

Timing (local)	Activity	
09.00 – 09.30	Registration open, tea and coffee provided	
09.30 – 09.40	Welcome to the National Archives of Australia by Rod Butler, A/Director of Preservation	
09.40 – 09.50	Introduction to the Unconference by Robin Wright and Paul Wheatley, DPC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of programming for the morning</li> <li>• Introductory breakout sessions</li> </ul>	
09.50 – 10.30	<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b>  <u>Migrating collections between digital preservation systems</u>            I am interested in discussing experiences with migrating collections between digital preservation systems. Particularly on decisions around what metadata to migrate vs regenerate in the new system. For example, file format identification and technical metadata extraction.</p> <p>Matt Burgess, SLNSW            Discuss</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b>  <u>Digital Preservation teams – the nomads of collecting institutions</u>            Digital Preservation touches every aspect of a digital object’s life cycle – from selection/acquisition/transfer, through to access and use. As such, DP teams have struggled to find their ‘forever homes’ in many organisations – being tossed around from IT to Preservation to special/standalone project teams, often with non-ongoing funding. Various work has been done in the past on this topic. At National Archives, we would like to revisit this work, and benchmark where these teams currently sit in organisations across the GLAM sector and try to work out if there is an ideal of where they <i>should</i> sit. It would be great to kickstart this discussion at the DPC Unconference, to benchmark the ideal location of a DP team, calling on the knowledge and ideas of the local mindhive. The resulting paper will be shared with the Australian DP community.</p> <p>Serena Coates, NAA            Discuss</p>
10.30 – 10.35	<i>Break + move to sessions</i>	
10.35 – 11.15	<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b>  <u>How to process diverse digital collections</u>            We sometimes receive hard drives containing thousands of files across all the main media types – audio, moving image, photographic, manuscript, art &amp; object etc. Interested to learn how others deal with them – from transfer (disk imaging or not?); profiling; appraisal; arrangement; description; reformatting; packaging. What happens to unselected files? What do you do with temporary files, Apple resource forks, system files etc? Could those files possibly be required for (future) emulation?</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b>  <u>Born Digital Categorisation and Activity Measures</u>            A lot of born digital processing work can sit quietly in the background as part of organisational workflows or are still being developed in a truly operational /BAU sense. We are interested in: 1. developing robust and practical categorisation and activity measures for born digital collections, and 2. how to better capture and share reporting data and stories around the work involved in digital archiving activities. This includes examining established measures of categorising and quantifying collection materials (e.g.</p>

Timing (local)	Activity	
	<p>Jeni Wie, AIATSIS Share / Discuss</p>	<p>analogue carrier counting in categories such as “film”, “audio” etc. - quantities digitised and resulting file counts) and extending this to explore how born digital collection materials are categorised and counted for useful activity reporting (e.g. how to adequately categorise and count complex digital materials like “podcasts” and “games”). We’d like to discuss if anyone has seen good examples of this done, or if not, discuss approaches to developing principles on how and what categorisation / activity / measures to capture for born digital materials, and how to best reflect this into robust and meaningful reporting / storymaking.</p> <p>Jaye Weatherburn, NFSA Discuss</p>
11.15 – 11.35	<i>Coffee break and networking</i>	
11.35 – 12.15	<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> Unconference session – bring your themes to discuss on the day!</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> Unconference session – bring your themes to discuss on the day!</p>
12.15 – 12.20	<i>Break + move to sessions</i>	
12.20 – 13.00	<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Digital File Formats: File extensions, recognising research and risk</u> File format identification has always been a key activity in digital preservation. Registries like PRONOM and tools like DROID have been developed to carry out file format identification and are continually being improved through contributions by the international digital preservation community. However, PRONOM is still far from comprehensive, and DROID identifies a large number of formats by extension only, which we know is not a reliable indicator of format.</p> <p>The National Archives of Australia has only recently started analysing formats that are not identified by DROID or other format identification tools like Siegfried. Drawing on the work of other institutions like the US National Archives and Records Administration, we have developed a format risk register and an individual</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Soft skills - learning from software development to build digital preservation capacity</u> After participating in DPC Python study groups I’ve been going down a software rabbit hole, and recently read Marianne Bellotti’s book Kill It With Fire: Manage Aging Computer Systems (and Future Proof Modern Ones). I’d like to share some points from the book which I felt resonated with the work of digital preservation and discuss them (Why the work is hard, building momentum, and where to start). There is no software knowledge required.</p> <p>Susannah Bourke, State Library Victoria Share / Discuss</p>

Timing (local)	Activity			
	<p>format risk template to help us understand to level of risk a particular format may represent. However, this work is resource intensive and the tools available to us to investigate formats are limited, given corporate cyber restrictions on software downloads.</p> <p>We'd like to collaborate and share stories, challenges, achievements in analysing digital file formats, and hear from you about the success, failures and new ideas and approaches in file format identification – where has your research taken you, what tools are you using, and how are you recording the information that you find?</p> <p>James Doig and Jonathan Dennis, NAA Share</p>			
13:00 – 14.00	<i>Break for Lunch</i>			
14.00 – 14.15	<p>Welcome back after lunch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmation of programming for the afternoon</li> </ul>			
14.15 – 15.00	<p><i>Move to sessions</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="400 1196 1495 1644"> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1196 935 1644"> <p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> Unconference session – bring your themes to discuss on the day!</p> </td> <td data-bbox="935 1196 1495 1644"> <p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Determining scope in Digital Preservation advocacy/documentation</u> This topic would be a general discussion around how institutions have determined the scope of their digital preservation programmes, advocacy, documentation or other, and whether other institutions have found value in limiting scope or reach.</p> <p>Jack Wain, Deakin University Library Discuss</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> Unconference session – bring your themes to discuss on the day!</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Determining scope in Digital Preservation advocacy/documentation</u> This topic would be a general discussion around how institutions have determined the scope of their digital preservation programmes, advocacy, documentation or other, and whether other institutions have found value in limiting scope or reach.</p> <p>Jack Wain, Deakin University Library Discuss</p>
<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> Unconference session – bring your themes to discuss on the day!</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Determining scope in Digital Preservation advocacy/documentation</u> This topic would be a general discussion around how institutions have determined the scope of their digital preservation programmes, advocacy, documentation or other, and whether other institutions have found value in limiting scope or reach.</p> <p>Jack Wain, Deakin University Library Discuss</p>			
15.00 – 15.10	<i>Break + move to sessions</i>			
15.10 – 15.55	<table border="1" data-bbox="400 1702 1495 2076"> <tr> <td data-bbox="400 1702 935 2076"> <p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Managing Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) Protocols in digital collections</u> We have recently done some work to capture ICIP metadata in our archival management system and we are currently exploring how we might manage access to digital records with ICIP metadata and cultural restrictions in our digital</p> </td> <td data-bbox="935 1702 1495 2076"> <p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>AI in digital preservation</u> The preparation of metadata templates in order to process legacy digital materials into the digital preservation system often proves to be labour intensive, repetitive and frankly, quite boring. It's what we often refer to as 'donkey work'. The import spreadsheet must have minimum metadata to validate and create records against in our systems, but</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Managing Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) Protocols in digital collections</u> We have recently done some work to capture ICIP metadata in our archival management system and we are currently exploring how we might manage access to digital records with ICIP metadata and cultural restrictions in our digital</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>AI in digital preservation</u> The preparation of metadata templates in order to process legacy digital materials into the digital preservation system often proves to be labour intensive, repetitive and frankly, quite boring. It's what we often refer to as 'donkey work'. The import spreadsheet must have minimum metadata to validate and create records against in our systems, but</p>
<p><b>Plenary room 1 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>Managing Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) Protocols in digital collections</u> We have recently done some work to capture ICIP metadata in our archival management system and we are currently exploring how we might manage access to digital records with ICIP metadata and cultural restrictions in our digital</p>	<p><b>Room 2 (<a href="#">shared notes</a>)</b> <u>AI in digital preservation</u> The preparation of metadata templates in order to process legacy digital materials into the digital preservation system often proves to be labour intensive, repetitive and frankly, quite boring. It's what we often refer to as 'donkey work'. The import spreadsheet must have minimum metadata to validate and create records against in our systems, but</p>			

Timing (local)	Activity	
	<p>preservation system, Preservica. In this session I hope to share where we're up to and discuss how other organisations manage access to digital collections with cultural restrictions.</p> <p>Nathan Andrews, NAA Discuss</p>	<p>unfortunately cannot be directly exported from the extraction process. We have played a little with generative AI in order to do much of metadata transfer for us but have been met with limited success. I am interested to know if anyone has used AI in their digital preservation workflow and to what success. I'd like to know what worked and what hasn't worked and discuss any ideas others may have for incorporating AI in their workflows in the future.</p> <p>Amy Ibbotson, QSA Discuss</p>
15.55 – 16.30	<p>Feedback of actions Wrap up and close</p>	