

(DPA2010C)

## Digital Preservation Award 2010: Voter's Pack

### 1. Introduction

The Digital Preservation Award celebrates the excellence and innovation that will help to ensure our digital memory is accessible tomorrow.

The Digital Preservation Coalition sponsors the Digital Preservation Award, one of a set of awards which are collectively called the Conservation Awards. The Conservation Awards began in 1993 and their presentation is co-ordinated by a working party of the Institute for Conservation (ICON). Although based on the high level criteria of the Conservation Awards, the size of the community and the nature of the work it recognises mean that the Digital Preservation Award is distinctive in how it is implemented.

In September 2010, the judges of the Digital Preservation Award shortlisted five nominations which in their view meet the criteria to win the award. These are subject to a further round of scrutiny before the prize is finalised and to help them complete the process the judges wish to consult the wider membership of the Digital Preservation Coalition. This document provides a guide to voting.

### 2. Criteria for the Digital Preservation Award: 'Assessment of Quality by Peers'

The Digital Preservation Award is awarded to the nominee who, in the eyes of the judges, best demonstrates excellence and innovation that will help to ensure our digital memory is available tomorrow. Ten broad criteria have been published to that help nominees make their case:

- Clarity of aims and objectives.
- Effectiveness of the methodology used to achieve those aims.
- Exemplary or innovative application of digital preservation tools or principles.
- Impact of the work and its relevance and applicability to others.
- Understanding of digital preservation issues and reference to existing body of knowledge.
- Clarity and practicality of benefits that accrue.
- Durability of contribution to the field.
- Demonstrable effectiveness of resources and effort expended.
- Significance of heritage preserved.
- Assessment of quality by peers.

'Assessment of quality by peers' is a difficult to measure, so an online poll of DPC members will provide material evidence to support the judges' deliberations.

### 3. Assumptions and conditions

The following assumptions apply to voting

- Each Full Member, Associate and Allied Organisation of the DPC may submit one polling card. The list of members is provided below.
- The Polling Card must clearly identify the name and email address of the person submitting the polling card and the organisation they represent.
- Members must not vote for projects they are associated with. Potential conflicts of interest have been identified and members are asked to inform judges of any others.
- Members should take time to familiarise themselves with the shortlist, coming to a rounded and informed view on each project prior to voting.
- Persons submitting the polling card should take appropriate steps to ensure that their actions are representative of the whole member organisation, not simply a personal preference.
- The DPC maintains a list of 'designated contacts' with its members (see below). In the event of a dispute, the DPC will follow the recommendation of this designated contact.
- Polling cards should be submitted online via the DPC website.
- Polling cards should be submitted by registered users of the DPC website.
- Polling cards must be received by 1700 (UK time) on Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010.
- Results of the poll will be submitted to the judges as evidence for one criterion of the award.
- Summary results of the poll will be published after the award has been announced.

- Members should not discuss their vote with nominees.
- Nominees should not solicit votes.
- Members and nominees should avoid any actions which would bring the award into disrepute.
- Some of the judges represent DPC member agencies. They are entitled to contribute to or lead their institutional responses.
- Judges' decisions are final and will remain confidential until 1<sup>st</sup> December.
- The winner will be announced on the evening of 1<sup>st</sup> December at the Royal Institution in London.

#### 4. Polling Card: how to vote

To access the polling card, you must first of all register to use the DPC website. This can take up to 24 hours so it is recommended that you register as soon as the poll is released. Registration can be initiated online at: <http://www.dpconline.org/login/registers>

Once you have registered, login to the DPC website and follow the links on the DPC home page to the restricted access pages relevant to the Digital Preservation Awards. You will first be presented with an introduction to the award and conditions of use. The polling card can be accessed using the link at the bottom of that page. The following

1. Please check that the user name and email address on the polling card are accurate. Submission of the polling card is monitored by email address so you may be prevented from voting if the address is wrong. As an additional security check please enter the code from the small animated image. You can get a different code by refreshing the page.
2. Enter the name of the organisation you represent. This is a required field.
3. Using the radio buttons, pick the project which you believe best exemplifies the innovation and excellence that will ensure our digital memory is accessible tomorrow. You are asked not to vote for projects where you believe there is a conflict of interest and judges will discard any votes where they believe such a conflict exists. You cannot submit your vote without completing this field.
4. Judges seek brief comments for the commendation of the winner and in feedback. Please use the comments box provided. We may publish these comments but will not attribute them to you unless you specifically give us permission to do so.
5. The judges would like to know your second choice. This will be useful in the event of a tie and will help us provide feedback to runners up. Please do not vote for the same project as winner and runner up.
6. You also have an opportunity to provide feedback to the judges. These comments will not be released. Please use this box to provide us with any information which you think would assist the judges in their deliberations.
7. Review the details on the form to make sure that you are content.
8. Hit the button marked 'Cast your vote'.
9. You will then be taken to a message thanking you for your vote. **Only once you have seen this page can you be sure that your vote has been accepted.** We will follow up by email subsequently to confirm receipt. You may now logout of the DPC website or continue browsing as appropriate.
10. If you have any difficulties casting your vote, please contact us by email to [william@dpconline.org](mailto:william@dpconline.org)

The screenshot shows the top portion of the polling card. It starts with a security code verification step. Below that, there's a section titled 'Select the project which you believe best exemplifies the innovation and excellence that will ensure our digital memory is accessible tomorrow'. This section contains five radio button options: 'The Memory Project: Time Travel for the Web', 'Web Connectivity: Enabling Access to Online Government Information', 'Plan 5: Preservation Planning Needs Simple', 'The Blue Ribbon: Time For an Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access', and 'Preserving Virtual Things'. Below this is a section for 'Comments for the Winner and Feedback to Runners Up', which includes a text area for comments and a checkbox for 'I want to give permission to the judges to publish my comments'.

This screenshot shows the bottom portion of the polling card. It features a section titled 'Comments for the Judges' which includes a text area for providing feedback and a checkbox for 'I want to give permission to the judges to publish my comments'.

## 5. Shortlist and noted conflicts of interest

- 

- **The MEMENTO Project: Time Travel for the Web**

**Old Dominion University and the Los Alamos National Lab in the United States**

The Memento project, sponsored by the Library of Congress, has proposed, demonstrated, and promoted internationally an approach to integrate the current and past Web in a manner that is fully aligned with the Architecture of the World Wide Web. Memento's approach is based on a straightforward extension of the very widely used 'HTTP' tool that results in a way to navigate seamlessly current versions of web resources as well as prior versions which might be held by Web Archives and or embedded within wikis. Just enter a web address in your browser, set the time slider to a desired date and see the web as it used to be.

For more information see: <http://mementoweb.org/>

*Guidance on voting: The Library of Congress (funder) may not vote for this nomination.*

- **Web Continuity: Ensuring Access to Online Government Information**

**The National Archives UK**

The arrival of a new government – with new ambitions and new structures – could have been very disruptive for citizens trying to navigate the government's extensive web estate, had it not been for the Web Continuity project. The Web Continuity is a solution to broken links on government websites which helps provide access to millions of pages of archived government information and data. So, when a new government comes in with new policies and plans, the links to old pages are not lost. The redirection software enables users who try to a web page that is no longer live to be taken automatically to where the information is held in The UK Government Web Archive. The web archive, dating back to 1997, contains regular snapshots of government websites which are preserved for posterity.

For more information see: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/webarchive/>

*Guidance on voting: The National Archives (nominee) may not vote for this nomination*

- **PLATO 3: Preservation Planning Made Simple**

**Vienna University of Technology and the PLANETS Project**

Experience shows that there is not a single route to preservation: that different solutions have strengths and weaknesses depending on scenarios and institutions. Preservation planning is the process of evaluating potential solutions and specifying a preservation plan for a given set of objects. It is at the heart much digital preservation work but up till recently has been a manual, sometimes ad-hoc process. The planning tool Plato is a Web-based decision support tool that provides a planning process for evaluating actions and specifying plans. It accesses a range of preservation services and integrates a controlled environment for experimentation and measurement. In this way it enables trustworthy, evidence-based preservation planning, with actionable plans that meet the specific needs of an institution, set of objects, and different types of usage. Plato is one of the tools developed by the PLANETS project, now overseen by a new body called the Open PLANETS Foundation.

For more information see: <http://www.ifs.tuwien.ac.at/dp/plato/>

*Guidance on voting: partners of the PLANETS project (nominees) may not vote for this nomination – British Library, National Archives, HATII.*

- **The Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access**

**OCLC on behalf of The Blue Ribbon Task Force**

The Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Digital Preservation and Access was an international, multi-disciplinary group convened to examine the challenge of economically sustainable digital preservation. Ensuring that digital preservation activities are provisioned with sufficient resources to achieve their long-term goals is an essential aspect of securing permanent access to society's scholarly and cultural record. The Task

Force produced two substantial reports that provide a comprehensive examination of the economics of digital preservation, ranging from basic principles like the definition of economic sustainability in a digital preservation context, to practical recommendations for shaping effective economic sustainability strategies for digital preservation.

For more information see: <http://brtf.sdsc.edu/>

*Guidance on voting: partners and funders of the Blue Ribbon Task Force may not vote for this nomination – OCLC (nominee), JISC (funder), DCC (nominee), Library of Congress (funder).*

- **Preserving Virtual Worlds**

**University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign with Rochester Institute of Technology, University of Maryland, Stanford University and Linden Lab**

Virtual worlds, video games, digital fiction, and other interactive media represent important aspects of the design and creativity of the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century's cultural heritage. They are highly complex so are at high risk of loss because the technologies on which they are based rapidly become obsolete. Indeed the gaming industry is hooked on new releases: it's how the market is structured and the result is a systematic obsolescence of previous releases. The Preserving Virtual Worlds project has explored methods for preserving representative case sets for this important class of digital materials as part of the Library of Congress's National Digital Infrastructure and Preservation Program. Major activities have included developing basic standards for description and representation and conducting a series of archiving case studies for early video games, electronic literature and Second Life, an interactive multiplayer virtual world.

For more information see: <http://pvw.illinois.edu/pvw/>

*Guidance on voting: The Library of Congress (funder) may not vote for this project.*

## 6. Electorate and Designated Contacts in Member Agencies

The following organisations are eligible to vote in Digital Preservation Award 2010:

| Agency  | Membership          | Designated contact      |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Archaeology Data Service  | Associate           | Jen Mitcham             |
| Archives and Records Association (formerly Society of Archivists)               | Associate           | Sarah Higgins           |
| BBC   | Associate           | Helen Wallenda          |
| British Library   | Full Member         | Adam Farquhar           |
| British Library Preservation Advisory Centre                                    | Allied Organisation | Caroline Peach          |
| Cambridge University Library  | Full Member         | Patricia Killiard       |
| Centre for E-Research, King's College London                                    | Associate Member    | Sheila Anderson         |
| Council for Museums Library and Archives  | Full Member         | Katie Pekacar           |
| Creative Scotland (Formerly the Scottish Arts Council)                          | Full Member         | Kate Wallace            |
| Digital Curation Centre   | Full Member         | Kevin Ashley            |
| English Heritage  | Associate Member    | Mike Evans              |
| Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute, University of Glasgow | Associate Member    | Ann Gow                 |
| Joint Information Systems Committee   | Full Member         | Neil Grindley           |
| Inter- University Consortium for Political and Social Research                  | Allied Organization | Nancy McGovern          |
| Library of Congress (National Digital Infrastructure and Preservation Program)  | Allied Organization | Martha Anderson         |
| National Archives   | Full Member         | Tim Gollins             |
| National Archives of Scotland   | Full Member         | B Longmore / L Mitchell |
| National Library of Australia   | Allied Organization | Colin Webb              |
| National Library of Scotland  | Full Member         | Cate Newton             |
| National Library of Wales   | Associate Member    | Sally McInnes           |
| Natural History Museum  | Associate Member    | Polly Parry             |
| OCLC  | Associate Member    | John McColl             |

|  |                  |                    |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| Open University                          | Associate Member | Nicky Whitsted     |
| Oxford Archaeology                       | Associate Member | Chris Puttick      |
| Oxford University Libraries              | Full Member      | Richard Ovenden    |
| Parliamentary Archives                   | Associate Member | Adrian Brown       |
| Portico                                  | Associate Member | Eileen Fenton      |
| Public Record Office of Northern Ireland | Full Member      | Patricia Kernaghan |
| Publishers Licensing Society             | Associate Member | David Bishop       |
| Research Councils UK                     | Full Member      | Paul Gemmill       |
| Research Information Network             | Associate Member | Stephane Goldstein |
| Research Libraries UK                    | Full Member      | Mike Mertens       |
| St Andrews University                    | Associate Member | Birgit Plietzsch   |
| SWISH – RCAHMS / RCAHMW                  | Associate Member | Kirsty Lingstadt   |
| Tate                                     | Associate Member | Kate Sloss         |
| Trinity College Dublin                   | Associate Member | Tim Keefe          |
| UK Data Archive                          | Associate Member | Matthew Woollard   |
| University of London Computer Centre     | Full Member      | Richard Davis      |
| Wellcome Library                         | Associate Member | Dave Thompson      |

Personal members are not listed here but are entitled to vote.