Environmental Scan of Moving Image Collections in the United States

September 2008

Jennifer Mohan

DIGITAL LIBRARY FEDERATION

Contents

About the Author

Jen Mohan

Jen Mohan is a research associate with Intelligent Television. Previously, she was an account manager at Critical Mention, a television monitoring service in New York City. Among her research interests are moving image archiving and preservation, copyright law and media distribution, digital distribution of moving images, new technology, Internet culture and new media sharing and creation. Ms. Mohan received her M.A. from the University of Massachusetts-Amherst in 2004 in Public History/ Museum Studies with a concentration in Modern American Cultural History. In 2006 she earned her M.A. in Moving Image Archiving and Preservation from New York University, where she wrote her thesis on the digital distribution of archival materials.

She is the author of "The Digital Library Federation's Environmental Scan: Issues with the Digitization of the Moving Image" published in the Summer, 2008 edition of the Metropolitan Archivist , and is the co-author, along with Peter Kaufman, of "The Economics of Film and Video Distribution in the Digital Age," written for and published by the Tribeca Film Institute.

I. INTRODUCTION

In July of 2007, the Digital Library Federation (DLF) hosted a landmark meeting at the University of California, Berkeley, of a group called Lot 49 on the topic of moving image digitization. Organized by Peter Brantley of DLF and Rick Prelinger of the Prelinger Archives, the meeting assembled a number of moving image experts. The group's aim was to facilitate broader access to the incredible trove of film and video held in archives, libraries, museums, broadcast stations, and other sources.

The group agreed that access is key to the survival of moving image archives and that digitization is the best way to improve access. During the course of the day, the group identified as its priorities (1) doing an assessment of moving image collections (since funded by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and resulting in this report) and (2) coming up with a set of principles for increasing access to those materials. In part, the group wished to be prepared for interest on the part of funders and potential private sector partners in digitizing motion materials.

In preparing this report, discussion of digitization for access could not be entirely separated from digitization for preservation purposes. In most past practices, the latter has been done before the former. For the purposes of this report, the word *archive* is used as shorthand for any institution or other body that houses moving image collections.

The moving images survey aimed to investigate the overall condition of moving image collections in the United States as well as to assess which archives were ready to move forward with moving image digitization projects. The digitization of moving image col-lections improves access for researchers, students, and the general public, and it enables archives to expose important collections. While an unprecedented level of access is possible, hundreds of thousands of films and videos remain locked in vaults or unused on shelves because their existence is unknown to the public.

For more than a century, the only way researchers could access moving image collections was if they visited the physical location of the collection and were permitted to view the material in the reading room. Technical developments have given the moving images community an opportunity to provide on-demand access unavailable to previous generations. **The goal of this survey is to assess the nature and condition of these collections and to determine to what extent these technologies are being adopted by moving image curators.**

The survey's timeframe of five months limited its reach to major research universities, independent archives of moving images, major museums, major public libraries with significant holdings of film and video, and a number of public television stations. In addition to the survey, research visits were made to archives in New York, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and Boston.

Although smaller and niche archives were not targeted, they ended up playing a major role in the research. A number of small and niche archives participated in the project despite the draw on time and staff to complete the survey. Their contributions made the findings more diverse and will increase the benefits to the broader archival community. Small and niche collections present special opportunities

and challenges in the community's mission of offering access to as many archival collections as possible.

Out of the 506 archives that were contacted, 70 archives responded. Because not all survey questions applied to each type of archive, the survey takers were encouraged to skip questions that did not pertain to them. Overall, most archives answered all the questions.

The survey included 30 questions that covered the following topics:

- size
- funding
- condition
- content
- preservation assessments and costs
- access issues
- cataloging
- new projects in development
- formats, media, standards, and obsolescence
- rights
- digital projects
- public-private agreements

The ultimate goal of this survey was to determine the overall health of the archives and to see how ready they are to begin digitizing their moving image collections. Many issues need to be resolved before archival collections can be digitized, and the answers to questions in these topical areas will help give the community an overall idea of how ready they are to begin such projects.

This survey is not the first investigation into the condition of moving image collections in this country. Other surveys launched over the past 10 years have provided valuable information regarding many aspects of the nation's collections. Michael Brewer (University of Arizona) and Meghann Matwichuk (University of Delaware) completed a 2007 survey, ALA Video/Media Collections. It provides essential background on many aspects of a variety of archives, including academic and public libraries and community colleges, among others. Another survey, the 2005 Open Video Project by Gary Geisler, Caryn Anderson, and Karan Sheldon, investigated many digital issues among archives. Examining the questions and responses of these materials served as guidance in how to craft this survey in ways that would encourage rich, meaningful responses filled with vital information about archives.

Although these prior surveys include information that overlaps with this survey, the ambitions of this environmental scan differ from both. While Brewer and Matwichuk's work is exceptional in its concentration on demographics, access, budget, and staff, this scan concentrates on types and formats of content, digital formats, and copyright concerns. Whereas the work of Geisler, Anderson, and Sheldon focused almost exclusively on archives' progress into the digital space, this survey concentrates on each archive's apparent readiness to do so and the obstacles and roadblocks they currently face. Much of this survey examines how prepared archives are to begin digital projects and, perhaps even more important, why many are not. Only by delving into individual archives can we get an indication of how prepared they are to launch projects that will take them into the digital realm.

Another unique aspect of this scan is its investigation into archives' attitudes toward digitization projects funded by private companies. Google, Microsoft, Amazon, and other corporations have launched large-scale digitization projects with libraries and archives in the past four years, providing new opportunities to increase access and exposure. The vast majority of archives cannot afford such projects on their own. The financial power of these companies, together with the uniqueness of the community's moving image collections, offers an extraordinary opportunity to enhance access to some of the most prestigious collections.

Although these partnerships have the potential to provide unrivaled access, many questions have arisen regarding how beneficial the terms of the contracts are for the institutional partners. Many issues related to the ownership of digital copies and the ability to freely share digital copies make it essential to improve the terms in the next generation of these partnerships. The surveyed archives had strong opinions as to what would be important for them if they were to enter into such agreements and were eager for a basic policy to guide their approach to public-private partnerships.

The survey concentrated on large archives that would be more likely to have the resources for digitization projects, but the responses represented a variety of archives: 17 film and television archives, 5 historical societies, 3 public television stations, 22 colleges and universities, 13 museums, 4 Presidential libraries, 2 state archives, and 4 public libraries.

II. SIZE

The sizes of the moving image collections were diverse. Four archives said they have between 1–250 moving image items, 7 have 251–500, 3 have 501–1,000, 32 have 1,001–10,000, and 11 archives reported they have tens of thousands to over a hundred thousand films and videos. Not all respondents answered the question regarding the size of their collections. In summary, the holdings range from 200 to 112,000 items.

III. STAFF

Inadequate staffing poses a major obstacle to digitization. Most of the archives had little or no staff time to dedicate to the major processes that are required to initiate and execute digital projects. In extreme cases, single archivists take on the roles of many people, constantly balancing multiple responsibilities, sometimes with no support staff. To ask them to somehow find the time to plan, organize, and supervise digitization projects, on top of all their other responsibilities, is unrealistic.

Staffing is especially problematic in some of the government archives—archives one might assume would have greater access to resources and funding. Some government agencies, in fact, were at the other end of the spectrum. One government-funded museum has only one archivist for an entire audiovisual department, where there are a variety of day-to-day responsibilities, including processing, cataloging, preservation assessment and repair, assisting researchers, and writing grant proposals, leaving little time for any new initiatives.

IV. FUNDING

A vast majority of the archives surveyed have a variety of funding sources, although only a handful receive income from the reproduction or licensing of materials in their collections. In fact, the only archives surveyed that actively engage in the selling of copies of their collection are Electronic Arts Intermix, one of the most prestigious collections of video art in the world, and Documentary Educational Resources, a producer and distributor of ethnographic films. Both organizations recoup a portion of the costs of their programs through the sale of DVDs and other copies of work to museums, universities, private collectors, artists, and galleries.

Other archives function as material providers for researchers and scholars. Most museums, university special collections, and libraries provide materials, but at the cost of producing the DVD, VHS tape, or Beta SP copy. An added benefit is that the researcher pays for the initial reproduction of the original, which provides the archive with a copy. Although this does not go very far toward digitizing entire collections, it does provide a start to efforts to digitize and transfer portions of collections, most of which will happen to be the most frequently used and "important" parts of the collections.

It is no surprise that virtually all the surveyed archives rely heavily on grants, private donations, and budget allotments from parent institutions. The baseline budget often can support only basic necessities such as staffing, storage, and supplies. Most projects such as digitization, reformatting (and other preservation activities), installation of cold storage, cataloging, and processing new collections are achieved primarily with funds procured through fund-raisers, grants, and private donations. Unfortunately, writing grant proposals takes time from busy staff members. Often a consultant is hired, drawing on those limited funds.

For the collections that require grants to digitally preserve their material, many steps precede the writing of the grant proposal. These steps include a collection assessment, a copyright assessment, the cataloging of the collection, and the prioritizing of highest-risk materials—all this takes an enormous amount of time. Although some archives can use interns or volunteer workers, this work is best done by trained and qualified professionals who can make accurate assessments. For the surveyed archives, staffing and funding deficiencies are serious problems in their preservation efforts and on their digitization aspirations.

V. CONDITION

An overwhelming number of the surveyed archives claimed that their collections vary in terms of condition. Most of the materials that are at risk are video (mostly reel-to-reel, U-matic, and various Beta tapes). Various film formats are also at risk, such as 8-mm, nitrate, and 16-mm film. Home movies, which have often been treated badly before coming to the archive, are of particular concern. The most important component of proper condition is cold storage. Virtually all the surveyed archives that have cold storage claimed that their collections are either in good shape or very good shape. All archives without cold storage claimed that their collections are in bad condition or at risk. The cost of proper storage is a huge obstacle in proper housing of deteriorating collections.

A wide variety of issues surrounded the condition of materials. Some of the most frequently named were the backlog of unprocessed materials, deterioration of magnetic tape–based materials, lack of long-term storage, preservation challenges presented by electronic media (including e-mail and obsolete storage media), the need to transfer materials to new formats, vinegar syndrome[1], the need to make new copies of films, improper storage, inadequate storage space, and inadequate staff to care for the collections. Specific comments given by participating archives can be found in appendix III, "Survey Comments."

---

[1] Vinegar syndrome is a slow form of chemical deterioration of cellulose acetate film, which is caused by poor storage conditions. It is so named because as film degrades, it gradually shrinks, becomes brittle, and generates acetic acid, which evaporates into the air, producing a sharp, vinegar odor—Image Permanence Institute Glossary, http://www.imagepermanenceinstitute.org/shtml_sub/glossary.asp#V

VI. CONTENT

Perhaps the most important information gathered in this project regards the content represented in the various archives. Archives should be valued as much for the uniqueness of their holdings as they are for their size. The survey asked the archivists to describe the types of content they held. Many archives responded to the question by saying something along the lines of "name it and we have it," from which it is assumed their collections represented virtually every content type mentioned by others. Below are the content types that were most often mentioned. A complete list is located in appendix II, "Selected Summary Data."

- documentary
- news film and video
- educational
- feature films
- oral history
- television programs
- nonfiction
- fiction
- home movies
- amateur
- commencement footage
- biographical features

Getting a sense of what collections researchers used most would indicate perhaps some of the best collections to digitize, or at least the first to begin digitizing. The answers varied significantly, and a sampling is listed in appendix III, "Survey Comments."

VII. PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT AND COSTS

To determine how much knowledge the archivists had about the condition of their collections, the survey inquired about previous preservation assessments that have been performed at their archives. The responses were encouraging, as most archives could recall when their last assessment was performed, and for many archivists, the materials were given preservation assessments as they were processed. Many assessments were dated, and again, lack of time and staff were major obstacles in updating preservation information or launching new preservation assessments for their moving image collections.

Some of the most common preservation costs, including staff, supplies (acid-free folders, film containers, and splicing tape), and storage, are also the most frequently mentioned preservation issues. Other needs mentioned were film-to-film reformatting, processing collections, transfers from various obsolete film and video formats, and inadequate server space for digitized materials.

Most of the archives surveyed do not have an in-house preservation team or conservator to maintain the collection. However, many do have established and productive relationships with an outside vendor for transfer of materials. Other archives are able to perform basic maintenance on their own materials, such as leader changes, splicing, canister transfers, etc. A significant number of archives send their materials to a general conservation center within their parent institution. These conservationists may be specialists in materials such as photos, maps, and manuscripts but not necessarily moving images.

Not only is there a risk in having the moving images treated by those who are not trained to preserve those media, but some institutions are more hesitant to provide funding for transfers and other preservation activities when the institution has a conservation center of its own. It is up to the archivists and others to convince senior management that transfers and duplication of moving images should only be entrusted to moving image preservation specialists. A sizeable number of archives engage in grant writing in order to fund such preservation projects, while others are able to hire outside consultants who specialize in moving image preservation.

VIII. ACCESS ISSUES

The overwhelming barrier regarding access to moving images is the absence of viewing copies for researchers, students, and others. This lack of copies puts archivists in a difficult situation, as the only way they can provide access to these materials is to make available the originals, increasing the risk of unrecoverable damage or loss. Of course, viewing the material also depends on whether the archive has a working player, as many of the viewing copies are on U-matic or Beta players that are difficult to obtain and expensive to maintain. Some archives require a requesting researcher to pay for the making of a viewing copy that the archive then keeps.

Another major issue is the lack of catalog records. Many archives reported that they have a cataloging backlog, preventing them from knowing all that is in their collections. Another issue is having outdated records, such as finding aids that have not been updated to indicate materials have been repaired, reformatted, or moved to or returned from cold storage. Many archives reported not having enough detailed information in their finding aids and catalog records, which in turn hampers the discovery of important materials by researchers. Considering the time and staff constraints to fix these problems, archives rely heavily upon the extensive knowledge of senior archivists in these situations. Once these archivists retire or move on, this resource for researchers is lost.

Rights concerns prevent many archives from making viewing copies because they are precluded by donor agreements or because sometimes the copyright holders cannot be identified or located. To ameliorate the issue of rights concerns, archives may find it useful to update donor agreements with permission to transfer materials without having to contact the donor. Some copyright owners pass away and it is unclear who assumes control of the materials, making it difficult for the archive to know whom to contact.

Other access issues that were mentioned were the lack of staff to supervise patrons, inadequate viewing rooms, need for researchers to travel to the site to view materials, lack of computers, and lack of server space. For more detail, see appendix III, "Survey Comments."

IX. CATALOGING

Another goal of the survey was to learn what kinds of catalog records and standards archives are using for their collections. The most used standards were MARC and Dublin Core. A majority of archives surveyed created their own data models that borrowed fields from MARC and Dublin Core. Virtually none of the archives surveyed upload their catalog records to the Moving Image Collections (MIC) Union Catalog for discovering, locating, and (in some cases) viewing moving images from around the world. However, almost all were familiar with MIC and some had debated sharing their records.

The majority of respondents said that they accept materials into their collections even if they have incomplete or even nonexistent descriptions, so some of the materials are not cataloged until archivists have time to do in-depth research into their origins. Many of the respondents, as reflected in the survey's responses, feel curatorial responsibility for these materials and value their potential usefulness over the need to catalog them. Such materials therefore may be filed in the archive with inadequate information and, as a result, may remain undiscoverable by researchers and scholars. For more detail, see appendix III, "Survey Comments."

X. NEW PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

The survey asked archives about new projects currently in development not only to learn if they were already engaged in digitization projects, but also to find out if other new initiatives distracted or prevented them from digitization. Many of the moving image archives are part of larger collections that also include audio, paper, paintings, books, etc.; some of the moving images projects compete with needed preservation and maintenance of those other materials. Thirteen archives were currently engaged in projects dealing with some sort of digitization, either for in-house use or for public access on their Web site. Other new projects mentioned were cataloging new collections, merging existing catalog records into a single system, and transferring obsolete media to newer, more stable formats. For more detail, see appendix III, "Survey Comments."

XI. FORMATS, MEDIA, STANDARDS, AND OBSOLESCENCE

The variety of formats held in the participating archives is of critical importance. The diversity of film and especially video present particular preservation challenges, as archivists need to ensure that they have the personnel, supplies, equipment, and know-how to effectively take care of a wide range of formats in their collections.

Virtually every archive surveyed stated they had either obsolete media or media that required obsolete machines. Two archives said they did not know if they had such media or equipment in their collections, and only two said that materials on obsolete media had been transferred to newer formats, or that they had adequate equipment for viewing such media. The types of media that were most commonly mentioned were Digital Audio Tape (DAT), reel-to-reel video, Hi-8, U-matic, various Beta tapes, 2-inch quad, 1-inch quad, 8-mm, Super 8, and 16-mm film. To the right is the statistical breakdown of what is held in the participating archives. (A full list is located in appendix II, "Selected Summary Data.")

Although some archives are currently transferring their materials to newer formats (mostly Beta SP preservation copies or DVD viewing copies), many others have difficulty finding transfer equipment or find that the equipment is too expensive for them to purchase. Another frequently overlooked issue is that very few professional archivists know how to operate and repair obsolete equipment. Archives will increasingly rely on trained professionals at preservation and migration houses such as Vidipax and Media Matters, since new generations of archivists will not arrive with the necessary training or may not have access to the necessary equipment.

Some of the collections at greatest risk are those that have small numbers of items on obsolete media. It is difficult to convince management to spend money on the necessary equipment, since the materials do not constitute a large portion of the overall collection. For the same reason, it is difficult to raise funds or get grants to transfer the materials.

While many archivists did not want to participate in the survey because they felt their collections were not substantial enough to warrant their inclusion, the results have made it clear that many resources and much energy need to be dedicated to the smaller collections that are often falling through the cracks.

Roughly half the archives surveyed have adopted standards for digital copies, though in many cases those standards pertain to photograph and paper collections.

FILM:
- 8-mm: 51.4%
- 16-mm: 74.2%
- 35-mm: 55.7%
- Super 8:   28.5%

VIDEO:
- VHS: 78.5%
- DVD: 68.5%
- Beta SP: 58.5%
- U-matic: 54.2%
- 2-inch video: 44.2%
- Digibeta: 44.2%
- 1-inch: 42.8%
- Betacam: 38.5%
- ½-inch: 28.5%

Most archives support many digital formats and have different formats for preservation and viewing purposes. The most common formats for digital preservation copies are Digibeta and DV. For digital access copies, a wide variety of formats were named, the most popular being WAV, Real Media, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, MOV, QuickTime, and Flash, as well as DVD.

Many respondents said that they attend conferences and workshops dealing with digital standards. But all are very aware of the debate surrounding digital standards. Some of the most frequently named organizations offering conferences and workshops were the Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) and the Society of American Archivists (SAA), but many archivists attend local or regional meetings and workshops.

XII. RIGHTS

Perhaps no other issue pertaining to digitization has been as much a hindrance as copyright. Archives are particularly sensitive to this issue because most of the collections given to them were not deemed financially valuable, sometimes leading to lapses in copyright status as copyrights; other times, resulting in transfers of rights that are not communicated to archivists.

Rights restrictions can be detrimental to archivists' attempts to preserve works, as copyright holders, donors, or other rights holders can restrict the transfer of materials, even if they are on obsolete formats, to newer, more stable media. It is often very difficult for an archivist to contact the owner to request permission—or even to identify the owner.

Rights assessments are enormously important for archivists, yet time, labor, and legal costs are barriers that prevent a vast majority of the archives from assessing rights. Out of the 60 archives responding to this question, only 5 answered that they had performed a copyright assessment for their collections. A few others stated that rights information is documented when the collections are processed and that most of their rights information is obtained in this way rather than through large, expansive projects such as copyright assessments. Five archives stated that they have 90 to 100 percent clearance for their moving image collections; a few others state that they have a good grasp on the overall copyright status of their collections. However, a much greater number said that they do not have acceptable information on the copyright status or very little is known with complete confidence.

XIII. DIGITAL PROJECTS

Funding is the biggest obstacle preventing archives from engaging in digital projects. It is no secret that archives have a history of basic funding limited to the necessities to run an archive. Extra funding for preservation and digital projects must be acquired through grants, private donations, or fund-raising. Virtually all the archives said they received grants, held fund-raisers, or received private donations in order to support projects, but very few of these projects were digitization projects. Most of the money funds collection stabilization and development, including new cataloging projects and transfers of obsolete film and video formats for preservation and access. Other concerns are improper storage, costs of temporary staff for cataloging projects, and the need to make new copies of rare film prints.

Larger archives with unique material, special collections housed in prominent universities attracting a substantial number of researchers, and film and video collections at large museums have many more opportunities to generate revenue for their collections. Some digitization is going on in these archives; but even though many films and videos have been put on Digibeta or other forms of digital tape, a vast majority of their films and videos have not been transferred to digital files.

Right now, the main efforts of archives seem to be concentrated on infrastructure stabilization. It is difficult to justify planning digitization projects if the vast majority of archives are not able to document the materials in their collections, maintain adequate conditions, or provide sufficient catalog records of the materials. Although digital projects are the subject of a lot of recent discussion, very few of the archives can actually afford them.

XIV. PUBLIC-PRIVATE AGREEMENTS

The survey asked whether archives had been approached by private companies regarding digitization projects. The answers were roughly split, with half the respondents saying that they had been contacted and the other half saying they had not. Virtually all the respondents expressed concern over the deals between private companies and collections, with many of them stating loss of control over their collections as the primary reason they would hesitate to enter such agreements. Other archives were concerned about who would be handling the materials, as portions of their collections are fragile and need to be handled in a professional manner. Copyright was another major issue, as some archives doubted being able to provide copyright information, while others doubted the owners would be willing to participate in the project. Aside from a few enthusiastic respondents who would like to explore potential deals, the majority of the respondents feared there would be too many issues to overcome, most notably staff constraints, labor needs, and rights management. For more detail, see appendix III, "Survey Comments."

XV. OBSERVATIONS

- Because improving the catalog and other metadata is essential before digitization projects can be launched, grants and other resources are well spent on collection infrastructure. Initiating preservation analysis projects will increase awareness of the collections in greatest need of transfer from unstable formats.

- Archivists might think about creating some kind of union catalog (or using MIC) to share information on what materials are currently available in digital form. Transfer costs could be reduced by sharing copies with fellow archives.

- Many archives are very passionate about accepting materials into their collections whether or not they come with descriptive information, feeling that it is their duty to protect and preserve the materials. It is unlikely that future acquisitions will be rejected due to inadequate descriptive information.

- Many archives expressed anxiety at the many roadblocks they face when attempting to transfer and preserve materials. Rights determination is one of the biggest challenges they face, as many donor agreements restrict the transfer of materials. For future acquisitions, archives should include transfer rights in their donor agreements, including digital transfer; this will help archives deal with increasingly digital acquisitions.

- Another crucial issue is the loss of senior archivists. Sometimes the senior archivist's knowledge of the materials is so thorough that he or she serves as a walking catalog. The knowledge acquired about a collection through working with the materials for years or decades is hard to replace. Further, retiring staff members often have no junior staff to whom they can impart their knowledge. Extensive knowledge will be lost as senior archivists depart, taking their long-standing, intimate knowledge of the collections with them. Especially missed will be their crucial knowledge of uncataloged moving images, materials that are in other parts of the institution, and materials of special interest to scholars and researchers. Researchers, students, and scholars who rely on specialists to guide them in the right direction will feel the loss.

- When archivists enter into public-private partnerships, they should undertake the solicitation of a **digitization impact statement** that includes answers to these questions: What are the ramifications of this digitization for the public? Will it benefit the archive's responsibility to preserve and steward this material? What is the impact on the institution and on its continuing pursuit of its core mission and values? And what is the impact on the kindred organizations and their ability to achieve their own aims? Public institutions should make public these impact statements, and when the stakes are believed to be exceptionally high, they should involve external consultation.

- Perhaps most important, the community needs to weigh preservation needs against access mandates. Sometimes materials need to be stabilized before they can be digitized to make an access copy, but it should not always be assumed that this is the case. If archives do not make more materials accessible, they may lose the funding that allows them to preserve their collections at all.

Emerging points

Although the point of the survey was to assess the state of motion archives, following are some encouraging developments in the field:

- The Columbia University Libraries have engaged in a project to create a tool for archives and other repositories to help them prioritize the collections most in need of preservation. The archivist enters information into the system and the program generates a preservation priority code. Although this will take significant time for archivists, especially those at large archives, it can be a valuable tool for archivists who need help assessing materials in need of attention and repair.

- Re/new Media, headquartered in New York City, has launched a new initiative called the Re/frame Project, which aims to offer, on demand through Amazon's Unbox, materials and collections of independent filmmakers, archives, and other repositories. Re/frame will digitize video collections for free (film is digitized at cost) and make them available via DVD-on-demand, download to own, or download to rent. Supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Re/frame Project hopes to digitize 10,000 films and videos in their first year and should provide an opportunity for archives without the time, staff, and resources to digitize their own collections.

- New programs at the University of California, Los Angeles, and New York University (NYU) provide training for students who will be the next professionals in the moving image archive field. As a recent graduate of the NYU program, I can attest that the program provides an unrivaled educational experience. The program offers access to professors, visiting professionals, library resources, internships, industry contacts, and conferences essential to students' development in the field. However, no education obtained through classroom instruction, no matter how infused it is with real-world contacts, can replace what senior archivists know about their collections.

Preservation and access

In transferring analog materials to digital form, archivists must not only invest labor and financial commitment, but they must also be concerned with the ever-changing digital technology and formats that are constantly being replaced by better ones. Just as analog materials must be transferred to newer, more stable formats, digital collections face a similar trajectory. In his article "Building the Archives of the Future," Kenneth Thibodeau[2] writes:

> Any system, conceived as a final solution, even if it solved all of the known and knowable problems of obsolescence and fragile media, would itself inevitably become obsolete in what, from an archival perspective, would be a relatively short time. Furthermore, probably the only valid prediction about the future of information technology is that it will continue to change. Therefore, the solution to the challenge of digital preservation must incorporate the capability to accommodate and incorporate changing technology and unforeseeable products of that technology. … Similarly, we must anticipate that in the future there will be improved options available for ingest, preservation, and archives management as well as access.

In light of this, it is important to stress that digitization of materials is not an archival or preservation *solution*—it is sometimes a step in that direction, but it is also a huge step forward in terms of providing access to moving image collections. But as digital formats change, so must our processes for migrating them—and finding the resources to do it. Many archivists who participated in the survey stated that they were uneasy about launching digital projects because set digital standards have not been agreed upon and, even if they were, they may quickly be supplanted.

---

2 Thibodeau, Kenneth. "Building the Archives of the Future," *D-Lib Magazine 7*, no. 2 (February 2001). http://www.dlib.org/dlib/february01/thibodeau/02thibodeau.html

XVI. CONCLUSION

Presenting at the SAA's 2005 annual meeting in New Orleans, Richard Pearce-Moses wrote, "I believe that the next step requires us to shift our attention from the conceptual to the practical and empirical, to pay more attention to what needs to happen in the trenches. Archivists and records professionals—as a whole, and not just digital records specialists—must respond by becoming as comfortable working with digital materials as they are with paper. In fact, I believe that in the future, the notion of 'digital archivist' will be useless because all archivists will be digital archivists."

Archives will no doubt begin to receive collections of film and video in digital form. The Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum is vastly different in its holdings profile than is the William J. Clinton Presidential Library, and we must anticipate the challenges of maintaining collections that perhaps have never been anything but digital.

The goal of this project was to provide a representative picture of moving image archives, their condition, and their readiness for digitization projects and to suggest possible solutions to some of these issues. Through my contact with the 70 participating archives, it became clear that severe issues threaten to cripple collections and interfere with the mission of preserving moving images and providing access to them.

Admittedly, this is a short essay for a large topic and can be interpreted as painting extremely broad strokes that have little evidence to ensure success. However, I firmly believe that the immediate challenge and responsibility is to begin exploring new approaches to see if they will get us further toward our goals of preservation and access.

XVII. APPENDIX I: ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN QUESTIONS

1) What types of media formats does your archive contain? (Please include all formats, not just moving images.)

2) What kinds of genres (documentary, fiction, etc.) are included in your collections?

3) How large is your staff? Please include interns and volunteers.

4) Do you currently receive funding for your organization? Please include grants, private donations, fund-raisers, etc.

5) Do you have any new projects in development for your collections right now? If so, could you describe? You can also include projects that are still in an incubation stage.

6) When was your last preservation assessment for your moving image collection?

7) What is the biggest preservation concern for your moving image collection?

8) What is the biggest preservation cost for your moving image collection?

9) Based on your preservation efforts, how would you describe the condition of your moving image collections? Are some collections in better condition than others?

10) What is the most frequently used portion of your moving image collection in terms of requests from researchers, students, etc.?

11) Do you have an onsite conservator or preservationist?

12) If not, who performs preservation or conservation work on your moving image collections?

13) What issues hamper access to your moving image collections the most?

14) Other access issues?

15) Do you have media that plays on equipment that is obsolete or is in danger of becoming so? If so, please describe.

16) Have you ever done a copyright assessment for your moving image collections?

17) How much of your moving image collection would you feel confident about having clear and complete copyright information?

18) How much of your moving image collection would you estimate has no copyright information?

19) Do you have a disaster management plan?

20) Has your organization adopted standards for digital copies?

21) If you have digital copies of materials, either for access or preservation purposes, what kinds of formats are those in (MPEG-1, MPEG-2, Windows Player, etc.)?

22) Do members of your organization currently attend conferences or workshops that deal with the adoption of digital standards?

23) Have you been contacted by a private company or organization related to deals to digitize your content in order to provide digital distribution, such as the agreements Google is making with archives?

24) Is this something you would be interested in? If so, what are your main concerns for entering these types of agreements?

25) Would there be any issues you consider deal breakers? For example, giving up control of aspects of the collection, not being able to share digital copies with other institutions, etc. Please also list any other comments or concerns you have.

26) What kind of cataloging standards has your institution adopted for moving images? For example, MARC, Dublin Core, MPEG-7, SMPTE?

27) Does your institution upload catalog records to the Moving Image Collections Union Catalog?

28) How complete are the catalog records for the moving images in your collections? Do you feel your records have sufficient information regarding author/creator, date, title, copyright, names of performers, etc.?

29) Do you accept new moving images into your collection if they do not have proper cataloging information? If this causes issues or concerns for your staff, please describe.

30) In your estimation, how many individual pieces of moving images do you have? (Please include just film and video.)

A) 1–250
B) 251–500
C) 501–1,000
D) 1,000+

Please include any additional comments you may have in regards to the general scan.

You may also include additional information about your collection you feel is important:

XVIII. APPENDIX II: SELECTED SUMMARY DATA

HOW MANY INDIVIDUAL PIECES OF FILM AND VIDEO DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR COLLECTIONS?	
1–250:	**5.7%**
251–500:	**10%**
501–1,000:	**4.2%**
1,000+:	**41.4%**
2,000+:	**1.4%**
5,000+:	**2.8%**
10,000+:	**7.1%**
22,000+:	**1.4%**
25,000+:	**1.4%**
45,000+:	**1.4%**
50,000+:	**1.4%**
100,000+:	**2.8%**
No Answer:	**12.8%**

HOW LARGE IS YOUR STAFF?	
HOW MANY FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES DO YOU HAVE?	
1–5:	**61.4%**
6–10:	**21.4%**
11–15:	**4.2%**
16–20	**0%**
20+:	**0%**
30+:	**8.5%**
No Answer:	**4.5%**
HOW MANY PART-TIME EMPLOYEES DO YOU HAVE? (INCLUDING PROFESSIONALS AND STUDENT WORKERS)	
1–5:	**21%**
6–10:	**7.1%**
11–15:	**1.4%**
16–20:	**2.8%**
20+:	**0%**
30+:	**1.4%**
HOW MANY INTERNS DO YOU HAVE?	
1–5:	**27.1%**
6–10:	**11.4%**
11–15:	**1.4%**
16–20:	**2.8%**
20+:	**0%**
30+:	**2.8%**

WHAT KIND OF FUNDING DOES YOUR INSTITUTION RECEIVE?

Grants:	**64.2%**
Donations:	**35.7%**
Foundations:	**22.8%**
Fund-raisers:	**8.5%**
Endowment:	**10%**
State Budget:	**21.4%**
Federal Budget:	**15.7%**
City Budget:	**12.8%**
University Budget:	**25.7%**
Ticket Sales:	**1.4%**
DVD/Tape Sales:	**4.2%**
Admissions:	**2.8%**
Charge for Services:	**7.1%**
Events:	**2.8%**
Retail Sales:	**2.8%**
Membership:	**10%**
Facility Rental:	**2.8%**
Other:	**4.2%**

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE OVERALL CONDITION OF COLLECTIONS?

Excellent:	**8.5%**
Good:	**15.7%**
Bad:	**2.8%**
Okay:	**7.1%**
Some Collections Are Better than Others:	**12.8%**
Some Better than Others, Video in Danger:	**21.4%**
Some Better than Others, Film in Danger:	**20%**
Some Better than Others, Electronic/ Digital Formats in Danger:	**2.8%**
Don't Know:	**2.8%**
No Answer:	**5.7%**

DO YOU HAVE AN ONSITE CONSERVATOR? IF NOT, WHO DOES THE WORK?

In-House Conservator:	**31.7%**
Outside Vendor:	**34.2%**
Contractor/Consultants:	**2.8%**
No One/Work Doesn't Get Done:	**20%**
Done In-House, Different Department:	**11.4%**

WHAT KINDS OF GENRES ARE REPRESENTED IN YOUR COLLECTIONS?

Documentary:	**71.4%**	Instructional:	**11.4%**
News film and video:	**35.7%**	Personal/family:	**20%**
Sports film and video:	**10%**	Corporate histories:	**4.2%**
Feature films:	**20%**	Musical performances:	**17.1%**
Classical music:	**1.4%**	Dance:	**4.2%**
Conferences:	**4.2%**	Foreign:	**5.7%**
English dept. readings:	**1.4%**	Newsreels:	**14.2%**
Commencement:	**14.2%**	Propaganda:	**10%**
Lectures:	**7.1%**	Literary adaptations:	**1.4%**
Student events:	**5.7%**	Interviews:	**14.2%**
Media in MA theses:	**1.4%**	Speeches:	**12.8%**
Dramatic productions:	**4.2%**	Commercial and field recordings:	**4.2%**
Biographical features:	**14.2%**	Wildlife/scenic:	**7.1%**
Cartoons:	**7.1%**	Public meetings:	**1.4%**
Travelogues:	**8.5%**	Coursework:	**2.8%**
Museum excavations:	**1.4%**	Professional in-service:	**1.4%**
Photojournalism:	**5.7%**	Health education:	**1.4%**
Oral history:	**24.2%**	Public safety:	**2.8%**
Political speeches and campaigns:	**10%**	Military:	**8.5%**
Fiction:	**20%**	Medical:	**4.2%**
Television programs:	**20%**	Movie trailers:	**2.8%**
Experimental/avant-garde:	**12.8%**	Ethnographic:	**1.4%**
Animation:	**7.1%**	Science/engineering:	**5.7%**
Home movies:	**24.2%**	Children's education:	**7.1%**
Student films:	**8.5%**	Maritime history:	**1.4%**
Advertising:	**10%**	Awards:	**2.8%**
Industrials:	**15.7%**	Exhibit:	**5.7%**
Educational:	**25.7%**	Talk shows:	**1.4%**
Southwestern films:	**1.4%**	Amateur:	**20%**
Texas films:	**1.4%**	Outtakes:	**12.8%**
Music:	**5.7%**	Marketing:	**2.8%**
Performance:	**4.2%**	Political advertising:	**5.7%**
Governmental films:	**5.7%**	School-related:	**8.5%**
Nonfiction:	**20%**	Public affairs:	**11.4%**
Travel:	**8.5%**	Commercials:	**7.1%**
Shorts:	**11.4%**		

WHAT ARE SOME OF YOUR BIGGEST PRESERVATION COSTS?

Storage:	**21.4%**
Supplies:	**22.8%**
Reformatting/Transfers:	**22.8%**
Staff:	**17.1%**
Digital Projects:	**8.5%**
Outsourcing/Outside Vendors:	**4.2%**
General Operating Expenses:	**1.4%**
Issues Related to Video Formats:	**5.7%**
Issues Related to Film Formats:	**10%**
Data Storage:	**4.2%**
Building Costs:	**4.2%**
Indexing/Cataloging/Processing Collections:	**5.7%**
Restoring/Repairing Damaged Materials:	**4.2%**
Replacement of Lost/Damaged Materials:	**1.4%**
Don't Know:	**4.2%**
No Answer:	**4.2%**

WHEN WAS YOUR LAST PRESERVATION ASSESSMENT?

Before 1998:	**5.7%**
1998–2002:	**10%**
2003–2006:	**14.2%**
2007–2008:	**12.8%**
Ongoing Process:	**28.5%**
Never:	**14.2%**
Don't Know:	**14.2%**

DO YOU HAVE COMPLETE CATALOG RECORDS FOR YOUR COLLECTIONS?

Very Complete:	**17.1%**
Very Incomplete:	**17.1%**
Overall Good:	**14.2%**
Overall Okay:	**15.7%**
A Mixed Bag:	**14.2%**
No Answer:	**21.4%**

DO YOU ACCEPT MOVING IMAGES INTO YOUR COLLECTIONS IF THEY DO NOT HAVE COMPLETE CATALOG RECORDS?

Yes:	**60%**
No:	**1.4%**
Yes, if They Fit into the Mission of Our Collection:	**14.2%**
Does Not Apply:	**5.7%**
No Answer:	**18.5%**

HAVE YOU ADOPTED CATALOGING STANDARDS?

MARC:	**31.4%**
Dublin Core:	**15.7%**
AACR2:	**2.8%**
ARC:	**2.8%**
PB Core:	**2.8%**
IMAP Template:	**4.2%**
SMPTE:	**1.4%**
AMIM:	**1.4%**
Open Video:	**1.4%**
We Developed Our Own:	**20%**
We Do Not Currently Catalog Moving Images:	**12.8%**
Don't Know:	**2.8%**
No Answer:	**20%**

UPLOAD CATALOG RECORDS TO MOVING IMAGE COLLECTIONS UNION CATALOG?

Yes:	**7.1%**
No:	**57.1%**
Planning on It:	**17.1%**
No Answer:	**18.5%**

WHAT KINDS OF FORMATS ARE REPRESENTED IN YOUR COLLECTIONS?

FILM:		DAT:	**8.5%**
8-mm:	**51.4%**	DVRs:	**4.2%**
16-mm:	**74.2%**	S-VHS:	**20%**
35-mm:	**55.7%**	Mini-DV:	**24.2%**
Super 8:	**28.5%**	Hi-8:	**20%**
28-mm:	**8.5%**	D-1:	**4.2%**
15/16-mm magnetic film:	**5.7%**	D-2:	**12.8%**
9.5-mm film:	**11.4%**	DVCPro:	**4.2%**
Filmstrip:	**10%**	DV-Master:	**2.8%**
17.5-mm:	**8.5%**	Mini-Disc:	**2.8%**
35/32-mm (unslit 16-mm):	**4.2%**	DV-Cam:	**1.4%**
16/8 (slit):	**1.4%**	¼-inch:	**8.5%**
A/B rolls:	**8.5%**	Betacam SX:	**7.1%**
Workprints:	**7.14%**	D-8:	**5.7%**
Sheet film:	**7.14%**	VHS-C:	**5.7%**
		8-mm:	**15.7%**
VIDEO:		HDCam:	**1.4%**
VHS:	**78.5%**		
DVD:	**68.5%**	**DIGITAL:**	
Beta SP:	**58.5%**	3½-inch floppy disks:	**2.8%**
U-matic:	**54.2%**	5¼-inch floppy disks:	**2.8%**
2-inch video:	**44.2%**	Hard drives:	**5.7%**
Digibeta:	**44.2%**	Windows Media:	**2.8%**
1-inch:	**42.8%**	Real Player:	**2.8%**
Betacam:	**38.5%**	VX30 (Java):	**1.4%**
½-inch:	**28.5%**	Digital linear tape data storage:	**5.7%**
Videodisk:	**8.5%**	MPEG:	**5.7%**
Betamax:	**24.2%**	WAV:	**2.8%**
2-inch helical scan:	**7.14%**	Various formats:	**15.7%**
Laserdiscs:	**17.1%**		

DO YOU HAVE MEDIA THAT PLAY ON OBSOLETE FORMATS?

Yes, Video:	**35.7**%
Yes, Film:	**10**%
Yes, Video and Film:	**34.2**%
Yes, Not Specific:	**7.1**%
Yes, Computer/Data Formats:	**1.4**%
No:	**4.2**%
Not Sure:	**2.8**%
No Answer:	**4.2**%

ARE YOU CONFIDENT WITH THE COPYRIGHT INFORMATION YOU HAVE FOR YOUR COLLECTIONS?

5–10% Clear:	**10**%
10–25% Clear:	**14.2**%
25–50% Clear:	**7.1**%
50–75% Clear:	**5.7**%
75–100% Clear:	**41.4**%
No % Known, but We Have a Good Grasp:	**14.2**%
Not Sure:	**2.8**%
No Answer:	**4.2**%

HAVE YOU ADOPTED STANDARDS FOR DIGITAL COPIES?

Yes:	**37.1**%
No:	**44.2**%
Considering:	**10**%
Not Sure:	**7.1**%
No Answer:	**1.4**%
FORMATS LISTED:	
Windows Media:	**4.2**%
Real Player:	**2.8**%
MPEG-2:	**10**%
MPEG-4:	**4.2**%
QuickTime:	**7.1**%
Flash:	**4.2**%
AVI:	**5.7**%
MOV:	**4.2**%

ATTEND CONFERENCE OR WORKSHOPS THAT DEAL WITH DIGITAL STANDARDS?

Yes:	**80**%
No:	**15.7**%
Don't Know:	**1.4**%
No Answer:	**2.8**%
ORGANIZATIONS NAMED:	
AMIA:	**12.8**%
Local Workshops:	**4.2**%
APTS:	**1.4**%
ARSC:	**1.4**%
NARAS:	**1.4**%
SAA:	**1.4**%
Don't Know:	**1.4**%

XIX. APPENDIX III: SURVEY COMMENTS

WHAT IS THE OVERALL CONDITION OF YOUR COLLECTIONS?

- "Good overall; archival originals and masters are stored off-site in pristine conditions."
- "The paper records of the library are, for the most part, in quite good condition. Electronic media (floppies, hard drives, e-mail, etc.) are at great risk. Film, video and audiotapes are also at risk, which is why we are embarking on a project to digitize priority items over the next three years using interest from endowment funds."
- "We have only recently found funding sources to initiate preservation projects with our audiovisual holdings. These collections need a great deal of attention, from basic inventories and immediate storage enclosures to preservation reformatting/ digitization as well as description (cataloging/ metadata), finding aids, and long-term management and accessibility of the digital surrogates."
- "The main television news film collection is in fairly good condition. It isn't all out of the old metal film cans, but most of it is. We maintain the temperature and humidity in the vault where the film is stored. We are making transfers based on client request and when grant funds are acquired."
- "Most moving image media in need of archival housing, storage furniture, and ideally cold storage conditions."
- "Paper collections are very stable and easy to maintain. We're working for quality and consistency with all digital collections and our progress is too early to have success be determined. I'm also concerned about how to keep preservation needs for digital collections in the institutional memory if there is staff turnover or after several years have passed."
- "Improved vastly in recent years b/c of increased expenditure for conservation; also implemented program 3 years ago to host summer conservation intern which has allowed us to begin addressing some specific needs."
- "Overall it is in good shape. Of course some collections are in better shape than others, and this depends on how they were stored before they came to us. Also we have some collections that have been heavily used by the university in the past, and these show more wear."
- "We range from NARA standard preservation to stuff thrown in a shoe box. We have an enormous back-log and very little staff."
- "Varies greatly, some very bad. Film is slowly deteriorating. VHS is poor."
- "Everything in the vault is in good condition; unprocessed collections run the gamut, but we are getting sub-zero vault."
- "Vinegar testing of old reel-to-reel film showed better condition than expected. Material is housed in climate control vaults."

WHAT COLLECTIONS DO RESEARCHERS USE THE MOST?

- "Seattle World's Fair."
- "The archives for the university's athletic department are heavily used by television media, print news media (newspapers, magazines), authors of books, students and others interested in the history of the university's athletic program. We have one of the largest archives of collegiate athletics in the nation."
- "Audio recordings of William Faulkner when he was in residence."
- "The television news film collection dating from 1958 through 1982 by documentary film producers. This collection was created by the local NBC affiliate here in Sacramento."
- "Films about U-Chicago and history, unable to meet their needs."
- "Movies from the Edmund Muskie Papers."
- "Civil rights materials and desegregation."
- "'The Emerald City' and community access TV."
- "Past conventions, sermons, addresses."
- "Documentary videotapes of this area before it became a center of high-tech industry."
- "The most often requested is news material from WAVE-TV in Louisville, but the most often used is the collection of Frontier Nursing Service nurse training videos."
- "Archival collections that use home movies, industrial outtakes, educational collections, TV news coverage of a 2 year local event that was pulled for a use in a documentary made by local PBS."
- "Demonstration of scientific principles and history of holiday traditions."
- "SF media archive: historic films of SF; for Oddball, historic and cultural footage from the 1960's and 70's."
- "Videos from the oral history project."
- "Material on Auschwitz/concentration camps, war crimes trials, Hitler speeches, liberation, pre-war Jewish life."
- "Shipbuilding and fishing materials."
- "Changes because of museum shows, exhibitions, retrospectives; mainly artists such as Bruce Nauman, Matta-Clark, Baldessarri, Joan Jones, Martha Rossler, Nam June Paik."

- "The films by John Marshall, Timothy Asch and Robert Gardner."
- "Industry on Parade; Ernie Smith, Television commercials, jazz oral history, various oral history, computer history."
- "Our White House Communications Agency Videotape Collection, Navy Photographic Center Motion Picture Film Collection and White House Staff Super 8 Motion Picture Film Collection all sustain high levels of use."
- "Athletic video."
- "Avant-garde films of the 1960s–70s."
- "Programs screened in 220-seat theater. These include documentaries, television series, compilation reels compiled by staff for specific museum programs, others for researchers using reference library."
- "Public domain materials; newsreels."
- "Alvin dive video."
- "Our student produced materials are continually accessed by filmmakers, faculty and staff of the school, as well as graduated students and actors."

WHAT ARE SOME OF YOUR BIGGEST ACCESS ISSUES?

- "Past mis-use or mis-handling of objects; most items are uncataloged; done using interns."
- "Single copies of most titles in the collection; viewing is on-site only."
- "Films on outdated videotape formats; theft."
- "Lack of duplicate copies and facilities to view them; lack of equipment for all these formats."
- "Format obsolescence; the need for expensive playback equipment and expertise (even if the format is not yet obsolete). We have some copyright issues; sometimes it is difficult to get funding to migrate materials to another format if we cannot provide wider (i.e., Web) access to these materials."
- "Lack of funding to purchase updated formats (digital) and to replace LPs with CDs, and our VHS with DVDs."
- "Fragility of the original films/videos is one issue. Lack of sufficient descriptive information about the films/videos/tapes hampers access by both researchers and staff."

- "Searchable databases for the entire collection. We do have Microsoft Access databases for some portions of the collection. These were created by graduate students doing master's projects on the collection. We would like to migrate the old databases into our current system."
- "Backlog of undescribed materials; reading room inadequate, hours are limited."
- "Lack of intellectual control over the backlog of unprocessed or poorly processed collections, as well as the limited computerization (i.e., the entering of records in a database) of our photographic collections."
- "The cost of labor to catalog, transfer and digitize physical media. The cost of physical and digital storage; web based tech and IT labor expenses."
- "The inability to roll out our digital archive. We are still trying to process the collections so we are open to the public by appointment only. Also, we need to develop finding aids for each interview."

COMMENTS: HOW COMPLETE ARE YOUR CATALOG RECORDS?

- "As there are currently no catalog records, they are quite incomplete. However, we do have a substantial amount of information regarding donor, author/creator, state, date, etc. Not all films have associated information."
- "Moving image items in our Reference Collections have full cataloging and we feel that is sufficient. Moving image items in our archival collections are not cataloged and we feel we have insufficient information on these items."
- "We have a good deal of metadata for them, but it is not in a standard cataloging format. I feel the metadata we have is sufficient."
- "Very incomplete, but this has a lot to do with the fact that until last year our moving image materials were often not inventoried at an item level."
- "Not all our motion picture films are properly identified, though we have excellent identifying information for portions of it. For most of our films we have at least creator, date, and title."
- "Our cataloging records are pretty basic. For example, they do not include names of performers, unless the performer is native to this area."

- "Extremely incomplete. Frankly, the cataloging of the materials has always taken a back seat to accessioning of backlog collections that do not yet have accession records."
- "We have an internal database that provides the basics (if we know them) of title/event; sponsor; type of original format; performer; dates; contents; permission rights (if we have them); length; subject/keywords."
- "We have minimal records for our moving images. Most are campus produced so we have author, date, title, copyright—not necessarily all the 'performers.'"
- "About 1/3 have extremely detailed records, including time code log; the other 2/3 have basic information entered from the tape box (date, producer, title, run time); we have not yet watched or processed these tapes."
- "We have detailed catalog records only for the student materials. We record all of the indicated information in the record. We only have the other material logged mainly by title."

DO YOU HAVE NEW PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT?

- "Funding for disaster management."
- "Licensing and digitizing for streaming high-use items in the collection."
- "New gift of 1,200-inch video, trying to digitize ones that have never been offered for sale."
- "Making oral histories streamable via CONTENT-dm, digitizing audio tape originals and creating metadata for the audio and transcripts, pondering digitizing transcription discs."
- "Cataloging major acquisition from a defunct art video store. Received a large gift of classical and jazz CDs."
- "Seeking bids for a 3-yr digitization project for film and video."
- "Various digitizing projects, processing and cataloging backlog."
- "Raising private funds, writing grant proposals to expand preservation programs to include a preservation lab, audiovisual collections reformatting lab."
- "Grants for film preservation, marketing the film collection to documentary filmmakers."

- "Preservation projects with various actors, goal is to loan and distribute the new preservation prints to other museums, archives, festivals, etc."
- "Digitize our photo collection, migrate AV to CD and DVD, catalog book holdings, migrate current database records to new archival management software, put archival finding aids on website."
- "Film preservation, cataloging collection in MARC so it is available through the library catalog, more accessible to public."
- "Restore video as we received funding, build more archival space, 25th anniversary exhibit."
- "Making digital copies of moving images with Elmo machine—slow process."
- "Possible digitizing of student newspapers, photo collection. Some 16/8mm reformatting this summer but small."
- "Currently bringing in the Woodsongs collection, a local TV show featuring folk music. All on recorded formats that cannot be played back."
- "Childhood obesity educational materials, STEM educational materials related to Nevada Atomic Test site, veteran and Holocaust survivor oral histories, green building in the desert documentary, Nevada presidential visits."
- "Archiving 6,000 TV commercials, integrating a dozen FilemakerPro databases into one database and are in the preliminary stages of prioritizing grant applications for selected film preservation projects of historic SF films."
- "We are looking for a digital down load to own service the replicates the distribution arrangement we had with GOOGLE VIDEO. We are also revamping the infrastructure of our web site, our on-line e-business solutions, etc."
- "Digitalization of our campus newspaper."
- "Planning to weed entire collection and document what we decide to keep; currently we have no library catalog, so we hope to create one."
- "Partnership with commercial entertainment company. DVD release of material where rights were donated with source material."
- "I am currently working with another group on a possible NSF grant to deal with hosting and serving large data video files."
- "Betacam to DVD conversion; just about done, 130 films will be on DVD; started with public domain, will move to copyrighted."

COMMENTS ON PUBLIC-PRIVATE AGREEMENTS?

- "The orphan works issue is actually a bigger issue for us than my answers might communicate, because making copyright determinations for AV materials seems to be so much more complicated in general. Anytime someone wants to even view one of our non-university films we have to go through a painful analysis of who owns the copyright and thus who to seek exhibition permission from. It makes copyright analysis on photographs look easy."
- "The only deal-break would be with copyright issues. The library board and membership may have other ideas.…There are also issues related to our A/V staff and their willingness to cooperate."
- "Who is handling the material? Can we share copies? When we generally deal with one transfer company, how do we deal with another?"
- "The problem with a Bill of Rights for stuff in current commercial distribution is that commercial contracts will always trump whatever noble intentions we as providers may have. I'd like to say 'the right to perpetually retain and migrate licensed materials,' but the reality is that the distributor ultimately calls the shots as far as terms of use."
- "Typically we do not want our materials leaving our archive as we are directly responsible for their preservation, access and security. Also, if we feel that the preservation concerns would not be met, we would not enter into an agreement. And we must retain all custodial rights to the materials we own outright."
- "The security and proper handling of materials to support their physical preservation needs, and the ability to have long-term storage and ease of migration for all digital product produced, making it easily manageable and accessible for staff and patrons—but also enable certain content to remain secure or with limited access permissions."
- "The main thing archives need to focus on in the future is only accepting collections from parties that can legally give them, not throwing a metaphorical Goodwill box beside the front door and let anyone drive up and dump stuff. And even if the parties can give it, make sure agreements are in place that gives the archives some if not all

control over the materials. We let patrons dictate terms, even in situations where there is no money attached for the processing or storage of the material.…'Don't take in material unless you have control over it' will be a hard policy for many places to implement, but they have got to learn."

- "Yes; contacted by Media Matters for a beta test but this failed; we do not have a digital repository, no staff also; major issues are control over the content; protect the material, library may be liable."

- "No, and of no interest."

- "Yes, we are a Google partner. We're concerned with the care and handling of our materials during the digitization process and also of restrictive, or, on the flipside, illegal or unethical use of the digital surrogates."

- "Yes. Our main concern would be to maintain all preservation integrity of the materials as digitization is not worth the risk of damaging the original archival holdings which is part of our mission. Without preservation, access is irrelevant."

- "Yes, but mostly have ignored them. The terms of the current agreement with the Internet Archive to digitize our motion picture film collection state that the digitization will be done for free as long as we allow the Internet Archive to post the films to their website."

- "No, but it could be of interest. Main concerns are having our original materials going out of our hands into an unknown company, and what percentage of use fees the Society would obtain from an outside distribution agreement."

- "Yes; Google came but they were turned them down; IT was handling the contract; perhaps interested—who would prep the materials because we don't have the staff? We could only digitize processed collections."

XX. APPENDIX IV:
LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

- Columbia College, Chicago:
  Center for Black Music Research
- Oregon Historical Society
- Las Vegas PBS
- SF Media Archive
- University of Toledo, Special Collections
- Oregon Health and Science University
- Houston Public Library
- U.S. Holocaust Museum, SS Archive
- Los Angeles Public Library
- Mariners' Museum
- Museum of History and Industry
- National Press Club
- The New York Public Library for the
  Performing Arts: Jerome Robbins Dance Division
- UC Berkeley Media Resource
- University of Florida
- University of Louisville
- University of New Mexico
- Buffalo Bill Historical Center
- University of Michigan
- University of Virginia
- Sacramento Archives
- Anthology Film Archives
- University of Chicago
- Louisiana State Archive
- Wheaton College
- Southwestern Writers
- Bates College
- Harvard Film Archive
- University of Georgia
- Gay and Lesbian Center, New York City
- University of Pennsylvania Museum
- Southern Baptist Historical Center
- Washington State Historical Society
- Hollins University
- History San Jose
- University of Massachusetts, Boston
- University of Kentucky
- Electronics Arts Intermix
- Documentary Educational Resources
- The HistoryMakers
- Archives of Appalachia
- Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation and
  Library
- Smith College
- Walker Art Center
- Country Music Hall of Fame
- National Museum of American History,
  Smithsonian Institution
- National Air and Space Museum, Smithsonian
  Institution
- Human Studies Film Archives, Smithsonian
  Institution
- Richard Nixon Library and Birthplace Foundation
- Davidson College
- KCTS TV
- Video Data Bank
- Media Burn
- Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and
  Museum
- Guggenheim Museum
- Oceanographic Society
- Cleveland Museum of Art

- University of Southern California
- William J. Clinton Presidential Library
- Appalshop
- University of Georgia, Peabody
- New York University, Fales Library
- Rhode Island Historical Society
- Chicago Public Library
- Roger Tory Peterson Institute of Natural History (RTPI)
- University of Arizona
- KQED
- WNET
- New England Ski Museum
- Texas Archive of the Moving Image

XXI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Brewer, Michael, and Meghann Matwichuk. "Online Survey of Video Collections: Survey Results," Video Round Table: Results of Spring 2007 VRT Survey on Video Librarians and Video Collections. Chicago: American Library Association, 2007. http://www.ala.org/ala/vrt/vrtresources/vrt2007surveys.cfm

Note this survey led by Michael Brewer (University of Arizona) and Meghann Matwichuk (University of Delaware) provided an essential background about many aspects of a variety of archives, including academic and public libraries.

Geisler, Gary, et al. *Open Video Project*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Interaction Design Laboratory, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 2005.

Note this project led by Gary Geisler, Caryn Anderson, and Karan Sheldon investigated various digital issues among archives. It progressed to the creation of open-source software that allows archives and other media repositories to generate their own online digital archives.

California Preservation Program. *Preserving the 20th Century: California Preservation Survey of Moving Image and Recorded Sound Collections*. California Preservation Program, 2007. http://calpreservation.org/management/cppav/av_needs.html

Note although this study led by the California Preservation Program focused solely on California archives, it is a useful investigation into the vital issues involved in moving image archives today.

XXII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to many people regarding the creation of this work. First and foremost, I would like to thank Peter Brantley and Barrie Howard from the Digital Library Federation, who entrusted me with this work and provided countless acts of kindness and support.

A heartfelt thank-you goes out to Donald J. Waters at The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for his support of this work, and for the Mellon Foundation's continuing support of scholarly communications in the archival and academic community.

I would also like to thank all the archivists and librarians who dedicated time and effort to answering the numerous questions in my scan. They responded to my e-mail messages, phone calls, and follow-ups with patience and thoughtfulness, and I greatly appreciate all their help.

The following individuals met with me and provided crucial insight to their archives:

Tanisha Jones, The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, Jerome Robbins Dance Division

John Anderson, Electronic Arts Intermix

Janet Gertz, The Columbia University Libraries

Wendy Shay, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution

Mark Taylor, National Air and Space Museum, Smithsonian Institution

Pam Wintle, Human Studies Film Archives, Smithsonian Institution

Rachel Chatalbash, Guggenheim Museum

Nan Rubin, WNET

SPECIAL THANKS TO:

Peter Kaufman for all of his support and trust.

All my classmates, professors, and colleagues at NYU's Moving Image Archiving and Preservation Program, Tisch School of the Arts.

All the members of the Lot 49 group.

DIGITAL LIBRARY FEDERATION:

The Digital Library Federation (DLF) would like to acknowledge the generous assistance of Jaime Moore of DLF and Ricky Erway of Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) in the preparation of this report.