Digital Preservation Strategy (DPS) Working Group - Phase Two

Charge

Background: Phase Two

In June 2018, the Direction and Oversight Committee (DOC) drafted a charge for the Digital Preservation Strategy (DPS) Working Group - Phase One to begin developing a practical, shared vision of digital preservation for library content using a phased approach. The group formally launched in late 2018 and included representation from nine campuses plus the California Digital Library. In April 2019, the group issued its report to DOC, and in June 2019, its chair, Edson Smith (UCLA) presented the report to a joint gathering of the Council of University Librarians and DOC. See: UC Digital Preservation Strategy Working Group: Phase One Report, April 10, 2019 ("Phase One Report").

The Phase One Report focused on three primary areas:

- A snapshot of twelve external digital preservation service providers, including organizational models, architectural approaches, and technical services;
- A high-level overview of current practices for bit-level digital preservation, based on the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) reference model; and
- Results from interviews with representatives from the ten UC campuses and CDL, including background information on current and planned digital preservation systems and activities.

Importantly, in their interviews with representatives from the campuses, the Phase One Working Group surfaced the following observations:

- For the majority of UC libraries, there is no digital preservation unit or staff with ongoing digital preservation responsibilities. Where staff with expertise do exist, they typically have other primary responsibilities and only engage in digital preservation activities on a project basis.
- Lack of campus resources (staff, financial, information) is a hurdle to integrating ongoing best practices; funding for preservation efforts is uneven and in some instances, non-existent.
- A need and desire exists for defined digital preservation policies, workflows, guidance, training and collaborative action.

The findings of phase one, particularly as they relate to the needs of the campuses for policies, local workflow development, education and collaborative action, provides a solid foundation by which to move forward with phase two. Additionally, for purposes of collective strategic planning, the Council of University Librarians requests that the phase two working group undertake an exercise to identify content types in need of digital preservation and common to the majority of campuses and that, by extension, hold potential for collaborative action.

Approach, Goals and Activities: Phase Two
Similar to phase one, the phase two approach should be practical, guided by the recognition that cost (both staffing and budget dollars) is a primary factor in local campus decision-making related to the adoption of preservation activities.

The overarching desired outcome for phase two is to inform a path for collective action related to the digital preservation of content types common to the majority of campuses. In doing so phase two also seeks to: 1) continue building a community of digital preservation practice across the UC Libraries, 2) provide ongoing opportunities for collaboration and expertise development, and 3) identify areas where policies or guidelines are needed and, if possible, create draft policies or guidelines to help kickstart a conversation with appropriate groups. Guidelines may assist individual campuses in defining and achieving their desired digital preservation/ stewardship level.

The phase two working group charge is largely about starting a conversation around our shared vision for digital preservation. The group should be mindful that the likely charge for the phase 3 working group will be to create a shared vision and roadmap for UC-wide digital preservation.

Through engagement with a full array of stakeholders, the overarching work of phase two will be to:

- Develop a high-level taxonomy of content types and associated preservation requirements. Identify those content types that are common to the majority of UC libraries and that hold potential to be managed at a collective level, e.g., through policy, shared expertise, storage, etc. For the identified common content type(s), develop an estimate of the amount of content (e.g., TB, files) held by each of the ten UC libraries + CDL, and identify approximate cost ranges for specific types of preservation. If possible, describe cost areas in some level of detail (e.g. infrastructure, staffing, incremental storage costs). It is understood that this inventory will serve as a snapshot in time.

- Begin to identify areas where best practices, shared policies, and guidance related to digital preservation activities are needed, with the understanding that the bulk of the work involved in documentation will likely be completed in the next phase of the project.

- Provide opportunities for skilled library staff to provide input and share expertise in assessment of local practices, workflow development, and approaches to content appraisal and selection for preservation decision-making.

- Build awareness within the UC Libraries of digital preservation issues.

DOC members are available for consultation and to provide support in identifying local stakeholders and project resources.

**Timeline**

Work should commence by November 2019, with planned activities launched early 2020. A report of intended activities should be provided to DOC by February 2020. A report on the progress of the planned activities, and the recommendations pertaining to common content types should be delivered to DOC by May 2020. The DPS Working Group chair will present a report on phase two to CoUL and DOC via Zoom at a CoUL meeting (date TBD). DPS Working Group members are invited to meet with the DOC liaison or DOC steering committee as often as desired or necessary.
**Membership**

John Chodacki, CDL  
Mary Elings, UCB  
Salwa Ismail, UCB  
Greg Janée, UCSB  
Eric Lopatin, CDL  
Charlie Macquarie, UCSF  
Kevin Miller, UCD  
Erik Mitchell (CoUL Liaison), UCSD  
Shira Peltzman, UCLA  
Adrian Petrisor, UCI  
Chrissy Rissmeyer, UCSB  
Sibyl Schafer, UCSD  
Edson Smith (Chair, Phase One), UCLA  
Roger Smith, UCSD  
Sarah Troy (DOC Liaison), UCSC

All campuses, regardless of representation on the working group, will be asked to participate in community building activities, educational workshops and/or calls for response from the working group on draft guidelines and policies.

The DPSWG chair will call meetings, set meeting agendas, direct the work of the DPSWG and work with the DPSWG to ensure documentation is complete, timelines are set and the charge is met. The chair will be approved by DOC.

**Reporting Line**

The DPS Working Group – Phase Two is charged by, and will report to, the Direction & Oversight Committee. One DOC representative will be assigned the role of liaison to the working group and will provide oversight and guidance as needed.