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Preface

The following is based on a research poster presented at the Society of American Archivists’ Research Forum at the annual meeting and conference in 2012.
Introduction

• Increasingly, archivists, librarians, and technologists are focusing attention and resources on digital curation. Examples include curation of research datasets, establishment of institutional repositories, and providing virtual work spaces for researchers to collaborate and archive their scholarly output.

• Information professionals rely on models such as OAIS and standards such as ISO 16363 for design, audit, and certification of trustworthy digital repositories. Archivists have valuable knowledge, skills and abilities to contribute to digital curation efforts, but they must justify their involvement in these activities in ways that non-archivists can understand in order to be included.
Problem Statement & Objectives

• Archivists are sometimes forgotten in an institution’s digital curation efforts, or added after the initial planning stages. If archivists allow their exclusion from this type of stewardship of unique digital materials, future archival collections and their researchers will suffer.

• Archivists need successful communication strategies to convince stakeholders of the expertise they bring to digital curation. Terms used by archivists to describe their skills may not be understood by librarians and technologists. Mapping traditional archival functions to terms describing digital curation functions will enable communication efforts across disciplines, allowing archivists to demonstrate how their existing knowledge and expertise in managing archival materials contribute towards digital curation and implementing trusted digital repositories.
Methods

Using the functional entities of the OAIS reference model, and the ISO16363 standard, functions were identified for digital curation. Using the 10 Basic Characteristics of Digital Preservation Repositories as a framework, archival functions for analog holdings were mapped to functions for digital curation, listing sample techniques and guiding documents in each category to discern commonalities.

Fig. 1. Functional entities of OAIS reference model
Trusted Repositories vs. Traditional Archival Practice

Introduction to the Comparison Chart

The functions necessary for digital curation for trusted digital repositories are very similar to traditional archives functions informed by archival theory and practice. The chart below addresses characteristics of a trustworthy digital repository and illustrates how each characteristic can be informed by traditional archival theory and practice. These practices are cross walked to the digital curation practices needed for managing born digital collections. In many cases there is overlap. In some cases, emerging best practices and additional documentation are needed to supplement archivists’ practices in managing traditional analog collections. Yet, the basic guiding principles and theory for archives work govern all aspects of trustworthy stewardship, whether the secure repository is a physical vault for storing analog materials or a trusted digital repository.
## Comparison Chart: Trusted Digital Repositories, Archival Practice & Digital Curation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Preservation reformatting; archival holdings maintenance</td>
<td>Normalization, migration; checksums/fixity checks; DOIs; metadata (technical, preservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational fitness</td>
<td>Mission statement; qualified staff; adequate resources, authority, support; identification of core customers or communities</td>
<td>Mission statement; qualified staff, adequate resources, authority, support; identification of core customers or communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights</td>
<td>Deeds of gift; research usage agreements; rights information included in finding aid</td>
<td>Deeds of gift or submission/ingest agreements, including research usage guidelines; rights and usage information included in metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy framework</td>
<td>Planning and policy documents: mission statement; strategic planning goals and objectives; collection development policy; access and use policy; reproduction policy</td>
<td>Planning and policy documents: mission statement; strategic plan goals and objectives; collection development policy; access and use policy; reproduction policy; digital preservation policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires/ingests based on criteria</td>
<td>Collecting policy; deed of gift; accessioning procedures, accession number/unique identifier, physical control (location), intellectual control (content description, documentation of provenance)</td>
<td>Collecting policy; deed of gift or submission agreement; accessioning procedures, virus checks, accession number/unique identifier, physical control (location of media or virtual file location), intellectual control (content description, documentation of provenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity, authenticity, usability over time</td>
<td>Deed of gift and accessioning documents; appraisal process; usability and preservation of materials assessed during accessioning and processing; notation of obsolete formats or critical preservation challenges requiring action; usage metrics can inform continuing value (reappraisal)</td>
<td>Deed of gift or submission agreement; accessioning worksheet; virus checks; checksums; unique identifiers; capture provenance metadata; ongoing fixity checks; normalization/migration; audit trails/change history captured in metadata; usage metrics can inform continuing value (reappraisal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metadata about actions taken, access support, usage contexts</strong></td>
<td>Collection documentation including processing notes, deed of gift, donor correspondence, accessioning documents, condition reports, &amp; finding aids document actions taken during preservation, accessioning, processing; access support &amp; usage processes documented in finding aid and/or use policies; commitment to access stated as part of mission.</td>
<td>Processing notes; submission agreement; accessioning documents; audit trails/change histories metadata; digital preservation policy documents commitment and challenges to long-term preservation, level of commitment over time specified; reappraisal of content; deaccessioned objects are documented; DOIs; commitment to access stated as part of mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination</strong></td>
<td>Materials used in secure environment (reading room) according to usage policy; rights information in finding aid; reproduction policy clarifies dissemination; related materials listed in finding aid; citation information in finding aid.</td>
<td>Materials used in secure digital environment according to usage policy; rights information in metadata; reproduction policy clarifies dissemination; links provided between related objects in metadata; repository enabled for harvesting by other repositories and aggregators; citation information in metadata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program for preservation</strong></td>
<td>Roles, responsibilities for preservation specified (structure, staffing, budget); preservation assessment during accessioning, processing; stabilization, reformatting, and/or restoration completed as feasible; usage metrics and collecting priorities used in future reappraisal; decisions documented; emergency response plan.</td>
<td>Roles, responsibilities for preservation specified in organizational structure (structure, staffing, budget); accessioning and processing workflows include identification and verification of file formats and virus checks; technology watch; regular fixity checks; preservation metadata; audit trails/change history; usage metrics and collecting priorities used in future reappraisal; decisions documented; emergency response plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical infrastructure for maintenance, security</strong></td>
<td>Access policies, limited access to collection storage areas; security and preservation monitoring; archival holdings maintenance; emergency response plan; some collections may be reproduced and stored in multiple locations (for example, separation of analog masters from digital or microfilm copies)</td>
<td>Access policies, limited access/dark archive for master objects with separate storage for access copies; ongoing fixity checks; audit trails/change history; firewalls; virus checks; emergency response plan; redundancy (LOCKSS) with geographic distribution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

The actions necessary to building, implementing, and managing trusted digital repositories are very similar to traditional archival practices and are informed by both archival theory and practice. For traditional analog materials and digital materials, it is critical to have an infrastructure that includes guiding documents such as mission statements, collecting policies, and use policies. Adequate staffing and other resources are needed to ensure sustainability. Mapping traditional archival functions to functions for digital curation illustrates the ways archivists’ existing knowledge, skills, and abilities can be used to inform the processes needed in managing digital collections. Just as importantly, mapping these functions allows archivists to justify to librarians, technologists, administrators and other stakeholders the role archivists can and should play in digital curation and managing trusted digital repositories.
Conclusion

Archivists have led digital curation and preservation efforts for as long as computers have been used, to manage and preserve information of long-term value. Unfortunately, the groundbreaking work of archivists in digital preservation and data curation is not always recognized outside the archives profession. By using common terminology, and understanding how digital curation functions expand upon traditional archival functions, archivists can communicate with confidence the role they play and the value they bring to digital curation activities and creation of trustworthy digital repositories. The need for institutions to demonstrate trustworthiness offers opportunities for archivists to communicate specific ways they can contribute to meeting the ISO 16363 standard for digital repositories. Based on the functional mapping results, archivists are particularly well-suited to creation of policies and procedures relating to appraisal, accessioning, and preservation, including security and emergency plans, all critical components of trustworthy repositories.

• Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories; CCSDS 652.0-M-1; Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems: Washington, DC, 2011.

• Reference Model for an Open Archival Information System (OAIS); CCSDS 650.0-B-1; Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems: Washington, DC, 2002.
INTRODUCTION

Increasingly, archivists, librarians, and technologists are focusing attention and resources on digital curation. Examples include curation of datasets, establishment of institutional repositories, and providing virtual work spaces for researchers to collaborate and archive their scholarly output.

Information professionals rely on models such as OAIS and emerging standards such as ISO 16363 for design, audit, and certification of trustworthy digital repositories. Archivists have valuable knowledge, skills, and abilities to contribute to digital curation efforts but they must justify their involvement in these activities in ways that non-archivists can understand in order to be included.

METHODS

Using the functional entities of the OAIS reference model, and the ISO16363 standard, functions were identified for digital curation. Using the 10 Basic Characteristics of Digital Preservation Repositories as a framework, archival functions for analog holdings were mapped to functions for digital curation, listing sample techniques and guiding documents in each category to discern commonalities.

RESULTS

The functions necessary for digital curation for trusted digital repositories are very similar to traditional archives functions informed by archival theory and practice (see Fig. 2). For both traditional analog materials and digital materials, it is critical to have an infrastructure that includes guiding documents such as mission statements, collecting policies and use policies, as well as adequate staffing and other resources to ensure sustainability. New techniques for expanding archival functions into digital curation to address workflow revisions for stewarding digital versus print collections are identified in the chart below in orange font. Mapping traditional archival functions to functions for digital curation illustrates the ways archivists’ existing knowledge, skills, and abilities can be used to justify or inform new processes needed in digital curation.

CONCLUSION

Archivists have led digital preservation efforts for as long as computers have been used to record information of long-term value that archivists must preserve, but the groundbreaking work of archivists in digital preservation and data curation are not always recognized outside the archives profession. By using common terminology, and understanding how digital curation functions expand upon traditional archival functions, archivists can communicate with confidence the role they play and the value they bring to digital curation activities and creation of trustworthy digital repositories. The need for institutions to demonstrate trustworthiness offers opportunities for archivists to communicate specific ways they can contribute to meeting the ISO 16363 standard for digital repositories. Based on the functional mapping results, archivists are particularly well-suited to creation of policies and procedures relating to appraisal, accessioning, and preservation, including security and emergency plans, all critical components of trustworthy repositories.

PROBLEM STATEMENT AND OBJECTIVES

Archivists are sometimes forgotten in an institution’s digital curation efforts, or added after the initial planning stages. If archivists allow their exclusion from stewardship of unique digital materials, future archival collections and their researchers will suffer.

Archivists need successful communication strategies to convince stakeholders of the expertise they bring to digital curation. Terms used by archivists to describe their functions may not be understood by librarians and technologists. Mapping traditional archival functions to terms describing digital curation functions will enable communication efforts across disciplines.
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