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3-4 May, 2007
Rydges Carlton, Melbourne

AGENDA

772. Introduction & Welcome. Eve Woodberry

773. Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

- From CAUL: Judy Stokker, QUT; Angela Bridgland, UMelbourne;
  Alison Hunter, USQ; Jim Graham, ACU; Con Graves, Griffith;
  Stephen Parnell (UniSA, for Thursday morning); Debbie Orr, CQU;

- From CONZUL: Ainslie Dewe, AUT; Gail Pattie, UCanterbury;
  Janet Copsey, UAuckland; John Redmayne, Massey;
  Teresa Horn, Lincoln; Sue Pharo, UOtago

- Guests: Jocelyn Priddey, UQ; Jan Fullerton, NLA; Tony Boston, NLA;
  Dr Rhys Francis, NCRIS PIC;

- Apologies: Alan Smith, USQ; Chris Sheargold, ACU; Maxine Brodie, Macquarie (attending day 1 only); Sue Roberts, VUW;
  Stephen McVey, UNDA; Janice Rickards, Griffith; Helen Livingston, UniSA (attending Thursday pm and Friday only); Graham Black, CQU;

774. Arrangement of the agenda. Items will be starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting will be considered noted, and all recommendations will be considered approved.

775. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2006/2 Perth 18-19 September 2006. (Paper included)

776. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2006/5, 2006/6, 2007/1, 2007/2. (Papers (4) included)

777. Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

778. Review of the Strategic Plan. Eve Woodberry

779. CAUL Achievement Award 2006. Jocelyn Priddey, UQ, will be presented with her award on the morning of May 4.

Support for Research

780. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Andrew Wells (Paper included)

   a) CEIRC Operational Plan 2007-2008. (Paper included)

   b) Long-term Access to Electronic Content – archiving and preservation, including Portico. Andrew Wells, Craig Anderson

   c) National Licensing Proposal. Heather Gordon

781. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

782. Research Quality Framework. (Standing item) Eve Woodberry

783. eResearch. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
784. Research Infrastructure.

a) **NCRIS (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy).** Hot Topic.
   John Shipp, Rhys Francis

FRODO Projects

b) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).**
   https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams
   The steering committee doubles as the RAMP steering committee. The Australian Access Federation’s (AAF) Shibboleth Trust Federation will be delivered by MELCOE and overseen by MAMS. Eve Woodberry (Paper included, also covering RAMP)

MERRI Projects


d) **RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).** http://www.rubric.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry


New Projects:

f) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project] Cathrine Harboe-Ree

g) **RAMP (Research Activityflow & Middleware Priorities).** The steering committee doubles as the MAMS steering committee. Eve Woodberry (Paper included, also covering MAMS)

i) **DRAMA (Digital Repository Authorization Middleware Architecture)** is a sub-project within RAMP (http://www.ramp.org.au) that aims to develop a web front-end for Fedora repository, and to re-factor Fedora authentication and authorization into pluggable middleware components.

h) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree

i) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Eve Woodberry

j) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) – Stage 2.** Vic Elliott

k) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project]

Support for Learning & Teaching

785. **Resources for Law Libraries.** Hot Topic. Vic Elliott

786. **Information Literacy Working Group.** Ruth Quinn (Paper included)

787. **Services for Offshore Students.** Helen Livingston (Paper included)

788. **University Library Australia.** Shirley Oakley

a) **Open University Australia.**

789. **Carrick Institute.**

a) **Learning and Teaching Performance Fund.**

b) **RIN (Resource Identification Network).**
Delivering Quality & Value

790. Organisational Restructuring. Hot Topic. Derek Whitehead will chair a session on issues surrounding organisation restructuring, with case studies from CSU, SCU and Macquarie.


792. Print Collections - Usage Analysis. Hot Topic. Graham Black

793. Best Practice Working Group. Liz Curach

794. Statistics. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)

795. Standards. (A standing item) Maxine Brodie, Derek Whitehead.

Advocacy & Influence

796. Copyright. Eve Woodberry, Derek Whitehead (Paper included)

797. International Engagement.
   a) Study Tour of India. Hot Topic. Vic Elliott
   b) CONZUL (Council of New Zealand University Librarians). Janet Copsey (Paper included)
   c) IATUL 2008 (International Association of Technological University Libraries).
      Auckland, April 21-24. Ainslie Dewe

798. Relationships with other Organisations.
   a) National Library of Australia.
      i) Libraries Australia (formerly Kinetica). Linda Luther, Anne Horn, Jan Fullerton
         (attending the meeting on May 4, with Tony Boston). (Papers (2) included)
   b) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).
   c) NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).
   d) CAUL regional and sectoral groups.
      i) QULOC. Jim Graham (Paper included)

799. Forthcoming Meetings
   a) CAUL Meeting 2007/2. Adelaide, September 20-21, with committee/group meetings on September 19.
   b) CAUL Meeting 2008/1. Sydney (venue and date tbc)

CAUL Administration

800. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment. Jeff Murray

801. CAUL Finances. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   a) CAUL Budget 2006. The 2006 audit is in its final stages.
   b) CAUL Budget 2007. Progress report. (Paper included)

802. Executive Officer’s Report. Diane Costello (Paper included)

803. Other business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th># pax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-7.30</td>
<td>Informal dinner @ University Café, upstairs @ 257 Lygon Street, Carlton</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>CAUL Executive</td>
<td>Rydges Carlton, 701 Swanston Street, Carlton</td>
<td>Eve Woodberry, Jeff Murray, Heather Gordon, Andrew Wells, Cathrine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harboe-Ree, Diane Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Curach, Graham Black, Ruth Quinn, Heather Gordon, Greg Anderson,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Parnell, Derek Whitehead, Jeff Murray, Jan Gordon, Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Quinn, Chair; Graham Black, Anne Horn, Leeanne Pitman, Greg Anderson,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Parnell, Linda Luther, Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black, Des Stewart, Anita Crotty, Jeff Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>IRUA-L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maxine Brodie, Earle Gow, Bill Cations, Con Graves, Margaret Jones, Greg</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson, possibly one person from the IRUA Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Anderson, Chair; Alex Byrne, Imogen Garner, Stephen Parnell, Judy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stokker, Ainslie Dewe, Gabrielle Gardiner (LATN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Shipp, Andrew Wells (chair), Keith Webster, Vic Elliott, Cathrine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harboe-Ree, Angela Bridgland, John Arfield, Ray Choate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>CAUL Meeting – Hot Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Panel on restructuring – Derek Whitehead, Des Stewart, Maxine Brodie,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley Oakley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law Libraries feedback – Vic Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>Meeting closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm for 7.30</td>
<td><strong>CAUL dinner @ Il Vicolo</strong>, 50 Grattan Street, Carlton (upstairs, ACODE will be dining downstairs)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday 4 May 2007**

**Venue:** Rydges Carlton, 701 Swanston Street, Carlton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9am</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting - Hot Topics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30m</td>
<td>Jocelyn Priddey - CAUL Achievement Award presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45m</td>
<td>Libraries Australia - Jan Fullerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td><strong>Hot Topics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCRIS - John Shipp, Rhys Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Management - Cathrine Harboe-Ree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Business Meeting, including the following .....</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQF - Eve Woodberry, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADT Business Plan &amp; the future of the ADT - Andrew Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portico and other options for long-term access to electronic information - Andrew Wells, Craig Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Business</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Meeting close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CAUL Meeting 2006/2**

**18-19 September, 2006**

Curtin University, Council Chambers

**DRAFT Minutes** (updated 6/3/07)

738. **Introduction & Welcome.** Professor Greg Craven, Acting Vice-Chancellor of Curtin University, welcomed members at 1.30pm on the 18th, and addressed the issues of diversity in the higher education sector, and idea of university as corporation. CAUL president, Eve Woodberry, welcomed members and guests, particularly those from NSLA.

739. **Attendance & Apologies.**

**From CAUL:**
*Jim Graham, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
*Wendy Abbott, Bond U
Graham Black, CQU
Ruth Quinn, CDU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
%Anne Horn, Deakin U
Jeff Murray, ECU
*Helen Culshaw, Flinders U
*Con Graves, Griffith U
Heather Gordon, JCU
Earle Gow, La Trobe U
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U
*Wilna Macmillan, Monash U
Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
#Carolyn Young, QUT
*Deidre Gillespie, RMIT U
Des Stewart, SCU
Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U
Ray Choate, U Adelaide
Leeanne Pitman, U Ballarat
Anita Crotty, U Canberra
Linda O’Brien, U Melbourne
Eve Woodberry, UNE, President
Andrew Wells, UNSW, Deputy President
Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA
Greg Anderson, U Newcastle
%Stephen McVey, UNDA
%Keith Murray, UQ
Helen Livingston, UniSA
*Alison Hunter, USQ
John Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania
#Fides Datu Lawton, UTS
%Sandra Jeffries, USQ
John Arfield, UWA
Liz Curach, UWS
%Philip Kent, VU

In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

**From CONZUL:**
Gail Pattie U Canterbury;
Annette McNicoll, U Waikato

**From NSLA:**
Anne-Marie Schwirtlich and Sue Hamilton,
SLV;
Alan Smith, SLSA;
Margaret Allen, SLWA;
Penny Carnaby, NLNZ;
Warwick Cathro, NLA;
Regina Sutton and Lucy Arundell, SLNSW;
Jo McGill, NTL;
Lea Giles-Peters, SLQ;
Kate Irvine, NSLA;

**Guests:**
Professor Greg Craven, Acting Vice-Chancellor Curtin University;
Ruth Pagell, University Librarian, Singapore Management University;
Michele Sabto, Monash University;
Barry Burton, University Librarian, Hong Kong Polytechnic University;
Darren Holland, University of Ballarat;
Dr Kerry Smith, Curtin University;

**Apologies:**
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash;
Gaynor Austen, QUT;
Janice Rickards, Griffith;
Gulcin Cribb, Bond;
Felicity McGregor, UOW;
Chris Sheargold, ACU;
Bill Cations, Flinders;
Anita Crotty, UCanberra;
Craig Anderson, RMIT;
Alan Smith, USQ

%first meeting as CAUL Member
#Acting Director
*Delegate of CAUL Member
At the beginning of the CAUL business meeting on the 19th, Eve Woodberry welcomed new members to CAUL and to the CAUL meeting, and farewelled others. She expressed great appreciation for Gaynor Austen’s wonderful contribution to CAUL over many years, including her terms as Deputy President and on the Executive Committee. She invited designated members to introduce new members: Derek Whitehead introduced Philip Kent; Graham Black introduced Keith Webster; Eve Woodberry introduced Sandra Jeffries; Imogen Garner introduced Stephen McVey; and Andrew Wells introduced Jan Gordon.

740. Arrangement of the agenda. Items were starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting were considered noted, and all recommendations were considered approved.

741. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting - 2006/1, April 6-7, Canberra. There was no discussion on the minutes.

742. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings - 2006/2, 2006/3, 2006/4. Copies of the minutes were included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

743. Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.
   a) Endnote. La Trobe has trialled both RefWorks and EndNote, has done a comparative analysis, and will circulate the report as soon as it is finished - Earle Gow. This item was not discussed.
   b) E-Grad School (Australia). The LATN Information Literacy sub-committee will complete “InfoScholar: Information literacy for e-research”, the information literacy online module by the end of December 2006. It will be one of the Modules that make up the online content of e-Grad School (Australia). The website is being developed at www.egradschool.edu.au. Shibboleth will be used for students to access e-Grad School (Australia) with Identity Provider (IdP) being set up by the partners, however more work is required to allow for selective access – Imogen Garner. This item was not discussed.
   c) Digital Reference. The plan is to agree on a set of definitions (e.g. what is “referral”) and data collection forms and to make them available via the CAUL best practice site – Greg Anderson. This item was not discussed.

STRATEGIC PLAN

744. Review of the Strategic Plan. The revised plan for 2007-2009 is included with the agenda. Eve Woodberry thanked members for their active contributions at the April meeting, and called for comment on the revision, particularly whether any activities had been omitted.

   Linda O’Brien suggested that the research agenda was too narrowly defined. It should be sustainable. CAUL should partner with the research community, and should be more involved with output rather than concentrating on input.

   It was confirmed that “information management” not be confined to scholarly information management because expertise may be called upon by other areas of the university.

   It was suggested that information access be emphasized better, as most focus is on service delivery and models.

   It was confirmed that the environment should refer to the library’s role rather than the librarian’s role.

   It was noted that there are no actions under L&T to reflect online services – service delivery models, benchmarking, etc.

   It was confirmed that it was not necessary to include any specific relationship with the Carrick Institute or the Teaching and Learning Performance Fund.

   The responsible parties will be added to the actions for quality. The plan will be revised and circulated to CAUL. A short version will be produced, and consideration given to whether print copies are required. (Action: Executive)
745. **CAUL Achievement Award 2005.** The winner, Michele Sabto, Monash University, attended the meeting. Her nomination, which was read by Eve Woodberry, and presentation are available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/CAULAchievementAward.htm](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/CAULAchievementAward.htm). In the course of her presentation, Michele reported that the Monash ePress focuses on the humanities; print is not warehoused or handled, but managed as print-on-demand through Sydney University Press; the ePress operates on a cost-recovery basis, with titles accepted on a minimum revenue basis, recoupable from the author if not achieved within two years; a standard design is used for all journals and books, and the document is automatically converted from Word to XML to PDF; the Atypon system is used for both journals and books.

746. **CAUL Elections.** Eve Woodberry congratulated Andrew Wells on his re-election as Deputy President for 2007-2008. She recommended that members considering nominating for the forthcoming Executive position and CEIRC position. *(Action: All)*

**Support for Research**

747. **Research Infrastructure. Hot Topic.** Warwick Cathro's presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062research-cathro.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062research-cathro.pdf). He defined research infrastructure in terms of services which allow research teams to work together, make research accessible and to preserve it. He reported on a number of government bodies looking at access to, and preservation of, research data – ERCC, PMSEIC, NSB (the United States' National Science Board), and the various ministerial advisory avenues, some of which include the NLA. He advised members of the range of programs in which the NLA is working with the higher education sector, viz ARROW, APSR and MAMS, and that the NLA has expertise in digital preservation and sustainability of data. He suggested that some of this work, e.g. MAMS tools, could be applicable outside the higher education sector.

The presentation on the **National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy** by John Shipp is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062research-shipp.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062research-shipp.pdf). He particularly referred to the work of capability 16, Platforms for Collaboration, chaired by Dr Rhys Francis. He noted that although the humanities and social sciences won’t be able to benefit directly from the funding, the infrastructure will be applicable to many areas in H&SS. The other 15 capability groups will be asked how they plan to curate and disseminate data collected and created as part of their programs. Data generated during the conduct of ARC-funded projects is expected to be retained for five years, a requirement of the grant. Linda O’Brien, who sits on PfC with John Shipp, reported that $70m has been allocated for IT-related infrastructure. It was suggested that CAUL members can add value in cross-disciplinary areas while the individual disciplines will focus on their own metadata and structures.


Gail Pattie’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20062ir-conzul.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20062ir-conzul.pdf). She reported on four projects, three of which were funded by the Tertiary Education Commission, focussing on different institutional repositories architecture. The government’s Research Performance Management program has provided the impetus for bringing the academic community on board with institutional repositories.

Andrew Wells reported on the status of institutional repositories in Australia. He noted that although the driver for establishing institutional repositories was “the serials crisis” and its open access successors, this is no longer the case. Although the basis of management of the ROF’s evidence base is intended to be institutional repositories, they are not yet properly funded or staffed, and the process will have to be evaluated properly. He asked whether the case for institutional repositories has been made, and whether they are sustainable. It was noted that QUT has a very strong policy environment in which to encourage contributions from academic staff.
John Shipp proposed that libraries had the textual analysis skills that form the basis of digitisation projects, the same skills required to manage the knowledge base of the universities, and should take the initiative now. He added that capturing journal articles was unnecessary, and the effort would be better applied to capturing unique material. Linda O’Brien suggested that projects such as PARADISEC would need to be “owned” in order to survive, no matter how valuable they were. Libraries must show clearly how they can add value to this process.

749. Digitisation Summit. Hot Topic. Anne-Marie Schwirtlich reported on the summit organised by the Collections Council of Australia, an entity established by the Cultural Ministers Council. She represents libraries on the CCA. Two clear areas are to be addressed – fast digitisation on demand and building a mass digitisation capability and processes masses of data through it. The summit’s communiqué referred to both digital content and cultural collections.

750. ARIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).

FRODO Projects Hot Topic

b) ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World). http://arrow.edu.au/ Andrew Wells reported on behalf of Cathrine Harboe-Ree, whose notes are available at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc Highlights included: 15 libraries are signed up to VITAL, or in the process, including the RUBRIC institutions; the first ARROW Community Day was held recently; working with MAMS and DART on the delivery of XACML access control functionality.

c) MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project). https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

MERRI Projects Hot Topic
d) MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy). http://www.middleware.edu.au/ This item was not discussed.

e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively). http://www.rubric.edu.au/ This item was not discussed.

f) OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management). http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/ Carolyn Young reported that the project has produced an analysis of publication agreements – a list interoperable with that of the Sherpa project. They are investigating new forms of publisher agreements for researchers.


h) E - Security Framework for Research. A report from Maxine Brodie was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

New Projects: Hot Topic

j) Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP). http://www.melcoe.mq.edu.au/projects/RAMP/index.htm Maxine Brodie summarised the aims – a suite of tools for work-flows based on open source software, analogous to ILMS which are work-flow tools over print materials. Currently institutional repositories must be either totally open or totally closed, whereas RAMP will allow granular authentication to individual resources.
k) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2.** Andrew Wells reported on behalf of Cathrine Harboe-Ree, whose notes are available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc). A key activity will support the RQF implementation, and a new activity will develop infrastructure for persistent identifiers. USQ will lead the latter, while the current partners – Monash, UNSW, NLA and Swinburne – will pursue the rest.

l) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Carolyn Young reported that the project will undertake an analysis of copyright law for dissemination of theses and distribution of data.

m) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) – Stage 2.** Vic Elliott reported that stage 2 will extend existing programs, and expand national outreach. They will work with ARC researchers under a research data consultancy service, designed to meet demand for hands-on advice and assistance in managing digital data. A series of workshops and conferences will address repositories for research management, the well-grounded repository, developing good digital collections, and interoperable repositories for research (focussing on the operational implications of the JISC eFramework).

n) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] Alison Hunter reported that ICE plans to take into production those elements of the RUBRIC project concerned with work-flow from research management and content management. She sees some commonality with Monash ePress work-flows. Peter Sephton will lead the team.

751. **Research Quality Framework. Hot Topic.** (Standing item) Cathrine Harboe-Ree’s report is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc). Andrew Wells reported that the RQF model has not yet been finalised, but DEST clearly wants to manage the RQF evidence through institutional repositories. Members discussed the level of involvement of CAUL and individual members in the methodology of the RQF, suggesting that comment be limited to copyright and information technology implications. It was noted that CAUL is generally invited by DEST to contribute to discussions on copyright, and that DEST had asked for a CAUL nominee on its ERCC.

752. **eResearch Coordinating Committee (ERCC). Hot Topic.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree’s report is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc). Andrew Wells reported, on behalf of Cathrine Harboe-Ree, that the ERCC interim report had been presented to the two ministers in April – the Ministers for Communication, IT and the Arts, and for Education, Science and Training, but has not yet been made public. It has relevance for both PMSEIC and NCRIS PfC. CAUL’s eResearch working group will meet after the ERCC report is finalised. Notes of a meeting on eResearch between the CAUL and CAUDIT Executive committees are attached to the minutes of Executive 2006/3. Linda O’Brien reported the $4.7m has been allocated to a Victorian eResearch Strategic Initiative to develop eResearch capability at the regional level - participants include Monash and Melbourne universities and the Victorian Department of Primary Industries. Helen Livingston reported that Ian McBain, Flinders University, is a member of the South Australian committee on eResearch.

753. **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** A report from Andrew Wells was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

754. **CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC).** A report from Heather Gordon was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed. A separate discussion on the annual CEIRC fee was held under the budget item 769(b)(ii).

755. **Collection Analysis. Hot Topic.** Wilna Macmillan reported on a project to assess Monash’s ability to support research. Her presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062macmillan.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062macmillan.pdf). One aim was to develop a methodology that could be used in other discipline areas. Because a statistically valid approach was not feasible in the given time,
a descriptive approach was used. Conspectus was not used because of the intensive resources required. Monash has developed a question bank for re-use in similar exercises and plans to develop a checklist for the methodology. How do you define the “best collection in Australia?”

The project stimulated positive dialogue between researchers and library staff, who were able to address some gaps in information about library resources and services, particularly from early career researchers. A question raised was whether researchers go elsewhere if their needs are not met, or do they limit themselves to the areas that are supported and resources available.

**Support for Learning & Teaching**

756. Off-shore Services. Hot Topic. Jeff Murray’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062offshore.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062offshore.pdf) He reported on work in progress at Edith Cowan University, focussing on offshore services, an area identified from customer services surveys as in need of some improvement. The process involves mapping a service catalogue, for both staff and students, measuring availability of e-books, with the aim of developing holistic online services. He identified barriers to effective service delivery – document delivery e.g. impractical to post books to China; bandwidth limitations on delivering video offshore and to rural students; the latest editions of textbooks not available electronically; licensing for access to offshore staff. It was noted that LATN is running a pilot project for delivering information literacy packages to offshore students, and some of the issues raised by ECU are being addressed. The report will be made available to CAUL.

*(Action: IG)*

757. *Information Literacy Working Group.* Ruth Quinn drew members attention to the circulated papers, noting that there is a sunset clause for the working group and recommending a slight change to the terms of reference.

*Recommendations for CAUL*

1) **That the Information Literacy Working Group continue to exist in its current form for a further two years until the end of 2008.**

2) **That the terms of reference be changed to:**

   a. **Provide advice to CAUL on information literacy and related issues (no change);**
   b. **Provide ongoing support and resources to facilitate effective assessment of information literacy knowledge and skills and appropriate evaluation of information literacy courses and programs within university libraries (old (b) and (c) combined);**
   c. **Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning (no change); and**
   d. **Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy (no change).**

3) **That nominations for the position of Convenor ILWG for 2007-2008 be called.**

4) **That the future directions of ILWG as outlined above be accepted.**

She requested feedback on the structure of the current group – one member of CAUL and a group of practitioners which meet by teleconference. There is value in a group of directors, rather than practitioners, focussing on impact issues, providing direction, and being able to make decisions without having to seek permission. It was suggested that skills need to be embedded into the curriculum rather than standalone in the library. It was noted that there is very little sharing of tools and other outputs in this area, with each institution still tailoring their own. CAUL should focus on sustainability and impact.

It was agreed that the working group should be comprised of library directors and review the terms of reference in light of the changed membership. The convenor will be elected from the group’s membership. Philip Kent, Con Graves, Greg Anderson all volunteered to be on the new working group. Diane Costello will call for expressions of interest. *(Action: DC)*

It was suggested reviewing the activity already underway and in place, e.g. web service to assist with EndNote, and link it to the web site. Eve Woodberry thanked Ruth Quinn for her work to date.
758. *University Library Australia.* Shirley Oakley suggested that, as with the ILWG, the current membership of the ULA working group does not feel able to speak on behalf of either their institution or their state or to achieve consensus. The original membership was made up of representatives of the regional reciprocal borrowing groups. The group should be able to focus on policy, and a smaller group, comprised of CAUL members, would be more constructive.

Fides Datu Lawton reminded members that UTS is a city-based campus which feels the impact of city-based campuses of other universities who are relying on ULA for their library services and asked for ULA to be reviewed in this context.

The recent CAUL survey showed some lack of understanding about what could be expected from the ULA program, regarding what is in scope and what is out of scope. It was noted that in most cases, the partner organisation makes the library arrangements, however many students appear not to use the designated service but rather choose their preferred library. It was suggested that negotiations be conducted between university librarians and that appropriate induction programs be implemented.

Some institutions report overuse by these students but do not have the data to support the assertion. QULOC does collect data for use between institutions.

It was recommended that a small working group include someone from an inner city campus on the group to report to CAUL 2007/1, and have the data to support it. Fides Datu Lawton volunteered. *(Action: DC)*

The group was asked to address the following: It would be useful to have CAUL guidelines for “shop-front” campuses if only to use within those institutions. Look at the rationale for why this issue was raised in the first place. It continues to be very important to make the protocols simple and consistent for desk staff. To what extent has the environment changed. Affirm or not whether each institution can institute its own rules and have the discretion to apply certain conditions. Recommendations should be made at the principles level. Do shop-front students need to be treated differently from other students.

759. Carrick Institute. Hot Topic

a) **Learning and Teaching Performance Fund.** John Shipp’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062ltpf.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062ltpf.pdf) He outlined the process involved in the first allocation of funds, noting that the four discipline groups were unsuitable for many universities and courses. Some universities may take into account the library’s proven contribution to learning and teaching and will allocate a proportion of their funding accordingly. Opportunities for highlighting this contribution may be through Rodski and LibQUAL+ surveys, information literacy impact on graduate attributes, student effectiveness and attitudes as expressed through the Course Experience Questionnaire.

b) **RIN (Resource Identification Network).** Derek Whitehead’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062whitehead-rin.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062whitehead-rin.pdf) He reported that the RIN has been allocated $7m over 2006-2008 to develop mechanisms for, *inter alia*, the dissemination of good practice in learning and teaching. He was CAUL’s nominee at the think tank on September 1 which was intended to define the RIN. He noted that earlier attempts at building repositories of learning objects have not been successful, often because of intellectual property barriers - the reluctance of academic staff to contribute to the repositories. The Discipline Based Initiatives Scheme may provide opportunities for libraries to participate, particularly under the Higher Education Enterprise projects. *(Action: All)* He recommended that CAUL keeps engaged with the programs, particularly because of the potential overlap with other DEST-funded activity – e-frameworks, standards, ARROW, MAMS, etc.

Delivering Quality & Value

760. Workforce Planning. Hot Topic. Linda Luther’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20062libraryworkforce.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20062libraryworkforce.pdf) She outlined the development of the University of Tasmania’s library workforce plan, driven by the aging of the workforce and a number of applications for reclassification. The review looked closely at
paraprofessional roles, and the library is working closely with TAFE with respect to the level 4 certificate.

Margaret Allen reported that State Libraries’ workforces were also aging, with 60% aged over 45 and only 3% under 25. A particular difficulty is encouraging staff to take on higher level responsibilities, particularly if close to retirement. She asked whether library schools are teaching what is required in the workplace, where the next generation of cataloguers is coming from. She suggested some areas in which NSLA could work with CAUL - joint staff development, formal staff exchanges - either regionally or nationally. It was noted that SLSA and the three SA universities already have a joint development program.

It was suggested examining why people are entering the profession, and how library school programs might be restructured to teach relevant skill. Alan Smith advised members of the new program beginning at the University of South Australia in 2007, in business information management, with information technology embedded throughout the course.

Alternatives were suggested – employing non-librarian graduates with the appropriate attributes and training them in-house; collaborating more with the publishing industry through cadetships, scholarships, etc.

761. **Off-site storage. Hot Topic.** Alan Smith, SASL, reviewed the outcomes of CAUL’s 1999 workshop [http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/Store990806.min.doc], noted that the papers encapsulated all the issues, and outlined what had happened since. He asked why consensus had not been able to be achieved on any of the issues raised. He noted the focus on print, and that for NSLA, a key driver is preservation. New stores have been built for the NLA and SLV, and CAVAL has extended its boundaries into NSW. Macquarie is examining on-site automated storage, while QUT is looking at options for storage of journal back-sets - its least used material. The need to keep the “last copy” was questioned when so much is already available elsewhere, e.g. at the British Library and the Library of Congress. Members also asked why state boundaries are important, whether the environment is becoming amenable to disposal and what role document delivery plays.

762. **Best Practice Working Group.** A report from Jeff Murray was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

763. **Statistics.** A report from Derek Whitehead was included with the agenda, along with a proposal for enhancement of the CAUL Statistics Website. These items were not discussed.

764. **Standards.** (A standing item) This item was not discussed.


**Advocacy & Influence**

766. **Copyright. Hot Topic.** A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. Derek Whitehead’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/copyright/caul20062copyright.pdf]. He discussed the changes to laws on technological protection measures (TPMs) required under terms of the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement, to come into effect on 1 January 2007. Additional changes have been included in the omnibus bill, relating to exceptions for libraries and the private consumer. Although the Digital Agenda Bill was reviewed in 2006, it is not clear which recommendations will be taken up. It was noted that the AVCC’s agreement will CAL expires in 2007.

767. **Relationships with other Organisations.**

a) **NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).** Members of NSLA (formerly CASL) joined CAUL members for the Hot Topics sessions on September 18. This joint meeting arose out of discussions between the CAUL and CASL chairs on issues of mutual interest. Some issues will be identified for further discussion with NSLA. **(Action: Executive)**

Anne-Marie Schwirtlich reported that significant funding is being given to new NSLA building projects. Most members are looking for better ways to articulate the role of the
organisation, and expanding activities related to sponsorship, bequests and retailing; recruitment and better management of staff; and advocacy and representation.

i) **CAULdron: peak bodies and their relevance to institutional interests. Hot Topic.** Vic Elliott suggested that, in light of the recent review of the AVCC and the Go8's concern that the AVCC cannot always speak on behalf of all universities, CAUL should consider where it may, and may not, speak on behalf of the sector. He suggested there is a tendency to identify horizontally rather than vertically within the university. Libraries are part of the academic enterprise, even though also part of a wider national and international community.

CAUL is a collection of individuals, only some of whom have the brief or authority to speak on behalf of their institutions, and CAUL itself cannot presume to speak on behalf of either the member libraries or their universities. Members may indeed speak with the authority of experience and expertise, but should be clear when they are not speaking on behalf of their own institution or all members. It should also be clear that CAUL members appointed to external bodies can only be nominees of CAUL rather than representatives. It should be recognised that some institutions would prefer that institutional expertise on government bodies be funnelled through the university rather than through CAUL.

Vic Elliott went on to suggest that the emergence of sectoral groups within higher education is significant, and CAUL should consider where it can best focus its strength e.g. in CEIRC and in ULA, and where it might devolve some activity to the sectoral groups e.g. collection development framework, off-campus storage. A national approach to the latter foundered because of the business model, whereas a limited Go8 approach may be more attractive to those universities. A framework for measuring the value of collections to the academic enterprise will vary across types of universities.

Members discussed the relative value of working as a total group compared with specific advantages of working in smaller groups, either sectorally or regionally based. The importance of how CAUL was presented within each institution was noted, along with the increasing importance of defining the savings and other benefits which CAUL contributes to each institution.  **(Action: Executive, ALL)**

b) **CONZUL (Council of New Zealand University Librarians). Hot Topic.** Gail Pattie reported on significant issues within CONZUL – repositories, print storage – focussing on last copies of journals – and cooperative purchasing, including through the EPIC consortium.

Annette McNicol recently joined the University of Waikato and Helen Tait has been Acting University Librarian at VUW. Ainslie Dewe has been elected to the IATUL board, and has raised the possibility of holding a joint CONZUL/CAUL meeting in conjunction with the 2008 IATUL conference to be held in April in Auckland.  **(Action: Executive)**

c) **CAUDIT and ACODE.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree's report is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20062harboe-ree.doc) Andrew Wells reported that four librarians attended the CAUDIT EDUCAUSE Institute on 27-31 August. Feedback suggests that it was extremely interesting and stimulating and CAUL members were encouraged to send more library staff. Discussions are underway on an institute for higher level staff.

i) **EDUCAUSE 2007.** April 29 to May 1. Melbourne. Linda O'Brien reported that the program is shaping up well and will include workshops in identity management, data management plans, enterprise architecture. Keynote and featured speakers are both national and international, including Tony Hey, Chris Rusbridge, Susan Gibbons and Richard Johnstone. She encouraged members to register early.  **(Action: All)**

d) **National Library of Australia.**

i) **Libraries Australia (Kinetica).** A report from John Arfield was included with the agenda. Following the last CAUL meeting the Executive wrote to the NLA outlining the
issues raised by members. A reply has been received but there is still work to be done on defining the service/s provided. The current model will stay in place at least until next year. Previous models were all unacceptable to some members. There will be further consultation with CAUL. **(Action: Executive)**

ii)  

*National Licensing Proposal.* Heather Gordon reported that CAUL is not participating in the evaluation group. The purchasing model adopted is the vendor/library agreement where each purchaser signs their own agreement with and the head of agreement with the National Library. The governance models allow individual libraries as well as consortia to participate in the governing group. CEIRC will coordinate CAUL members’ decisions to purchase or not. **(Action: DC)**

e)  

CAUL regional and sectoral groups.

i)  

**QULOC.** A report from Jim Graham was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

768. Forthcoming Meetings

a)  

**CAUL Meeting 2007/1.** Melbourne, May 3-4 (in conjunction with EDUCAUSE 2007, April 29 – May 2)

b)  

**CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, September.

CAUL Administration

769. CAUL Finances.

a)  

**CAUL Budget 2006.** A report to date for 2006 was included with the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

b)  

**CAUL Budget 2007 – Draft.** The draft budget and supporting documentation was included with the agenda papers. The items which were not discussed are considered accepted.

i)  

**Membership Fees.** *It is recommended that the CAUL membership fee remain at $4,500. This item was not discussed, hence accepted.*

ii)  

*CEIRC Levy.** Eve Woodberry referred to the budget item showing an increase in the CEIRC fee for 2007. The fee was last increased in 2006 following 12 months’ tracking the work of CEIRC, and a previous CAUL decision (2003/2) that the program should make a $10,000 surplus. It is recommended that the CEIRC levy again be increased by 5% to account for salary increases - to $1,320 and $1,980 for “internal” and “external” participants respectively. Internal participants include 39 CAUL institutions (ADFA is a campus of UNSW), 8 CONZUL institutions and the CSIRO. The CPI increase is about 4%.

Heather Gordon reminded members that any recommendation should go to CEIRC first for recommendation to CAUL. The fee is able to be accommodated, but process is very important.

John Shipp commented that the University of Sydney saves an enormous amount of money through CEIRC. He asked whether a flat fee was still appropriate?

*It was moved (John Shipp) that the 5% be agreed to this year, and that CEIRC review it for 2008. Approved. (Action: DC)*

It was suggested that CAUL should decide when it wants to stop taking new members.

iii)  

*CAUL Web Site Redesign.* An estimate of $25,000 has been included in the budget – the lowest quote received by CAUDIT for a similar revamp of its site in 2005. Jeff Murray reported that a request for proposal to take the CAUL web site a bit deeper, to prepare some examples of how it might be changed. The proposal will be evaluated by a small working group. **(Action: JM)**
iv) **CAUL Statistics Site Enhancements.** A proposal to fund some enhancements of the CAUL statistics site was included in the agenda papers. The total price is $5643 if all enhancements are done, plus GST. This item was not discussed, hence accepted. *(Action: DC)*

770. **Executive Officer’s Report.** A report was included in the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

771. **Other business.**

   a) **Researching the Information Commons.** Kerry Smith’s presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062smith-information-commons.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20062smith-information-commons.pdf) The information commons is a mechanism to make known those working in the same areas of interest. An aim is to build the nexus between teaching and research. [Later note: the website is now established at [http://infocommons.curtin.edu.au/](http://infocommons.curtin.edu.au/)]

   b) **Classification Review Board. Banned Books.** Linda O’Brien reported on the recent decision by the University of Melbourne to remove books from the open shelves after they had appeared on the list of books “refused classification” by the Classification Review Board. It was noted that most books on this list are pornographic, but that the list is increasingly likely to include terror-related books. It was also suggested that books that would be likely to be refused classification should they be submitted to the CRB should also be removed. It was questioned whether removing books that had not been submitted, but potentially “submittable,” would be akin to self-censorship – what impact would this have on research?

   The University of Melbourne is seeking advice from the Attorney-General. It was noted that making these books available could result in quite severe penalties, 2 years imprisonment or $20,000, but that state legislation is responsible for the penalties, reflecting the crime covered in federal legislation.

   Members discussed what action CAUL could or should take with regard to either the legislation or to the logistics of managing these books. There is an inherent conflict between freedom to read, and reading material that is not “within the law.” The content of restricted materials is relevant e.g. it is not the same as making child pornography available. This concerns legitimate research material in a university context. It is a research issue, an institutional and an AVCC issue, an issue relevant to ALIA and the Peak Bodies Forum. The making of laws is a social act, with a range of pressures and influences being brought to bear. It is legitimate for citizens to question laws, especially if they compromise values sets. It was agreed to work with ALIA to develop a common approach to the perceived problems with the legislation. *(Action: EW)*

   Members also discussed the filtering of web sites, with the associated issues of privacy, confidentiality, rights of appeal against access limitations, technical support, filtering algorithms and classifications.

Eve Woodberry thanked Imogen Garner for the smooth organisation and the excellent venue, and other members for their participation.

The meeting concluded at 3.30pm
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1463. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President), Jeff Murray, Derek Whitehead. In attendance: Diane Costello. Apologies: Cathrine Harboe-Ree. Guests: Linda Luther and John Arfield joined the meeting at 10.30am. Starred items will take priority for discussion in this shortened meeting.

1464. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2006/ 4 15 August, 2006. The minutes were accepted.

1465. Business Arising.
   a) CAUL Research Levy. Derek Whitehead will scope a project for the use of data already collected in libraries. (Action: DW)

1466. *CAUL Membership. It was noted that a number of members (7) are sending delegates to the CAUL meeting rather than attending in person, while two institutions will not be represented.

1467. CAUL Elections. There were no new nominations for the position of the Deputy President, and Andrew Wells was re-elected for another term. A call for nominations for the remaining position on the Executive has been made, with nominations due September 25. One nomination has been received.

The Executive confirmed Andrew Wells as its representative on CEIRC for 2007, so the remaining CAUL position on CEIRC can now be filled. (Action: DC)

STRATEGIC PLAN

1468. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1469. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). Derek Whitehead.

FRIDO Projects
   a) APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories).
   b) ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World). Andrew Wells
   c) MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project). Eve Woodberry

MERRI Projects
   d) MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy). Jeff Murray
   e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).
g) **DART (Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation E-Research Technologies).**

**New Projects:**

h) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project]

i) **Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP)**

j) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2. Andrew Wells

k) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project]

l) Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) – Stage 2.

m) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project]

1470. **E-Research Coordinating Committee.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree.

1471. **Research Quality Framework.** (Standing item)

1472. **CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).** Andrew Wells

a) **National Licensing Working Group.** The CEIRC committee recommended that CAUL coordinate any offers from the National Licensing program as though it were any other offer. It was agreed that CAUL not be involved in governance.

1473. **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** Andrew Wells.

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1474. *Information Literacy.** Ruth Quinn has provided a report to CAUL which includes recommendations for the future of the Information Literacy Working Group.

1475. **Review of CAUL Principles for Library Services to Off-shore Students.** Members were invited to nominate for a working group to review the principles. Nominations are due September 25. Responses have been received from Imogen Garner, Liz Curach, Helen Livingston, Graham Black, Philip Kent and Shirley Oakley (connection with ULA).

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1476. *Best Practice Working Group.** Nominations for the chair of the BPWG are due September 25. Volunteers for membership of the BPWG are due at the same time. Expressions of interest have been received from Philip Kent, Graham Black, Leeanne Pitman, Ruth Quinn, Derek Whitehead and Jan Gordon. Jeff Murray will chair the meeting, using the strategic plan to guide the agenda, and the group will elect a chair. The BPWG may establish its own work plan and process. On the basis that interested members are already attending the meeting, it was decided not to proceed with the current nomination process.

1477. **Statistics.** Derek Whitehead

1478. **Library MIS Workshop.** Diane Costello will conduct a CAUL survey to determine how members are currently using which software and systems, and what gaps there are. *(Action: DC)*

1479. **Workforce Planning.** Eve Woodberry

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1480. **Communication.** (Standing item)

a) **President’s Report.** Eve Woodberry. Letters have been written to: Sandra Jeffries to welcome her to CAUL; Megan Deacon to thank her for her reports on the Forums on Orphan Works and Technological Protection Measures.
b) Public Relations/ Media Reports.


d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is included in the CAUL agenda. Diane Costello

1481. CAUL Web Site.

1482. Copyright. Eve Woodberry

a) Technological Protection Measures. Derek Whitehead

1483. Submissions to Public Inquiries.


b) NCRI S. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. John Shipp will attend July 17.

- March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.
- March – September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals
- Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved

1484. Relationships with other organisations.

a) *DEST. Vivienne Teoh (DEST) is exploring options for the hosting of the AICTEC secretariat with a like-minded organisation in Canberra. Derek Whitehead noted that these kinds of position are usually hosted by a state government body. DEST prefers it to be based in Canberra but cannot host it in DEST because of “capture” issues. They are interested in CAUL because it is a separate body with many crossover issues. It would create an informal link between the two organisations. Members agreed it must be considered more broadly in the context of CAUL’s being hosted at ANU. Eve Woodberry will discuss further with DEST. (Action: EW)

b) *CAUDIT & ACODE. CAUDIT has called for agenda items for the November meeting.

i) EDUCAUSE 2007. Standing Item.

c) National Library of Australia.

i) *Libraries Australia (Kinetica) Cost Allocation Model. A letter was sent to Jan Fullerton in May, and a response received at the end of June.

Linda Luther and John Arfield joined the meeting at 10.30am. It was suggested that CAUL consider a business model which would maximise the participation of CAUL Discussion at CAUL 2006/1 was broad-ranging. Members wanted clearer definition of the funding model, separating out the services. Another issue was the total cost to the sector. The previous funding approach was less transparent, and less relevant to the way the service had changed. Any model should be rational, explicable and consistent. A fixed model will always create big winners and losers. The alternative is for the National Library to continue to negotiate individual costs.

There is a contradiction in the way the service has developed – it is both a service and a national good. What services are being paid for – a database paid for by subscription; a cataloguing utility, both or neither. The business model should define whether it is a utility or a service. It is perceived as a fundamental piece of information infrastructure. Members noted that there are alternatives now to Libraries Australia, e.g. OCLC, though it is a useful tool for resource-sharing.

The cataloguing client and infrastructure are very expensive to maintain and run. The model hasn’t changed to reflect the move to in-house cataloguing clients.
The level of appropriation allocated to the service within the NLA is significantly short of that needed to run the service. Should CAUL take responsibility for the difference? It was suggested that very small libraries also provide a significant contribution. What is the fairest way to fund the service? How should it be approached as a sector. It was agreed that any fixed model is likely to cause some institutions to withdraw completely. Although members recognise its value, if the model is wrong they could still opt out.

CAUL has asked the National Library for a business model. If members are to be satisfied with CAUL members contributing a collective $2 million per year there should be more information about the costs.

1. does CAUL wish to be dealt with as a sector and adopt a model;
2. which model? and transitional arrangements?
3. continue with the same model, but individuals will want to negotiate down as their circumstances change.

It was agreed to write another letter to the director-general to suggest a memorandum of understanding showing what the NLA and CAUL are each expected to contribute and clarifying the aspirations for the national bibliographic system. **(Action: EW)**

**ii) Peak Bodies Forum.** The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007.

d) **CASL.** CASL has been renamed National and State Libraries Australasia, NSLA.

e) **AVCC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree represented the Executive at the meeting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Research) on July 28 in Wollongong.

1485. **CAUL Meetings.**

a) **CAUL Meeting 2006/2.** 18-19 September, 2006 in Perth (in association with the ALIA biennial conference). Members reviewed the agenda for the CAUL meeting.

b) **CAUL Meeting 2007/1.** Melbourne, May 2-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1.

i) **RFID.** Craig Anderson was unable to attend CAUL 2006/2 but offered to speak on RFID at CAUL 2007/1.

c) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, October 2007. Helen Livingston is checking venues with a view to setting the date, possibly 3-5 October. It was agreed to stay with mid-September because of school holidays. **(Action: DC)**

1486. **Forthcoming Executive Meetings.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree in Europe most of October; Jeff Murray available during WA school terms: 24/7-29/9, 16/10-7/12.

a) **2006/6 November 7, pm and November 8, am, Melbourne** (in conjunction with CCA, the afternoon of the 8th, and the CEIRC committee on the 9th)

b) **2007/1.** Note that the proposed start date for a 3-week study tour of India is late January or early February.

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

1487. **CAUL Finances.** Diane Costello

a) **CAUL Budget 2006.** Diane Costello

b) **CAUL Budget 2007.** Diane Costello

i) **CEIRC Budget.** Diane Costello included an annual increase of 5% in the CEIRC levy for 2007, as previously proposed in the budget paper for 2005/2. It had not been raised at the CEIRC committee meeting in August.

**From Heather Gordon:** An annual increase was not approved previously by CAUL and should have been discussed first with CEIRC and the recommendation should come from CEIRC. I think that it does merit discussion by CEIRC and that the recommendation should come from CEIRC. I am not against or commenting on the salary increases but it
does provide an opportunity for CEIRC to consider how it operates and what a 5% increase annually means to that operation. As such I will vote against the motion at CAUL.

From the CEIRC minutes 2005/4:

**CEIRC Budget.** Review of the draft 2006 CEIRC Program budget for operational activities. Diane Costello foreshadowed changes to the 2006 budget due to the accounted cost for program support, *viz.* 85% of the time of CEIRC assistant. It was recommended (Heather Gordon/Gulcin Cribb) that the CEIRC fee be increased by 5% to $1,260 and $1,890 respectively for CAUL and external participants, and recommended that a CPI increase be built in annually. Approved. *(Action: DC)*

Members noted that CPI does not cover the increase in salaries but that CAUL had agreed that the program should make a profit. It was agreed that the supporting documentation to the budget carry forward to CAUL, for approval at the meeting, and noted that formal recommendations should be handled via the CEIRC committee. *(Action: EW)*

1488. Risk assessment for CAUL  Andrew Wells

1489. Other business.

The meeting concluded at 12 noon.
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1490. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President),
Jeff Murray, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Derek Whitehead. In attendance: Diane Costello.
Guests: Sue Hutley and Dagmar Schmidmaier joined the meeting at 10am on the 8th.

1491. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2006/5 and CAUL Meeting 2006/2. The minutes are yet to
be circulated. (Action: DC) Items for attention are listed below in business arising.

1492. Business Arising from CAUL 2006/2 and Executive 2006/5, not otherwise listed on
the agenda.

a) AICTEC. Vivienne Teoh is exploring options for the hosting of the AICTEC secretariat
with a like-minded organisation in Canberra. Eve Woodberry has advised AICTEC that
CAUL is unable to take on this responsibility at present.

b) CAUL Research Levy. Derek Whitehead will scope a project for the use of data already
collected in libraries. (Action: DW) Derek will do this but it will be removed from the
agenda.

c) CAUL Elections and Working Groups. Andrew Wells was re-elected Deputy President
unopposed; Heather Gordon was elected to the Executive Committee following a ballot,
from Keith Webster and Shirley Oakley; Philip Kent was elected to the CEIRC Committee
following a ballot, from Anne Horn. The Executive nominated Andrew Wells as chair of
the CEIRC committee. Liz Curach has taken on the chair of the Best Practice Working
Group. The ULA Working Group is being reconstituted with CAUL members only. A
Working Group chaired by Helen Livingston is reviewing the protocols for services to
offshore students. It has been redrafted and will be reviewed by the group before
circulation. (Action: DC) Teaching and learning protocols will also be reviewed to see
that the links are there.

i) Information Literacy Working Group. Philip Kent, Con Graves, Greg Anderson all
volunteered to be on the new working group. Diane Costello will call for interest in
membership. (Action: DC)

d) NSLA (formerly CASL). CAUL members will be consulted on opportunities and topics
for further discussion with NSLA members. It will be useful to meet with them periodically,
and hear what their issues and priorities are. It was agreed to keep the channels of
communication open, perhaps at conferences.

Suggested areas of cooperation are digitisation, strategies for leadership, marketing,
communications, staff development, staff exchanges. should have a national digitisation
plan. Anne Marie Schwirtlich represents libraries on the Collections Council of Australia. It
was agreed that protocols for digitisation are needed. The project to digitise national
newspapers is still in train – awaiting a business plan. Another area of overlap is
copyright. Alan Smith represents NSLA on the ALCC, and is involved in IPRIA.
e) **UniSA Business Information Management course.** Professor Paula Swatman wrote to CAUL in June suggesting that the CAUL Executive discuss the future of the course with them. Alan Smith, SLSA, has been involved in the course development. It begins February 2007, and information technology is embedded throughout.

f) **Carrick Institute. Disciplines-based Initiatives Scheme.**
http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/pid/120 Derek Whitehead recommended that members may make use of these funds for information literacy developments. He suggested that CAUL should stay engaged with the Resource Identification Network (RIN). CAUL should pursue every opportunity to be represented at these meetings. *(Action: DC)*

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

1493. **Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).** A revised plan was circulated to the CAUL Executive on November 6th. The plan covers those activities and issues that CAUL can address collaboratively, rather than individual or institutional activities.

At the CAUL meeting, it was suggested that information access be emphasized better, as most now focus on service delivery and models. Libraries Australia could be considered a part of this. It is more a guiding principle than a specific action, and winds through other areas of the plan. Is there anything that CAUL should be doing e.g. getting cheaper deals on information access?

At the CAUL meeting it was suggested that CAUL’s research agenda was too narrowly defined and that CAUL should be involved with output rather than concentrating on input, and should partner more actively with the research community. (This area was specifically written to make it broader.) It was also suggested that CAUL should be more involved in managing and tracking research output. (This is covered under action 7 – repositories.)

At the CAUL meeting it was noted that there are no actions under Learning & Teaching to reflect online services – service delivery models, benchmarking, etc but were reminded that most actions are under other areas e.g. under research. It was noted that CAUL surveys are a form of benchmarking, but other forms may be inappropriate for learning and teaching. Add a “see also” other specific actions at the end of each section. *(Action: DC)*

It was suggested that CAUL build a framework and develop a set of mechanisms to measure the value of collections and to define the benefits of library services and collections to the academic enterprise. The framework would vary across types of universities, and needs to be built individually from the ground up. Andrew Wells has been discussing this with Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Vic Elliott and John Shipp, but they are yet to decide on the approach to take.

Members discussed the risks of developing such a document and questioned whether it would make any difference within the university. Would it be an economics exercise, a marketing exercise, an exercise in highlighting prestige? It was suggested that greater value could be achieved by contributing to the university's strategic plan or the elements that contribute to the strategic plan e.g. the research management plan, etc. How CAUL is presented within the institution is very important. More could be done to explain what CAUL adds to the institution e.g. savings, benefits, etc *(Action: DC)*

John Shipp suggested that CAUL members will have to manage the knowledge of the universities. To do this will require textual analysis skills, and skills similar to those required for digitisation projects. The above three items will be combined in Andrew Wells’ review. *(Action: AW)*

It appears that libraries are heading into serious economic times. It was suggested basing the May hot topics around case studies dealing with economic stringencies. *(Action: Executive)*

Diane Costello will produce short form in a version that prints nicely, in pdf. *(Action: Executive)*

1494. **CAUL Achievement Award 2006.** Nominations have been received from the University of Queensland, Griffith University and the University of Western Australia. It was agreed to make the award to Jocelyn Priddey. *(Action: DC)*
CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1495. E-Research Coordinating Committee. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the government has not yet released the report. The CAUL group will not be convened until it is released.

1496. Research Quality Framework. A government decision on the model is expected on November 14.


Linda O’Brien suggested that the NCRIS Platforms for Collaboration will only provide funding for science, but the same platforms will be usable for humanities and social sciences.

Three sets of consultations are underway - AAA, data management, eResearch toolkit. AAA is authentication, authorisation and accounting - this area is effectively covered by MAMS. CAUL should maintain links with MAMS, MAPS, ERCC, NCRIS, etc RAMP is now DRAMA.

Chin Nguyen is responsible for the eResearch toolkit. It can be used to set up personal space for collaboration within and between institutions e.g. RSS feed, wikis, blogs, etc DEST was asked to mandate that the toolkits be used for projects funded through DEST.

The only area in CAUL’s space is data management. CAUL should scope the problem and identify who is responsible for addressing it. Nobody is doing this really well. CAUL could run seminars and bring in those who are working in the area. John Shipp will be consulted re the best approach for CAUL. (Action: CH-R) Repositories are not managing datasets or software versions so it isn’t obvious that libraries might be best able to deal with these areas.

1498. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells reported that Tom Girke has produced an interesting marketing plan. It raises the question about how much CEIRC should grow. The risk management plan will be reviewed and used to conduct an audit, paying particular attention to licence terms related to long-term access.

Jeff Murray raised the issue of lack of availability of current e-books for a range of types and disciplines. He asked that publishers be lobbied to improve the volume of content available. (Action: AW)

a) National Licensing Working Group. Heather Gordon recommended that she continue to participate until governance committee is finished its work. It was agreed to write to the NLA, advising that CEIRC will coordinate offers that come through and Diane Costello will act as an information conduit within CAUL, but CAUL prefers not to commit further CAUL resources to governance activities. Refer to the good work done on the head deed agreement. (Action: DC)

1499. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells reported on the policy group meeting. The Technical Committee has proposed that the Virginia Tech software not be further supported. The Policy Group is planning a meeting in March to examine the ADT’s status and future. They will invite representatives of ARROW, APSR, RUBRIC, etc. It is unclear whether the NLA is committed to supporting the national discovery service, and this will have implications for the ADT. (Action: CH-R) A survey is being undertaken to look at the status of the program and the move towards repositories. Derek Whitehead noted that the OAK-Law project report looks at theses - some facts pertaining to the ADT were wrong, though there is a good discussion on third party copyright. He recommended that members read chapters 5 and 6. http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/

1500. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).

FRODO Projects

b) ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World).  
http://arrow.edu.au/ Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that ARROW is expanding into a broader community group. The next meeting is in Canberra on November 17.

The PILIN (Persistent Identifiers Linking Infrastructure) project has begun, led by Kerry Blinco, working with JISC, exploring the business case, the governance models and the technical requirements of a globally acceptable approach to persistent identifiers. Currently there are institutional solutions within ARROW which could be rolled into a wider solution. The best solution would involve an agency, possibly commercial, to manage persistent identifiers along the lines of the ISBN agencies.  
http://www.arrow.edu.au/PILIN.php

ARROW has been funded for  
1. preparing for the RQF;  
2. PILIN;  
3. creative development of ideas;  
4. stabilising the work done to date.

ARROW is aiming to find a backsets solution for publishers. Its e-press option is OJS, and its members can share their experience. The intent of ARROW is to capture the scholarly output of the university in any format. Toby Burrows’ AARL article on electronic journals describes some of the recent changes in the environment.  
http://alia.org.au/publishing/aarl/

c) MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).  
https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams  
Eve Woodberry attended a MAMS meeting on November 6 and reported that MAMS is now supporting federated access across a select number of institutions. MAMS is funded to the end of 2007, aiming to apply the work done to date e.g. encourage CAUDIT to implement some of its solutions. The mini-grants process is encouraging buy-in to this expansion.

It will be necessary to have a single directory system upon which to layer MAMS developments e.g. take out e-trust and put in Shibboleth. MAMS is working with database suppliers to shibbolise their databases, which should eventually mean that EZProxy won’t be needed. Shibboleth solutions are being rolled out in the UK. JISC has developed policies and documentation, which MAMS will pick up for local use. ARROW has specialists working with MAMS on Vital 3, the version which includes access mechanisms. Models of authentication and authorisation are being built outside the applications so that it doesn’t have to be built in to the application. MAPS will help to identify what applications are able to use authentication.

MAMS is also involved with the PKI project and the NCRIS PfC.

MERRI Projects

d) MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy).  

e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).  
http://www.rubric.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry

f) OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management).  

g) DART (Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation E-Research Technologies).  
http://dart.edu.au/


New Projects:

i) Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER) [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project]
j) **Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP)** [The project is organized into 3 areas, namely (1) RAMS (Research Activity Management System), (2) Activityflow Research and (3) DRAMA (Digital Repository Access Middleware Architecture).] [http://www.melcoe.mq.edu.au/projects/RAMP/index.htm](http://www.melcoe.mq.edu.au/projects/RAMP/index.htm) Chin Nguyen has taken over the RAMP project, focussing now on digital repositories and authorisation middleware priorities, DRAMA.

k) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.**

l) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project]

m) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.**

n) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] [http://ice.usq.edu.au/introduction/ice_rs.htm](http://ice.usq.edu.au/introduction/ice_rs.htm)

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1501. **University Library Australia.** CAUL approved a change in membership of the ULA working group to consist of CAUL members only - Shirley Oakley, chair, Imogen Garner, Jan Gordon, Fides Datu Lawton and Diane Costello. Other members of the group have been advised.

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1502. **Best Practice Working Group.** Liz Curach is acting chair of the BPWG. Jeff Murray has circulated notes of the September meeting. Diane Costello has established an email list for the group.

1503. **Statistics.**

1504. **Library MIS Workshop.** Diane Costello will conduct a CAUL survey.

1505. **Workforce Planning.** Eve Woodberry (Linda Luther?)

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1506. **Communication.** (Standing item)

a) **Public Relations/ Media Reports.** The statement on the removal of books denied classification by the Classification Review Board from the shelves of the University of Melbourne Library has generated a huge amount of coverage in all areas of the press. A statement was released on September 25, jointly prepared by CAUL, IFLA, ALIA and the Australian Society of Authors. Derek Whitehead suggested that the government is dealing with political works as though they were pornography, and CAUL should work with others to change this. He has written to Irene Graham of Electronic Frontiers Australia. Eve Woodberry will contact the Australian Society of Authors to discuss their future plans. UNSW has a procedure to check the Classification Review Board site regularly. Andrew Wells will advise CAUL if anything relevant is added. (Action: AW)

It was agreed to develop a resource for CAUL members to advise their Vice-Chancellors and Academic Boards. Diane Costello will send package of information to Cathrine Harboe-Ree who will draft a document with Derek Whitehead. (Action: DC)

Professor Glyn Davis wrote to the Attorney-General to request that universities be exempted, however this implies that researchers should not be subject to the same rules as others when it is preferable that all should have access. Librarians are champions of lifelong learning, and should not be expected to restrict access. At present, only indigenous materials are restricted in some cases, while other “rare books” do not require the reader to identify themselves.

Decisions of the Classification Review Board are online at [http://www.oflc.gov.au/special.html?n=262&p=66](http://www.oflc.gov.au/special.html?n=262&p=66) though there is no mechanism for automatically informing interested parties when a decision has been made and published.
Implementation of the decisions is defined by state law, not federal law. Media Releases are at http://www.oflc.gov.au/special.html?n=196&p=174 which is the best place to see quickly the classification awarded.

References in the media are listed below. In addition, correspondence has been received from the following: Stephen Blanks, Secretary, NSW Council for Civil Liberties; Michael McKinnon, FOI Editor, The Australian; Jessica Train, Newcastle Radio 2NUR; Peter Rose, Editor, Australian Book Review; Emmett Stinson, Fiction Editor, Wet Ink; Doug McIntyre [xqzart@gmail.com]; Dominique Wilson, co-Managing Editor, Wet Ink; Laura Buttigieg, Journalist - Westside News, Quest Community Newspapers

i) ABC Radio Hobart. Interview with Alex Byrne. 26 September


iii) ABC Lateline. Broadcast: 02/10/2006 Melbourne Uni to challenge terrorism laws. Australian Broadcasting Corporation Reporter: Helen Brown Interviewees were the Attorney-General, Philip Ruddock, Professor Glyn Davis and Derek Whitehead.

iv) The Chronicle of Higher Education October 2, 2006 Australian University Library Seeks Exemption From Ban on Books Said to Inspire Terrorism By DAVID COHEN

v) The Sydney Morning Herald October 3, 2006 - 10:34AM Academics could get banned terror books.

vi) ABC News Online October 3, 2006. 5:26am (AEST) Ruddock may allow researchers access to banned books.

vii) SBS Radio. Interview with Alex Byrne. Richard Ewart. 3 October

viii) Sydney Morning Herald. October 4, 2006Phillip Coorey Chief Political Correspondent Book ban anger: it will hinder freedoms

ix) The Australian. 4 October.

(1) p.22 Ruddock barriers impede research, by Brendan O'Keefe (HE)
(2) p.4 Ruddock to rethink ban on 'hate books' by Samantha Maiden (political correspondent)
(3) p.15 Throw the book at 'em: government must tread warily when restricting jihadi texts (editorial)

x) Newsmakers. Tuesday 03 October 2006

*Vice-Chancellor Glyn Davis discusses the banning of research books dealing with Jihad, which he says will limit legitimate research and educational experiences of staff and students at the University. Glyn Davis wrote to Federal Attorney-General Phillip Ruddock for clarification on the issue. Phillip Ruddock says he will review the Vice-Chancellor’s concerns.

-ABC Channel 2, Lateline, Monday 02 September (sic)
-The Age, Tuesday 03 October, page 3

For more information visit http://uninews.unimelb.edu.au/articleid_3707.html

*Federal Attorney-General Phillip Ruddock will consider allowing restricted access to books banned because they insight terrorism. Mentions that the University of Melbourne has removed three books from its library shelves amid concerns it could be breaking the law.

-ABC 774 Melbourne Tuesday 03 October
-ABC 702 Sydney Tuesday 03 October
-2SM Sydney Tuesday 03 October
-Triple J Melbourne, Tuesday 03 October
-SBS Radio Tuesday 03 October
-ABC 66 Canberra, Tuesday 03 October
-ABC 612 Brisbane, Tuesday 03 October
xi) Panorama. Student Youth Network, Melbourne. 9 October. Interview with Eve Woodberry.

xii) Times Higher Education Supplement. 6 October. Anger at ban on books on terror. Geoff Maslen.

xiii) SCONUL e-bulletin September 06. Terrorism legislation in Australia.


xv) Uni staff in a bind over binned journals
September 5, 2006 THE University of NSW has thrown out its collection of international law journals.

xvi) inCite. November 2006

(1) p.12. Article by Heather Gordon on CEIRC business practices and tools for institutions. ‘License management tools available from CEIRC.’

(2) p.30. Who’s where. Sandra Jeffries appointment to USC.

(3) p.32. Making news.... additional reference to “Anger at ban on books on terror” The Times Higher Education Supplement, 6 October, Geoff Maslen, plus “Banning of books upsets librarians” Sunday Tasmanian, 1 October, Christopher Bantick.

b) inCite Schedule. Jeff Murray to do community partnerships in March, Andrew Wells to do licences in June, Cathrine Harboe-Ree to do academic libraries in August, customer service in September and library buildings in November (perhaps Maxine Brodie), copyright in December; Andrew Wells will do a piece on UNSW Asia. (Action: DC)

c) AARL. Ross Harvey wrote:

I’m the editor of AARL, and am interested in learning from CAUL about how AARL might publish material that can better match the interests of a large part of its potential (and actual, one hopes) readership. I would also like to know about who you might suggest as possible authors to address some of these topics.

It was noted that CAUL has several people on the editorial board already. Diane Costello to volunteer to ask CAUL members to contribute, and to inquire whether AARL has a schedule of themed issues. (Action: DC) Eve Woodberry will send her paper from IFLA 2006. (Action: EW)

d) CAUL Report 2005-6. The report is underway. (Action: DC)

e) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is appended to this agenda. Diane Costello reported briefly on the IFLA survey and on the procurement project.

1507. CAUL Web Site. Jeff Murray circulated the project proposal and draft RFP on October 30 and requested feedback. He will edit and circulate for one more check by the Executive before calling for interest from the sector, possibly in November. (Action: JM)

It was suggested directing submissions to Diane Costello by late January for circulation to the Executive. $25,000 was included in the budget. Content migration is included in this, but should be priced separately.

The evaluation should cover: the ability to be migrated to another site; extent to which it is standards driven; able to be updated and maintained by someone who isn’t a webmaster, and by multiple people. A service level agreement covering backup and data recovery is essential – currently a copy of the site is housed on a laptop and files are uploaded to the server. A fully fledged content management system is not required.
Diane Costello is meeting with ANU regarding current setup and future plans to ensure that CAUL's site is supported. (Action: DC)

Andrew Wells and Cathrine Harboe-Ree can suggest names of site developers, used for ARROW, DAAO, etc. Other suggestions are CSU (who designed the CAUDIT site) and Swinburne. (Action: All)

1508. Copyright. Eve Woodberry and Derek Whitehead reported. The revised Copyright Act, with changes to Technological Protection Measures, must be in place by January 1. The changes were combined into an omnibus bill with TPM appended and it appears to be too late to make any changes - the exposure draft changes the definition of the library; further limits fair dealing; makes 10% exhaustive; takes away references to “insubstantial portion”. The LACA committee met November 6, but would discuss only caching, not fair dealing, with university representatives - their intention is to strengthen the copyright ownership part of the Act, bowing to owner interests, particularly those from the US through the FTA-induced changes.

Statistics indicate that photocopying is declining but CAL claims the opposite, which suggests that it is picking up material covered by contract. Copying in departments or printing centres may affect the figures. It is important to understand patterns of use of our online reserves, what is in them, how they are used; a link is not a copy; CEIRC contracts generally cover electronic reserve and course-packs for journals, but not necessarily databases. Eve Woodberry and Derek Whitehead will draft a briefing note to Vice-Chancellors on these issues. (Action: EW, DW) It was suggested that data collected through Baker and Mackenzie would be covered by legal privilege.

1509. Submissions to Public Inquiries.


b) NCRIS. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy.

- March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.
- March - September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals
- Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved

1510. Relationships with other organisations.

a) ALIA. Sue Hutley, Executive Director, and Dagmar Schmidmaier, ALIA President, joined the meeting at 10am on the 8th. They discussed the governance of ALIA, the education of professionals and the health of the profession, the value of libraries, censorship.

Governance.

ALIA is working to engage with all institutional members, and to redefine ALIA's role. It is proposing a change in the constitution to move to two-year terms for board members and president. It is moving towards standing committees aligned with planning and budgets, to be chaired by board members. It is planning a greater education role for board members, in recognition of the size of the corporation and its requirements for strategic directions, a financial plan and an investment plan. ALIA is looking for ways to encourage senior members to stand for election to the board and to serve on accreditation panels who meet with deans, Vice-Chancellors and Deputy Vice-Chancellors.

The profession.

The discussion focussed on library schools and their assessment, their use (or lack thereof) of professionals to showcase real jobs, the role of university librarians as advocates and role models in careers fairs and recruitment, the change in balance between the numbers of professionals and library technicians. ALIA is participating in careers fairs and has noted the significant presence of universities - it was suggested that CAUL members participate with their universities. They were looking at the differences in
presentation and image between accountants and librarians – accountants have a well-
documented body of knowledge and standards and are a recognised source of specialist
advice; their requirement for a professional year is recognised by employers.

ALIA is looking at moving into career counselling, not necessarily at the operational level.
It wants to expand on-the-job training to fulfil the requirements of those who will only
hire “experienced” staff.

Keith Webster has joined the education standing committee. Andrew Wells advised that
he has become patron of the New Librarians group. He added that UNSW is directing
projects at its IT Services as a way of encouraging their interest in digital libraries. The
State Library of Victoria commissioned a study on workforce planning. [Workforce
Sustainability and Leadership: Scoping Research April 2006 by Brigid van Wanrooy
Workplace Research Centre.
http://www.libraries.vic.gov.au/downloads/Public_Libraries_Unit/final_workforce_scoping_report_iul_06.pdf] It was suggested that Sue Hutley participate in CAUL’s workforce
planning theme in May. (Action: DC) ALIA will hold a workshop when Gillian Hallam’s
report is released; (Action: Executive)

The value of libraries.

The discussion covered why governments at all levels should be investing in libraries –
with different arguments for public and university libraries – space, community,
collections, professional contribution; identify why schools are being built around their
libraries; develop a value statement – not a dollar statement, though it may be linked.

Censorship.

Two current issues for ALIA are internet filtering and censorship. Members discussed how
to bring the latter to the attention of those able to reach the electorate e.g. sympathetic
senators and MPs, independent think tanks, IFLA representatives, etc. It is a practical
issue for universities.

b) CAUDIT & ACODE. Joint meeting will follow this meeting. ACODE will not be
represented.

i) EDUCAUSE 2007. Standing Item.

c) National Library of Australia.

i) Libraries Australia (Kinetica) Cost Allocation Model. Andrew Wells circulated a
draft Memorandum of Understanding with the National Library.

Derek Whitehead suggested some rewording: The annual contribution from CAUL
members entitles them to unlimited use of identified Libraries Australia services ..." Other
services will be provided at discounted prices to CAUL members.

Linda Luther has written to the Executive with a revised draft of the MOU based on the
CAUL paper with comments from John Arfield included.

Members reviewed previous discussions re:

whether CAUL should attempt to act as an intermediary - a new role - between the NLA
and its university customers or whether the NLA should continue to deal individually with
the institutions;

CAUL cannot commit the sector to a given contribution to Libraries Australia, nor expect
institutions to pay more should others drop out; CEIRC can handle subscriptions but the
product and the licensing conditions need to be clearly spelled out; CAUL made several
attempts to devise a fair model, but compared with current contributions to Libraries
Australia, there were too many winners and losers for members to be able to commit to
any of the options presented; complicating factors included members who use UNILINK
and Northern Territory who have an ‘all of Territory’ agreement. This suggests that the
MOU with the NLA needs to be wider than just Libraries Australia. The question for the
Executive is how far we go in formalising an agreement with the NLA and what it should cover.

following CAUL 2006/1, CAUL requested that the NLA provide information about the "product", the business model, the communication channels, etc but only a pricing model has been proposed; CAUL members see a number of products - a database, a discovery service (including the “free” service), a bibliographic utility - and their individual use of these products has changed and is changing; a business model/plan should describe how these are likely to change over time and how they will be funded; it should also take into account other services which can compete with Libraries Australia, particularly for the larger institutions;

what assistance can CAUL be to the NLA in identifying areas of benefit and savings for mutual benefits - this would require sharing of data/information; is Libraries Australia considered a business or a collaborative enterprise?

CAUL members are highly likely to take the public good aspect into account when deciding to continue to support Libraries Australia, though their altruism may be limited; their holdings already make a significant contribution to the public good.

It was agreed to arrange a meeting with the NLA, and include Linda Luther and John Arfield if possible. (Action: DC)

ii) Peak Bodies Forum. The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007.

iii) CONZUL. Liz Curach represented CAUL at the October meeting in Wellington and provided a report to the Executive.

1511. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2007/1. Melbourne, May 3-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. Suggested items for the agenda include:

i) ADT Business Plan. Operational review. Andrew Wells

ii) RFID. Craig Anderson. Held over from CAUL 2006/2

iii) e-framework. Kerry Blinco or Neil McLean.

iv) Rodski. Stan Rodski has offered to participate in any way needed.

v) Management Information Systems Forum/ Workshop.

vi) Copyright Changes.

b) CAUL Meeting 2007/2. Adelaide, 18-19 (tbc) September 2007. It was agreed to stay with mid-September because of school holidays.

c) CAUL meeting 2008/1. CONZUL has suggested that a joint CAUL/CONZUL meeting be held in Auckland in April, 2008 in conjunction with IATUL 2008. It was agreed to ask members whether they would be likely to attend IATUL, noting that few stayed on for ALIA after the Perth meeting. The alternative would be Sydney. Diane Costello will draft a message to CAUL. (Action: DC)

1512. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) Draft schedule for 2007. Potential clashes:

2007 - Sydney Online runs January 30-February 1; Easter 6-9 April; ICOLC April 23-27; ALA Washington D.C. June 21-27 (Blackwell Library Advisory Board); IFLA 19-23 August, Durban, South Africa; October 23–26 Seattle, Washington EDUCAUSE 2007; ARROW meeting 30 November;

2008 - IFLA Québéco City – Québec, Canada, 10-14 August 2008;

Planned Leave: Diane - mid-May to mid-June; Andrew – 25 May to 24 June;

Note that the proposed 2-week study tour of India is February 4-17. Eve Woodberry is participating.
i) 2007/1. Sydney, Friday 2 February, in conjunction with Sydney Online at UNSW.

ii) 2007/2. Sydney, Monday 19 March at UNSW.


v) 2007/5. Adelaide, Monday 17 September, in conjunction with CAUL 2007/2. tbc

vi) 2007/6. Sydney, Tuesday 20 November from 1pm and Wednesday 21 November from 9am, in conjunction with CCA, afternoon of 21 November.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1513. CAUL Finances. As this is Derek Whitehead’s last meeting, Cathrine Harboe-Ree volunteered to be treasurer. It was noted that the budget presentation is getting close to the required format.


i) CEIRC Levy. At CAUL 2006/2, members approved that the 5% be agreed to this year, and that CEIRC review it for 2008. John Shipp commented that the University of Sydney saves an enormous amount of money through CEIRC. He asked whether a flat fee was still appropriate?

ii) EDUCAUSE attendance. Budget approximately $1,200 for early bird registration and 2 nights extra in Melbourne for the Executive Officer. (Action: DC)

1514. Risk assessment for CAUL. Andrew Wells circulated a draft on October 25. Diane Costello will forward amendments to Andrew Wells, with governance separated from administration, including all risks, including those that are already being addressed, with a cover note for high priority items. (Action: DC)

1515. Other business. Members expressed thanks to Derek Whitehead for his time and wonderful contribution over a number of years, and particularly for advice on copyright and statistics.

The meeting closed at 12:30 pm
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1516. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Jeff Murray. In attendance: Diane Costello. Eve Woodberry welcomed Heather Gordon to her first meeting of the CAUL Executive.

1517. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2006/5, 2006/6 and CAUL Meeting 2006/2. Minutes of 2006/5 and 2006/6 have been circulated, amendments have been incorporated, and accepted.

1518. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1519. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

a) Publication. It was agreed that a short form be produced. Options include a two pager that includes only the action items, or a four page booklet which can include the rationale behind the actions. It was agreed to send 10 copies of the booklet version to each University Librarian for circulation internally. (Action: DC)

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1520. E-Research Coordinating Committee. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that CAUDIT is planning a data management seminar in April, and suggested that CAUL replicate it. The program will be circulated when available so CAUL can decide. (Action: CH-R) APSR is holding a conference in 2007, June 27-29 Brisbane eResearch Australasia 2007. It appears unlikely that the work will proceed as there is no agreement at the governmental level. The report is generally available. The future of the CAUL eResearch working group is unclear. The work is effectively being undertaken under NCRIS. The centres will now not go ahead, but may proceed under NCRIS. CAUL members can play an advocacy role within their institutions, particularly related to the humanities.

1521. Research Quality Framework. Eve Woodberry and Cathrine Harboe-Ree attended a meeting at DEST on December 6 regarding preparation for management of the RQF. Others present were Tom Cochrane, John Shipp, David Groenewegen (ARROW) and Adrian Burton (APSR). DEST announced the Australian access federation, effectively MAMS work. A DEST survey on institutional readiness was sent to the Pro Vice-Chancellors (Research) and the University Librarians. Two forums on the RQF implementation are planned for February.

As part of the process, members of assessment panels will need access to published versions of journal articles, and CAUL will be asked to assist in providing access to these articles. Monash has arranged permission from several larger publishers (Elsevier, Springer and Taylor & Francis) to copy the published versions of the cited material. Each institution would hold its own collection. Either deposit to repository and provide temporary access or copy to CD and distribute it. If the publisher agrees to allow a copy to be held locally, this would not be
included in the CAL audit. In the UK, they plan to link through to the published version, but
cannot assume members can do the same here. Publishers have understood that this would
be a precedent – copying to a repository and providing access. The reviewers will come in via
a DEST portal, and be redirected to the institutional repository. The trial begins in 2008.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree will ask David Groenewegen to draft a briefing paper for the CAUL
Executive. (Action: CH-R) It was suggested that costs be attributed to DEST.

1522. NCRIS (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy). Platforms for
Collaboration. Capability 5.16. Diane Costello will ask John Shipp for the latest on NCRIS and
whether further monitoring on the web site is necessary. (Action: DC) [Later note: detailed
activity for PfC will only be provided through http://www.pfc.org.au//cgi-bin/twiki/view]

1523. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells reported
on the meeting on 30 January. The 2006 operational plan is largely completed, and a further
two-year plan will be drafted. A formal review of high risks will be conducted at the second
and fifth meetings of the year. The committee welcomed representatives from Sage/EBSCO
and Taylor and Francis to discuss proposals and problems. Archiving, preservation and
perpetual access to electronic information will stay on the agenda, and it is recommended as a
hot topic at the next CAUL meeting, and regularly thereafter. Andrew Wells referred to the
CLIR report which urges publishers enter into partnership with e-journal archives initiatives.
http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub138abst.html He reported on the Datasets Coordinators’
forum on January 29, and the workshop on usage statistics being organised by Neil Renison
and Colleen Cleary for mid-year. CAVAL is collaborating in the planning and the Executive
should determine the level of subsidisation by CAUL. It will be held in Melbourne or Sydney.

a) CEIRC Marketing Plan. The plan was drafted by Tom Girke with John Redmayne. It
raised questions about whether CEIRC should grow by a particular percentage e.g. 15%.
The original strategic directions document referred to process improvements and
efficiency, and this will be a focus in 2007. It was suggested that CAUL’s 2003/2 decision
for the program to make a $10,000 profit be reversed. (Action: Executive)

It was agreed that the marketing plan should not sit in isolation from the business plan.
The program is intended to serve the needs of CAUL members, and if it moves away from
member requirements, some ownership may be lost. Membership may already have
reached saturation point, with expansion targets unnecessary. The biggest advantage of
the wider membership is in the perception of CAUL – offering services to a wider research
community – rather than in financial advantage to CAUL members. Heather Gordon wrote
an article for inCite on what is offered to non-members via the web site and external
participation. She noted that the draft CEIRC minutes are available so quickly that the
chair’s report is almost redundant.

There is a body of work around the business case, stimulated by the marketing plan, and
it may be worth revisiting it with the many new CAUL members, and with all operating
under tight budgets. Even if CEIRC is deemed to be excellent value, will members still
want to pay for it? The biggest risk is that the Go8 will negotiate on their own outside
CEIRC.

It was noted that most of the renegotiated packages have achieved better conditions and
lower price caps. It is difficult to put a cost on the benefit of not having to negotiate for
each licence.

The committee would like to understand better the unit costs of the CEIRC program –
what does it cost to take on a new member? do external members cost more than CAUL
members? are external members being subsidised in any way by CAUL members? what
is the cost of taking on new products? is it better not to take on new products if there is
a low demand?

It was noted that it is not possible to determine demand until the membership is polled,
by which time much of the work will have been done. It was also noted that the growth
in products is more time consuming than the growth in members.
It was suggested employing a consultant to review system costs, evaluate operational processes and suggest process improvement. Should the CAUL budget be used for these process improvements.

The CEIRC budget process should involve the defining and scoping the work plans, identification of costs, then salary costs and budgets. Diane Costello is monitoring the allocation of time across CAUL/CEIRC. She added that the bulk of audit and accounting costs ought to be attributed to the CEIRC program.

The source and amount of interest earned, especially on the foreign currency accounts, will be more clearly reported in the budget (Action: DC)

b) **CEIRC Budget.** See CAUL budget item.

c) **National Licensing Working Group.** Eve Woodberry wrote to the National Library to advise that CAUL had been happy to contribute, but it was time to withdraw. CEIRC will manage offers as with other vendors. Heather Gordon reported that the product evaluation was 99% complete but the reference group has not yet finalised the governance document, nor closed off the group and working groups. The committee structure then has to be established. The National Library will manage the process.

d) **NPG Invitation.** Andrew Wells advised members that Diane Costello had been invited to the next meeting of the Nature Publishing Group’s Library Committee. Members queried whether the invitation to CAUL/CEIRC or to Diane Costello personally, what is the term of “office” and whether someone else could represent CAUL. (Action: DC) It was considered generally valuable to have input into publishers’ advisory boards.

NPG has proposed holding regular conference lunches with guest speakers. Heather Gordon suggested that exposés on activities in other countries would be of interest.

1524. **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.**

a) **Membership Survey 2006.** A key purpose of the survey was to determine members’ preparedness for being weaned off the VT software into other institutional repositories. Andrew Wells reported that all members had responded to the ADT status survey. Everyone will have an institutional repository by the end of 2008, most before the end of 2007. No-one wishes to start using VT, but rather will begin depositing theses in other institutional repositories. RUBRIC has developed a process for migrating data to other repositories, ARROW and DSpace. Mandatory submission has increased dramatically. With the current status, approximately 60% of current theses will be digitised.

b) **Workshop on the Future of the ADT.** Andrew Wells spoke to the proposed agenda for a “futures workshop on the ADT” at the next ADT meeting in March 2006. The workshop could include other stakeholders, e.g. an expert in institutional repositories, particularly in research area, e.g. ARROW, DEST and NLA/NLNZ.

1525. **ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).** Two forums are being held in February. DEST aims to have open access repositories in all institutions.

**FRODO Projects** Cathrine Harboe-Ree noted that participants have learned a vast amount through these projects.

a) **APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories).**

http://www.apsr.edu.au/

b) **ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World).**

http://arrow.edu.au/ Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that 16 institutions have bought a licence for the software.

c) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).**

https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams Eve Woodberry reported that the next meeting will be held February 5th. Further development will be rolled out via the access management federation, compatible with institutional access management. CEIRC should...
be encouraging more publishers to Shibbolise though it is more important for institutions to be. All institutional repositories will need to be Shibbolised.

MERRI Projects.

d) MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy). http://www.middleware.edu.au/ Jeff Murray reported that the middleware survey report is now available. A conference on the legal framework for eResearch will be held 11-12 July, with keynote speakers Dr Michael Spence and Paul Uhlir.

e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively). http://www.rubric.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry reported. The aim was for smaller institutions to testbed some solutions to see whether they would join ARROW, APSR or other solutions. It is a process for decision-making. All have made decisions about which solutions will be implemented. It was noted that Peter Sefton is involved in Shibbolising VITAL.

i) e-framework.

f) OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management). http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry reported that the first report has been receiving a great deal of positive feedback. Chapters 5 and 6 and particularly interesting.

g) DART (Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation E-Research Technologies). http://dart.edu.au/ Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that most effort is now going into ARCHER, but DART is delivering what it is supposed to. 32 modules are being produced in a range of institutions.

h) E-Security Framework for Research. This is the revamped PKI, and is being rolled in with MAMS into the Australian Access Federation. An open source certificate-sharing tool was developed for using the synchrotron. It is likely that this will be replaced by Shibboleth. Certificates do expire, but are generally compatible with Shibboleth.

New Projects:

i) Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER) [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project] Cathrine Harboe-Ree will provide a report to CAUL. It will be managed by Andrew Treloar.

j) Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP). Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that this is a workflow activity which can inform system development. It is a concept project rather than operational, and is now completed.

k) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.

i) PILIN.

l) Legal Frameworks for e-Research [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Eve Woodberry

m) Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.

n) Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS) [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] Eve Woodberry reported that Peter Sefton is leading this project, based on self-submission.

CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1526. Information Literacy Working Group. Recommendations for the new ILWG were circulated to the Executive on December 8. Expressions of interest were called from CAUL members for membership in the revamped working group, and have been received from Greg Anderson, Linda Luther, Philip Kent, Leeanne Pitman, Helen Livingston, Anne Horn, Graham Black and Ruth Quinn. It was noted that no-one from the Go8 is participating but that this is not considered a problem. The group will be asked to choose its own chair. (Action: DC)
Assess information literacy skills, work with course developer to incorporate IL skills into the curriculum, assess again and work again with the developer. Rethinking information literacy – ask the ILWG to focus on looking at this newly.....

**1527. Carrick Institute.** It was recommended that CAUL monitor activities, particularly those related to the Resource Identification Network (RIN), and opportunities for CAUL to be represented at appropriate meetings. Diane Costello has signed up to the alerting facility. *(Action: DC)*

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

**1528. Statistics.** Diane Costello reported on the meeting of the CSFG held 1 February. Members discussed whether the annual statistics should continue to be made available in print. It was noted that many non-CAUL members receive it, however there is concern that it becomes outdated very quickly and the version on the web site is always the most current. Diane Costello will ask CAUL if there is support for retaining the print. *(Action: DC)*

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

**1529. Communication.** *(Standing item)*

**a) President’s Report.** Letters have been sent this year to the following: Steve O’Connor on his appointment to Hong Kong Polytechnic University; Director General of the National Library of Australia re CAUL’s ongoing role in the National Licensing Proposal. Eve Woodberry attended a meeting on the RQF at DEST in December.

**b) Public Relations/Media Reports.** Members were notified of the winner of the 2006 CAUL Achievement Award, Jocelyn Priddewy, and information was circulated also to ALIA and *Australian Library News*. Several CAUL members have been invited to submit articles to *inCite* over the year.

It would be interesting to know how members are dealing with the background paper on banning books prepared by Monash. Heather Gordon circulated the document to QULOC with information on the Queensland legislation.

The press announcement for the Emerald / CAUL Agreement was picked up at the Online Conference.

**c) CAUL Report 2005-6.** A skeleton of the report was circulated in early January. Suggestions from Heather Gordon, Cathrine Harboe-Ree and Andrew Wells have been included in the report. Further comments from Cathrine Harboe-Ree:

I agree with Heather’s helpful suggestions. In particular, I think there should be a financial statement. CAUL is not a company, but members could reasonably expect some financial reporting. I suggest the year end profit and loss statements and balance sheets. A cash flow statement would be desirable but is not as important in the CAUL annual report as the two I am recommending.

It was decided that the report is more an activity report than a regular annual report, so the financial information will not be included.

**d) Executive Officer’s Report.** The report is appended to this agenda. It was noted that Diane Costello has long service leave owing, and needs to be looked at, and contingency plans made for replacement. *(Action: DC)*

**1530. CAUL Web Site.** Jeff Murray circulated the project proposal and draft RFP on October 30 and requested feedback. A further revision was circulated December 12. It was affirmed that we would not use a CMS (content management system), and that non-technical personnel are expected to be able to update it easily. It will be circulated to CAUDIT and copied to CAUL members. The software and platform have not been specified. *(Action: JM)*

**1531. Copyright.** Eve Woodberry reported that Sarah Waladan has resigned, and a replacement process is underway. The ALCC generally holds one meeting a year. The annual Griffith University copyright conference will be held February 15th, and is a very valuable agenda-setting conference.
Eve Woodberry expressed concern about the AVCC-CAL negotiation process now that John Mullarvey has left the AVCC. The negotiation for the new AVCC contract starts this year. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will discuss with Richard Larkins, the AVCC deputy president. (Action: CH-R) Eve Woodberry has nominated for another term on the IFLA CLM committee. She added that the ALIA Committee on Copyright and Intellectual Property is very active.

1532. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) Review of the Higher Education Support Act 2003. Request for submissions and discussion paper Funding Cluster Mechanism (including Funding of Clinical Disciplines) Pipeline Arrangements for funding of new Commonwealth supported places received by CAUL 11/1/07, submissions due 26 February 2007. It was agreed to write and thank DEST for the invitation, but noting that CAUL has nothing to add. (Action: DC)

b) Productivity Commission. Science and Innovation Study. The draft report was released on November 2. [http://www.pc.gov.au/study/science/draftreport/index.html] SPARC offered to write a letter of support for recommendation 5.1 concerning deposit of funded research output into institutional repositories. Andrew Wells drafted CAUL's response, which was sent December 21.

c) Collections Council of Australia. CAUL was invited to comment on the review of the Collections Council of Australia. Derek Whitehead drafted the response which was sent November 22.

d) NCRIS. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy.

- March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.
- March – September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals
- Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved

1533. Relationships with other organisations.

a) CAUDIT & ACODE. A joint meeting was held in Melbourne on November 8. The draft minutes were circulated. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will be on the faculty of the CAUDIT institute again in 2007 and wishes to encourage more CAUL members to send staff. The institute will include a professional leadership component.

i) EDUCAUSE 2007. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the planning was working well. It would be interesting to get a profile of delegates – what stage of their career are they at.

b) ALIA. Sue Hutley wrote to CAUL to remind members that nominations for several ALIA Board positions are closing soon. It was noted that Derek Whitehead is standing for president-elect.

c) NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).

d) National Library of Australia.

i) Libraries Australia (Kinetica). It was noted that the NLA has decided to resume responsibility for determining individual subscriptions after attempting to find a parameter-based model which would be acceptable to all members. They plan to use the same model for all universities, rather than a service-based approach. The current subscription is essentially a flat fee based on the historical model.

(1) CAUL Representation on Libraries Australia Advisory Committee. John Arfield wrote to the President:

I was first nominated by CAUL as one of its two nominees on what was then the Kinetica Advisory Committee in 2002 for a two year period. This was then extended in 2004, and although I'm not sure whether that was for any particular period, and although there is no term fixed by the National Library on the CAUL nominees, and
although I’m quite happy to continue, its probably time after four years to let someone else have the opportunity of serving on the LAAC.

Diane Costello wrote to Jan Fullerton in mid-November re the potential for moving to a more regular turnover of representatives. The NLA will check their guidelines for membership terms and respond. CAUL’s term for its other committees is two years with up to one renewal. The NLA term may be longer because there are few meetings and continuity is important.

It was agreed to call for nominations from CAUL members.  (Action: DC)

(2) Cost Allocation Model. A meeting with NLA representatives was scheduled for Thursday 1 February from 10-12. Linda Luther attended and John Arfield joined by teleconference. Notes of the meeting are included as an appendix to these minutes.

(3) OCLC. The NLA is close to an agreement with OCLC re contribution to WorldCat and RLIN. Records will be synchronised between WorldCat and Libraries Australia. The NLA will write to all CAUL members.

ii) Newspaper Digitisation Project. It was noted that the NLA is planning to build its own platform for this service.

iii) Peak Bodies Forum. The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007.

The NLA will circulate a call for items for the agenda prior to the meeting and for those items to be accompanied by an issues paper. It is intended to be an information sharing meeting.

1534. CAUL Meetings. Members discussed whether to include other library staff at CAUL meetings. Previous delegates have expressed interest in attending meetings with their CAUL member. The opportunity for networking is a big incentive, and more usable than just reading papers or viewing presentations. Logistics is a major consideration. It was also suggested that members would have an uneven opportunity to participate. Is there potential for webcasts? It was noted that CAUDIT includes its deputies at one meeting of the year. Perhaps consider a "CAUL forum" with one day of hot topics?  (Action: Executive)

a) CAUL Meeting 2007/1. Melbourne, May 3-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. It was suggested that the topics be more targeted or themed, though the current model does allow people to discuss what they are currently working on. Diane Costello will draft a message for inviting contributions from CAUL.  (Action: DC) Suggested items for the agenda include:

i) ADT Business Plan. Operational review. Andrew Wells

ii) RFID. Craig Anderson. Held over from CAUL 2006/2. If it has been implemented, then this will be very useful. (Action: DC) Monash has implemented RFID in Malaysia and UNSW in Asia.

iii) e-framework. Kerry Blinco and Neil McLean are willing to speak to CAUL. It was suggested waiting until the work is more advanced.

iv) Rodski. Stan Rodski has offered to participate, but it was agreed to postpone until there is more comparative information available.

v) Management Information Systems Forum/Workshop. This will be kept on the list in case there is a gap in the schedule.

vi) It was suggested basing the May hot topics around case studies dealing with economic stringencies.}

vii) Restructuring. It was suggested that case studies on restructuring would be interesting - before, after and why.

viii) It had been suggested that Sue Hutley participate in a workforce planning theme in May - regarding where the profession is going and what skills are needed and
recruitment. It was agreed not to include this at the May meeting. QULOC has been focussing on this area.

ix) It has previously been suggested that Tricia Kelly, CSIRO’s senior librarian, be invited to this meeting. (Action: DC)

x) The CEIRC committee recommended that Portico, and the associated issues of archiving preservation and perpetual access, be included on the agenda.

xi) Jan Fullerton, NLA, will discuss Libraries Australia on Friday 4th in the morning. (Action: DC)

b) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, 18-19 (tbc) September 2007. It was agreed to stay with mid-September because of school holidays. (Action: DC) Suggested agenda items include:

i) **Monash project on resource discovery.**

b) **CAUL Meeting 2008/1.** CONZUL has suggested that a joint CAUL/CONZUL meeting be held in Auckland in April, 2008 in conjunction with IATUL 2008. It was decided to hold the meeting in Sydney. (Action: DC)

1535. **Forthcoming Executive Meetings.**

a) **Draft schedule for 2007.** Potential clashes:

2007
- study tour of India February 4-17 (Eve is attending);
- Springer North American Library Advisory Board March 14-17 (Diane attending);
- Easter 6-9 April;
- ICOLC Montreal April 22-25 (Diane is attending);
- IATUL, Stockholm, Sweden 11-14 June;
- ALA Washington D.C. June 21-27 (Blackwell Library Advisory Board);
- IFLA 19-23 August, Durban, South Africa;
- EDUCAUSE 2007 Seattle, Washington October 23–26;
- ARROW meeting 30 November;
- Planned Leave: Diane – mid-May to mid-June (tbc); Andrew – Singapore/Hong Kong April 8-17; 25 May to 24 June;

2008 – ICOLC, San Francisco, April 13-16; IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August 2008;

i) **2007/2.** Sydney, Monday 19 March, at UNSW Library. The workshop on the future of the ADT will be held on the 20th. (Action: DC)

ii) **2007/3.** Melbourne, Thursday 3 May (morning) in conjunction with CAUL 2007/1, Melbourne May 3-4; EDUCAUSE 2007 April 29-May 2.

iii) **2007/4.** Brisbane, Thursday 26 July, in conjunction with CCA, 27 July 2007 9am-1pm QULOC will be held in the afternoon of the 27th. Arrange at the Customs House. (Action: DC)

iv) **2007/5.** Adelaide, Wednesday 19 September in conjunction with CAUL 2007/2.

v) **2007/6.** Sydney, Tuesday 20 November from 1pm and Wednesday 21 November from 9am, in conjunction with CCA, afternoon of 21 November.

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

1536. **CAUL Finances.** The signatories on the CAUL accounts have been updated – they are now the new treasurer, Cathrine Harboe-Ree plus Eve Woodberry, Vic Elliott and Diane Costello. Any two may sign withdrawals from the CAUL accounts, but the usual signatories are the latter two.


1537. Risk assessment for CAUL. Proposed amendments to Andrew Wells’ draft were circulated by Diane Costello November 9, and updated January 15. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/risk-assessment2007.doc It was agreed to review high risk items regularly.

Legal. It was noted that there is a legislation alert service http://www.comlaw.gov.au/comlaw/subscriptions.nsf/subscription?OpenForm It was recommended reviewing how new legislation is covered at ANU and whether the library receives any relevant information. CAVAL’s approach may be useful.

CEIRC. Add “get a better understanding of costs”.

If checking new options for the location of the CAUL office, check with the University of Canberra. (Action: DC)

1538. Other business.

a) D-Lib Magazine. Request for CAUL sponsorship. CAUL’s guidelines state that if the organisation/activity is not of direct benefit to members, then CAUL does not contribute/join, however CAUL may offer to circulate information to members to invite them to sponsor the activity. (Action: DC)
Notes of the Meeting between the CAUL Executive and representatives of the National Library of Australia, 1 February 2007 from 10am, Sydney.

Present: from NLA: Jan Fullerton, Warwick Cathro, Tony Boston. from CAUL: Eve Woodberry, Andrew Wells, Jeff Murray, Heather Gordon, Linda Luther, John Arfield (by teleconference), Diane Costello. Apology: Cathrine Harboe-Ree

Eve Woodberry listed some items for discussion – Libraries Australia, the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee, the National Licensing Proposal, the Peak Bodies Forum – and Jan Fullerton added the newspaper digitisation project and OCLC.

The newspaper digitisation project is funded from the NLA’s depreciation funding. The search and delivery functions will be developed in-house. Nineteenth century papers will be digitised first, then the 20th century. CASL has funding to digitise some regional newspapers.

Libraries Australia. Jan Fullerton noted that a formula for Libraries Australia charges which would satisfy all subscribers was deemed impossible to find – CAUL was also unable to devise such a formula. In particular, usage was rejected as an option. Libraries Australia pricing will be based initially on the status quo, with nil to small (CPI) annual increases, moving towards a benchmark based on total library budget.

The NLA conducted a qualitative survey of 16 CEOs in Australia in August/September 2006, and concluded there was great support for ABN. Another survey, a quantitative survey of all CEOs, is planned. The survey identified a lack of understanding of the difference between Libraries Australia and ABN. It was agreed that a vision statement outlining what the Libraries Australia is, and does, could be included as part of the 2007-2009 business plan. It was agreed that Jan Fullerton will attend the CAUL meeting on May 4 to discuss Libraries Australia. It was suggested that the forthcoming comprehensive survey be used as a basis for discussion.

Members discussed the nature of the relationship between Libraries Australia and CAUL members, whether as partners of customers, what functions the service offers and which of those are being used or seen as important. The NLA definitely looks on it as a partnership. Members acknowledged the range of current relationships between the NLA and individual CAUL members, and affirmed the ongoing broader relationship between CAUL and the NLA. It was suggested that an annual meeting be held with the CAUL Executive. (Action: DC)

National Licensing Proposal. Jan Fullerton reported that a small number of products had been selected in the areas of news, general reference and health; details will be released in March. She acknowledged the good practical and moral support given by CAUL. It was noted that CEIRC will coordinate responses from CAUL institutions. The governance plan will be signed off at the next forum.

OCLC The NLA foreshadowed an agreement with OCLC for cataloguing access to WorldCat and RLIN for all Libraries Australia members. Synchronisation between Libraries Australia and WorldCat would be automatic.

Peak Bodies Forum. Jan Fullerton expressed support for widening the agenda of the Peak Bodies Forum, to consider broader information policy agendas across all sectors. Suggested items for the agenda should be accompanied by a briefing paper. The NLA would like support for legal deposit for digital publications. Jan Fullerton will draft a model letter.

Pandora. Two complete captures have been made of the .au domain, though not with the rigour of Pandora. Regional areas have expressed concern about their local websites. State libraries have done some work for Pandora, and they could be further involved, but it is a significant workload.

The meeting concluded at 11.30am
1539. **Attendance & Apologies.** Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Jeff Murray. In attendance: Diane Costello.

1540. **Minutes of CAUL Executive 2007/1, CAUL Meeting 2006/2.**

1541. **Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.**

    a) **D-Lib Magazine. Request for CAUL sponsorship.** It was noted that requests for this type of sponsorship are increasing. CAUL responded with a reference to its policy on external memberships and sponsorship.

    b) **Classification Review Board.** CAUL agreed to work with ALIA, but it was noted that legislation is state-based. This item will be added to the agenda of the Peak Bodies Forum.

    c) **Offshore Protocols.** The protocols have been updated by the working group, for presentation at the CAUL meeting. **(Action: DC)**

    d) **Communication of CAUL activity within institutions.** Members highlighted areas of CAUL activity which could be used within institutions as examples of CAUL’s adding value to individual institution – AUQA reports frequently refer to libraries’ benchmarking activity and Rodski client surveys, ROI from the CEIRC program, etc

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

1542. **Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).**

    a) **Publication.** It was agreed that a short form be produced.

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

1543. **eResearch.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree. Peter Nissen's report on the 2006 CAUDIT eResearch Study Tour was circulated for information. Ask CAUDIT if they are able to report at the next CCA meeting, especially regarding follow-up actions. **(Action: DC)** John Shipp, Linda O'Brien and Cathrine Harboe-Ree are addressing this issue at the next CAUDIT meeting, from their own institutional perspective.

1544. **Research Quality Framework.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree and Derek Whitehead were both speakers at APSR’s colloquia on the RQF, February 13 and 15. Andrew Wells and Diane Costello attended as delegates.

    DEST organised a meeting in Brisbane on March 9 - Diane Costello described the proposed approach to obtain publishers’ permissions for handling the RQF evidence, noting that the assessors will want to use the publisher’s version. Access will be provided only to the assessors, via the DEST portal. DEST is keen to support institutional repositories in all universities.

    Cathrine Harboe-Ree suggested that some institutions will want a fully dark repository and others won’t. Andrew Wells noted the importance of keeping the open access ARROW separate from the RQF ARROW.
Cathrine Harboe-Ree raised the issue of whether it is CAUL’s role to be handling this work. It was agreed that DEST should be responsible for the negotiations, even if CAUL is assisting with the contacts. In the UK, it was negotiated within the RAE. DEST is concerned about anonymity, and should bear responsibility for the additional work required. What is the risk for CAUL? What are the resourcing implications? It was agreed that Eve Woodberry would discuss the level of CAUL’s involvement and clarify the lines of responsibility. (Action: EW)

Eve Woodberry will send a brief note to CAUL members about the process. It was also suggested that Datasets Coordinators be advised. (Action: AW)

It was agreed that a hot topic on data curation, how it is defined and what institutions are doing with it, would be of value at the CAUL meeting. The associated ethical guidelines are important.

1545. NCRI S (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy). Platforms for Collaboration. Capability 5.16. Rhys Francis has drawn heavily on the ERCC draft report in the draft PfC strategy which was released in March. He will also be addressing the CAUDIT meeting. It is not clear what happens next. It was agreed to include in the agenda for the CAUL meeting. (Action: DC)

1546. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells reported on the draft operational plan for 2007-2008. A key issue will be operations - staffing levels and whether the program should be expanded or curtailed. It was suggested that it be included in the CAUL meeting papers. (Action: AW) The review should also look at the number of products being undertaken, the take-up, etc. A workshop will be held, in conjunction with CAVAL, on management of usage statistics.

a) CEIRC Marketing Plan. This has been put on hold until further work on the operational plan.

b) CEIRC Risk Management. A formal review of high risk items will be undertaken at the second and fifth meetings of the year. The first year take up of Portico was encouraging.

c) National Licensing Working Group. Eve Woodberry reminded members that Julie RAE had written to ask that CAUL reconsider its decision to withdraw from the program’s Executive Committee. The first Executive Committee will be drawn from the reference group, until elections are held in six months time. The final forum will be on May 9, and Heather Gordon suggested that it would be best not to participate if CAUL is not able to take on extra work. There is room in the governance group for co-opting individuals, and this may be an option. It was suggested CAUL may participate as an observer. (Action: DC, EW)

1547. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells.

a) Workshop on the Future of the ADT. Andrew Wells reported on the delegates list for the workshop on March 20. Most institutions will mainstream their theses into institutional repositories sooner rather than later. The workshop will examine possibilities and options for the future, which may simply be to share expertise and lobbying information. It was agreed that the ADT is still a very good brand for CAUL.

It could be too early to make any decisions, but perhaps CAUL could set up a forum to address the range of issues around institutional repositories. What kinds of investment will CAUL want to make: what are the migration paths; what further development might be needed; could the NLA’s ARROW discovery service replace part of the ADT; develop an exit strategy for the software, and a migration strategy for the program.

1548. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). DART, ARROW and APSR I, and any other projects which have been superseded or otherwise completed will be removed from the agenda. (Action: DC)
FRODO Projects

a) **APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories).**
   http://www.apsr.edu.au/ APSR is running a number of seminars which have been advertised widely.

b) **ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World).**
   http://arrow.edu.au/ Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that ARROW is working with MAMS on a Shibboleised system.

c) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).**
   https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams Eve Woodberry

MERRI Projects


e) **RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).** http://www.rubric.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry reported that Sue Craig is now leading the project. A copyright group has been formed, and is working with OAK-Law.

f) **OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management).** http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry reported on the OAK-Law meeting, noting that the group has produced two excellent papers - one on developing an open access policy for digital repositories; and a guide for PhD students in understanding copyright compliance. They are also planning a guide for supervisors. They are planning to set up an OAK list, supplementing the Sherpa work, focussing on Australian publishers, to promote appropriate clauses for open access in authors’ contracts. Heather Gordon suggested that the QULOC list of publishers be used as a starting point. (Action: EW)

g) **DART (Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation E-Research Technologies).** http://dart.edu.au/ Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that this has been taken over by ARCHER.

h) **E-Security Framework for Research.**

New Projects:

i) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project] Cathrine Harboe-Ree

j) **Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP)**

k) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.**

l) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Eve Woodberry

m) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.**

n) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] Eve Woodberry

CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1549. **Information Literacy Working Group.** Ruth Quinn was elected chair, and the group will meet at the CAUL meeting in May.

1550. **Carrick Institute.** Diane Costello signed up to the alerting list and is forwarding relevant information to CAUL members.
1551. **ULA.** Diane Costello reported on a number of questions to her, as the ULA contact on the web site, from students from Open University Australia. In the process of clarifying what services are available to students enrolled at the seven partner universities, it was discovered that OUA had planned to convene a working group to draw up protocols for borrowing library materials. Diane Costello will confirm the services, and refer to the ULA working group.  
*(Action: DC)*

John Hall, Durham University, on behalf of SCONUL has asked whether there might be some way of linking the SCONUL Access scheme to ULA. [http://www.sconul.ac.uk/groups/access/](http://www.sconul.ac.uk/groups/access/)

Members noted that walk-in access is freely available in all Australian university libraries, even terminal access is available to most, and that may make such a scheme unnecessary. It is thought that academics are usually affiliated with an institution so do not require such access. The potential numbers is unknown, and it was agreed that including tourists would not be welcome. The ULA Working Group suggested that this could make a simple scheme quite complicated. It was agreed to ask them for a formal recommendation.  
*(Action: DC)*

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1552. **Statistics.** Diane Costello has asked DEST for a customised extract of student data, identifying EFTSU by narrow discipline group by institution. The standard DEST output includes EFTSU by institution, and narrow discipline group by course level – neither of which supports the increasing number of FTE-based datasets pricing by specific disciplines. The customised extract will save a lot of time both in the CAUL office and in the institutions when discipline-based FTE are required.

The enhancements to the statistics web site have been completed, but not yet tested. They are expected to be available before the collection of the 2006 data begins.

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1553. **Communication.** *(Standing item)*

a) **President’s Report.** Eve Woodberry. Letters have been sent this year to the following: Alan Smith, chair, National and State Libraries Australasia; to Steve O’Connor on his move from CAVAL to Hong Kong & Judy Stokker and Angela Bridgland on their installation as CAUL members. Eve Woodberry participated in a DEST meeting re obtaining permission for the deposit of RQF evidence portfolios in institutional repositories. Diane Costello will draft a letter to new members of CONZUL – perhaps for CONZUL president to send.  
*(Action: DC)*

b) **Public Relations/ Media Reports.**

i) **Serials,** 20(1) March 2007. A day in the life of a consortium executive officer. Diane Costello

c) **CAUL Report 2005-6.** It was agreed to delete the statistics appendix, and instead refer to CAUL-supported activity under ULA, and include a summary in the introduction. Derek Whitehead will be invited to make a commentary on trends, under the statistics section. It will be ready for the CAUL meeting in May. It was agreed to not print the CAUL report, just point to the pdf version.  
*(Action: EW, DC)*

d) **Executive Officer’s Report.** The report is appended to this agenda. Diane Costello reported on the meeting of the Springer Library Advisory Board in Orlando 14-16 March.

1554. **CAUL Web Site.** The goal is to have a mock-up of the web site before the September meeting - the project is potentially a three-month job. Jeff Murray will follow up with CAUDIT and with individuals. A project Gantt chart will be developed, for the information of CAUL.  
*(Action: JM)*

1555. **Copyright.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree advised that Megan Deacon is drafting a briefing paper for the Monash University Vice-Chancellor in preparation for the negotiations process between the AVCC and CAL in 2007. This paper may be used by CAUL members to brief their Vice-Chancellors. Tom Cochrane is also preparing a briefing for the AVCC.
Laura Simes has replaced Sarah Waladan at the ALCC/ADA and has already met briefly with Diane Costello. The next meeting of the ALCC is in May. Heather Gordon attended the ACIPA conference in Brisbane and reported on an interesting paper on the implications of YouTube and similar services, and another by Carolyn Dalton, on behalf of WA schools, who highlighted the range of questions being generated because of the complexity of the legislation.

1556. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

   a) DEST Indigenous Higher Education Advisory Council. DEST has invited CAUL to suggest appropriate indigenous persons for this council. It was agreed to circulate to members. (Action: DC)

1557. Relationships with other organisations.

   a) CAUDIT & ACODE. Andrew Wells will follow up with the AVCC re options for staff development programs at the director level for CAUL, CAUDIT and ACODE. It was suggested that the AVCC’s senior leaders program is very useful, and the breadth of delegates across academia and executive leadership was particularly valuable. The advertisement for the CAUDIT institute has been circulated. Harvard runs one-week leadership courses for CEOs. Aurora is discussing a program for more senior librarians. The next meeting is July in Brisbane. (Action: AW)

   i) EDUCAUSE 2007. Standing Item. It was noted that early-bird registrations were lower than expected. It was questioned why committee members were expected to pay for registering at the conference even if not attending the conference.

   b) National Library of Australia. In discussion of the range of areas where CAUL members are in active collaboration with the National Library, it was noted that the NLA is involved in most of the ARIIC projects; CAUL members are all participants in Libraries Australia, and CAUL is represented on the NLP reference group. Most interactions are at the institution level or the project level, rather than at the peak body level. It was agreed that Eve Woodberry meet with the Director-General in the near future to discuss expectations of the two organisations. (Action: DC, EW) Issues for discussion might include: issues in common; research collections; extent of dependence on NLA collections.

   i) National Licensing Proposal. A letter was received from Julie Rae, NLP chair, in response to CAUL’s letter to the Director-General, withdrawing from active participation in the NLP. It was agreed to reply, confirming the decision, but offering to provide expert advice should it be needed. (Action: EW)

   ii) Libraries Australia (Kinetica) Heather Gordon reported on the survey run by the NLA, and noted that respondents were not asked to nominate preferred products and priorities.

   (1) CAUL Representation on Libraries Australia Advisory Committee. Information from Tony Boston regarding the position was circulate to CAUL members and expressions of interest invited. Responses have been received from Graham Black, Liz Curach, Stephen McVey, Anne Horn and Craig Anderson. Anne Horn was nominated, and the NLA agreed. Andrew Wells will brief Anne Horn before the teleconference on March 27. (Action: AW)

   iii) Peak Bodies Forum. The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007. Eve Woodberry invited members to nominate items for the agenda. Suggestions include:

       Google Book and Million Book projects etc (Action: AW)

       Censorship / restrictions on access to information e.g. Classification Review Board, official requests for details of library transactions. (Action: DC)

       Diane Costello will respond to Sandra Henderson. (Action: DC)

1558. CAUL Meetings.
a) **CAUL Meeting 2007/1.** Melbourne, May 3-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. It was noted that there was reduced time for group meetings where the members of the Executive were also members of other groups e.g. Go8, NGU, etc. It was agreed to extend the morning session, and reduce the time for hot topics on the Thursday afternoon.

**Thursday**

Hot Topics
2pm Panel on reorganisation/restructure - Derek Whitehead volunteered to be involved. Other institutions could be Macquarie, CSU, Swinburne, SCU - and as backups UNE, CQU, Deakin, UNSW, Murdoch, - no more than four. (90m) *(Action: DC)*

tea

4pm China business tour.

**Friday**

Hot Topics
9am CAUL Achievement Award. Jocelyn Priddey will receive her award on the morning of the 4th.
NLA will present on Libraries Australia
John Shipp on NCRIS - hot topic or business meeting?
Graham Black offered to speak on print collection usage (30m)
Data management - Cathrine Harboe-Ree, John Shipp, invite Linda O’Brien to this session. (90m)

**Business meeting**
The CEIRC committee recommended that Portico, etc, be included on the agenda. Andrew Wells
RQF. Eve Woodberry
ADT Business Plan. Operational review. Andrew Wells
CAUL web site. Jeff Murray


i) **RFID.** Craig Anderson. Hold over until implementation can be discussed. Macquarie, Monash, UNSW.

ii) **Management Information Systems Forum/Workshop.**

iii) **education.au.** Jenny Millea has offered a presentation on the Carrick Exchange project. Hold over to Adelaide.

I was also wondering if CAUL might be interested in someone from the Carrick Exchange project coming along and talking about the project at a general meeting? Some interesting work is underway in the metadata area, as well as in content identification. I think support of the Exchange by the university librarian community will be an important component of its usage and success so it would be great to have the opportunity to talk about the project and get more input and ideas.

c) **CAUL meeting 2008/1.** Sydney (hosted by ?) Eve Woodberry

**1559. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.**

a) **Draft schedule for 2007.** Potential clashes:

2007
Easter 6-9 April;
ICOLC Montreal April 23-27 (Diane is attending);
IATUL, Stockholm, Sweden 11-14 June;
ALA Washington D.C. June 21-27 (Blackwell Library Advisory Board);
IFLA 19-23 August, Durban, South Africa;
EDUCAUSE 2007 Seattle, Washington October 23-26;
ARROW meeting 30 November;
Planned Leave: Diane - mid-May to mid-June (tbc); Andrew - Singapore/Hong Kong April 8-17; 25 May to 24 June;
2008 - ICOLC, San Francisco, April 13-16; IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August 2008;


ii) 2007/4. Brisbane, Tuesday 26 July, in conjunction with CCA, 27 July 2007 9am-1pm

iii) 2007/5. Adelaide, Monday 17 September (later confirmed at September 19), in conjunction with CAUL 2007/2.

iv) 2007/6. Sydney, Tuesday 20 November from 1pm and Wednesday 21 November from 9am, in conjunction with CCA, afternoon of 21 November. The latter will be held UNSW Library level 3.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1560. CAUL Finances. Cathrine Harboe-Ree wrote (5/2/07):

I have spoken to David Knox (my Finance Manager) about reporting on the foreign currency accounts. He is going to suggest some wording about the interest to Diane for the regular reports. His view is that we do not need to analyse the performance of the foreign currency accounts (e.g. we do not need return on investment reports), as we're basically taking a risk management approach to the financial reports.

CEIRC likes to point out ROI to its investors, the interest that CAUL earns is mostly due to cash flow from the CEIRC program. A footnote will be added to the budget report to indicate that 90% is based on the CEIRC program. (Action: DC)


CAUL Credit Card. The CAUL credit card carries a limit of $10,000. All CAUL travel and meeting venues are charged to the card. On the first Monday of each month, the card balance is automatically transferred from the CAUL bank account. Occasionally, a payment is rejected because a series of transactions in that month have left the balance too low for the payment concerned. It is more likely to happen in the future as the costs of each transaction increase, but is most likely to happen in those months where the big-ticket item is a conference venue or CAUL meeting dinner compounding travel arrangements for those meetings. On occasions Diane Costello has used her personal card when the CAUL credit limit has been reached.

One way around this would be to arrange a credit line with each venue and to pay later on invoice. The simplest approach would be to increase the limit to $15,000. Diane Costello will ask Vic Elliott to countersign each monthly statement – otherwise approved. (Action: DC)


a) New legislation. How is new legislation tracked at ANU? (Action: DC)

b) Options for CAUL Office location. Check with the University of Canberra. (Action: DC)

c) High Risk items. For review. (Action: Executive)

1562. Other business.

a) Chifley Library, Australian National University. Due to storm damage to the building, the CAUL Office was closed for 3 days, and lost 3 days of the Administration Assistant’s time. Diane Costello was able to work at home.

The meeting closed at 4.05pm.
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CAUL Strategic Plan

Report to CAUL

Author: Andrew Wells
Date: 26 April 2007
Date of previous report: September 7, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>II. Contribution to research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchasing and licensing of electronic information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CEIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>Meeting held on November 9, 2006 (Melbourne), 30 January, 2007 (Sydney) and 18 April, 2007 (Brisbane).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>CEIRC 2006 Operational Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is completed, except for the development of a marketing plan. A draft marketing plan raised issues about the scope and purpose of CEIRC. These issues will be dealt with as part of the CEIRC 2007/2008 operational plan.

Achievements against the CEIRC 2006 operational plan can be read at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc2006achievements.doc

CEIRC 2007-2008 Operational Plan
A draft plan was discussed by CEIRC on 18 April 2007. The most recent available version is available at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc2007operationalplanPK.doc. A revised version will be presented to CAUL Executive. A major action will be to review staffing and operational issues for CEIRC.

CEIRC Membership
CAUL Executive approved membership of BSES Limited (Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations).

Product and Vendor Negotiations
At its January 2007 meeting, CEIRC met with Sage to discuss the preferred feature of a proposal to CEIRC members. Negotiations are continuing. Representatives of Taylor and Francis also attended this meeting to hear concerns about T&F systems and processes.

Access to Fairfax business content has been removed from Factiva and will soon be removed from NewsBank. The terms and conditions for the new service from Fairfax Business Media do not suit the educational market, both in price and technical terms. Another part of Fairfax is offering a new service called the SMH (Sydney Morning Herald) Digital Archive. The licence terms do not suit the higher education environment. CEIRC is pursuing these issues as a high priority.

Datasets Coordinators Meeting
This was held on January 29 in Sydney. Members expressed interest in a workshop on statistics and measurement.
Publicity, reports, publications since last report


Plan for forthcoming activity

Workshop on statistics to be held in July or August. CEIRC is making arrangements with CAVAL to hold this event.

Finalise scope and terms of reference of CEIRC staffing and operational review and seek CAUL approval, including funding.

Next meeting in Sydney on June 28, 2007.

CAUL budget implications

No issues for normal operations.

Funding requirements for CEIRC staffing and operational review not known at this stage.

Recommendations to CAUL

Note the report

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframes (start – end)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.3 Survey CEIRC participants to identify trends and issues in licensing electronic resources. | • Collate & analyse results.  
• Apply results to CEIRC operations and priorities. | Jan – June 2008 | John Redmayne  
• Tom Girke  
• Diane Costello | Documentation as required. | | | |
| 1.5 Work with market place to negotiate competitively priced products. | Priorities for 2007  
• Sage – negotiate offer to CEIRC members.  
• Taylor & Francis – negotiate improvements to pricing and services.  
• Fairfax Business Media – negotiate reasonably priced access  
• Lawbook Online & CCH – obtain proposal for complete collection | Jan – August 2007 | Diane Costello  
• Neil Renison  
• Colleen Cleary | % CEIRC members taking up offers (over 3 years) | | | |
| 2.1 Monitor risk for CEIRC operations. | • Review high risks.  
• Revise strategies to address risks as required. | Second and fifth meeting of each year. | Craig Anderson  
• Tom Girke  
• John Redmayne | System ensures compliance, and is applied at the strategic, operational and project level. | | | |
| 2.2 Review operational procedures and | • Submit project to CAUL Executive for external | July 2007 – June 2008 | Andrew Wells  
• Philip Kent  
• Colleen Cleary | Identification of efficiency improvements | External consultant. | $20,000 |
**Strategic Goal**

**Task**
- Review of staffing and procedures and obtain funding.
- Establish priorities and identify resource and CEIRC/CAUL levy implications.
- Make recommendations to CAUL.

**Timeframes (start – end)**

**Responsibility**
- Tom Girke

**KPI**

**Resources Required**
- None.

**Budget**
- Workshop will recover costs.

**Actions Taken**

---

**2.3 Invest in skills development and awareness of issues for CEIRC members.**

- Conduct workshops & hold events addressing current issues, including statistics and industry trends.
- Revise CEIRC documentation as required arising from issues raised at workshops.

**Timeframes (start – end)**
- Jul-Dec 2007

**Responsibility**
- Colleen Cleary
- Tom Girke
- Diane Costello

**KPI**
- Capture of knowledge reflected in CEIRC documentation.

**Resources Required**
- None.

**Budget**
- Workshop will recover costs.

**Actions Taken**

---

**3.1**

- Take stock of CEIRC licences to identify perpetual access provisions

**Timeframes (start – end)**
- Annually at each meeting of Datasets

**Responsibility**
- Diane Costello
- Tom Renison
- Neil Renison

**KPI**
- New products and services added to CEIRC operational plan.

**Resources Required**
- Included on agenda for Datasets Coordinators meeting January 2007, and priorities discussed.
## 3.4 Investigate cost of external membership

- **Task:** Design and execute a project to analyse the cost of external membership.
- **Timeframes:** July 2007 – March 2008
- **Responsibility:** Andrew Wells, Philip Kent, John Redmayne, Tom Girke
- **KPI:** Recommendation to CAUL about external membership.
- **Resources Required:** Budget
- **Actions Taken:**

  - **Coordinators:** Cleary
  - **Date Approved:** March 22, 2006
  - **Date Revised:** April 18, 2007

## 4.1 Identify and produce documentation that will promote and communicate CEIRC activities

- **Task:** Gather data on progress against operational plan.
- **Timeframes:** Annually, Jan-Mar
- **Responsibility:** Andrew Wells, Diane Costello
- **KPI:** Statement of benefits report is available and of use to stakeholders.
- **Resources Required:** Writer to produce reports, CAUL EO to post information on CAUL website.
- **Budget**
- **Actions Taken:**

  - **Coordinators:** Cleary
  - **Date Approved:** March 22, 2006
  - **Date Revised:** April 18, 2007

## 4.2 Publish a statement of benefits report annually on CAUL website and in CAUL annual report

- **Task:** Invite select vendors to CEIRC meetings to discuss issues.
- **Timeframes:** Ongoing
- **Responsibility:** Andrew Wells, Diane Costello, Other CEIRC members
- **KPI:** Vendors accept invitations to meetings.
- **Resources Required:** EO’s time, CAUL assistant’s time.
- **Budget**
- **Actions Taken:**

  - **Coordinators:** Cleary
  - **Date Approved:** March 22, 2006
  - **Date Revised:** April 18, 2007

## 4.4 Educate vendors and publishers about the Australasian higher education sector as it affects the provision of electronic information resources

- **Task:** Send letter from CEIRC to select vendors to raise issues.
- **Timeframes:** Ongoing
- **Responsibility:** Andrew Wells, Diane Costello, Other CEIRC members
- **KPI:** Relationships with vendors to invite to meetings.
- **Resources Required:** Budget
- **Actions Taken:**

  - **Coordinators:** Cleary
  - **Date Approved:** March 22, 2006
  - **Date Revised:** April 18, 2007
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframes (start – end)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vendors are productive and constructive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved: March 22, 2006
Revised: April 18, 2007
## 4.2 Strategic Directions

### Key Result Area 1: Member Participation

Factors contributing to member participation: costing models and conditions may not be competitive; products may not be relevant to members; other buying groups offer better price and conditions

**Goal:** Members will participate in CEIRC for the cooperative purchasing of electronic resources.

**Actions**

1.1 Use different costing models to facilitate maximum participation of members.
1.2 Report return on investment (ROI) to CAUL members through ROI reporting tools.
1.3 Survey CEIRC participants to identify trends and issues in licensing electronic resources.
1.4 Analyse and address members’ reasons for not participating in new offers and/or not renewing existing offers. (done in 2006, not necessary to repeat)
1.5 Proactively work with the marketplace to ensure that relevant and competitively priced products are offered to members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors contributing to member participation: costing models and conditions may not be competitive; products may not be relevant to members; other buying groups offer better price and conditions</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.1.1 Number of products that members take up and renew as a percentage of offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Annually</td>
<td>1.1.2 Number of members that take up each product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 July 2008</td>
<td>1.2 ROI communicates value to CEIRC participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.3 Survey results are included in CEIRC checklist, sample clauses for reference when negotiating contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.4 Decrease in non-participation rate for new and renewed offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.1 Quality and number of new products offered each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.2 Same as 1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Result Area 2: Business Continuity</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors contributing to business continuity issues: need to improve risk management processes, analysis and reporting; staffing single point sensitivity; wide range of knowledge and expertise of datasets coordinators; availability and access to operational documentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Ongoing 2.2 Jan 2008 2.3 Jan 2008 2.1.1 Risks are identified and level of risk is managed by priority and treatment strategies. 2.1.2 Business records are accessible, secured and backed up as appropriate. 2.2. Implementation of any recommended changes; evaluation 12 months following implementation. 2.3 CEIRC members have skills and knowledge that contributes to efficiency and effectiveness of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: Ensure that CEIRC activities are managed efficiently and effectively and minimise risk to CAUL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Monitor risk for CEIRC operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Review and develop policies and staffing requirements for CEIRC operational activities and draft recommendation to CAUL Executive regarding changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Ensure CEIRC members and datasets co-ordinators have the skills and knowledge to optimise investment in CEIRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Result Area 3: Future growth and development

Factors contributing to future growth and development of CEIRC: growth vs maintenance; expansion of external membership; continuation of opt in opt out purchasing model; emergence of, and competition from, other buying clubs and consortia; pressure from external organisations; support from CAUL.

**Goal:** Determine future directions and priorities for electronic information resources and services.

**Actions**

3.1 Identify projects and activities for short and long term objectives e.g. strategies to address perpetual access
3.2 Survey datasets coordinators & external participants to identify and prioritise new products and services.
3.4 Investigate cost-benefit analysis of further expansion of external membership. (incorporated in 2.2.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 January &amp; during year 2008.</td>
<td>3.1. Projects are completed on time and within budget and meet project goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 January 2008.</td>
<td>3.2. AVCC receives information prior to any re-negotiation and acknowledges receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 CEIRC negotiates agreements for identified products and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.1 CAUL executive approve external members nominated by CEIRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4.2 Costs of external membership understood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Result Area 4: Communication

Factors contributing to communication: managing expectations of stakeholders, eg CAUL, datasets coordinators, others; no established turnaround times for agendas, minutes and papers; currency and navigation issues with the CAUL website; no return on investment reports; influence and actions of external organisations (AVCC, DEST); autonomy/authority of local vendor representatives.

**Goal:** All stakeholders understand and acknowledge the role of CEIRC and the value of CEIRC activities.

**Actions**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Identify and produce documentation that will promote and communicate CEIRC activities.</td>
<td>4.1 Dec 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Publish a statement of benefits report annually on CAUL website and in CAUL annual report.</td>
<td>4.2 Sept 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Document and promote roles and responsibilities of datasets coordinators, CAUL officers, CEIRC chair and deputy chair positions, and members.</td>
<td>4.3 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Educate vendors and publishers about the Australasian higher education sector as it affects the provision of electronic information resources.</td>
<td>4.4 Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Relevant documentation is available on CAUL website.</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>CEIRC strategic directions are relevant, current and support the CAUL strategic plan.</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>CAUL receives timely advice on emerging issues and trends.</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Statement of benefits report is available and of use to stakeholders.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Role statements are on the CAUL website.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>CEIRC is invited to participate on vendor and publisher advisory committees and focus groups.</td>
<td>4.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>Vendors meet with CEIRC to resolve issues identified by dataset coordinators and CAUL.</td>
<td>4.4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section** | II. Contribution to Research  
**Action** | 5. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program  
**Responsibility** | ADT Policy Reference Group  
**Time-line** | Ongoing  
**Activity since last report** | **ADT-ARIIC: Expansion and Redevelopment Report**  
This project is complete.  
**OAI-PMH harvesting**  
Work is progressing slowly. Issues to be addressed include relaxing the strict checking of XML that the central ADT software undertakes.  
**Research discovery services**  
**Achievements since last report** | **Membership**  
There are 40 active members. Three members have become active since the last report: University of Auckland, Auckland University of Technology, and James Cook University of North Queensland.  
**Theses**  
There are 13,356 theses that link to a digital version of the thesis. 10,753 have been contributed directly by members and a further 2,603 have been loaded from the National Bibliographic Database. There are 138,833 records for theses on the database altogether representing those without links to digital theses.  
**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
<th><strong>ADT Policy Group</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An expanded meeting of the ADT Policy Reference Group canvassed the future of the Australian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) with contributors to the service, including the National Library of Australia on Tuesday 20 March 2007. The meeting covered a wide range of issues, ranging from technical considerations to discussions about the future of the ADT Program in the light of developments in institutional repositories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADT Technical Committee**

The Technical Committee met on Thursday 1 February. It will recommend to the Policy Group that the PDF Security Settings for ADT be change to unlocked to enhance accessibility for people with disabilities and searchability, and for long-term preservation; and remove the recommendation to use acrobat 6. The survey of members was also discussed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>Ongoing levy to CAUL and CONZUL members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>Note the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAMS/ RAMP Report to CAUL

Author: Eve Woodberry
Date: 18 April 2007
Date of previous report: 4 September 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Represent CAUL on the MAMS and RAMP Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td><a href="https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams/">https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>MAMS has met twice, in November and February, since the last CAUL meeting. The main issue for MAMS is the development of the Australian Access Federation (AAF) which is planned to facilitate the role out of MAMS federated identity management as part of the RQF. The AAF will have three main deliverables:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Policies and legal framework for the AAF, governance and operational responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. PKI for Australian higher education (to be delivered by AUSCERT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Shibboleth Trust Federation to be delivered by MELCOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The RAMP (Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities) project involves three sub-projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Authentication: generalised authorisation library using XACML which will be delivered by DRAMA (Digital Repository Access Middleware Architecture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ActivityFlow: will be delivered by RAMS (Research Activity Management System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fusion of AuthN/Z and ActivityFlow components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is anticipated that selected of these developments will be implemented by DEST when building their RQF management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Attend the MAMS/RAMP Steering Committee meeting to be held on 14th May 2007 in Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>CAUL note the developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## OAK-Law Report to CAUL

**Author:** Eve Woodberry  
**Date:** 18 April 2007  
**Date of previous report:** 27 March 2006

### Contribution to Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Represent CAUL and the RUBRIC project on the Project Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>To end of OAK-Law project <a href="http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au">http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>The OAK-Law Project Advisory Group met on the 8th March 2007 at QUT. A significant amount of work has been happening through the project groups which were created following the release and recommendations in the OAK-Law Report no.1. These project groups are working on several of the recommendations. A forthcoming project publication <em>A Guide to Developing an Open Access Policy for your Digital Repository</em> was distributed in final draft form for comment. The purpose of the guide is to provide legal protocols for the whole process of establishing and managing a digital repository. A second draft document <em>Copyright Guide for PhD students depositing their Electronic Thesis in an Online Repository</em> which will also be released soon was provided for comment. Once available these documents will be valuable additions to the toolkit for the creation of digital repositories. Another project is the OAK List which will focus on creating legal frameworks for open access to academic and research material. Phase one involves reviewing the Publishing Agreements of major Australian publishers and recommending on clauses for open access. This project supplements the Sherpa/Romeo project in the UK. The work from these projects is timely and will benefit the sector in the development of institutional repositories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements since last report</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>Release of the documents currently in draft form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>Members note the report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
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### Section 1. Contribution to Teaching and Learning

#### Action

2. Review global best practice in information literacy and make it available to CAUL members (ILWG)

#### Responsibility

Information Literacy Working Group (ILWG)

#### Time-line

2. September 2007 (CAUL meeting)

#### Activity since last report

The final makeup of the reformed ILWG confirmed: Anne Horn, Graham Black, Helen Livingston, Leeanne Pitman, Linda Luther, Philip Kent, with Ruth Quinn as Convenor for 2007.

ILWG Website and caul-ilwg e-list updated to include above.

First face-to-face meeting to be held 3 May.

#### Achievements since last report

ILWG Terms of Reference confirmed:

a) Provide advice to CAUL on information literacy and related issues (Strategic Plan Action 2)

b) Provide ongoing support and resources to facilitate effective assessment of information literacy knowledge and skills, and appropriate evaluation of information literacy courses and programs within university libraries (Strategic Plan Action 15)

c) Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning (Strategic Plan Action 35)

d) Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy (Strategic Plan Action 35)

#### Publicity, reports, publications since last report

None

#### Plan for forthcoming activity

To be confirmed at first meeting to be held 3 May

#### CAUL budget implications

None yet

#### Recommendations to CAUL

That the report be noted.

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
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CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students
to Support Teaching and Learning

Context

The following guidelines have been developed as an aid for Australian university librarians providing services to students enrolled at offshore campuses of Australian universities.

There has been significant growth in the number of students studying at offshore campuses of Australian universities over the last 10 years. In 1994 there were around 10,000 such students; in 2003 there were over 40,000. (http://www.idp.com)

The total enrolment of international students at Australian universities in Semester 2 2003 was estimated at 174,732 or 21.5% of the total student population in Australian universities. Of these, 41,313 students were enrolled at offshore campuses of Australian universities. (http://www.idp.com).

The Australian government has recognised the importance of quality assurance for offshore courses. The Department of Education, Science and Training has allocated $10.4 million over four years to explore and develop with industry a quality assurance framework for services delivered outside Australia. (http://aei.dest.gov.au/budget)

The Australian Universities Quality Agency conducts audits of Australian Universities, components of which include consideration of offshore courses and library support services. (http://www.auqa.edu.au/qualityaudit)

Australian university librarians have responded to the development of offshore courses in a variety of ways. These include the establishment of new campus libraries offshore, arrangements for provision of services by local partners; agreements for service provision from other local libraries and provision of electronic services from the onshore library in Australia.

It is important that students studying on offshore campuses have access to library information resources and services that are monitored through quality assurance mechanisms. There are currently no international standards which could be applied to the Australian situation. Standards which have been developed in the UK and the U.S. fall into the category of services for off campus students rather than services for offshore students.

The Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) encourages library quality assurance through mechanisms such as client satisfaction surveys, benchmarking and a range of best practice measures. These principles aim to provide assistance to Australian universities in ensuring the provision of quality offshore campus library resources and services.

Definition of Offshore Student

An Offshore Student is considered to be a student who is enrolled in an Australian higher education course and who is undertaking study offshore with the home institution’s staff or with local staff employed by, or employed in consultation with, the home institution.
**Definition of Offshore Staff**

Offshore staff may be:
- employed directly by the home institution;
- employed by a contractor of the home institution;
- employed by the host institution,
and they may be employed on an ongoing or contractual basis.

**Distinction between Offshore and Distance Education Students**

Distance Education Students are considered to be Australian (or overseas) based students who do not require on campus attendance (except perhaps for block work.) Library services and information resources for Distance Education Students are provided directly by the home institution, and are not covered by these guidelines.

**Types of Offshore Arrangements**

These Guidelines apply to a wide variety of offshore arrangements including:

- Direct teaching at a local institution
- Partnering with a local educational institution to teach an Australian course
- A commercial partnership with a local agent to teach an Australian course.
- A fully-owned and run offshore campus of an Australian university.

**Principles**

1. Offshore Students will have access to core library services and information resources to support their learning.
2. Offshore Students will be authenticated for remote access to a range of library services and information resources arranged by the home institution.
3. Appropriate access to the home library’s services and information resources should be made available to the partner teaching and support staff to support offshore teaching and learning.
4. The home institution’s planning, accreditation, quality assurance and decision-making processes will take into account the requirements for offshore students to access library information resources and services.
5. The cost of providing library services and information resources to offshore students shall be recognised in university budget allocations and costing models.

**Guidelines**

1. **Planning**
   1.1 A Library Impact Statement (see Appendix 1 for an example) should be completed as part of the formal university planning, accreditation, quality assurance and implementation process for all offshore courses.
   1.2 The Library Impact Statement is considered prior to finalisation of agreements with partners.
   1.3 Student computer workstations should meet minimum hardware and software specifications which enable offshore students to access home library electronic services and information resources.
   1.4 The home institution or partner must ensure access to internet enabled computers with bandwidth suitable for accessing home institution electronic library services and information resources. National filters should not prevent access to teaching
materials and resources.

1.5 The Library should confirm whether proposed locally provided library services and resources are adequate for the offshore student cohort and academic programme/s.

1.6 The Library may facilitate agreements with local library providers to provide adequate services and information resources for offshore students.

2. Library Services and Information Resources The Library should ensure access to adequate levels of service and information resources for offshore students and the academic staff teaching them.

The core services should include:

2.1 Access to a range of electronic information resources, reflective of those provided to onshore students; for example electronic journals and databases, e-reserve articles, past examination papers, lecture notes etc.

2.2 Licence agreements for electronic information resources should include access for enrolled offshore students and registered staff.

2.3 Access to a range of appropriate library information communication services (e.g. phone, postal, email, web etc), including a virtual help service which provides assistance with passwords, access and guidance in the selection and use of resources.

2.4 Access to information literacy training programs which may be virtual, interactive, face-to-face, etc.

2.5 Access to a document delivery service for designated offshore student cohorts and academic staff.

2.6 Advice for academic staff on library services and information resources available prior to programs being offered offshore, including information literacy training for academics to enable them to assist offshore students.

2.7 Feedback mechanisms and quality assurance processes to monitor the quality and appropriateness of the library services and information resources available to offshore students.

2.8 Library staff at the home institution may need to liaise with offshore library providers to facilitate access to locally provided library services and information resources. If physical collections at local sites are to be provided, consultation with academic staff regarding development of those collections may be required. It will be important that if services specific to offshore-located students are provided, these are very clearly communicated to students through the website and other communication mechanisms.

3. Funding. The cost of providing library services and information resources to offshore students and staff should be recognised in costing models and funding disbursements.

3.1 The Library should receive adequate funding for the offshore services and information resources provided.

3.2 Specific charges may need to be negotiated for additional services eg creation of learning centre/library offshore print collection, and additional licence costs for offshore campuses.

3.3 Payments to local library providers may be necessary to ensure access and borrowing privileges for offshore students and staff.
Attachment 1

OFFSHORE COURSE LIBRARY IMPACT STATEMENT

This form should be completed by the course / program coordinators, in consultation with the Library, for any proposed course being taught offshore.

A. LOCAL (offshore) RESOURCES AND LIBRARY FACILITIES
1. Details of existing collections in print and electronic, available for students that would support the proposed course

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

2. Is there an agreement in place with a local educational institution to facilitate library access to students? What services and resources does it cover?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

3. What are the resources required locally, not currently available? Estimated cost to Faculty/School supplying resources.

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

4. Do the students have access to computer facilities?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

5. Do the students have Internet access?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

6. What study areas are available for students? e.g. for private study, group study, silent study, internet access, etc

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students (11 May, 2004, updated 29 March 2007)
B. SERVICES/SUPPORT NEEDED FROM HOME LIBRARY

1. Will the students need access to home Library e-reserve and electronic databases (subject to licence agreements)?

2. How will the students receive information literacy training support – from the home institution or the offshore partner/institution?

3. Will academic staff, whether home or offshore, require access to and training in the use of electronic resources?

(NB Print resources are not normally available to offshore students.)

4. Will academic staff and/or students require access to document delivery services from the home library?

C. CONSULTATION WITH LIBRARY

1. Outcome of consultation with Library (including any Library cost implications)
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## Section 3 - Management for Best Practice

### Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Collect and publish statistics on Australasian university library outputs and activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Review the current CAUL statistical measures - presentation format, usefulness, use and users and present a plan and proposal to CAUL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responsibility

Statistics Focus Group / Derek Whitehead

### Time-line

Ongoing.

### Activity since last report

Since the last meeting of CAUL (in Sept 2006)

2. Following development of the statistics website now located at [http://statistics.caul.edu.au](http://statistics.caul.edu.au) a program of minor enhancements has been substantially completed by the contractor, CAVAL.
3. The 2006 data has been published but could not be finalised until late November, because 2005 DEST population data was unavailable earlier.
4. CAVAL has produced a report on the collection of the 2005 data (Mar 2007)

### Achievements since last report

See above

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report

1. The 2006 CAUL statistics have been made available on the statistics website and in AARL.

### Plan for forthcoming activity

1. Data collection for 2006 data will commence shortly. Data will be made available on the site even if data collection is not complete.
2. The activity program still includes these items:
3. Draft a statement indicating how the deemed list is used in the statistics.
4. Trend analysis of CAUL statistical data for the past decade, as commissioned research. A specification for the work will be developed and proposals sought.
5. We will aim to collect more complete ULA use data.
6. The Datasets Coordinators plan to hold a mid-year seminar or workshop on the collection and use of usage statistics for electronic resources. They conducted a survey on this subject in February.
7. Additional measures. The CSFG monitors the need for additional measures and the relevance of existing measures. There was a report at the last meeting.
8. A further meeting will be held in conjunction with the planned CEIRC/CAVAL workshop.

### Recommendation to CAUL

That this report be accepted.
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### Section
Communication and Influence

### Action
Present CAUL position to copyright meetings, references and inquires.  
Represent CAUL at meetings involving copyright issues in various forums

### Responsibility
Eve Woodberry.

### Time-line
ongoing

### Activity since last report
Derek Whitehead provided an excellent presentation on copyright for institutional repositories at the repositories meetings in Melbourne and Sydney in February.

### Achievements since last report
1. Legislation passed in late 2006 has some significant benefits for libraries and for the higher education sector. The changes achieved are the result of significant efforts by libraries and universities.
2. Universities have begun to consider the options for a renewed agreement relating to used of the Part VB licence.
3. The AVCC has provided a draft version of a new FAQ for copyright officers and others closely involved in managing copyright (such as libraries), taking into account legislative change in 2006.
4. The Attorney-General's Department has announced a program for 2007 which includes
   - the orphan works issue
   - the postponed consideration of safe harbour legislation which would apply to universities
   - new regulations currently being drafted to consider extending the definition of "Key Cultural Institutions" for the purposes of the new preservation exceptions (s 51B, s 110BA and s 112AA). This may include Universities, or at least special library collections within key University libraries.
   - Legal deposit amendments.
5. The amended legislation includes new exceptions in section 200AB which are likely to provide some significant opportunities for libraries. Two papers presented at the recent ACIPA Conference consider this new provision: see [http://www.acipa.edu.au/frame_conferences_Feb2007.html](http://www.acipa.edu.au/frame_conferences_Feb2007.html)
6. The ALCC / ADA Copyright Advisor, Sarah Waladan, left at the end of 2006. Her replacement, Laura Simes, commenced in March 2007.
7. DEST convened a meeting on 9 March in Brisbane with CAUL and others to consider the best approach to copyright issues arising in connection with the RQF.

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report
A short report is provided below.

### Plan for forthcoming activity
Attend ALCC meeting Canberra 25 May 2007  
AICTEC is planning a copyright session in August.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>Travel and accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations to CAUL</strong></td>
<td>Members note the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONZUL Report
CAUL Meeting, Melbourne, May 2007

1. Meetings:
The first CONZUL meeting of the year was held in late March at the University of Auckland Library and included a tour of the new Engineering Library. CONZUL welcomed Sue Roberts, the new University Librarian at Victoria University of Wellington, to her first CONZUL meeting in New Zealand. Some CAUL members may have met Sue when she visited Australia as part of the last SCONUL tour. At least two other Australian university library staff members as well as myself had the pleasure of meeting Sue at the Ticer Digital Libraries Summer School at Tilburg in 2006.

CONZULAC, which now consists of all NZ University Libraries, successfully completed negotiations with monograph suppliers for a UK and a North American supply contract at the end of 2006. The contract was previously held by YBP’s offices in US and UK, but has this time been awarded to Blackwell’s Book Services. The contract runs from January 2007 – December 2009.

Three NZ university libraries (AUT, University of Auckland and University of Otago) have decided to swap from Rodski to LibQual+ in order to have more effective international benchmarking. Other CONZUL members are now considering their options as there was general agreement that one benchmarking tool would be preferable for NZ university libraries.

A second Collection Practices Forum was held following the CONZUL meeting, as a follow-on from the earlier meeting in July 2006. Alison Elliott, from the National Library, also joined CONZUL members for the meeting. The University of Auckland presented a detailed proposal to rationalise storage based on earlier-supplied details of print bibliographic holdings where there were duplicate electronic holdings. The proposal was accepted in principle, with minor alterations. A contract is currently being developed by a working party outlining the basis of the proposed cooperative storage arrangement which will result in space savings in a number of libraries. The next step is a similar evaluation of the overlap in printed holdings for journals available as electronic files; the focus will initially be on journals published by Elsevier, Wiley, Springer, Oxford, Cambridge & Blackwell’s. There appears little likelihood of funding from the NZ Government for a shared store at this point in time so cooperative rationalisation of print holdings seems to offer the only way forward to those university libraries with shelving / storage issues.

As a result of funding from the Tertiary Education Commission, as well as funding from the Ministry of Education for Massey University to join the Australian RUBRIC project, six New Zealand university libraries have been able to begin the development of institutional repositories in-house or via service providers such as the Digital Commons hosted service. The other two university libraries also have initiatives underway. It is likely that most, if not all, of the universities will transfer to DSpace as their software environment by the end of 2007 although a number of the universities did initially pilot both DSpace and Digital Commons. The National Library of New Zealand is well down the track of completing a pilot National Research Discovery Service in association with several of the TEC funded projects.

CONZUL, in association with the Institutional Repositories Aotearoa (Ira) TEC funded project (UofA, VUW and UC), is sponsoring a second seminar on institutional repositories on 28th May in Christchurch. Professor Tom Cochrane from QUT will be the guest speaker at the seminar which will showcase all current tertiary sector repository projects in NZ. On 29th May there will be a DSpace User Group meeting; the Ira project is sponsoring Scott Yeadon from ANU as the guest speaker for this first DSpace User Group meeting in New Zealand. For further information on the seminar and the DSpace user group meeting see http://www.conzul.ac.nz/conferences.htm

A half-day meeting with SCIT, the NZVCC Standing Committee of IT Directors, is scheduled for Tuesday, 29th May following the CONZUL institutional repositories seminar. The joint meeting will be held at Lincoln University and will include presentations from the National Library of NZ on the National Digital Heritage Archive (NDHA) as well as discussions on a number of issues relating to e-research and the development of the KAREN high-speed network in NZ. There will also be a
tour of Lincoln’s new Information Commons facility. An additional half-day CONZUL meeting will be held in the afternoon and any visitors from CAUL, who might be attending the Institutional Repositories seminar, would be welcome to attend the originally unscheduled meeting.

2. Merger of Endeavor Inc and Ex Libris library systems

Six of the NZ university libraries, as well as the National Library of NZ, were customers of Endeavor Inc although not all of the sites were using the full suite of former Endeavor software products. The libraries, including the National Library, have all been offered the opportunity to swap out of the three Encompass software modules to the Ex Libris equivalent products. The University of Auckland Library is the first library to swap over from Endeavor’s former linking product to SFX, with swap overs to Digitools and Metalib scheduled in the coming months. This is the first SFX implementation in NZ. Some of the other libraries have taken the opportunity to swap to competitor products. National Library of NZ is, as I understand it, still in negotiation with Ex Libris about the suitability of DigiTools for the significant NZ Digital Archive (NZDA) initiative. The majority of libraries are pleased with the merger as there is the opportunity, with the larger group of customers, for improved investment in the core suite of products.

3. Partnership between OCLC and Te Puna, NZ’s equivalent to Libraries Australia

In early February the National Library of NZ signed a new partnering agreement with OCLC to participate fully in their WorldCat union catalogue. From 1 July 2007 Te Puna libraries are expected to gain considerable operational benefits from this arrangement, including the opportunity to catalogue directly onto WorldCat with the records being downloaded the next day to Te Puna, and unlimited use and access to a range of other OCLC services, including First Search.

4. Update from the Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC), including the National Library of NZ’s Next Generation Strategy

Ainslie Dewe, University Library at AUT University, has stepped down as inaugural Chair of LIAC and Janet Copsey, University Librarian at the University of Auckland has been appointed as a new member of the Commission. LIAC and CONZUL both made submissions relating to the Government’s proposed “digital content strategy”, with both being supportive of the document and its direction although both concern was expressed by both parties in regard to insufficient reference being made to the importance of appropriate operational and governance frameworks in delivering on the vision for “Creating Digital New Zealand”.

The National Library of NZ was successful, along with other partners, in gaining funding from the Government’s initial Digital Strategy community partnership fund for the establishment of phase one of an Aotearoa NZ’s People’s Network based on the successful UK model. The project is being rolled out over the next two years and it is hoped that there will be additional funding made available to complete a full roll-out throughout all public libraries in New Zealand.

LIAC continues to lobby the Minister for the National Library and other parties in relation to the seriously problematic issue of poor access to high speed broadband in New Zealand. There is currently discussions going on between the Government and Telecom NZ in relation to the apparent stranglehold that Telecom appears to have on the development, or non-development, of broadband in NZ.

LIAC was briefed by Penny Carnaby on the National Library on the National Library’s Next Generation Strategy which includes aligning National Library of NZ’s operations to meet the opportunities and challenges of the 21st century. Prior to the release of the final version of the strategy there was extensive consultation with libraries and with the Chief Executives of all major Government departments in Wellington.
5. **IATUL Conference in Stockholm in June 2007 to be followed by IATUL Conference in Auckland, 21-24 April 2008**

Ainslie Dewe, University Librarian at AUT University, has agreed to be Conference Chair for the 2008 IATUL Conference which is to be held in Auckland, 21-24 April 2008 with the official welcome being held on 20th April. Delegates may also wish to participate in ANZAC events on 25th April. Derek Whitehead and Imogen Garner have agreed to be corresponding members of the Program Sub-Committee. The theme of the 2008 conference is “Digital Discovery: Strategies and Solutions”. This ties in with the NZ government Digital Strategy ([http://www.digitalstrategy.govt.nz/](http://www.digitalstrategy.govt.nz/)) and it is hoped the conference will attract some high profile speakers. There is a similar Canadian strategy, the UK e-infrastructure for science and innovation and, many Australian initiatives. Possible sub-themes are national digital strategies, e-infrastructure for research discovery and Web 2.0 for learning discovery. Assistance of CAUL members in promoting the conference to potential Australian delegates will be greatly appreciated.

6. **KAREN network and e-research issues**

New Zealand universities are finally in a position to connect to high-speed broadband suitable for e-research initiatives with the implementation of KAREN – Kiwi Advanced Research Network. CONZUL has had brief discussions about the desirability of developing a national approach to selected data archives and would welcome the opportunity for further discussion with CAUL on this issue. It is noted that there is a workshop day scheduled for Friday 29th June at the end of the upcoming eResearch Australasia 2007 in Brisbane. Perhaps there is an opportunity for a joint workshop relating to data curation or a similar topic??

Janet Copsey, University Librarian, The University of Auckland
Chair, CONZUL
27 April 2007
This page is intentionally blank.
### Advocacy and Communication

**Action**
Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

**Responsibility**
Linda Luther and Anne Horn

**Time-line**
ongoing

**Activity since last report**
The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee has held three meetings since the last report: 2 November 2006 (Melbourne), 27 March 2007 (teleconference), 18 April 2007.

The 2006 Libraries Australia Forum was held on 3 November 2006

CAUL Executive met with Jan Fullerton, Director-General, National Library of Australia, Warwick Cathro, Assistant Director-General, Innovation and Tony Boston, Assistant Director-General, Resource Sharing Division, on 1 February 2007

**Achievements since last report**
Discussions have continued through 2006 and 2007 regarding subscription rates for CAUL members. The meeting between National Library staff and CAUL Executive in February agreed that the National Library would establish the subscription model, and that the subscription would be predictable, fair and easily understood. The Director-General sent a letter advising each University the new subscription rates on 30 March 2007.

The National Library has reached agreement with OCLC regarding access to WorldCat for Libraries Australia subscribers. Following signing the agreement between Libraries Australia, all contributing members will be governing members of OCLC as part of the Asia Pacific Group.

**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**
Papers for the 18 April LAAC meeting were circulated to CAUL members. They include an IT architecture project report. The report identifies a new framework for building digital library and resource discovery services based on:

- Implementing a service-oriented architecture
- Adopting a single business approach
- Considering open-source solutions

There is not extensive use of Libraries Australia by end users within universities. This is an opportunity that could be further promoted.

The newspaper digitisation project is progressing. Scanning will be undertaken of 19th Century capital city papers, as prioritised in discussion with State libraries. Search and delivery will be provided through the new search software Lucene. Several hundred thousand pages should be available by mid-2008.

A new strategic plan is being developed for Libraries Australia. This will build on the plan for 2007 which will be available on the website shortly.

**Plan for forthcoming activity**
May 4 2007 - Jan Fullerton will attend the CAUL meeting

September 5 2007 – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee Meeting, Brisbane

September 6 2007 – Libraries Australia Forum - Brisbane

**CAUL budget implications**

**Recommendations to CAUL**
### Libraries Australia Futures Costing

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia</td>
<td>4,366,324</td>
<td>4,707,989</td>
<td>4,004,884</td>
<td>3,967,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Royalties</td>
<td>56,647</td>
<td>66,504</td>
<td>36,622</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,422,971</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,744,493</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,041,286</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,022,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,065,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,055,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,055,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,055,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,055,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenses

**Employee expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia</td>
<td>1,690,392</td>
<td>1,672,815</td>
<td>1,905,859</td>
<td>2,096,000</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
<td>2,170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employee Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,690,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,672,815</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,054,859</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,451,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,625,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplier expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Australia</td>
<td>762,428</td>
<td>716,157</td>
<td>675,774</td>
<td>957,000</td>
<td>878,000</td>
<td>878,000</td>
<td>878,000</td>
<td>878,000</td>
<td>878,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Global Services</td>
<td>1,908,874</td>
<td>1,784,076</td>
<td>938,383</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>PICA including enhancements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,494</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware / Software maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,113</td>
<td>211,747</td>
<td>218,721</td>
<td>170,721</td>
<td>170,721</td>
<td>170,721</td>
<td>170,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supplier Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,671,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,701,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,333,747</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,288,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,248,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,248,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,248,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,248,721</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Depreciation / recovery of non capitalised costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>604,460</td>
<td>611,835</td>
<td>892,000</td>
<td>539,705</td>
<td>539,705</td>
<td>539,705</td>
<td>545,643</td>
<td>545,643</td>
<td>545,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of non-capitalised costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,344</td>
<td>220,886</td>
<td>220,886</td>
<td>220,886</td>
<td>220,886</td>
<td>220,886</td>
<td>220,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal service charge</td>
<td>(294,000)</td>
<td>(348,049)</td>
<td>(278,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate overheads</td>
<td>693,601</td>
<td>764,574</td>
<td>857,732</td>
<td>772,005</td>
<td>775,478</td>
<td>775,478</td>
<td>775,478</td>
<td>775,478</td>
<td>775,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,365,755</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,201,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,938,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,007,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,047,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,998,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,005,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,005,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,005,531</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus / (Deficit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>(942,784)</td>
<td>(426,915)</td>
<td>(895,413)</td>
<td>(985,146)</td>
<td>(932,593)</td>
<td>(944,593)</td>
<td>(950,531)</td>
<td>(950,531)</td>
<td>(950,531)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Explanatory Notes

**Employee expenses**

The National Library's IT Division has responsibility for applications and infrastructure support for Libraries Australia system components. This support includes enhancements to those parts of the system which were developed internally.

**Supplier Expenses**

Includes ongoing expenses associated with Libraries Australia, together with payments to major suppliers of IT infrastructure, previously to IBM Global services for AMICUS and Librivision, and now to OCLC | PICA for provision of the CBS software.

**Depreciation / recovery of non capitalised costs**

This area shows the depreciation of the capital costs of Libraries Australia, including costs associated with staff time, hardware and licensed software that were formally capitalised. Libraries Australia development costs that could not formally be capitalised are included for recovery.

**Internal service charge**

As well as being a provider of Libraries Australia, the National Library is also a user. The attributed revenue from the Library's use of the service is shown here as an offset to costs.

**Corporate overheads**

This area shows the cost attributed to Libraries Australia from staff elsewhere in the National Library that supply corporate services, together with the cost of floor space and IT equipment.
Frequently Asked Questions – Libraries Australia

1. What is Libraries Australia?
Libraries Australia is a service supporting resource discovery by the Australian library community, as well as shared cataloguing and interlending between Australian libraries. The service is based on the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD), built through the collaboration and contribution of Australian libraries over the last 25 years.

2. What is the value of Libraries Australia to Australian libraries?
Australian libraries have collectively invested over $100M in ABN/Kinetica/Libraries Australia over the last 25 years. This unique national resource is unmatched by most nations around the world and supports shared collection management and collaborative and cooperative activities across libraries in Australia. Different libraries will receive value from different aspects of the Libraries Australia service; for example, some libraries gain greater value from the copy cataloguing service, others will find more value in providing end user access, while others will place more value on the data syndication services such as the provision of data to Google.

3. What is the business model for Libraries Australia?
Libraries Australia would not be possible without the financial support of Australian libraries who subscribe to the service. The current annual cost of running the service is approximately $5.01M of which about $4.02M is contributed by subscribing libraries with the balance of approximately $0.99M contributed by the National Library as shown in the attached cost model.

Over the past ten years there have been significant reductions in the operating costs of Libraries Australia and these savings have been passed on to subscribing libraries through reduced charges. In 1995/1996 revenues from Australian libraries were approximately $7.64M per annum\(^1\). In the current financial year revenues are estimated to be $4.02M. This reflects actual reductions in unit charges which are independent of changes in usage patterns.

4. Is the nature of Libraries Australia changing with development of a free search service?
A key function of Libraries Australia remains support for shared cataloguing and interlending. The advent of the free Libraries Australia Search service, launched in February 2006, does not diminish this fundamental purpose. However the National Library is repositioning Libraries Australia for the digital age.

5. What is the relationship between the National Library and CAUL?
The National Library sees CAUL very much as a partner in the development of Libraries Australia. Since 1981, the university library sector has provided valuable input into and guidance for the development of this national service through representation on the advisory committee of the day. University librarians continue to have strong representation on the advisory committee through Linda Luther (current chair of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee) and Anne Horn. In addition, currently two of the elected members of the Committee are from the university library

sector. Significant numbers of university library staff regularly attend and contribute to state user group meetings and the Libraries Australia User Forum.

6. **How does the National Library justify the charges paid by different library sectors for Libraries Australia?**

Historically, charges for the service across library sectors were based on usage. To encourage increased use, the National Library introduced a subscription model on 1 July 2005, which no longer links charges to usage. The National Library is currently investigating whether the attribution of Libraries Australia costs across the various library sectors is equitable. Preliminary research indicates that CAUL libraries currently pay 39% of the total operating cost of the Libraries Australia service and represent 37% of the total library expenditure of subscribing libraries.

However, the National Library will continue to research this issue.

7. **Why is total library expenditure an appropriate and equitable criterion on which to base the subscription model?**

The National Library believes that total library expenditure is the best criterion because:

- It is the one measure that is common across all library sectors;
- The data is already available therefore the implementation cost of the model is low;
- Total library expenditure broadly reflects the overall size of a library operation and therefore should be a good indicator of the value that the library will receive from its use of Libraries Australia;
- It is not tied to the expenditure on a specific aspect of the library services, e.g. acquisitions, cataloguing, reference, or interlibrary loans, or to student numbers. This fact is important as the model needs to accommodate different usage patterns in different libraries, i.e. different library will receive greater or lesser value from different aspects of the service.
LIBRARIES AUSTRALIA SUBSCRIPTION MODEL FOR CAUL LIBRARIES

Background

In 2005/2006, the National Library, with the assistance of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee (LAAC) and in particular the recently retired chair Mr John Arfield, developed several new charging models for discussion with the university library sector. These models were developed to alleviate concerns regarding the fact that subscription costs for the Libraries Australia service introduced on 1 July 2005 were based on historical usage of the service and not any independent external criteria.

The CAUL Libraries agreed in February 2006 to a review of their payments while the existing model was continued into 2006/2007. This decision was taken to allay concerns raised that earlier models did not reflect the participant-based nature of the Libraries Australia business, and that the existing model could not be extended across sectors without incurring significant variations in subscription levels, making their application harder to understand and manage.

The models were presented to a Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) meeting in April 2006. In May, a formal CAUL response suggested a negative impact would be incurred by the newly proposed models, including a 10% increase for the Group of 8 libraries over ten years. The National Library and LAAC were encouraged to consider alternatives, taking into account changes in library services and university library roles in Libraries Australia.

Rationale

The current subscription model, which was set in July 2005 based on historical usage of the service (search and document delivery services from 2003-2004), is no longer justifiable. It is necessary to recalibrate the current model by removing the historical baseline.

A change now is also timely because it incorporates the proposed new relationship with the OCLC WorldCat service. Savings created by this merger have been included proportionately. Please refer to paper LAAC/2007/1/2 for further details of this arrangement.

In addition the new model has identified that for every $1,000 allocated to university libraries, 37 cents is spent on Libraries Australia services.

Principles

The National Library is committed to finding a payment model which is reasonable, seeks to minimise variance, and reflects the changing nature of national infrastructural services while acknowledging contributions to those services. For Australian university libraries, this may mean supporting the National Library’s role as a broker in arranging third party services as a contribution to the national information infrastructure, as well as continuing to support new developments to the Libraries Australia service.

The principles adopted for Kinetica charging models still apply to Libraries Australia:

- prices need to be predictable;

1 Libraries Australia: Update on subscriptions model [LAAC/2006/1/5]
2 Kinetica pricing model: proposed subscription model [KAC/2005/1/6]
charges must be sustainable for participants and the National Library;

for participants, charges need to represent value for money and need to be at a level to encourage contribution to the Australian National Bibliographic Database;

charges need to enable the level of service required by participants to be met and to enable developments to ensure the service remains relevant;

charging should encourage new and innovative uses of the service, particularly those which increase direct access by the public to the Australian National Bibliographic Database;

the pricing model needs to be simple and easily (or clearly) understood by participants and the National Library;

the pricing policy must promote and reinforce the objectives of the Libraries Australia service, i.e., fair, equitable, reasonable pricing structures for all university library participants;

reductions in administrative costs will always be sought, to benefit all libraries.

Implementation strategy

The November 2006 meeting of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee sought a new pricing model which (a) seeks to reduce anomalously high subscriptions, by introducing a tiered structure; (b) attempts to avoid large increases or decreases by transitioning all university libraries over a three year timeframe; and (c) is easily applied to existing or new universities in a transparent fashion. The proposed new model aims to achieve these outcomes.

During February and March, various baselines were tested to create a new tiered model. These included grouping universities according to their membership of consortia such as the Group of 8 and the Australian Technology Network, but these did not result in evenly distributed tiers. To derive the model, the following steps were applied:

1. the most recently published library budgets for each university were used as a baseline to establish a set of tiers;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiers - based on total expenditure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 million</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 million</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 million</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 million</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 million</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25 million</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 million</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30 million</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Libraries Australia Business Plan development [LAAC/2006/3/5]
2. where applicable, current Libraries Australia subscriptions and OCLC WorldCat subscriptions were combined;

3. a modest price rise reflecting the Consumer Price Index was added. [Note that no CPI increase has been applied to Libraries Australia subscriptions since 2002];

4. an adjustment to reach the proposed tiers was calculated, with the goal of transitioning to the tiers over a three year timeframe. [Note that where the subscription increase is greater than $5000 per annum, this will be transitioned over a five year timeframe for the few affected libraries.];

5. Each library will be advised by 31 March 2007 how its tier will be reached over the three year timeframe from 2007-2008, 2008-2009, to 2009-2010. This ensures budget predictability; and

6. The National Library is not expecting to apply any other price increases until every university library reaches its appropriate tier.

It is proposed that the model be implemented from 1 July 2007. Of the 37 university libraries to whom the model will be applied, 15 will receive discounts. Of the remainder, most price increases are modest. The total revenue from the university library sector will only increase by 1.8% which is less than the CPI increase proposed for all other Libraries Australia users.

The National Library will progressively calculate new subscription models for the other Library sectors with principles similar to those above in mind.

**Recommendation**

That the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee endorses the proposed model.
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Frequently Asked Questions – CAUL subscription model

1. What has been the basis for CAUL subscriptions in the past?
With the introduction of the current subscription model from 1 July 2005, CAUL subscriptions were based on the average Kinetica Site Licence payments for the financial years 03/04 and 04/05. In effect the basis of costs was historical usage for the 02/03 and 03/04 financial years.

2. Why do we need a new subscription model for CAUL libraries?
The current subscription model, which was set in July 2005 based on historical usage of the service (search and document delivery services from 2003-2004), is no longer justifiable. We wish to remove the connection between subscription charges and usage as this represents a significant disincentive to the use of the service. Also the value of the services provided by Libraries Australia can no longer be measured simply by search usage of the system. We therefore need to base subscription charges on a measure of library size.

3. How was the current subscription model developed?
During 2006, a number of models were developed based on different independent criteria. These included total library expenditure, EFTSU, and acquisitions budgets (serials and non-serials). In 2007, these models were re-visited, and tiers were created to smooth out variations and then compared with existing subscriptions for CAUL libraries. The model that matched existing subscription levels the closest, and hence the model that would cause the least changes for CAUL libraries, was based on total library expenditure.

4. Has the National Library consulted with CAUL about subscriptions?
Yes. There has been considerable consultation between CAUL and the National Library regarding subscriptions including:
   • The meeting with the CAUL Executive on 11 March 2005 when the National Library discussed the new Libraries Australia subscription model;
   • The consultation with CAUL on 6-7 April 2006: several possible CAUL subscription models were presented, all were rejected and a letter was sent from CAUL to the National Library;
   • The meeting with the CAUL Executive on 1 February 2007: CAUL executive made it clear that the National Library should develop a model for CAUL subscriptions.

5. How have the charges for WorldCat been included in the model?
The National Library has developed a model to pass on OCLC agreement costs to all Libraries Australia subscribers including the savings gained through the merger of RLG and OCLC. Key features of the model are:
   • For existing subscribers to WorldCat, no library will pay more than their existing subscriptions;
   • Where libraries currently subscribe to both WorldCat and RLG, future charges will be based on their WorldCat subscription; and
   • Libraries that currently only subscribe to RLG will continue to pay a comparable amount for access to WorldCat.
6. Isn’t the OCLC cost for CAUL libraries irrelevant as the amount that libraries end up at after three or five years through the subscription model is the same anyway?
Yes, the OCLC cost is irrelevant in determining which tier a library falls into in the new pricing model. However, as the OCLC fee is an operating cost that has to be recovered, it was used in determining the final subscription charge for each of the tiers in the model.

7. Why has the final new subscription charge been implemented for some CAUL libraries over three years while for others it is implemented over five years?
In trying to minimise the impact of the transition, libraries whose subscription charges will increase by more than $15,000 will be able to transition to the new subscription charge over five years instead of three. Where the new model results in a decrease in the subscription charge the transition will be implemented over three years irrespective of the size of the reduction.

8. Isn’t this just a money making exercise by the National Library?
The model is essentially revenue neutral for the National Library. The total revenue from the university library sector will increase by 1.8% over the 3-5 year life of the model which is less than the CPI increase proposed for all other Libraries Australia users in 2007/2008.

Under the new model, for every $1,000 of expenditure by university libraries, 37 cents is spent on Libraries Australia subscriptions.

9. What if the CAUL total library expenditure figures are not accurate for my library. What can I do?
The National Library is happy to discuss particular issues that you may have. Please provide evidence, for example from annual reports or other figures, showing the discrepancy in total library expenditure information. If this moves your library within the tier structure then the National Library will consider a different subscription level. Note that if this applies to a substantial number of CAUL libraries, then the tier model would need to be adjusted as the model needs to be essentially revenue neutral.
LIBRARIES AUSTRALIA AGREEMENT WITH OCLC

Introduction
Libraries Australia subscribers currently have limited access to the WorldCat database for searching and cataloguing. In 2002, the National Library negotiated a “small libraries agreement” that allows Australian libraries, excluding NSLA and CAUL members, to access WorldCat for a per search cost through Libraries Australia. Many NSLA and CAUL libraries currently use WorldCat as a secondary source of catalogue records but such arrangements have to date been negotiated directly with OCLC’s Australian distributor, DA Information Services, outside of their participation in Libraries Australia.

All Libraries Australia subscribers currently have access to the RLG Union Catalogue through an agreement negotiated by the National Library in 2006. In July 2006, RLG and OCLC merged and RLG Union Catalogue records will be migrated into WorldCat by the middle of 2007.

There has been a trend in recent years for National Union Catalogues from around the world to supply data to WorldCat as OCLC aim to expand the scope of the database as a global catalogue of library holdings. For example, the National Library of New Zealand recently announced a “partnering” agreement with OCLC which includes supply of Te Puna records for the New Zealand National Union Catalogue to WorldCat¹.

The National Library of Australia has in recent years been exploring options for a closer relationship with OCLC which would support improved access to WorldCat for Australian libraries. The merger of RLG and OCLC provided a new imperative for development of a closer relationship to support the cataloguing needs of libraries currently using the RLG Union Catalogue through Libraries Australia.

Issues
In August 2006 the National Library resumed negotiations with OCLC for cataloguing and search access to WorldCat on behalf of subscribers to Libraries Australia. The starting point for negotiations with OCLC was that any agreement should have benefits for all Australian libraries and support the continued development of the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD).

In February 2007, the National Library reached agreement with OCLC regarding access to WorldCat for Libraries Australia subscribers. Key points of the Agreement are:

- All Australian libraries who subscribe to Libraries Australia would have unlimited search and cataloguing access to OCLC’s WorldCat;
- Libraries must be Libraries Australia subscribers to get access to WorldCat through this Agreement;
- FirstSearch (access to non-WorldCat databases) and OCLC ILL access are not included in the Agreement;
- The Agreement includes access to RLG Union Catalogue data which will be migrated to WorldCat by mid 2007;
- The Agreement includes cross-synchronisation of records: provision of in-scope ANBD records² with Australian library holdings from the ANBD to WorldCat and provision of WorldCat records with Australian library holdings from WorldCat to the ANBD;

² In-scope ANBD records include Australian library contributed bibliographic records with holdings in the ANBD but may not include some records sourced from commercial suppliers.
- CONFIDENTIAL -

The National Library is committed to providing a high level of service through Libraries Australia and the ANBD. The Library recognises the support of Australian libraries over the past 25 years through development of the service, sharing of catalogue records and library resources and contribution of records to the ANBD. The Agreement with OCLC has been designed to protect the ANBD and Libraries Australia service through a number of provisions including: that users need to be Libraries Australia subscribers to get access to WorldCat through this Agreement; that in the event of termination of the Agreement between the National Library and OCLC, OCLC will remove Australian holdings from WorldCat; and that OCLC has granted the National Library the right to market in Australia access to WorldCat through Libraries Australia.

The National Library believes that the contribution of Australia library holdings to WorldCat will be of benefit to Australian libraries by increasing the visibility of our collections worldwide and will facilitate retrospective cataloguing by Australian libraries through increased access to WorldCat. An additional benefit is that contribution of records from the ANBD to WorldCat is free under the Agreement which represents a large saving for Australian libraries to contribute their holdings – a saving in both monetary and technical terms through centralised contribution via the ANBD.

Under terms of the Agreement, the National Library will pay OCLC a fixed annual cost for access to WorldCat and recover costs from Libraries Australia subscribers. The annual cost of the Agreement is comparable to the current total cost paid by Australian libraries for WorldCat cataloguing access. OCLC have the right to increase their annual fee each year by a maximum of 3%. The Library has developed an equitable model to pass on costs to Libraries Australia subscribers which passes on savings gained through the merger of RLG and OCLC. Key features of the model are:

- For existing subscribers to WorldCat, no library will pay more than their existing subscriptions;
- Where libraries currently subscribe to both WorldCat and RLG, future costs will be based on their WorldCat subscription;
- For existing users of WorldCat through Libraries Australia under the “small libraries agreement”, costs will be based on usage trends over the last two calendar years; and
- Libraries that currently only subscribe to RLG will continue to pay a comparable amount for access to WorldCat.

It is proposed to increase the Libraries Australia subscriptions of non-WorldCat/RLG users by approximately 3% for 2007/2008 (Weighted average CPI for 2005/2006 was 3.2%4) for the following reasons:

- To partially fund the Agreement for WorldCat access with OCLC; and
- To partially fund the continued development and enhancement of Libraries Australia services.

---

3 Levels of participation and roles and responsibilities of governing members of OCLC are defined here:
http://www.oclc.org/membership/levels/default.htm
http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/contribute/principles/default.htm
http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/contribute/guidelines/default.htm

In support of this increase we note that:

- There has been no CPI-based increase in Libraries Australia subscriptions since July 2002 when there was an increase of 3.5%; and
- In July 2005, with the introduction of the subscription model, a discount of $520,000 was distributed across subscribers to Libraries Australia.

It is proposed to increase the Libraries Australia subscriptions of WorldCat/RLG users by a lesser amount of approximately 1% for 2007/2008 as these libraries are funding the bulk of the cost of the OCLC Agreement.

The expected implementation date for the Agreement is 1 July 2007. OCLC will provide pro-rata credits to libraries with existing cataloguing subscriptions for WorldCat that end after this date. The National Library will soon be writing to each Libraries Australia subscriber to inform them of the OCLC Agreement and subscriptions for 2007/2008.

Access to WorldCat will be extended to all Libraries Australia subscribers and will be supported through a number of different workflows. This will include access through Libraries Australia Cataloguing (both via the cataloguing client and web cataloguing services), Libraries Australia Search, and as a target in the Libraries Australia Zgateway. Subscribing libraries will be encouraged to continue cataloguing using the ANBD and to use WorldCat as a secondary source of cataloguing records via Libraries Australia services.

The National Library believes that this Agreement is of great benefit to Australian libraries while protecting their interests in maintenance of a viable Australian National Union Catalogue and Libraries Australia service. It represents a major step forward in the sharing of Australian bibliographic data and exposure of the collections of Australian libraries internationally and we seek the endorsement of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee for its implementation.

**Recommendation**

That the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee endorses the proposed OCLC Agreement and the increase to Libraries Australia subscriptions for 2007/2008.

Assistant Director-General, Resource Sharing
Contact: Tony Boston
        (02) 6262 1143

7 March 2007
Frequently Asked Questions - OCLC agreement

1. Why is the National Library entering into an agreement with OCLC?
The National Library has in recent years been exploring options for a closer relationship with OCLC which would support improved access to WorldCat for Australian libraries. At the same time OCLC has been expanding the scope of WorldCat to provide a global catalogue of library holdings and has substantially changed its position on how it relates to Libraries Australia. The merger of RLG and OCLC provided a new imperative for development of a closer relationship to support the cataloguing needs of libraries currently using the RLG Union Catalogue through Libraries Australia. A closer relationship will also allow Australian libraries to benefit from OCLC research and development.

2. Are all Libraries Australia subscribers included?
Yes. This agreement will cover all Libraries Australia subscribers including CAUL and NSLA members. OCLC was unwilling to include CAUL and NSLA members in the previous agreement which was negotiated in 2002. The inclusion of CAUL and NSLA members was a major driver for the National Library’s negotiation of this new agreement with OCLC.

3. What is the period of the OCLC agreement?
The agreement will commence on 1 July 2007 for an initial term of one year. Thereafter, the agreement will be renewed automatically for further periods of one year. The agreement can be terminated at any time by either party with 60 days notice.

4. What safeguards are there in the OCLC agreement to protect the ongoing viability of the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD) and Libraries Australia service?
The agreement with OCLC has been designed to protect the ANBD and Libraries Australia service through a number of provisions including: that users need to be Libraries Australia subscribers to get access to WorldCat through this agreement; that in the event of termination of the agreement, OCLC will remove Australian holdings from WorldCat; and that OCLC has granted the National Library the right to market in Australia access to WorldCat through Libraries Australia.

5. What are the financial arrangements in the OCLC agreement?
The National Library will pay an annual fee to OCLC that allows unlimited search and cataloguing access to WorldCat for Libraries Australia subscribers and their end users. OCLC have the right to increase their fee annually by a maximum of 3%.

6. Why is this agreement of benefit to Australian libraries?
This agreement will provide all Libraries Australia subscribers with unlimited access to WorldCat for copy cataloguing. This will be especially useful for the cataloguing of overseas materials and for retrospective cataloguing projects. Library end users will also have unlimited search access. The agreement will enable Australian libraries to benefit from OCLC research and development and service improvements.

The National Library has been attempting to build a closer relationship with OCLC for over 10 years. The agreement builds on a previous agreement which provided
“small libraries” (excluding CAUL and NSLA members) with charge per search access to WorldCat and also the National Library’s contract with OCLC PICA for the use of their CBS software to support the Libraries Australia Cataloguing service.

Under the new agreement OCLC will provide unlimited access to WorldCat at a price which is significantly lower than previously offered.

The National Library believes that this Agreement is of great benefit to Australian libraries while protecting their interests in maintenance of a viable Australian National Bibliographic Database and Libraries Australia service. It represents a major step forward in the sharing of Australian bibliographic data and exposure of the collections of Australian libraries internationally. Supporting this agreement will increase the value of Australian library holdings.

7. **Do contributing Australian libraries become governing members of OCLC?**
   Yes. Australian libraries who contribute current holdings to the Australian National Bibliographic Database (ANBD) and WorldCat through this agreement become governing members of OCLC.

8. **With the addition of so many Australian libraries, will OCLC governance arrangements change?**
   On 17 April 2007, OCLC announced that the OCLC Board of Trustees has appointed a special Governance Study Committee to conduct a study of OCLC’s governance structure. See: http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200660.htm.

The National Library has commenced informal discussions with OCLC about our requirements for better representation as input into the study of OCLC’s governance structure. The National Library is considering the benefits of Australasian grouping within the OCLC governance structure.

9. **Does the agreement provide for end user search access to WorldCat both through Libraries Australia Search and via Z39.50?**
   Yes. Unlimited search access is available to Libraries Australia subscribers and their end users.

10. **Which records from the ANBD will be uploaded to WorldCat?**
    Most ANBD bibliographic records which have holdings attached will be uploaded to WorldCat. A small number of records which have been supplied to the ANBD by commercial suppliers will be excluded where the supplier does not allow Libraries Australia to provide them to OCLC. Also under the agreement, existing and future WorldCat bibliographic records with Australian library holdings will be uploaded to the ANBD.

11. **Is there any cost involved in loading ANBD records into WorldCat?**
    The contribution of records from the ANBD to WorldCat is free under the agreement. This represents a large saving for Australian libraries – a saving in both monetary and technical terms through centralised contribution via the ANBD.

12. **How is the migration of the RLG Union Catalogue into WorldCat proceeding?**

13. How will Libraries Australia subscribers access WorldCat?
Libraries can search and obtain copy catalogue records from WorldCat using Libraries Australia Search or Z39.50. Later in 2007 it will be possible to access WorldCat (and other databases) using the Libraries Australia Cataloguing Client. Libraries that are already using WorldCat for searching and cataloguing may continue to use their current access mechanism.

14. How can I find out more about the OCLC agreement?
For implementation details please contact Rob Walls, Director Libraries Australia Database Services (rwalls@nla.gov.au). For other issues please contact Tony Boston, Assistant Director-General, Resource Sharing (tboston@nla.gov.au).
# CAUL Strategic Plan

## Report to CAUL

**Author:** Jim Graham  
**Date:** 20th April 2007  
**Date of previous report:** 28th August 2006

### Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships with other organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QULOC activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convenor, QULOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Time-line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Activity since last report

| QULOC University Librarians met on 24th November 2006 at the University of Queensland and on 30th March at the University of New England. Approved minutes are available at [http://www.quloc.org.au/](http://www.quloc.org.au/) under QULOC Groups/University Librarians. |

### Achievements since last report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At its last 2 meetings the QULOC University Librarians have been preparing a new Strategic Plan which will be finalised at the July meeting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Since the last CAUL meeting QULOC has organised the following seminars:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working Effectively Across Collaborative Teams 8th September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Masterclass for EndNote Trainers 27th October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University Librarians Forum 23rd November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Challenges in Collection Development and Acquisitions 20th April 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report

| QULOC’s 2006 Annual report has been approved and will be published on the web shortly. Issue 7 of QULOC News is available on the QULOC website. |

### Plan for forthcoming activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forthcoming QULOC events include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Recruiting and Selecting Staff/ Staffing Issues WP 5th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building a culture of quality /Quality Issues WP 6th July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not just for techies! / Information &amp; Communication Technology WP October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EndNote Masterclass / Information Skills &amp; Services WP 27th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University Librarians Forum. 22 November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QULOC University Librarians will next meet on 27th July.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAUL budget implications

| None. |

### Recommendations to CAUL

| None. |

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
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Format of this Report
The main budget worksheet is CAUL’s Profit & Loss (P&L) for the year to date, showing:

In AUD:
- Budgeted income
- Budgeted expenditure
- Expected expenditure to date (based on the budgeted amount and the expected expenditure flow, which may be seasonal)
- Actual expenditure to date (from the MYOB AUD P&L report)

The sub-total (CAUL + CEIRC operations) reports CAUL's operational budget. Following this sub-total are items for which CAUL collects funds to pay subscriptions of various kinds, effectively cost-neutral: datasets subscriptions, Rodski subscriptions, SPARC membership.

In USD, GBP and EUR:
The income and expenditure of the foreign currency accounts are presented below the AUD report - these items, datasets income and expenditure, also are effectively cost-neutral with the exception of interest

The worksheets which follow the main report are the Balance Sheets, P&L reports, and Cash Flow Statements for each of the four currencies.

CAUL Income
The budget for CAUL income is presented once only, not month by month. The only variable items are interest earned and the sale of publications - currently the information literacy user guide, and the CAUL performance indicators which are sold through CAVAL. All other income is collected at the beginning of the year, due by January 31. Presenting a month-by-month report would be highly repetitive.

CAUL Expenditure
The expenditure to date is taken from the MYOB report AUD P&L, shown on a separate worksheet. The budget item may be a single MYOB item, or may be a sum of more than one item eg office expenses are the sum of accounts for fax, telephone, consumables, training, bank fees, etc; executive officer expenses are the sum of salary, on-costs, salary administration, etc.

Datasets Subscriptions "Budget" (and the foreign currency accounts EUR, GBP and USD)
As there is no budget for this item, income and expenditure patterns of the previous year have been used. The bulk of the income and expenditure happens during renewals time of November-January.

Liabilities
Provisions have been made for Annual Leave and Long Service Leave for the Executive Officer, expensed in 2005, retained as liabilities from 2006.
Audit of 2006 CAUL accounts
The audit of the 2006 accounts confirmed a "profit" of $..., of which $... was a surplus to the budgetted amount, and the remainder effective "income" from interest earned and "gain/loss on foreign exchange" on the foreign currency accounts. Retained earnings amount to $427,979 across all accounts. Cash held at the end of the 2006 financial year was AUD 3,131,029.

Salary Expenditure for 2007
The Executive Officer total is based on the 2007 salary of $89,039 plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39%
The Finance and Administration Officer (1.0 FTE) is based on the 2007 salary of $44,203 plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%
The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) is based on the 2007 casual rates of $30.02 plus plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%

CEIRC Income & Expenditure for 2007
CEIRC Income is based on a 5% increase over last year's fees, for both the 49 internal (CAUL, CONZUL and CSIRO) members at $1,320 and the 26 external participants at $1,980.
CEIRC Expenditure varies with the cost of travel of the committee, and increases annually because of salary costs, currently calculated at 35% of the Executive Officer and 85% of the Finance and Administration Officer - these allocations are being reviewed in 2007.

Interest earned on the foreign currency accounts is notionally available to the CEIRC program, though the funds are not actually transferred into the AUD account, and do not therefore show as income earned, except on paper. The funds are retained in the foreign currency accounts as a cash float.

Publications / Web Site for 2007
It is proposed that the web site design be updated. CAUDIT is in the middle of a similar exercise, and was given quotes of $21k, $35k and $99k for the first stage. Given that the CAUL requirements are simpler, specifically with respect to the number of levels of authentication, it is proposed that $25,000 be allocated from reserve funds.

Travel Costs for 2007
CAUL committee meetings are held in the most efficient and cost-effective venues, which generally means the least onerous travel conditions for the members (eg preferably be able to fly direct) while taking best advantage of the cheaper fare options available. Costs depend mostly on the home base of the committee members - more expensive where there is less competition between airlines. The average cost of fares hasn't changed much over the last few years, so the location of the committee members is generally the largest variable factor.

ADT Budget 2007 - Andrew Wells.
We set out cost of operation in business plan 2006-2009, item 4, operation. For 2006, we will use Marian's moneys to fund awards. The NTLTD invoice is on its way for the amount in the plan. There are no software maintenance costs but we do that ourselves now but will absorb. I do not think anyone will travel to NTLTD this year. So expenses over 2006 will be as per business plan minus (software maintenance + NTLTD expenses + awards). So $57 K + travel expenses. Levy across CAUL and CONZUL.

For 2007, add awards so $59 K plus travel expenses. Again, we will do NTLTD work via email.
### CAUL Budget 2007 (updated 19/4/07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Budgeted Balance</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.65)</td>
<td>80,446.60</td>
<td>26,815.53</td>
<td>$24,899.28</td>
<td>-$1,916.25</td>
<td>-7.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant</td>
<td>20,114.25</td>
<td>6,704.75</td>
<td>6,684.75</td>
<td>-$20.00</td>
<td>-0.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>3,720.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>7,006.00</td>
<td>2,333.33</td>
<td>1,698.55</td>
<td>-$436.78</td>
<td>-18.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>1,647.00</td>
<td>-$1,686.33</td>
<td>-50.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>2,730.00</td>
<td>2,470.80</td>
<td>-$259.20</td>
<td>-9.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>1,578.32</td>
<td>-$3,421.68</td>
<td>-68.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>3,941.31</td>
<td>-$58.69</td>
<td>-1.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President's Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>666.67</td>
<td>281.27</td>
<td>$385.40</td>
<td>-57.81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation/Seminars</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>1,333.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$1,333.33</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFLA Membership</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td><strong>211,720.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>190,750.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,969.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,916.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,399.28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROGRAMMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copyright</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALCC Levy</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Levy</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Best Practice

| CONZUL contribution | 5,045.00 |
| Statistics Publication | 30,512.00 |
| Meetings             | 1,000.00 |
| **Sub-total (Best Practice)** | **0.00** |

#### ULA

| Meetings | 0.00 |
| **Sub-total (ULA)** | **0.00** |

#### ADT Program

| ADT Membership Fees | 64,800.00 |
| Meetings            | 4,000.00 |
| NTLTD Meetings      | 10,000.00 |
| **Sub-total (ADT)** | **64,800.00** |

#### CEIRC PROGRAM

| CEIRC Levy (CAUL)   | 63,360.00 |
| CEIRC Levy (external) | 51,480.00 |
| Meetings            | 15,000.00 |
| Research            | 5,000.00 |
| CAUL-Industry ThinkTank | 0.00 |
| **Sub-total (CEIRC)** | **114,840.00** |

#### SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)

| Surplus / (Deficit) | (25,453.00) |
|**SUB-TOTAL (AUD account)** | **412,934.46** |

#### FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)

| Subscriptions Income | 1,574.46 |
|**Datasets Subscriptions** | **Total in AUD** | **26,930.45** |

#### Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)

| USD account | 1,092,189.44 |
| GBP account | 4,950.06 |
| EUR account | 0.00 |
| Interest | 18,314.00 |
| Interest | 2,057.74 |
| Interest | 0.00 |
| **TOTAL EUR** | **0.00** |

Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 1. EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC, salary 84k from 11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: This is the combined interest expected on the four caul accounts, based on the previous year's interest earned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 19,000 in 2003; 22,717 in 2004; 14,014 to 30/6/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: &lt; 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity HEW4 incl o/c &amp; salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 9000 minus CEIRC contribution for external 8*630=5040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 315+GST per fortnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: $5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Approved CAUL2004/2, not to be renewed caul2005/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Library Consortium £335 ($500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: including awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: USD7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B51</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B52</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: External members estimate for 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: &gt;85% time on CEIRC activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E55</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 1 meeting only in 2007 late April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Interest on Foreign Currency Accounts expected to be AUD25k, not transferred to AUD account, but &quot;applied&quot; to CEIRC income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Profit & Loss [Last Year Analysis]

January 2007 through April 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1/1/07-1/4/07</th>
<th>1/1/06-4/30/06</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Income</td>
<td>$3,720.00</td>
<td>$3,720.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Membership Subscriptions</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Membership</td>
<td>$64,800.00</td>
<td>$73,440.00</td>
<td>($8,640.00)</td>
<td>-11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy</td>
<td>$118,140.00</td>
<td>$112,920.00</td>
<td>$5,220.00</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datasets Subscriptions</td>
<td>$5,744.45</td>
<td>$56,685.44</td>
<td>($55,110.98)</td>
<td>-97.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (DO NOT USE)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCU Levy</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Fees</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Interest</td>
<td>$9,730.92</td>
<td>$11,861.54</td>
<td>($2,130.62)</td>
<td>-17.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight reimbursement</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc (DO NOT USE - use Suspens)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$397,965.38</td>
<td>$458,836.98</td>
<td>($60,871.60)</td>
<td>-13.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Cost Of Sales**        |               |                |              |              |
| Database Subscription Payments | $1,677.57    | $56,857.79     | ($55,180.22) | -97.05%      |
| **Total Cost Of Sales**  | $1,677.57     | $56,857.79     | ($55,180.22) | -97.05%      |

| **Gross Profit**         | $396,287.81   | $401,979.19    | ($5,691.38)  | -1.42%       |

| **Expenses**             |               |                |              |              |
| Services to Members      |               |                |              |              |
| Executive Officer EO Salary | $27,309.04   | $25,917.66     | $1,391.38    | 5.37%        |
| EO On-costs              | $7,986.08     | $7,102.80      | $873.28      | 11.17%       |
| EO Conferences / CE      | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| EO Salary administration fees | $2,560.00    | $2,923.38      | ($363.38)    | -12.43%      |
| Annual Leave (EO)        | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| Long Service Leave EO    | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| EO Appointment costs     | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| EO Travel                | $541.47       | $541.47        | $0.00        | 0.00%        |
| **Total Executive Officer** | $38,306.59   | $35,943.84     | $2,362.75    | 6.57%        |

| Office expenses          |               |                |              |              |
| Fax/Telephone            | $182.22       | $231.06        | ($48.84)     | -21.14%      |
| Postage/Courier          | $91.27        | $93.09         | ($1.82)      | -1.96%       |
| Printing                 | $0.00         | $110.80        | ($110.80)    | -100.00%     |
| Publications             | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| Consumables              | $252.35       | $224.19        | $28.16       | 943.20%      |
| Hospitality              | $0.00         | $224.72        | ($224.72)    | -100.00%     |
| Equipment servicing/repair | $90.91       | $0.00          | $90.91       | #DIV/0!      |
| **Total Office expenses** | $616.75       | $683.86        | ($67.11)     | -9.81%       |

| Office rental            | $2,470.80     | $2,779.65      | ($308.85)    | -11.11%      |

| Office Staffing          |               |                |              |              |
| Salary & Costs           | $4,744.80     | $5,651.16      | ($906.36)    | -16.04%      |
| Training                 | $985.00       | $985.00        | $0.00        | 0.00%        |

| Financial Support        |               |                |              |              |
| Book-keeping             | $1,647.00     | $2,130.00      | ($483.00)    | -22.68%      |
| Auditing                 | $0.00         | $70.00         | ($70.00)     | -100.00%     |

| Bank Fees                |               |                |              |              |
| Bank fees                | $294.80       | $1,147.39      | ($852.59)    | -74.31%      |
| Transit Interest (reimbursable) | $0.00     | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| Sundry expenses (DO NOT USE) | $0.00      | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| **Total Services to Members** | $49,065.74  | $48,405.80     | $659.94      | 1.36%        |

| President                |               |                |              |              |
| President Travel         | $281.27       | $525.77        | ($244.50)    | -46.50%      |
| President Office expenses | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| **Total President**      | $281.27       | $525.77        | ($244.50)    | -46.50%      |

| General Meetings#        |               |                |              |              |
| CAUL Meetings Travel     | $423.77       | $519.03        | ($95.26)     | -18.35%      |
| CAUL Meetings Venue Costs | $1,154.55    | $3,176.09      | ($1,921.54)  | -60.65%      |
| CAUL Meetings Catering   | $0.00         | $5,258.88      | ($5,258.88)  | -100.00%     |
| **Total General Meetings** | $1,578.32    | $8,954.00      | ($7,375.68)  | -82.37%      |
| ACODE, CAUDIT, CAUL      | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| Honoraria, Gifts to 2005 | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |
| Achievement Award        | $0.00         | $0.00          | $0.00        | #DIV/0!      |

| Executive Meetings       |               |                |              |              |
| Exec Travel              | $3,341.41     | $2,722.88      | $618.73      | 22.73%       |
| Exec Venue Costs         | $290.36       | $0.00          | $290.36      | #DIV/0!      |
| Exec Catering            | $309.54       | $68.18         | $241.36      | 354.00%      |
| **Total Executive Meetings** | $3,941.31   | $2,790.98      | $1,150.45    | 41.22%      |
### Profit & Loss [Last Year Analysis]

#### January 2007 through April 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>1/1/07-1/19/07</th>
<th>1/1/06-30/4/06</th>
<th>$ Difference</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stats Consultancies</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stats Collection &amp; Preparation</td>
<td>($5,585.00)</td>
<td>($4,600.00)</td>
<td>($985.00)</td>
<td>21.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Focus Group</td>
<td>$141.82</td>
<td>$14.55</td>
<td>$127.27</td>
<td>874.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Roadshow</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTR Membership</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Statistics</td>
<td>($5,443.18)</td>
<td>($4,585.45)</td>
<td>($857.73)</td>
<td>18.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$441.00</td>
<td>($441.00)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy WG</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Australia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$138.95</td>
<td>($138.95)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRA - Natl Coop Store</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of CAUL(Various)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLIS-AGPS Liaison Committee</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIC Representation</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Ind Consultancies</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Ind. Publ. &amp; Distrib.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy Project</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Performance Indicators</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,407.38</td>
<td>($1,407.38)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Catering</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Meetings</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCC Membership</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Consultancy</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Copyright</td>
<td>$20,500.00</td>
<td>$21,407.38</td>
<td>($907.38)</td>
<td>-4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL/Industry Thinktank</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL/Industry Thinktank Income</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL/Industry Thinktank Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CAUL/Industry Thinktank</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus - Cooperative Information</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus Travel</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus Consulting</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janus Total</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Digital Theses</td>
<td>$5,157.93</td>
<td>$560.84</td>
<td>$4,597.09</td>
<td>819.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT - Travel</td>
<td>$5,157.93</td>
<td>$560.84</td>
<td>$4,597.09</td>
<td>819.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Administration</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTLD Membership</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTLD travel</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Australian Digital Theses</td>
<td>$5,157.93</td>
<td>$560.84</td>
<td>$4,597.09</td>
<td>819.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Program</td>
<td>$17,537.70</td>
<td>$15,817.88</td>
<td>$1,719.82</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Admin Staff</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Telephone/Fax</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Postage/Courier</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Printing</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Meetings from 2006</td>
<td>$3,052.31</td>
<td>$2,980.43</td>
<td>$71.88</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Travel</td>
<td>$3,052.31</td>
<td>$2,980.43</td>
<td>$71.88</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC Travel to 2005</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Venue Costs</td>
<td>$932.63</td>
<td>$472.73</td>
<td>$459.90</td>
<td>97.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Catering</td>
<td>$3,250.00</td>
<td>$1,111.63</td>
<td>$2,138.37</td>
<td>192.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Consultancies</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC travel from 2006</td>
<td>$4,469.85</td>
<td>$4,008.22</td>
<td>$461.63</td>
<td>11.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CEIRC Program</td>
<td>$29,242.49</td>
<td>$24,390.89</td>
<td>$4,851.60</td>
<td>19.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARC membership</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Membership</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Not used</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$104,323.88</td>
<td>$103,333.22</td>
<td>$990.66</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Profit</td>
<td>$291,963.93</td>
<td>$298,645.97</td>
<td>($6,682.04)</td>
<td>-2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains/Loss on Foreign Exchange</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Expenses</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Profit/(Loss)</td>
<td>$291,963.93</td>
<td>$298,645.97</td>
<td>($6,682.04)</td>
<td>-2.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CEIRC Budget 2007 (updated 19/4/07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEIRC PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (CAUL)</td>
<td>63,360.00</td>
<td>43,317.40</td>
<td>14,439.13</td>
<td>$13,407.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>51,480.00</td>
<td>53,239.75</td>
<td>17,746.58</td>
<td>$18,940.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CEIRC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>114,840.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,557.15</strong></td>
<td>-6,717.15</td>
<td><strong>42,352.38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Datasets Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>1,574.46</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,677.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS</strong> (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>1,092,189.44</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>417,817.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>18,314.06</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USD</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,110,503.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>418,117.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£ ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>24,842.15</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34,008.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2,057.74</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL £</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,899.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,027.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUR ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EUR</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDENDUM to CEIRC accounts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notionally in CEIRC income (AUD value at date of worksheet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>26,930.45</td>
<td>Accounting &amp; Auditing 294.80</td>
<td>1,647.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Notionally in CEIRC expenses, currently in main budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Fees</td>
<td>21,980.39 @ 0.8332</td>
<td>USD account</td>
<td>21,980.39</td>
<td>0.8332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBP account</td>
<td>4,950.06 @ 0.4157</td>
<td>EUR account</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.6129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in AUD</td>
<td><strong>26,930.45</strong></td>
<td>Total in AUD</td>
<td><strong>26,930.45</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This report includes items previously reported to the Executive.

CAUL Office.

Late September and early October were occupied by a flurry of media activity and correspondence after the joint press release on the banning of terrorism books was picked up, particularly after the interview with the Attorney-General on ABC’s Lateline. Details are listed in the minutes of Executive 2006/6 under media reports.

CAUL elections for the Executive Committee, CEIRC and the Datasets Coordinators were completed. The CAUL report for 2005-2006 is all but completed, and the strategic plan finalised and printed.

I convened a working group to respond on behalf of CAUL to the IFLA study library services for Visually Impaired People. The results are available from the CAUL survey register. Members of the working group were Geoff Payne, La Trobe; Jenny Wildy, UWA; Deidre Boland and Rose Shaw, CSU; and significant comments on the draft were received from Veronica Dawson, Griffith and were included in the final response.

University of Newcastle procurement project. I have been in touch with Nat McGregor of the university and Cynthia Hansen of HES regarding the project, and potential relevance of the CEIRC program.

Prior to Christmas most activity was related to the processing of CEIRC subscriptions and invoices, while post-Christmas, there is bulk catch-up of the associated paperwork. The volume is increasing annually, and has highlighted the need to monitor CEIRC vs other CAUL activities for 2007 (itself a major task) to determine the current cost of maintaining the CEIRC program.

Both Alisha Davies and I began tracking our allocation of time between CEIRC and the rest, from January 29. This was last done by me in 2003, and by Rachelle Morgan in 2004. This time I have broken it down into CEIRC, Finance and the rest – a high proportion of finance-related activity is CEIRC-related, except for the actual preparation of the CAUL budget papers. Finance activity increases in proportion to CEIRC activity.

CEIRC.

There is relatively little new activity in the first quarter of the year, but 20 new offers have been received and made available to members, and renewals information for two others have been processed. Ongoing negotiations with Sage have consumed considerable time – initial discussions were held in March 2005, suffered significant interruptions from the Sage end, and were restarted in November with a new Sage office opened in Singapore, and attendance by Sage and EBSCO representatives at the January CEIRC meeting.

I attended a meeting of the Springer North American Library Advisory Board in Orlando, March 14-16. It was attended by senior Springer representatives, including Peter Hendriks, Global Director of Sales and Marketing. The meeting was facilitated by an outside company to allow all participants to participate fully – it worked very well. There were a few short presentations, with more time devoted to breakout groups and discussion, topics covering the new SpringerLink platform, e-books and pricing models. Springer is keen to sell full packages with targeted pricing, rather than targeted collections, or unbundling – which is both expensive and reduces the distribution of the content. Transfers into collections are a big issue for all libraries,

I attended the North American ICOLC meeting in Montreal, April 22-25. Vendors invited were Wiley-Blackwell – who were very open with merger activity to date and plans for the future, including confirmation that all current contracts will stay in place; CSA-ProQuest, who weren’t prepared to discuss merger activity or future plans, but instead discussed their new approach to selling digitised databases, to include subscriptions rather than just purchases; Lexis Nexis discussing their new archival databases, purchase only for significant amounts of money. The licensing discussions focussed on approaches to pricing models, included internal consortial allocations (I chaired one of three breakout sessions); the SERU guidelines for a shared understanding of terms of use to replace contracts and licences, particularly for small and society publishers; the issues and impacts surrounding the transfer of titles between publishers and their packages (I presented this session...
with Joan Emmet from Yale); and the proposal for encoding licence conditions for inclusion in ERMs.

Other sessions focussed on group-based repositories.

**Finance & Audit.**

From November to January, 2,100 invoices were raised; 580 payments received (many covering multiple invoices); for a total of AUD 22m approximately (USD 10.1m, AUD 1.5m, £ 2.9m). The bulk of these transactions were CEIRC-related.

Many of the December invoices were raised *ad hoc* for those institutions who wanted to pay all their subscriptions before their finance department closed down – some as early as November 30. Provision of “estimated” invoices generally takes significantly more time than those processed normally. Some vendors were extremely late in providing information for 2007 (Taylor & Francis (both the journals and the Europa reference division)), or have been slow in dealing with reconciliation of subscription lists (Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press) and consequently we have not received final invoices from them.

The audit of 2006 accounts began on February 5, following the final reconciliation of the four accounts, and the collection and compilation of the data required by the auditors. The 2006 budget report has been updated, but won’t be finalised until after the audit is completed. Under- and over-expenditure is generally as reported to the CAUL 2006/2 meeting and reflected in the draft budget for 2007.

The 2007 budget for the President’s meetings has been reduced because this item is consistently under-spent - in the main because the President extends travel for other purposes, and makes only a few trips specifically in the role of CAUL president.

Similarly, the 2007 budget for representation/seminars and CCA meetings has been reduced. This item will be monitored.

Only one ADT meeting will be held in 2006, in October. The costs are likely to be less than budgeted.

CEIRC has not commissioned any external work, with the committee undertaking all identified work. The research budget is likely to be unspent.

Audit and accounting costs have increased, both because of the volume and because, in the case of the audit, of greater complexity. Complexity is mainly due to the foreign currency accounts and the accrual of subscription purchases and sales in the year in which the invoice is received – to show subscriptions as income neutral. The last major clean-up task for this year’s audit will be to balance the balance sheet for the USD account – to ensure that the “retained earnings” and “current earnings” accurately reflect that state of the account.

The 2007 budget presentation document has been prepared in the new format, involving all Profit&Loss, Balance Sheet, and Cash Flow Statements from the four accounts included, and reconciled with the main budget presentation worksheet (to allow automatic update of the latter when the P&L data in the other worksheets is updated monthly.)

The CEIRC committee requested that the program’s budget show all the foreign currency interest. As this was one of the issues in the revamp of the budget presentation over the past year, that the different currencies be kept completely separate, I offered to prepare a notional CEIRC report, though its actual value will vary according to exchange rates, and cannot be regarded as real figures unless the funds are physically transferred from the foreign currency accounts into the AUD account.

Balances in the foreign currency accounts provide a cash flow for payment of subscriptions if institutional payments to CAUL are lagging. For example, at the end of January USD 11k was more than 90 days overdue, another 81k more than 60 days, and another 53k more than 30 days. By contrast, I contract with our vendors for a 60 day payment period, but try to pay as close to 30 days as possible.

**Banking.** The Commonwealth Bank asked us to change the way we make payments from our foreign currency accounts. Since 1998, we have taken signed authorities to the local branch where they have entered the transactions online, usually as we wait, and we are provided with a printed receipt. In late August, the branch advised us that we were to change our procedures, to fax
authorities directly to Global Payments, and were required to sign an indemnity document to release 
the bank from liability should they make transfers in good faith on receipt of our faxes (should there 
be some problem with the eventual payment.) There is a security call-back made if the payment is 
over $50,000, but there is effectively no security for CAUL for lower amounts if we fax them 
ourselves. An alternative is to take the fax authorities to the branch and have them counter-sign and 
fax them to Global Payments. We are now doing this.

Online banking is another option, but when investigated last year, the documentation required to be 
signed was incomprehensible and I could not in good faith recommend that we move to that option. 
I am now reviewing a new service with better and clearer documentation.

The following appeared in the IT Australian on March 27: 

AUSTRALIAN financial institutions are bracing for hundreds of millions of dollars in new 
compliance spending as they prepare to meet the requirements of stringent anti-money-
laundering (AML) laws. …. Financial institutions have two years to comply with the Anti-
Money-Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act 2006, which introduces an 
unprecedented level of customer transaction monitoring. …. 

I have concluded that the above is the reason that the bank has been changing its procedures for 
international transactions over the last six months, and making our lives more complicated as a 
result. We were unable to process a request for a bank draft in NZD that we prepared on February 
20 for more than six weeks. The “compliance manager” has made it impossible for us to process our 
transactions at the ANU Branch (where they know us by sight) without previous approval by our 
“relationship manager” (whom we have never met). It is costing CAUL a lot in wasted time – in the 
above comments they refer only to the banking systems costs!

Meeting Planning - Agenda, Minutes, Travel, Venues - & attendance

CAUL 2006/2 18-19 September, 2006 and associated meetings & dinners – Perth 
ADT Policy Reference Group 30 October 2006 – Sydney 
CAUL Executive 7-8 November, 2006 – Melbourne 
CCA Meeting 8 November 2006 – Melbourne 
CEIRC 9 November, 2006 – Melbourne 
Datasets Coordinators Meeting 29 January 2007 – Sydney 
CEIRC 30 January, 2007 – Sydney 
CSFG 1 February, 2007 – Sydney 
ADT Technical committee 1 February, 2007 – Sydney 
CAUL Executive meeting with the NLA re Libraries Australia, 1 February 2007 – Sydney 
CAUL Executive 2 February, 2007 – Sydney 
CAUL Executive 19 March, 2007 – Sydney 
ADT Futures Workshop 20 March, 2007 – Sydney 
CEIRC 18 April, 2007 – Melbourne 
CAUL 2007/1 3-4 May, 2007 – Melbourne 
CEIRC/CAVAL Forum/Workshop on Management of Electronic Statistics – June/July/August – Sydney? 
CAUL meeting 2007/2 September 2007 – Adelaide

Other Meetings/ Events attended/ held.

September 12 – teleconference re CAUL web site with Jeff Murray and Jenny Dewar 
October 26 – teleconference re review of CAUL principles for library services to offshore campuses 
December 1 – Eve Woodberry, in Canberra for DEST RQF meeting 
December 1 – Christian Lackner, Radisson, re Sydney meetings venues 
December 12 – Margot Bell and Clare McLaughlin, DEST, Eve Woodberry re RQF readiness survey of 
universities (via teleconference) 
December 15 – Vic Elliott with visitors Dr Haruki Nagata and Dr Uda from University of Tsukuba in 
Japan 
January 19 – site visits for CAUL 2007/1 venues, Melbourne 
February 13 – RQF Colloquium – Sydney 
March 9 – DEST RQF meeting re copyright in institutional repositories – Brisbane 
March 23 – Russell Livermore & Ingrid Shogren, Walter Turnbull, re CAUL audit 2006
April 2 – Noel Bradfield, CAUL’s Commonwealth Bank Relationship Manager re ongoing problems undertaking normal banking transactions (see report under Banking, above)

April 16 - Australian Digital Alliance AGM, Canberra

**Meetings held – CEIRC-related.**

September 20 (ALIA2006 Trade Exhibition) – David Elek, Springer and Gayle Villaume, DA Information Services;
- Ian Hames and Susanna Lob, Oxford University Press;
- Bev Foster and Carol Durham, Emerald;
- Linda Dunne and Robert Gorter, Elsevier Science;
- David Sidebottom, ProQuest;
- Anthony Shaw, Thorpe-Bowker;
- Maryce Johnstone and Marika Whitfield, Thomson Gale;
- Heather Crosbie, Blackwell Publishing;

September 25 – Carsten Boeckmann, Ovum, teleconference;
- Carol Dykman, Crown Content, teleconference;

October 18 – Geeho Liu, Thomson Scientific

October 19 – Bruce Heterick, Portico, teleconference

October 26 – Nancy Matus, Director of Marketing, Thomson ResearchSoft and Ben Currie, Crandon re EndNote

November 1 – Alex Pring and James Murray, Lexis Nexis

November 27 – Albert Prior, Content Complete re JISC Collections Program and possible inclusion of other consortia members (via teleconference)

December 6 – Tom Taylor and Mark Kendall, Sage Publications (via teleconference)

January 24 – David Sidebottom, ProQuest.

January 30-31 (Online Trade Exhibition) – Yeoh Wey Loh, BMJ Publishing
- Adrian Tang, IEE
- Lesley Boyle, CUP
- Andrew Hall, Alexander Street Press
- Eric Calaluca, Paratext
- Poonam Ramchand, Euromonitor
- Nicky Hewlett, Swets Information Services
- Jay Glaisyer and Sid McNeal, EBSCO
- Patrick Doogue, IOPP
- Antoine Bocquet & Tamara Joyner – Nature Publishing Group (with Andrew Wells)
- Marianne Josserand, BioMed Central (with Andrew Wells)
- Andrew Pitts, ACS re new pricing model
- Christine Midwinter, CISTI
- Belinda Sharpe and Terry Macmanus, Ovid and Betsy Jones, LWW VP & General Manager re late payments to CAUL
- Jenny Walker, Xrefer
- James Mercer and Ged Welford, OUP
- Mike Walsh, CAS
- Mohammad Baghdatis, ebrary

March 14-17 – Springer Library Advisory Board, Orlando, Fla

March 19 – Jeroen Prinsen, Thomson Scientific

March 22 – Andrew Coffey, Alex Pring, Lexis Nexis re account management for CAUL, LexisNexis.au package options.

March 28 – Rick Bremble, Andrew Birmingham, Fairfax Business Media re continuing access to Fairfax news after the withdrawal of content from all third party channels on March 31.

April 3 – Peta Menck, Thomson Legal and Regulatory, re a potential offer for all Lawbook Online content

April 22-25 – ICOLC 2007 – Montreal, Canada – including a joint presentation with Joan Emmet on the transfer of journals between publishers, and chairing a parallel session on cost models and internal cost allocations within consortia.

Diane Costello

27 April 2007