

Digital Cultural Heritage Roadmap for Preservation

Intermediate version of the Roadmap

Workshop in Tallinn 23-24 April 2014

Comments by

Leif Laaksonen/CSC/e-IRG/RDA
Europe

What is an roadmap?

Wikipedia

- A technology roadmap is a plan that matches short-term and long-term goals with specific technology solutions to help meet those goals.
- It is a plan that applies to a new product or process, or to an emerging technology.
- Developing a roadmap has three major uses.
 - It helps reach a consensus about a set of needs and the technologies required to satisfy those needs;
 - it provides a mechanism to help forecast technology developments and
 - it provides a framework to help plan and coordinate technology developments.

Pragmatic approach

- The DCH-RP roadmap is built on two basic assumptions:
 1. Existing e-Infrastructures for research and academia are efficient channels also for the delivery of advanced services to be used by the digital cultural heritage sector for distributed digital preservation and,
 2. that it will be possible to establish common policies, processes and protocols which will allow digital DCH organisations to access e-Infrastructures, despite the fact that NRENs and NGIs are national entities, sometimes with different policies and procedures for access and usage.

Questions

- Who will pay for the e-Infrastructures in the long run?
 - National, EC, global resources
- Are the European/Global e-Infrastructures available?
 - EUDAT, EGI.eu, OpenAIRE, GEANT, PRACE, National data centers...
- Are there international standards/processes/procedures/agreements available for resource utilization and interoperability across domains available?
 - CODATA, RDA, WDS
- How will the resources be findable/searchable/usable?
 - Persistent identifiers/digital objects

Francine Berman and Vint Cerf

Science, 9 August 2013, vol. 341, p. 616

POLICYFORUM

SCIENCE PRIORITIES

Who Will Pay for Public Access to Research Data?

Francine Berman¹ and Vint Cerf²

On 22 February, the U.S. Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) released a memo calling for public access for publications and data resulting from federally sponsored research grants (1). The memo directed federal agencies with more than \$100 million R&D expenditures to “develop a plan to support increased public access to the results of research funded by the Federal Government.” Perhaps even more succinctly, a subsequent *New York Times* opinion page sported the headline “We Paid for the Research, So Let’s See It” (2). So who pays for data infrastructure?

The OSTP memo requested agencies to provide plans by September 2013 that describe their strategies for providing public access to both research publications and research data. Plans are expected to be implemented using “resources within the existing agency budget,” i.e., no new money should be expected. Currently, federal R&D agen-



Research data of community value are supported today in a variety of ways. Some of them, like those in the Protein Data Bank (PDB) (3)—a database of protein structure information used heavily by the life sciences community—are supported by the public sector. (In particular, U.S. funding from

When economic models and infrastructure are not in place to ensure access and preservation, federally funded research data are “at risk.”

What happens to valuable data when project funding ends? Consider, for example, a 3-year research project in which valuable sensor data are collected from an environmentally sensitive area. Those data may be useful not just for the duration of the project but for the next decade or more to collaborators and a broader community of researchers. For the first 3 years, the costs of stewardship (including development of a database that supports analysis, access to the data for the community through

a portal, adequate storage and management of the data collection, and so on) may be paid for by the grant. But who pays for subsequent support? In such cases, research data may become more valuable just as the economics of stewardship become less viable.

From the roadmap conclusions:

- When summarising the work on the DCH-RP projects road map, so far, the use of e-Infrastructure in meeting these demands looks promising. The two basic assumptions that the DCH-RP roadmap is built on are achievable:
 - existing e-Infrastructures for research and academia are efficient channels also for digital cultural heritage sector to be used for distributed digital preservation
 - it is possible to establish common policies, processes and protocols to allow digital DCH organisations to access e-Infrastructures, despite the fact that NRENs and NGIs are national entities, sometimes with different policies and procedures for access and usage.
- Another important issue is the level of maturity in the DCH sector to handle distributed digital preservation solutions. E-Infrastructures can reach their maximum potential in serving the DCH preservation practice only if the DCH sector is prepared to exploit the opportunities of the e-Infrastructure. This is obviously not the case today.

Research Data Alliance (RDA)

Digital Practices in History and Ethnography IG



The Interest Group for Digital Practices in History and Ethnography will address the data concerns of history as a research domain and those of the ethnographic disciplines (including cultural anthropology, folklore studies, ethnomusicology, interpretive sociology, and science and technology studies). This group proposes to build a medium sized tent (smaller than the whole of the digital humanities or of the social sciences, larger than a particular discipline) to explore strategies and frameworks for the collaborative care and use of research data of diverse t

[READ MORE](#)

Preservation e-Infrastructure IG



Status: Recognised & Endorsed

The aim of the Preservation e-Infrastructure Interest Group is to reach wide agreement on the e-Infrastructure services which are needed to help repositories to preserve their data holdings, to ensure the interoperability of service implementations, and to build trust of service providers.

And back to Finland

- Initiated by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture:
 - The National Research Data Initiative (TTA) of the Ministry of Education and Culture (OKM) builds and funds services for actors in the Finnish research system.
 - One of the currently available TTA services is the centralised research data storage service IDA. The Kata metadata catalogue and AVAA publishing platform will be launched soon. The PAS long-term preservation solution and other services are also under development.
 - The Ministry of Education and Culture has launched the Open Science and Research Initiative 28.2.2014
 - <http://www.tdata.fi/en/tta-frontpage?param=param>

DCH-RP: Digital Cultural Heritage Roadmap for Preservation

- A technology roadmap is a plan that matches short-term and long-term goals with specific technology solutions to help meet those goals.
- It is a plan that applies to a new product or process, or to an emerging technology. YES
- Developing a roadmap has three major uses.
 - It helps reach a consensus about a set of needs and the technologies required to satisfy those needs; Perhaps
 - it provides a mechanism to help forecast technology developments: Perhaps not but does it need to?
 - it provides a framework to help plan and coordinate technology developments. No, not entirely
- It is not fully clear to me if the Roadmap is lead by technology or actual needs/services?
 - The enterprise architect links the business mission, strategy, and processes of an organization to its IT strategy (Wikipedia)