

Integrated Access Council
May 17, 2004
1:00-2:00pm
SML Room 409

Present: Katie Bauer, Matthew Beacom, Meg Bellinger, Dan Chudnov, Ann Green, Katherine Haskins, Julie Linden, Kenny Marone, Fred Martz, Jack Meyers, Kim Parker, Bobbie Pilette, Tom Saul, Kalee Sprague, David Stern, Joan Swanekamp, Rich Szary, Frank Turner,

Absent: Dale Askey

Guest: Roy Lechich

Meg opened the meeting by introducing Tom Saul and Julie Linden (members who were not present at the first meeting) and Randy Main (note taker).

1. Overview of the Rescue Repository Requirements Task Force – Roy Lechich

Roy opened by giving a brief background of the Rescue Repository. He spoke about the Draft proposal issued in March by Meg, Fred, David Gewirtz and Audrey Novak and read highlights. He also read the charge:

To Develop a systems requirements document that describes the functional requirements for a rescue repository/storage environment for readily supported file format types that will be procured, installed (ITS AM&T), tested and with a first collection selected and ingested by the end of summer 2004. The RR must be functional without major intervention for 36 months.

Roy said that this group focused on the functional requirements of a Rescue Repository. This led to:

1. Intentionally exclude technical considerations that should fall to the implementation team - i.e. systems maintenance, choice of operating systems. They should stay vendor and solution blind and keep the requirements generic.
2. Three main functions the Task Force looked at: ingest, storage backup, retrieval.

Roy said this could be a simple system if you don't need to look at larger preservation concerns. They didn't talk about making this a layered system. They mostly talked about the content, the main target of the system. This is passive data being held for storage, not for searching. The real reason for the system is giving breathing space while looking at a final repository system. We are trying to address media decay (such as CD's and tapes) to get these items saved - functional preservation.

Roy said that the group has met four times since April. The questionnaire is the result of several revisions. For ingest information the number of CD's in a collection and their capacity are important. Roy made a few comments about the questionnaire. Estimated growth of the collection over the next 36 months is a very important factor. Under Ingest Requirements the consensus was to have a detailed log. For Retrieval/Access Roy noted that this system is not

meant to replace the current on-line system. Everyone answering the questionnaire agreed it is to be a “safe haven” and most said data would be retrieved only sometimes. As to the number of people needing access to the collection the average response was 2 to 5 people per collection. As to “showstopper” requirements, only one respondent said to definitely make this system automated.

The members of the task force are Arthur Belanger, Ellen Cordes, Ann Green, Katherine Haskins, Brian Kupiec, Roy Lechich (chair), Derek Merleaux, Audrey Novak, Martha Smalley, and Jennifer Weintraub. Roy said there were 14 to 15 responses which included the task force group (excluding Roy and Audrey) and Carol DeNatale (Art Gallery), Bill Fray (Law), Abe Parrish (Maps), Maggie Powell (Walpole), and Karen Reardon (ELI). Katherine said the questionnaire was well done and easy to use.

80% said that the content is primarily TIFF's. There are some other types too. The question of dynamic web sites did not come up in the Task Force discussions. We would not be able to handle this at this time.

These electronic collections are growing, and we need to make sure that the metadata is also available.

The repository will be located at ITS. Frank asked if there would be an off-site backup located in another city in case something happened in New Haven. Roy replied that the group did not go so far as to look for an off-site backup location. This will be left to the Implementation Team.

David asked if the Rescue Repository could handle websites. Roy said it could only reserve a snapshot of a website, but could not retain the usability of that website. Meg said that the issue of selection for preservation and other policy issues would need to be addressed in the overall planning for digital preservation that will occur over the next 3 years.

Roy mentioned that this is just the beginning of looking at media decay. Kim said we might always need a rescue repository as a holding pen for items that the preservation system is not quite ready for yet. We are looking at this as a collection project – a directory based system.

There is an issue of what do we do if data has already been lost. Roy said that perhaps this goes back to the individual collection to see if it is important enough to try and recapture the lost material.

Roy said the next steps are to compile the questionnaire responses.

Meg said she would send the document to the IAC members for feedback and comment before it was finalized.