Project background: preserving legislative digital records

National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program

Minnesota Historical Society
Issues & challenges

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

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

• MN (ROS, LRL, MHS)
• 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
Process

- Lots and lots of meetings
- Documentation: BaseCamp
- Research
- Re-grants
- Implementation
- Evaluation
Lessons we’re learning

• Change: perpetual beta, budgets, personnel
• “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, charisma
- Local knowledge
- No single model: common problems, but not the same solutions
Practical outcome: incremental improvement

Storage → Preservation

Policies
Standards
Partners
Technologies
Model

Minnesota Historical Society
Progress

• Research and white papers: access, records mgmt, digital audio/video, legislative history, XML usage, mashups, authentication etc.
• Education: handouts, podcasts, NCSL
• Schema
• NCCUSL model law
MHS: next steps

• Integration of non-XML content
• Import and export: web and CDL
• CA and KS
• Automating the process
• Education
• Gap analysis and toolkit
• Evaluation
Partners: next steps

• Education
• Sharing content
• Adapting models
• Gap analysis
• Evaluation
Solution: ongoing process

- Standards
- Migration
- Conversion
- Innovation
- Collaboration

Minnesota Historical Society
More information

• Project website:  
  www.mnhs.org/ndiipp

• Contact:  
  Bob Horton  
  robert.horton@mnhs.org
Policy framework

- Document decision and transactions
- Accountability, transparency, FOI
- Privacy
- Re-engineering government
- Costs
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
"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 (access, transparency, open gov’t)
- Collaboration
Archivists’ role

• Add value, define niche
• Facilitate use and collaboration
• Context and significance
• Web 2.0
• Long term preservation
Conceptual framework

- Access
- Data consultancies
- Guidelines and standards
- Policy and technology
- Outreach, education, promotion
- Larger context
Common ground

- Trustworthy
- Preserved
- Accessible
- Standards based

- NCCUSL: Authentication Model Law