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Key ideas of this talk

• For preservation: “Trust, but verify”
• Client usage is important part of verification
  – Example: LOCKSS verification at Penn
• Tests can be planned and carried out for many types of outcomes, systems
• Shared verification efforts sustain shared preservation efforts
Preservation is valued

Figure 3: Percent of faculty rating these library roles as "very important," in 2003 and 2006.
But assurance lags

Figure 22: Faculty answers to "How satisfied would you say you are with the way electronic journals are being preserved for the long term?"
What are we investing in, electronically?

• Electronic materials: > 40% of ARL materials budgets
  – (2005-2006 figures; some libraries reported > 50%)
• Electronic preservation: much smaller investments
  – Local preservation largely special rather than general collections
  – “Preservation in place” delegates preservation to publishers by default
  – Preservation consortia for libraries developing
    » Portico, LOCKSS, Hathi Trust, Preserv…

• Questions library directors have:
  – What are we buying?
  – How much will it cost us? (Not just now, but also in future)
  – How do we know they’ll give us what we need when we need it?
    » Especially when preservation copy not the usage copy
  – What might go wrong?
  – What happens when things go wrong?
• Early reassurances can avert future nasty surprises
Centralized audits

Benefits:

– Can lower redundancy and costs (by outsourcing to experts)
– Can thoroughly vet policy and management (via things like OCLC’s audit checklist)
– “Trusted broker” can evaluate sensitive data (confidential content, finances, etc…)

Limitations:

– Ultimate test of preservation is usage, not audit
– Auditors will not interact with preservation systems in same manners, extents, as actual clients
– Finding, funding appropriate auditor may be problematic
Distributed client auditing

- Measure, record, share externally visible preservation outcomes
  - Through normal usage, and through controlled experiments
- Testing by clients for clients
- Costs can be spread out among clients, targeted and scaled according to client concerns
- Clients need to have appropriate rights to do test
  - Dark archives need to open up appropriate access both for testing and recovery
  - Client testers need to be able to share results (at least among selves)
- Different types of archives may call for different types of tests
  - E.g. centralized third-party archives like Portico vs. distributed self-maintained archives like LOCKSS
An example: LOCKSS

• Install LOCKSS box(es) to preserve journals, other static content you subscribe to
  – If a crawling plugin exists, and the publisher has okayed LOCKSS crawling
  – Content cached on archive disk(s), noted in manifest file
  – Content periodically checked against peers

• If publisher content lost:
  – LOCKSS box takes over delivery

• If locally cached content lost:
  – LOCKSS box “self-repairs” from peers that it’s checked with in the past
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First failure test: Spring 2007

• 80 GB disk filled up
• We backed up our manifest file, then replaced our archive disk with an empty disk
• Most of the archive self-repaired, but not all
  – Most reconstructed from crawls, but not all material was still crawlable (expected, due to publisher site and subscription status changes)
  – Some reconstructed from polling, but some didn’t, or did so unacceptably slowly (not expected; apparently due to protocol changes around the time of the failure test)
• LOCKSS worked with us to expedite repairs, and updated protocol to avoid problem in future
• We planned for another failure test
Support for testing by preservation system crucial

- **Diagnostic tools**
  - Overall summaries of crawl and poll status
  - Drill down to individual archival units

- **Controls**
  - Could decide which archival units to include on box
  - (Might also be useful to have controls for running test scenarios, as with certain programming practices; pulling disks a little drastic)

- **LOCKSS staff willing to work with me and respond to my concerns**
  - Thanks especially to Tom Lipkis

- **Preservation systems need to give enough information, control to let users easily detect when things go wrong, diagnose causes**
  - Trust for trust
Second failure test: Summer 2008

- 250 GB disk filled up; we did another empty disk swap
- Recovery crawls unexpectedly slow
  - And seemed to be oddly reported
  - (and poll-based recovery wouldn’t happen until crawls had been tried or archival units marked as “discontinued”)
- Problems included
  - Runaway recursive crawls
  - Misleading crawl summaries
  - Publisher bottlenecks (crawls still not done as of now)
  - Poll recovery still too slow in some cases (file by file)
- Subsequent daemon releases designed to alleviate many of these problems
- Larger scale made many of these problems manifest
What can be tested by clients

- **Operation**: See if recovery, access, etc., work as expected under controlled or live conditions
  - E.g. failure test, proxy test, versioning/migration tests…
- **Coverage**: See if titles and volumes are present with the coverage and currency we expect
  - E.g. title and volume content scans against library holdings or pub. list
- **Fidelity**: See if contents are what we expect them to be (and in expected formats)
  - E.g. file and metadata sampling with visual cross-check, JHOVE validation; manifest checking if applicable
- **Policy**: See if repository meets its obligations to libraries
  - E.g. check reports based on OCLC’s *Trustworthy Repositories Audit and Certification* checklist; see if checklist items need to be added or expanded
- **Multi-category**: E.g. post-cancellation replacement tests
Investments needed for tests

- **Staff expertise and focus**
  - Know how the systems work, commit to oversight
    » Penn “Lockss/Portico group” supported by admins
  - Know what outcomes to expect, behaviors to watch

- **Staff time for testing and reporting**
  - Devise experiments / measurements
  - Conduct tests, monitor progress
  - Share results with appropriate audiences
  - LOCKSS test time: a few minutes a week to monitor recovery, a few hours total to write up summaries and questions for LOCKSS staff

- **In some cases, special equipment / environment**
  - For LOCKSS test, using the production box not a good idea if scale high, or cache in active use
  - But LOCKSS boxes are commodity items
Efficient, effective community auditing

- Check with archives/projects to see what formal audits have occurred or are planned
  - E.g. from the OCLC checklist
  - And see the reports (if you’re paying an organization to audit, they should let you see the reports, if not full data)

- Plan simple tests for cases of concern not covered in formal audit
  - E.g. failure test, proxy usage, migration assessment

- Share results with community
  - Useful to have well-known location/index of such results

- Work with other coalition members to make sure bases are covered, redundancy minimized
  - Can be a fairly lightweight process, using existing organizations (e.g. CRL, NERL) or user/customer groups for Portico, LOCKSS…
  - Can also involve collaboration to automate more complex tests, monitoring
Moving testing into the community: CRL

• Did audits of Portico, planning more (along with AP, UMI Dissertations, Hathi Trust, other groups)
• Level, focus of audits based on interests of members (who are funding the audit expenses)
• Acting as “trusted broker” (for things like financial reviews)
• Convened small group to consider, plan community auditing
  – Including Penn, CDL, Chicago, Dartmouth, CDL, TRLN…
• Conducted survey of usage and concerns of LOCKSS, Portio users
• Confluence space used to share some results, reports
• Interested in knowing more, participating?
  – See http://www.crl.edu/
  – Or Contact Bernie Reilly (reilly@crl.edu)
Other community focuses?

• Purchasing groups: influence and funding
  – publishers to use preservation backup
  – preservation systems to be adequately tested
  – fund crucial audit, development activities?

• Research support: planning and development
  – Where is testing most effective? What tools, infrastructure can be built to enhance verification and quality assurance?

• Shared knowledge resources: coordinate testing plans and results
  – Simple options: Wiki
  – More complex: Registry
  – Piggyback on WorldCat/union catalog/global metadata network?
    » We’ve done it for digitization and rights info, why not preservation info as well?
Conclusion: Preservation with our eyes open

• We must verify that our digital archiving systems work
  – We’ve invested huge amounts in these electronic materials
  – Diagnose problems before they bite us, improve the systems

• We clients have the resources and expertise to do this
  – Can verify outcomes, not just inputs and practices
  – Can find important results not found in centralized auditing

• We can coordinate to magnify the effectiveness and efficiency of our verification
  – Through consortial organization, shared knowledge resources, influence on publishers and preservation organizations

• First steps: Harness the will to find the way…

• Thanks!
  – My contact address: ockerblo@pobox.upenn.edu
  – Slides: http://works.bepress.com/john_mark_ockerbloom/