



*Memory is the human faculty
of retaining and reproducing present
and past thoughts, objects, habits, culture
for future generations independently
from circumstances that provoked them*

DPE members

www.digitalpreservationeurope.eu

digital preservation **Europe**

raising awareness on digital memory preservation challenges



Funded by the European Commission,
Information Society
and Media Directorate General, Luxembourg



Objectives

Two macro objectives:

1. to foster collaboration and synergies among on-going projects and existing initiatives across the ERA [repositories and audit and certification tools]
2. to raise up awareness on digital preservation challenges among different user communities [different level of awareness on the subject and its strategic significance]

Advocacy and Outreach



- Foster awareness of digital preservation among funding agencies
- Promote awareness of innovative practice amongst researchers in archive, library and information sciences departments, computer science and schools of engineering
- Raise awareness among small and medium enterprises across Europe
- Reach out to the Ministries of Culture and Education across Europe
- Establish cooperation with key organisations and projects active in the field



Training

Training and Continuing Professional Development

- Creation of a Trainer and Training Materials Repository
- Coordination Framework for Training and Education
- Co-ordinate and deliver DPE Training Programme

Community building



Participating partners:

“Registration Agreement”

Contributing partners:

“Cooperation agreement”

“Associate partners”

“Repository initiatives”

Register to the DPE community:

www.digitalpreservationeurope.eu/mou

Briefing papers

1. Topic oriented

- Focus on specific concepts (technical/organisational)
- Preliminary introduction
- General language

2. User oriented

- Tailored on the single user category
- Introduction to basic DP challenges and risks
- Questionnaire and list of suggested actions

User-oriented briefing papers

USERS	AUTHORS
Public administrations	Regione Toscana
E-health care infrastructures	ULSS n.8 Asolo + Emilia Romagna Publica Administration
Funding agencies	ACRI + FRD
Broadcasters	PRESTOSPACE + Mediateca Regionale Toscana

Arranged agreements

Cooperation Agreement CASPAR + PLANETS

- a web platform with common services, a calendar of events, a bulletin board, resources
- shared publications
- joint events
- common training calendar and joint courses (NICE meeting)

International Conference

14-15 Dec. 2006 Firenze

- 27 International Speakers
- Around 300 participants
- New synergies started:
 - NRG
 - IFLA-PAC
 - NDIIPP
 - InterPARES
 - CASPAR/PLANETS/ PrestoSpace



*The challenge of accessibility
and preservation*

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
Firenze, 14th - 15th December 2006

Architectures and Value of Competence Centres

Table of content

1. brainstorming section
2. landscape on experience
3. benchmark model

What's Competence



- What does 'competence' mean?*
- Do I really need or miss some competence ?*
- Who is the leader in the sector ?*
- Do I really trust her/him/it ?*
- What's a 'competence centre' ?*
- Does a unique list of competences exist ?*
- What do I expect from such a centre ?*
- Why should I follow its recommendations ?*

What's a competence centre ??

Competence concept is different in different environments/communities.

It's different in terms of measurable parameters, of indicators, in terms of credibility building, in terms of functions or services that might be offered and, of course in terms of sustainability models.

1. Academic and scientific
2. Ministerial
3. Industry
4. International and professional bodies
5. International consortia and projects

EXPERT CENTRE

A centre with experience on specific topics and with activities or projects in the field.

COMPETENCE CENTRE

A centre with experience on specific topics and with activities or projects in the field.

A centre able to produce new expertise and with a **leadership** in the sector.

Not a ‘**ivory tower**’ but a centre integrated in its target community and with a strong credibility. The centre must have a **clear role**, function or provide a service for its community with evident **benefits for users**.

COMPETENCE CENTRE II

Likely, the centre should integrate, as needed, different **competences from other sectors** (technical, legal, economic, managerial, ...) in addition to the background of its community. Experience in the **international context** is supposed to be necessary, e.g., like R&D EC-projects, **events** organisation, participation at work of **standardisation** bodies. Competence centres can be instrumental in paving the way for **interoperability** among user community. The centre must demonstrate capacity of **community building** and **communication** strategies. In particular it should cooperate with other centres in other sectors or countries.

COMPETENCE CENTRE III

Training expertise would be expected/welcome, and it's reasonable, that the centre can establish a cooperation with other centres for **training** programmes.

Some **sustainable models** must be adopted. So we can imagine that both a **funding agent** covers part of the costs and some **revenues** are produced by the centre itself through services sell or affiliation of users.

In order to facilitate the implementation of a sustainable model it seems crucial having a **commitment** by the user community or by the authorities ruling/funding that.

Competence centre ‘de facto’

Some academic centres or cultural institutions or research centres have experience and develop new expertise that distribute to the user community. They are credible and users understand benefits in using the centres services, recommendations or advises.

Competence centre ‘de jure’

Some centres have a mandate from authorities to provide some types of service or guidelines. The user community is ‘obliged’ to follow the recommendations and use the services. Anyhow the centres must be credible and trustable by the users.

Examples of competence centres that have been investigated to identify models

- University and scientific research community
- Ministerial structures
- National structures
- Industry
- Healthcare infrastructures
- International and professional associations
- Standardisation bodies
- EC-funded projects

Models of competence centres

- distributed centres of expertise (e.g., AHDS, CETIS, NESTOR, NDIIPP)
- single research-led institutions with preservation expertise (e.g., HATII, ULCC, UKOLN, CCLRC)
- national libraries, archives or other organisations with preservation expertise (e.g., NLA, BL, LoC, KB, LOUVRE)
- dedicated preservation centres/services and committed centres
(e.g., DPC, INA, ICCU, CNIPA)
- international bodies or consortia, professional associations
(e.g., W3C, DCMI, ICA, IFLA, UNESCO)
- individual projects funded to research digital preservation and provide services
(e.g., DCC, DELOS, PRESTOSPACE)

NETWORK OF EXPERTISE IN LONG-TERM STORAGE AND LONG-TERM AVAILABILITY

Coordinated by the **national library** with the objective of **creating a stable network of expertise** in Germany.

They created a **matrix** with some pre-selected **centres** (criteria for selection are certainly based on excellence but they are not clear and defined) and **competences** on the other dimension.

For each competence a workgroup has been set up and each centre has been invited to participate with the suitable experts: the **workgroups** are responsible for issuing recommendations and mobilising the user community and so they are a sort of '**distributed competence centres**'.

NATIONAL DIGITAL INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE and PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Coordinated by the Library of Congress 100 M\$, with some government agencies and expert entities (e.g., RLG, OCLC). Committed by the **United States Congress**: the goal of the project is the **development of a stable network of competence centres**.

A **scientific committee** defined, after some interviews with operators, a list of '**priorities for projects objectives**' to define **components** of the 'digital preservation infrastructure'.

Eight **lead institutions** proposed some **strategic projects** creating the technical components that enable digital preservation.

NATIONAL LIBRARY of AUSTRALIA

It's quite interesting how they have acquired a diffuse credibility thanks to important projects, like **PADI** and **PANDORA**, with an international prospective. In particular, the production of digital preservation guidelines under commitment by **UNESCO**, and cooperation with IASA have been important. The Library has set up a **IFLA PAC** centre of excellence in digital preservation.

Clear **commitment from national authorities** to lead other libraries with concrete and practical projects.

Probably the most important example of centre even if for some initiatives it's not evident a sustainable model.

International Consortia start normally as spontaneous initiatives and the success is also depending by the importance and strengths of its members. They can influence the user community and the standardisation bodies. Normally the ‘competence centres’ are the members of the consortium.

(e.g., **W3C, DCMI, IIPC, DICOM3**)

International and professional organisations define **policies** and **strategic objectives** for their target community. Normally they are instrumental in provoking some initiatives from the user community and in the process of ‘**credibility building**’ of some centres.

(e.g., UNESCO, IFLA)

A vertical banner with a yellow background and a maroon shape on the left. The letters 'DPC' are written vertically in white on the maroon shape.

DPC



DIGITAL PRESERVATION COALITION

The aim is to secure the preservation of digital resources in the UK and to work with others internationally.

The coalition provides some internal services and **activities** of **common interest** and **benefits** to all its members (e.g., DPC guides and ‘handbooks’). A series of **seminars** and workshops are organised for members training.

Some **collaborative projects** are funded on selected topics. Funding is from national authority and other sponsors.

The coalition has a clear **leader role** at national level and it has developed strong **alliances** with **international entities** or projects (e.g., PADI, NDIIPP, OCLC)



INA

ISTITUTE NATIONAL de l'AUDIOVISUEL

A precise reference point within the Ministerial structure with explicit committed responsibilities for preservation of audio-visual archives and for production of practical recommendations.

Strong credibility both at national and international level.

Participation in many EC-funded research projects and international initiatives.

Reasonable sustainability model, even if the services selling is not completely implemented.

ICCU - CNIPA

Ministerial structures normally implement an internal organisation with some reference centres as competent about specific topics.

ICCU (central institution for unique catalogue) in Italy, that is responsible for maintaining a national expert workgroup on metadata that is authorised to produce recommendations for all the Ministry. **CNIPA** is another important example, it's an agency for adoption of informatics in the public administration sector and three Ministries refers to that agency for technical and organisational recommendations.

Benchmark model C7

BENCHMARK MODEL – C7

- 1. Capacity**
- 2. Context**
- 3. Credibility**
- 4. Commitment**
- 5. Certification**
- 6. Competition**
- 7. Communication**

CAPACITY

The centre must demonstrate the ‘excellence’, having experience and know-how, having resources and expertise to do the work. Participation in international projects and community building initiatives. Experience in offering a service to the user community, organisation of events, training programmes, and the capacity of coordination and cooperation with other centres.

The concept of capacity is now linked to the concept of a ‘service’ or role that the centre can play in the framework of the community world.

CONTEXT

A competence centre must be seen as part of a wider scenario where it plays a role, an information service, training service, coordination service, technical service, but anyhow a very useful service, necessary for the community itself.

Benefits and reasons for the community in 'using' the centre must be very clear and well defined in order to motivate them.

A specificity of this proposed model is that the four elements are not 'independent' but in series order, one criteria after the other. A 'conditio sine qua non' for a practice is that if the practice evaluation fails in one of them, one can't go ahead with the following elements of the benchmark.

Indicators can be qualitative, quantitative or scored and they are instrumental to evaluate user performance against the benchmark model.

CREDIBILITY

Being trustable and reliable both by the authorities and by the user community. In particular for the user community it is very important to feel the centre not only very competent about the topic but also aware of the context of application and of legal-organisational issues, as 'one of the community' and speaking the same language.

The first two elements of the model together specify the concept of a 'trustable service'.

COMMITMENT

A sort of commitment or mandate seems to be necessary both for a matter of authority towards the user community and for a model of financial sustainability. ‘Authority’ here is obviously something different from the concept of ‘credibility’ we spoke above, in this case the user is obliged to refer to that centre, not only because it’s credible.

The mandate can be ‘limited in time and scope’ and must be given, for example, by the country authorities, by professional associations, by international bodies, by the European Commission. The commitment might be also very useful to define some practical business models suitable for a long term sustainability of the centre activity.

The four points together determine the elements of a ‘sustainable service’.

CERTIFICATION

Compliance with international standards is a 'must' nowadays for everybody working in almost all the sectors of our society. Standards are (fortunately) dominating all the domains from professional to personal equipments.

In particular, each member state is responsible for implementing the European Commission recommendations and regulations.

A 'certification flag' can be obtained simply on the base of respect of specific standards, or it can be given by a 'super partes' agency, granting the quality level of the centre. The specification of what standards must be referred is also a way to create a sort of competition among centres.

The first three elements of the model specify the concept of a 'certified service'.

COMPETITION

An environment that encourages competition can benefit all stakeholders. it can also help to ensure that competence centres do not become complacent and that they constantly strive to improve the quality of their services and resources.

Adherence to standards can be a clear and transparent reference to test the performance and policies of competence centres, providing a '*super partes*' reference to stimulate fair competitiveness.

COMMUNICATION

A competence centre must be able to communicate effectively with many different stakeholder communities. They must be able to communicate their user communities' needs and requirements to policy makers and funding bodies and be able to influence change.

..... those needs to commercial vendors software to better meet their user community's requirements.

They must also demonstrate that they are able to disseminate their expertise through outreach and training programmes aimed at a range of levels.

Competence centres must also be able to communicate with other competence centres to ensure that duplication of effort is avoided and to maximise limited resources.

Benchmark indicators

DPE - SUCCESS INDICATORS

	Success overall indicators	Type of the benchmark [qualitative/quantitative]
1	Number of Associated Partners	quantitative
2	Number of cooperation agreements established with other projects, networks and organisations worldwide	quantitative
3	Number of meetings or workshops or training sessions and number of participants	quantitative
4	Number of papers or tutorial presentations or publications or training material	qualitative/quantitative
5	Estimation of the community supporting and adopting the guidelines or recommendations	qualitative/quantitative
6	Re-use of training materials in other training schemes	qualitative
7	Contribution to the standard development for digital repository and certification process	qualitative
8	Number of test-bed implementations of digital repository based on DPE recommendation	quantitative
9	Number of centres and institutions federated in the DPE training framework	quantitative
10	Number of distributed copies of the publications produced by DPE	quantitative

Thanks

Check it out & contribute to DPE:

www.digitalpreservationeurope.eu

lunghi@rinascimento-digitale.it



Fondazione **RINASCIMENTO**
digitale
nuove
tecnologie
per i beni
culturali