

BHL-Europe Minutes Workshop Collection Policy Meise/NBGB 7.6.2011:

1. Goal:

Minutes:

Agreement on a BHL-Europe Collection Policy
Collection Policy will be a chapter in the BPG

2. General introduction

a) Content Scope:

Minutes:

Consequences: BHL does not scan volumes in isolation but rather seeks to provide the complete set of volumes of any given title. Early literature published in a broader scope than it is use today.

3. Discussion of CoPo Forum

Minutes:

Example: Antonio Valdecasas CSIC

Conceptual side:

Know what is relevant for a portal like BHL-E

But many people found it nice to have particular portals

CSIC has five different portals

Also trying to publish doctoral theses

Academic

Example: Patricia Mergen:

Avoid effort of duplication – big national project – maps and areal

Selection priorities – first look out of copyright and not on BHL US, own museums publications.

Priorities ask scientist – made a list of priorities – ingest

Digitise have only volunteers

Maps

list asked scientist to give them their most important “to be digitised” literature

Example Régine Fabri and Nicole Hanquart NBGB:

First list of African literature – first pillars of Belgium flora, use excellent contacts to get the rights

They have negotiations with rights holders

very good scanning facilities – people from Brussels

Example: BHL US Bianca Crowley

Have a list

Analyse what has been missing

Entomology Smithsonian

Looking for gap filling in the serials runs, collections

Issue tracking software

Rely on users which pieces are not online

Feedback button – system that allows that

Policy put together two different things

Public and non public

Internal policy: Scan something from a library with cover – scan the entire volume

Google scans – they are not documented

Public policy: let the public know what the BHL US Collection Policy is about

Visual diagram

Collection Boundaries – are not limiting themselves to any terms only for public

De-accession policy – remove content if users thinks it is not appropriate

Primary books and journals

Citebank

Journal search possible based on metadata

Coverage – how they addressed duplicates, focus on open access materials

More than simply selection, let people know BHL US is very wide, policy is very wide

Mostly gap filling

International plants name index

Zoorecord

Own zoological records

Long term usability

Get more emails from normal email (generic) addresses

Scanning of rare materials – get funding no access

1923 date to which is open access

Does BHL US scan the Journal “Science”?

At least get metadata from Jstor

Scan also if literature is in google books or Jstor

Priority issue tracking software it is the bridge that we have scanned and what we have not scanned yet – this volume is incomplete,...

Make sure that people are participating in this system

Bianca makes sure.

Laszlo Peregovits HNHM:

Responsibilities: belong to the two largest museums

Many of non museums materials are also collected – in close alliance with museum

Various authors

Not going until the co-publisher signed asked them to put it online

Another kind of responsibility – national institution has given up

Journals and serials – no expertise together to put it together – natural history network – are going to submit material

Problem facing – countries behind iron curtain cut off in terms of information exchange – all kind of journals published behind the iron curtain

Rescue policy – so bad quality paper – paper breaks up (even from 1960) – is also an approach in terms of rare materials

Another issue – many publishers disappeared - museums says it is the publisher – here no problem with publishing

LANDOE approach:

I am explaining shortly: We digitise everything within natural sciences which has been published within austrian borders. We do scan whole volumes even if sometimes the theme is not met in an article. We have now approx digitised half of the literature in natural sciences of Austria in 5 years of digitisation (nearly 1 million pages – 50 000 persons/month access to the literature)

Short break

4. Important points to consider

a) Type of materials: (and quality?)

Almanacs
Bibliography
Journal/Magazine
Serials
Periodicals
And many more

, whatever you consider to have appropriate content
Scholarly, general science materials, intellectual significant materials, popular treatments of complex scholarly topics for non-scholars

Suggestion: All kinds of materials available.

Minutes:

No splitted books, “franklin” books, need the metadata for the books, 50 pages there and 50 pages there
Format of file, pdf, jpeg
Digitising of a section is ok
Question of timing for phd thesis – collation of theses – funding for scanning
Manuscripts
Phd thesis that has been catalogued - yes

b) Incorporation of content from non BHL member libraries

Minutes:

No google books scans – it is not open access – cannot be reused
Everything has to be open access
Journal Zookeys is in BHL US

c) Licensing & Permissions

Minutes:

IPR in the responsibility of each institution
Keep in mind the legislation of your own country
BHL-E is open access keep that in mind for your digitisation efforts and what you provide to BHL-E
Cecile duteille Vorschlag:
“ Scherpa Romeo” www.sherpa.ac.at/romeo
www.arrow-net.eu

something separately to discuss in case of Europeana signing contracts – might have a problem sign things on project level if project is not a legal entity, at least when the project is over BHL-US agreement they are very open

d) Selection considerations

- Current and future goals of BHL-E and global? What do we want to include?
- Scan whole serials and volumes – even if content scope is not always met (do not scan volumes in isolation – seek to provide the complete set of volumes) – no single books, try to plan in advance for half a year or a year
- Digitise everything within state borders – coordinate yourself with other institutions in your country – perhaps each institution digitises which is the speciality e.g. botany of the institute – (scientist in this discipline are available can give input what they would need online)
- GRIB should be of great help in this matter – coordinating digitisation efforts
- Scope very broad – specification often can depend on institution – **no Darwin, no old works – recent literature shall be digitised**
- Digitise works which only your institution holds or which are very rare.

Also incorporate new literature not only old - bilateral agreements!!!! Also new literature should be scanned and provided online – (hobby botanist does not look up an article from 1850 that is outdated.

Do not think too long about what to digitise and what not – just do it

Minutes:

Points from above!

Scan whole serials even if content scope is not met

Everything within state borders

Try to communicate to each other

Scan everything: state restrictions communicate to each other

Coordinate with National library and other institutions very important

Heimo sends me his ideas on scanning everything what to consider might not be wise

GRIB:

Appendix in BPG: every CP quickly state what they are scanning – quick overview

Try to avoid duplication – GRIB will be the tool

Scope very broad do not restrict yourselves

Do scan newer material

As far as possible include most recently literature – digital born and not digitally born

Problems are monographs

e) Alphabetical list of core and supporting themes:

Minutes:

Do you want a figure or list like the one of BHL US has in **BHL collections diagram**

<https://bhl.wikispaces.com/BHL+Collections+Diagram>

Do not make it more complicated as necessary. Just scan everything in the library shelf from top to down

Include figure of BHL- US but with statement of Antonio Valdecasas in Collection Policy additional themes for the figure?

BHL Africa??? Question digitising?

f) Further important points

Minutes:

Talk to each other at least for Belgium

5. Time frame

Minutes:

Bianca Crowley helps editing!!! (is away in June)

Heimo sends me his ideas to CoPo and Antonio send me the words to the figure of BHL-US which is going to be incorporated in the Collection Policy

Deadlines 31.7.2011 – deadline for BPG chapters to be delivered to me

Summary thought: do we have everything cleared and discussed? What we discussed today will come into the CoPo.

Henning Scholz questions on funding:

Are institutions able to pay?

Or can institutions maintain their digitisation without funding?

Need funds for scanning, need to find funds for new scanning

Backup for project

A survey will be sent around on this theme.

Perhaps fund a help desk

Adding gradually one