The Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) grew out of the 1997 merger of the Commission on Preservation and Access (CPA) and the Council on Library Resources (CLR). Over the years, CPA and CLR, in partnership with libraries, archives, and other information providers, advocated collaborative approaches to preserving the nation’s intellectual heritage and strengthening the many components of its information system. CLIR was founded to continue this tradition of support for a national information system and a seamless web of information resources, of which all libraries and archives are a part.

The convening role is central to CLIR’s mission. CLIR brings together experts from around the country and around the world and asks them to turn their intelligence to the problems that libraries, archives, and information organizations face as they integrate digital resources and services into their well-established print-based environments.

CLIR urges individuals to look beyond the immediate challenges and imagine the most desirable outcomes for the users of libraries and archives—to be rigorously practical and to dream.
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The ancient walls between types of institutions and between users and providers of information have broken down, and the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) is helping forge new relationships among traditionally unrelated groups. Librarians, publishers, museum directors, and scholars must begin to talk to one another, and during the past year CLIR has sponsored meetings that brought together members of these groups.

Perhaps the most challenging and potentially fruitful of these dialogs is that between librarians and scholars. In both teaching and research, faculty must now use material in electronic and Web formats, and increasingly they use images as well as texts. Librarians must support these new activities and must understand how they relate to traditional research methods. Supporting the dialog between information users and providers, especially between scholars and librarians, is a primary objective of CLIR’s current work.

1999–2000 was a year of significant “firsts” for CLIR. The first of 10 annual sessions of the Frye Institute at Emory University was a grand success. Fellows of the Institute are drawn both from libraries and from academic computing organizations, because we believe that these two groups now share the task of acquiring and managing information for teaching and research. CLIR also inaugurated its annual Sponsors’ Symposium in May. The symposium, which focused on library services of the future, drew 120 representatives from sponsoring institutions. Also in May, CLIR and the Digital Library Foundation (DLF) launched a new Program for Distinguished Fellows. The program will support senior information professionals for up to a year to pursue research that furthers the agendas of CLIR and the DLF. Finally, CLIR staff this year began to integrate international components into all of its areas of activity. Begun in 1989, the international program previously had been devoted almost exclusively to preservation and access issues. Reflecting this broadened scope of activity, three years ago the Board added a second international member. It will continue to have at least two members from abroad.

You will see from this annual report that CLIR’s finances are in very good shape. President Marcum and the staff have found solid financial support for CLIR’s core expenses and projects. The Board congratulates the president and staff on a stellar year.
What is a library? This question is the foundation for CLIR’s agenda at a time when digital technology is transforming academic and research institutions. Former Stanford University President Gerhard Casper offered a thoughtful answer in his remarks at the dedication of the Bing Wing of Stanford’s Green Library in October 1999:

Guarding the rational process is the Western university’s major contribution to civilization. . . . The search to know—the search for truth—has always been characterized by the need to doubt, the need to be critical, including being self-critical: looking not just for the evidence, but for the counterevidence as well. The holdings of the university library, paper, object, and digital, are one of the means by which the university performs its role as the custodian of that rational process.

It takes courage for a university or college president to build expensive library facilities at a time when so many technologists predict that electronic networks and ubiquitous access will make libraries obsolete. Caught in the debate between library as place and library as information service, campus communities are forced to find new meaning for the library.

In some ways, the library’s identity seems self-evident, because the library building has been a symbol on American campuses for more than 200 years. The library is an iconic expression of the campus community’s belief in the importance of knowledge and the creation of new knowledge. Despite this tradition, however, libraries cannot continue in their established patterns. They must reinvent themselves so that tomorrow’s scholars and students will be well served by the choices made today.

Reinvention is necessary because the library no longer has a lock on information resources. Before digital technology changed everything, the library was the primary information source for students and faculty alike. What the university or college could afford to spend on library acquisitions determined the level of easy access the campus community had to information. No more. There is no central site for scholarly resources on the campus. Today, libraries must be understood in terms of the services they provide, not simply in terms of their physical holdings.
The new information environment poses challenges to libraries of all types. Even the Library of Congress is uncertain how to respond to the questions posed by digital technology. As James O’Donnell, chairman of a National Academy of Sciences’ study of the Library, made clear in his overview of LC 21: A Digital Strategy for the Library of Congress, all libraries are confronted with a series of questions:

Will the distinctive features of the Western library survive? Will preserved information continue to be widely and freely available in public libraries? Will the great research libraries continue to be the point of entry to the information universe for their select band of users? Will the integration of digital with print information succeed, or will print suffer a damaging loss of prestige in the general rush to exploit the possibilities of the Internet? Will new integrators and organizers of knowledge emerge, perhaps from the commercial sector, bypassing libraries and finding ways that succeed in putting information directly in users’ hands? No individual and no committee knows the answers to those questions, but librarians must guide their institutions with an acute awareness that the questions will be answered decisively—perhaps within a very few years.

The questions O’Donnell raises go to the heart of the difficulties in being a steward of the rational process. So many new players are now appearing on the information stage that it is very hard to know how each influences the whole. And the questions are not left to librarians alone to answer. Campus administrators are now faced with choices about investments in information. While once they counted on libraries to select the most appropriate resources to meet the campus community’s information needs, now the many departments and units on campus are securing the specialized information they need from Web-based sources developed by colleagues around the world.

CLIR’s agenda has been shaped by our belief that the reinvention of libraries must involve many different communities—administrators and funding entities who pay the bills, scholars who use the resources to create new knowledge, and publishers who have been part of the information chain for well over a hundred years. CLIR sees its role as one of helping the many interested parties determine how the new system will preserve the best of the old and incorporate the most promising features of the new. It would be a mistake to think that the new system involves only adapting to digital technology. The most interesting questions are connected to the role of the artifact in the new environment, the legal and organizational requirements of preserving digital information, and the preparation and formation of a new cadre of professionals who will be tomorrow’s stewards of information resources. The projects described in this annual report...
reflect our understanding of the questions that must be addressed. In every case, we bring together the diverse interests of the many groups affected by changes in the system of scholarly communication.

**In Gratitude**

The activities described in this annual report are generously supported by 215 institutions, private foundations, and individual donors.

CLIR is not a membership organization; rather, it invites all libraries that see CLIR’s agenda as integral to their own to become partners in a common enterprise. This year, the number of CLIR sponsors grew from 109 to 145, a 33 percent increase. Twenty-five research libraries support the full operational costs of the Digital Library Federation (DLF). To all of the institutions that invested in our work, we extend sincere thanks.

We are especially grateful to the two foundations that have provided general support. Funds from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation have enabled CLIR to remain flexible in identifying and responding to the issues we see as critical to the library and scholarly communities in a time of rapid change. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has made generous grants to support both general operations and specific projects. The entire library community benefits enormously from Mellon’s farsighted views about changes in scholarly communication and the library’s role in the system.

Other foundations—the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, the Institute for Museum and Library Services, the William Penn Foundation, and the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation—have enabled us to advance some important projects in leadership and resources for scholarship.

Financial resources are essential, but the ideas about what will most help libraries, archives, and other information agencies come from CLIR’s talented staff. Their contributions, made on a daily basis, often grow out of the thoughtful, deeply reflective discussions held with the Board twice annually.

There were some staff changes at CLIR during the year. Hans Rütimann, who was responsible for international preservation programs for nearly a decade, resigned in December 1999 to become an independent consultant. We appreciate the skill he brought to developing networks of international colleagues who are also working to advance the cause of preservation. Daniel Greenstein joined CLIR as director of the DLF in December 1999. He brings great intellect and energy to the task of finding ways to help
research libraries collaborate and develop effective digital library services. DLF Research Associate Rebecca Graham left CLIR in May 1999 to become head of library computing services and the digital library program at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Novera King joined the CLIR staff in May as the DLF administrative associate. She comes with a degree in film studies from Columbia University. Finally, we are pleased to have the able assistance of Ann Marie Parsons, a graduate student in library science at Catholic University, who joined the CLIR staff as an intern in January 2000.

It is a privilege to lead this organization. The Board, the staff, and our sponsors are all committed to creating a future library that takes full advantage of technology in delivering better and more customized services. There are many difficult choices facing the library community, but I take comfort in being surrounded by so many who are stubbornly dedicated to achieving meaningful change.

Deanna B. Marcum
President

September 30, 2000
When the Council on Library Resources and the Commission on Preservation and Access merged in 1997 to form CLIR, the new organization presented its agenda in four programs of activity: preservation and access, digital libraries, economics of information, and leadership. One staff member led each program and was responsible for its activities. In the ensuing two years, it became clear that this model of organization was too rigid: CLIR’s work could not be so neatly circumscribed. Our concern about digital archiving, for example, related to preservation, economics, and digital libraries. We realized that it would be more effective to identify the issues or themes that are most important for the advancement of libraries, archives, and other information organizations and to think of those themes as a collective assignment to our staff.

At the same time, we recognized that the four program areas did not convey the full scope of our work. Developments in digital technology, for example, had forced us to consider issues of preservation separately from those of access. Moreover, the international program, which had been lodged within the Commission on Preservation and Access, had the potential for a much broader mandate. Consequently, we began to think of our work not in terms of programs but in terms of activities that reflect six areas of interest: resources for scholarship, preservation awareness, digital libraries, economics of information, leadership, and international developments.
universal collection universally available: digital technology makes the dream appear achievable. What will it take for libraries collectively to realize that dream? And what will happen to the collections of books, serials, and audio and visual resources that libraries have built over the centuries, many characterized by a high level of redundancy and each bearing a heavy burden of preservation? How can libraries provide the resources their patrons need in a cost-effective manner and live up to the often-unfunded mandate of preserving culturally significant but low-use collections?

CLIR is working to ensure that libraries of the future will be well positioned to provide researchers the resources they need to pursue their lines of inquiry. Digital technology broadens access to research materials that have, in the past, been scarce or expensive to share. It also challenges traditional models of collection development in libraries—methods that have been based on procuring physical artifacts to provide access to information. In the hybrid library, physical items will no longer be the default mode of access for all genres. Many scholars, including humanists, already prefer the convenience of desktop access to print journals rather than making multiple trips to the library. It is important to track the patterns that emerge as scholars have increasing choice among modes of access. Libraries must work closely with researchers to develop robust collections that are easily located and retrieved.

The Artifact in Library Collections
In this hybrid environment of analog and digital, affected by ambiguous copyright directives and changing economic models of access and preservation, librarians face new and often perplexing choices in collection development. At this turning point in the building of library collections, it is critical to engage the scholarly community in discussions about the development and responsible custody of information resources. In October 1999, the Task Force on the Role of the Artifact in Library Collections met to consider how to define the research community’s needs for the artifact, rather than a surrogate, for research and teaching.

Chaired by Stephen Nichols, an eminent medievalist and former library director, this international group of scholars, university and college administrators, librarians, and archivists is evaluating the intrinsic value of different genres and formats of primary and secondary sources in an effort to determine how they can best be preserved and made accessible and how to ensure access to originals when research demands it. The inquiry is focused not only on print collections but also on analog audio-
visual and digital materials. The group will circulate a draft among a variety of focus groups in the winter of 2001 and will issue a report of its findings and recommendations the following spring. The work of the Task Force is supported by a grant from The Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation.

**Collections, Content, and the Web**

In October 1999, in partnership with the Chicago Historical Society, CLIR hosted a conference, *Collections, Content, and the Web*, that investigated issues museums and libraries confront when digitizing their collections of artifacts for dissemination over the Internet. By convening leaders of public and academic libraries, as well as art and historical museums, CLIR provided an opportunity for these institutions to cultivate closer relationships and find common solutions to the problems they face: selecting collections suitable for broad distribution; managing intellectual and privacy rights; identifying virtual audiences and developing tools for their use online; and understanding how collections of artifacts operate in a virtual environment. As a result of the meeting, managers developed a deeper appreciation that, from the online user’s perspective, libraries and museums are more similar than different, and that often a search will begin with a specific subject or object, rather than with the collection of a specific institution, in mind. Libraries and museums share online identities as repositories of culturally significant materials. They are trusted sources of information and, to a large degree, entertainment. CLIR will remain engaged with museums to foster resource development and sharing among cultural communities. A report of the conference findings was published in January 2000. The conference and report were supported by a grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services.

**Authenticity in the Digital Environment**

Researchers look to libraries and archives to find valuable and trustworthy sources—at least sources that they can trust to be what they appear to be. In January 2000, CLIR convened a group of librarians, archivists, computer scientists, historians, documentary editors, publishers, and digital-asset managers to address the question: What is an authentic digital object, and what are the core attributes that, if missing, would render the object something other than what it purports to be? The topics under debate included the notion of fixity in digital documents, continuity of reference linking, the role of trusted third parties in assuring integrity and authenticity, and the promise of technological solutions to address the issue of trust and reliability. A report of the conference, including papers written for the occasion, was published in May 2000.
T here is a trend in libraries and their funding agencies to emphasize broadening access to collections through the creation of digital surrogates. At the same time, there is increased awareness of the many problems in keeping digital files—whether born digital or reformatted—refreshed and readily accessible on current hardware and software. As a greater portion of library budgets and grant funds goes to digital resources, funding for preservation remains flat or is shrinking. This trend, if continued, will endanger the well-being of research collections nationwide and may lead to the loss of print and critically at-risk audiovisual collections created in the last two centuries.

CLIR believes that preservation remains a fundamental mission for libraries and that preservation has a long-term payoff, even though it has grown more difficult to fund and manage. Libraries must balance local needs with the national agenda, weigh the value of content on each new medium against its typically short life span and funding constraints, and monitor the changing research priorities of scholarship. Preservation of nondigital materials is complicated by the difficulty in setting priorities for selection and by the unrealistic, if understandable, view of many that all resources are of equal value and must be preserved. Preservation of digital information is challenging not only for technological reasons but also for legal reasons. Traditionally, libraries have had a mandate to preserve what they own. Few if any libraries are willing to take responsibility for preserving licensed electronic resources that they do not own, even though they recognize that publishers are not archivers.

Increasingly, the preservation of cultural and scholarly resources is becoming the responsibility of all who have a stake in them—creators, publishers, and users—as well as of the traditional custodians in libraries and archives. Preservation awareness must reach beyond the walls of the library and the grounds of the campus.

Preserving Multimedia Resources

In July, CLIR published a report on the state of resources documenting the art of dance. Dance documentation exists in all formats, from print to video to digital, and the challenges of preserving and enabling access to these materials mirror those of all the performing arts. The report, entitled *Securing Our Dance Heritage: Issues in the Documentation and Preservation of Dance* and produced by the Dance Heritage Coalition, identifies the numerous formats in which information about dance is recorded and the range of individuals and institutions that have some responsibility for providing long-term access to this information. Not surprisingly, many of
the individuals charged with this responsibility are not professional
librarians or archivists. Therefore, any strategy to preserve these materials
must involve many small groups and communities in a coordinated
national effort to raise awareness of what is at risk. CLIR lent further
support to the Dance Heritage Coalition to convene a series of meetings
that developed a national strategy for the preservation of dance documen-
tation.

Recorded Sound in Peril
Like dance documentation, recorded folklore collections are an endan-
gered resource. Such collections consist mostly of field recordings, some of
which date from the Depression era or earlier and exist on a variety of
fragile and obsolete media. Besides being physically vulnerable, these
materials are imperiled by a lack of agreement on standards for descrip-
tion and access. Some have been accessioned into libraries and archives,
but many exist in private collections or in small cultural agencies that lack
adequate storage facilities. To address the needs of this corpus of poten-
tially national significance, CLIR is working with the American Folklore
Society and the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress to
develop a strategy for preservation and access. The first step in this project
is a baseline survey of ethnographic materials in institutions and private
collections to determine the scope of the documentation and the preserva-
tion needs. The work will culminate in December 2000 in a conference that
will bring together experts—archivists, librarians, recorded-sound techni-
cians, preservation and media specialists, intellectual-property lawyers,
and recording company executives—to explore all aspects of the crisis and
reach a consensus on collaborative action.

Digital Preservation
Among the most widely used techniques for managing long-term access
to digital files is migration, i.e., the transfer of digitally encoded informa-
tion from one hardware-software configuration to another. Migration is
intended to keep selected digital information accessible by ensuring that
hardware or software obsolescence does not strand files in unreadable
formats. It is, in essence, a translation program, and, as is the case with all
such programs, some measure of information is lost in the movement
from one encoding scheme to another. CLIR commissioned the Cornell
University Library to do a study of what could happen to digital files over
time as a consequence of multiple migrations. The study was conducted
over 18 months, and the results were reported in June 2000 in a publica-
tion entitled Risk Management of Digital Information: A File Format Investi-
gation. This report provides tools for assessing risks to some standard
formats and enabling managers to make informed decisions when imple-
menting migration strategies.
LIR is committed to fostering the development of digital libraries as a resource for research and learning. Our aim is to help policy makers, funding organizations, and academic leaders understand the social and institutional investments in digital libraries that are needed to organize, maintain, and provide access to a growing body of digital materials for scholarly purposes.

The Digital Library Federation (DLF) is the primary manifestation of CLIR’s interest in digital libraries. Operating under CLIR’s auspices, the DLF is a consortium of 25 leading research libraries that are developing online collections and services. Members work through the DLF to share research and development; identify and promote the application of digital library standards and good practices; and incubate innovative digital library organizations, collections, and services, particularly where these are commonly required but are beyond the ability of any single organization or consortium to produce.

The past year has been one of change and growth for the DLF. In December 1999, the organization appointed a new director, Daniel Greenstein, to succeed Donald Waters. Mr. Greenstein, formerly director of the Arts and Humanities Data Service in the United Kingdom, has expanded the DLF program and developed its communications arm.

The DLF Program
Since its inception in 1995, the DLF has undertaken research-and-development work on some of the technical challenges that libraries confront as they move collections and services online. Its work on structural and administrative metadata (catalog records for digital information objects), on strategies for preserving digital information, and on methods for securing access to online information have had particular impact in library and technical communities. Building on this work, the DLF has broadened its program to include other areas of pressing concern to the digital library. It is currently active in the following six areas.

- Developing and applying appropriate architectures, technologies, systems, and tools. Members pool otherwise limited research-and-development capacity to scan the larger technical environment and to define, clarify, and develop prototypes for digital library systems and system components.

This year, the DLF began to explore a wholly new model for accessing scholarly resources—one that will enable users seamlessly to explore the contents of numerous geographically distributed, and often very different,
scholarly information resources. In this model, data providers, such as managers of OPACs and finding aids, e-journals, e-print archives, or online data and image repositories, would agree to provide extracts of their metadata in a common, minimal-level format in response to requests from service providers. Service providers, such as libraries, data repositories, and e-print archives, would use the extracted metadata to build user-oriented services, such as catalogs and portals to materials distributed across multiple sites. This model would lead to the development of subject portals opening out onto information in all formats, whether print or digital, database or sound, and dealing with a specific topic or theme. Localized or regional services could also arise; for example, to present a wide range of information in a manner appropriate to users in a particular geographically defined community, such as a university campus.

In pursuing this work, the DLF and the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI) have agreed to support the Open Archives initiative, a technical framework that can support harvesting. In the coming year, harvesting services will be developed to test the protocol and allow the organizational, business, legal, and scholarly ramifications of such services to be explored.

- Developing sustainable, scaleable, and useful digital collections and services. The digital library transforms traditional collections through the integration of new formats, licensed (as opposed to owned) content, and third-party information over which the library has little or no direct curatorial control. Collection-development strategies and practices do not yet take account of these changing circumstances, and their legal, organizational, and business implications are not well understood. The DLF is therefore active in identifying, evaluating, and, where necessary, developing collection strategies and practices that are appropriate for the digital library, and in assessing the legal, organizational, and business implications of these strategies.

The DLF is also encouraging the development of new kinds of scholarly collections that take full advantage of computer and network technologies. Work this year focused on the Academic Image Cooperative (AIC) prototype, a database of curriculum-based digital images to be used for teaching the history of art. Developed with support from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the AIC supplies a framework for a service capable of launching and sustaining a comprehensive scholarly resource that will promote innovation in research, learning, and teaching in the history of art and other arts and humanities disciplines that depend on the use of visual resources as evidence.
Developing support and other services that enable the digital library to respond to its users’ information requirements. In a digital library, how information is made, assembled into collections, and presented online affects whether, to what extent, and how it can be used. Accordingly, libraries need to engage more effectively with their user communities to build better, more useful, and more usable collections and services. They also need to rethink and restructure user-support services to make them appropriate for library services and collections that are delivered online. An obvious starting point is a thorough review of how scholars and students are using existing online collections and services. However, because there are no standard methods for evaluating such use, no body of data exists to support such a review. The DLF has launched an initiative to identify and seek agreement on appropriate evaluative methods and to deploy them in a comprehensive investigation of how students and scholars are using online collections and services.

Gaining experience in preserving digital information. Building on the work of the Commission on Preservation and Access, CLIR and the DLF remain committed to maintaining long-term access to the digital intellectual and scholarly record. The DLF has cooperated with CLIR in developing digital archival repositories for electronic scholarly journals (see page 16).

Identifying standards and practices that enable the digital library to develop and maintain its collections and services cost-effectively. The DLF seeks to identify, document, endorse, and promote the adoption of data-creation standards and best practices for producing digital information that can be managed, exchanged, distributed to end users, and preserved cost-effectively. Two initiatives have borne fruit this year.

First, the DLF and the Research Libraries Group (RLG) copublished the DLF/RLG Guides to Quality in Visual Resource Imaging. The five Web-based guides offer practical advice on planning and carrying out a scanning project. The topics covered include general planning, scanner selection, considerations for imaging systems, digital master quality, and storage of digital masters.

Second, the DLF sponsored a workshop to explore the use of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) and XML in libraries. The workshop led to the creation of recommendations for applying the TEI and best practices for encoding electronic texts developed for different purposes. The recommendations have been endorsed by leading text centers in the United States and Europe and are already in use.

Gaining a better understanding of the digital library’s institutional roles, responsibilities, and potential. CLIR and the DLF share an interest in helping
libraries promote themselves within their own institutions and within the communities they serve. DLF and CLIR will identify communities with a stake in the library’s future and develop literature to inform those communities about such issues as the distinctive educational and cultural value of online collections and services, and their real costs, legal ramifications, and organizational requirements.

Communications Infrastructure

Effective communications are vital to the DLF. They ensure that its programs respond to members’ needs and interests, and they enable the DLF to inform its members and the broader library community about the strategies, technologies, organizational mechanisms, and legal and business issues that affect the development and cost-effective maintenance of high-quality digital library services and collections. This year, the DLF has taken the following steps to enhance its communications efforts:

- Revised, reorganized, and updated the DLF Web site, its primary vehicle for communicating with the broader community.

- Established several e-mail lists to support communication between the director’s office and staff at DLF member institutions.

- Prepared to launch a quarterly newsletter in which the director’s office will report to members and members will report about recent developments in their digital libraries.

- Built two online registries to supply information about members’ digital library initiatives:

  - Documenting the digital library: a database of policies, strategies, working papers, standards and other application guidelines, and technical documentation developed by DLF members to inform or reflect upon their digital library development activities; and


The DLF Forum is also an important part of DLF’s communications infrastructure. Drawing professional staff from each of its member institutions, the forums serve as meeting places, marketplaces, and congresses. This year, the DLF held its first two forums. The first focused on digital library technologies, the second on organizational issues and challenges.
The changes brought about by digital technology obligate librarians and university administrators alike to consider new economic models for providing information services. What does it take to create self-sustaining information services while honoring the ethics of the library profession and engaging all of the stakeholders, including publishers and information creators? This year, CLIR focused on economic models for managing the content of electronic journals.

**Electronic Journal Usage Statistics**

Librarians rely on usage statistics to inform a range of decisions, from acquisitions to storage. In the print environment, librarians developed methods for tracking collection use. With the advent of electronic publishing, however, usage data reside with the publishers, and fewer than half make such statistics available. Given the expense of implementing the statistical-analysis function, many publishers are slow to add this capability. What is available varies widely among publishers, and librarians are often unclear about what to ask for and how they will use the data. Guidelines are just emerging and are not widely adopted. There is a need to promote dialog between librarians and publishers on the issue of usage statistics to identify each side’s concerns, and to reach agreement on standards for compiling such statistics.

To provide a basis for dialog, CLIR commissioned Judy Luther, president of Informed Strategies, to develop a white paper on use statistics for electronic journals. Her findings will be based on extensive interviews with publishers and librarians. The paper, scheduled for completion in fall 2000, will offer practical suggestions for librarians and publishers on making available and using statistics that are not cumbersome or costly for either party.

**Stanford University Study on Scholars’ Use of Electronic Journals**

With support from CLIR, Stanford University designed a project to study the use of scholarly journals in electronic form. Stanford’s interest in usage is twofold. Because the university is a publisher (it runs HighWire Press), it hopes that the knowledge gathered will assist in the transition from the present, financially unstable condition of scholarly journal publishing to information products and services that meet the needs and interests of scholars. Stanford’s library is interested in making electronic journals available to users more quickly and economically. Stanford will use this design as the basis for a large-scale study, for which it will seek funding.
Economics of Digital Library Collections
Following earlier work in the economics of digital library collections, the University of Michigan held a conference on “Economics and Usage of Digital Library Collections” in March 2000 in Ann Arbor. Hosted by the university’s Program for Research on the Information Economy and its library, the conference was funded by CLIR, Elsevier Science, and John Wiley & Sons. The conference, which focused on the pricing of electronic publications and on cost and usage studies, presented data from a number of projects that served as a useful basis for discussion among librarians, publishers, and economists. The conference marked the end of the university’s three-year project in Pricing Electronic Access to Knowledge (PEAK).

Columbia University Press Study of Online Resources
Columbia University Press, which is developing two new online publications, was funded to bring together focus groups of scholars and teachers to discuss how these online curricular materials could be used in undergraduate teaching. This project reflects CLIR’s belief that a better understanding of how teachers view electronic materials will help publishers deliver higher-quality products to the university and college communities.

Responsibility for Digital Archiving
In October 1999, CLIR, the DLF, and CNI convened a group of publishers and librarians to discuss responsibility for archiving the content of electronic journals. The group was asked to consider what would be required to ensure access to electronic journals for 100 years. In December, CNI hosted a second meeting to pursue the same question with a larger group. Much interest, but little activity, resulted from the two meetings. To stimulate progress, CLIR staff extracted minimum requirements for archival repositories from the Open Archival information System (OAiS) reference model and presented a document on the requirements for electronic journal archiving to a group of library directors. After incorporating the directors’ suggestions for improvements into the document, CLIR invited Karen Hunter of Elsevier Science to convene a group of commercial and nonprofit publishers to review the document. Finally, Ann Okerson, of Yale University, was asked to convene a group of licensing experts from the library and publishing communities to review the document and make suggestions about the language that needs to be used in negotiating license agreements that include responsibility for digital archiving. Now that input from these groups has been secured, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has issued a request for proposals from a select number of libraries that have agreed to work in collaboration with publishers to develop approaches to digital archiving.
CLIR will remain involved in the archival repositories project by gathering information about archival practices and costs, documenting processes and costs of the pilot projects funded by the Mellon Foundation, and disseminating information about the projects to the library and publishing communities.

Managing Cultural Assets from a Business Perspective

Libraries face the ongoing challenge of having to account in financial terms for the real value of their chief assets, their collections. The context for collection valuation and the method of accounting vary from library to library, depending on the institution’s mission and how its information resources are used to fulfill that mission; however, as information and its products become more important parts of the economy, there is a stronger push to view library holdings from a business perspective.

To address that need, CLIR published a report describing a business risk model for managing library collections. Written by Laura Price of KPMG LLP and Abby Smith of CLIR, the report was published in cooperation with the Library of Congress. It is a case study of the Library of Congress’s baseline risk assessment of its collections, a program that was developed several years ago and is now a permanent feature of the Library’s annual financial accounting procedure. The business risk model treats collections as core institutional assets and defines good stewardship as a dynamic process of identifying risk to the collections and instituting policies and procedures that mitigate the risks. This model is valuable to managers because it is designed not only to identify risk to library assets but also to determine which risks are least acceptable and what measures must be taken to reduce them. It guides management decisions about investments in collections and is grounded in the individual mission of each library.
he library of the future—based on new relationships with many other campus units—calls for a new kind of leadership. CLIR, in collaboration with other organizations, continues to emphasize leadership-development programs that equip librarians to work in partnership with other managers of information resources.

Frye Leadership Institute
The first Frye Leadership Institute, sponsored by CLIR, EDUCAUSE, and Emory University, was held at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, June 4–16, 2000. Forty-three librarians, information technologists, and faculty members took part in the sessions, which were led by Richard Detweiler and Deanna Marcum, deans of the Institute. Thirty-one faculty members conducted sessions on topics such as scholarly communication, intellectual property and copyright, public policy, technological developments, university governance, student life, teaching and learning, and management. College and university presidents, provosts, faculty, and financial officers offered personal perspectives on the changing landscape of higher education and on meeting the challenges it offers.

The participants came from community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive and research universities. Without exception, they rated the Institute as uniformly excellent. Following the Institute, the participants are engaged in a yearlong practicum project on their home campuses, and they continue to communicate with one another through a listserv.
The Frye Leadership Institute is a 10-year project. The second session will be held in Atlanta, Georgia, June 3–15, 2001. The Institute is funded principally by the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation. The Institute for Museum and Library Services and The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation provided supplemental fellowship funds to encourage participants from liberal arts colleges and diverse cultural backgrounds to attend.

**College Libraries Committee**

When the College Libraries Committee met in March 2000, the group expanded its charge and its membership. Formed originally to advise the Commission on Preservation and Access on preservation problems confronting liberal arts colleges, the group has now broadened its role to cover all CLIR’s areas of interest.

Following the publication of *Innovative Use of Information Technology by Colleges* in August 1999, the College Libraries Committee identified the four topics that are of greatest concern to the institutions they represent:

*Technology:* defining the library’s role in supporting course-management software and in addressing institution-wide concerns about authorization and authentication; identifying the kinds of rights management systems that best serve the needs of college and midsize university libraries.

*Special collections:* evaluating organizational models for special collections; identifying ways to manage special collections more effectively, including selection criteria and economic models for digitization projects.

*Collections:* understanding the meaning of "core collections” in the digital environment and the role of off-site storage in collection management; addressing the development of cooperative collections.

*Leadership:* communicating library issues to administrators; studying requirements for leadership in the profession; and analyzing staffing and recruitment patterns and problems.

Recognizing that these topics are not specific to college libraries, the Committee concluded that it should broaden its membership to include representatives from midsize universities, and it extended an invitation to Nicholas Burckel, director of Marquette University Libraries. The name of the committee will be changed to reflect its broader advisory role.

Following in-depth discussions about the most pressing needs of college and midsize university libraries, the Committee chose four projects for its immediate agenda:
• Determine best practices for libraries working with Web-based or Web-assisted courses. Offer guidance on the role of the library in such courses.

• Conduct a study of outsourcing to determine what activities small and midsize libraries are outsourcing to vendors and to suggest areas where outsourcing would be helpful.

• Develop a position paper on staffing that considers what types of skills are needed for small and midsize institutions. Speculate about where the best-qualified people can be found.

• Develop a strategy for communicating library issues to college and university administrators.

**Patricia Battin Scholarship Endowment**

Friends and family of Patricia Battin, former president of the Commission on Preservation and Access, established a scholarship endowment in Ms. Battin’s name in June 1999. The fund provides financial assistance for promising participants in the Frye Leadership Institute whose institutions cannot afford to support their attendance. The first award was made in June 2000 to Rita Gulstad, associate professor and director of libraries and user services at Smiley Library, Central Methodist College.

**Zipf Fellowship**

Al Zipf, a pioneer in information management systems for whom the Fellowship was named, died on January 1, 2000. Having taken part in the selection process the first three years of the Fellowship program, he had firsthand knowledge of the high caliber of applicants for this award.

The fourth Zipf Fellowship was awarded to Rich Gazan, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. Mr. Gazan’s research interests are information retrieval, database design, and content integration. The selection committee, chaired by Martin Cummings, also includes Christine Borgman, Billy Frye, Deanna Marcum, and Rena Zipf.
This year, as in previous years, CLIR’s international projects emphasized building preservation awareness and capacity by supporting the translation of preservation texts and training in preservation management. Although these projects are linked implicitly with some of the themes in CLIR’s evolving agenda, in the future more CLIR initiatives will be designed with an explicit international component.

**Preservation Awareness in Brazil**

In November 1999, CLIR published *Building Preservation Knowledge in Brazil*, by Ingrid Beck, director of preservation at the National Archives of Brazil. The report describes a highly successful project to mobilize preservation awareness and action throughout Brazil. The project, supported by CLIR with funds from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, trained more than 3,600 staff members from libraries, archives, and museums throughout that country in basic preservation procedures.

**Capacity Building in South Africa**

Under contract with CLIR, the Northeast Document Conservation Center conducted preservation-management training in Cape Town, South Africa. The workshop, held in March 2000, included site visits to major libraries and archives in the Cape Town area to conduct preservation assessments. A local coordinating committee headed by Lesley Hart, archivist at the University of Cape Town Library, organized the workshop, which was intended to provide practical training in how to assess collections for preservation treatment and to establish a structure for effective, sustained efforts led by South Africans. Twenty people representing diverse institutions from throughout the country, from the Fort Hare Library to the Ulundi Archives in Kwazulu–Natal, attended the workshop.

**Survey of Preservation Science Research**

An increased awareness of the vulnerability of much of the world’s cultural heritage has led to a proliferation of research on preservation science. Researchers and research institutes are making significant efforts to supply conservators and restorers with properly tested means to treat individual artifacts as well as means for mass conservation. Although such research is reported regularly, it has not been compiled in an easily accessible overview.

Under contract with CLIR, the Royal Library of the Netherlands agreed to produce a survey of recent significant research in preservation science. The survey’s principal investigators are Henk Porck, preservation scientist at the Royal Library, and consultant René Teygeler. The survey, to include
extensive references and contact information, will be copublished by CLIR and the European Commission on Preservation and Access in autumn 2000.

**Access to Manuscripts and Archives**

CLIR is sponsoring a group of American archivists and librarians, working in collaboration with German counterparts, to explore the adaptation of encoded archival description (EAD) for international exchange. This project, expected to extend over one year, is also receiving funding from the German research consortium, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. If successful, the result will be not only a pilot for German-American exchange of records but also a template that can be used for further development of EAD in non-U.S. collections.

**Translation of EAD Standards into Spanish**

CLIR awarded funds to the University of California at Berkeley (UC-Berkeley) to oversee the translation of EAD standards into Spanish and the production and distribution of 1,000 copies of the standards. The Spanish translation will be finished in time to be distributed gratis at the XIV International Congress of Archivists in Seville in September 2000. UC-Berkeley is working with the Fundación Historica Tavera, in Madrid, which is hiring and supervising the translators and is providing matching funds.

The texts to be translated are *Encoded Archival Description Tag Library, Version 1.0*, and *Encoded Archival Description Application Guidelines, Version 1.0*, both published by the Society of American Archivists; and *The Encoded Archival Description Retrospective Conversion Guidelines: A Supplement to the EAD Tag Library and EAD Guidelines*, published by UC-Berkeley.
Publications

July 1, 1999 - June 30, 2000

Monographs and Reports


Newsletters

CLIR Issues, nos. 10–15.

Preservation and Access International Newsletter, nos. 7–10.

Brochures

CLIR brochure.


## Advisory Groups

### College Libraries Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willis E. Bridegam</td>
<td>Amherst College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas C. Burckel</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cohen</td>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie V. Dowell</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Haeuser</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria L. Hanawalt</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frye Leadership Institute Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Battin</td>
<td>Deanna Marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bishop</td>
<td>Council on Library and Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Brown</td>
<td>Polley McClure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Deiss</td>
<td>Jack McCredie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Research Libraries</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan I. Gotwals</td>
<td>Betsey Patterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hawkins</td>
<td>Susan Rosenblatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCAUSE</td>
<td>Carolyn Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul J. Kobulnicky</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLIR Task Force on the Role of the Artifact in Library Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis X. Blouin</td>
<td>The University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Cerquiglini</td>
<td>Institut national de la langue francaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca S. Chopp</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Hackney</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mela</td>
<td>Université de Geneve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen G. Nichols, Chairman</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James J. O’Donnell</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Petroski</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DLF Steering Committee

Scott Bennett
Yale University Library

Harold W. Billings
University of Texas at Austin

L. Reynolds Cahoon
National Archives

Jerry D. Campbell
University of Southern California

Nancy Cline
Harvard University Library

Nancy Eaton
Pennsylvania State University

William A. Gosling
University of Michigan Library

Joan I. Gotwals
Emory University

Michael A. Keller
Stanford University

Gerald Lowell
University of California, Berkeley

Richard E. Lucier
California Digital Library

Clifford Lynch
Coalition for Networked Information

James Michalko
Research Libraries Group

Aubrey Mitchell
University of Tennessee Libraries

Steve Wheatley
American Council of Learned Societies

Paul H. Mosher
University of Pennsylvania

Donald Muccino
OCLC, Inc.

Susan K. Nutter
North Carolina State University

Martin D. Runkle
University of Chicago Library

Gloriana St. Clair
Carnegie Mellon University

Thomas W. Shaughnessy
University of Minnesota Libraries

Elaine Sloan
Columbia University

Winston Tabb
Library of Congress

Sarah E. Thomas
Cornell University Libraries

Suzanne Thorin
Indiana University Libraries

Karin Trainer
Princeton University Library

William D. Walker
New York Public Library

Karin Wittenborg
University of Virginia

Karin Wittenborg
University of Virginia
### Grants and Contracts

**Active in FY 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baron, Robert A.  &lt;br&gt; Larchmont, NY</td>
<td>To organize a meeting and develop a plan and proposal for the Academic Image Cooperative Project</td>
<td>4/1/99</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron, Robert A.  &lt;br&gt; Larchmont, NY</td>
<td>To oversee aspects of the Academic Image Cooperative Project</td>
<td>11/29/99</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron, Robert A.  &lt;br&gt; Larchmont, NY</td>
<td>To develop database and proposal for second phase of the Academic Image Cooperative Project</td>
<td>8/25/99</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearman, David  &lt;br&gt; Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>To write a report on the migration-based solution to digital preservation</td>
<td>4/19/99</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behrens, Paula  &lt;br&gt; Conshohocken, PA</td>
<td>To develop a concordance of images, including architectural monuments, for the Modern Period</td>
<td>5/27/99</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridegam, Willis  &lt;br&gt; Amherst, MA</td>
<td>To write a report on the Five College Library Depository</td>
<td>6/1/00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockman, Bill  &lt;br&gt; Urbana, IL</td>
<td>To write a report on humanities scholars’ use of electronic resources</td>
<td>10/19/99</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Shaver and Company, Inc.  &lt;br&gt; New York, NY</td>
<td>To conduct an assessment of CLIR</td>
<td>3/20/00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University  &lt;br&gt; Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>To develop a prototype for the Academic Image Cooperative</td>
<td>10/26/99</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Jeff  &lt;br&gt; Bryn Mawr, PA</td>
<td>To produce a concordance of images of architectural landmarks for the Renaissance Period</td>
<td>5/27/99</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colet, Linda Serenson  &lt;br&gt; New York, NY</td>
<td>To write a section for the series, <em>Guides to Quality in Visual Resource Imaging</em></td>
<td>3/8/99</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Press  &lt;br&gt; New York, NY</td>
<td>To support electronic publications focus sessions</td>
<td>5/18/99</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Library  &lt;br&gt; Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>To conduct a study on risk management of digital information</td>
<td>6/26/98</td>
<td>$75,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew, Spencer  &lt;br&gt; Washington, DC</td>
<td>To write a paper on the subject of audience for the conference, “Collections, Content, and the Web”</td>
<td>4/14/99</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullen, Charles  &lt;br&gt; Chicago, IL</td>
<td>To write a paper for the workshop, “Authenticity in the Digital Environment”</td>
<td>9/10/99</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Authorized</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Amato, Donald North Potomac, MD</td>
<td>To write a section for the series, <em>Guides to Quality in Visual Resource Imaging</em></td>
<td>3/1/99</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Heritage Coalition Washington, DC</td>
<td>To support the Dance Leadership Forum</td>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frey, Franziska Rochester, NY</td>
<td>To write two sections for the series, <em>Guides to Quality in Visual Resource Imaging</em></td>
<td>3/1/99</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirtle, Peter Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>To write a paper for the workshop, “Authenticity in the Digital Environment”</td>
<td>9/9/99</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyvarinen, Eva Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>To transcribe and enter data for the Academic Image Cooperative Project</td>
<td>6/24/99</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA National Organizing Committee 2001 Chicago, IL</td>
<td>To help support IFLA 2001 conference programming</td>
<td>3/1/00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information International Associates, Inc. Oak Ridge, TN</td>
<td>To write a report on knowledge organization for digital libraries</td>
<td>6/28/99</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Strategies Ardmore, PA</td>
<td>To write a report on electronic journal usage statistics</td>
<td>2/10/00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Learning Innovation Annapolis, MD</td>
<td>To assess institutional Web sites</td>
<td>5/28/99</td>
<td>$39,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney, Anne Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>To write a paper on technology for the conference, “Collections, Content, and the Web”</td>
<td>4/14/99</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohl, Allen Coon Rapids, MN</td>
<td>To provide a concordance of images from current editions of art history survey textbooks</td>
<td>6/24/99</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPMG Peat Marwick Washington, DC</td>
<td>To write a report on risk assessment of heritage assets</td>
<td>9/28/99</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy, David M. Oakland, CA</td>
<td>To write a paper for the workshop, “Authenticity in the Digital Environment”</td>
<td>11/11/99</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library for Foreign Literature Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>To produce and distribute Russian-language translation of <em>IFLA Principles</em></td>
<td>12/1/98</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Authorized</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM</td>
<td>To support a meeting to discuss universal preprint services</td>
<td>8/31/99</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, Daniel, Chicago, IL</td>
<td>To serve as recorder at the conference, “Collections, Content, and the Web”</td>
<td>9/3/99</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Book Centre of Greece, Athens, Greece</td>
<td>To translate preservation literature and organize preservation workshops</td>
<td>11/15/99</td>
<td>$56,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neustadt Center for the Benton Foundation, Washington, DC</td>
<td>To produce a video on the role of the library in the community</td>
<td>12/14/98</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilsen, Micheline, Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>To produce a concordance of architectural landmarks of the Ancient and Medieval periods</td>
<td>5/27/99</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISO, Bethesda, MD</td>
<td>To support a workshop on technical metadata for image files</td>
<td>3/11/99</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Document Conservation Center, Andover, MA</td>
<td>To conduct two workshops on preservation in South Africa</td>
<td>12/23/98</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Document Conservation Center, Andover, MA</td>
<td>To conduct a workshop in South Africa on managing preservation programs</td>
<td>11/22/99</td>
<td>$35,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Libraries Group, Mountain View, CA</td>
<td>To support RLG DigiNews</td>
<td>5/19/99</td>
<td>$19,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothenberg, Jeff, Santa Monica, CA</td>
<td>To shape the workshop, “Authenticity in the Digital Environment,” and write a paper</td>
<td>8/9/99</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Library of the Netherlands, The Netherlands</td>
<td>To conduct an international survey of significant developments in preservation science</td>
<td>11/9/99</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University, Alexandria Project Laboratory, New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>To explore variable pricing for online services in research libraries</td>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>$24,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University, Alexandria Project Laboratory, New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>To undertake a study, “The Efficiency of Research Libraries: A New Analytical Tool and Pilot Study Using 1995 ARL Data”</td>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>$24,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeger, Anthony, Chevy Chase, MD</td>
<td>To write a paper for the conference, “Folklife Heritage Collections in Crisis”</td>
<td>6/29/00</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR International, New York, NY</td>
<td>To conduct a study of internships/fellowships for librarians and information professionals</td>
<td>3/15/00</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Authorized</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Library Network, Inc.</td>
<td>To design a leadership development program for staff of state libraries and multitype consortia</td>
<td>12/15/98</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University Libraries</td>
<td>To conduct an in-depth study and survey of users of scholarly electronic journals</td>
<td>11/23/98</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenlake, Rodney</td>
<td>To analyze possible licensing arrangements among digital libraries</td>
<td>9/30/98</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>To plan a project on performance measures for research library collections and information services</td>
<td>6/21/96</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>To oversee translation into Spanish of texts on Encoded Archival Description</td>
<td>12/20/99</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education and Information Science</td>
<td>To write a report on the value of the archival perspective in the digital environment</td>
<td>9/16/99</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education and Information Science</td>
<td>To transcribe interviews with UCLA graduate history students</td>
<td>10/12/99</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cape Town Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>To support local expenses related to a preservation workshop in Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>11/30/99</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>To support the development of a report on humanities scholars’ use of electronic resources</td>
<td>8/27/99</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>To support the project, “Pricing Electronic Scholarly Information: A Research Collaboration”</td>
<td>11/15/96</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>To support the conference, “Economics and the Use of Digital Library Collections”</td>
<td>2/2/00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>To support the development of a distributed finding aid server, with Harvard University</td>
<td>5/6/98</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>To support a study on the theory of cost allocation for information resources</td>
<td>7/18/97</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van de Sompel, Herbert</td>
<td>To support research on reference-linking systems</td>
<td>12/16/98</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gent, Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS’ REPORT

To the Board of Trustees
Council on Library and Information Resources
Washington, D.C.

We have audited the accompanying statement of financial position of the Council on Library and Information Resources as of June 30, 2000, and the related statements of activities and changes in net assets, and cash flows for the year then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Council’s management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Council on Library and Information Resources as of June 30, 2000, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The accompanying schedule of functional expenses is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

Herndon, Virginia
August 10, 2000

Certified Public Accountants

Members American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
The accompanying notes to financial statements are an integral part of this statement.
COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS

For the Year Ended June 30, 2000
(With summarized financial information for June 30, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Total 2000</th>
<th>Total 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>$ 30,962</td>
<td>$ 3,483,597</td>
<td>$ 3,514,559</td>
<td>$ 711,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>225,444</td>
<td>858,500</td>
<td>1,083,944</td>
<td>680,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication sales</td>
<td>31,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,312</td>
<td>32,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>49,185</td>
<td>162,864</td>
<td>212,049</td>
<td>159,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td>31,951</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,951</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 368,854</td>
<td>$ 4,504,961</td>
<td>$ 4,873,815</td>
<td>$ 1,584,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets released from Restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of program restrictions</td>
<td>$ 1,864,117</td>
<td>$(1,864,117)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,232,971</td>
<td>$ 2,640,844</td>
<td>$ 4,873,815</td>
<td>$ 1,584,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$ 1,009,119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,009,119</td>
<td>$ 851,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>398,891</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>398,891</td>
<td>395,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital libraries</td>
<td>522,535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>522,535</td>
<td>551,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for scholarship</td>
<td>42,982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,982</td>
<td>19,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of information</td>
<td>24,596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,596</td>
<td>12,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Services</td>
<td>$ 1,998,123</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,998,123</td>
<td>$ 1,830,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>385,701</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>385,701</td>
<td>335,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$ 2,383,824</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,383,824</td>
<td>$ 2,166,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(150,853)</td>
<td>2,640,844</td>
<td>2,489,991</td>
<td>(582,423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets, Beginning of Year</td>
<td>1,398,375</td>
<td>1,861,925</td>
<td>3,260,300</td>
<td>3,842,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets, End of Year</td>
<td>$ 1,247,522</td>
<td>$ 4,502,769</td>
<td>$ 5,750,291</td>
<td>$ 3,260,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes to financial statements are an integral part of this statement.
COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS

For the Year Ended June 30, 2000
(With summarized financial information for June 30, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in net assets</td>
<td>$ 2,489,991</td>
<td>$ (582,423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash provided by (used) in operating activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>26,299</td>
<td>25,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in other assets</td>
<td>(6,259)</td>
<td>2,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accounts receivable</td>
<td>(21,000)</td>
<td>22,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in accounts payable and accrued expenses</td>
<td>109,186</td>
<td>61,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in sublet deposits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Provided (Used) By Operating Activities</td>
<td>$ 2,598,217</td>
<td>$ (472,615)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sales of investments</td>
<td>$ 12,021,918</td>
<td>$ 5,757,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of investments</td>
<td>(14,499,530)</td>
<td>(5,528,933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of furniture and equipment</td>
<td>(26,744)</td>
<td>(18,732)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Provided (Used) By Investing Activities</td>
<td>$ (2,504,356)</td>
<td>$ 209,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal payments on capital lease</td>
<td>(2,631)</td>
<td>(2,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cash Provided (used) By Financing Activities</td>
<td>$ (2,631)</td>
<td>$ (2,630)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change in Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$ 91,230</td>
<td>$ (265,442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents, beginning of year</td>
<td>481,880</td>
<td>747,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents, end of year</td>
<td>$ 573,110</td>
<td>$ 481,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental Cash Flow Information

Interest paid during the year | 722 | 747 |

The accompanying notes to financial statements are an integral part of this statement.
COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

June 30, 2000

NOTE 1- Organization

The Council is a not-for-profit organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia in 1988 for the purpose of fostering, developing, and supporting systematic and purposeful collaboration in order to ensure the preservation of the published and documentary record in all formats and provide equitable access to that information.

The Council's operations are financed through contributions from colleges, universities and other organizations and through general support grants and restricted grants from private foundations and other sources. The Council conducts its work directly through committees and working groups as well as through contracts with other organizations and individuals.

NOTE 2- Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Basis of accounting - The accompanying financial statements of the Council have been prepared on the accrual basis.

Grant revenue and recognition of grantor restrictions - The Council reports grants as temporarily restricted support if they are received with grantor stipulations that limit the use of the grants as to time or purpose. When either condition is satisfied, temporarily restricted net assets are reclassified to unrestricted net assets and reported in the statement of activities and changes in net assets as net assets released from restrictions. Support that is restricted by the grantor is reported as an increase in unrestricted net assets if the restriction expires in the reporting period in which the support is recognized.

Contracts / Grants payable - Contracts made by the Council are recorded as contracts payable and expensed at the time contracts are awarded. Current period expenses are adjusted for contract refunds or over appropriations when received.

Board designated net assets - From time to time, the Board of Trustees designates a portion of unrestricted net assets for various short-term projects.

Cash and cash equivalents - For purposes of the statement of cash flows, cash and cash equivalents consist primarily of deposits in a money market mutual fund and investments with original maturities of 90 days or less.
NOTE 2- Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

Functional allocation of expenses - Costs of the various programs have been summarized on a functional basis in the accompanying financial statements. Certain indirect costs which include rent and other expenses are identified as support services costs and have been allocated directly to programs and administration. Salaries and travel costs have been allocated directly to programs and administration on a time-allocated basis.

Furniture and Equipment - Furniture and equipment are recorded at cost, less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation expense is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the respective assets. Expenditures for maintenance and repairs are charged against income as incurred; betterments which increase the value or materially extend the life of the related assets are capitalized.

Contributions - The Council records grant income as unrestricted, temporarily restricted, or permanently restricted support, depending upon the terms and conditions of the grant.

Fair value of financial instruments - Management estimates that the fair value of all financial instruments at June 30, 2000 does not differ materially from the aggregate carrying values reported in the accompanying statement of financial position due to the short term maturities of those instruments.

Use of estimates - The preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements. Estimates also affect the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Summarized financial information - The financial statements include certain prior year comparative information summarized in total but not by net asset class. Such information does not include sufficient detail to constitute a presentation in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. Accordingly, such information should be read in conjunction with the Council's financial statements for the year ended June 30, 1999 from which the summarized information was derived.

Reclassification of prior year information - Certain amounts from the prior year have been reclassified to enhance comparability.
COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

June 30, 2000
(Continued)

NOTE 2 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (continued)

Investments – The Organization has adopted SFAS No. 124, “Accounting for Certain Investments Held by Not-for-Profit Organizations”. Under SFAS No. 124, investments in marketable securities with readily determinable fair values and all investments in debt securities are reported at their fair values in the statement of financial position. Unrealized gains and losses are included in the change in net assets. Investment income and gains restricted by a donor are reported as increases in unrestricted net assets if the restrictions are met (either by passage of time or by use) in the reporting period in which the income and gains are recognized.

Investment return consists of the following at June 30:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gain/loss on Investments</th>
<th>Unrealized Gain/loss on Investments</th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>$8,199</td>
<td>$(13,500)</td>
<td>$86,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate fixed income</td>
<td>34,125</td>
<td>(2,918)</td>
<td>2,240,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government securities</td>
<td>41,337</td>
<td>(10,940)</td>
<td>389,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual funds</td>
<td>109,016</td>
<td>(19,852)</td>
<td>2,730,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$192,677</td>
<td>(47,210)</td>
<td>$5,447,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>66,582</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$573,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$259,259</td>
<td>(47,210)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE 3 - Income Taxes

The Council is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and applicable regulations of the District of Columbia.

NOTE 4 - Furniture and Equipment

Furniture and equipment consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>$140,275</td>
<td>$161,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>$4,015</td>
<td>$4,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$144,290</td>
<td>$165,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: accumulated depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>$(109,654)</td>
<td>$(131,128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$34,636</td>
<td>$34,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE 5 - Net Assets released from Restrictions
Net assets were released from grantor restrictions by incurring expenses satisfying the restricted purposes or by occurrence of other events specified by grantors.

NOTE 6 - Retirement Plan
Employees are eligible for participation in the Council’s defined contribution retirement annuity program ("the Plan") administered through the TIAA/CREF insurance companies. Individual contracts issued under the Plan provide for full and immediate vesting of the Council’s contributions. The Council contributes 15% of employees’ salaries to the Plan each year. The Council’s contributions were $109,300 and $116,420 in 2000 and 1999, respectively.

NOTE 7 - Concentrations of Credit Risk
Financial instruments which potentially subject the Council to concentrations of credit risk consist primarily of cash equivalents. At June 30, 2000 and 1999, approximately $310,635 and $220,154 respectively, in cash equivalents was being held by a third party in a money market mutual fund that invests solely in United States government securities. This amount is not insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. In addition, cash in the bank at June 30, 2000 and 1999 exceeded FDIC insurance limits by approximately $168,044 and $214,642.

NOTE 8 - Commitments
The Council has entered into a noncancelable operating lease agreement for its office space which expires in August, 2003. The Council is subleasing a portion of its space until August, 2003. The Council is also leasing a phone system at a cost of $13,150 which has been classified as a capital lease.

Future minimum payments under all leases, net of sublease receipts, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending June 30,</th>
<th>Capital Lease</th>
<th>Operating Lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,352</td>
<td>$133,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$3,352</td>
<td>$138,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>$144,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,704</td>
<td>$440,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount representing interest $1,564
Present value of Net Minimum Lease payments $5,140
COUNCIL ON LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES

SCHEDULE OF FUNCTIONAL EXPENSES

For the Year Ended June 30, 2000
(With summarized financial information for June 30, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Digital Libraries</th>
<th>Economics of Information</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Total Program Services</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
<th>Total 2000</th>
<th>Total 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,189</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 22,122</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 31,311</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 31,311</td>
<td>$ 88,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11,518)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11,518)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11,518)</td>
<td>(4,507)</td>
<td>354,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>152,344</td>
<td>31,141</td>
<td>36,225</td>
<td>150,387</td>
<td>24,238</td>
<td>394,335</td>
<td>14,359</td>
<td>408,694</td>
<td>209,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting &amp; Travel</td>
<td>119,508</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188,872</td>
<td>81,319</td>
<td>16,888</td>
<td>406,587</td>
<td>21,391</td>
<td>427,978</td>
<td>209,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Expenditures</td>
<td>20,418</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>17,208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,626</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>67,839</td>
<td>69,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>33,233</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>13,626</td>
<td>24,586</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>73,667</td>
<td>41,885</td>
<td>115,552</td>
<td>87,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>171,085</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,852</td>
<td>684,889</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>913,901</td>
<td>47,511</td>
<td>961,412</td>
<td>1,012,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>11,739</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,705</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,461</td>
<td>17,442</td>
<td>69,903</td>
<td>66,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>14,208</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33,611</td>
<td>21,591</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>69,753</td>
<td>219,246</td>
<td>288,999</td>
<td>262,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,654</td>
<td>21,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>522,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,596</strong></td>
<td><strong>398,891</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,009,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,982</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,998,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>385,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,383,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,166,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes to financial statements are an integral part of this statement.