

Project background: preserving legislative digital records

**National Digital Information Infrastructure
and Preservation Program**

Today

- Informal
- Review of the issues
- Update on progress and products
- Discussion of next steps

Background: MHS

- ER projects: TIS, ERM, DHS
- XML research
- E-government research
- PAT project
- Collaborations: legislative tapes, records retention schedules, government publications
- Adoption of XML based bill drafting system
- E-legislature project

Assumptions and conclusions

- Collaboration
- Standards
- National cyberinfrastructure
- Rigorous appraisal and ROI: use value of electronic records
- Cultural and institutional change
- Sustainability

NDIIPP program

- National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program
- Library of Congress
- Series of programs
- State studies, states initiatives

Four state grants

- Arizona: LOCKSS implementation
- Minnesota: legislative records
- North Carolina: GIS
- Washington: digital archives

Preservation issues

- COOP, disaster recovery
- Legal framework – records laws, litigation, discovery
- Increased public attention and expectations
- Complexity of systems – email, RMA, web, web 2.0
- Costs
- Lack of a good model

Familiar challenges



Solution: ongoing process

- Standards
- Migration
- Conversion
- Innovation
- Collaboration

Policy framework

- Document decision and transactions
- Accountability, transparency, FOI
- Privacy
- Re-engineering government
- Costs

Legal framework

"The current law is just completely unhelpful. The Legislature has to get to this. ... it'll be messy and quite ungratifying, but it has to be done."

Minneapolis Star-Tribune

13 July 2008

Sustainability: business case

- Appropriate solutions
- Integration into routines
- Priorities – appraisal, scope
- Cost control
- Use value
- Collaboration

Archivists' role

- Add value, define niche
- Facilitate use
- Context
- Web 2.0
- Long term

Conceptual framework

- Access
- Data consultancies
- Guidelines and standards
- Outreach, education, promotion
- Collaboration
- Larger context

Project outcomes

- 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

Project partners

- MN
- CA and KS
- CDL
- NCSL
- AR, IL, MS, ND, NE, TN, VT
- ThomsonReuters, private sector

Partners: unique and appropriate

- Audiences
- Mission
- Priorities
- Initiatives
- Capacity
- Resources

Goals: California

- Core schema
- Authentication (legal framework for preservation and access)
- Accessibility
- Access pilot
- Web harvesting (CDL project)
- Optimal conditions for preservation (content creation standards)

Goals: Kansas

- Core schema: sharing content
- E-democracy: and citizen engagement
- Comprehensive hardware and software solution: collaborative and modular
- Policy issues
- Retrospective digitization: standards
- KEEP

Goals: Vermont

- Core schema: recordkeeping metadata and XML
- Policy issues: authentication, accessibility
- Retrospective digitization: standards
- Preservation vs. storage (disaster recovery, continuity of operations)
- Web harvesting

Next steps

- Review of technology
- Legislature's perspective
- Your interests and environment