DPC Planning Day - report and outcomes

Kings Manor, York
28th June 2006

The aims and objectives of the day were to:

- Examine DPC Business plan 2006 – 2009
- Discuss the long-term influence of the DPC
- Examine international collaboration and exposure of the DPC
- Discuss recommendations from UKNA and how the DPC can take these forward
- Consider sustainability and membership of the DPC
- Review DPC policy and structure
Ronald Milne welcomed everyone to the event and stressed the importance of the planning day, reminding everyone that this was the members’ chance to have an input into how the DPC is run.

Najla Semple gave an overview of DPC membership, current and future activities and website details such as usage and areas for improvement. She went on to outline the new business plan and described in detail each of the three work packages; delivery of member services; DPC as a centre of expertise; growing the DPC and fostering collaboration.

The Digital Archiving Consultancy gave an overview of international digital preservation activities. They gave an overview of the international context and suggested three possible scenarios for how the DPC can work with the international community; do nothing; set up a DPC Europe especially dedicated to digital preservation. The audience gave some positive feedback on their presentation, and it was suggested that the DPC could act as a bridge between public and private initiatives, both within the UK and internationally. There is a recognition that the DPC cannot carry out its activities entirely in isolation, and needs the support of other bodies. It is the case that there is no international body funded by the EU which concentrates solely on digital preservation. In terms of how the DPC can actively involve itself at an international level, it could develop its training agenda internationally; provide downloadable training sessions and ‘webinars’; streamline the DPC website, and a specific resource which it could build up is an archive of digital preservation strategies. It was concluded that members should inform the DPC on what is happening in Europe and where appropriate where it could be involved.

Neil Beagrie gave an excellent critique of the UK Needs Assessment findings and recommendations. In his suggestion for a more specific ‘Plug the Gap’ version, Neil went through each recommendation in detail, with suggestions for how the DPC could build on them and play a pivotal role. He concluded that the recommendations could be ‘tighter’ and that the DPC and its membership should lead on implementing these recommendations.

Toby Bainton from SCONUL was asked to assist the DPC by suggesting ways in which policy could be improved. SCONUL is a small membership organization that serves a large library community. While the DPC has a different remit than SCONUL the two organisations share similar policy issues. SCONUL currently has 170 members and is now taking on corporate members. Their subscriptions policy has changed and they are now introducing tiered subscriptions. Toby shared the organisation’s risk register with us. The overall theme of the presentation was that good policy is essential for the DPC and that it doesn’t have to be too time-consuming to implement.
Breakout session 1: Role of the DPC in the information environment

Comments on the Business plan:
• WP1: DPC responsibility for following up ‘Plug the Gap’ is crucial. Implementing the recommendations can be strategic and practical.
• WP2: The group supported the DPC as the first port of call to find authoritative information on digital preservation.

How the DPC can contribute to the national digital preservation infrastructure?
• This can be done by co-ordinating ‘Plug the Gap’.
• One particular area to concentrate on is the repository movement; a discussion of the interested parties within the UK and commercial sector could be facilitated.

How to engage the government with the DPC agenda
• There is a need to galvanise the archives community.
• Another area of DPC involvement is with the e-government strategy working group.
• Specific e-government ministers could be approached and the DPC could respond to calls for consultation
• DPC should respond to the Gowers report.
• Long-term strategy for government legislation needed and the DPC could play a role here.

Examine the delivery of DPC resources: role of the DPC website; success of forums
• The DPC needs to continue awareness raising via its website.
• It should be the first port of call for the UK but the resources need to be balanced carefully.
• Do we really want to bring the website in house? Content is more important. Consultation about website needed.
• Fact finding to be done on commercial sector requirements; creative industries.
• Forums should be issues-based e.g. open source
• The website should be as generic as possible and appeal to a wide-range of people

Sustainability of membership: membership fee structure; how can we build on Gill Joy’s marketing report?
• Look into tiering membership fees.
• Fee structure could be reviewed in next 3-year work programme, not in this one.
• An HR consultancy for small businesses could be used for consultancy at policy level

Consider DPC policy issues: how to retain staff; developing a risk register
• There is definitely a need for a risk-register.
• Contribution of 3% staff costs for training is essential.
• Balance of autonomy with appraisal and continuing professional development is needed.

Breakout session 2: Results of UK Needs Assessment

Comments on Business plan
• Discussion focused on web developments: contracting out of development to be for developing a CMS with RSS and other interactive/proactive technologies, using tricks such as directing people to reports via links in emails rather than providing the content in the email (could have content on page plus PDF for download?).
• Web development requirement born out of internal perception but also some feedback regarding difficulty of navigation "easier to use Google!"
• The DPC should gather feedback from site visitors with popup surveys etc.
• The website should have the ability to interact/feedback for members within the members area - and publicise the members area! (this could also enable members to have content add/edit rights, possibly restricting publishing capability to only DPC staff).
• The DPC must also ensure the website is archived (and that future solutions preserve URLs, custom 404s etc.).
• The members' services section needs to be more active in language and proactive in engendering collaboration and funding bids.
• Prioritisation of advocacy/lobbying is needed; taking the message outside of the circle using the members but ensuring efforts coordinated.
• Clarifying the difference between roles of DPC and DCC is needed.
• A coordination of related bodies events is needed, such as shared calendaring function to minimise overlaps etc.

How can the DPC can contribute to the digital preservation training agenda?
• Look for ways of sponsoring places in DPTP.
• Advocacy within JISC funding guidelines of attending relevant training courses, and including the costs in project funding bid.
• Trying to get more digital preservation training into relevant courses as well as specialist courses e.g. library and information management, IT, MIS etc.
• Working with bodies that feed into these courses.
• Finding ways of targeting smaller organisations in regard to training and availability of course materials/tailored courses around digital preservation.

How can the DPC promote standards and tools?
• Case studies from members regarding successes and failures.
• Bringing online materials of models derived from DPTP.
• Some provision of central place to find information - not necessarily creation of material but rather mirroring existing content and giving practical illustrations of usage with the case studies (could possibly cross-link this sort of material e.g. case-studies and information section separated, then link to each other where relevant case study/tool/standard wiki-like).

Involvement of DPC in network of trusted digital repositories
• Looking at ways to be able to certify repositories - mixing peer review with quantifiable standards. The DPC could advise on cost models; suitable personnel; facilitate inspections.
• Probably best to feed into the debate - important it contains some qualitative element to allow flexibility in approaches.
• The DPC could also contribute to the debate on certification and the risk in allowing non-practitioners becoming certifiers.

Involvement with e-Government
• The DPC should contact the new e-government head with regard to potential membership.
• The DPC should build on contacts with new DPC members, e.g. the House of Lords information services.

AOB
• The DPC should consider developing a business case framework/Q&A for others to use in promoting digital preservation in their organization.
• The DPC should act as an honest broker providing information and bringing digital preservation expertise into open source/standards development.

Breakout session 3: International Activities

Comments on Business Plan
• The group felt that this plan is much better focussed than the previous plan, and sets achievable goals.
• The plan needs to articulate an intermediate level between the detail of individual work packages and strategic goals. Following Lynne Brindley reporting on the Board meeting earlier in the day - perhaps it should set out the “Grand Challenges” to be addressed in the next three years, viz:
  ▪ The need for the DPC to be seen to contribute to the planned reviews of significant initiatives such as OAIS standard and the RLG.
  ▪ To address and influence the e-Government process.
• Contribute to the establishment of trusted digital repositories.

• The whole area of digital preservation is in need of consolidation, in the sense that there are many initiatives, proposals, tools and conclusions available over a plethora of sources, but there is no overview or road map available to those new to area. Should the DPC work to provide this overview and clarification?

• Specific milestones need to be set, so that the work packages can be paced in a fashion which provides continuity of effort, avoids last-minute rushes and provides a series of points which can be marked by completion and a sense of achievement.

International Engagements
• It was agreed that the DPC should not lose its practical, UK focus when exploring international engagements.

• International collaborations should only be undertaken when they are purposed, and can lead to benefit for the organisation’s members, An example of an initiative which met these criteria is the relationship with the NLA / PADI.

• “Reverse engineering” by the DPC members should be encouraged (DAC’s question: should this be an obligation of membership?) to provide feedback and leads from their various international contacts/activities to the DPC for the benefit of other members. (DPC: Not clear how this can be done apart from exhortation).

• Interactions at an international level can be virtual (e.g. on-line), thus minimising effort and costs.

• It was felt that language barriers in international collaborations could be overcome with a little effort/

• Training programmes were seen as a good candidate for international collaboration.

• Some budgeting was needed for international work; this could come from setting aside a portion of the existing budget, possibly from EU sources (FP7?) or possibly from foundations such as the likes of the Mellon Foundation and similar.

The national perspective and gaining more influence
• The DPC should and could use the press more, but the general press and the trade press. Ways suggested of facilitating this were:
  ▪ Members be encouraged to donate press contact information they may have.
  ▪ Use the technical press as well as the general press
  ▪ Have a press area on the website
  ▪ Make well known speakers available at events and encourage the press to come and report on them.

• More effort is needed in targeting government members, including ministers. This might be built on the records management agenda in government.
Commercial contacts

- The feeing was that membership should not be made available to individual commercial companies on the vendor side (but perhaps to their trade associations). Feelings are mixed regarding allowing membership by commercial entities who are not vendors but who share the same problems as the existing members.

- Influencing vendors was identified as Grand Challenge number four for the DPC. It was felt that the combined weight of the individual organisations (some of whom are large and/or influential) would facilitate this. Commercial entities not on the vendor side would add to this weight of influence.

Lynne Brindley closed the day with some final comments. She emphasised that the planning day had provided some rich strategic and practical ideas for the DPC. These ideas can build into practical aspects of the work packages. However, there is a need to further refine the Business plan.

She stressed the importance of staff development and training. A DPC risk register is essential, and this is to be presented to the Board in 12 months time.

‘Plug the Gap’ is an excellent term for following on from Mind the Gap. The DPC needs to ensure that progress is being made. Training is essential and the DPC should look into fellowships for training courses.

An overall sentiment was that the DPC shouldn’t lose its focus on UK activities as this is what gives value to its members. Better PR is needed and members should work to raise the profile of the DPC, to act as ambassadors on its behalf. Awareness raising of the digital preservation issue is never finished and that more coverage of the DPC’s activities is needed. The DPC should work to leverage a higher profile. It was also made clear over the course of the day that the website needs richer content.

The combined expertise of the DPC is very special and it is a unique group of cross-sectoral members. Lynne commented on the strong staffing that the DPC has had, both in the past and now. It is now in a new phase, it should feel self-confident and look positively to the future.
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## Overview of the day:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>Introduction – Ronald Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>‘Overview of DPC activities’ – Najla Semple, DPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>‘International activities, moving forward’ – Philip Lord &amp; Alison Macdonald - Digital Archiving Consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lunch -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>‘Results of UK Needs Assessment’ – Neil Beagrie, BL/JISC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>‘SCONUL Policy’ – Toby Bainton, SCONUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>Breakout sessions: 1) Role of DPC  2) UK Needs Assessment 3) International activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coffee -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>Plenary discussion – Lynne Brindley, BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>