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Community Context
digital preservation

technology (how?)

organization (what?)

resources (how much?)
Trusted Digital Repository Model

1. Administrative Responsibility
2. Organizational Viability
3. Financial Sustainability
4. Technological and Procedural Suitability
5. System Security
6. Procedural Accountability (Certification)
OAIS High Level Reference Model
Integrated Digital Preservation Matrix

1. Administrative Responsibility
2. Organizational Viability
3. Financial Sustainability
4. Technological and Procedural Suitability
5. System Security
6. Procedural Accountability (Certification)

Preservation Planning

Descriptive Information
Data Management
Descriptive Information

Ingest
AIP
Archival Storage
AIP
Access
AIP
DIP

Producer
Consumer
Blue Ribbon Task Force on Sustainable Preservation and Access
LIFE Cost Model

\[ L_T = C_T + Aq_T + I_T + M_T + BP_T + CP_T + Ac_T \]

- \( L \) = Complete lifecycle cost over time 0 to T.
- \( C \) = Creation
- \( Aq \) = Acquisition
- \( I \) = Ingest
- \( M \) = Metadata Creation
- \( BP \) = Bit-stream Preservation
- \( CP \) = Content Preservation
- \( Ac \) = Access
TRAC and Related

- TRAC 2007
- DRAMBORA
- nestor
- Ten Principles
- Data Seal of Approval
- ISO 2010
DPM Approach

• What’s happening?
  o Continual DP community and beyond scan
• What’s not?
  o Conduct gap analysis
• What should happen?
  o Build/share compliant models/framework
Revisit 2006 Report

E-Journal Archiving Metes and Bounds: A Survey of the Landscape

by Anne R. Kenney, Richard Entlich, Peter B. Hirtle, Nancy Y. McGovern, and Ellie L. Buckley

September 2006
Reviewed 12 Programs

• CISTI (Canada)
• CLOCKSS
• OCLC ECO
• OhioLINK EJC
• KB e-Depot (Holland)
• kopal/DDB(Germany)

• LANL-RL
• LOCKSS Alliance
• Ontario Scholars Portal
• PANDORA
• Portico
• PubMed Central
Seven Program Indicators

- Explicit mission and necessary mandate
- Necessary rights and responsibilities
- Content coverage
- Minimal set of services
- Access and triggers
- Organizational viability
- Network
### Commitment to Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard or Practice</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>EJC</th>
<th>KB</th>
<th>KOP</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>LANL</th>
<th>NLA</th>
<th>OSP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>PORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAIS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted Digital Repositories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREMIS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAI-PMH</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAI DTD (NLM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Checklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open source software</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open file formats</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproprietary storage media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Responses to question: “Do you follow any of the following standards and best community practices for archiving?” (* = yes; P = plan to within six months)
For Libraries

2006
• Push publishers on archiving
• Transparent about what, how and why
• Join 1+ initiatives – press to meet needs
• Develop registry of archived publications
• Lobby programs to participate in networks

2010
• Systematically address small publishers
For Publishers

2006
- Join 1+ e-journal archiving programs
- Provide adequate information and data
- Extend liberal archiving rights in licenses

2010
- Transparent about what, where, how
For Archiving Programs

2006
• Provide evidence of minimal services (well managed collections)
• Transparent about what and how
• Assure appropriate rights
• Move toward public domain

2010
• Still: Develop interdependent network
Minimal Requirements

Well-managed collection status for all:
• Basic deposit information
• Minimal metadata for content
• Common or *normalized* file formats
• Controlled and known storage of content
• Multiple copies in at least 2 locations

Achieving this is everyone’s concern
Conclusion
Implications: NSF Report Components

• Value – case for use
• Incentives – beneficiaries & owners
• Roles – responsibilities
Implications: NSF Scenarios

- Scholarly discourse
- Research data
- Commercially owned
- Collectively produced
Holistic, Balanced Approach

- Expectations
- Standards
- Practice
- Requirements
- Developments