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MN NDIIPP project

- Capture, preserve and provide access to “at-risk” digital content from state legislatures
- Test the model in MN
- Determine capacity of other states to adapt the model
- Promote the results through education and outreach
- Connect to national cyberinfrastructure

Minnesota Historical Society
Project partners

- MN (ROS, LRL, MHS)
- CA and KS
- AR, IL, MS, ND, NE, TN, VT
- NCSL
- CDL, Tessella
- Thomson Reuters, Sunlight Foundation
Uniform Law Commission

- NCCUSL
- State commissioners
- Uniform v. model
- Uniform law process: study, drafting comm, reports, approval
- State enactment
UELMA (1)

- Print to digital
- “Official” = digital
- Outcome based
- No specified technologies
- Assignment of roles and responsibilities
UELMA (2)

- Drafting comm members
- What’s covered
- Standards
- Costs
- Uniformity and acceptance
Access

- Reasonably available
- Web sites
- Batch, API, mobile
- Role of private entities: copyright, open government
Authentication

- Trustworthiness
- Presumptions
- Electronic or automatic
- Chain of custody
- Rules of evidence
Preservation

- Long term access and authentication
- Ongoing process
  - migration
  - conversion
  - innovation
  - collaboration
  - sustainability
Lessons we’re learning

• Change: perpetual beta, budgets, personnel, technology
• “Constant partial attention”
• User expectations: preservation = access over time; success = content + functionality
• Access: open content, loosely coupled, specialized needs
Lessons we’re learning (2)

• Collaboration and integration
• Lower costs, lower barriers
• Catalysts: business case, mandate, fiscal, charisma, green
• No single model: common problems, but not common solutions
MN progress/results

• Research and white papers: access, authentication, preservation
• Education: handouts, podcasts, NCSL
• Preservation pilots (CDL, Hathi Trust, Tessella)
• Access pilot (Sunlight)
• Evaluation
Evaluation

• Matrix
• “Case studies”
• Timelines
• Documentation
• Comparison
Matrix: preservation costs

- Annual cost
- Cost per item
- Cost per GB
- Cost of retrieval per item
- Cost of retrieval per GB
- Cost of staff to manage preparation
- Cost of staff to manage retrieval or reconstitution
More information

- www.mnhs.org/ndiipp
- www.digitalpreservation.gov
- www.nccusl.org
- robert.horton@mnhs.org