

Table reports

Attendees were asked to have table discussions and report out their answers to the following questions:

1. What did you hear today?
2. What do you have concerns about?
3. What has inspired you?
4. What unanswered questions do you have?

TABLE 1

- Terminology seems to matter—calling efforts projects, programs or products—programs might be better
- DuraSpace did not bring concerns about DSpace and Fedora sustainability to the community soon enough
- New Fedora needs to be backwards compatible and easy to migrate forward
- Everyone is keen to do open source until it gets hard
- Ownership; DuraSpace seems to be the place to do it
- Inspired that DuraSpace took DSpace and Fedora
- Lyrasis is positioning itself as a product; DuraSpace could do the same
- Curiosity about additional investment in Fedora
- What kind of governance model would enable better commitment going forward; perhaps a governance roadmap

Michele--would like to see a community model for governance going forward for DSpace and Fedora coming out of this meeting; we are bringing these issues to the community now--we have time. Neither program is in jeopardy right now.

TABLE 2 (Dean)

- Sponsorship program solicitation should be more explicit about indicating where funds go—DSpace, Fedora or VIVO
- Need to engage those who cannot afford to pony up
- A multiple stack 20K per initiative commitment is a problem for institutions

TABLE 3 (Tufts)

- funding and return on investment are good arguments but don't necessarily convey to others in institutions
- There is value in having DuraSpace foster DSpace and Fedora
- Governance is needed to allow for a greater voice from the community
- I respect tremendously that people came together to make a board for Fedora Futures
- Governance
- Fedora Futures has a self-appointed steering committee made up of folks with more skin in the game; governance is of great concern
- Most interested in the process of soliciting input towards decision-making
- Governance ensures that information flow is robust and representative
- Hathi Trust governance model; had a constitutional convention that came up with a voting scheme
- DLF and CLR came together to form one organization; 9 people were nominated by the community as a board
- How to ensure that there is robust input from people who have more or less resources, and have been using Fedora for a long time and don't have many technical resources. Takes outreach to gain feedback from those stakeholders
- Glad to have financial understanding of where DuraSpace fits
- Good reminder of acceleration of creation of digital data and content; vetting mechanisms for what gets preserved?
- What's next?
- Governance question
- Stakeholder engagement; more information about here's how you participate

TABLE 4

- DSpace and Fedora communities can't stand still
- Risk factors in community efforts are that there can be too much reliance on one person
- Transparency appreciated
- Can we expand marketing (use cases) and user acquisition efforts--DSpace and OJS?
- Community of users might be stilted
- Cases--slide deck about some of these issues today; meta issues that have inspired us today
- Itemized approach or bundled approach
- Can we approach other sectors of the non-profit community?

TABLE 5

- Not enough university librarian/dean level administrators here
- Financial concerns about low percentage rate of sponsor contributions (free riders)
- If this is a DSpace and Fedora community effort, can you lump both "Futures" together as a community concern instead of focus on individual platforms?
- DSpace is left out--more excitement about Fedora; concern about neglect there
- Institutions who are contributing large amounts of resources may be fatigued; need to expand reach for fundraising
- The preservation stack is compelling
- Tyler comment about actual \$\$ being spent is relatively small; how do we boost contributions?
- How can we connect DuraSpace value proposition to higher education in general; if it's puzzling in this room then it is doubly hard for university administrators to understand

Jonathan--How sponsorship \$\$ are connected to efforts is tallied by what platform you are using; if both then it is split; that's where the numbers are coming from about \$\$ for yearly development of the software. Those of us not using anything \$\$ goes into general fund.

To date DSpace Futures has been driven by DuraSpace to find out what the issues are and what use cases are not being fulfilled; growing out of that were a series of issues about what had the most traction; API, Hydra and metadata improvement. Little traction so far from the DSpace community. Our question is why is there no traction? Not communicated enough or no interest?

TABLE 6

- Surprised that both projects are in the red
- How do we get the word out on campus?
- "Long term access" are better words than "preservation"
- Need a funding overview strategy for the whole preservation stack
- Both projects are mature and the development is diffused; may not be a good model; maybe Kuali model would work better
- Governance and contribution--how do you develop a coherent road map
- Need a common pitch to provosts and administrators

TABLE 7

- Perhaps there really is a crisis for the community if DSpace and Fedora are underfunded
- "It's one thing to be in a train wreck and quite another to be driving the train; this is a community crisis"
- It's easier to see physical backlog than a digital backlog
- We need IT partners; willing academic partners in research data preservation
- Need a migration path between DSpace and Fedora? Fedora is a better choice; shift forward
- Armageddon in the stacks?
- Appreciated the communications around Digital preservation value proposition; that conversation is happening everywhere; if we could share going forward it would be helpful
- We should all appreciate the urgency of the digital preservation problem

TABLE 8

- We need "A louder roadmap" going forward

MISCELLANEOUS FEEDBACK

- we knew this day was coming – funded thru grants, at some point something needs to change – this is it – the point where we have to step up
- urgency of the digital dark age – physical backlog of books vs. a digital backlog – digital resources are vulnerable
- 70% of organizations resources are dedicated on physical objects
- only 10% of our adopter community that are sponsoring – needs to be higher
- how do we make sure non-sponsors are included in community
- multiple 20K sponsorship needs
- deficits of DSpace and Fedora are a concern, can they be resolved?
- Same/usual suspects that contribute – fatigue – need to expand contributions (financial and inkind) by other institutions
- acceleration of the creation of dig data – is there a space to consider policy workflow layers so we don't all re-create
- appreciate DuraSpace's openness and transparency
- we are not dealing with digital humanities we are dealing with humanities that are digital
- more ways to participate
- more sharing of knowledge and expertise
- need to make the invisible visible
- need a shared value proposition for selling investment now to leadership