I'm Brandon Weigel... I manage and support Arca, which is a collaborative digital repository service, serving an ever-growing population of libraries and other organizations across British Columbia and beyond.

- Built on the open-source Islandora platform, which is mainly composed of Drupal, Fedora, and Solr parts.
- We have 23 member organizations, mostly post-secondary but also groups representing museums, galleries, and archives -- each with their own site for their repository content -- and one parent site that links them all together and provides access to all of their content, combined.
● The fact that each member can have their own site, which is simultaneously indexed and discoverable alongside all other partner organizations’ content within a single parent site, is one of Arca’s most important features - and it’s one of the main reasons so many organizations want to be part of it.

● (Another major reason is that it’s really cheap to join.)

● But in order to make this kind of shared effort work, we need a certain amount of standardization.
One of the things I work very hard on is making sure that certain key metadata -- the kind of metadata that we use for faceting and filtering -- are standardized.

- Date filters, for example, only work if the date format is absolutely consistent.
- Standard genre terms are critical... if users want to search for Photographs -- you can't force them to run four different searches for “photographs with lowercase P” “photographs with uppercase P” and “photograph (not plural)”, or “photos”.
● o that end, we have a set of shared ingest forms that enforce (or at least suggest) certain standards and taxonomies, and I check in on occasion to make sure that there aren’t any aberrations -- and get them fixed if I discover any.
● With shared standards for metadata, all of the objects from our 23 member sites can be discovered together.
Standardized metadata also lets us do cool things with technology. One of my first forays into PHP programming was a set of modules called Islandora Badges -- which read specific metadata from objects (typically a DOI), pass that information into an external API, and return a badge that displays when you view the object, with useful information about it -- number of citations, altmetric data, unpaywall link, etc.
• So… Why do you care about this?
• Our adoption of Rights Statements came out of this need for standardized metadata… And other work we’d been doing to expose that metadata in ways that are useful to end-users.
What really pushed this idea forward was the late-2017 Confederation of Open Access Repositories Report on Next-Generation Repositories… Arca was already doing a lot of the things recommended by that report, but one of the behaviours we hadn't yet accomplished, or addressed to my satisfaction, was “Declaring licenses at the resource level.”
● While we broadly recommended including a statement of usage rights in the metadata, thus far the statements had all been quite free-form, if they were applied at all.
● And some of our sites have strong requirements from their content providers for statements of usage rights -- we don’t want to lose those.
Adopting Rights Statements

- So in February 2018, I offered our members a vision -- standardized statements of usage rights, selectable on our ingest forms, which could be processed and turned into badges that would let users know, at a glance, how they could use the objects.
- All our members were on board with the idea -- this was coming off of an initiative to standardize role terms, dates, and genre terms, so it was a logical next step.
- Plus we’re lucky to have a very collaboratively-minded group, and over the years we’ve built up a very strong trust-based relationship with our libraries -- so they tend to trust our judgment.
○ We had a precedent for this, as well -- our ingest forms already included a field where the submitter could add a Creative Commons license URI, and a corresponding badge that displays when you view the object.
○ But of course, most objects don't have a Creative Commons licenses -- they're in copyright, or have certain contractual restrictions -- so we needed a similar standardized vocabulary that could apply to all of our objects.
So… Why Rights Statements specifically?
  ○ Basically, when I was looking for standardized declarations of usage rights… well, they’re what I found.
  ○ Rights Statements seemed to be the most applicable standardized vocabulary, and the most commonly used in the outside world -- and if we’re going to use a standard, it should be, well, standard. And interoperable with the data in other repositories out in the world.

So, to make the decision on whether or not to adopt Rights Statements, I assigned our members some homework… To review all of the available Rights Statements, and identify whether there were any objects in their collections for which there was no Rights Statement nor Creative Commons license that could apply.

Nobody found any objects that couldn’t accept a Rights Statement… So that was enough to make it happen.
First, in order to make sure all NEW objects would have Rights Statements URIs in their metadata, all of our ingest forms got a new Rights Statement field. The submitter selects one of the statement titles from a dropdown list, but the URI is what’s actually written into the metadata.

Alongside the Rights Statement (which I just recently made a required field), there’s also a field for a free-text, more specific articulation of the rights to go alongside the broader Statement.
Next, I created another Badge, modeled on the Creative Commons badge, which can read the Rights Statement URI and return the appropriate image from rightsstatements.org, with a link out to the full statement.

Finally, I asked all of the local administrators to identify collections or other groups of objects already in the repository, that could all receive the same Rights Statement. This way I could update them all in large batches (by downloading the files and using a mass find/replace function), and cover the majority of our objects at once.
Some of this work is still ongoing, but so far we’ve got a Rights Statement on over 30,000 objects -- about 42% of the repository. Eventually we’ll get it all.
Challenges

- People are busy
- Lack of resources at smaller sites
- Advisory role - not enforcement

Advantages

- Our members trust us

While everyone in principle is on board with this initiative, they’re all busy librarians - and for only a handful of them is the repository a major component of their jobs. So even with clear instructions and requests, it isn’t always easy to make a change actually happen. Patience and regular reminders are required.

With smaller organizations, they may not have the resources to fully investigate the copyright status of their objects -- more interest in digitizing and making them available.
  - So we have a lot of objects marked “Copyright Not Evaluated” -- it’s our second most common Rights Statement -- which is fine!
  - At the very least it tells the end user to be judicious about using the object, and maybe to look into it themselves.

Arca is not a top-down organization… we don’t dictate to our members, we merely advise. So I can persuade them to make changes, and I can build things that make it easier to adhere to the guidelines -- but my enforcement powers are limited. Happily, everyone understands what we’re doing and why, so we share common goals -- it’s just that their priority levels may be different.
Lessons

- Just do the thing.

- I’ve been asked by a few organizations how we managed to organize this -- how we could get so many different organizations to choose a specific standard and implement it, without getting caught up in months of deliberation and planning.
- BC ELN has a long history with our partner libraries through our various services. They trust us to get them the best deals on licensing, and in general to work toward the best possible outcomes for all of our partners.
- With Arca, we are the centre of repository expertise that our members rely on. As the manager of the service and their direct support line for every question they have about their repositories, they trust my recommendations.
- So there’s our partners’ trust… Combined with my own … call it impatience?
- My philosophy that rather than spend a lot of time deliberating, it’s better to just do a thing -- after all, if the risks are low (all we’re doing is adding some metadata, which causes zero harm to the object and only improves it), and the benefits are evident -- why not just go ahead and do it?
- That’s my main takeaway from this process. Low risk? Clear benefits? Your partners are willing to try it out? Then what are you waiting for?