

## **HathiTrust - Technical Feasibility of a Consortial Membership**

A Shared Content Team Report to the Alliance Board of Directors

By Kathi Fountain (Program Manager) and Gordon Aamot (Chair)

September 2016

**Background:** [Overview of HathiTrust membership\\*](#) (Shared Content Team, July 2016)

### **HathiTrust's "Single Entity" Partnership Definition**

HathiTrust requires that the Alliance "be represented as a single entity through its holdings, contracts (a consortium must be a single legal entity, having a single legal counsel and insurance) and authentication."

**Charge:** The Shared Content Team was asked to investigate the technical feasibility of pursuing a "single entity" HathiTrust partnership. This report outlines feasibility for each "single entity" criteria.

### **Contracts and Insurance**

The Alliance is an independent 501(c)(3) organization. It is empowered to sign legal documents independently on behalf of the members, and it has its own insurance. The Alliance could sign the partnership contract, provide the single primary contact, and support central billing as required by HathiTrust.

### **Holdings**

Underlying the HathiTrust partnership is an overlap analysis between the HathiTrust collection and the institutions' print holdings. Single entity partners must provide a full collection holdings file for all member institutions. This is done initially to establish the partnership, and then it is done annually or more frequently at the partner's discretion.

Holdings files must be prepared using an Alma Analytics API because of the size of the files. The University of Washington alone extracts 4 million records for each submission, and Kate Diebel (UW) built the API to accomplish the process.<sup>†</sup> [We're inquiring about time estimates for that annual extraction, which would benchmark an Alliance time estimate.]

If pursuing a HathiTrust partnership, the Alliance would need to support a single holdings export for all libraries. This would require new W1 staffing with the right expertise. More research is required to provide an accurate estimate of staffing needs.

### **Authentication**

HathiTrust establishes authentication directly with individual institutions even if they join HathiTrust through an Alliance's partnership. However, it has strict requirements for authentication that are unlikely to change.

---

\* See: [https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxfq6\\_ZibgAyQV9GWmNDdDBWMFU](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0Bxfq6_ZibgAyQV9GWmNDdDBWMFU)

† See <https://bitbucket.org/uwlib/uwlib-alma-analytic-tools/wiki/HathiTrust%20Print%20Holdings>

Institutions must be InCommon members and implement Shibboleth single sign-on authentication to access restricted HathiTrust materials and features. InCommon is a member organization that provides “trusted shared management of access to resources.” It sets industry standards for service providers and identity providers, which ensures secure access to academic and scholarly materials. This requirement from HathiTrust is unlikely to change, and HathiTrust does not support EZ proxy use.

Twelve Alliance institutions are already InCommon members.\* The remaining 27 institutions are not, and they would need to consult their institutions’ IT unit for consent and leadership in overhauling the campus’ authentication system.

Full description of Hathi Trust’s technical requirements: <https://www.hathitrust.org/shibboleth>  
InCommon Basics and Resources: <https://www.incommon.org/docs/InCommonBasicsandResources.pdf>

### **Action Options for the Board and Council to Consider**

1. Shared Content Team designees discuss with HathiTrust the option of membership with the 12 existing InCommon members, reporting back to the Board in June 2017.
2. Shared Content Team completes research on staffing needs and reports back to the Board in June 2017.
3. Council returns to their campus to investigate the feasibility of InCommon membership and Shibboleth implementation locally and report back to Shared Content Team by April 2017.
4. Ask the Systems Team Representatives to complete a survey on the feasibility of InCommon membership and Shibboleth implementation locally by April 2017.

### **Addendum 1: InCommon (September 2016)**

#### ***Current InCommon Members***

- Central Washington University
- Eastern Washington University
- Oregon State University
- Pacific University
- Portland State University
- Reed College
- Southern Oregon University
- University of Idaho
- University of Oregon
- University of Washington
- Washington State University
- Western Washington University

#### **InCommon Fees**

Start Up: \$700

Annual: Tiered pricing based on Carnegie Classification, \$1,180-\$3,250

### **Addendum 2: Hathi Trust Fees (presented in July 2016)**

### Single Entity Partnership Model

Fees assessed to the Orbis Cascade Alliance as so:

- Public domain fees paid once for consortium and distributed to members
- Copyright fees determined by collective holdings analysis
- Internal redistribution for the total is possible

### Collective of Institutions Model

Fees Assessed Individually to each Institution as so:

- Public Domain Fee, flat fee paid by all participants
- Copyright fees determined by holdings analysis

#### *Example of Single Entity vs. Collective Pricing*

<b>Contribution Size</b>	<b>Single Entity Model (Est.)</b>	<b>Collective Model (from HT)</b>
Small Contributors	\$2,000-\$10,000 + fee share	Less than \$20,000
Medium Contributors	\$10,000-\$20,000 + fee share	\$20,000-\$30,000
Large Contributors	\$20,000-90,000 + fee share	\$30,000-\$100,000
Very Large Contributors	\$90,000 and up + fee share	\$100,000+

<b>Current Institutional HathiTrust Costs</b>	
University of Idaho	\$14,721 (quote)
Washington State U	\$17,553 (member)
U of Washington	\$43,000 (member)
Whitman College	\$12,019 (quote)
U of Puget Sound	\$11,650 (quote)