

**The Center On Philanthropy at
Indiana University and the
IUPUI University Library**

550 West North Street
Suite 301
Indianapolis, IN 46202-3272

Phone 317.274.4200
Fax 317.278.8900

Knowledge Management for Foundations: Planning Study

Funded by
The Lumina Foundation for
Education

Knowledge Management for Foundations

Table of Contents

Executive Summary3

Project Background and Objectives.....4

Methodology5

Relationship Among Projects6

 Program Management.....7

Existing Practice8

Market Study..... 10

Copyright Issues 12

Technical Standards..... 14

Philanthropic Taxonomies 16

Digital Repository Pilot 18

Potential Project Participants20

Executive Summary

The project goals and objectives of the study were to:

1. Query a select number of foundation leaders to explore their problems, plans and current vision in knowledge management and to determine what range of solutions would be optimal to them.
2. Identify existing technology options for knowledge management and establish solution alternatives that could meet the needs of the foundation community.
3. Review relevant legal issues, including copyright. Review issues of long-term preservation and archiving and to make recommendations for managing those issues.
4. Review cost requirements and revenue options and propose one or more economic models for a foundation knowledge management structure.
5. Propose a plan of action to address the needs of foundations to organize, provide access to, archive, and preserve the knowledge that is created as the result of their operations.

Project Background and Objectives

The project originated with discussions with representatives of the Lumina Foundation for Education with the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. In March of 2004, Lumina awarded a grant of \$48,900 to support a study regarding knowledge management for foundations to the Center on Philanthropy with the IUPUI University Library as a partner in the study.

As noted in the goals stated earlier the project's major goal was to assess the state of knowledge management in the foundation community and to determine potential solutions to issues identified. To accomplish the above, a pre-planning meeting was held on March 31, 2004 in Indianapolis with the major purpose to map out the strategy. This meeting was attended by Dwight Burlingame, David Lewis, Brenda Burk, Robin Crumrin, all from IUPUI; Tim DeChant, Kellogg Foundation; Sara Engelhardt, Foundation Center; Jill Wohlford, Lumina Foundation; Clifford Lynch, Center for Networked Information; and John Blegen, Blegen Technology Management.

Much time at this meeting was spent on coming to a common understanding of what we meant by Knowledge Management. Consensus developed around intranet (internal knowledge sharing); extranet (sharing internally and with select customers); and internet (public sharing of information). Published materials, sharing among foundations while maintaining privacy issues, and linked operations are major issues that need to be considered in the distribution of internal information.

Major challenges include:

1. knowing when new information is available—aggregation problem;
2. Boundaries between foundations and other groups are not “tidy”;
3. How much of the information is generated from foundations or from grantees?
4. How are intellectual property rights handled?
5. Can a reviewing function for post publication be put in place along with standards for metadata?
6. Is a consistent use of taxonomy feasible? What role should standards play?
7. Determining the appropriate roles of various actors in the field in order to achieve more effective collaborations in this field.

The meeting concluded with assignments being made to convene a one-and-a-half day meeting (in Chicago made possible by the Chicago Tribune Foundation) with invited foundation staff, technology experts, and IUPUI staff to serve as a focus group to articulate foundation management needs and options.

Methodology

The approach used was to convene the representatives noted above in Chicago in July (See Appendix A for a list of participants). At this meeting participants began by hearing a vision of what might happen along with an overview of the broad issues of knowledge management. Groups addressed the following items:

1. Definition of published/semi-published materials. How foundations are currently dealing with them.
2. Issues around access including centralized vs. distributed access, levels of access, ownership dealing with intellectual and physical rights, metadata or classification of the material, and do different formats require different solutions.
3. Issues with preservation, including how to deal with different formats and long-term access and ownership of materials.

The second day we moved to a full group discussion for creating an action plan. The group identified various issues and formed the agenda that resulted in the following six project areas as the most important for future action: Survey of existing practice, Market Study, Copyright issues, Technical Standards, Philanthropic Taxonomies and a Pilot Digital Repository.

Members were assigned briefing paper responsibility in the major issue areas and the resulting drafts were shared with participants. The products and recommendations follow.

Relationship Among Projects

While each project could be done independently the six individual projects naturally build on each other and provide important checkpoints for planning and reassessing future work. For example, if the market study determines that there is no need, or more likely, improves our understanding of the need from the perspective of the diverse stakeholders, the planning for any or all of the future projects could be influenced.

The table below identifies some of the project interactions. It can be read from the top to the right indicating what the project on the top row provides to the project on the right. This table should not be taken as a comprehensive list of project interactions. Each team should be thorough in their own project planning to identify appropriate interactions and manage the necessary coordination.

Survey of Existing Practice	Market Study	Copyright Issues	Technical Standards	Philanthropic Taxonomies	Pilot Repository	
	Coordinate objectives and marketing efforts	Provide input to survey objectives	Provide input to survey objectives	Provide input to survey objectives	Provide input to survey objectives	Survey of Existing Practice
Coordinate objectives and marketing efforts		Provide input to study objectives.	Provide input to study objectives	Provide input to study objectives	Provide input to study objectives	Market Study
Identify current practice	Provide names of IP decision makers				Provide first real test of copyright solutions	Copyright Issues
Identify existing standards May identify additional requirements	May identify additional requirements Identify interested participants	Provide IP requirements		Coordinate projects	Test standards	Technical Standards
Identify existing taxonomies	Provide User Needs Identify interested participants		Coordinate projects		Test taxonomies	Philanthropic Taxonomies
Identify existing practice	Provide User Needs Identify needs of smaller foundations	Provide IP requirements	Provide baseline standards	Provide baseline taxonomy		Pilot Repository

Special Coordination

Two pairs of projects have uniquely close relationships and should coordinate their activities accordingly.

The Survey of [Existing Practice](#), and the [Market Study](#) are distinct projects with very different objectives. For several reasons, however, the two projects should be closely

coordinated. They will use similar survey techniques and in some cases will seek participation of the same individuals. The projects should consider joint marketing efforts to ensure that participants understand the objectives of the two separate surveys. The two surveys should also conduct a coordinated review of their respective survey instruments. If they are asking the same or similar questions they should clarify the objectives of the questions, be sure that their vocabulary is consistent, and avoid accidental duplication. The two projects, despite their different objectives, should determine if information collected by one could be helpful for the other.

Similarly, the [Technical Standards](#) and [Taxonomies](#) projects, while distinct, should be closely coordinated. Taxonomies are clearly a portion of the metadata of a document and therefore could be considered a subset of the technical standards. The two projects should coordinate activities and reviews as appropriate. Members of the Taxonomies project team should participate at the kickoff meeting of the Technical Standards project to ensure appropriate coordination.

Program Management

The overall program consists of six independent projects with potentially six different sponsors, even more funding agencies, and numerous stakeholders and participants. The project of overall success is likely to be limited without a single program manager who has responsibility for facilitating and expediting communications between teams and overall scheduling. Services provided in this role should include:

- Facilitating and coordinating inter-project meetings.
- Producing overall project newsletters and other communications to the stakeholders.
- Coordinating and maintaining an overall program schedule.
- Expediting (reminding) team members of agreed upon due dates.
- Establishing a project electronic workroom (online workspace) where project documents could be stored, threaded discussions held, and calendars posted.
- Monthly phone meetings with the leadership of each project team to update overall status and identify necessary or appropriate coordination assistance.

Existing Practice

Currently there is no comprehensive survey of the current state of Knowledge Management practice throughout the industry. While small groups of foundations tend to communicate informally, more often each foundation is finding its own way through the complex issues related to the management of knowledge resources and associated technology. A comprehensive industry-wide survey could provide insight into the current state of knowledge management practice. Management and boards could be provided with indicators of best practice, financial and staff commitment benchmarks, identified success factors, and contact information for others who had succeeded with similar challenges.

Objectives:

The survey will provide substantial value to the participants across a broad spectrum of knowledge management issues and concerns. Foundations will be able to benchmark their own practice against a meaningful peer comparison group. The survey and the final report will be designed to maximize the help and information that foundations can share with each other and improve the rate of industry-wide learning.

Specific objectives include:

- Provide foundations and boards with information on what others are doing, how much they are spending, and how they are evaluating their Knowledge Management investments.
- Generate an inventory of Knowledge Management initiatives by type of initiative that provides key descriptive information and contact points and resources for foundations that are undertaking similar projects.
- Identify the most difficult and most common issues and problems related to Knowledge Management projects that have been encountered. Enable sharing of solutions and focus third party providers on the industry's needs.
- Identify what political and cultural influences have an impact on Knowledge Management projects and how foundations have responded to those influences.
- Identify the specific criteria and factors that foundations have linked to their successful or unsuccessful experiences.
- Identify specific technical standards that have been employed by foundations in Knowledge Management initiatives.
- Identify and create a collection of useful case studies that describe noteworthy project management initiatives. Develop a "Lessons Learned" summary from prior project experience.

Methodology:

The most critical step in the process will be clarification of the desired results at the beginning. The goals, stated above, will be confirmed by the team and expanded and clarified as necessary.

One approach would be to design a survey protocol in two components. An initial paper or web survey could be distributed broadly (to all or a significant cross section sample) of foundations. This could be followed by an interview survey (telephone) to be conducted with selected foundations whose initial survey indicates potential activities of interest.

The project will require adequate pre-survey marketing efforts to insure a high level of participation and participation in a meaningful way. This will involve identification of participants by name and building of awareness of the project in advanced.

Following the initial survey the data will be gathered, collated, and analyzed by experienced industry professionals. The results will be used to revise the protocol and select participants for the interview based phase of the project.

Following the interview phase, further analysis of the results will involve project participants as well as industry experts. Two separate written reports are suggested. A detailed analytical report including much of the raw data and contact individuals for various project types will provide detailed project specific assistance for foundations seeking to address their own Knowledge Management needs. A second short executive summary report will distill the most significant implications and potentially high priority recommendations for action.

Issues:

The planning team will have to make decisions with respect to how detailed the study should be. A longer survey with more detailed questions, for example, would provide a larger catalogue of specifics about current practice. Massive detail, however, might not achieve the important objectives of the survey and may reduce the participation rate. Too little detail, however, can result in the collection of opinion about concepts and little description of actual practice.

The team must also consider how to balance the focus of the survey with respect to various categories of foundation processes. For example, should it focus on internal foundation processes such as grants management or more on externally facing processes such as publications, communications and marketing?

Since the results of an "existing practice" survey will become obsolete over time, periodic updates of the survey should be contemplated and, to the extent possible, should be designed into the original survey.

Finally, the team must consider if there are advantages to using outside resources such as consultants or a university partnership to conduct or assist with the survey.

Market Study

Objectives:

As been proven again and again, the world will not beat a path to your door to buy a “better mousetrap” if they don’t have a mouse problem. The primary purpose of this project will be to conduct or commission a survey of the largest foundations to determine their interest in participating in a shared digital repository for preserving their documents and making them available for research.

Beyond the basic question, however, the investigation will discover the foundation community’s needs and priorities at multiple levels. Are there issues with Knowledge Management? Are they perceived as Knowledge Management issues? What solutions are being considered? If there is a need for some or all of the functions of a digital repository, which functions are most important? And of course, who would pay for it and how much?

The survey will not only help planners to determine if a digital repository project should proceed at this time, it will provide major input into the functions, features, financial support model, and development priorities for such a repository.

Specific objectives include:

- Helping the participants understand the objectives of a library based digital repository. While not technically a survey output objective, this educational objective is an essential precondition to meaningful participation in the survey.
- Determine if the foundations have or perceive needs for the functions of a digital archival system?
- Determine what specific system functionality the foundations would find most valuable? Value will be assessed in terms of intrinsic long-term value, measurable financial benefit, benefit to constituencies, and other measures as perceived by the stakeholders.
- Determine what related functionality and services the participants identify that might not have been a part of the original concept.
- Establish the participants’ level of concern with respect to security. Identify what specific security issues would they have? Would any security issues get in the way of full participation?
- Determine what are the intellectual property issues that would impact participation? Identify the influential decision makers with respect to intellectual property within each foundation.
- Determine what branding issues would have an impact on participation?

Of course the overriding question of the entire research project is “Would they use it?” Closely related is the question of the extent to which the foundations would contribute to the development of such a system and how they would support its ongoing maintenance and operation.

Methodology:

Because of the specialized nature of market research and the need to avoid bias in the results it may be wise to employ a specialized market research firm to conduct or supervise the survey. A project team should be charged with selecting the independent firm and managing and coordinating the project.

The most important step beyond identifying and employing an appropriate firm, would be working with the research firm to clarify and confirm the survey objectives in detail. The survey protocol should be developed jointly with the research firm.

Other support to the research firm would include a determination of the specific foundations, and what specific individuals within each foundation should contribute to the survey. This may include multiple titles such as the Executive Director, Board President, or CIO.

The survey firm should provide both raw results in the form of a research dataset as well as an analyst of the results. The written report, prepared by the survey firm with input and comment by the project team, should provide analysis of the results and recommendations for any next steps. The report should be provided to all participants. It may be valuable for the Existing Practice report and the Market Survey report to be published together, or at least coordinate their efforts.

Issues:

Since helping participants understand the objectives of a library based digital repository is one of the project objectives the team will need to develop an approach that addresses this need. This will require some judgment as to the participants' current understanding and what means will be most appropriate to reach an adequate common understanding. This could involve preparatory training and written material. In addition, some information and understanding could be conveyed in the survey questions themselves.

The design team must determine and be very clear on the level of detail that should be addressed in terms of functional requirements. Is it enough to determine if a repository is of value or is it necessary to determine general characteristics (documents can be protected by security measures), or specific characteristics (a specific document can have security rules that control copy capability or print capability and allow me to track each access by name and time or even charge for them)?

The team must also test the assumption that a professional market research firm is required. Can this survey be done well by lower cost resources? What is the link between cost and objectives?

Copyright Issues

Assuming that the Market Study demonstrates sufficient demand to continue working toward a Library Based Digital Repository, it will be important to identify and address potential copyright issues before substantial design has been completed. In order to facilitate this initiative, the agencies must, cooperatively and independently, address these copyright issues.

Objectives:

The proposed “system” consists of technology, processes, people, organizations, and agreements. If unresolved, copyright issues can become a barrier to participation or create potential for future disputes. The broad objectives of this initiative is to enlist appropriate representatives from participating organizations to identify potential issues and find means of resolving them supported by properly designing the software, the supporting agreements and contracts, and the operational policies and processes.

Specific objectives include:

- Preventing copyright from becoming a barrier to participation by foundations and to prevent copyright from limiting the documents and reports that are included in the repository.
- To prevent copyright from becoming a barrier to making documents available for distribution to or access by the public or other large groups of readers.
- To assure that the integrity of the documents is protected through proper assertion of legal rights.
- To prevent the assignment of rights to publishers or other third parties in a manner that can jeopardize the availability of documents in the repository.
- To protect the interests of researchers and authors with respect to their writings and research.
- To enhance public interest in the documents by facilitating their access through the repository.

Methodology:

A key success factor is the identification of the appropriate project team and obtaining their full and active participation. The team must be sufficiently broad to be able to create an “industry consensus” and create broad acceptance of its work. The team must also represent deep knowledge in the areas of intellectual property law, research, publishing, and electronic media. The issues are initially management issues and should be shaped by influential decision makers at the agencies.

The team is will develop a working process that will include periodic in-person meetings separated by working groups, conference calls, individual assignments, and draft reports. Three broad phases include identification of issues, development of solutions, and consolidation of results. Most of the work occurs in the development phase, but the largest risk would be a failure at the identification phase.

During the first phase, the team will identify relevant copyright issues arising in the management of the research reports and the creation of the repository and establish minimum expectations for the availability of documents from the repository.

At a minimum, the second phase will include identifying alternative copyright provisions to include in grant contracts and identifying alternative copyright provisions for authors to include in contracts with publishers of their work.

In the consolidation phase, the team will consider processes and procedures for assuring that all reports are submitted to the funding agency and included in the repository with appropriate rights assertions. While legal counsel should have been involved throughout, they should be particularly attentive during the consolidation phase help shape the language of any contracts or other instruments as needed to meet the desired objectives.

The team will publish its results and develop a plan for ensuring that its solutions gain acceptance from the broader community.

Issues:

The primary and overriding issue for the team is, of course, identifying the copyright issues. Unidentified issues cannot be resolved.

Once resolutions are developed the team will need to determine options for implementing the resolutions. If there are multiple options, the team will determine if they intend to support more than one. If so they should be prepare to publish the appropriate decision factors.

The team should consider at what stages in the life cycle of a publication the copyright issues can be addressed; what are the choices at each stage; what is the best practice?

The team should provide recommendations for individual agencies as well as the repository operator as to which standards should be set strictly and which can have flexibility to meet diverse needs.

The team should consider whether authors, publishers, and other interested parties would cooperate with the effort to better manage the copyrights. The motivations of each group of parties should be considered. Where appropriate, follow-on educational or "sales" efforts should be considered to encourage broad compliance with best practice. Unless all parties cooperate with the concept of publishing these documents for public access, the digital repository system cannot succeed.

Technical Standards

The success of a Library Based Digital Repository will depend significantly on its ability to serve the needs of diverse constituents separated by time, space, and culture - each operating with its own unique technical infrastructure. Key to that success will be a well-designed and universally accepted set of technical standards for access and preservation and retrieval of repository contents.

Objectives:

While standards should be considered for every aspect of the repository architecture, the most important at first, and the hardest to change going forward are the boundary rules. Specifically the standards that define the rules related to what contents are accepted by the system, how are they preserved, and how they are presented. Preservation involves decisions on which documents are preserved bit-for-bit in what may become inaccessible formats, and which ones will be periodically updated. For example, should a 1982 *VisiCalc* file be preserved bit-for-bit in its original form or should it be periodically converted to the most current version of Excel or whatever replaces Excel in the future.

Specific objectives include:

- Identify a comprehensive list of necessary and desired standard categories for a digital repository.
- Identify relevant existing standards that might apply directly or with appropriate extension to a digital repository. Ensure that all standards developed, to the extent possible, are compliant with the best and most widely accepted existing standards.
- Develop and obtain consensus agreement on the most critical sets of standards for documents provided to the repository including but not limited to formats and metadata.
- Develop and obtain consensus on minimum standards and best practices for preservation of contents including forward migration of file formats.
- Ensure that standards developed support easy and effective sharing and collaboration among stakeholders.

Methodology:

Standards development tends to be a slow and tedious process that requires a balance between careful and seemingly endless examining and reexamining of the options and periodic “leaps of faith” where decisions are made. Nearly all accepted and useful standards are still works in process that have, none-the-less gained substantial acceptance. It is likely, therefore, that the standards development process will be a series of efforts resulting in *draft standards* and that the drafts will become the working standards as needed.

A kickoff meeting of the entire standards working group should be convened with the charge of determining what standard sets are required. The group should then establish a priority for each standard set and a subgroup to work on each set.

Sub-groups could be developed around topics such as file formats, format migration, metadata, taxonomies, OAI/XML, security, retrieval technologies and data harvesting. The team itself will revisit this list, however, and may choose to organize itself around the needs it sees at the time.

The subgroups will then prepare working plans and schedules and coordinate that with the core team to ensure that schedules are supportive of the overall project agenda. While the work of individual sub-groups will tend to have active and inactive times, the core team will need to stay focused in order to expedite the overall project and gather and publish results.

Each sub-group and the core team may consider publishing, where appropriate, separate sets of standards for individual foundation in-house use as well as for a shared Digital Repository use.

The sub-groups and core team together must not only create draft standards, but they must create plans for promoting and gaining acceptance of the standards by the broader community. Unused standards have no value.

Issues:

The core standards team and each sub-group should consider the following issues throughout their work.

What is the cost and effort burden of the standards/best practice on the foundations? Is it relatively larger for small foundations than large ones? Do the foundations have the technical capabilities and staff to handle the standards? What tools or resources could be shared that would greatly reduce the burden to individual foundations?

What do stakeholders need to understand about the standards and their objectives? Which stakeholders and how many need to agree before a standard can be considered generally accepted as a true standard? What standards have management and policy level implications in addition to technical implications?

Do foundations have the onsite technical expertise? What can be done to develop or supplement existing expertise? What outside resources will foundations need?

How does the Dublin Core fit the needs of this project? Will it be used?

Will we be compliant with OAI (Open Archives Initiative) standards for the ability to share information?

Philanthropic Taxonomies

Even in an age of full text search, consistent application of metadata is critical to managing a wide range of content and making it accessible. The ability to manage and make accessible and searchable a wide range of disparate content depends on consistent application of metadata. Standard terms and definitions must be adopted for the metadata used to organize information that is to be shared. A formal taxonomy documents the terms, definitions, and guidelines to be used for indexing and aggregating a specified collection of content.

Objectives:

The purpose of this project is to understand the information needs of foundations and their audiences, generate broad understanding of the benefits of taxonomy usage, and assess the feasibility of creating a taxonomy encompassing foundation activities.

If successful in the above, the project could create a taxonomy for foundations and develop strategies for its adoption. As in any standard, its usefulness is largely dependent on its adoption – and its adoption is largely dependent on its usefulness.

Methodology:

A Taxonomy team will be drawn from personnel committed to standards setting with special interest in taxonomies for the field. An initial team may be expanded after the surveys, which might identify other qualified and interested personnel.

Survey information on the anticipated needs of repository users will provide essential input into taxonomy development. Those studies along with other resources and team experience will be used to clarify the goals and objectives for taxonomy for foundation literature. This, and an inventory and description of existing taxonomies will provide the basic working tools to the team.

It is expected, although not certain, that the basis for appropriate taxonomy exists and that the team will not need to start from scratch. If so, the team's approach will probably to review and select the most promising starting points from among existing taxonomies, expand a taxonomy to meet the known needs, ensure that the resulting taxonomy is further extendable as needs change, and develop a strategy for encouraging acceptance of their results.

As with other standards teams, the Taxonomy team will probably create a series of draft standards, which will be presented to for comment and revision by the larger community. The team must find means to promote acceptance of the taxonomy in order to make it useful.

Issues:

The team will need to address a variety of issue, starting with improving community understanding on the purpose and importance of taxonomies and clearing up important misconceptions about them and their use. This is an essential step in creating the necessary motivation collective action and adoption.

The team will need to clarify its goals with respect to acceptance and use of the Taxonomy. If it is intended to support true inter-foundation knowledge management than its scope of coverage and acceptance must be adequate to that mission.

The focus of the team must not see Taxonomy creation as an intellectual exercise, but must push for taxonomy adoption. This will likely require a combination of elegant design and a spirit of pragmatic compromise that focuses on results.

The design of the taxonomy must consider whether the metadata will be applied centrally, by a group of taxonomy experts, or by librarians at individual foundations, or by document authors. There are clear trade-offs between the specificity of the taxonomy and the level of expertise required to apply it. A related problem is how metadata will be applied to archive or legacy content.

The work involved will require significant commitment on the part of the team while understanding that this is a collaborative effort, not a “second job” for the members. Planning, and potential funding, must consider that this will not be a one-time effort. Any Taxonomy developed and adopted will require maintenance. Thought should be given to the maintenance processes as well as the cost of those processes.

Digital Repository Pilot

The penultimate activity in the Library Based Digital Repository project is, of course, to create an actual working pilot repository. The pilot project will be undertaken with the assumption that it is the first step toward an expanded implementation. A pilot, however, will allow the planning assumptions to be tested in a live situation and allow new and important information to be discovered before expanding the project to a broader user base. Of course, some of the powerful leverage of a shared repository will not be achieved until the repository is actually shared by larger number of foundations.

Objectives:

The broad, overarching objectives of the repository are to encourage and enable the sharing of information between foundations and with other interested parties, facilitate the transparency and accountability of foundation work to the public, preserve valuable historical information, and become a recognized and accessible point of access for a broad base of stakeholders.

Specific objectives related to the pilot include:

- Building a flexible and scalable technical architecture and testing in a real working environment.
- Resolve the legal and intellectual property issues to make the repository workable, at least with a small number of participants.
- Evaluate DSpace software's ability to meet the identified needs of the project stakeholders.
- Determine the level of staffing support and technology resources required to operate the initial implementation scope, and make projections on requirements for a larger implementation.
- Learn from user experience. What exceeded or fell short of expectations? How should the implementation be improved?

Methodology:

The prototype project will involve one or two foundations in its first phase and will plan to be fully operational within one year of startup. The team will work closely with the participating foundations to establish a priority subset of requirements for the pilot. The focus will be on achieving the most important objectives while aligning the initial requirements closely with the existing capabilities of the DSpace software. Gaps between the comprehensive requirements specification and initial system capabilities will be documented. If there are critical gaps, that is gaps between the system capabilities and requirements that are determined to be essential, then the team will develop solutions to fill the gaps. Other non-critical gaps will not delay the initial pilot implementation.

Careful project management throughout the effort will track all costs of the project, including out-of-pocket costs, labor (paid and volunteer) and overhead costs so that appropriate projections can be made going forward. To the extent possible, development costs will be segregated from operational costs.

Periodic stakeholder meetings will review project progress and make decisions regarding operational and policy issues. Particular attention will be paid to submission procedures, transmittal of rights and creation of metadata. All other issues regarding the performance and usefulness of the system to the stakeholders will be tracked. As more requirements are discovered, they will be added to the requirements document and tracked on the gap analysis.

All changes to the project or project scope will be rigorously tracked and a change review and approval process will focus on keeping the project on track.

Based on the experienced value of the project to stakeholders and identified costs and cost projections, the team will develop a sustainable economic model for expanding the system to more foundations.

Assuming that a workable economic model can be found, the repository will be opened to more foundations, with a goal that it will be open to all foundations as soon as possible. Ongoing enhancements to the software and the surrounding processes will be expected indefinitely and will be included in the economic model for the system.

Adequate marketing and promotion of the system will be essential to its general acceptance and long-term success. This should start from the very beginning and may begin with maximizing industry visibility into the progress of the pilot project.

Issues:

The team will need to maintain its perspective with respect to the major differences in size of foundations. In particular, they will need to determine if smaller foundations need this service more than larger foundations, but for the repository to have its largest impact it must serve foundations of all sizes.

No matter how widely the repository is accepted, there may be a number of foundations that, for one reason or another, do not participate. The team should consider how the materials of those foundations are preserved and what role, if any, it can have in making them available.

The pilot project will need to address issues of ownership and copyright in practice for the first time. Any new intellectual property issues that come up during the pilot must be addressed, including multi-party ownership issues involving authors, publishers, foundations, and the repository.

Intellectual property discussions will likely lead to requirements for access control. The team may not only need to consider who has access to the documents but when. It is likely that the access agreements may provide for change over time. For example, a document could be restricted until some future date. The team will not only need to consider the technical solutions but the legal, administrative, and operational issues of such policies.

Determining requirements for technical assistance and customer service needs will be an important objective of the project and should not be underestimated. What level of ongoing assistance is necessary? Should there be levels of support with some set of fee-based premium services?

Potential Project Participants

Project	Potential Sponsor(s)	Potential Participants	Potential Funding Organization(s)
Survey of Existing Practice	Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (in 2006 pending project funding)	Annie E. Casey Foundation Technology Affinity Group	
Market Study			
Copyright Issues			
Technical Standards			
Philanthropic Taxonomies		Annie E. Casey Foundation Council on Foundations Northwest Area Foundation	
Digital Repository Pilot	IUPUI University Library		

Rev. 12/20/2004