Collaboration to Clarify the Cost of Curation

4C Focus Group at iPRES 2013 in Lisbon, Portugal

Report

Project funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	✓
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Version History

Version	Date	Changed pages / reason	Modified by
0.01	Jan 13 2014	First draft	SS
	Jan 14 2014	Edited	KH
	Mar 07 2014	Edited	KH

Attendees

4C:

- Alex Thirifays, DNA

- Sabine Schrimpf, DNB

- Katarina Haage, DNB

- Diogo Proença, INESC-ID

- Sarah Norris, DPC

- Paul Stokes, Jisc

- Neil Grindley, Jisc

- Raivo Ruusalepp, NLE

Participants:

- Anna Henry, TATE

- Yvonne Fries, ZBW Kiel

- Artur Caetano, INESC-ID

- Kirnn Kaur, British Library (APARSEN)

- Paul Wheatley, University of Leeds

- Catherine Jones, Science + Technology Facilities Council

- Christina Bankhardt, AbbVie

- Sheila Morrissey, Portico

Agenda

Time	What?	Who?
14:00-14:15	Welcome Short introduction of 4C approaches, goal, priorities etc. Short self-introductions	Katarina Haage, DNB Neil Grindley, Jisc
14:15-15:15	Presentation of Focus Group "Game" results Brief introduction of the concept Group discussion in smaller groups about specific questions according the determinants Discussion of the group results in plenum	Raivo Ruusalepp, NLE
15:15-16:15	Presentation of ESRM Brief introduction to the model Introduction of the 4C ESRM self-assessment questionnaire based on the model Discussion on relevance and potential of the model Capture recommendations from the discussion	Neil Grindley, Jisc
16:15-16:30	Wrap up	Sabine Schrimpf, DNB

Participants' motivations to take part and expectations

The participants represented most stakeholder groups that are of interest to the 4C project. From the motivations and expectations expressed in the introductory round, it became clear that motivations ranged from "experience exchange" to "hope to get more clarity on economically relevant concepts" and "hope to find out if [my institution] does preservation in an efficient way".

Indirect Economic Determinants ("IED")

The 4C concept of "Indirect Economic Determinants" was presented by Raivo Ruusalepp (NLE). He explained that the seemingly rather unfamiliar term "IED" was chosen in the attempt to reach out to the higher level managers and decision makers, who are assumedly more familiar with business terms than with DP terms. The intention of 4C is to help them seeing the business case in digital preservation.
Most DP managers will be familiar with the terms "direct costs" and "indirect costs". There are costs, however, that do not easily fit into these 2 categories (e.g., the costs of an audit to become certified as a Trustworthy Digital Archive). These kinds of costs have not been well described yet. The 4C projects sets out to describe them more clearly and calls them IED for that purpose. By working through the list of IEDs, an organization that is tasked with DP can assumedly capture its unique organizational context and thereby get a better understanding of its mission. Ultimately, they are hoped to help determine the benefits of digital curation.

In preparation of the focus group meeting, the participants had been asked to rank the list of IEDs. The combined ranking led to the following order: 1. Risk, 2. Trustworthiness, 3. Benefits, 4. Sustainability, 5. Efficiency, 6. Value.

Break out group discussion on IEDs:

In a break-out session, the participants were roughly sorted into a "memory institutions group" and a "non-memory institutions group". Both groups discussed separately about the IEDs.

The "non-memory institutions group" reported back that they had some difficulties with the IEDs. Some of the IEDs were considered a mere precondition for some organizations and an organization does not have much choice in prioritizing or even selecting from the list of IEDs. The participants raised the question if it cannot even be assumed that the most general, most well understood, terms, will likely always be on top in any organization. The participants also raised the question how the IEDs fit into cost models. Neil Grindley explained that they are supposed to help making business cases as they help to create a narrative around cost modeling.

The "memory institutions group" reported back that they thought it was likely that managers and practitioners will have different views on the importance of the IEDs and that it would help to have scenarios to highlight the conceptual terms. Although this is not in the scope of the 4C project, it was registered as input into the roadmap.

The Economic Sustainability Reference Model (ESRM)

The ESRM was presented by Neil Grindley (Jisc). He explained that different people have, due to different roles, different perspectives on digital assets, their values and the benefits from preserving them. Like the IEDs, the ESRM is mostly targeted to high level managers and decision makers that decide about time and effort spent in digital preservation. Intentionally, the ESRM keeps clear of costs. It is designed more as a managerial tool and shall serve as a tool to make first steps into more detailed cost/benefit considerations.

"ESRM exercise" – interviews along the ESRM appendix between 4C members participants and non-member participants

All ESRM appendices with notes were collected by Neil Grindley for further analysis. In a feedback round, participants reported that they had some difficulties with the questions, and that they found them only "more or less useful" altogether. Specifically, it was mentioned that public organizations have little or no control over some of the issues that the questionnaire touches upon. There should be an answer option: „Not applicable", or „not in our control". Furthermore, the term "issue" was not quite clear to all participants. The whole ESRM document was found rather too long and detailed to be read by the high level managers and decision makers that it is targeted at. It was suggested that this target group would better be served with a 10 pages checklist.

The final recommendation of the participants was that the purpose and the value of completing the ESRSM exercise needs to be made clearer and needs to be pitched by the 4C project.