- Alzheimer's Australia (WA) [WALZ]
- Australian National University Library [ANU]
- Australian Taxation Office: Jan Brady Library [AATO]
- Botany Bay City Council: Central Library, Eastgardens [NBNY]
- Brimbank Libraries [VBRIM]
- Broome Public Library [WBRM]
- Canterbury City Council Libraries: Canterbury City Council Library Service [NCML]
- Central Queensland University Library [QCQU]
- City of Joondalup: Joondalup Public Library [WJLS]
- City of Perth Library [WPER]
- City of Stirling [WSCCL]
- Corrective Services NSW: Library & Information Service [NCOR]
- Dalton McCaughey Library [VJTL]
- East Gippsland Shire Library: Bairnsdale Library [VEGS]
- Geraldton-Greenough Regional Library [WGER]
- Gold Coast City Council Libraries [QGCCL]
- Gosford City Council: Gosford City Library [NGCL]
- Great Lakes Library Service: Forster Library [NGLS]
- Port Phillip Library Service: St Kilda Library [VPPLS]
- Redland City Council - Redland City Library Service - Library Headquarters [QRSL]
- RMIT University Library [VIT]
- Singleton Shire Council: Singleton Public Library [NSIN]
- State Library of Queensland [QSL]
- Stonnington Library and Information Service: Toorak / South Yarra Library [VSLIS]
- SA TAFEs [SFED]
- The Hills Shire Council Library Service [NBAU]
- The Ronald Lowe Library [VEE]
- The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists [VCOG]
- University of Canberra Library [AUC]
- Waverley Council: Waverley Library [N WAV]
- Willoughby City Library: Central Library [NWML]
Appendix B

The following libraries joined the Libraries Australia Document Delivery service during the period 1 July 2009 to 28 February 2010:

- Albury City Libraries (NALB)
- Canterbury Hospital Medical Library (NCBY)
- Wagga Wagga Base Hospital Library Services (NWWH)
- Moreton Bay Regional Council (QMBC)
- Department of Justice and Attorney-General (QLD) (QAG)
- ESR Christchurch Science Centre, Information and Research Services (CESR)
- ESR Mt Albert Science Centre, Information and Research Services (AESRA)
- Riverina Regional Library – Henty (NRIV:H)
- Riverina Regional Library – Culcairn (NRIV:CUL)
- Riverina Regional Library – Junee (NRIV:J)
- Riverina Regional Library – Coolamon (NRIV:CML)
- Riverina Regional Library – Temora (NRIV:TE)
- Riverina Regional Library – Tumut (NRIV:TU)
- Riverina Regional Library – Cootamundra (NRIV:CT)
- Riverina Regional Library – Gundagai (NRIV:G)
- Australian Dental Association - Victorian Branch: Tuckfield Memorial Library (VDA)
- Macarthur Clinical Library (NCH)
- Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts: Australian Antarctic Division Library (TANT)
- URS Australia Pty Ltd (NURS)
- AstraZeneca Pty Ltd: Library & Resource Centre (NAPH)
- Santos Ltd: Santos Library and Research Centre (Brisbane) (QSLT)
- Gardiner Library Service: John Hunter Hospital Library (NGAL:JH)
- Mallesons Stephen Jaques (NMST)
- Port Augusta Public Library (SPA)
- The Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library and Information Service (Y CURL)
- Scotch Oakburn College, John Morris Library (TSOC)
- WorkCover NSW (NWC)
- Department of Community Safety (QLD) (QES)
- Mackay Health Service District Library (QMBH)
- Western Australian Museum Library (WMU)
- Avondale College Library (NAVC)
- The Prince Charles Hospital Library (QCPH)
In the same period the following libraries cancelled their Libraries Australia Document Delivery membership:

- Alice Springs Health Library (XASH) No longer using service
- University of Newcastle Ourimbah Campus (NNCU:C) No longer using service
- Woodside Energy: E&P Library (WWOP:NV) No longer using service
- Deacons (QSW) No longer using service
- Bankwest (WBW) No longer using service
- Orica Australia (NICR) No longer has a librarian
- Peter James Centre: Health Science Library (VESG) No longer using service
- Australian Human Rights Commission (NHRE) Library has closed
- Department of Justice Correctional Services South Australia (SCOR) Library has closed
- Royal Women’s Hospital Library (VWH) Merged
- Department of Child Protection (WCW) Library closed
- Pine Rivers Shire Council Library (QPRS) Using another account
- Minter Ellison Lawyers (NMINT) No longer using service
- Greater Western Area Health Service Library, Dubbo Base Hospital (NOFR) No longer using service
- Department of Health (SA) (SSHCl) Merged
- Moreton Bay Region Libraries - Caboolture District (QCSC) Merged
- Concept Economics Pty Limited (NCE) Subscription cancelled
- Gympie Regional Libraries (QGYM) Consolidating accounts
- Burkitt Ford Library (NU:BF) Library closed
- Australian Red Cross (VRCS) No longer using service
- DSTO Research Library, Maribyrnong (VMRL) Merged
- DSTO Research Library, Fisherman’s Bend (VARL) Merged
- Dibbs Barker Lawyers (NDAS) Subscription cancelled.
## 2009/2010 Libraries Australia Statistics

Report for Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

### July 2009 to February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$2,675,551</td>
<td>$2,685,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$3,122,933</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Activity</td>
<td>9,136,164</td>
<td>9,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings Added</td>
<td>2,446,521</td>
<td>954,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Records Added</td>
<td>668,938</td>
<td>618,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia Doc Del Requests</td>
<td>204,775</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$4,062,000</td>
<td>$4,062,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$4,680,000</td>
<td>$4,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Activity</td>
<td>13,885,000</td>
<td>14,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings Added</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Records Added</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia Doc Del Requests</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % of Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Target</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>includes depreciation, overheads, IT Staff and hardware maintenance costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Activity</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>includes all search targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdings Added</td>
<td>253%</td>
<td>University of Queensland holdings refresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Records Added</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia Doc Del Requests</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RDA: Resource Description and Access – an update

The new standard RDA: Resource Description and Access is being developed by the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA as a replacement for AACR. The JSC reports to the Committee of Principals (CoP) - the directors or their representatives from the Canadian, UK, and US professional library associations, the British Library, Library and Archives Canada, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Australia. RDA focuses on the data elements needed to support FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) and FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Records).

Timeline

June 2010  RDA: Resource Description and Access will be published.
+ 3 months  Preparatory period for US national libraries testing

RDA will be available for a free trial period.

+ 3 months  US national libraries formal testing
+ 3 months  US national libraries formal assessment

Mid 2011  Earliest date for implementation by Australian and overseas libraries.

Update on progress for release of RDA

- The three U.S. national libraries, the Library of Congress (LC), the National Library of Medicine (NLM) and the National Agricultural Library (NAL), made a commitment to the further development and completion of RDA. The three libraries agreed to make a joint decision on whether or not to implement RDA, based on the results of a test of both RDA and the Web product. The goal of the test is to assure the operational, technical, and economic feasibility of RDA. Testers include the three U.S. national libraries and 20 testing partners from the broader U.S. library community.

The U.S. national libraries will provide the National Library of Australia with documentation of testing methodology and results, as well as documentation and training materials.

Although the National Library of Australia will be monitoring the U.S. national libraries’ testing of RDA, we are not conducting testing per se. The National Library has an implementation plan for RDA which encompasses some aspects of testing to enable us to refine our procedures and plan training. A detailed plan is not yet publicly available, but when it is complete, will be added to the ACOC website.
The Australian Committee on Cataloguing has released a survey to Australian librarians to determine the training needs for RDA. Information from the survey will be used to facilitate the provision of training in RDA for Australian and New Zealand libraries.

The MARC changes needed to implement RDA are already available. The Network Development and MARC Standards Office at the Library of Congress has published MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data Update No. 9 (October 2008), Update No. 10 (October 2009) and Update No. 11 (February 2010). Many of the changes in these updates have been made to accommodate RDA. See www.loc.gov/marc/status.html and www.loc.gov/marc/RDAinMARC29.html for further information.

Due to strong demand a print version of RDA will be published as well as an online version.

RDA pricing for the US market was announced at the 2010 ALA Midwinter Meeting. Details of pricing for Australia are not available yet.

Implementation

- From the agreed Australian implementation date, Libraries Australia is committed to supporting the creation and exchange of records according to RDA.
- Libraries Australia will provide users with as much notice as possible of any changes to the data format and cataloguing policy.
- Libraries Australia will implement support for RDA in our training system well in advance of the implementation date. RDA-related changes will be reflected in LA training courses and system documentation.
- Changes will be made in the Libraries Australia Cataloguing and Search test, training and production systems to support RDA. These will include changes to the Record Import and Export Services, validation, match/merge, WebCat cataloguing template, WinIBW cataloguing templates, presentation and indexes to allow searching, input and exchange of new or changed MARC fields.
- Libraries Australia will investigate whether it is feasible and/or desirable to use global change programs to create any new RDA data elements using data that is already present in the record, or to massage existing data elements so that they comply with RDA. The timing of any such changes will be carefully considered so that they meet the needs of the greatest number of Australian libraries.

Cataloguing policy

- Just as records created according to older cataloguing rules continue to be used and exchanged some 30 years after the implementation of AACR2, these, and AACR2 records, will continue to be used and will co-exist in our library systems with records
created according to RDA. Libraries Australia will continue to support the exchange of records created according to AACR2 or other standards as long as they are supported in MARC21.

- Libraries Australia will also publish a policy guideline as to when AACR2 records should be upgraded to reflect RDA.

**Further information**

- The Australian Committee on Cataloguing (ACOC) is a joint author of RDA. Further information can be found about the Australian implementation on the ACOC website: [www.nla.gov.au/lis/stndrds/grps/acoc/rda.html](http://www.nla.gov.au/lis/stndrds/grps/acoc/rda.html)

- Information about RDA development is available on the Joint Steering Committee for the Implementation of RDA (JSC) website: [www.rda-jsc.org/rda.html](http://www.rda-jsc.org/rda.html).

**Recommendation**

The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee to note the report.

Libraries Australia Database Services

Contact: Deborah Fuller  
(02) 6262 1328  
dfuller@nla.gov.au

31 March 2010
TAFE LIBRARIES SUBSCRIPTION MODEL

Background

This paper provides a further progress report on the implementation of the new subscription model for TAFE libraries. The previous report was provided in 2008\(^1\).

All subscription modelling has been based on a parameter of “intrinsic size” of the member library. The parameter will vary between sectors. Libraries Australia has already applied such a model to the university library sector (using total library budget as the measure of size), to the state, territory and public library sector (using population served as the measure of size), and to special libraries (offering a choice between total budget and full-time equivalent staff numbers).

The background for this change is that usage-based charging (which was used prior to July 2005) creates a disincentive for libraries to increase their use of the service. The Libraries Australia team would like all members of Libraries Australia to use the service to the maximum extent in accordance with their needs.

The new subscription model was announced in principle in 2005. As an interim measure, prior to moving to the new model, libraries have been charged according to the average of their payments in 2003 and 2004, with CPI adjustments in some years.

For all sectors, the impact of transitioning has been reduced by phasing it in over several years. This will be done whenever the change in charges is significant, and whether the change involves an increase or a decrease.

Development of the TAFE library sector model

In 2008, the federal Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) published a table listing 59 registered TAFEs, but it has been difficult to confirm recent figures. Not all TAFEs in Australia have their own libraries. TAFE library membership of Libraries Australia sits at 60 libraries. ALIA has established a new advisory committee to improve statistics collection and other issues concerning TAFE libraries.\(^2\)

WA TAFE Libraries belong to a consortium, which has been operating effectively for many years. NSW TAFEs are served by a central office which manages all acquisitions and cataloguing for all of their libraries. The South Australian TAFE libraries are currently in the process of forming a consortium.

---

\(^1\) New subscription model for special libraries – progress report. [LAAC/2008/1/5]
\(^2\) ALIA TAFE Libraries Advisory Committee

The need to establish subscription tiers under a new model for the TAFE sector was recognised by the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee in April 2009. It was agreed that this work should be completed in time for the July 2010 invoices.\(^3\)

The TAFE library sector represents a modest proportion of Libraries Australia revenue (2.6 %). An enquiry seeking total budget information for each TAFE library confirmed that this data is not uniformly available, due to confidentiality requirements in some states.

This was followed by a survey of the TAFE libraries which already subscribe to Libraries Australia in January 2010. It outlined the need for a new subscription model and sought information about their total full time equivalent staff and the number of full time equivalent student contact hours in 2008.

The initial response rate of 40% was not sufficient to develop a complete model but based on data received, a draft tiered model was provided as part of a further request to non-responding libraries. This tiered model will be refined when final figures are received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Student Contact Hours</th>
<th>Subscription (ex GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>&lt;1,000,000</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>1,000,001 – 3,000,000</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>3,000,001 – 5,000,000</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>5,000,001 – 10,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 5</td>
<td>10,000,001 +</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed tiered model for TAFE library subscriptions

The final subscription model will be published on the Libraries Australia web site as part of the charging schedule.\(^4\)

**Recommendation**

That the Committee approves the model.

Contact: Warwick Cathro  
Assistant Director-General  
Resource Sharing & Innovation  
wcatbro@nla.gov.au  
02 6262 1390

January 2010

\(^3\) New subscription models for Special, TAFE, and School library sectors. [LAAC/2009/1/5]  

EVALUATION OF THE LIBRARIES AUSTRALIA FORUM 2009

The fourth annual Libraries Australia Forum was held at the Hobart Function and Conference Centre on 6 November 2009. The Forum followed several days of related events in Hobart, including the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee meeting, two library tours and the Charles Sturt University Empowering Users seminar.

There were 146 attendees for the Forum this year, compared to 303 in 2008. The Forum was promoted via the regular channels – messages to the Libraries Australia and Libraries Australia Document Delivery mailing lists, at State User Group Meetings, the Libraries Australia Home Page and on the Libraries Australia space on Ning.

Keynote speakers included: Jim Michalko, Vice President RLG Programs Development, OCLC, Dublin, Ohio, who gave an ‘environmental scan’ of the current social, policy and technology influences on libraries and the overall relevance of libraries in today’s world; Janifer Gatenby, Research Integration and Standards, OCLC, Leiden, The Netherlands, who talked about the current status and future of the Centraal Bibliotheek System (CBS); and Margaret Allen, CEO and State Librarian of the State Library of Western Australia (SLWA), who looked at the challenges facing state libraries, the background to the NSLA’s Re-imagining Libraries project and the SLWA’s strategic plan to enable libraries to collectively meet the needs of the community in the digital world.

Attendees were asked to fill out an evaluation form prior to departing from the Forum. There were 58 responses equating to a 40% return rate from the total number of attendees. This report summarises the evaluation forms. Statistical responses can be found at Attachment A of this report. A summary of responses can be found at Attachment B.

The evaluation form was reviewed and updated this year. The rating for Meals and Refreshments was incorporated into Meeting Venue/Catering, and Helpfulness of Libraries Australia Staff was removed from the form. Questions inviting comment were reduced from five to three.

The most frequent comment was disappointment with the duplication of content across the CSU seminar and the Forum itself. This was exacerbated by duplication in the ILL interactive session and the Forum’s afternoon keynote.
Overall Meeting
Approximately ninety-two per cent of respondents to the evaluation rated the Forum overall as above average or excellent. Around eight percent rated it as average.

![Overall Meeting Chart](chart1.png)

*Figure 1: Overall ratings – 2008 and 2009*

Parallel sessions
The parallel sessions were well received, with sixty-five percent of respondents rating the sessions as either excellent or above average. Thirty-three percent rated these sessions as average, while only two percent rated sessions as below average and none considered the presentations were of poor quality.

There were two interactive sessions that ran concurrently. One on Interlibrary Loans covering current ILL issues and an overview of LADD developments; the other on Cataloguing and Metadata Futures which discussed current issues relating to the creation and exchange of metadata, as well as Libraries Australia Cataloguing service developments.

![Parallel Sessions Chart](chart2.png)

*Figure 2: Parallel sessions – 2008 and 2009*
Quality of Presentations
Eighty-nine percent of respondents rated the quality of presentations either above average or excellent. None of the presentations were considered as below average or poor by respondents.

Some comments:

Good mix of visionary and practical presentations.

Excellent speakers with information of relevance.

Opportunity to hear a variety of speakers on initiatives I wouldn’t have been aware of.

Meeting Content
Seventy-four percent of respondents rated the meeting as above average or excellent. Sixteen percent rated the meeting content as average, while none of the meeting content was rated as below average or poor.

Figure 3: Quality of presentations - 2008 and 2009

Figure 4: Meeting Content – 2008 and 2009
Opportunities for discussion
Seventy-one percent of respondents rated the opportunities for discussion as above average or excellent compared with sixty percent in 2008. Twenty-five percent rated these opportunities as average, and four percent below average.

Some example comments include:

*Time for learning and reflection away from work.*

*Opportunity to meet and talk with NLA staff and catch up with colleagues from other libraries and service providers.*

*It’s always good to hear from LA and our NLA colleagues.*

![Figure 5: Opportunities for discussion – 2008 and 2009](image)

Meeting Venue/Catering
In contrast to the sixty-seven percent rating in 2008, fifty percent of respondents found the venue excellent or above average, and forty-two percent found it average. Seven percent rated the venue as below average to poor. A number of respondents commented about the seating being uncomfortable. Other comments about the venue included it being too small; difficulty seeing the speakers and bottom of the projector screen, especially from the back of the room.

It should be noted that the Libraries Australia Forum was the last significant event to be held in the Hobart Function and Conference Centre prior to a full refurbishment.

Some comments regarding the catering included:

*Good session, great food.*

*Venue – picturesque. New ideas for innovation*

*Depending on location i.e. cold climate – warmer food.*
Analysis of Attendees by State or Territory


Recommendation

That the Committee notes the report.

Contact: Laurel Paton
Manager Libraries Australia Customer Services
lpaton@nla.gov.au

January 2010
Attachment A: Statistical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Meeting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel sessions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of presentations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting content</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for discussion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting venue/catering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008-2009 comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall meeting</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td>30.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>64.90%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parallel sessions</strong></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2008</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>10.30%</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>16.40%</td>
<td>49.10%</td>
<td>32.70%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Quality of presentations</strong></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2008</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
<td>54.10%</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
<td>52.70%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Meeting content/Venue</strong></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2008</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>15.80%</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunities for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2008</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td>44.30%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>46.40%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meeting venue/Catering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2008</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2008</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses 2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage 2009</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>42.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2

Summary of Comments from Attendees’ Evaluation Forms

What did you like most?

Good venue. Good speakers.
2nd keynote speech.
The location and speakers were good.
Discussion on cataloguing workflows.
Forthcoming developments in LA e.g. Trove. OCLC connections.
Time for learning and reflection away from work.
The morning sessions were good, but rest of the day was a bit light on.
Venue – picturesque. New ideas for innovation.
Opportunity to meet and talk with NLA staff & catch up with colleagues from other libraries + service providers.
Really enjoyed getting a wider perspective on the direction of the profession.
Trove.
Program.
Keynote speakers v. good.
Keynotes were terrific.
The view.
Opportunity to hear a variety of speakers on initiatives I wouldn’t have been aware of.
Jim’s keynote address.
Combination with CSU. Good mix of visionary & practical demonstrations.
Content of presentations.
Janifer Gatenby’s presentation.
Janifer Gatenby presentation.
The venue/location – excellent
The location was superb but the venue itself was awkward, e.g. if you were seated on the outer you couldn’t see the screen properly. Solution more screens and the afternoon glare gave me a headache.
Content.
Keynotes for the three speakers.
Enthusiasm of speakers.
Great location. Good range speakers.
The keynote address in the morning.
Interlibrary loans interactive session.
Debbie Hanington’s demonstration of DocStore. Trove demo.
Morning keynotes, esp. Jim’s session – v. thought provoking. What format did he use for his cool presentation?
The fact that another seminar is co-scheduled. It makes it far easier to justify my attendance, when I live in Darwin. Also that it’s on the first or last day of the week: don’t lose a work day travelling.
Excellent speaker with information of relevance. Felt the parallel session worked better than previous years.
Jim Michalko.
Great to have the overseas speakers.
Attempt to keep to time. Presentations were very good.
Janifer Gatenby and Jim Michalko’s talks. Food was great especially the soup.
Is there anything that you would change?

Less of a repeat of items if a seminar is held the day before.
A lot of the material repeated information from the CSU seminar yesterday – maybe they could have been better coordinated?
No.
Venue not very comfortable particularly the chairs which were too hard for a full day of sitting.
Room set-up for parallel sessions.
Repetition of the Re-Imagining scenarios could have been managed better.
Name of delegates published?
No.
Seating arrangements, not facing speaker.
Not much lunch (got cheese only).
Less repetition with previous days’ programme.
Venue could have been a little larger.
There is enough content to run as a full day, with slightly longer breaks. This would allow for more discussion & networking with LA members.
The food!
Possibly too much overlap with yesterday’s sessions. Very congested meal areas!
Venue – more lecture-style seating would be better.
More power points for in-conference Tweeting. (Blogging is so passé).
Repeated sessions from Thursday were not necessary. Because of the location (Hobart) many people came for both events.
Shame that at times noise from outside permeated the sessions which was distracting - However not something that could have been foreseen.
Depending on location re cold climate – warmer food.
More overhead screens, higher for viewing.
Duplication between CSU seminar the day before.
No.
A lot of overlap from CSU – more coordination of content.
Too much repetition. The SLWA keynote was a repeat of the DocDel parallel session and too much duplication with the CSU seminar.
There was a bit of repetition of the State Library projects between the CSU seminar and today’s forum.
More coordination with presenters/content from 5th Nov (and even today) would provide opp(ortunity) for more unique content. Too much overlap/repetition (NSLA, Trove).
The conjoined CSU Seminar.
Hard to see the slides when all seating on the same level – Chairs very uncomfortable in rooms – Hard to manage plate & drink outside.
More coffee stations – Chairs very uncomfortable – Impossible to see from the back.

Any further comments?

Seats too hard.
Overlap between LA Forum and CSU Forum
Softer seats
No.
Please bring back the opening cocktail function.
It’s always so good to hear from LA & our NLA colleagues.
Food was good. Thanks.
Good session, great food.
Catering was okay but not as good as it could be – very cold.
Perhaps a little too much overlap in the area of the projects related to Re-Imagining libraries.
Enjoyed the library tours. Thanks.
Smaller, more focussed, group splits to provide more choice on what to attend. Thank you for the Onya bag.
The seats suck! The 40 mins+ sessions, though very interesting, were just too long for comfort. Welcome/start of day tea/coffee would have been good!
Duplication of content was not good.
P.S. The ISO ILL NLA meeting called on Wed 4th useful & would like to see repeated. Would be helpful to provide notepaper in bags. Catering very good – tasty.
Meeting content overlapped in the afternoon. After lunch speaker repeated Margaret Allen. No need to repeat projects again. Cataloguing session was good with NLA improvements & RDA presenters were clear and understandable. All good.
RESULTS OF THE WORLDCAT RESOURCE SHARING SURVEY

Introduction

Libraries Australia is investigating the feasibility of interconnection between the Libraries Australia Document Delivery (LADD) and WorldCat Resource Sharing (WRS) systems. Interconnection would allow LADD libraries to exchange ILL requests with the more than 9,000 libraries worldwide that use WRS, with the WorldCat database at its core. For more information on WRS see www.oclc.org/us/en/resourcesharing/support/default.html.

At present Libraries Australia Document Delivery users can request from the National Library of New Zealand’s Te Puna Interlending and from the commercial supplier Infotrieve.

Some preliminary discussions have been held with OCLC staff in Dublin, Ohio. Several business and technical issues would need to be resolved before WRS-LADD interconnection could be implemented. For example, Libraries Australia would want to ensure that libraries from each network would need to opt in to request from the other network, and Libraries Australia would only accept payment via OCLC ILL Fee Management (IFM) (so that from the LADD user point of view payment would be rolled into the LADD Payments Service).

It was decided that it would be valuable to gauge the level of interest in interconnection with WRS among the LADD community through a survey.

Objectives

The survey aimed to identify:

- The extent to which LADD libraries currently request items from overseas;
- The extent to which LADD libraries currently supply items to overseas libraries;
- Whether requests are for interlibrary loan or for document supply;
- Which overseas sources are used by LADD libraries;
- The extent to which LADD libraries would request/supply items if WorldCat Resource Sharing were made available;
- Any perceived financial constraints.

Methodology

The survey was launched on 11 January 2010, and was originally scheduled to close on 5 February. However, in an attempt to improve the response rate the survey was extended until 19 February. Libraries input their responses using an online web form using the SurveyMonkey service www.surveymonkey.com/. The survey was publicised via the librariesaustraliadocdel-l list. The survey questionnaire is provided at Attachment A. Respondents were asked to exclude requesting/supplying to Te Puna in their answers, as Te Puna is already provided as a target in LADD.
Results

In total there were 107 responses, with 16 of these from libraries that interoperate with LADD using the ISO ILL protocol (see www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/isoill.html).

Question 3. Does your library currently request copies (non-returnables) from overseas libraries?

The highest number of copies requested per year by a single library from overseas sources was 5,000. The average number for those libraries that do request copies was 455 requests per year.

Overseas sources cited included the British Library Document Supply Centre and Subito (mentioned most frequently), then CISTI, Infotrieve, WorldCat Resource Sharing, National Agricultural Library, National Library of Medicine, Linda Hall Library, and North American universities.

Question 4. Does your library currently request loans (returnables) from overseas libraries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of libraries requesting loans from overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest number of loans requested per year by a single library from overseas sources was 1,500. The average number among those libraries who do request loans was 93 requests per year.

Overseas sources cited included: British Library Document Supply Centre and Subito (mentioned most frequently), then WorldCat Resource Sharing, North American and European universities.

**Question 5. Does your library currently supply copies (non-returnables) to overseas libraries?**

![No. of libraries supplying copies overseas](image)

The highest number of copies supplied per year by a single library to overseas sources was 3,600. The average number for those libraries that do supply copies was 145 copies supplied per year.

Overseas requests for copies came mainly from European and North American universities.

**Question 6. Does your library currently supply loans (returnables) to overseas libraries?**

![No. of libraries supplying loans overseas](image)
The highest number of loans supplied per year by a single library to overseas sources was also 3,600. The average number for those libraries that do supply loans was 292 loans supplied per year.

Overseas requests for loans came mainly from European and North American universities.

**Question 7.** Would your library request copies from overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?

![Potential requests for copies from WRS](chart)

**Question 8.** Would your library request loans from overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?

![Potential requests for loans from WRS](chart)

**Question 9.** Would your library supply copies to overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?
Question 10. Would your library supply loans to overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?

Question 11. Does your library policy allow the supply of loans to overseas libraries?
Question 12. Would you be prepared to pay a fee (in addition to the loan/copy charge levied by the supplying library) for each request sent to WRS?

A number of libraries noted that requesting from WRS would depend on the size of the extra fee levied.

Recommendation

The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee to confirm that we should proceed with interoperability, subject to resolving the barriers for the technical and business issues.

Libraries Australia Database Services
Contact: Deborah Fuller
(02) 6262 1328
dfuller@nla.gov.au
22 March 2010
Attachment A  LADD WorldCat Resource Sharing Survey

1. Please enter your contact and library details.

2. Please enter your Library NUC symbol.

3. Does your library currently request copies (non-returnables) from overseas libraries? Yes / No
   If so, approximately how many per year?
   If so, which sources do you use?

4. Does your library currently request loans (returnables) from overseas libraries?
   Yes / No
   If so, approximately how many per year?
   If so, which sources do you use?

5. Does your library currently supply copies (non-returnables) to overseas libraries?
   Yes / No
   If so, approximately how many per year?
   If so, which organisations request from you?

6. Does your library currently supply loans (returnables) to overseas libraries?
   Yes / No
   If so, approximately how many per year?
   If so, which organisations request from you?

7. Would your library request copies from overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?
   Yes / No

8. Would your library request loans from overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?
   Yes / No

9. Would your library supply copies to overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?
   Yes / No

10. Would your library supply loans to overseas libraries if LADD was connected to WRS?
    Yes / No

11. Does your library policy allow the supply of loans to overseas libraries?
    Yes / No
    Any comments?

12. Would you be prepared to pay a fee (in addition to the loan/copy charge levied by the
    supplying library) for each request sent to WRS?
    Yes / No

13. Any other comments?
TROVE – A PROGRESS REPORT

Introduction

Trove is the Library’s flagship service for discovering content within Australian collections. It has already become an essential starting point for discovering information about Australia and Australians. Trove offers a single search across 90 million items, including books, video and sound files, images, manuscripts, original research and newspaper articles. Many of the items are available for viewing online; and others are found in Australian library collections.

After being in prototype for seven months, Trove was released as an ongoing service in December 2009. Feedback from the unofficial launch which was blogged on 4 November 2009 is still being received:

“I just stumbled across the trove today, and am particularly appreciative! Thank you to all those involved for making this great website”. (24 March 2010).

A number of improvements to Trove have been made since the October 2009. They include:

- A new look and feel for the user interface
- User capability to add tags and comments to any format of material in Trove
- Implementation of user registration, which allows users to invoke the “in my libraries feature” and to be identified as the creator of tags and comments which they add
- Improved printing facilities
- Improvements to the display of digitised newspaper articles
- A “Cite this” feature
- Provision of Copyright Status information
- A number of changes behind the scenes to make the service more robust.
- Allow the user to hide those result set zones which they do not need.

Users can optionally register with the service and specify a list of “my libraries” to do a search restricted to material available in those libraries (with the option of including material found online). These libraries can be changed at any time.¹

Trove has replaced the Libraries Australia free search service and the Register of Australian Archives & Manuscripts. The National Library is in the process of replacing the separate Australian Newspapers interface, with an anticipated completion by the end of April.

Usage

The usage of Trove has been steadily increasing since it was moved out of prototype status on 3 December. The usage now exceeds 12,000 visits per day, or 60,000 searches per day:

![Daily visits graph]

While registration to use the service is optional, more than 9,000 users have done so including those who had already registered for the Australian Newspapers service. Trove users have been identified as being located in 205 countries, although 65% of the usage is coming from Australia.

It is possible to view user interaction activity from the Trove Home Page, including:

- the most recent searches and viewed works
- the most prolific newspaper text correctors, month by month
- the most recent works merged or split
- a tag cloud showing the tags added in the most recent hour, day, week or month
- the most recent comments added to records.
Feedback

Trove has received an overwhelming amount of feedback, with many compliments but also some suggestions for improvements. Researchers in the United States wrote:

“I just wanted to take a moment to thank you for this amazing resource. I am a theatre historian trying to research a few American minstrel performers who spent extended periods of time performing in Australia. I was despondent of finding any information on their time there until I stumbled upon this resource, and what a find! I have spent a great deal of time in a wide variety of databases, and I do not believe I have ever found anything as useful or comprehensive. I love that I am able to search newspapers, books, diaries, etc. all at the same time. As someone teaching at a university with somewhat modest financial resources for our libraries, I welcome the access to vital information. I have been telling all of my fellow scholars about Trove, and will be using it as a model of what can be for years to come.”

“This is so COOL! Finally, all that metadata pays off!”

Ideas for improvement are being reviewed continuously:

“Why can’t I keep using the Libraries Australia site - all I want is to find books and journals not all this other stuff.”

“I am a researcher who has found using the Libraries Australia site very accurate and useful for tracking bibliographic queries accurately. By contrast Trove seems very good at throwing up lots of references but not good at finding the one needed at the top of the pile. Using the advanced search requires tiresome entry of indexing terms and doesn’t seem to produce much better results. Why not use just an old fashioned search box with index term options and allow searching of exact terms? Or am I missing something? Hope this is helpful feedback!”

Impact

Several major issues have emerged as a result of the new displays in Trove of bibliographic data from the National Bibliographic Database. They are:

1. the lack of updates applied to holdings, which is particularly noticeable for public libraries. A range of factors are at play here, including the outsourcing of cataloguing to third party providers. Collection turnover is viewed as more important than retention, even of contemporary works of enduring literary value, but holdings are not being updated.

The Trove team has addressed this in the short term by adding an explanation to the Trove FAQ.2

“You say my local library has this book, but it isn’t in their catalogue. Why is your information wrong?
Trove shows you which Australian libraries hold a book or other collection item. This information is supplied by libraries through the collaborative network "Libraries Australia".
This information is not always up to date. For example, where libraries discard items from their collections, information relating to these discards can sometimes take a considerable period to be reported to the National Library. In these cases some collection items are wrongly shown in Trove as being held by a library.
The National Library is working with other Australian libraries to improve the currency of library holdings, and is now planning to increase these efforts.”

In the medium term, the Trove team in conjunction with the Libraries Australia Office expects to implement a series of activities to encourage and support more responsive updating of holdings.

2. The lack of currency of URLs.
We estimate that there are more than half a million broken URLs, such as for digitised images, in Libraries Australia which are manifested in Trove as well. This has arisen in lot of cases where libraries have changed their domain names without implementing a resolver service, and as a consequence, several thousand links can be broken with one small change. URLs which are linked to items such as images which were for sale have caused particular angst.

The Trove team and the Libraries Australia team are working on a set of tasks firstly to remove the problem, and secondly to try to reduce its severity in the future.

3. An increased demand for self-borrowing.
Clients both familiar and unfamiliar with the Libraries Australia InterLibrary Loan/Document Delivery service have requested the ability to place an order through their local library for items they find. This function is currently only available in the subscription service, and therefore requires a review of the service model.

Recommendation

The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee to comment on the report.

Contact: Debbie Campbell
Director Collaborative Services
dcampbel@nla.gov.au

March 2010
NSLA DESCRIPTION AND CATALOGUING PROJECT

Background
This paper provides information about the Description and Cataloguing Project, which forms part of the NSLA Reimagining Libraries initiative.

Some of the approaches being considered in this Project may be of interest to libraries beyond the NSLA sector.

The Project aims to:
• improve access via Libraries Australia (and now Trove) to documentary heritage materials, especially unique materials, held by NSLA member libraries
• stimulate the use of more productive and streamlined ways of processing and cataloguing that are appropriate to the category of materials; and
• identify cost-effective approaches, tools and standards and develop workflow models for integrating control of unique materials.

It is a basic goal of NSLA to expose, as comprehensively as possible, their collections in Libraries Australia and Trove. It is an assumption of the Project that some categories of NSLA member library collections will never receive detailed item-level cataloguing. However, in many such cases, collection-level descriptions, summaries or lists have been created.

The Lists Project
To make these lists and summaries available for searching via Trove, the project has identified a specific action in its Action Plan called the Lists Project.

A common approach is to create one bibliographic record that describes the collection and to create a list of items in the collection for a more detailed level of access. Generally, the collection level record is entered into the institution’s catalogue and is sometimes contributed to Libraries Australia. However, more often than not, the lists of items within the collection are available only within the institution or at best through the local catalogue.

The lists come in many forms and formats from paper to electronic (Word and Excel), and are used within a library as an aid to access – for instance, they might be housed with the physical collection, available for consultation at the reference desk, be available for browsing or searching on a local catalogue or through a web site. They are for the main part not findable through resource discovery services, including Trove.

Most collections described in the lists consist of unique or rare heritage material and they are often large and complex. The lists can comprise for instance, detailed notes on the history and provenance of a collection; captions and citations for individual items; and index references. The research value generally lies in the collection as an entity but it is necessary to know what is in the collection to assess its usefulness. It would be beyond the resources of any library to catalogue such collections in sufficient detail using more traditional approaches in order to provide researchers (and staff) with the level of information they require to use and manage the collection. It is therefore necessary to find another way of revealing those largely “hidden” collections more widely through commonly used resource discovery services.
Trove functionality now provides opportunities for libraries to make such information about important collections available for searching online without the need to catalogue items individually. To streamline the process of converting existing descriptions into online searchable data and to maximise discoverability of the data, guidelines on different approaches and on data standards are required.

NSLA has agreed to provide funding to develop these guidelines, based on a review of the range of existing lists and to test them by carrying out a trial to convert a representative range of the lists.

The NSLA funding will support the appointment of a Project Officer for a three month project to be undertaken during 2010. The Project Officer will:

- gather examples of lists from each institution to have a representative range of the types of lists in existence
- analyse the lists to gain understanding of the issues involved in their conversion and to identify possible solutions
- discuss local requirements and constraints (such as library management system functionality) with member institutions
- discussing possible models for converting lists of collection description with the Trove team, taking into account bibliographic standards required
- trial the conversion of a selection of lists
- document models and guidelines and discuss these at a workshop with member libraries
- develop agreed NSLA/Trove models and guidelines for contributing information related to collections to Trove.

**Ingestion of lists into Trove**

This Project has a relationship with the plans of the Resource Sharing and Innovation Division to strengthen the coverage of Trove by exposing collection-level descriptions and finding aids provided by libraries, archives and museums. A good example is the “local history collection” pages that have been published on the Web by many public libraries.

Where these collection summaries exist as published web pages, it is relatively straightforward for Trove to index them. The envisaged workflow is:

- Trove ingests a brief record for each collection guide, finding aid or file description. Each brief record would include the URL of the web page containing the full text of the guide
- If Trove finds an appropriate trigger in the brief record, it will follow this link and will index the text of the guide
- Trove will expose the brief record in an appropriate result set in response to a user search
- If the user clicks on a link in the search result, he or she will be taken from the brief record to the web page containing the original guide
- Where the web page contains further links into the local web site, the user can follow these links to obtain more granular, item level information.

This strategy will provide an effective context for the user and will expose library, archive and museum collection content that has not been catalogued at item level.
Stage 2 of the Trove Project (now due for completion at the end of April 2010) will include an enhancement to index the full text of collection summaries and finding aids, triggered by incoming records which contain appropriate trigger phrases and URLs.

There remains the question of the “brief record” and how Trove would obtain it. For libraries, the most appropriate method of contributing such a brief record is to catalogue the web page into Libraries Australia.

If the contributing institution is not a library (for example, if it is a museum, gallery or archive) it is unlikely that the brief record would be contributed through Libraries Australia. In these cases an appropriate strategy may be for the institution to create a brief Dublin Core-compatible record for the collection through a form hosted on the Trove home page; or to provide such a record to an aggregator partner (a possible example is the Collections Australia Network) and that partner provides the record to Trove.

**Recommendation**

That the Committee notes the report.

Contact: Pamela Gatenby
pgatenby@nla.gov.au
02 6262 1672
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NSLA RE-IMAGINING LIBRARIES PROJECT 7
(COLLABORATIVE COLLECTIONS) UPDATE

Background

This paper is to provide a brief update on the National & State Libraries Australasia (NSLA) Re-Imagining Libraries Project 7 (Collaborative Collections). Noelle Nelson (project manager) will speak to this paper at the LAAC meeting.

The Project 7 Collaborative Collections project is looking to identify models for collaborative collection development for both current collections (retrospective) and future acquisitions (prospective) in the formats of eResources, serials and monographs.

The Project Group has initially focused on developing a set of principles for collaborative collecting within the NSLA libraries, developing a costed model for a national set of e-resources and developing a project plan for serials and guidelines for cancellations.

The Project Group has developed the following documents that may be of interest to other sectors, which were endorsed by NSLA at its 9-10 March 2010 meeting:

- National set of principles for collaborative collections (Attachment A); and
- Criteria for cancelling, keeping or relocating serials subscriptions (Attachment B).

This project is being led by the State Library of New South Wales and the State Library of Queensland.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the report.

Contact: Noelle Nelson
nnelson@sl.nsw.gov.au
02 9273 1412

22 March 2010
Attachment A

NSLA Re-imagining Libraries
Project 7, Collaborative Collections Principles

1. Provide access to the widest possible range of resources – onsite and online 24/7.

2. Develop a national core set of e-resources for all Australian citizens regardless of location within Australia [whether at home, work or school].

3. Provide access to a range of resources via collaborative collecting and shared delivery mechanisms to build efficiencies and eliminate unnecessary duplication.

4. Maximise development and access to our unique Heritage collections – onsite and online 24/7 through efficiencies in non-heritage collections.

5. Provide a comprehensive set of collections guidelines for print and online resources with an agreed approach to retention and disposal.

6. Acknowledge and pursue repatriation opportunities which will build stronger and more complete collections.

7. Acknowledge the legal deposit roles of the NLA and state libraries for Australian and state material respectively.

8. Work within existing legislative frameworks applicable to each participating library.

9. Develop a MOU agreement for creating access, and developing and managing collection responsibilities.

10. Align to key principles of level one Levels of Engagement endorsed by NSLA - All Libraries acting as One Library

   a. Plan together, or on behalf of all

   b. Policies aligned in every Library

   c. Central systems and discovery service.
Attachment B

Criteria for cancelling, keeping or relocating serial subscriptions (Work Package 5)

These criteria relate to serials in paper format in NSLA reference collections. They do not relate to serials in Research Level subjects, statiana, or other unique heritage content; or to material that has been acquired with restrictions on disposal. The criteria operate in the context of each library’s overall collection budget. Issues of value for money and cancellation decisions may depend on a combination of the criteria.

A serial title should be considered for cancellation if:
1. it is outside the scope of the library’s collection development policy
2. there is a more appropriate title available, particularly if there is an acceptable but less expensive alternative
3. it has low use, particularly relative to high cost, when considering
   - usage statistics such as retrieval, reshelving or interlibrary loan statistics
   - whether the title is displayed or routed
4. a currently duplicated title is required only in a single copy
5. comparable or similar information can be sourced online
6. it is in poor condition or missing a majority of issues
7. the online format is available and if
   - the title is available without an embargo or licensing restrictions on new or current content, or if not, if the library can meet client requirements within the restrictions
   - the online version is complete including images and charts, reviews, letters and index
   - the possibility of loss of access to the back-set if the online format ceases to be available (for example, if an aggregator loses the rights to the publication) is deemed to be acceptable
   - there is no preference for access to the hard copy (for current browsing)
   - the title is a paper indexing and abstracting service
8. it is held at a NSLA Library and the title can be copied/loaned.

In cases where a title is cancelled and identified for disposal, where practical it will be offered for repatriation to the NSLA holding library or libraries with the object of making a complete set to support client service.

---

1 In this document, Research Level refers to an extensive collection consistent with the Australian Conspectus definition.
NSLA OPEN BORDERS PROJECT

Background

The Advisory Committee was previously advised (paper LAAC/2008/2/11) about the Open Borders Project, which forms part of the NSLA Reimagining Libraries initiative. This new paper provides an update on the Project. Some of the approaches being considered in this Project may be of interest to libraries beyond the NSLA sector.

The Open Borders Project aims to:

- make visible all of the collection holdings of NSLA members;
- connect this collection content through enhanced discovery services;
- establish new links to NSLA collection resources from popular online resources, such as Wikipedia;
- allow NSLA member libraries to enhance their own discovery services by leveraging off the collaborative discovery service; and
- provide seamless access to the suites of electronic resources that are subscribed to by Australia’s state, territory, public and national libraries.

Several of these aims will be met by building on Trove, the national discovery service implemented by the National Library in late 2009. Another Reimagining Libraries project (Project 8: Description and Cataloguing) will aim to make the collection content of NSLA member libraries as comprehensive as possible in Trove. Further, the Trove Application Programming Interface (API), to be released later in 2010, will enable NSLA member libraries to leverage off Trove, if they wish, as they build or implement their local or statewide discovery services.

A particular priority for the Open Borders Project will be to enhance access to the suites of electronic resources that are subscribed to by Australia’s state, territory, public and national libraries. The Project will take a “user-centric” approach which will aim to address these questions:

- How can NSLA and public libraries ensure that the electronic resources which they license are used to the maximum extent possible?
- How can their discovery services be configured to allow users to search for and access those articles which they are entitled to access by virtue of their library memberships and their libraries’ licences?

The second of these questions may require further explanation. At present it is not possible for a user who is registered with (say) the Waverley Public Library, the State Library of New South Wales and the National Library of Australia to:

- see a comprehensive view of all the licensed e-resources that they are entitled to use; and
- use a common authentication process to access all these e-resources.

---

1 Refer separate LAAC paper in this set for a description of Re-imagining Libraries Project 8.
Open Borders Project

The Open Borders Project will address these questions in the context of a major extension to Trove which the National Library is planning to commence in the second half of 2010. This extension will involve:

- support for search and delivery of the full content of any journals digitised by the Library;
- inclusion of journal article indexing data and the linking of this data to library holdings; and
- the ability for Australian library users to easily discover and link to e-resources, from selected vendors, which they are entitled to access by virtue of their library memberships.

Achieving these objectives for access to e-resources will be complex in cases where the end user is off-site, and developing a satisfactory solution to these complexities will involve some investment by NSLA.

The National Library released a discussion paper in December 2009 which described a possible model for authenticating users who wish to access e-resources subscribed to by multiple libraries with which the users are affiliated.

This model relies on collaboration with e-resource vendors, whereby:

- article-level metadata including the vendor’s article URL, and in some cases full-text articles for indexing, will be provided by the vendor to the National Library for inclusion in Trove;
- the vendor will also supply data about which articles are in which products and which products are licensed by which libraries;
- users of Trove will be encouraged to register with Trove and to provide information to Trove about which libraries they are affiliated with;
- Trove will index the article-level metadata (and full text where available) and would use the subscription and affiliation data to give “Available online” status to those articles which the user is entitled to click through to and read;
- Trove will facilitate the process of authenticating the user; and
- Trove will refer the user to the vendor’s site, where any remaining authentication and access to the full text would be managed.

The discovery and linking process may follow the path described below:

- An article of interest is discovered by the Trove user. If the user has not registered or none of the user’s libraries subscribe to the article, it will be found after applying the facet “Online – Access conditions”. If the user has registered and at least one of the user’s libraries has subscribed to the article, it will be found after applying the facet “Online – Freely available”
- The user clicks on the article details in the Trove result set
- If the user has not yet registered, Trove informs them that if they registered with Trove and established a profile identifying their affiliated libraries, Trove may be able to offer them free access courtesy of those libraries.
If the user has not registered or none of the user’s libraries subscribe to the article, Trove may refer the user to the vendor site’s “pay per view” page, passing the URL of the article as a parameter. Access to the PDF of the article will be provided after the user supplies valid credit card details.

If the user has registered and at least one of the user’s libraries has subscribed to the article, Trove provides an intermediate page informing the user of which of their affiliated libraries can provide access to this article, and asks the user to select a library.

If the user is on-site, Trove refers the user to the vendor site, where the IP address of the library will be verified, and the user will be given access to the PDF of the article without further authentication.

If the user is off-site but the library concerned has an EZproxy server, Trove will create a link to the EZproxy server where the user will enter their credentials, and the EZproxy server will authenticate the user and redirect the user to the article URL.

If the user is off-site but the library concerned does not have an EZproxy server, Trove will present the user with a login screen and, after the user has entered their credentials, Trove will “pretend to be a human being” and enter the credentials at the real library login page; if this is successful, Trove will connect to the vendor’s site, obtain the PDF of the article and provide it to the user.

The above processes will require the National Library to construct databases of Australian library EZproxy server addresses with appropriate configuration information, and of Australian library login web addresses with associated information. It will also be necessary to develop a mechanism to maintain these databases.

To date two vendors (Cengage Gale and RMIT Publishing) have agreed to work with the National Library to expose their e-resource content in Trove in accordance with the scenario above. Some other vendors who currently participate in Electronic Resources Australia (ERA), including Encyclopedia Britannica and Forward Learning, have expressed strong interest. The National Library has also approached ProQuest and Ebsco, who are studying the proposal.

At its meeting in March, NSLA approved funding to assist the National Library with this project, and in particular to assist the Library to construct databases of Australian library EZproxy server addresses with appropriate configuration information.

The most difficult authentication challenge arises in the case where the user is not onsite, and the user’s library does not have an EZproxy server. At this stage it is not certain that this scenario can be supported, but the Library may be able to undertake a “proof of concept” by building a small database of public library login web addresses with associated information.

**Recommendation**

That the Committee notes the report.

Contact: Warwick Cathro
wcathro@nla.gov.au
02 6262 1403
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‘it is clear that we are in a period of uncertainty, where learning and experimentation will require risk-taking and leaps of faith’

Joy Palmer

INTRODUCTION

Online technology is changing quickly. Any attempt to capture a snapshot of such a rapidly moving target is fraught with difficulty and likely to be outdated by the time ink meets paper. This morning, for example, my Twitter stream alerted me to three items of relevance to this report: an article on the use of Flickr by the Smithsonian, a report on developments in augmented reality, and a discussion paper on Archives 2.0. Each day brings more. It is an exciting time for archives, but it can also seem overwhelming.

Beneath the excitement of the new lurk many familiar questions. Issues of authority and authenticity were being discussed in the archival circles before the possibilities of user-generated content were fully recognised. The limitations of finding aids were well-known before developments in visualisation and data-sharing started to change the meaning of discovery. While the rapid march of online technology brings many new issues, it also forces us to re-examine many old and complex problems.

Labels can be misleading. ‘Web 2.0’ itself bears a strong whiff of technological determinism, implying a clear-cut periodisation of history. But when the web was first developed in the laboratories of CERN it was imagined as a platform for community collaboration. What we know as Web 2.0 was a movement back towards a user-centred model that had been obscured by the influx of commercial interests in the late 1990s.

Similarly, labels would have us think that ‘Web 3.0’ – the semantic web – is bound to supersede its numerical predecessor. But these are not versions of the web, they are bundles of technologies, standards, approaches, assumptions and ideals. Some of the most interesting possibilities for archives will come from the combination of Web 2.0 with the semantic web.

Web 2.0 and 3.0 will not change archives. But they do provide tools with which archives can change themselves. Doing so will require many old and difficult questions to be re-examined. It will demand a thoroughgoing reassessment of the relationship between archives and their users. It’s not just about technology. As Kate Theimer pointed out in a recent conference presentation, Archives 2.0 is not equal to Archives plus Web 2.0.

---
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ARCHIVES 1.0
Closed
Opaque
Archivist/record-centred
Localised practices
Technology-phobic
Results ‘unmeasurable’
Archivist as provider or gatekeeper, authority
Focused on ‘perfect’ products
Archivists valued because of what they know
Tradition
Relied on users to find us

ARCHIVES 2.0
Open
Transparent
User-centred
Use of standards
Technology-savvy
Measuring outcomes, outputs, impacts
Archivist as facilitator
Open to iterating products
Archivists valued because of what they do
Innovation & flexibility
Looking for ways to attract new users

Source: <www.slideshare.net/ktheimer/archives-20-an-introduction>

This transformation will not be won by waiting. Perhaps the most valuable feature of Web 2.0 is its emphasis on participation and experimentation. You learn by doing. The knotty problems that seem to block our way might unravel as we become more familiar with the technology, as we work with users to develop new resources, as we try, fail and try again.

For these reasons this report does not attempt to provide a detailed summary of online technologies. Even if it were possible, it would be of little use. Nor does this report provide a Web 2.0 primer – such resources are already available online. What this report seeks to provide is a set of potential starting points – questions, technologies and possibilities – that might form the basis for further discussions and experiments.

What is required is an ongoing commitment to explore. We need to share ideas and resources and to seek answers together.

RESOURCES
Overviews and surveys
THE INTERACTIVE ARCHIVIST <LIB.BYU.EDU/SITES/INTERACTIVEARCHIVIST>
- A useful introduction to Web 2.0 technologies and their potential impact on archives.
- Includes a series of detailed case studies covering topics such as blogs, mashups, photo sharing, tagging and wikis.

ARCHIVES 2.0 <ARCHIVES2POINT0.WETPAINT.COM>
- A wiki listing archives, special collections and historical societies that have implemented Web 2.0 technologies.
- Categories include: blogs, wikis, podcasts, microblogging, image sharing, video sharing and mashups.
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Primers and online courses

23 THINGS <PLCMCL2-THINGS.BLOGSPOT.COM>
- A step-by-step introduction to Web 2.0 technologies.
- Originally developed for library staff this program has been widely copied and adapted.

NSW PUBLIC LIBRARIES LEARNING 2.0 <NSWPUBLICLIBRARIESLEARNING2.BLOGSPOT.COM>
- A 12-week program based on ‘23 Things’ developed by the State Library of NSW.

Discussions and communities

ARCHIVES 2.0 <ARCHIVES20.NING.COM>
- A social networking site for archivists interested in discussing and sharing experiences of Web 2.0 technologies.
- There are currently 189 members from around the world.

TWITTER <TWITTER.COM>
- Many individuals interested in archives and emerging technologies share information through Twitter.
- Many useful resources can be found by searching for the #archives hashtag.
- For a useful introduction see ‘When archivists Twitter’ <www.slideshare.net/superfectablog/twitter-for-archivists>.

ARCHIVESNEXT <WWW.ARCHIVESNEXT.COM>
- A blog by Kate Theimer that provides a useful round-up of activities in the Archives 2.0 sphere.

ARCHIVES OUTSIDE <ARCHIVESOUTSIDE.RECORDS.NSW.GOV.AU>
- A blog by State Records NSW that includes a variety of links, hints and ideas for exploring the possibilities of Web 2.0.
DISCOVERY

When the ArchivesNext blog asked readers in March 2009 to respond to the question ‘How did the web change archives?’, one reply began simply: ‘Three words: online finding aids.’ The web has dramatically changed the way we find archival materials. A simple Google search can reveal material of interest in collections around the world. Specialised portals or aggregators can allow structured searching across the holdings of multiple institutions. Websites of individual archives can provide detailed collection databases or finding aids linked to digital copies of the items themselves. The process of discovery has changed. But has it changed enough?

There is certainly more information out there, but can users find what they want? How well do their search habits or research processes mesh with the systems, structures and standards that archives provide? Such questions were not born of the digital age, of course. Well before the first finding aid went online, archivists were examining their practices in the context of user needs. Issues were examined and problems were identified, but few solutions were provided before the web swept through the doors and opened archives to the world.

As a result, online finding aids tend to be just that – online versions of traditional finding aids, often created more for management or control than access. Many of the problems they raised for discovery and use have simply been carried over into the new environment. But, as Wendy Scheir observes, ‘input standards need not dictate output standards’. Freed from the printed page, archival data can be presented and re-presented in forms that reflect the needs of users rather than the architecture of our databases. William E Landis calls for a change in the way we imagine finding aids, proclaiming: ‘we are guilty as a profession of fetishising the outputs of our descriptive systems’. Traditional finding aids are, he adds, ‘just one possible output of our archival descriptive systems’.

Once we move beyond the idea of a finding aid as a hierarchical list or database, exciting possibilities emerge. A finding aid could be a map, a tag cloud, a timeline or a portrait gallery. Mitchell Whitelaw’s ‘Visible Archive’ project is just one of a growing number of visualisation projects aimed at extracting and displaying the structures, contexts and relationships inherent in archival descriptive data.

But increasingly the question is not just what a finding aid is, but where it is. Already archival metadata is available through aggregators and specialised portals. Archives are publishing collection materials on Flickr or YouTube. As long as appropriate links and contextual data are provided, these excursions beyond the collection database can provide a web of extended finding aids. To use Lorcan Dempsey’s oft-quoted phrase, ‘discovery happens elsewhere’.

Such reconceptualisations of the nature of the finding aid are largely dependent on the existence of adequate metadata. We can’t build maps, for example, without clearly identified place names. So, do our descriptive tools and practices capture the information we need? Again, this question is hardly new. In 1982, Mary Jo Pugh surveyed the limitations of subject access and imagined a

---

5 See <visiblearchive.blogspot.com>.
future in which automated systems might allow richer indexing of archival materials. However, such systems ‘will be unable to solve our problems of subject access’, she cautioned, ‘if we do not clearly identify the assumptions underlying our activities and specify our needs precisely and imaginatively’.7

Pugh’s challenge remains – we need to continue to work at aligning the expectations of access with the practicalities of description. This issue will be brought into ever-sharper focus as online technologies evolve. However, such technologies bring with them solutions as well as problems. Increasingly useful metadata will be able to be harvested from sources beyond the archive.

Visualising collections
Archives are good at structured data – we have lots of it. A variety of named attributes such as dates, dimensions, formats, titles, identifiers, series and creators are methodically recorded and maintained. Documentation such as this helps ensure the authenticity of the record. But there is also much that might be done with this metadata to aid discovery and understanding.

For example, the series system defines a series of entities and relationships. We are accustomed to representing these relationships in the form of a hierarchy – agencies create series that contain items. But hierarchies can’t provide a manageable overview of an institution’s holdings, nor do they make it easy to understand relationships between series or agencies.

Mitchell Whitelaw’s prototype series browser uses existing series metadata to create a totally new way of seeing and understanding the National Archives of Australia’s holdings. In a single glance you can see more than 60,000 series in chronological order, with visual indicators of their linear dimensions and the number of items described in each. Clicking on a single series enables you to explore relationships with other series and with recording agencies. More than a simple browser, it provides an enhanced representation of the context the Archives’ holdings – a greater understanding of the whole, as well as its parts.

Similarly, Whitelaw’s prototype item browser shows how new forms of visualisation can allow patterns to emerge from existing metadata. Word frequency analyses of file titles in a particular series are used to create an interactive word cloud. This, combined with a simple histogram based on item dates, provides a surprisingly powerful way of navigating the series. Unexpected relationships bubble to the surface, encouraging exploration and promoting serendipity.

But Whitelaw’s ‘Visible Archive’ project is only one approach – there are innumerable ways in which archival metadata might be visualised to improve both discovery and understanding. Mapping our Anzacs extracted place names from file titles and used a geocoding service to represent these on a map.8 ArchiveZ is harvesting and displaying metadata relating to subject, date and dimensions from EAD-encoded finding aids.9 The recently-funded Neatline project aims to represent the content of archival collections using interlinked timelines and maps.10

All of these projects are using existing metadata. They are just using it differently. Australian archives should be encouraged to take stock of their existing metadata holdings and think about how these might be re-used. Dimensions could be aggregated, compared and graphed. Dates could

7 Mary Jo Pugh, ‘The illusion of omniscience: Subject access and the reference archivist’, American Archivist, vol. 45, no. 1, p. 44.
8 See <mappingouranzacs.naa.gov.au>.
9 See <www.archivesz.org>.
10 See <www.neatline.org>.
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be placed on a timeline. The text content of titles could be mined and analysed. Many archival institutions have invested considerable resources in the compilation of a variety of name indexes, how might this investment be better employed?

A number of the examples cited use freely available web services or software such as Google Maps or Simile Timeline. There has been a rapid development in the tools and techniques available for data visualisation. Services such as Many Eyes make it easy to develop sophisticated graphical analyses. The tools exist, but no one institution can hope to gain mastery of the possibilities. More should be done with Australian archival institutions to share knowledge, code and examples.

RESOURCES

Visualisation projects

THE VISIBLE ARCHIVE <VISIBLEARCHIVE.BLOGSPOT.COM>

ARCHIVESZ <WWW.ARCHIVESZ.ORG>

NEATLINE <WWW.NEATLINE.ORG>

Examples of visualisation tools

SIMILE TIMELINE <WWW.SIMILE-WIDGETS.ORG/TIMELINE>

TIME RIME <TIMERIME.COM>

TIME MAP <WWW.TIMEMAP.NET>

MANY EYES <MANYEYES.ALPHAWORKS.IBM.COM/MANYEYES>

Opening up data

Visualisation offers many exciting possibilities for understanding and using archival collections, but it need not be archival institutions themselves that actually do the visualising. Equipped with a growing array of tools to aggregate, analyse and explore data, users can create their own means of navigating collections. What they need is access to the archival metadata.

The evolution of the semantic web as well as the Gov2.0 movement has focused attention on the sharing of raw data rather than the production of new websites. As the W3C working draft on ‘Publishing Open Government Data’ states:

External parties can create new and exciting interfaces that may not be obvious to the data publishers. For that reason, do not compromise the integrity of the data to create flashy interfaces. If you must create an interface, then publish the data separate from the interface, and ensure external parties have direct access to the raw data, so they can build their own interfaces if they wish.11

Of course archives have been sharing metadata for many years, cooperating in the development of portals that aggregate content from a variety of institutions – Picture Australia, for example. But

portals require substantial cooperation amongst partners to develop individual, customised solutions. As Riley and Shepherd suggest, ‘this one-by-one approach to sharing does not support the wide distribution of data that is essential for archives to participate fully in a constantly changing information environment’. Instead of focusing on end products, such as finding aids or portals, they argue that archives should adjust their descriptive practices to ensure that their metadata can be usefully shared in a variety of contexts, using multiple technologies.

Riley and Shepherd articulate the idea of ‘shareable metadata’ which ‘is designed explicitly to operate in an aggregated environment and represents a descriptive view of the resource optimized for this particular use’. Unlike the metadata we maintain for the local management and preservation of archival materials, shareable metadata is designed to be exist in a broader world of use, re-use, mashups and aggregations. We cannot predict how archival data might be used in the future, but by following a few basic principles we can ensure that it can continue to be interpreted meaningfully within a wide variety of circumstances.

The recent shift in the name and focus of the UK National Archives Network reflects this change from product to process. According to the Archives Hub blog, the NAN’s original aim was ‘to provide one gateway to search archives across the UK’. The difficulties in building and maintaining portals have made this vision unachievable, prompting a change of name to the UK Archives Discovery Network. The new network’s aims include ‘working together in the best interests of archive users, surfacing descriptions, opening up data, sharing experiences and increasing links between repositories and networks’. The ‘network’ is thus a facilitator rather than an architecture.

There are a wide range of technologies and standards that might be used to publish archival data. These range from a simple content distribution standard such as RSS, through to Linked Data – a set of semantic web best-practice guidelines. DigitalNZ has opened up aggregated collection data via an API (application processing interface). By doing so it has encouraged developers to create a range of new collection tools and interfaces. The Library of Congress’s Chronicling America project has strongly embraced the idea of re-use, exposing newspaper metadata both through an API and as Linked Data.

‘The semantic web, the web of data, gives us the means to open up our data in new ways’, notes the UK National Archives online strategy, ‘the National Archives embraces the possibility of serendipitous re-use’. If Australian archives wish to promote discovery and access in this rapidly-changing environment, they need to focus not just on the provision of finding aids or reference services, but on the delivery of appropriate metadata in forms that allow for the development of resources as yet unimagined.

---

13 ibid., p. 95.
15 See <www.digitalnz.org/developer>.
16 See <chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/about/api>.
### RESOURCES

**Examples**

DIGITAL NZ <WWW.DIGITALNZ.ORG/DEVELOPER>

CHRONICLING AMERICA <CHRONICLINGAMERICA.LOC.GOV/ABOUT/API>

**Useful references**

LINKED DATA <WWW.BBC.CO.UK/BLOGS/RADIOLABS/S5/LINKED-DATA/S5.HTML>

WORKING WITH APIs <WWW.PROFHACKER.COM/2009/08/31/WORKING>

---

**Enhancing data**

Studies of archives users over the past thirty years have agreed that users ‘want to discover archival materials using subject information’. It is clear that users expect to discover archival material through its content rather than its arrangement – its ‘aboutness’ rather than its ‘ofness’. However, limited resources and the emphases of existing descriptive systems have meant that archives are rarely able to meet these expectations.

Even when detailed subject information has been recorded it is often-times locked away within descriptive notes or titles. The names of people and places might be mixed together within a single text field, making them difficult to identify or retrieve. To take full advantage of emerging technologies, to build sophisticated faceted search and browse interfaces, or to deliver good-quality linked data via the semantic web, subject information needs to be accessible as structured data – people need to be identified as people, places as places.

Increasingly collecting institutions are looking to their users to help overcome resource restrictions and improve subject metadata. Projects such as the National Library’s Australian Newspapers Digitisation Program and the Flickr Commons have successfully harnessed an online army of willing volunteers to transcribe and tag collection materials. User-generated content is discussed elsewhere in this report, but it is important to note that structure can emerge in a variety of ways – it does not always have to be imposed from above. Tags can form clusters, communities can self-regulate. Interestingly, contributors to the Australian Newspapers project have themselves asked for guidelines on the entry of personal names in tags to improve data quality.

The availability of massive computing power has opened other possibilities for metadata extraction. Research teams around the world are developing ever more sophisticated techniques for data mining. Of particular interest to archives is the field of record linkage that seeks to find common identifiers within merged data sets. This raises the possibility of identifying and matching individuals in named records across series, collections or institutions. The Muninn Project, for example, is seeking to combine data mining techniques with advances in optical character recognition to harvest structured data about World War I from archives around the world.

You don’t need supercomputers to begin the automatic extraction of structured data, all you need is a web browser. Interest in semantic technologies has fuelled the development of web services

---


18 See <www.muninn-project.org>.
that will parse a block of unstructured text and return a list of named entities – such as people, institutions, places and events. Open Calais is the best known of these and provides free access to its API, allowing institutions to create metadata on the fly.\(^{19}\) The Powerhouse Museum is currently using Open Calais to extract subject tags from its collection descriptions. Other services, such as Yahoo Placemaker, are more specialised, extracting and locating place names from within unstructured text.\(^{20}\)

The semantic web has emphasised the importance of structure and standards. A wide variety of vocabularies and ontologies have been created to define the semantic relations underlying this new web of data. Importantly though, these vocabularies are themselves shared and re-usable. A surname property defined in FOAF, a widely-used social networking vocabulary, can be re-used to attach subject information to a collection item.\(^{21}\) You don’t need to start from scratch.

Similarly, there are greater opportunities for sharing and re-using authority records. The National Library’s People Australia project is harvesting information about individuals from a variety of sources and assigning unique identifiers. Available through an API, this data could be used to create semi-automated mark-up tools and enhance descriptive systems in archives. Amongst the projects under discussion by the federal government’s Gov 2.0 taskforce is the creation of a ‘one stop shop’ for geospatial data which would greatly simplify the identification of place names.

Good structured subject data will become an increasingly valuable commodity, allowing archives to take advantage of a range of emerging technologies. Fortunately these technologies are also bringing with them new methods for extracting such data.

RESOURCES

Examples

AUSTRALIAN NEWSPAPERS (NLA) <NEWSPAPERS.NLA.GOV.AU>
FLICKR COMMONS <WWW.FLICKR.COM/COMMONS>
MUNINN PROJECT <WWW.MUNINN-PROJECT.ORG>
PEOPLE AUSTRALIA <WWW.NLA.GOV.AU/INITIATIVES/PEOPLEAUSTRALIA>

Useful tools

OPEN CALAIS <WWW.OPENCALAIS.COM>
YAHOO PLACEMAKER <DEVELOPER.YAHOO.COM/GEO/PLACEMAKER>

Using and re-using data

In her paper ‘Push for pull’, Cath Styles describes how the findability of collection items could be improved by harvesting descriptive material about the items generated through their use.\(^{22}\) The

---

\(^{19}\) See <www.opencalais.com>.
\(^{20}\) See <developer.yahoo.com/geo/placemaker>.
\(^{21}\) See <www.foaf-project.org>.
idea that use can improve discovery is hardly new – studies of researcher behaviour have shown that one of the main ways archival material is found is through the footnotes of other researchers. But, as Styles notes, in the online environment this cycle of user engagement and archival enrichment has the potential to develop increased momentum and power. A reference to check sometime in the future can become a pathway to explore right now.

Already many of the products of archival research are available online. Google has made the contents of millions of books and articles fully searchable. Research organisations are creating digital repositories to store and promote the work of their staff. Scholarly journals are increasingly moving online, joining an astonishing range of magazines, newsletters and blogs. All of these can contain references to archival materials that, if harvested, would be provide a source of descriptive metadata.

So how can they be harvested and used? It would be a relatively simple matter to use the Google Books API to attach a list of books that cite an item to that item’s description. By mining the source for other footnotes it might be possible to build a list of related items. There are a growing number of possibilities, but they do, of course, depend on the user including some sort of link back to the original item – whether this be a citation or a URL.

There is much that archives can do now to improve the chances that such links will be made. Standards for citation need to be simple and as consistent as possible across institutions. Collection databases should support research managers such as Zotero, that allow users to easily capture, store and format appropriate item metadata. ‘Blog this’ links could be attached to digitised items, using the APIs of blogging software to automatically insert the necessary links and citations. Item data should be accessible through persistent URLs that can be readily bookmarked and shared. Basic guidelines for use and re-use should be prominently displayed. We just need to make the whole thing easier.

Such improvements would help us capture the processes as well as the products of research. Persistent URLs, shared through social sites such as Delicious or Facebook, could be easily found and their context harvested. References saved in Zotero can already be tagged, annotated and shared. A forthcoming API will allow archives to retrieve this metadata from public Zotero libraries and re-use it in their own collection databases.

But it is not just external use that can be harvested and redeployed. The Archives Reference Blog created by the Dickinson College Archives shows how staff use can also be captured to improve discovery. The blog is used by archives staff to record both reference inquiries and a summary of their responses. As well as helping to manage the reference process, the blog brings to the surface material that might otherwise be buried deeply within finding aids and provides a new access point for users.

The activities of users visiting archives websites provide yet another source of useful data. Basic web server statistics can be analysed to reveal navigation pathways. This data can be reused to provide suggestions for other researchers – something akin to the ‘customers who bought this book also bought....’ links provided by Amazon. Elizabeth Yakel and her colleagues describe how these kinds of link paths were incorporated into the ‘next generation’ finding aid developed for the Polar Bear Expedition digital collections. User statistics can also be mined for common search

23 See <www.zotero.org>.
24 See <itech.dickinson.edu/archives>.
keywords, which in turn can be used as a word cloud, as browse headings, or as the basis for a custom vocabulary.

**RESOURCES**

**Examples**

ARCHIVES REFERENCE BLOG <ITECH.DICKINSON.EDU/ARCHIVES>

POLAR BEAR EXPEDITION DIGITAL COLLECTIONS
  <POLARBEARS.SI.UMICH.EDU>

**Useful references**

ZOTERO <WWW.ZOTERO.ORG>

GOOGLE BOOK SEARCH APIS <CODE.GOOGLE.COM/APIS/BOOKS>
DELIVERY

In 2005, Lorcan Dempsey exhorted libraries to get ‘in the flow’. His point was not merely to encourage libraries to colonise existing social networks, but to think about how their services might be integrated with developing user workflows. The library, he argued, needs to ‘co-evolve with user behaviors’. This process of integration will increasingly take place in spaces beyond the institutional website. ‘The library needs to be in the user environment’, he noted, ‘and not expect the user to find their way to the library environment’.\(^{26}\)

In the past 15 years, archival websites have evolved from online brochures through to complex sites incorporating a range of finding aids and user services. Ian G Anderson has attempted to model this development, identifying a scale of website types from the ‘poster’ to the ‘interactive user community’.\(^{27}\) Anderson’s work usefully identifies possible paths for the evolution of archival services online, but its main limitation is the focus on the institutional website.

Already archival institutions share photographs and videos using services such as Flickr and YouTube (see Appendix). Some have established a presence in social networks like Facebook or Twitter. Many deliver collection metadata through specialised portals and aggregators. Archives are starting to get ‘in the flow’. Users can find, use and interact with a wide range of archival materials without ever visiting an institutional website.

In the physical world, users engage with archives in highly-controlled, structured spaces. From finding out where to leave your bags, through to how to order photocopies, a successful researcher needs to learn the rules and procedures of each individual archive. But archives are now venturing into user spaces, where the rules are not theirs to make. As archives broaden their delivery options they face a number of challenges – both technological and cultural.

Living on clouds

On the Archives 2.0 social network, Amanda Hill has described how Flickr can be used to greatly increase the outreach activities of a small local archive with limited financial and technical resources.\(^{28}\) For a small annual fee, institutions gain access to unlimited file storage and a sophisticated image management system, complete with a full range of Web 2.0 features. Developing something similar in-house would be prohibitively expensive.

But Flickr is just one of a growing range of web services that enable archives to quickly and easily add new facets to their online offerings. Hosted blogs can be set up in a matter of minutes at sites like Wordpress.com or Blogger. YouTube and Vimeo bring streaming video within reach of all. Twitter offers a free micro-blogging service, while Ning allows you to create your own social networking site. You can push your profile on Facebook, add comments using Disqus, and share your presentations using SlideShare. You can even develop your own complex web applications using Google’s AppEngine. Such services make it possible to have a rich web presence at minimal cost without ever having to worry about the problems of servers, software and bandwidth.

---
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For institutions that are perhaps a little nervous about venturing into the realm of social media, these services also allow a degree of experimentation in a space safely removed from the corporate website. New audiences can be pursued and new ways of communicating trialled, without radically changing institutional priorities. Collection items can be exposed to user comments and tagging without challenging the authority of the finding aid.

In any case, there is good reason to believe that efforts to attract user input will be more successful if you go where the people are. A number of archival writers have commented on the problem of attracting a ‘critical mass’ to Web 2.0 endeavours. Can archival finding aids, for example, ever attract enough users to create an active and sustainable community? By tapping into existing social networks you can take advantage of a ready-made audience and expose your content to the so-called ‘network effects’ that accrue to popular services.

This separation between social and corporate spaces is not, however, absolute. One of the most useful, though often overlooked, features of these web services is the ability to reuse their content in different contexts. Images stored in Flickr can be presented on your own site as a slideshow. Videos from YouTube or Vimeo can be embedded in your own pages. For example, the National Archives of Australia’s education website Vrroom uses Vimeo to provide streaming video services within its own item description pages.

Even more interestingly, services like Flickr and Twitter provide access to rich and powerful APIs that allow you to extract and reuse a wide range of useful metadata. The Powerhouse Museum, for example, is harvesting user tags attached to particular items in Flickr and ingesting them into their own catalogue. Similarly, the ‘Flickr context harvester for archives’ Greasemonkey script demonstrates how easy it is to display Flickr comments within a collection database.

The possibilities for integration are further enhanced by Flickr’s use of ‘machine tags’ – structured tags drawing on defined vocabularies or schemas. By using machine tags it’s possible to create a semantic relationship between an item on Flickr and an entry in your collection database. Is this photo part of an album or a series that is described in your database? Is it the same as a photograph displayed on your own site? By explicitly defining these types of relationships, Flickr is drawn into service as an extension to your existing finding aids.

**RESOURCES**

**Examples**

VRROOM – ‘AUNTY JACK INTRODUCES COLOUR’

<VRROOM.NAA.GOV.AU/RECORDS/?ID=25902>

FLICKR CONTEXT HARVESTER FOR ARCHIVES

<USERSCRIPTS.ORG/SCRIPTS/SHOW/56135>

---


30 See <vrroom.naa.gov.au>.


32 See <userscripts.org/scripts/show/56135>.
The question of voice

Blogs, Twitter, podcasts, Facebook – the Web 2.0 explosion has presented archives with an exciting array of communication tools. But just who is doing the communicating and why? Archival finding aids have typically been reluctant to expose the presence of the archivist, while corporate publications are generally more concerned with issues of branding than personality. But as community-building tools are turned to institutional ends questions of voice come to the fore.

For archives, blogs provide an easy way to provide a dynamic source of information. Blog interfaces are easy to use, allowing non-technical staff to develop and maintain their own content. Easily updated, shareable through RSS feeds and with the capacity to include user comments, blogs can also provide new means of engagement. But as Nina Simon points out, institutions need to think about the purpose of the blog and the voice it will project.33

Simon provides a useful typology of museum blogs, ranging from the ‘institutional info blog’ with routine announcements of coming events, through to the ‘personal voice blog’ in which staff provide individual commentaries on the work of their institution. Other blogs might aggregate community experience, such as the ‘Archives Outside’ blog of State Records NSW, or feature collection items like the Powerhouse Museum’s ‘Object of the week’.

Simon is attracted to the possibilities of the personal voice blog, dangerous though it might seem. She also notes that even the standard institutional info blog can benefit from the occasional personal touch – such as an account of a recent event. Similarly, staff at the Brooklyn Museum, perhaps the cultural sector’s leader in the use of social media, insist that behind each blog ‘must be a real person with a real personality’. Similar considerations apply to the use of services such as Facebook or Twitter: ‘social media should not be about organisation talking to client, but a person from the organisation talking to the client’.34

As a microblogging service, Twitter offers the same ease of use and timeliness of a conventional blog – just in bursts of no more than 140 characters. Again, institutional uses can vary widely. An unofficial NARA account distributes information from its ‘Today’s document’ feature. The Library of Congress feed aggregates material from its blogs and news services, but these are interleaved with the occasional personal note. Once again, Nina Simon offers an instructive list of dos and don’ts for museums entering the Twitterverse. These include ‘Tell me something I can't find on your homepage’ and ‘Tell me who you are’.35

Chelsea Hughes and Courtney Johnston of the National Library of New Zealand have reflected on their own experience of using Twitter. While they mostly tweet about material from their collection, the quirkiness of their selections, the humour of their tweets, and their readiness to engage with their followers has made it a successful and enriching experience. They also provide some useful ground rules – identifying themselves in their account details, and setting aside a certain time each day for their ‘Tbreaktweets’.36


36 Chelsea Hughes and Courtney Johnston, ‘This is how we do it: @nlnz on Twitter’, 5 May 2009, <librarytechnz.natlib.govt.nz/2009/05/this-is-how-we-do-it-nlnz-on-twitter.html>
But while social media are most effectively used when these sorts of personal connections are made, it can be difficult for staff more accustomed to an environment where external communications are highly formalised or closely controlled. Where does the person end and the institutional representative begin? Many institutions are now developing guidelines to assist their staff in understanding their responsibilities in using social media.

RESOURCES

STATE RECORDS NSW, ARCHIVES OUTSIDE
<ARCHIVESOUTSIDE.RECORDS.NSW.GOV.AU>

POWERHOUSE MUSEUM, OBJECT OF THE WEEK
<WWW.POWERHOUSEMUSEUM.COM/COLLECTION/BLOG>

SOCIAL MEDIA POLICY DATABASE
<SOCIALMEDIAGOVERNANCE.COM/POLICIES.PHP>

Extending, experimenting and integrating

There is no standard set of tools or technologies that define Web 2.0. Indeed, one of the hallmarks of Web 2.0 is the encouragement to experiment, to extend, to remix and to hack. Familiar tools such as blogs can be enhanced with plug-ins or adapted to serve a range of purposes. The Dickinson College Reference Blog is an example of this sort of re-use. In a similar vein is the ‘catablog’, which uses blogging software to document collection materials. A catablog, such as UMarmot, takes advantage of common blog features such as tags, categories, and rich media integration, to bring collection descriptions to the surface, promoting engagement and facilitating discovery.37

Web 2.0 encourages us to think beyond the finding aid or collection database. For example, Omeka is a powerful open source exhibition builder and publishing platform. It could be used to quickly create exhibits or feature collection items. Moreover, its open architecture makes it possible to develop your own plug-ins – so you could create a plug-in that imports metadata directly from your collection database. Similarly, open source projects such as Exhibit and Runway, or browser add-ons like CoolIris can suggest new ways of displaying and interacting with collection materials.

From there it is but a small step into the world of mashups. A mashup simply combines data or services from a range of different sources. The National Archives’ Mapping our Anzacs is a mashup, combining archival metadata with a Google maps interface and an online scrapbook built using a blogging service called Tumblr. Why would you bother creating your own maps when Google provides a simple and freely accessible API? Mashups take advantage of the Web 2.0 ethos to create innovative, cost-effective and rapidly deployed applications.

There are also multiple platforms to explore. Instead of building a stand-alone application, you could create a widget or plug-in that users could install to display your content on their own blog or Facebook page. Not only does DigitalNZ provide data via an API, it fosters a culture of integration, encouraging developers to create libraries and modules that allow the API to be easily accessed from within a variety of languages and programs. For example, a module providing integration with the popular content management systemDrupal was recently developed.

37 See <www.library.umass.edu/spcoll/umarmot>.
EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE PROVISION OF ACCESS TO ARCHIVES

Perhaps the most exciting possibilities lay in the realm of mobile devices. As a recent report by the Centre for History and New Media notes, it is predicted that by 2020 ‘mobile devices will be the primary connection tool to the internet for most people in the world’. Many museums are examining ways of delivering content and educational experiences using such devices. Both the UK National Archives and Duke Digital Collections have already released iPhone applications that display a selection of images from their collections. But as well as providing a means of accessing collections on the move, mobile devices offer the opportunity to embed archival materials within the landscapes of everyday life. Place-identified records could automatically retrieved based on your location. Augmented reality applications could superimpose historical photographs over the existing streetscape.

The challenge of Web 2.0 is not to master the blog or become a Twitter maven. It is to remain aware of the possibilities, to take advantage of opportunities as they arise, and to be ready to experiment and adapt.

RESOURCES

Examples

DICKINSON COLLEGE REFERENCE BLOG <ITECH.DICKINSON.EDU/ARCHIVES>

UMARMOT CATABLOG <WWW.LIBRARY.UMASS.EDU/SPCOLL/UMARMOT>

DRUPAL MODULE FOR DIGITALNZ <DRUPAL.ORG/PROJECT/DIGITALNZ>

UK NATIONAL ARCHIVES IPHONE APP <WWW.APPTISM.COM/APPS/THE-NATIONAL-ARCHIVES>

DUKE DIGITAL COLLECTIONS IPHONE APP <LIBRARY.DUKE.EDU/BLOGS/DIGITAL-COLLECTIONS/2009/06/16/LIBRARY-DIGITAL-Collections-Theres-an-app-for-that>

Tools

OMEKA <WWW.OMEKA.ORG>

EXHIBIT <WWW.SIMILE-WIDGETS.ORG/EXHIBIT>

RUNWAY <WWW.SIMILE-WIDGETS.ORG/RUNWAY>

COLLABORATION

In the last decade or so many of the old certainties of archival practice have been challenged. Instead of being the defender of truth and authenticity – a window on a carefully-preserved past – the archive has been identified as a site to observe and contest the workings of power. Archivists have been told that their supposed impartiality is a myth, that it is impossible ‘to describe records in an unbiased neutral or objective way’. ‘Description is always story telling’, argue Duff and Harris, ‘intertwining facts with narratives, observation with interpretation’.39

If archivists are political players then whose interests do they serve? The theorising of power relations within the archive has drawn attention to the relationship with users. How can we make space for the marginalised and the silenced? How can we broaden the range of perspectives? ‘We need to create holes that allow in the voices of our users’, suggest Duff and Harris, ‘We need descriptive architectures that allow our users to speak to and in them’.40

At the same time as this, archives are struggling to meet the demands of an ‘information-hungry citizenry’. Burdened by backlogs and confronted with ever-increasing volumes of material to describe, archives have to manage users’ expectations that everything will just be there on the web. Max J Evans suggests that the solution may lie in a new model for archival work based on the idea of ‘commons-based peer production’. New layers of descriptive data would be generated by harnessing ‘the eyeballs and the intellect of thousands of volunteers’. ‘Acting as partners with archivists’, Evans declares, ‘users can do what archivists alone cannot do’.41

Support for collaboration and the development of communities are, of course, amongst the main features of Web 2.0 technologies. Systems for commenting, tagging, annotating and sharing are commonplace – just waiting to be used. It seems that theory, technology and the weighty practicalities of archival management are converging on a future where users will play a much more active role in the description of archival material.

As Verne Harris and Wendy Duff argue, it is not simply a matter of improving the design of our systems, it is a matter of recasting the power relationships that inhabit them. Harris and Duff raise many difficult questions relating to accountability and access. How do archives decide who to serve first, who gets preferential treatment? ‘We can develop a number of interfaces to our descriptive systems’, they note, ‘but we cannot afford to develop a different system for each type of user’.42

Perhaps not, but emerging technologies will empower users to create their own interfaces, to shape their own experiences, to build their own archives.

Knowing users, building communities

It is now well-established that online communities can make valuable contributions to descriptive projects. Volunteers indexing census data for FamilySearch have transcribed more than 115 million names. The Library of Congress has updated 3,266 records in its photographic catalogue based on the contributions of Flickr Commons users. More than 2.2 million lines of text have been

40 ibid, p. 279.
corrected by contributors to the National Library of Australia’s newspaper digitisation project. As Rose Holley notes:

Users have demonstrated a willingness to work towards the ‘common good’, to volunteer their time, energy, skill, knowledge and ideas and to be involved long term in a program of national historic significance.\(^{43}\)

This is work that simply could not have been done using existing institutional resources.

Max J Evans argues that this sort of commitment to the ‘common good’ could be turned to the service of archives.\(^{44}\) But how do you know which projects will be successful? How do you turn visitors into collaborators? Elizabeth Yakel discusses the process of ‘place making’ whereby sites become communities, suggesting that a sense of ownership and ‘common ground’ help foster social interaction.\(^{45}\) ‘Giving control to users and entrusting the community’, Rose Holley observes, ‘helps build a dedicated, responsible, engaged and committed user base’.\(^{46}\) Trust is repaid with commitment.

However, there is no reason why there should be a single formula. Joy Palmer wonders about fostering a ‘deeper involvement’ with the records through the creation of communities of practice engaged in historical inquiry and debate. But what about contributors who have no interest in archives at all? An iPhone application has recently been released that encourages users to spend idle moments tagging photos from a variety of institutions including the Powerhouse Museum and the Dutch Nationaal Archief. This form of ‘micro-volunteering’ is more a game than a commitment to the common good, but its outcomes can be similar. Likewise, the US National Endowment for the Humanities has recently funded the development of an online game to enhance archival metadata.

In pre-internet days it was relatively easy to identify and categorise researchers – they came through the doors, they wrote letters, they talked to archivists about their projects, – and now contemporary studies seek to divide users into market segments or personas. But the task is complicated by the increasing number of what Amanda Hill describes as ‘invisible researchers’.\(^{47}\) Many new users will arrive courtesy of Google. They may have never used an archive before and may never again. Most of them we will never know. Many of them will never even visit our sites.

Just as we can never completely know our users, we cannot predict with certainty how they will behave. But this should not paralyse us or provide an excuse for inaction. Web 2.0 technologies encourage us to learn by doing. Rather than building for particular audiences we can build with
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them – we can undertake iterative development processes that combine rapid and responsive deployment with rigorous user research.

**RESOURCES**
Examples

**FAMILYSEARCH INDEXING**
<WWW.FAMILYSEARCH.ORG/ENG/INDEXING/FRAMESET_INDEXING.G.ASP>

**FLICKR COMMONS** <WWW.FLICKR.COM/COMMONS>

**AUSTRALIAN NEWSPAPERS** <NEWSPAPERS.NLA.GOV.AU>

**MICRO-VOLUNTEERING** <PERSONALDEMOCRACY.COM/BLOG-ENTRY/EXTRAORDINARIES-MICROVOLUNTEERING-YOUR-FINGERTIPS>

**METADATA GAMES – AN OPEN SOURCE ELECTRONIC GAME FOR ARCHIVAL DATA SYSTEMS** <WWW.NEH.GOV/ODH/DEFAULT.ASPX?TABID=111&ID=127>

**Harnessing knowledge**

The Library of Congress released 3,000 photos into the Flickr Commons in January 2008. Within 24 hours, Flickr users had added 11,000 descriptive tags. This dramatic explosion of the Library of Congress’s tag cloud has perhaps overshadowed other aspects of user engagement. For example, by October 2008, a total of 7,166 comments had been left on 2,873 photos. In particular, a group of 20 ‘power commentators’ were returning regularly to research and contribute detailed historical information including links to related resources. 48

In a similar way, tagging tends to dominate discussions of archives and user-generated content. This is perhaps understandable as tagging does offer a simple way of overcoming the lack of subject access points in many descriptive systems. But the possibilities for user participation are much greater than this, greater perhaps than we can yet imagine.

Tagging is simply the process of attaching descriptive keywords to an item. Typically this is done without restriction, enabling the development of a social classification system or folksonomy. 49 The Powerhouse Museum, for example, allows users to tag items in its collection database. But there is no one-size-fits-all version of user tagging. Subtle controls can be introduced to avoid misspellings or word variations. Lists of ‘suggested’ tags can be generated to encourage clustering. If desired, users can be forced to choose tags from a limited vocabulary, although such heavy-handed controls are likely to discourage participation.

As the Library of Congress’s experience demonstrates, users are also willing to contribute specialist knowledge or expertise, correcting or expanding existing descriptions. Sometimes these corrections arise from increased visibility. Exposing WWI service records through Mapping our

---


Anzacs has, for example, brought a wave of corrections to existing file titles. Users can also be deliberately mobilised to fill in known gaps. State Records NSW has recently begun using its Archives Outside blog and Twitter account to seek help dating photographs.

Online communities can help develop as well as describe collections. Picture Australia successfully uses a series of Flickr groups to build its collection and extend its coverage of Australian life and culture. Similarly the State Library of South Australia uses Flickr to solicit images relating to South Australian history.

Users can also add value in more complex ways, assisting in the analysis of collection data. The ‘Plebeian Lives’ project in the UK aims to digitise a wide range of archival materials documenting the interactions between ‘ordinary’ Londoners and a number of government and charitable organisations. When the website is launched it will include a workspace where users can link together records relating to the same individual. The ‘Founders and Survivors’ project in Australia is also recruiting volunteers to assist in record matching, as well as inviting contributions of related genealogical data.

Comments and annotations can serve a variety of functions. The UK National Archives links catalogue entries to its YourArchive wiki, enabling users to contribute detailed background information relating to records. In Mapping our Anzacs, the online scrapbook takes on a more personal, reflective role, allowing users to contribute notes, comments or images concerning a particular individual. In both cases the meaning and context of records can be significantly enriched.

Krause and Yakel note that allowing user annotations within finding aids might promote dialogue, both within the user community and between archivists and users. Such annotations could also ‘assist historians and other archives users in filtering and identifying relevant materials by taking advantage of the value of socially constructed descriptions and taxonomies’.  

However we seek to define the scope of user engagement, we must expect, like the Library of Congress, to be surprised. In a report on its Flickr project, the Library catalogued some of the wide variety of user interactions that had evolved around their images, these included: ‘sparking memory and conversations about history’, ‘looking from all over the world and reflecting on related experiences’ and ‘offering visual humour’. People are not machines – they will create their own roles, they will find their own uses and they will set their own standards. To open ourselves to user collaborations is to invite new possibilities.

### RESOURCES

**Examples of collection development**

**PICTURE AUSTRALIA FLICKR PROJECT**

<www.pictureaustralia.org/contribute/participants/flickr.html>

**SLSA COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT**

<www.flickr.com/groups/statelibrarysouthaustralia/>
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Examples of creating connections
PLEBEIAN LIVES
<WWW.SHEF.AC.UK/HRI/PROJECTS/PROJECTPAGES/PLEBEIANTIVES.HTML>

FOUNDERS AND SURVIVORS <WWW.FOUNDERSANDSURVIVORS.ORG>

Examples of building context
MAPPING OUR ANZACS SCRAPBOOK <OUR-ANZACS.TUMBLR.COM>

DIY archives

The 2.0 designation, as applied to Web 2.0, Gov 2.0 or Archives 2.0, signals a new relationship with the public. No longer the passive receivers of information, the public are empowered to contribute, and contest. Within this environment, we cannot expect finding aids to remain locked in time-honoured formality. Users can be given, or will take for themselves, the power to shape their own experience.

Web 2.0 brought with it a new focus on usability and personalisation. We now take it for granted that social media spaces can be customised to reflect our tastes and interests. The bundle of technologies commonly known as Ajax allow the content and design of a web page to be changed without reloading the page. Javascript libraries such as JQuery simplify the process of interface design and offer a wide variety of widgets and effects. Users can be given the ability to drag, resize and reorder items, reconstructing the screen as they desire. Developments such as these have fuelled the creation of rich and responsive web applications.

Where limits have been drawn, users have found other ways to claim their new found right to customisation. Working within the browser, user-scripting languages, such as Greasemonkey can radically change the design and even the functionality of web sites. If you don’t like a way a site is laid out, you can change it. For example, there is a Greasemonkey script that radically changes the way digitised files are viewed within the National Archives of Australia’s RecordSearch database.

Increasingly, the public will also take the data provided by government, or by scientific and cultural institutions, and use it to build their own applications. This is already happening. Community organisations such as MySociety in the UK and the Sunlight Foundation in the USA have shown how the reuse of existing government information can foster accountability and improve responsiveness. From FixMyStreet to Capital Words, a range websites, applications and APIs have given the public new ways of interacting with all levels of government.

Governments themselves have begun to realise that by supporting these types of activities they can bring efficiencies to government business while promoting a greater sense of transparency. The USA now provides access to thousands of government data sources through its data.gov site, while the UK has engaged web-founder and open linked data evangelist Tim Berners-Lee to advise them on developing access to public sector information. In Australia, the Gov2.0 Taskforce is investigating similar possibilities.
By exposing their data to the public, archives can similarly open many new possibilities for discovery. Accessing descriptive data through an API, users could, for example, develop their own ways of navigating the collection. They might extract word frequencies from file titles to develop interactive word clouds. Or they might mash-up provenance information with other biographical sources to build a person-based browser. Notably, the National Archives of Australia has recently released data from its collection database for use in the Gov 2.0 Taskforce’s mashup competition.

Using such data, individual enthusiasts or communities of interest could develop applications that meet their own specific needs. Archives will thus be able to service an infinitely-wide range of users without any additional investment. The power to create such applications is not limited to programmers. Already Yahoo Pipes provides a graphical interface that enables users to retrieve, combine and transform data from a variety of sources. For example, there is a Yahoo Pipes script that aggregates featured collection items from a range of Australian sources.

The semantic web promises another level of flexibility and openness. Instead of manually stitching together the outputs of individual APIs, users will be able to create new interfaces on-the-fly – adding and deleting sources, creating views, and saving and sharing complex queries.

**RESOURCES**

**Examples**

RECORDSEARCH IMAGE TOOLS  &lt;USERSCRIPTS.ORG/SCRIPTS/SHOW/33485&gt;  
FEATURED ITEMS FROM AUSTRALIAN COLLECTIONS  
&lt;PIPS.YAHOO.COM/WRAGGE/FEATUREDITEMS&gt;
CONTROL

In the movie *Citizen Kane*, the reporter assigned to investigate Charles Foster Kane’s life visits the Thatcher Memorial Library to consult the unpublished memoirs of Kane’s guardian, the wealthy businessman Walter Parks Thatcher. More mausoleum than archive, the library is a forbidding vault-like structure where the librarian carefully lays down the rules for access. When the reporter finally views the manuscript, it is in an otherwise empty room, accompanied by an armed guard.

The uniqueness of archival materials has meant that physical access to them has had to be tightly controlled. While few archives would aspire to match the Thatcher Library’s levels of invigilation, potential researchers are usually confronted by a substantial list of rules and policies to which they are expected to conform. Credentials are proffered, bags are deposited, pencils are wielded, and files are never re-organised. These rules are reinforced by the physical space – by locked doors, signage, and even the arrangement of desks. There is no doubt who is in control.

The descriptive systems of archives can be similarly forbidding. Even experienced researchers will generally need some orientation to the finding aids of a new repository. The jargon can be confusing, the arrangement idiosyncratic – but fortunately the archivist is on hand to explain the system and guide researchers to relevant material. Access to archives in the analogue world takes place within a highly mediated environment, constrained by a rigid series of physical and intellectual controls.

Archives 2.0 offers an alternate vision, taking advantage of technology and reconfiguring relations between archivist and user.

Establishing authority

Archives have sought to ground their authority in systems of appraisal, description and management that aim to ensure that records retain their evidential value over time. The exercise of archival authority through such systems builds a strong case for authenticity. A properly-described record held in an archive would generally be assumed to provide stronger evidence than a document of unknown origin bought at a garage sale.

But while the link between archival description and authenticity is often assumed, Heather MacNeil points out that it has been subject to little research or in-depth examination. It has also, of course, been challenged by theorists who question whether such a process can ever be objective or neutral. With their theoretical assumptions already under attack, archival systems have now been forced to face the challenge of Web 2.0. How can traditional ideas of authority be sustained in an environment where users become collaborators, where finding aids speak with multiple voices?

Already new models are starting to emerge based not on the supposed objectivity of the archivist, but on a new transparency of the descriptive process. MacNeil describes it as ‘laying bare the device’ – ‘surrendering our role as invisible and omniscient narrators and accepting that we are among the characters in the story told through our descriptions’. Terry Cook similarly argues that archivists should be ‘more self reflective and transparent about what they do’. Light and

---

53 ibid., p. 272.
54 Terry Cook, ‘Fashionable nonsense or professional rebirth: Postmodernism and the practice of archives’, *Archivaria*, vol. 51, p. 34.
Hyry suggest that colophons attached to finding aids could provide a space ‘where archivists can acknowledge and explain their impact on the transmission and representation of a collection’.55

For a practical implementation of such a system, MacNeil notes that the web provides:

an ideal vehicle for transcending the artificial limits imposed by current descriptive practices and for exploiting an expanded vision of archival description; one that unseats the privileged status currently accorded to the standards-based finding aid and repositions it as part of a complex network of hyperlinked and interactive documentation relating to the history, appraisal, preservation, use, and interpretation of a body of records over time.56

There could also be spaces, she adds, where users are ‘free to contribute additional perspectives and alternative readings’. The web makes complex and contested descriptive resources possible – instead of single hierarchical structure there can be layers and links, pathways and perspectives.

While Web 2.0 challenges traditional notions of archival authority, it also provides the technological foundations for an alternative system based on transparency and trust – where, in Terry Cook’s terms, emphasis is shifted ‘from product to process’.57 Wikis, for example, can do more than provide a platform for the collaborative development of content, they can document in great detail the actual process of creation. In Wikipedia, each addition, each edit, is recorded on the ‘history’ page. A user can easily compare the current document to past versions, rolling the content back if necessary. Meanwhile on the ‘discussion’ page, editors can vigorously debate proposed changes. The context of creation is not only captured, but made visible to all.

Similarly, Web 2.0 applications have developed their own means for users to accrue and display authority. The trustworthiness of Ebay sellers is indicated by user ratings. The experience and knowledge of forum contributors can be signified by a change in title or icon. Valued contributors can be invited to take on roles of moderators or administrators. Ratings can be applied to books, movies, or answers to questions – ‘How helpful was this?’ The conventions of Web 2.0 technology allow users to make informal judgements about value and reliability without even thinking about it. If someone we respect retweets a link in Twitter, we are more likely to click on it. If a site in Delicious has been bookmarked several thousand times we are more likely to be interested in it. Trust does not adhere to positions or titles, it is earned through continuing and complex processes of value-making and value-sharing.

Maintaining context
With archival materials potentially popping up everywhere from Flickr to Facebook, concerns have been expressed about a loss of context. Records gain much of their meaning and significance through being embedded within a descriptive system that documents their provenance. The loss of this context can hamper interpretation and raise questions about authenticity.

But this danger is hardly new. Every time a document is quoted in an article, or a photograph is published in a book, context may be lost. Fortunately over time we have developed a simple but powerful technology to meet this threat – it’s called a citation.

The significance of citations is often overlooked and archives have sometimes been careless in their management. As previously mentioned, citations, unique identifiers and persistent URLs are the glue that link a record’s provenance to its use outside the archive. If a photo on Flickr is published with the information necessary to locate the original item within the archives’ descriptive system, then its context is intact. Questions about accuracy can be resolved by going to the source.

Conversely, if such a link is absent, then, like a history book without footnotes, any claims to authenticity will be substantially diminished. The arrival of Web 2.0 has not dispelled our users’ capacities for critical appraisal. Nonetheless, we should do what we can to help them. We need to value and promote citations and develop technical systems that support their use within a networked environment.

Of course, each use of a record adds to its context. Researchers use other peoples’ citations to find archival material because of the value that has been added to them by the processes of researching, writing and publication. As Ian G Anderson notes:

> Historians can judge very quickly how a source was used, what evidence it provided, how strong this evidence was, and what conclusions were based upon it. It may also provide links to other corroborating or contradictory sources or highlight gaps in the record.\(^{58}\)

While lacking the same formal processes of mediation, each blog, bookmark, digg, tweet or tag wraps another layer of meaning around the record. The greatest challenge wrought by emerging technologies is not the loss of contexts, but their proliferation. Both our descriptive systems and theoretical structures need to become more inclusive. As Duff and Harris argue:

> We need to move the debate beyond discussions of what provenance really is by problematising the word ‘provenance’ and the concepts archived in it, and by accepting that there have always been and always will be many provenances, multiple voices, hundreds of relationships, multiple layers of context, all needing to be documented.\(^{59}\)

This seems an impossible task, but by providing space in our descriptive systems for user annotations, by harvesting metadata generated through the use of archives, by creating new ways to visualise context, by opening raw data to the ingenuity of our users, and by creating new mechanisms for transparency and trust, we will be starting to document some of these layers of meaning and building a richer conception of context.
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\(^{58}\) Ian G Anderson, ‘Are you being served? Historians and the search for primary sources’, Archivaria, no. 58, Fall 2004, p. 98.

Use and reuse
A study of the reasons for controlling access to collections in libraries, archives and museums found that one of the main motivators was ‘the desire to ensure that digital surrogates of cultural objects are not misused or misrepresented’. As the defenders of the record, as the interpreters of arcane finding aids, as the keeper of undocumented subject knowledge, and as the arbiters of what constitutes ‘misuse’ or ‘misrepresentation’, archivists have been traditionally cast in the role of gatekeepers. But this role is being challenged on numerous fronts.

Jennifer Schaffner notes that while archivists have generally expected to mediate the research of their users, ‘people want to be autonomous and discover information about primary sources at the network level, not at the institutional level’. Rather than inducting researchers into the mysteries of the archives, Schaffner suggests that their primary role is now in ‘making the collections more visible and staying out of the way’.60

Similarly the very idea of what constitutes ‘access’ is changing as Web 2.0’s emphasis on transparency, openness and participation gains an increasingly keener political edge. Governments in the UK, USA, Australia and elsewhere are undertaking programs to deliver open access to public sector information. As Australia’s Gov 2.0 Taskforce notes:

The concept of ‘open access’ means access on terms and in formats that clearly permit and enable such use and re-use by any member of the public. This is broader than simply providing mere access to material, which permits only reading of the material or limited non-commercial use. Because open access can facilitate use and re-use of government information, it can drive innovation in the digital economy and generate real economic and social benefits. It allows anyone with an innovative idea to add value to existing public sector information for the common good, often in initially unforeseen or unanticipated ways.61

Through open access users can become collaborators, consumers can become innovators. It is expected that the liberal provision of public sector information will help bulwark our democracy and enliven our economy. The time for gatekeepers is past.

Excited by the technology and inspired by theoretical challenges to traditional notions of archival authority, the Archives 2.0 manifesto similarly looks forward to the demise of the gatekeeper. The role of the archivist is now imagined as a facilitator, removing barriers to participation and developing new avenues for engagement.

Despite the growing clamour for open access, long-standing concerns about copyright and privacy remain. While new models such as Creative Commons have emerged to simplify licensing agreements and foster the remix culture, they do not diminish the responsibilities of archives to investigate the copyright status of their holdings. Likewise, the desire for open data is often accompanied by concerns to protect individual privacy, leaving archives holding name-identified records caught uncomfortably in the middle.

Archives are not alone in their concerns. As well as the Gov 2.0 Taskforce, there have been recent initiatives both from the community and academia to address issues relating to copyright and cultural collections. The GLAM-Wiki conference brought together representatives of the cultural


61 See <mashupaustralia.org/open-access-to-psi>.
sector with member of the Wikimedia community. The detailed list of recommendations produced by the conference provides important suggestions, many of which could be acted upon by archives immediately. The ‘Intellectual Property: Knowledge, Culture and Economy’ project hosted by the Queensland University of Technology has also convened a series of meetings on ‘Opening Access to Australia’s Archives’. This project is developing a set of ‘open access principles’. 

While there are likely to be no easy answers, the current convergence of theory, technology and political will offers an opportunity to the archival community to engage constructively in the open access movement and work towards the liberation of their collections and the ‘almost infinite array of possibilities for opening up avenues for access to and use of these resources’.

62 See <meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/GLAM-WIKI_Recommendations>.
64 See <gov2.net.au/blog/2009/09/11/TableView/heritage-collections>.
CONCLUSION

This report has highlighted a range of issues and options for archives that have emerged through continuing development of online technologies. It has not sought to provide recipes or set down guidelines simply because prescriptive approaches are of limited value in an area where the possibilities are so numerous and the pace of change is so rapid.

We can instead find guidance in the underlying principles of Web 2.0, charting a course which is focused on the needs of users, on the building of communities, and on the fostering of collaboration. The investigation of emerging technologies for online access should itself be an iterative process, where we learn by doing and sharing rather than by pursuing a fixed goal.

What is needed is an environment that supports experimentation, that encourages the sharing of research and tools, and creates opportunities for cooperation. Perhaps this could be achieved through a structure such as the UK Archives Discovery Network.

In the meantime, there needs to be continuing discussion. The forums already exist, on the Archives 2.0 Ning site or even on Twitter – we don’t need a new venue, simply a commitment to participate free of smug cynicism or narrow-minded pragmatism.

As Joy Palmer notes in a recent article, ‘it is clear that we are in a period of uncertainty, where learning and experimentation will require risk-taking and leaps of faith’. 65
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65 Joy Palmer, ‘Archives 2.0: If we build it, will they come?’, Ariadne, no. 60, July 2009, <www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue60/palmer>.