



DIGITAL PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF AMERICA

DPLA Beta Sprint Review Panel Meeting Notes

September 20, 2011

Process

Before the review meeting, the DPLA Secretariat divided submissions roughly into eight categories drawn from the projects themselves: Search and Discovery; Theory and Principles; Preservation, Repositories, and Architecture; Metadata and Citation Data; Building on Metadata; Multimedia/Visual Storytelling/Mashups; Use Cases; and Legal Issues. Each reviewer was assigned one category and asked to prepare a short introduction.

At the meeting, John Palfrey gave an introduction; Maura Marx and Rebekah Heacock gave process instructions and then left the room to ensure the impartiality of the process. Reviewers each then introduced and led a 15-20 minute discussion of the projects in their categories, after which all reviewers scored each project along the following criteria:

1. To what extent will the DPLA's users as a whole be better served by the successful completion of this project?
2. To what extent does the project adhere to the [DPLA Technical Principles](#)?
3. What is the quality of the conception, definition, organization, and description of the project?
4. What is the project's quality of innovation in terms of the idea, approach, method, or digital technology?
5. In terms of time and funding required, what is the feasibility of completing this project in the next 18 months?

These criteria were adapted from the review criteria for the National Endowment for the Humanities' Digital Humanities Start-Up Grants program. This program is intended to support "planning and developing prototypes of new digital tools for preserving, analyzing, and making accessible digital resources, including libraries' and museums' digital assets," among other kinds of projects.

After the initial scoring, reviewers engaged in an open discussion to develop their final recommendations.

Results

The panel recommended that the creators of the following six projects (listed in alphabetical order) be invited to present at the October 2011 plenary meeting:

- Digital Collaboration for America's National Collections: National Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress
- DLF/DCC: DPLA Beta Sprint
- extraMUROS
- Government Publications: Enhanced Access and Discovery through Open Linked Data and Crowdsourcing

- Metadata Interoperability Services
- ShelfLife and LibraryCloud

The panel also suggested a “lightning round” of presentations by creators of projects they saw as being useful additions to the DPLA’s initial technical foundation:

- Bookworm
- DPLA Collection Achievements & Profiles System
- WikiCite—A Universal Citation Platform

The panel also highlighted the following three projects as holding great potential for the DPLA:

- Federated Repositories and Providers: reviewers commended this project for being a cogent overview of critical challenges facing the DPLA and recommended it for careful Steering Committee and Technical Aspects workstream consideration.
- A public demo of OCLC's Crosswalk Web Service: reviewers recognized this project as a valuable contribution but expressed concerns that the terms of use outlined by OCLC may conflict with the spirit of the Beta Sprint’s intellectual property policy.
- Proteus: reviewers acknowledged the promise of this project for the DPLA and recommended it of futher consideration but were concerned that the project description was unclear about specific technology used.

Notes

Overall, reviewers suggested that starting with a solid corpus that could be put in place in the first 18 months would help provide a platform/API upon which future projects could be built. They recommended beginning with structured metadata/a federated search system and noted that beginning with aggregation and early integration will help the DPLA establish authority quickly.

Reviewers were intrigued by the idea of a crawl (DPLA Vertical Search Demo) and suggested this might be applicable to smaller organizations or collections, rather than as a foundational part of the DPLA.

Reviewers noted that the visualization aspects of several projects, including ShelfLife, appealed to them. They emphasized the need to spend time and money on a well-designed GUI for the DPLA.

Reviewers also highlighted a number of projects they saw as complementary, rather than integral, to the DPLA prototype. These included the three projects recommended for the “lightning round” above as well as the Digital Rights Registry project submitted by Charlie Nelson. Reviewers saw this project as something that could or should run parallel to the DPLA, rather than inside it, and noted that it could be used for projects outside of the DPLA as well.