1. Call to order and introductions
   a. Meeting convened shortly after 3:00 p.m.; group introduced themselves and gave a short summary of experience and job duties.

2. Old business
   a. Review of initial meeting
      i. Donna gave a brief overview of the general topics discussed during the group’s initial meeting back in October 2015. After the initial meeting, the committee experienced difficulty gaining traction in part due to staffing changes at MOBIUS that left the group without an MCO organizer for some months. The detailed minutes of the October 2015 meeting were approved shortly thereafter via e-mail and are now available on the MOBIUS website (https://mobiusconsortium.org/node/99).
   b. Article-Reach Direct update/follow-up
      i. Since the committee recommended pursuing a demo of Article-Reach Direct at its prior meeting, which resulted in many members choosing to participate in its adoption, Donna provided an update on the status of its pending implementation. Donna, Steve Strohl, and Christina Virden from MOBIUS have had weekly calls with III to work out the details of its implementation and preparation will soon be completed. Seven libraries in the SWAN cluster, as well as West Des Moines Public Library, are slated to begin testing later in the month
3. New business
   a. Discuss the future of authority control: The Board had requested that the topic of authority control at both the INN-Reach and local/cluster levels be brought to the committee for discussion. The group was asked to consider the question of whether continuing the current model was in the best interest of the membership from both a technical and financial standpoint.
      i. INN-Reach
         1. After some overview that resulted in questions from the group, Donna brought Christopher Gould, Systems Librarian at MCO, in to help explain how authority records work at the INN-Reach level and field questions.
            a. MOBIUS is only INN-Reach system that does any sort of authority control at union catalog level. Keeping IR authority records current is virtually impossible given size of database
            b. Some cost (sub from Backstage) involved in annually updating authority records, larger impact is MCO staff time.
            c. The adoption of Encore platform as primary IR union catalog presents additional factors to consider, as it does not interact with authority records in the same way.
            d. Questions were posed about usage of classic IR catalog versus Encore. If classic is still being widely used, there are concerns about eliminating authority control at the INN-Reach level too quickly.
            e. Donna will be meeting with members of Encore team from III at ALA Midwinter to discuss its future evolution as discovery for INN-Reach systems.
            f. After discussion, the consensus was reached that more information and research is needed before bringing the discussion to the membership: Clarification is needed from III regarding how Encore interacts with authority and statistics/more information is needed regarding how often and in what manner the classic INN-Reach catalog is still used.
      ii. Cluster/local
         1. The committee generally agreed, after brief discussion, that eliminating authority control at the local level is not likely to be desirable at this time.
   b. Discuss potential of consortial repositories: Examining the possibilities of consortial repositories is part of the current MOBIUS Strategic Plan. The topic has been breached
on several occasions at Directors’ Retreats, etc., but there has generally been a lack of a sense of direction to take. The Board has thus asked this committee to begin considering what consortial repositories might look like for MOBIUS, both conceptually and logistically.

i. Discussion of existing digitization efforts/repository management by members: UM system (locally managed), KCAI (Internet Archive), Avila (has discussed and gotten funding approved, but lack of server space is an issue)

ii. Interest in a general sense is there, but scope of project(s) could be an issue, hard to navigate

iii. Possibility of grant funding was raised, possibly through State Library, but also raises concerns about long-term availability/sustainability

iv. Concerns raised over MOBIUS’s ability to take on managing a consortial repository as a value-add without having to distribute large costs

v. Third-party solutions versus self-managed probably more viable financially/logistically – question was raised if MCO could negotiated some kind of trial with a third party vendor

vi. Committee proposed putting together a session for MOBIUS Annual Conference exploring digitization and repositories to gather feedback from membership in an effort to begin ascertaining what the true needs of the membership would be. Donna and Stephanie will coordinate session, invite committee members to participate, and find someone with expertise to lead discussion.

4. Moving ahead
   a. Stephanie will send Doodle poll to schedule another meeting prior to April 21 Board of Directors meeting.

5. Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by Stephanie Ruhe