(DPC0709E2)

Publication Plan: Supplementary Comments from Associates

1. Introduction

In June the DPC sent a short consultation document to its associate members seeking comments on a planned publication roadmap for the DPC's series of technology watch reports. This consultation was in advance of a board meeting (in July) which would consider the DPC's publication programme 2009-2010. Because it is proposed to link the Technology Watch Reports to a series of invitational events, this consultation will also be influential in the development of the DPC workplan over that same period.

Responses to the consultation received until 9th July are presented here without commentary. Reader might want to cross-reference with the proposed publication plan (DPC 0709E)

2. Comments from Dave Thompson on behalf of the Wellcome Library

From: Thompson ,Dave [mailto:d.thompson@wellcome.ac.uk]
Sent: 02 July 2009 10:29
To: William Kilbride
Cc: Kiley, Robert
Subject: RE: Consultation re DPC Technology Watch programme

Hi William,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Road Map.

One of the reports that I'd love to see 'updated' is Jones & Beagrie's manual on digital preservation. Indeed a set text, practical and workable. Whilst it's still relevant some of the sections could use an update. I'm aware it has been updated quite recently in terms of reading material. This is a key document that the DPC 'owns' and is a valuable asset. It would be good to create an 'editorial board' who could oversee its update and continued relevance by ensuring that its content was directly relevant to DPC members.

That said I see a possible conflict between what DPC is proposing to publish and the DCC Digital Curation Manual. I'd suggest that the DPC drop science data as a lot of this is already covered by the DCC. I don't believe there is a need to compare notes with the DCC but ensuring that topics aren't duplicated would give the DPC something unique that it could leverage. On this basis I'd drop the proposed report on 'Preserving scientific data' as well as 'Massive scale data'. Audit and certification already seems well catered for and I'd drop this too.

I'm not convinced that 'Digital Art' should be a group 2 activity. This is a highly specialised - if fascinating - field for perhaps too narrow an audience. The requirements are highly technical and often only solved by specialised hardware and/or software. A situation I see as atypical with the majority of the DPC's community.

What's missing? Well, I'd like to see more general papers that tie the technology watch papers to real world scenarios. Perhaps taking the form of more 'how-to-do-it' manuals. E.g how to use PRONOM/Droid for format identification and creating metadata. Whilst very useful the Tech Watch papers can present quite a daunting view of the subject, greater use of real world scenarios and models and workflows that could be applied and followed might make it easier to use them to begin a piece of work.

With a narrow focus on formats and fine detail I see a need also for higher level 'strategic' papers looking at broader issues of direction, architecture and strategy in relation to digital preservation. Something like this could also form a framework within which the Tech Watch papers could sit.
There is also a need for a digital preservation training directory, courses, institutions, etc. At some point the DCC was trying to build a directory of expertise but this seems to have fallen by the wayside.

I’m not sure I have any suggested authors, you might approach Andrew Wilson at the National Archives Australia for Significant properties.

Happy to discuss further,

Regards,

dnt

3. Comments from Adrian Brown, Parliamentary Archives

From: BROWN, Adrian [mailto:BROWNAD@parliament.uk]
Sent: 01 July 2009 11:55
To: William Kilbride
Cc: FERNIE, Kate
Subject: RE: Consultation re DPC Technology Watch programme

Hi William

Many thanks for this - I think it's really useful to see the future plans for these reports. I discussed with Kate, and here are our combined thoughts:

Nominations for authors/reviewers

IPR, FOI and data protection: Andrew Charlesworth (Centre for IT and Law, University of Bristol) or Charles Oppenheim (Loughborough University)
Obsolete hardware: National Museum of Computing at Bletchley Park?
Computer games: Paul Gooding (BBC sport) and/or Melissa Terras (UCL) - wrote recent IJDC article (vol. 2/3)

I'd be happy to review 'web archiving' and 'significant properties'. If required, and depending on timing, I could potentially author the latter, if useful.

Proposals for new topics

We think that it might be useful if DPC were to commission reports on:
- training/skills/key competences for digital preservation & repository managers.
- costs/business models/funding
- an overview - setting up a digital preservation repository in easy steps
- preserving databases
- forensic computing
- preserving e-learning objects

Priorities
- In terms of the timing, it's not clear why Preserving CAD is in group 2, while 'Preserving 3 dimensions and virtual reality' is in group 3. Could these topics be tackled in the same report? Are the audiences different?
- Similarly why are separate reports proposed for 'IPR', 'data protection' and 'Freedom of Information'? Could these be tackled in a single 'DP and the law' report?
- Moving pictures and sound - bearing in mind the comparatively recent AHDS report on this subject, is this one a priority?
- It might be useful to provide a short summary/rationale for each topic, so the intended audience & topics are a bit clearer.
Other comments
We think that the reports that are proposed will be useful. We wonder if all the topics need the same depth of treatment and if there is any scope for (say) 4 long in-depth reports and 4 shorter briefings/updates each year rather than 6 long reports?

We note the need for alignment with the DCC Curation Manual - it would be useful to clearly set out how DPC sees the TW Reports being differentiated from this.

It is good to see updates to earlier reports being built into the programme, but we note that all the updates are in Group 3 (delivered only 'if resources can be found'). Could we ask for resources to be found for at least 1 update each year?

It probably goes without saying that for some of the topics it will be important to cover European/International research... It would also be good to see the international community being included in the peer review process.

We'd suggest that it might be useful to include a longer summary of the key points with the report, at the moment the proposal is for a 50 word precis followed by a 20-40 page report.

I hope this is useful.

Best wishes

Adrian

Adrian Brown
Assistant Clerk of the Records (Preservation & Access)
Parliamentary Archives
Houses of Parliament
London, SW1A 0PW
United Kingdom

4. Comments from Matthew Woolard, UK Data Archive

From: Woollard, Matthew G [mailto:matthew@essex.ac.uk]
Sent: 30 June 2009 15:19
To: William Kilbride
Cc: Deswarte, Richard
Subject: RE: Consultation re DPC Technology Watch programme

Dear William

I've had one response from staff about this, and thought it about time I passed it back to you with some of my comments too.

Of the reports to be commissioned, we were unsure about the level of priority accorded to "Post-cancellation access to E-journal content" though clearly this has link up with Edinburgh's acting as a CLOCKSS delivery host.

Also while audio and "moving pictures" are both time based media, having both of them together might make a report unwieldy. Separating them out (or employing two specialists to work together) may be a good bet.

Amongst the additional reports to be commissioned; the one which probably doesn't need to be done BUT, on the other hand, may have the biggest impact will be the one on Intellectual Property Rights. Given the recent stuff from JISC SCA, this should perhaps be lower down the agenda. Second, DPA and FoI could (possibly) be combined, and also include some more general security theme! Third, sourcing obsolete hardware only really needs a well updated web page (in my 'umble opinion).
Persistent IDs should be considered in the light of the BLs activities in this area. Adam Farquhar is the chap to talk to about this. It should be on the agenda, but may be best to wait a little bit until this is a little more sorted out.

As for computer games. Well, I'm still smarting from the final lines of the comment made in the Guardian almost two years ago: http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2007/jul/12/games.comment !!

Possible additions
- Implementation guide for OAIS/OAIS-lite document (more than just an update to Brian's first version).
- DP and (UK) Local government archives

Anyway there may be more to follow. But this is a start from UKDA!

Cheers

Matthew

Matthew Woollard
email: matthew@essex.ac.uk
phone: +44 1206 873704

5. Comments from Chris Puttick, Oxford Archaeology

From: Chris Puttick [mailto:chris.puttick@thehumanjourney.net]
Sent: 25 June 2009 15:11
To: William Kilbride
Subject: Re: Consultation re DPC Technology Watch programme

Not so much a missing topic but a related "joint" topic that should be covered: GIS along with CAD.

Spatial data projects, generally encompassing both CAD and GIS applications, are problematic; although CAD and GIS each have their specific issues and different closed, undocumented monopoly-driven file formats to contend with, they share a common issue which (from our perspective) remains unresolved from a usability perspective. The issue is that a CAD or GIS file is often only useful if you have the entire project's files/data, which are inter-connected or cross-referenced. It is also common practice to use absolute paths in those links, which break outside of the original network environment they were created in, and it will become common practice to use data feeds as part of the project; indeed potentially all layers of a GIS or CAD project could be sourced from data feeds, a mix of internal and external, with just one user layer on top. Remove the feeds and all context is gone and with it most if not all the meaning.

I have staff I could nominate to write such a paper if nobody else more suitable (read "academic" or "accepted expert") could be found.

6. Comments from Sarah Higgins, Society of Archivists

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Higgins [mailto:Sarah.Higgins@ed.ac.uk]
Sent: 29 June 2009 13:50
To: William Kilbride
Subject: RE: Consultation re DPC Technology Watch programme

William,

Some suggestions...
7. Comments from Joy Davidson, Chris Rusbridge and Sarah Jones, Digital Curation Centre

-----Original Message-----
From: British.editor@erpanet.org [mailto:British.Editor@erpanet.org]
Sent: 09 July 2009 14:35
To: William Kilbride; c.rusbridge@ed.ac.uk
Subject: DCC and DPC Collaboration

Hi William,

Thanks very much for coming along to the DCC F2F we found it very useful to hear about the DPCs plans for the next few months. Unfortunately, Chris wont be able to make the meeting tomorrow but we did spend quite a bit of time discussing how we can progress DPC and DCC cooperation at the Directors meeting following the F2F today. We are very keen to progress cooperation and possible joint branding with the DPC on a number of outputs wherever it works best. Immediate thoughts we had included the DCC and DPC technology watch papers, curation manual, and DPC handbook. We'd be very interested in a meeting again in the near future to flesh out some of the ways in which we can combine our approaches and resources to provide the best coverage for our respective target audiences. Sorry again that the DCC won't be able to make the DPC Board meeting but please feel free to report on our behalf the outcomes of the F2F discussions and hope to be able to meet up with you again soon to progress this further.

Cheers,
Joy

Joy Davidson
DCC Training Coordinator and ERPANET British Editor Humanities Advanced Technology and Information Institute (HATII) George Service House, 11 University Gardens, University of Glasgow Glasgow G12 8QJ Scotland
Tel: +44(0)141 330 3549
Fax: +44(0)141 330 3788
http://www.dcc.ac.uk
http://www.erpanet.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Sarah Jones [mailto:s.jones@hatii.arts.gla.ac.uk]
Sent: 09 July 2009 17:17
To: William Kilbride
Subject: Technology Watch Papers

Hi William,

It was good to see you at the f2f.

The topics you've suggested cover pretty much all bases I could think of. The only other that crossed my mind was interoperability of repositories to avoid data silos and increase accessibility.

I had a couple of ideas for people who may be interested in papers - many are obvious though so I imagine you have these down already:

Preserving email - Maureen Pennock
Preserving CAD - Manjula Patel & Alex Ball from DCC or MacKenzie Smith (MIT)
Digital Art - Perhaps people at HATII / GU like Leo, Perla and Tina Fiske
Moving pictures and sound - Richard Wright
Significant properties - Gareth Knight
Preservation metadata - Michael Day
Audit and certification - Andrew McHugh / David Giaretta
IPR / DP / FoI - Mags McGeever or JISC legal
Computer Games - Mark Guttenbrunner and colleagues (Planets team in Austria)

All the best

Sarah
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