Slide 1
Hello everyone and welcome to the Recordings at Risk Open Call Applicant Information Webinar. My name is Pedro Gonzalez-Fernandez and I am the program associate for Recordings at Risk. I'm joined by my colleagues at CLIR: Amy Lucko, Director of Program Administration, and Christa Williford, Director of Research and Assessment.

The purpose of this webinar is to help you all become familiar with the program and all aspects of the application process. We're going to go in-depth with the individual sections of the application, provide some helpful tips, and point to other useful resources when possible. But before we dive into the application, we will provide a brief introduction to CLIR as an organization, as well as the genesis of Recordings at Risk.

Slide 2
CLIR is an independent, nonprofit organization. Our mission is to forge strategies to enhance research, teaching, and learning environments in collaboration with libraries, cultural institutions, and communities of higher learning.

Although we're talking about a funding opportunity today, and although many of you may already be familiar with our long-standing Hidden Collections programs, CLIR is not actually a funding agency. We are a private, sponsor-funded research organization that engages in activities related to research, teaching and learning. You may be familiar with our publication series, which is available free on our website at CLIR.org.

We are small, with only 16 employees. Most of our work happens collaboratively with other institutions, agencies, and groups. A few of our programs – such as this one – do provide funding, but this is not the only or even the primary thing we do, and so you may notice we operate somewhat differently from private foundations or government funding agencies.

Slide 3
For more than 20 years, CLIR has partnered with organizations to help raise awareness about the legal and practical threats to audio and audiovisual content. Two recent examples are our work with the National Recording Preservation Board which led to the creation of the *Library of Congress National Recording Preservation Plan* in 2012 and our *Cataloging* and *Digitizing Hidden Collections* programs.

There are a lot of unique challenges facing those performing audio/audiovisual digitization and description (aka fighting back against the threats of degradation and obsolescence):
- Content is often inaccessible. If your organization lacks the proper playback equipment or if the materials are in such bad shape that they can't handle being played, how can you assess what you have?
- Another problem is that materials of significant value often fall under the stewardship of archivists who lack specialized training regarding their description, storage, and maintenance needs.
- There can be prohibitive storage costs when it comes to creating preservation copies, production copies, access copies
- Another big one is unclear IP issues

Through the Recordings at Risk grant competition, CLIR aims to help professionals in a variety of contexts identify institutional priorities for digital reformatting, build relationships with partners, raise awareness of best practices, and develop practical strategies for getting the job done. Furthermore, the lessons gleaned from each successfully funded project will, when openly shared, assist other institutions in their own related work.

Slide 4
You can think of Recordings at Risk as complementary to the larger Digitizing Hidden Collections program offered by CLIR; we focus on smaller projects and are addressing a more specific need.

While on the topic of Digitizing Hidden Collections, I should note that if you have a collection that requires more funding than what is offered by Recordings at Risk, you could potentially apply to RaR for digitizing a small portion of the recordings, with the aim of establishing an efficient workflow and strong use case for a larger grant application to a program like DHC that would allow you to tackle the rest of the collection.

Slide 5
Eligibility. First of all, you must be a U.S. nonprofit academic, research, or cultural memory organization. You and your collections must also be located within the United States. Government units and their agencies are eligible, so long as their primary function is cultural heritage. We like to use the courts as an example to explain what we mean by "primary function." If a court were to contact us wanting to apply for funding to digitally reformat at-risk records, we would have to turn them down because these records would be preserved for the primary purpose of litigation, not research and the production of scholarship. That said, let me note that organizations like the National Library of Medicine would be classified as a "cultural memory organization," as they are dedicated to preserving and providing access to their records for research and the production of scholarship. It's not all your typical humanities fare that we're looking for! The same would go for, say, an audiovisual collection put forth by the Neils Bohr Archives (part of the American Institute of Physics) that deals with the history of geophysics. In fact, we *want* to get materials that represent a wide variety of disciplines.

Federally recognized tribal governments are eligible. The application has a few items that are slightly modified for these types of organizations, such as the proof of nonprofit status--which would be replaced by documentation showing formal status as a Native American tribe. These modifications are all pointed out in the application guidelines.

Moving on, an eligible institution can only put one application forward per cycle. If an institution sends more than one through, CLIR will contact you and require you to settle on one.

In anticipation of a question that we get a lot: we treat each individual campus as its own distinct institution. This means that Campuses X, Y, and Z of the same University are able to submit different applications during the same cycle, without worrying about CLIR requiring the University to select just one. The same goes for national libraries.

Slide 6
Allowable formats. Recordings at Risk does not have an official list of allowed and/or forbidden formats. So long as you can find a qualified external service provider (also known as a vendor) that can perform technically competent and cost-effective digital reformatting services for whatever format, you are good to go.

It is important to note, however, that the program was designed with analog-to-digital reformatting projects in mind. While born digital a/v content is no less important and is surely at-risk, we are primarily focused on digitizing existing analog recordings and creating resources to help institutions tackle these types of holdings.

There are, of course, a few formats that blur the lines when it comes to analog/digital, such as digital audio tape. This particular format, for instance, is *very* eligible and *very* at-risk. So feel free to reach out to us with questions about the eligibility of a certain format.

Slide 7
Here is a broad overview of our Application. It is nine sections total. Some of these will be fairly self-explanatory, so I'll move through them more quickly. You can follow along by clicking the Application Guidelines link provided below. During a webinar I can't give the level of detail seen in the Guidelines link, so if you see anything there that isn't clear, feel free to bring it up during Q&A.

The image on the right is a screengrab that shows the basic layout of the application. You can navigate between sections by clicking the links at the top and you fill information into the fields, occasionally you will upload documents.

Slide 8
I want to point out that we have a Google Doc version of the application that previous applicants have found very useful when preparing their materials and responses. You can find a link to it on our Application Guidelines page. The doc itself is read-only, but you can easily create a copy that you can edit freely (there's a button on the doc that will generate a fresh one for you). Previous applicants have assigned different sections of the app to individual team members and found that it helped keep things organized--a solid strategy!

Just don't forget to eventually paste those answers into the *actual* application form in WizeHive!

Slide 9
Project Summary. This is where you provide the Title, Summary, Size (that is, the amount of money requested), Length of your project, and an Institutional Letter of Support.

The summary is a very brief description that touches on the nature of the recordings, major project activities, and why the project is significant. This quick writeup provides reviewers with a good at-a-glance summary, and it also will be used in publicity for the program if you are a recipient.

The letter of institutional support should come from a head administrator at your institution and basically, as our guidelines state, affirm the institution's dedication to the project, including a commitment to the long-term preservation and access of the digital files.

Slide 10
Description of Content - This section is where you provide an as-thorough-as-you-can-manage description of the source materials to be reformatted. We are looking for information related to their provenance, arrangement, current accessibility… We also accept URLs that point to descriptions that are available in catalogs and finding aids.

The Condition of the carriers, housing, and storage environment gets its own subsection here. If some of this information is covered in a service provider proposal, it's okay to refer the reviewer to that document and just use this space to write about things that aren't already explained.

Finally, this section requires you to break down the materials by quantity and type. The image here shows you the form that you will be using in the application. The Material Type dropdown provides you with the "rogues gallery" or "usual suspects" of at-risk audiovisual formats--of course, you can select Other and then write in a format if it isn't listed there. The available Units of Measurement are **items** and **recorded hours**. Pick whichever one makes the most sense for your project, but do not list the same materials in both items and recorded hours--count each recording only once.

The Additional Information box is there to provide extra detail, if available. This is a good spot to point out brand types and such. Some off-brand format types are more at-risk than others, so this is data that we like to have when available. It's not a dealbreaker if this information isn't included, as sometimes it can be hard to figure out what the brand is, etc.

Slide 11
Scholarly and Public Impact. This is a big one! Scholarly and public impact are the primary criteria upon which applications to this program are assessed. CLIR instructs reviewers to prioritize projects that include collections that are of high importance to a variety of disciplines and uses, and will have broad national/international impact. Consider how your project will:
- spark the interest of scholars from multiple academic areas, perhaps encouraging interdisciplinary research efforts;
- generate some form of counter-storytelling that will contribute to meaningful public discourse; and
- make a national or international impact upon scholarship, policy, culture, or the lives of communities.

We've worked hard to get a review panel with members that represent as many relevant disciplines as possible. It's not just audio/video/film experts looking at your proposals; we have folks with backgrounds in anthropology, musicology, African American studies, gender studies, broadcast history, film history, and more.

I'll take this opportunity to point you all to the Sample Proposals that we have on the For Applicants page of our website (you can access them by clicking on For Applications in the

Helpful Links box. You can then click the Sample Proposals link, or just scroll down a bit to see them.). We have three very different proposals from pilot call recipients available, and they each provide solid statements regarding scholarly and public impact. I know that all the criteria I listed can be a little intimidating, so I recommend taking a look at how these proposals made a case for their collections.

On a similar note, the four images to the right represent some of the projects that have been funded by RaR.

I'll briefly identify them since, again, this might help ground things after me asking you to think about how your project meets all these different criteria. Starting at the top left we have the William Way LGBT Community Center who are having cassettes related to LGBT history, politics, and culture from the 1950s to the 1980s. On the top right we have the Museum of Flight's oral history digitization project which involves American fighter aces from WWI, WWII, and the Korean War. Bottom left is University of California Santa Cruz's collection of avant-garde art music performances at the Cabrillo Festival of Contemporary Music. And on the bottom right we have the University of Alaska Fairbanks who has a project involving the digitization of recordings from the first public radio station in Alaska, KUAC-FM--this includes interviews with Alaska Native leaders, discussions of Arctic policy and on global warming.

Finally, this section is where you will provide one to three letters of support from experts familiar with the collection. Only one letter is required, more is better. Make sure that letters do not come from individuals directly connected to the project, and it is strongly recommended that you get support letters from experts outside your home institution and, when possible, outside the local region--this can help to demonstrate wider interest.

Slide 12
Risk Assessment. Here is where the urgency of the proposed project is explained. Competitive applications will demonstrate the institution's understanding of these risks, their strategic priorities for mitigating these risks, and how the proposed project advances those priorities. Note that if your materials are in good condition, you aren't going to be looked at unfavorably by reviewers. Sometimes good condition is a big reason **why** the recordings should be preserved ASAP.

Make sure to note things like storage conditions (previous and current), age, degradation (such as soft binder syndrome on magnetic audio tape, or perhaps you are getting whiffs of the telltale smell of vinegar syndrome on nitrate/acetate film), and note how unique the materials are (value adds to risk!).

Slide 13
Rights, Ethics, and Re-Use. This section helps reviewers to assess an applicant's understanding of the legal and ethical issues affecting the provision of access to the nominated content, as well as the appropriateness of the chosen methods and policies for providing access given any legal and ethical considerations. Please take note that imposing reasonable limits upon access to digitized audio *due to legal or ethical considerations*, including things like personally identifiable information, will **not** necessarily disadvantage you in the competition.

One other thing: make sure that you touch on any plans to charge fees for commercial/non-commercial use, and discuss specific attribution requirements for re-use of digital copies created through the project.

Slide 14
Project Design. There are a few different things required in this section, so I'll address them individually. I also want to point out, again, that the Sample Proposals are available on our For Applicants page and they can serve as a very helpful resource--especially if you are lacking confidence in some of the more technical aspects, such as the Digital Preservation Plan or the Technical Approach.
- Project plan with timeline: Make this as explicit as possible. Identify all the major activities taken during each phase of your project, including the parties responsible and the deliverables.
- Technical approach: This section is asking for information related to preservation reformatting specs, metadata schema, and so on during the project term. This is another instance in which referencing the service provider proposal or digital preservation plan may be appropriate if some of the information is already covered. But you'll want to describe how the digital files will be ingested and backed up, quality control work… Maybe your staff will take some time to create additional descriptive metadata, etc.
- Digital preservation plan: Here you will describe the processes and parties responsible for preserving the audio files created during the project, and how preservation activities will be managed over time. (Storage, Security, Data Integrity, etc.) I know that this section will be a source of stress for some institutions, so I want to point out the Digital Library Federation's **Digitizing Special Formats** wiki (it's in the Helpful Links box). This resource was initially created for applicants for CLIR's Hidden Collection grants, however, it has been recently updated to provide resources of particular use to Recordings at Risk applicants. That's a snapshot of it on the right; you can see that there are some resources specifically aimed at helping people develop digital preservation plans with limited resources. Of course, the Sample Proposals also are a great place to look.
- Finally, you will provide a list of all envisioned project deliverables and how they will be made available to users. You'll also list conditions and terms that limit their availability. Will users need to be on-site to access the materials? What is the outreach strategy you have for getting the attention of scholars and/or the public? Are you planning to connect these materials with existing collections online? Do you have future plans that involve the work done in this project?

Slide 15
Service provider information. This section will include the name, address, and contact information for any service provider involved in the project. I'll note that you are totally allowed to use more than one service provider. Perhaps you need one provider who works on your U-Matic tapes while another handles your wax cylinder recordings. Perhaps one will be doing parallel transfers for the bulk of your items while another does one-to-one.

You also will be providing a Rationale for Service Provider Selection. Here you will demonstrate that you've done your due diligence and found a service provider who is performing technically competent and cost-effective digitization. Here you can definitely reference the service provider proposal(s), but make sure that you clearly explain your decision making process. (Just a quick note: the service provider proposals are actually included in the following section about Funding).

And here's an important bit… We technically only require one proposal. BUT! You are strongly encouraged to seek out additional ones. The most we'd like to see is three (including the one that you have selected). This is very much in line with best practices, as by comparing proposals from different service providers you will be able to compose a more informed application.

Of course, there may be some instances in which you want to submit a sole source justification, or perhaps you can only find two service providers that seem qualified to work with. These aren't dealbreaker situations! But you will need to make a strong case in the Rationale for Service Provider Selection. Help the reviewers understand that due diligence has been observed.

Slide 16
Continuing along with Service Provider Information, we do have a list of Allowable and Disallowed Costs published in the For Applicants section of our website (check the Helpful Links box for it, too).

Allowable costs within requests should be directly related to preservation reformatting of nominated materials and may include:

- costs charged by a service provider related to stabilizing media for the purposes of preservation reformatting (or some basic conservation work to ensure a decent capture), conducting preservation reformatting, or basic metadata creation (service providers should be creating technical metadata as they digitize);
- shipping of materials to the service provider; and
- insurance for materials during shipping and handling by the service provider.

As you can see on the slide, there are also some Allowable Costs listed for work done at your home institution. This is all pretty basic stuff so I won't go over it all, but if you will be using a bit of the award for this type of work you will need to make a case for its necessity in your budget narrative. You can definitely make a justification that refers to the limitations of current institutional capacity, but since the purpose of this program is to fund digital preservation reformatting, you are going to be less competitive if a substantial portion of your budget is going toward this kind of work.

Slide 17
Here are some of the Disallowed Costs. And these might not truly belong in the Service Providers section since they often deal with work done at your home institution, but… we might as well deal with them while we're on the topic!

I won't read them all here, but I can point out some of the ones that are particularly relevant:

Software licenses and services is unfortunately something that we can't cover. This can be tough for institutions when it comes to their digital preservation plan because they may be hoping to use RaR award money to cover a subscription for digital storage services. Since these services need to be re-upped regularly, it's not really appropriate to use a RaR grant to cover them.

Film-to-film transfer is unfortunately an expensive endeavor that also falls outside of our digital reformatting scope--so we can't cover that type of service.

Extensive conservation work beyond what is required to get a solid capture of the materials is not covered.

"Miscellaneous" costs are simply anything that is sort of vaguely referenced in your budget detail. I assume most of you are archivists, so you should know better than to use this word!

Of course, you can reach out to us with any questions you have regarding these items. If you have any immediate questions about ones that I didn't cover, feel free to bring them up in the Q&A.

Slide 18
I'd like to touch on two frequently asked questions regarding service providers...

How do you find out which service providers are the most "*qualified*" to partner with? The bad news is that there's no simple "trick" to obtaining this information instantaneously, but the good news is that there are many ways to find this information: reach out to colleagues for recommendations, check to see which service providers partnered with institutions on similar grant projects, check sponsorship lists of various conferences (I've put the logos for 3 relevant conferences on the right), or look to see if any representatives have participated in webinars/panels.

Some organizations, like the Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA), will publish lists of digitization service providers who meet their standards.

That said, you will need to do your homework when it comes down to assessing proposals. For instance, are the proposed deliverables up to snuff? (File formats, conversion specifications, technical metadata, etc.)

Unfortunately, we can't touch on all these aspects here, but again, the DLF's Digitizing Special Formats wiki has resources that can help you with this. For example, NYU Libraries' Preservation & Conservation Department has an RFP Guide and Template for video digitization projects.

Next: what can you do to get the most accurate proposals possible from service providers? RaR calls are pretty quick, so proposals will more than likely be composed by service providers without physical examination of your collections. For this reason, you need to submit as much information as possible. Give them a complete inventory, give them photographs of the materials, their housing, and even the storage environment. If you are supplying photos of

materials that you have packaged in boxes, make sure that you aren't simply taking a photo of the first layer in the box!

Slide 19
One last thing I'd like to mention regarding service providers. The Digital Library Federation will be hosting a Strategies for Audiovisual Digitization Projects webinar series and next Wednesday they will be have "Effective Outsourcing with Audiovisual Digitization Service Providers," a webinar that will feature service provider representatives discussing partnerships and answering questions. The timing is unfortunately right in the middle of the current RaR call, but this is still incredibly useful--especially if you are not feeling confident in approaching service providers or maybe if you want to apply to a later call.

Slide 20
Funding. There are three budget documents that need to be uploaded here…
- Budget Narrative and Budget/Financial Report Form - Together they break down the budget and justify all costs.The Budget/Financial Report Form is provided by CLIR and you can find it on the Application Guidelines page.
- In the Narrative you will essentially be justifying the need for each budget line and the method used to compute the projected costs.
- The third budget document is the Service Provider Proposal. This is simply a PDF upload of the proposal that you have selected. In the application you will also have the option to include up to two additional proposals. As I've mentioned, you're encouraged to seek multiple proposals, so add them if you have them, and you can cite them in the Service Provider Rationale that we discussed in the previous section.

Slide 21
So I skipped over the final section of the application, Applicant Information, because it's extremely straightforward and we covered some of it already in the discussion on eligibility. There is, however, one more thing to mention regarding the application: you can upload additional relevant appendices.

These include:
- Summary documentation of collection assessments
- Accession documentation
- Donor agreements: Very handy to reference when discussing rights issues.
- Photographs of the nominated materials: Very handy to reference when discussing how at-risk the materials are. Nothing sells the "at-risk-itude" of the carriers to a reviewer quite like seeing the ravages of soft binder syndrome and such.
- Audio/video samples relevant to the nominated materials: Depending on the context, these can give a boost to, say, your argument of the scholarly impact.
- Sample metadata records or even mock ups of how records will appear to users online: These can help illustrate the technical plan and how access will be provided to deliverables.

Again, these *aren't required*, but they can be very helpful to the reviewers and might make all the difference when it comes down to making a tough call between two proposals, so consider

what types of available supplementary information you may have available that would make sense to include.

Slide 22
This is an image of where you can go to upload your appendices. This is the WizeHive main menu. You can return here at any point while filling out your application (remember to save your work before hopping back to the menu, though). When you open this up, you'll see a list of all the files you have attached so far (including the ones from the application, not just appendices). From this point it's a simple matter of selecting files and uploading them.

Slide 23
The Cycle Timeline. Applications are due on July 31, 2017. Recipients will be announced by October 31, 2017.

You are able to begin your project immediately after the announcement is made--the earliest project start date being November 1, 2017. The latest that you can start a project is August, 2018. This is because projects can have a length between 3 - 12 months, but they need to fit within the year following the award announcement.

The schedules for the third and fourth calls are up on the For Applicants page.

Slide 24
Okay. So that about wraps up everything I have to say. Thank you all for being patient--I know that was a lot to get through!

Before we address questions from the chat, let me add that if you have any questions that come up in the future, please feel free to contact me at recordingsatrisk@clir.org. I am here to help you guys out, so don't hesitate to get in touch! ALSO, if you haven't already, make sure to follow us on Twitter: @CLIRRaR. I put up reminders for deadlines, upcoming calls, webinars, and all sorts of a/v preservation goodness.

Okay. So let's take a look at the questions we have...