ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ELECTRONIC RECORDS ARCHIVES MEETING NO. 2 NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING

MINUTES DAY 2 OF 2 APRIL 06, 2006

In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 92-463, the meeting was open to the public from 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The meeting commenced at 9:22 a.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	
Dr. Daniel Atkins – not present	University of Michigan	
Lewis Bellardo	National Archives and Records Administration	
Laura E. Campbell	Library of Congress	
David Carmicheal	Georgia Archives	
Sharon Dawes	Center for Technology in Government	
Luciana Duranti	University of British Columbia	
Dr. Richard Fennell	Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	
Daniel Greenstein	University of California	
Jerry Handfield	Washington State Archives	
Robert Horton	Minnesota Historical Society	
Dr. Robert E. Kahn	Corp. for National Research Initiatives	
Andy Maltz	Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences	
Richard Pearce-Moses – not present	Digital Government Information	
John T. Phillips	Information Technology Decisions	
Jonathan M. Redgrave	Redgrave Daley Ragan & Wagner LLP	
Adrienne Reagins	National Archives and Records Administration	
David Rencher	Federation of Genealogical Societies	
Mr. Richard L. Testa	U.S. Air Force	
Dr. Ken Thibodeau	National Archives and Records Administration	
Allen Weinstein	National Archives and Records Administration	
Dr. Kelly Woestman	Pittsburgh State University	

1. Discussion on the Subcommittee Strategy and Structure

Ken Thibodeau – Gave an overview of NARA's Virtual Archives Laboratory. NARA set up a prototype between San Diego SuperComputer (SDSC), Georgia Tech, University of Maryland, and NARA. We've won a 2006 award for Internet 2 driving applications. This is excellent acknowledgement in IT world. The purpose of the lab is for emerging technologies research and then knowledge transfer with LMC once technologies have been discovered.

Technology present in the lab includes:

• At NARA: GRID Brick, Apple, Microsoft,

• At MIT: DSPACE

Committee Value:

NARA operates under strict governance. ERA uses Integrated Product Teams (IPT) that brought in people from NARA but no one outside of NARA. They are restricted to current relationships.

Dr. Thibodeau expressed that this committee is the best input we have for getting input from outside community. He got excited with sitting in on subcommittees B and C on the previous day and expressed a strong interest in the input of the committee's finding

Dr. Thibodeau gave a few talking points on the Architecture subcommittee work:

- Don't reinvent the world. We've done a lot of work on this.
- OAIS is worldwide and they've thought through a lot of the problems. For example, Airbus relationship between architecture and archives
- I can get expert from NASA to talk about time to develop standards and checklists for compliance with architecture requirements.

Dawes – She's involved in a NSF project, Digital Research Program. Has NARA thought about workshops to determine research agenda for NARA?

Bellardo – Asked her if she would be interested in leading such a workshop.

Dawes - Yes.

Handfield – At Human Factors Lab, a lot of this is standard research done over last 20 years. Are they reinventing the wheel?

Thibodeau – No, they're focusing on NARA specific problems.

Kahn – There is a synergy between Group B and C. I'd like to get to the bottom of your reinventing the wheel regarding the architecture. Are we doing the right thing then by trying to develop an open architecture model for NARA? Should we stop?

Thibodeau - No, the work that was done should be informed. The OAIS is not an architecture. Because it was a multipurpose development, it's too generic for an archive. It's not specific to an archival institution.

Kahn – Are you afraid Subcommittee A will ignore work that's already being done? Why aren't you saying that about other subcommittees?

Thibodeau – Probably, because they aren't as focused.

Reed – Discussion of A and B may diverge. Architecture must be informed by the services that must be delivered. Should we merge these discussions or ban A?

Testa – Folks are working in a vacuum. Perhaps, we should go mingle A, B, and C in three (3) groups or virtually we can work these on our website –or perhaps two (2) groups should be considered.

Maltz – Part of what we should be doing is take a fresh look, unbiased and perhaps naïve look at what ERA is doing. Do we have the base knowledge to develop on open architecture model? If we won't get detail from A then we'll get it from B and C.

Kahn – What's motivating your concern for A?

Thibodeau – I am compelled to have A move forward.

Carmichael – What I heard is "don't ignore work already done for Group A" and that's all. If we have two (2) groups, let's have A for Architecture and merge B and C.

Kahn – Group B can mingle either way, A or C.

Phillips – We need to be cognizant of work that's been done before. The uniqueness of this group is we're not deep in Records Management, so we can take a fresh look.

Kahn – Someone needs to develop an open architecture for archives. It doesn't exist. If it did, you would have the protocols defined already. Even with LMC, I didn't see an open architecture in what they've reported to the committee.

Bellardo – Communities of interest are emerging to the extent that an open architecture design and a prototype between them would be of tremendous value. The social side is also growing.

Kahn – The social side of the Internet resulted from the users being responsible for taking ownership of the protocols being developed. We're too early for this here. We need to define the protocols then get communities involved to get their input.

Bellardo – How can we move forward?

Maltz – Start with protocols then pick one (1) to develop.

Kahn – We decided on the metadata protocol but there are others. The metadata registry can be developed.

A conversation followed on the value of Subcommittee A.

Dr. Thibodeau and Mr. Bellardo reassured Kahn they want him to proceed with "A" because NARA's constrained by money and governance.

Kahn – If "A" gets even more focused, you may get more concerned.

Kahn asked members if they wished to make a motion for two (2) groups to move forward -1) Architecture, and 2) Service and Utility. The motion was made and was seconded. The committee approved this motion by acclimation.

Kahn asked each group to generate a four (4) page write up of their agenda. He advised that whoever writes the agenda needs to avoid political spin.

Action Item 1: Kahn asked that the Open Architecture Slide be posted to core.gov after removing a parenthetical aside from the middle box.

Kahn then assigned the tasks that each subcommittee would work on during the breakout session.

Assignment: Define a set of (issues/areas) that you know how to deal with – make a mini work plan for 6 months, 9 months and 12 months. Come up with a plan and be able to report back.

Kahn consulted with the committee members and assigned the members to the subcommittees as follows:

COMMITTEE MEMBER SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS ON DAY 2

<u>Name</u>	<u>Subcommittee</u>
Dr. Daniel Atkins	A
Laura E. Campbell	В
David Carmicheal	В
Sharon Dawes	A
Luciana Duranti	В
Dr. Richard Fennell	A
Daniel Greenstein	A
Jerry Handfield	В
Robert Horton	В
Dr. Robert E. Kahn	A
Andy Maltz	A

Name	<u>Subcommittee</u>
Richard Pearce-Moses	В
John T. Phillips	В
Jonathan M. Redgrave	В
Dr. Dan Reed	A
David Rencher	A
Mr. Richard L. Testa	A
Dr. Kelly Woestman	В

2. Subcommittee Reports

Robert Kahn reported on Group A Subcommittee activity:

Kahn reported that yesterday, they simplified the open architecture to three (3) blocks.

Summary: Goals and Objectives

6 months: Identify some components of the open architecture. 12 months: Identify all components of the open architecture. 18 months: End result will be an open architecture document.

Jonathan Redgrave reported on Group B Subcommittee activity:

We discussed the question "What is the role of the Archives of the Future?

Summary: Goals and Objectives

Six (6) months: Create a five (5) – seven (7) page Concept Paper that would provide a functional description of the archives including policy, how NARA should be interacting with users i.e., educators and then come up with technical solutions.

Kahn asked NARA if they want to see this input.

Bellardo - Yes.

Dr. Thibodeau talked about the National Academy of Sciences report and how it lacked detail so yes; he would be interested in this input.

12 months: Drill down to more detail.

3. Wrap-Up

Robert Kahn announced that the next meeting should take place in approximately six (6) months (October/November 2006). Ken Thibodeau announced that the ERA Program is in the market for a Deputy Program Director so please pass resumes for any candidates to him.

4. Action Items: Committee members

Action No.	Description of Action or Request	Assigned to:	Status:
1.	Post the Open Architecture Slide to core.gov but first remove the parenthetical aside from the middle box.	Adrienne Reagins	
2.	Noted during Subcommittee A: Set up two subcommittee folders on core.gov	Adrienne Reagins	
3.	Noted during Subcommittee A: Post the movie industry url to core.gov	Andy Maltz	
4.	Noted during Subcommittee A: Find out if committee may have virtual accounts to the Virtual Archives Laboratory	Ken Thibodeau	
5.	Noted during Subcommittee A: Find out if the Advanced Distributed Learning project information can be made available to the committee.	Robert Kahn	
6.	Noted during Subcommittee A: Post information on NARA's participation in the global registry project to core.gov.	Ken Thibodeau	

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 12:30 p.m.

I herby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.

Adrienne M. Reagins

Secretariat

Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives

Robert Kahn, Ph.D.

Chairman

Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives

These minutes will be formally considered by the Committee at its next meeting, and any corrections or notations will be incorporated in the minutes of that meeting.