

This project was made possible in part by the
Institute of Museum and Library Services LG-73-15-0133-15



Software Preservation Network: Implementation Pathways

Coalition for Networked Information
San Antonio, Texas
April 4-5, 2016

Jessica Meyerson - UT Austin
<j.meyerson@austin.utexas.edu>
Zach Vowell - Cal Poly University
<zvowell@calpoly.edu>

Origin and Scope

- SAA 2014 presentation
- Archival discourse dates back to early 1980s
- IMLS application, summer 2015

IN SCOPE

Proprietary

Executable

Microcomputing

OUT OF SCOPE

Research software

Source code

Games

Research - SPN Study (Methods)

- Lack of empirical evidence demonstrating the need for software preservation
- CalPoly IRB Approved

METHODS

Survey - 23 questions including informed consent; no required questions; “Other” option provided for every question

Semi-structured interviews

RECRUITMENT

Listserves relevant to museums, libraries, archives, curation, digital preservation, preservation administration

Social media

Research - SPN Study (Prelim Findings)

- Type of Organization:
 - 22% Other
 - 19% University Library
- Position:
 - 43% Archivist
 - 15% Information Technologist

Research - SPN Study (Prelim Findings)

- Role:
 - 52% Permanent, Full time (with supervisory responsibilities)
- Avg. yrs experience working with digital materials
 - 46% More than 10yrs
- Level of preparedness to work with legacy software
 - 30% “well prepared”

Research - SPN Study (Prelim Findings)

- 32% IMPORTANT to collect legacy software
- Challenges for V/EaaS deployment
 - 35% “Other”
 - 27% “Staff resources”
- Challenging content types:
 - 19% Other

Research - Legal

- Berkman Center for Internet and Society (Harvard Law Clinic)
- Experience in both software licensing and digital preservation
- SPN defines the problem space - BC researches the case law

Research - Legal

- Copyright
- DMCA anti-circumvention
- Existing software agreements (think EULA)
- Trademark dilution
- Patent issues
- Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA)

Research - Legal

Key Questions:

- Is Fair Use enough?
- Ideal licensing framework for cultural heritage
- Outside of copyright: EULAs
- SPN's matchmaking role

Stakeholders

University of Freiburg
(bwFLA)

Yale University

Rhizome.org

Emulation

Stanford

Internet Archive

NSRL

Computer History
Museum

Collection

SSI

CAD/BIM Task Force

UNESCO-PERSIST

Rosenthal

Broader Initiatives

SPN Core Components

**Legal
Framework**

Collection

Technical Infrastructure

**Access
Preservation**

Potential Implementation Pathways

- Where does the “stuff” live?
- How do end users access the material?
- Who/Where is the organizational home?
- How is the “stuff” preserved?
- Who is responsible for rights management?
- How do people discover the “stuff”?
- What do partners contribute?
- What is the explicit role of SPN?

Potential Implementation Pathways

	STEWARD	MATCHMAKER	BROKER
Where is the software stored?	MetaArchive Private LOCKSS Network (PLN)	Project partner institutions	HathiTrust
How/What do partners contribute?	Support for an Educopia Program Manager; software; descriptive and technical metadata; rights metadata for centralized rights management	Support for Educopia Program Manager; descriptive and technical metadata; rights metadata for centralized rights management	Support for either a HathiTrust Program Manager or a Program Manager hired by an alternative organizational home; software; descriptive and technical metadata; rights metadata for centralized rights management
How do end users access?	Project partner institutions	Project partner institutions	Software “access cache” through project partner institutions via SPN’s HSaaS API

Request for Feedback

- Initial thoughts & concerns
- Is there any missing from this model - what questions are unanswered here?
- Any thoughts on current scope - ways that the same model or pathways might be expanded to address the needs of research software?
- Where does the university library or university IT sit in relationship to legal counsel? Is there a fair use advocate at your institution?
- Is your institution involved in consortial relationships that cover some aspect of each of these components (ex. Hathi Trust and rights management, etc.)?
- How to make the business case? What aspects of this model speak directly or indirectly to current administrative initiatives?
- What additional evidence or proof-of-concept would you need to see before you provided executive sponsorship for participation in SPN?