

Lessons from Repository Assessments with DRAMBORA

Raivo Ruusalepp
National Archives of the Netherlands /
Estonian Business Archives

British Academy
October 1st, 2008


Pilot Assessments



The NATIONAL ARCHIVES of SCOTLAND



nationaal archief



Pilot Assessments

- Archives
 - National archives, netarchive
- Libraries
 - National libraries, university libraries, e-print collections and institutional repositories
- Data centres
 - Social science, physics, geographical data, university computer centre
- Museums
 - Ars Electronica, Ethnocosmology

Repository Profiles

- To allow comparisons between peer organisations, profiles of repository types need to be developed
- An attempt at a typical digital library risk profile included in the DELOS report “Investigation of the potential application of the DRAMBORA toolkit in the context of digital libraries to support the assessment of the repository aspects of digital libraries”
- Support for peer comparisons should be built into the DRAMBORA Interactive system

Assessment Methodology

- The workflow and stages of the assessment are understandable, and have become more user-friendly in the on-line tool
- Flexibility in defining the scope and steps of the assessment is valued by users
- We have underestimated the time that is required to complete some stages of the assessment – depends on the ‘preparedness’ of the organisation

Risk Assessment

- Risk appears to be an easily understood concept for repositories
- We have had many discussions with users about the risk impact and probability scores and scales, and have modified them slightly
- Any risk assessment leaves some room for interpretation – keep the purpose of the assessment in mind
- We have no fixed benchmark on the number of risks or their severity

Risk Assessment

- 80 or so example risks to prompt thinking... insufficient
- *DRAMBORA Interactive* enables repositories to align their objectives, activities, strengths and shortcomings with other peer repositories' responses
- This will ultimately be collated as a series of repository profiles encapsulating key roles, responsibilities, functions and risks

Self-Assessment

- Most of the pilot audits have been facilitated by an expert who has training for DRAMBORA
- Is improvement in 'bottom-up' self assessment limited by one's own horizons?
- How can repositories comment on unanticipated risks? When they are unaware of available opportunities?
- What damage can dishonest auditors do?
- Are comparability and reproducibility of results compromised?

Service Classification

- We want to identify and describe classes of repositories in terms of their common services and characteristics
- Services are critical, with performance understood in terms of those services
- Auditors can space their own efforts within the context of comparable repositories
- They can reflect and inform the perspective of best practice that exists within their own particular 'repository-sphere'.

Trust in Repositories

- Strong link between the organisational context of the repository and its users' expectations
- Different focus on preservation in archives and data centres
- The concept of 'trust' is varying from one user community to another
- Linking 'trust' to services that a repository is offering is more meaningful than to a whole institution or unit within an organisation

Conclusion

- In isolation, or combined with objective guidelines, DRAMBORA offers benefits to repositories both individually and collectively
- DRAMBORA Interactive is offering more than just increased usability
- We need to train audit facilitators and guide the assessment process in the system
- The concept of ‘trust’ in repositories is evolving through this work and discussions with other groups involved in similar work

Your own feedback and suggestions are
very welcome at:

feedback@repositoryaudit.eu

and

www.repositoryaudit.eu