2003 Sustainability Standing Committee Survey Results

Prepared by Sarah Giersch

The 2003 SSC Survey was available online for two weeks during which no technical difficulties were reported with the survey form. These results have been validated, rendered anonymous and spell-checked. Please visit the SSC website (http://sustain.comm.nsdlib.org) to view the methodology, full survey and briefing paper which contains a summary of the results. *Indicates a question was required.

*2. Through which NSDL program track does your project receive funding? (N=42)

Options	Number of responses	Response ratio
Collections	27	64%
Core Integration	1	2%
Services	11	26%
Targeted research	3	7%
Not funded through NSDL program	0	0%

*3. Please indicate the anticipated life-span (from inception to completion) of your NSDL project. (N=42)

Options	Number of responses	Response ratio
1 – 2 years (short term project)	18	43%
3 – 5 years	12	29%
6 – 10 years	2	5%
over 10 years (long term project)	10	24%

*4. Do you have a plan for ensuring that your NSDL project will be funded until it is completed or until it reaches financial stability? (N=42)

Options	Number of responses	Response ratio
Yes, and I am implementing the plan. (please skip to #6)	24	57%
Yes, but I haven't begun to implement the plan. (please skip to #6)	12	29%
No, I don't have a plan. (please explain in #5, then skip to #7)	2	5%
No, I don't need a plan (please explain in #5, then skip to #7)	4	10%

5. Please explain why your project does not have (or does not need) a plan to ensure its funding. (fill in the blank) **(N=6)**

1. The 2-year NSDL funding we received will create the system (and we are right on track with that part) and populate it with bare bones contents. However, we will have only scratched the surface for K-12 engineering content at the end of this period. Preparation and classroom-testing of the contents to

ensure they are usable and educational contents standards-compliant for teachers in 50 different states is expensive, and not well funded in the grant. I have already initiated discussion with NSF to address this, and am also raising funds privately to augment the NSF funding. This all concerns me greatly. **So, we are working a plan from multiple sources, but I don't consider this a bullet-proof long term plan yet.**

2. My project is a fairly small-scale collection intended for computer vision educators. We have built the site to be as self-sustaining as possible, so it does not require continuous maintenance or upgrading. The materials are provided by the community, and we have had good cooperation and support so far. I expect this to continue. So the site will largely be maintained by me, and it does not require hardware/computers beyond what we will have in my lab for the foreseeable future.
   If there is a need for more development or funding, I would look to the NSDL program again for funds to expand the site based on its previous success and a clear need that would need to be met.
3. 2 projects have 1 month remaining. 1 project has one month remaining
4. Our Project is an evaluation project, and is intended to inform funders and researchers, not provide an ongoing service. I will continue to seek funding for our basic research work, funded under other NSDL proposals
5. Our project has been incorporated into the CI, so its sustainability is determined by the CI's sustainability plans.
6. Completed Phase 1.

6. If your project has a plan, how likely is it that you will seek funding from the following sources?

%=Respondent ratio; n=respondents selecting option	1- Low	2	3	4	5- High	6- NA	7- DK
Funding from philanthropic organizations (e.g., Pew, Mellon)	**38%** **14**	14% 5	16% 6	8% 3	19% 7	3% 1	3% 1
Funding from an institution (a university or a company)	11% 4	16% 6	16% 6	8% 3	**41%** **15**	5% 2	3% 1
Funding from NSF programs other than NSDL	19% 7	11% 4	11% 4	28% 10	**31%** **11**	0% 0	0% 0
Continued funding from NSF – NSDL program	5% 2	0% 0	16% 6	8% 3	**68%** **26**	3% 1	0% 0
Funding from government agencies other than NSF	11% 4	8% 3	**28%** **10**	22% 8	**28%** **10**	0% 0	3% 1
Funding from technology transfer	**29%** **10**	24% 8	24% 8	0% 0	6% 2	3% 1	15% 5
Direct sale of content or product (to institutions or end users)	**49%** **17**	6% 2	9% 3	14% 5	9% 3	11% 4	3% 1

*7. Please rank the level of expertise you or your project staff have with the following activities?

%=Respondent ratio; n=respondents selecting option	1- Low	2	3	4	5- High	6- NA	7- DK
Supporting a project for more than 2-3 years (the usual duration of an NSDL award) from one funding source	5% 2	2% 1	10% 4	19% 8	**62%** **26**	0% 0	2% 1
Supporting a project for more than 5	12% 5	10% 4	12% 5	31% 13	**33%** **14**	0% 0	2% 1

	1- Low	2	3	4	5- High	6- NA	7- DK
years from diverse funding sources (i.e., federal agencies, private foundations and institutional programs)							
Conducting market research	26% 11	14% 6	**29% 12**	19% 8	5% 2	7% 3	0% 0
Writing a business plan	21% 9	14% 6	21% 9	**24% 10**	12% 5	7% 3	0% 0
Implementing a business plan	14% 6	29% 12	14% 6	**29% 12**	10% 4	5% 2	0% 0
Collaborating with individuals, projects or institutions to explore or implement alternative sources of funding	0% 0	2% 1	2% 1	21% 9	**71% 30**	2% 1	0% 0

*8. Please rate the level of interest you or your project staff have in learning about the following topic.

%=Respondent ratio; n=respondents selecting option	1- Low	2	3	4	5- High	6- NA	7- DK
Writing a successful business plan	17% 7	10% 4	17% 7	14% 6	**36% 15**	2% 1	5% 2
Conducting market research	14% 6	7% 3	21% 9	12% 5	**36% 15**	5% 2	5% 2
Preservation of your digital collections or services	5% 2	5% 2	7% 3	29% 12	**52% 22**	0% 0	2% 1
Protecting the intellectual property of your project	12% 5	7% 3	19% 8	26% 11	**31% 13**	2% 1	2% 1
Digital Rights Management	10% 4	17% 7	17% 7	**31% 13**	24% 10	0% 0	2% 1
Identifying alternative sources of funding	0% 0	0% 0	17% 7	24% 10	**57% 24**	0% 0	2% 1
Fund raising strategies	2% 1	10% 4	12% 5	24% 10	**48% 20**	0% 0	5% 2
Building a community of users	2% 1	5% 2	2% 1	24% 10	**64% 27**	0% 0	2% 1
Ensuring my project's longevity beyond its current NSDL funding	2% 1	0% 0	0% 0	24% 10	**71% 30**	0% 0	2% 1

*9. Please rate the preferences of you and your project staff for engaging in the following activities to learn about the topics related to sustaining your project.

%=Respondent ratio; n=respondents selecting option	1- Low	2	3	4	5- High	6- NA	7- DK
Listserv discussions (reading and posting)	**26% 11**	12% 5	19% 8	**29% 12**	12% 5	0% 0	2% 1
Reading conference papers or white papers	5% 2	17% 7	26% 11	**33% 14**	17% 7	0% 0	2% 1
Listening to panel discussions	12% 5	10% 4	**38% 16**	31% 13	10% 4	0% 0	0% 0
Participating in tutorials at conferences	5% 2	10% 4	**33% 14**	29% 12	21% 9	0% 0	2% 1
Participating in a 1-2 day workshop	7% 3	10% 4	17% 7	**36% 15**	26% 11	0% 0	5% 2

Participating in tutorials at All-Projects meetings	2% 1	10% 4	24% 10	21% 9	**43%** **18**	0% 0	0% 0

10. Please provide additional responses to questions 6 - 9 here. (N=9)

1. [See following responses:]
    a) Regarding 6: We had plans in our proposal.
    b) It does not make sense in Computing and Information Technology Interactive Digital Educational Library (CITIDEL, http://www.citidel.org/) to go after philanthropic organizations (e.g., Pew, Mellon). That is appropriate for NSDL as a whole, though.
    We have support ongoing from 3 or more of the 5 universities that make
    up our core team. We have some support ongoing from several professional
    societies.
    c) We have a little slightly related support from NSF CISE IIS.
    I was subcontractor or co-PI on 6 NSFL proposals submitted in April. 5 were rejected. 1 should be approved, but it has only very minor connection with CITIDEL. The largest proposal, closest to CITIDEL, seems to have been rejected since we lacked data on the success of the (in process) CITIDEL effort. So, we'll try again April 2003. But this process seems very wasteful in terms of the effort of proposers and reviewers, and does not seem to make sense if a very active and effective and visible project that is the main effort covering a large topical area (all of computing and information technology) is not supported. It seems there should be at least some core NSF funding to cover NSDL efforts in each of the main areas of NSF interest (e.g., that concerning CISE).
    d) **Selling software in the digital library area is not a realistic way to fund an NSDL collection project. While we do have some content we manage, it is not feasible to sell it. We don't want to become yet another publisher trying to make money off authors.**
    e) **Sustainability for a collection project like ours requires support for a wholistic effort, that includes content, metadata, preservation, community building, (tailored) services, etc. We could deconstruct it and seek support from a variety of sources to take over parts, but then the wholistic effort would collapse. There are no other organizations interested in all that.** We've worked since drafting of our proposal with ACM, IEEE-CS, and other groups on sustainability. It is clear that CITIDEL overlaps only partly with each such group. Further, if we turn things over to them, what are now free services will turn into for-pay services - is that in the best interest of teachers and students nationwide?
    f) Regarding 7: We have typical knowledge of academicians working with professional and educational organizations, not much about business or marketing. I'm not sure the use of "business plan" really fits here - it needs to be related to our type of effort.
    g) I'm Executive Director of Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (www.ndltd.org), working on that since 1987, so have long term project experience, and have secured funding for it from many sources. Also have been working 10 years on Networked Computer Science Technical Reference Library (www.ncstrl.org).

    h) Regarding 8: We'd love to learn more!

    i) I'm not sure a business plan is what is needed. That does not help when seeking grant support. We need a wider range of assistance - negotiating, developing partnerships with a set of professional societies, etc.

    j) Preservation advice on the institutional commitment level is needed more than repeating comments on technical preservation.

    k) We need operational DRM info, not theoretical discussion.

    l) Fund raising info must be focused on what works in our community, not general discussion. This fits with finding alternatives for funding

    m) The real point is how to extend the project life! All the other topics should be cast in terms of how they help in that.

    n) Regarding 9: There must be some literature (conference or white papers) of help re sustainability - it would be great to have an annotated bibliography of the best!

    o) Panel discussions, tutorials, workshops, listserv discussions are good but they really need to be on point. Many sustainability sessions at earlier events have not really been helpful. Many of know the problems what we need are solutions, things that work.

    p) All projects events are great, but there always are so many parallel sessions that it is hard to attend something more.

2. We expect academic institutions to demonstrate expertise through the educational material that they support.

3. **Answers where we indicated no interest (such as digital preservation and community building) reflect areas where we feel comfortable with our level of expertise currently so don't feel the need for further training. They don't reflect our feelings about the importance of those areas.**

4. **One thing that must be emphasized is that all collection projects must be dynamic. Without some sort of funding, non-profit based, most projects will go the way of other heroic prototypes (Great American History Machine, Perseus)**

5. would like personal visits from core group

6. We participate at MERLOT, JCDL, NSDL, IEEE and others

7. While, I have led a company and large funded projects, written business plans, etc, and am still interested in learning how digital libraries (and our role in them) can be sustained by a range of sources.

8. **Question 8 mentions community building, a cornerstone of our sustainability efforts. However, our project funds were cut and we've had to concentrate on collection building.**

9. The participants in this project have experience in maintaining several long-term projects in educational resources and user support.

11. What aspects of your NSDL project would you like to sustain beyond its current period of NSF funding and why? Please be as specific as possible. (N=38)

1. Natural evolution of the technology that allows for greater functionality. Longitudinal evaluation that captures trends in software use.

2. We would like the usability of the chapters created for the Earth Exploration Toolbook to continue, which would require revision as tools and datasets and data access evolve.
   We would also like the Earth Exploration Toolbook template to become a

robust mechanism for creating new chapters thus making increasing amounts of Earth science data and tools more accessible and usable by educators and students.

3. The rationale of our project was to integrate the NSDL collections into the normal operations of the Journal of Chemical Education. This is being done. The Journal has operated as a nonprofit since 1924 and expects to continue for the indeterminate future.
4. Continuing to develop and up-date materials for the project.
Providing a community of users a way to contribute to the collection.
5. We'd like to sustain the community building (to develop a community in our field of educators willing to share and to deploy resources, and of students eager to use resources), the growing metadata collection, and the integrated environment supporting that (our software).
6. We would like to sustain both the generation and use of re-usable components (the focus of our NSDL grant) as well as continued creation of full-blown applets and related text.
7. Essential: Content maintenance, update, delivery mechanisms, hardware servicing. Desirable: content and service growth
8. We will be sustaining the collection, services (many), and research activities because they are core competencies and/or essential services for the variety of funding we currently receive.
9. We maintain a persistent archive of material that has been registered into the NSDL repository. The material includes time-dependent information and knowledge, and requires preservation for future access.
10. We have numerous ideas to improve the website's educational value but have not received additional NSF funding to pursue these.
11. Electronic journal, annotated bibliography, miscellaneous resources
12. The entire collection, and related services.
13. I would like to see the development of the core software continue. I believe that my service is useful to collection builders but I need additional time before the software is "ready for prime time".
14. Developing content
15. Making three collection useful to K-12 teachers in all 50 states, which implies cross-referencing the collection contents with the educational standards of each of the 50 states.
16. Providing for continuing to grow the project beyond the length of the grant and keep it current and viable
17. Database and website portal need to be updated in regular bases. The backbone of Cephbase/cephschool is our scientific database, updating is necessary as science progresses.
18. We have a need for periodic system administration, periodic hardware upgrades, and periodic recruitment and evaluation of new materials for the site.
19. Our project is a digital library that was developed with NSDL funds. Obviously, we would like to continue to provide services to our users and to enhance our collection beyond NSDL funding. We also would like to continue to adapt to and to incorporate emerging technologies and standards.
20. All the components of our project will need sustaining beyond the current period of NSDL funding. However, since the MIC serves a very diverse audience, with an equally strong Arts & Humanities base, we have many avenues for future funding. We will definitely sustain the science portal and continue to send data via OAI to the NSDL, regardless of any future funding from NSDL. We'd really like to build ongoing relationships with other NSDL

projects focused on building curricular materials from raw resources, so that we can continue the important work of integrating moving images into science education. We also have a lot of expertise in access to moving images, particularly the use of MPEG-7 and Dublin Core to describe digital video. We'd love to work with other projects that are also interested in access technologies for digital video, to leverage our combined expertise and interest in these areas.

21. Different areas of civil engineering and maintenance of current collection
22. I would like to continue to update the map materials, the viewer and the applets. This is not a small task.
23. keep service up and running even if no further development is done
24. Preservation and the addition of new materials as they are identified
25. Beyond our current and hoped-for continued NSDL funding to complete our collection, maintenance of links, addition and deletion of collection resources, and marketing to users will be important activities to sustain.
26. We'd like to sustain any accessibility tools created as long as they are of use to the NSDL community, as well as the archives of materials related to accessibility issues.
27. We want to preserve and add to both our journal and our general collection. We have several new components coming online that we hope will be at least self-supporting.
28. Maintaining the web sites, updating data sets (collections)
29. [See the following]
    a) Automatic metadata generation, because I feel that manual generation is poorer.
    b) Automatic assignment of the value of the Standards metadata element, so that teachers can easily search for relevant materials for us in teaching to a standard.
    c) Continuing evaluation of users while accessing the Digital Library, to understand what the Digital Library should be doing / providing.
30. We think the whole project will be of real value to math education, so we'd like to preserve it all as a self-sustaining community digital library that only requires modest involvement from the Math Forum.
31. The question triage research technique should be implemented into the core infrastructure system to be available for future use.
32. We'd like to ensure that questions - including complex and compound ones - can be answered to help support NSDL users
33. The collection.
34. We would like to maintain and expand the Alsos Library as a resource for the audiences we have identified. We feel that NSF's investment of $500,000 and the effort to produce the library would be wasted if we do not continue our work. The topics addressed are essential to science literacy of students and the general public. A knowledge of these topics is required if citizens are to make informed decisions on nuclear power and control of nuclear weapons.
35. User contributions.
    Transfer of research results from numerical analysis research community to engineering students and practitioners.
36. harvesting learning objects for the collection
37. Providing support through resources and communications for the users of the collections. Supporting the interest and efforts of users in using technology in the classroom through tutorials, workshops, and online resources.

38. The Collection or urls and metadata
The Workshub tool to manage Collection building by disperse and diverse community members

12. If your project receives no further NSDL funding, briefly describe what plans (if any) you have for the project? (N=37)

1. Continue to provide open-source access to the software and monitor its evolution.
2. We will be using the Earth Exploration Toolbook (EET) template as a mechanism for making Earth science data and tools available to educators and students through the DLESE Data Services workshops. However, this funding is finite also so we will continue to look for other avenues to maintain and grow the EET.
We are also interested in possibly expanding the EET to include other areas of science.
3. See #11
4. Look for alternate sources of funding. If none become available, the project can continue for a while at a rather low level of activity and the materials developed during the funding period can continue to be available.
5. Not sure. Are continuing to discuss this with ACM (and its various parts). Seek other options to explore. Think that NSDL should somehow support in some fashion the broad area of computing and information technology education as a crucial domain for our nation's future.
6. We have funding from industry and have applied for an NSF CCLI grant for a new aspect of the project.
7. Complementary dimensions are receiving funding from other sources, and provide short term protection. The home institution will maintain the portal for 10 years. Our goal is to embed the project within a major initiative, of which NSDL would be the most appropriate.
8. We will continue to "grow" the project through institutional, governmental, and industry support
9. We will work with the California Digital Library to build an equivalent collection. We also work with NARA and LOC to build preservation environments.
10. We are seeking to form a partnership with the American Ceramic Society to provide marketing visibility and to add additional images. This will not fund the ideas we had for improving the educational value of the website as proposed to NSF. Rather its purpose is to establish the website completed under NSF funding and to help sustain it.
11. Page charges for journal to sustain the project.
12. We will seek foundation funding, and maintain the currency of existing information.
13. I would submit to other NSF programs to try and find follow-on funding, although with the current DL slant of the work, that will be difficult.
14. It is going to be sustained by another agency
15. We already have a long-term contractual agreement in place with ASEE for dissemination. What we need is funding to expand the contents.
16. Write a proposal to another funding group, seek the support of business partners.
17. Seek for new founding sources
18. To continue to maintain it as a site for sharing educational materials and information, and to continue to recruit materials for the site from educators.

19. Improve user interface, include new services (e.g., personalization options), etc.
20. Our project may be unique in that we are building the Moving Image Collections project on behalf of the Library of Congress, who will be the permanent host site for the project. We are having our first MIC steering committee meeting in early October at LC to talk about the next phase and to establish the planning committee to identify features and future directions for Phase II, which will influence any future funding sought, from any source. It's a very compelling and integrating project for this community, with strong support from the Library of Congress, so we don't have major concerns about sustainability. We do feel very strongly that we want to maintain ties with NSDL and continue to actively build toward our mission of integrating moving images into science education. It is possible we will seek continued NSDL funding, but equally possible that we will look elsewhere for funding. In any event, we want to build ties to NSDL projects and the CI team to insure that science moving images in the MIC continue to be ingested into NSDL and develop lasting collaborations with other projects, particularly those using digital video for applications. Our commitment to the goal of integrating moving images into the education mainstream is very strong.
21. [See the following]
    a) Discussing endorsement and funding from companies and professional organizations.
    b) Preparing a business plan
    c) Initiated discussion with a publisher for publications of textbooks using resources in the digital library.
22. We are hoping to be able to sell packages of the GIS based maps packaged with workbooks through publishing and other sources.
23. talk to university officials to keep supporting it at low level
24. Leave in place with no support
25. We will need to change the scope and purpose of the collection to attract other funding agencies such as FEMA or private companies, who will be interested in more information for the general public. NSDL funding keeps our focus on K-12 and college education.
26. Everything would be passed along to the CI.
27. We are developing a number of components of the project that will be for sale. We will concentrate on making the site sufficiently valuable to the Associations members that they will be willing to support it.
28. Seek additional funding from other government and non-government agencies.
29. Broadly, we plan to seek NSF, NIH, foundation, or corporate funding to extend the automatic metadata generation capabilities, as well as the extension of the metadata values of standards, and a web-based environment (developed in MetaTest) to enable continuous input from users.
30. We are cultivating corporate partners who may step forward with some support. If we were to develop the library to the point of real viability, it may also fit with school subscription and membership programs just being instituted. In addition, the Math Forum has some modest community mechanisms in place that can maintain lower levels of collection building and community support. We'll have to cut way back, in particular with the community support and the large scale collection building. It's likely to become static and of less and less value unless we can get sufficient community activity functions implemented and reach critical mass.

31. The project is nearly 2/3 complete. However, it is unclear whether or not we would have the resources to complete the project if further funding is removed.
32. Keep materials free for as long as possible, through government and foundation funding. Switch to user fees when necessary. The rationale is that building a user community is challenging, and made more so by user fees. We want to have as large a community of users as possible before asking them for funds. The more we have, the less the per-unit cost will be.
33. We will solicit funds from private foundations, NSF CCLI, and our university.
34. Sustain with state-funded Center of Excellence funding or with funding from other related projects.
35. collaboration with other institutions
36. NSDL funding is vital for the development of new (pilot) projects and services that our professional organizations are providing. If NSDL funding is cut, the digital library would be scaled back to a level that the societies can support and the members of the societies demand.
37. Collection will be incorporated into DLESE and hopefully will continue to be added to over time

*13. In your opinion, is the sustainability of your project tied to the sustainability of NSDL? (**N=42)**

Options	Number of responses	Response ratio
Yes	18	43%
No	19	45%
Don't Know	5	12%

14. Please note if you or your project staff:
(check all the apply)

Options	Number of responses	Response ratio
Would like to know more about creating sustainable projects.	28	93%
Are willing to share sustainability experiences, expertise or plans with other NSDL projects.	18	60%
Would like to include your responses to questions 11 and 12 as part of your project description for the Collaboration Finder.	12	40%

16. Please comment on issues to consider when merging your project's work into NSDL. (N=19)
1. We'd love to merge with NSDL as much as possible. But we've had very little encouragement for this in spite of many offers.
2. We have finished a metadata bridge between Java's metadata scheme and Dublin Core.
3. What are the mechanisms the NSDL is building to integrate services?
4. Already part of the core infrastructure
5. evolving technical/human standards
6. DOI, copyright issues.
7. I need more info about merging

8. The NSDL core standards have been somewhat of a moving target, and the resources available for setting up an OAI server to permit integration are not yet stable or well documented enough to be easily usable. It took several knowledgeable students most of the summer to complete the integration, and it was by far the most difficult aspect of the project.

9. I don't understand this question.

10. The MIC is ultimately a collaboration of many agencies--those participating in the MIC, the Library of Congress as host site, and the Association of Moving Image Archivists, as sponsor. MIC has a steering committee consisting of representatives from all of those agencies. Future collaborations involving the MIC as a whole probably require steering committee approval. We also serve as a technology base for any participant, however, and can supply metadata in different schemas via OAI for any participating institution, for example, to support partnerships with individual participants. We have already been referenced in a grant proposal, for example, to supply MPEG-7 records for that agency, and I was happy to send a letter of support acknowledging this. There aren't any technical impediments to merging the work and I will work as a member of the Steering Committee for streamlined administrative procedures for continuing to support the NSDL.

11. how to reconcile commercial interest of participating societies and open access at university level

12. Because we are creating a full encyclopedia, which has catalogued links to educational as well as technical/informational resources, many of our "objects" won't be appropriate to be merged (for example, we catalog a photo for use on a page, but a single photo won't be shared with NSDL). We will identify those objects/resources that should be shared with NSDL. Also, if relevant resources already exist in NSDL that we have also catalogued then we'll need to carefully compare metadata and decide how to handle the duplication. These and other issues are resolvable and have been discussed with colleagues at DLESE and NSDL.

13. Without additional NSDL funding, it will be difficult to keep the collection free to the NSDL in general. Much of it will probably become a privilege of membership. Also, it will be difficult to continue organizing cooperative activities within the NSDL disciplinary community -- in this case mathematics.

14. I believe that a gap has developed between the technical team mounting the digital library and the technology developers who have useful tools to offer.

15. Our notion of a community-driven digital library has promise of proving to be a very fruitful one and we'll work to inform our NSDL colleagues of our findings as they emerge. We also need to work to keep our special features from being sheared off in the merging process since merging with NSDL so far has meant extracting catalog records.

16. We have no problems merging with NSDL if NSDL can improve the quality of the main portal.

17. Project has different content and user community that many of the other NSDL projects.

18. Because the users of the materials in these collections identify fairly strongly with the sponsoring organizations, this connection between resources and organization probably needs to be carefully maintained.

19. Recognition or branding of resources in the Digital Water Education Library collection

17. Please provide any final comments here. (N=13)

1. I think that these questions represent one narrow perspective on sustainability; one that comes from a publishing world perspective. Our research group has been around since 1984 without ever writing a single 'business plan' - I make this point because there are a rich variety of approaches and meanings to sustainability but in the NSDL we only talk about one.
   Our NSDL project has a plan to gradually hand over our service to the sponsoring professional society after a period (up to 5 years) of third party interim hosting. Your questions will not get at projects potentially creative approaches to sustainability because it is making too many assumptions.
2. I've exceedingly frustrated on this topic. I believe this matter is of highest priority. We are loosing a tremendous amount of the benefit of NSDL projects from the first 2 rounds by not focusing on this matter and engaging the collection and services projects in sustainability discussions and efforts.
3. The NSDL is a great concept. We enjoyed being a part of it with the components project and are glad to remain part of the community with our unrelated second NSDL grant for an NSDL Student Notepad.
4. Please note funding of this project has not been confirmed yet
5. Its been an interesting project but without further funding it feels like we were cutoff half way through.
6. I have not officially been funded (yet), but wanted to provide you with feedback. Thanks for the opportunity.
7. The model of NSDL does not lend itself to realistic profit oriented funding. If one were going to profit oriented funding the approach would be far different.
8. more contact from core group
9. I do not foresee the continued development of the NSDL without some sort of continuing support of its core components.
10. I believe that sustainability is key to the success of NSDL and is deserving of high-level commitment from both NSF and the funded teams.
11. It would be good to consider a mechanism like donor and local foundation fundraising and/or memberships that are implemented across NSDL that others can piggyback on in terms of building public awareness and momentum as well as share resources and combine efforts where that makes sense.
12. The core integration group needs to do some serious work on the portal, i.e. more focused searches and better presentation of results.
13. We feel that professional societies have an important role to play in the long-term maintenance and management of disciplinary digital resource collections. They are experienced in working with and supporting the needs of their members, and are a recognized authority for recognition of the efforts of innovators in education. Stable support for broad resource collections will need to come from organizations whose goals are in line with the general support of science education.