Publication Plan: 2009-2011

1. Introduction

The Digital Preservation Coalition (DPC) is a not-for-profit membership organisation whose primary objective is to raise awareness of the importance of the preservation of digital material and the attendant strategic, cultural and technological issues. Its vision is to make our digital memory accessible tomorrow.

This publication plan is a roadmap for DPC publications for the period (2009-11) and should be read as a supplement to the strategic plan. It specifies the values associated with DPC publications and then identifies six principal cycles of publication that the DPC will produce over the duration of the plan. For each type of publication the plan identifies ‘who, what where, when and why’ and provides basic quality criteria and impact measures. Some deviation from this plan is inevitable but the principles the plan lays out should remain.

This plan is principally concerned with ‘published’ outputs from the DPC and does not include other types of communications such as email, presentations and such. It is not a ‘web strategy’ (for which see ‘background’ and ‘objectives’ in the recent Invitation to Tender for a new website) but it assumes the existence and maintenance of the DPC website, and it assumes that the website will extend and add value to the publication processes that are described here. The values expressed here are (or should be) generic to all DPC communications, and they should also inform publications from joint endeavours with partners, or publications which seek DPC endorsement.

The DPC will communicate in six cycles: daily, monthly, quarterly, yearly, and three-yearly. In addition we will take such ad hoc opportunities as are afforded us and are consistent with our mission.

2. Our values: the measure of our publications

The values which underpin all of the DPC’s activities are expressed in the strategic plan. All DPC Publications, joint publications with partners, or publications which seek DPC endorsement should embody these values and articulate them implicitly or explicitly as the context permits. In everything we do, the DPC will:

- Operate as a neutral body.
- Embrace a consultative, innovative and open approach.
- Engage in a collaborative manner with all stakeholders to comprehend and respond to their needs.
- Maintain sound stewardship of the Coalition’s resources.
- Share best practice and knowledge transfer with our members to support their local priorities.
- Maintain vendor neutrality.
- Support developments of standards and generic approaches to digital preservation.

To ensure this happens all publications that emanate from the DPC or which carry DPC endorsement must meet each of the following criteria. All DPC publications should:

- Be informed, current, concise and balanced
- Lower the barriers to participation in digital preservation
- Be derived from the needs of the membership and deliver benefit to members
- Be consistent with the mission of the Coalition
3. Daily communications: Twitter feed

**Purpose:** to demonstrate momentum, to improve transparency, to create adhoc opportunities for participation

**Product:** Twitter feed carried on the DPC website and syndicated elsewhere identifying and inviting comment on ‘what the director is doing today’. Topics will be selected from the daily task list – not exhaustive. Necessarily short and direct.

**Audience:** members and non members, practitioners, DP and related, visitors to the website

**Who is responsible?**: Executive Director with occasional assistance (see Considerations below)

**Geography:** Intended audience is mainly UK-based, but in principle anywhere with a web or twitter connection

**Medium:** entirely electronic

**Distribution:** immediate

**Longevity:** updated every 24 hours, and current for about 7 days.

**Quality criteria:** brevity, currency, frequency, relevancy

**Impact measures:** number and appropriateness of ‘followers’, increase in page downloads, number of re-tweets

**Considerations:** there should be a facility for this feed to be kept up to date when the Director is on leave or otherwise reasonably unable to supply the feed.

**Roadmap:** initiated 14th April 2009

4. Monthly: What’s New (2.0)

**Purpose:** to provide concise and up to date news of developments of interest to members and to improve communication between members

**Product:** ‘What’s new in digital preservation’ updated monthly with short articles about new tools products or forthcoming events, a focus section with a member interview and an editorial from the Director (or invited)

**Audience:** members and non members, practitioners, DP and related, visitors to the website

**Who is responsible?**: Executive Director responsible for managing to production. Content production outsourced in partnership with DCC and NLA, editorial from the DPC director.

**Geography:** Intended audience is mainly UK-based, but of necessity it will describe material from around the world and will be available for syndication to other agencies (in particular PADI)

**Medium:** entirely digital, delivered by email and on DPC website and extracts syndicated through partners. Available for printing as a PDF.
Distribution: members receive one week in advance

Longevity: updated every month and current for up to 3 months

Quality criteria: currency, frequency, relevancy, clarity of expression, conformance with house style, conformance with design principles

Impact measures: increase in page downloads, contacts between members, adoption and evaluation of tools

Considerations: This publication supplants the current DPC ‘What’s new’ which is produced quarterly by Najla Semple. It is proposed that this alerting service evolves to incorporate the DCC’s equivalent monthly bulletin, but with added content to provide a ‘human voice’ specifically the editorial and member interview. What’s new is currently produced in association with NLA and so a final decision on the product must also respond their requirements and expectations. It is proposed that the DPC continues to hire a contractor to provide content but on a more regular cycle, that this content is merged with the DCC’s newsletter and that a copy editor checks content against house style before distribution.

Roadmap: Initiated as soon as discussions with partners are completed and contracts negotiated. Transition to new DPC website November 2009 will simplify production process.

5. Quarterly Publications: Technology Watch

Purpose: to provide authoritative support and foresight to those engaged with digital preservation or having to tackle digital preservation problems for the first time. These publications will support members work forces, to identify disseminate and discuss best practice and lower the barriers to participation in digital preservation.

Product: ‘Technology watch reports’, aiming for 3 per year which analyse a particular topic of pertinent to digital preservation and present evaluation of workable solutions, review the potential of emerging solutions or posit solutions that might be appropriate. These reports will be commissioned by the DPC from leaders-in-the-field and will be peer-reviewed prior to publication. Each report will include a 'key message' précis of not more than 50 words and explicitly identify its target audience.

Audience: members and non members; commercial and public; repository managers, librarians and archivists charged with long term support of digital data; principal officers of public authorities that are required to retain digital data; chief information officers of IPO in the public and private sector; those who teach and train information scientists; policy advisors requiring an advanced introduction to specific DP issues; researchers developing DP solutions.

Who is responsible?: Executive Director is responsible for commissioning authors and managing to completion. Authors are principally responsible for content of the reports. The Board will approve the roadmap and thematic areas in consultation with membership. Copy editing and design to be outsourced.

Geography: Intended audience is worldwide English-speaking community. Principal audiences are in the UK, Europe, Australia New Zealand, USA, Canada.

Medium: delivered on the DPC website and extracts emailed to members. Available for printing as a PDF, and expected to be printed out for use.

Distribution: DPC members receive preview one month in advance

Longevity: these reports will not be actively updated. While it is recognised that they will be superseded by developments in the field of digital preservation, they are intended to have a currency of at least three years, and are expected to remain current for five or more years.
**Quality criteria:** approval of peer reviewers, extensibility of topic, reference to previous work, clarity of expression, conformance with house style, conformance with design principles

**Impact measures:** number of downloads, citation, commentary and discussion, community approval, invitations to republish or review, use in teaching and training materials, citation in policy development, adoption of proposed solutions

**Considerations:** The ‘Technology Watch Reports’ are intended as the ‘blue ribbon’ publications for which the DPC will become known. They will be authoritative, concise and address mainstream concerns. There will be a close correspondence between these reports and the DPC events schedule.

They will be developed with active collaboration of the DCC and others to ensure clarity of purpose and audience when compared with cognate publications (such as the DCC Curation manual). Specifically these reports are designed for managers who administer digital preservation facilities such as archives, repositories or libraries. They receive data from producers and make data available to consumer but are not necessarily data producers or consumers. This specificity in audiences leaves considerable scope for parallel texts to be written for data producers or consumers.

Although planned as ‘quarterly publications’, we will produce 3 technology watch reports per year which are likely to be released at somewhat irregular intervals. The DPC Annual Report constitutes the ‘4th publication’ within this quarterly cycle.

**Roadmap:** Two reports were commissioned in Jan 2009 and are due for imminent release. A third has been approved but not yet fully commissioned. The board and membership is invited to comment on the attached ‘roadmap’. Nominations are sought for topics that have been ‘overlooked’, for authors or reviewers. Note also that within certain constraints the timetable is also variable. The table includes priority additions which will be progressed as the opportunity arises but which are not included in the current programme of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Proposed Commission</th>
<th>Proposed Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserving Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>Guy McGarva, University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>01/ 2009</td>
<td>06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Formats: making informed decisions</td>
<td>Malcolm Todd, TNA</td>
<td>01/ 2009</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Archiving for web archivists</td>
<td>Ioan Isaac-Richardson</td>
<td>07/2009</td>
<td>12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-cancellation access for E-journals</td>
<td>Adam Rusbridge, University of Edinburgh</td>
<td>01/2010</td>
<td>01/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving Email</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>04/ 2010</td>
<td>10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Art</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>01/ 2011</td>
<td>06/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving pictures and sound</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>04/ 2011</td>
<td>10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant properties</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>07/ 2011</td>
<td>11/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation metadata (update to report 05/01)</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and certification for digital preservation</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massive scale data (update to report 04/03)</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual property rights for preservation</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing obsolete hardware</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data protection and digital preservation</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital preservation for Fol officers</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository software (update to 04/02)</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer games</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving 3 dimensions and VR</td>
<td>Tbc– priority addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Annual Report: the brochure**

**Purpose:** to fulfil the regulatory requirements of a limited company, to act as an eye catching approachable advocacy document about the coalition and to highlight members achievements throughout the preceding 12 months.

**Product:** Glossy, full colour report containing introduction from the chair, overview of activities, accounts, account of AGM, and highlights report from each member and associate.

**Audience:** members and non members, public and private, prospective members, senior decision makers in organisations facing DP challenges, opinion formers, policy makers, conference attendees

**Who is responsible?:** Executive Director with contributions from chair, members, auditors and Admin Manager

**Geography:** Intended audience is mainly UK-based with some spread especially to designated overseas partners and EU policy makers

**Medium:** mainly paper with online version also available. Approximately 500 copies

**Distribution:** immediate and universal

**Longevity:** updated every year and current for about a year

**Quality criteria:** design, clarity of writing, timeliness, legal competence, presence of report from each member and associate

**Impact measures:** numbers picked up at conference, legal requirements discharged, no demand for ‘other’ literature

**Considerations:** This can be time consuming to produce

**Roadmap:** initiated 23rd July 2002. Next issue due 26th November 2009

7. **Tri-annual publication: the handbook**

**Purpose:** to provide an extended, comprehensive and digestible account of digital preservation for the information management community

**Product:** Either a digital preservation ‘text book’ or edition of the online Digital Preservation Handbook. Focus will be on preservation specific issues – some overlap with production and use are to be expected but are not to dominate.

**Audience:** information management professionals, teachers and students, those dealing with digital preservation.

**Who is responsible?:** A working party of the board will be convened to progress this action, establish parameter and then act as an editorial board. The publications will include case studies from members and also from Maggie Jones and Neil Beagrie as appropriate. It may be appropriate to approach a publisher with a view to co-publishing.
**Geography:** Intended audience is worldwide, though principally in the English speaking world

**Medium:** mainly paper with online version also available.

**Distribution:** immediate and universal. If on paper expected to retail as text book or subsidised small print run.

**Longevity:** Expected to be superseded by developments but no specific refreshment cycle. Likely to last 5 years, editorial board to review options 3 years after publication

**Quality criteria:** clarity of writing, comprehensiveness, pertinence of case studies

**Impact measures:** units sold, citation, quotation

**Considerations:** This is the next generation of the existing and popular ‘digital preservation’ handbook.

**Roadmap:** Working party to meet before November 2009
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