

## Workshop #3 Summary

**When:** September 17-21, 2002

**Where:** Crowne Plaza Beverly Hills, Los Angeles, CA, USA

**Attendees:** Paul Berkman, Justine Bizzochi, Jean-François Blanchette, Marta Braun, Martine Cardin, Michèle Cloonan, Henry Daniel, Luciana Duranti, Terry Eastwood, Phil Eppard, Sharon Farb, Arianna Franceschini, Tahra Fung, Jonathan Furner, Anne Gilliland, Yvette Hackett, Babak Hamidzadeh, Ken Hannigan, P.C. Hariharan, Peggy Heger, Hans Hofman, Sally Hubbard, Glen Isaac, Rick Kopak, Andrea Lam, Tracey Lauriault, Brent Lee, Michael Longton, Randall Luckow, Richard Marciano, Enrica Massella, Reagan Moore, Jean-Pascal Morghese, Michael Murphy, Vivek Navale, Isabella Orefice, Eun Park, J.S. Piché, Andrew Rodger, Shelby Sanett, Andrew Schloss, Leon Stout, Jim Suderman, Ciaran Trace, James Turner, Bill Underwood

### Workshop Objectives:

1. Discuss methodologies, outcomes, schedules, team members and specific activities of the Focus Task Forces as they relate to case studies
2. Discuss specific activities, responsibilities and methodologies of the Policy and Description Cross-domain research teams
3. Determine the scope of activities for each Focus Task Force
4. Discuss Domain activities to date and define future deadlines

### Summary:

The group evaluated the three InterPARES 1 models and discussed how the models could be integrated to establish an intellectual grounding for Domain and Focus research activities. There was also discussion about project communication and dissemination. Researchers developed a deadline for activities, which would be integrated with future scheduled workshops.

The Focus Task Forces met individually to discuss progress to date. Focus 1 reviewed the three case studies established thus far, while attempting to identify the nature of a record within artistic endeavours. In addition, the group identified subject areas for additional case study research, such as photography, graphic art and moving images. There was also discussion about whether a case study interview protocol was necessary to ensure consistency of methodology or whether there were other ways of ensuring consistency. In addition, several terms were identified for submission to the Terminology Cross-domain.

Focus 2 decided that further discussion was required before the scope of its activities could be defined. The group recognized the need to identify the types of scientific records that could be categorized as interactive, dynamic or experiential before a decision could be made about the types of records the group would focus on. Case studies were reviewed to establish the scope, methodology and timeline of each. Additional subject areas for case study research were identified and several terms were identified for submission to the Terminology Cross-domain.

Focus 3 defined the scope of its activities, noting that InterPARES 2 would focus on characteristics of government records, not transactions, which were the focus of InterPARES 1. It was decided that it would be necessary to define records in this environment, but emphasis was also placed on identifying the process to determine the elements of a record that need to be preserved. Focus 3 will conduct a literature review to determine the exact nature of e-government. The group identified additional subject areas for case study research, and also focused on the need for modeling to encompass the entire records continuum. Terms were identified for submission to the Terminology Cross-domain.

The Domain Task Forces also met separately to discuss their progress to date. Domain 1 discussed the nature of records and how this would be dealt with in the Focus 1 case studies, as well as the need for a comparison of creation processes within each Focus. It was agreed that a definition of “record” would help establish the boundaries for InterPARES 2. In reviewing the research questions for Domain 1, the group noted that case study results alone might not provide all the answers.

Domain 2 tried to define its role and the nature of its relationship to the Terminology Cross-domain. It was acknowledged that the product of this domain would be a scholarly paper, not a model. The group had begun work on a bibliography that defined the concepts of authenticity, accuracy and reliability as they related to InterPARES 2.

Domain 3 discussed the scope of its research activities. A review of the InterPARES 2 research questions determined that case studies had not fully considered preservation issues during development. Discussion of an integrated appraisal and preservation model was tabled until the next workshop.

Researchers in the Description Cross-domain determined that its first task, before explicitly defining its role, was to establish what had already been standardized in the areas of description and metadata, and how creators conceptualized records. Discussion also focused on the “Research Design Discussion” document, and whether the cross-domain needed to address issues such as arrangement or multimedia metadata standards by developing appropriate tools.

In the Policy Cross-domain meeting, the group identified three possible case studies, as well as issues not addressed in the original InterPARES 2 research questions. Benefits of examining systems in various states of completion were acknowledged. The group discussed the membership of this cross-domain, specifically, the possibility of getting more members by drawing researchers from other working groups.

**Next Workshop:**

Workshop #4, Rome, Italy (December 5-7, 2002)