Brief minutes from DPWG meeting June the 11th 2014

**Bold Italic is minutes notes**

**Brief Minutes**

1. Welcome and presentation of the participants
   a. Your name and your institution or company
      • Euan Cochrane University of Yale
      • Eric James University of Yale
      • Linda Newman University of Cincinnati
      • Carl Wilson OPF
      • Chris Awre University of Hull
   b. Expectations for this meeting
      • Digital Preservation Manager
      • Head of Digital Collections and Repositories
      • APTrust, Digital Preservation Network (DPN), tools, preservation events
      • Improving digital preservation tools
   c. Head of Information Management
      • Has a repository (Hydra head).
      • Not yet started with long term preservation.
   d. Anders Sparre Conrad The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Denmark (National Library and University library) (KBDK)
      • Placed in the general IT infrastructure department.
      • Project manager for the Hydra project at KBDK
   e. Claus Jensen, KBDK
      • Digital preservation specialist and generalist in the department of Digital Preservation.
   f. Christen Hedegaard, KBDK
      • Project manager in the department of Digital Preservation
      • Chair for DPWG

2. Discussion of focus/charter for this working group
   a. See Introduction and Charter for DPWG.
      • Went through the introduction and Anders supplied with following questions raised on the Power Steering Meeting in April 2014:
        • Does Hydra want to present itself as a preservation platform (Fedora and Islandora do)
        • If yes, then what do we mean when talking about Digital Preservation?
        • What’s the best practice for integration of preservation tools for Hydra applications
        • Is it possible to get synergy through a collaboration between Hydra and OPF
      • Chris pointed out that we should not work on the same task as the working group "Hydra for archivist".
        • We will need a clarification of the work area for the two Hydra work group
   b. An example of a preservation use case in a a Hydra context.
      i. KBDK use case
         • Claus briefly presented how KBDK have integrated Digital Preservation in their Hydra implementation as an introduction to the discussion of the following areas of interest in Digital Preservation.
   c. Examples of interest areas of digital preservation
      i. Policy and strategy
         1. LOC analyse
            • There was a general interest in this area.
      ii. Cost
         1. 4C
            • This area is very interesting but also a very challenging area.
            • Euan supplied with the following links to cost models that he had used with success
               • CNI/CDL Cost model
               • Princeton Cost Model
      iii. Technical Watch
         1. Format, tools...
      iv. Preservation planning
         1. Plato
            • There was a discussion of the purpose of preservation planning.
            • As stated by the Plato team the purpose is: “The mission of preservation planning is to ensure authentic future access for a specific set of objects and designated communities by defining the actions needed to preserve it.”
            • Carl noticed that it was not an easy tool to use. but it makes you think about your digital preservation material.
            • There was some interest.
      v. Preservation tools (Characterisation, validation, normalization....)
         1. COPTR
            • COPTR describes tools useful for long-term preservation and is a initiative of four preservation communities: DCC, DCE, NDSA and OPF.
            • Even though COPTR describes more than 370 preservation tools and is a great imitative, Carl would like more structure to the wiki page.
            • Great interest in this area.
   vi. Metadata
1. PREMIS
   a. PREMIS at KBDK
2. METS
   • Of course there was a lengthy discussion about the use of metadata and how the various standards such as PREMIS is implemented on individual institution.
   • University of Yale is also using PREMIS, but suggested to agree on a common way to use it.
   • Carl suggested that we should define a best practice for the use of PREMIS although larger institutions will surely define their own best practices.
   • Metadata is an area of interest for this group
3. Packing format for storage
   1. Package Formats for Preserved Digital Material (page 54)
      • Not a major issue
      • University of Yale plans to use Bagit.
4. Digital preservation based on risk management
   1. Level of bit safety
   2. Level of confidentiality
   3. Level of functional/logical strategy (migration, emulation, technical)
      • Everyone agreed that long-term digital preservation is a matter of risk management.
      • How many copies, geographical distance and so on
      • Also you have to consider the risk appetite of confidential data.
      • What risk are you willing to take for them to be published.
      • Desired level of confidentiality is often contrary to the desired level of bit safety. (Lots of copies: High level of bit safety, but the consequence is lower level of confidentiality)
      • Also an area of interest.
5. Retrieval of preserved material (resource and metadata)
   • Not a major issue
   • KBDK differentiate between full restore (resource+metadata) and import (only resource).
6. Preservation monitoring
   • Carl: Try to look at Scout which is a preservation watch system developed by the SCAPE project and can be used for monitoring your preserved content
7. Other (please specify)
   • It was suggested to take a closer look at standards for trusted digital repositories, such as TRAC (ISO standard) and Drambora.
8. Examples of cooperation with preservation community
   i. Open Planets Foundation
   ii. Digital Preservation Coalition
   iii. NDIIP
   iv. NDSA
   v. Other (Please specify)
      • It was agreed to start with OPF
      • Carl (OPF) suggested to create requirements for our preservation needs
      • OPF will then offer testing facility to ensure that the quality and performance of the Hydra implementation
      • Yale has received a grant to do a requirement analysis for their digital preservation needs, due in August.
9. Agree on focus area/charter for this working group
   • Although there is a lot of areas of interest it was decided to focus on integrating preservation tools in the Hydra environment
   • Integration could be wrapping of tools or other ways to help the Hydra community to make use of the preservation tools.
   • OPF can help testing framework/infrastructure (corpora), for example with signature files
   • To ensure that we don’t integrate already integrated/wrapped tools we need a list of integrated tools.
   • Action: Anders and Chris will ask for such a list in the next partner call.
   • Carl and Anders: focus on practical implementation of one or a few tools
   • All the other areas as discussed in the above are still of interest, but will not be the focus area for the next period.
   • We agreed to exchange knowledge and experience using this wiki page.
10. Define and agree on tasks for 2014
    a. Who will do what at what time?
    • Next Partner call (Anders and Chris): Ask for a list of tools already integrated into the Hydra environment
    • Writing on the Hydra-tech/partner list will also be an opportunity.
    • All the participants: Prioritized list of tools we get from OPF/others that we would like to be integrated/wrapped for use in the Hydra environment.
    • DPWG chair: Make sure that the interested partners in the DPWG gets informed of the above
    • Carl would like to test wrapped tools (one or two) with the OPF test framework
    • All the participants: Insert information about digital preservation requirements and “use cases” from the DPWG participants.
    • Chair of DPWG: Clarify the working area of the DPWG and the “Hydra for archivists” group
    • Yale offered to share part of their specification for discussion and maybe that would trigger some action?
11. Meeting and communication for DPWG
    a. Face to face meeting (Hydra connect,... ?)
    • We agreed to have the next DPWG meeting at the next Hydra connect meeting
    • A short introduction to the DPWG at the Hydra connect meeting.
    b. Virtual meetings (Skype, ..)
    • Yes if needed we’ll set-up a Skype meeting
    c. Wiki
    • We will use the wiki for knowledge exchange to the Hydra community
    d. Mailing list
    • Use the tech list
    e. Regular reporting on monthly Hydra partner calls
6. Any other items
   - *Yale would like partners for their future work with digital preservation (if they get grant for their digital preservation project)*