

RAR Cycle 10 Webinar Q&A

This document contains questions and answers from the March 8, 2023 Applicant Webinar organized by topic.

Quick Links to Presentation Resources:

- [Land Acknowledgment](#)
 - [ARSC Guide to Audio Preservation](#)
 - [Recordings At Risk Home Page](#)
 - [Apply for an Award Page](#)
 - [Document Library](#)
 - [DLF Digitizing Special Formats Wiki](#)
 - [ARSC Preservation and Restoration Directory](#)
 - [AMIA Global Supplier Directory](#)
 - [Grant Registry](#)
-

Question Categories

[General](#)

[Eligibility: Materials](#)

[Budget and Finance](#)

[Project Design and Application](#)

[General](#)

Q: As recipients of CLIR cycle 8, we would like to digitize the rest of our tapes. The project will be similar to the last one. Would it be necessary to change the title of the project? Changes for the new project are only the dates of the tapes and a few technical details.

A: It would not be necessary to change the title, but we would encourage adding a phrase like “phase two” to make clear to everyone that you’re asking for support to do new work.

Q: How does CLIR define “reasonable levels of access” to materials digitized through the grant program. Do the recordings have to be made accessible online?

A: As a caveat, we don’t necessarily define that; that’s left to the reviewers to interpret. It does typically mean the recordings will be made available and accessible online. There are incidents where portions of collections can’t be handled that way because it includes culturally sensitive material or personally identifiable information. Address that in the rights, ethics and reuse statement in your proposal. But if the entire collection will be kept in-house, you’d have to

address why to be competitive. You just need to make the case why your proposed approach maximizes access while respecting legal and ethical constraints.

Q: Does all the metadata have to be available online by the end of the grant activity period? Or can some of it be made available after the end of the grant period?

A: Yes. Within 12 months you need to spend all the money and meet all the project deliverables, including metadata. Outreach programming can happen after the project end date. If you're not done creating the metadata by the project end date you would have to request a no-cost extension. One no-cost extension per project is allowable. A no cost extension of 6 months is available for unexpected issues.. A second no cost extension would require Mellon approval. Please remember: don't spend money after your grant end date!

Q: So if the grant proposal includes the goal that all the recordings will be online, not just the metadata, are we obligated to get all those recordings uploaded?

A: Yes, that would be one of the deliverables to have completed by the end of the grant term. If you need more time, that's a perfectly reasonable reason to request a no-cost extension. But keep in mind that the Recordings at Risk program is a small, shorter program, designed to be completed in 12 months. A competitive application consists of projects designed to be completed within 12 months. That's the model the review panelists are looking for; grant modifications requests are for unexpected obstacles that slow down or hinder the project.

[Eligibility: Materials](#)

Q: Data DATs are ineligible as born digital materials, correct?

A: Digital Audio Tapes (DAT) are fragile media and reformatting them is eligible for the program. See the [FAQ](#) on the [Apply for an Award](#) page for a full explanation of allowable formats. DAT are viewed differently from CDs or DVDs because the equipment to play and digitize them is not widely available due to the rarity of the format.

Q: The collection that I'm thinking of submitting has some oral histories on CDs. They are not the original format the interviews were recorded in, but they are all that we have and we would like to get them off of discs. Would such material fall within the category of Digital File migration which is not eligible? The majority of the material is in mini-DV form.

A: This is a gray area for formatting and we understand that the formats are changing everyday. We would encourage you to understand RaR is a competitive program. We use an outside review panel so applicants will want to make the most compelling argument for funding. Consider including collections or materials outside of the born-digital material. If the entire collection is just on CDs we wouldn't encourage a submission. Sometimes CDs that are small

parts of a larger collection are allowable, but we've never funded a project that was just about migrating content off CDs and DVDs.

Q: The majority of the material is in mini-DV form.

A: Mini-DVs are an explicitly allowable format.

Q: That's what I thought. Based on Sharon's answer it sounds like we could include the DVD in with the mini-DVs.

A: Correct. You'll just have to be clear how many of each format you're proposing to digitize, this will also be included in your collections list.

Q: We are working on a proposal for recordings that have mixed rights considerations. We may have the copyright for some recordings, some could be in the public domain, and others are recordings of television recordings that we clearly don't have the rights to publish. Would it make our proposal more competitive to exclude commercial news/other recordings, even if they are relevant to the subject matter?

A: We understand that in some instances the copyrights for some of the proposed materials cannot be in the public domain. In your rights, ethics and reuse statements, if you clarify for the reviewers why they can not be in the public domain and that you have a plan to handle the copyrighted materials clearly it makes a more compelling case for the reviewers. Hopefully that's not the majority of your materials, which might make it a little less competitive than others. happen. In this section you'd explain what is available and what is not.

[Budget and Finance](#)

Q: Can we include stipends for the PIs in our budget?

A: The Recordings at Risk program was set up to fund smaller projects with a cap of \$50,000 primarily for the reformatting of at risk materials. However, you can fund staffing, if it is necessary to assist in the project (i.e., project manager, metadata). Just keep in mind to build a competitive project, you want to make sure the majority of your budget is used for reformatting. Whenever you're completing your budgetary narratives, explain your expenditures thoroughly.

Q: Please remind me if there is any cost share requirement for the grant.

A: There is no cost share requirement.

Q: Can we count in-house digital processing time as a direct cost?

A: Could you clarify what you mean by "in-house digital processing"?

Q: Metadata creation and other tasks directly related to making files available online.

A: Metadata and other project work can be done by in-house staff. Only the digital reformatting piece has to be outsourced to a vendor.

Q: You mentioned that we need the vendor's quotation for the digitization in our grant application. If there are changes to the statement of work, within the grant period. How is that handled?

A: That would be handled through a grant modification request and that's not an unusual thing to happen within the project term. We have institutions that are required to do specific bidding processes and may have to change the vendor entirely after the grant has been awarded. Some realized the tapes are worse than they realized, so they need to expand on that budget by taking it from somewhere else. Any changes to the size or specific items within the collections to be reformatted, the vendor to be used, or the approach to reformatting, access, or metadata creation would need to be approved by CLIR's team before implementation. You would do all this through the grant modification request process. Note that we cannot increase an award after it's been awarded. If more remediation is needed and you need more money, we would ask you to illustrate a cost share.

[Project Design and Application](#)

Q: In a collaborative university setting, from where should the Institutional Letter of Support originate? The materials and PI are in our Libraries, the award would be managed by our research foundation.

A: That could come from the library Director or a Dean that has oversight of the department. We have universities that we've awarded in the past and we've worked with the Office of Sponsored Research, but they're not necessarily the people who would provide that letter of support.

Q: I'm nervous about asking scholars I don't know to write a letter of support. How willing have you found people in being open to writing support letters?

A: That's not something we necessarily have direct experience with since we're not applicants, but many proposals have more Letters of Support than what is required and many scholars are eager to expound on collections and materials they are passionate about. We do have guidelines for authors of letters of support on the program's [Apply for Award page](#) that you may find helpful.

Q: Your page mentions that some government agencies cannot select a vendor ahead of time. We are getting proposals from a couple of vendors - but what's the best way to explain that the vendor is not set in stone?

A: You have the ability to upload multiple vendor requests in the application. The financial narrative is a good place to mention that we are a gov agency, people are sometimes required to use certain vendors, or have multiple. Once you choose your vendor, you'll explain in the

narrative and project proposal why this vendor is the best choice for you. Sometimes the least expensive is not necessarily the best choice, depending on other factors (type of material, shipping costs, etc.) The financial narrative is the place to explain your choices. See the instructions for the budget narrative in the [Cycle 10 Application Guidelines](#), as well as the [Guidelines for Grant Proposals Involving Subcontractors or Consultants](#).

Q: I see that the cycle 10 Guidelines and Template includes places to write a draft response. In your experience is it easier to cut and paste from a word or pdf version?

A: I'd use a Word version of the template and cut and paste into our SM Apply application system. There are word count limits at some point; it is easier at times to draft those sections in an external document so you can work collaboratively, check word count, and edit. But it's not required, you can work directly in SM Apply if you wish.

Q: We are in the middle of locating all of the video and audio recordings, prior to creating a complete inventory. Since we don't know the exact number of videotapes - 1/2" reel to reel, VHS, 3/4" U-Matic and audio cassettes and open reel, will we be able to supply estimates?

A: We usually get estimates from applicants. Until the vendor gets them, you typically don't know the conditions they will be in. We do encourage you to also have some standby that is connected to to substitute for the estimate. Get as close as possible to the estimate. It might be helpful to have a vendor look at what you have before you submit your application.

Q: We have a variety of tapes that need to be digitized. They cover very distinct topics such as public affairs shows, debates, mental health shows, youth shows, etc. Are we required to get approval from CLIR first on subject matter? And must all materials to be digitized be of the same theme. I.e., - all public affairs shows from 1987 to 1990.

A: If I'm understanding your question correctly, it's important that your collection has some commonality in it that hits core requirements for our program, most importantly, impact. You'd want to link it as a collection from a period, have a theme, or indicate the broad-based scholarly impact. What makes this collection stand out, why is it important? Coupled with rarity and risk factor of actual items. This isn't a subject-specific program, but you must proactively substantiate what makes your collection competitive in terms of scholarly impact.