

# **Project background: preserving legislative digital records**

**National Digital Information Infrastructure  
and Preservation Program**

# Today and tomorrow

- 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

# Goals: Mississippi

- Core schema: web presentation and recordkeeping metadata
- Policy issues
- Preservation

# Next steps

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