

Conference Proceedings

Edited by:
Luciana Duranti and
Elizabeth Shaffer

The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation

An international conference
on permanent access to
digital documentary heritage

Hosted by:



a place of mind
THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

In collaboration with



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Memory of the World
20th Anniversary

26 to 28 SEPTEMBER 2012

Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre



Conference Proceedings

Edited by:
Luciana Duranti and
Elizabeth Shaffer

The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation

An international conference
on permanent access to
digital documentary heritage

26 to 28 SEPTEMBER 2012
Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
Sheraton Vancouver Wall Centre

UNESCO Memory of the World Programme, Knowledge Societies Division

This book of Proceedings includes most of the papers and posters presented at the International Conference “The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation” held on 26–28 September 2012 in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, by the UNESCO Memory of the World Programme, Knowledge Societies Division, and The University of British Columbia in collaboration with the University of Toronto.

The proceedings have been compiled and formatted with minor editing; papers and posters appear as submitted. The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this publication and for the opinions they express, which are not necessarily those of UNESCO and do not commit the Organization.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The organizers of this UNESCO Memory of the World Programme Conference would like to sincerely thank everyone who contributed to the Conference in Vancouver and to these proceedings.

Published by UNESCO 2013, with the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada | Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada (SSHRC) and the International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) Project.



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada



InterPARES Project

International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems

Preface

This publication presents the proceedings of the international conference ‘Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation’ which was held in Vancouver, Canada, from 26 to 28 September 2012.

More than 500 experts and other interested persons from all regions of the world participated in this knowledge-sharing and policy-driving event to discuss and exchange opinions on how to protect the world’s documentary heritage. Although this heritage is the record of knowledge, its physical carriers are extremely vulnerable and can easily disappear without a trace. Whether recorded on a clay tablet or an electronic tablet, our methods of sharing content and knowledge need to be protected.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of documentary heritage in our lives. It governs our actions whether these relate to creating the basis of mutual respect between different civilizations and communities or building knowledge societies. Documentary heritage provides the foundation of peace, our identity and knowledge.

UNESCO’s interest in this subject matter is as fundamental as its constitution with its mandate to contribute to building peace through the spread of knowledge from improved access to printed and published materials. These core materials, our documentary heritage, have been preserved in archives, libraries and museums for generations.

But while measures needed to maintain access to print materials are globally understood, the newer challenges related to preserving digital information are not keeping pace with technological development. The need for dedicated hardware and software, associated with their rapid obsolescence, hamper our ability to keep invaluable content accessible. Unless timely migration to newer technologies, operating systems and software platforms is assured, we face the risk developing digital Alzheimer’s.

UNESCO’s expectation from this Conference was to obtain a better definition of our expected role, and our contribution to setting a global digital agenda. The UNESCO/UBC Vancouver Declaration sets out specific recommendations which we will be implementing and incorporating into our digital strategy. Likewise, we expect that our Member States, professional organizations and private sector bodies will also implement the recommendations addressed to them.

Only through collaborative strategic alliances can we overcome the major challenges threatening the preservation of digital information. We believe that the presentations featured in this publication provide the basis for a global commitment to preserving the memory of our world in this digital age.

Jānis Kārklīņš
Assistant Director-General
for Communication and Information

Contents

Preface	4
Opening Keynotes	
Kenneth Thibodeau <i>Wrestling with Shape-Shifters: Perspectives on Preserving Memory in the Digital Age</i>	15
Luciana Duranti <i>Trust and Conflicting Rights in the Digital Environment.....</i>	24
Anne Thurston <i>Digitization and Preservation: Global Opportunities and Cultural Challenges.....</i>	31
Intellectual Property Infrastructure Initiatives for Digital Heritage	
Heather Christenson and John P. Wilkin <i>Intellectual Property Rights & the HathiTrust Collection.....</i>	39
Elizabeth Townsend Gard <i>The Durationator® Copyright Experiment.....</i>	46
Kate Hennessy <i>The Intangible and the Digital: Participatory Media Production and Local Cultural Property Rights Discourse.....</i>	58
Preservation Infrastructures: Current Models and Potential Alternatives	
Ilaria Pescini and Walter Volpi <i>An Example to Follow: An Infrastructure for Interoperability and Governance in the Tuscan Public System for Digital Preservation</i>	70
Francis G. Mwangi <i>The Road to Providing Access to Kenya’s Information Heritage: Digitization project in the Kenya National Archives and Documentation Service (KNADS)</i>	83
Jeremy York <i>A Preservation Infrastructure Built to Last: Preservation, Community, and HathiTrust.....</i>	92
Hrvoje Stančić, Arian Rajh and Ivor Milošević <i>“Archiving-as-a-Service”: Influence of Cloud Computing on the Archival Theory and Practice.....</i>	108
The CODATA Mission: Preserving Scientific Data for the Future	
Elizabeth Griffin and the CODATA DARTG Team <i>Recovering the Forgettery of the World</i>	127
Patrick C. Caldwell <i>Tide Gauge Data Rescue</i>	134
Stephen Del Greco <i>Environmental Data Through Time: Extending The Climate Record</i>	150
Tracey P. Lauriault and D. R. Fraser Taylor <i>The Map as a Fundamental Source in the Memory of the World.....</i>	160

Preserving Tradition and Performing Arts in Digital Form

Ravi Katikala, Kurt Madsen and Gilberto Mincaye Nenquimo Enqueri

Life at the Edge of the Internet: Preserving the Digital Heritage of Indigenous Cultures..... 190

Lekoko Kenosi

Digital Madness, Archival Theory and the Endangered Sound Archives of Radio Botswana 206

Jørgen Langdalen

Editing Historical Music in the Age of Digitization..... 212

Lauren Sorensen and Tanisha Jones

Developing and Implementing a Digital Video Repository for Legacy Dance Documentation: Dance Heritage Coalition's Secure Media Network..... 217

Beyond Access: Digitization to Preserve Culture

Fernanda Maria Melo Alves, José António Moreira González and José Manuel Matias

Safeguarding of the Portuguese Language Documentary Heritage: The Lusophone Digital Library..... 229

Benoit Ferland et Tristan Müller

Le réseau francophone numérique 236

John Van Oudenaren

The World Digital Library..... 246

Strategies for Building Digital Repositories

Bronwen Sprout and Sarah Romkey

A Persistent Digital Collections Strategy for UBC Library 257

Neil Grindley

Building the Business Case for Digital Preservation..... 269

Kevin Bradley

Requirements of a Remote Repository 278

Digital Forensics for the Preservation of Digital Heritage

Wayne W. Liu

Accountability for Archival Digital Curation in Preserving the Memory of the World..... 288

Christopher A. Lee and Kam Woods

Automated Redaction of Private and Personal Data in Collections: Toward Responsible Stewardship of Digital Heritage..... 298

Corinne Rogers and Jeremy Leighton John

Shared Perspectives, Common Challenges: A History of Digital Forensics & Ancestral Computing for Digital Heritage..... 314

Giving a Permanent Digital Voice to the Silenced

Terry Reilly

For the Children Taken: The Challenge to Truth Commissions in Building digital collections for research and long-term preservation 338

National Strategies as the Foundation of Togetherness

Andris Vilks and Uldis Zariņš

National Planning as the Key for Successful Implementation of Digitization Strategies..... 348

Ivan Chew & Haliza Jailan

Preserving the Crowdsourced Memories of a Nation: The Singapore Memory Project 354

Ernesto C. Bodé

Digital Preservation Policy of The Chamber of Deputies: Methodology for its development..... 366

Web 2.0 Products as Documentary Digital Heritage: Can We Access and Preserve Them?

Jamie Schleser

Unprotected Memory: User-Generated Content and the Unintentional Archive 378

Heather Ryckman

Context 2.0: User Attitudes to the Reliability of Archival Context on the Web 393

Lisa P. Nathan and Elizabeth Shaffer

Preserving Social Media: Opening a Multi-Disciplinary Dialogue..... 410

The Role of Culture in Digitization and Digital Preservation

Fiorella Foscari, Gillian Oliver, Juan Ilerbaig and Kevin Krumrei

Preservation Cultures: Developing a Framework for a Culturally Sensitive Digital Preservation Agenda..... 419

Tukul Sepania Walla Kaiku and Vicky Puipui

Political, Cultural and Professional Challenges for Digitization and Preservation of Government Information in Papua New Guinea: An Overview 431

Xincai Wang and Yunxia Nie

Current Situation, Problems and Prospects of the Digital Preservation of Documentary Heritage in China 439

Open Archival Information System Reference Model: Answer or Inspiration?

Stefano S. Cavaglieri

Digital Archiving Systems Confronted with the OAIS Reference Model..... 451

Saeed Rezaei Sharifabadi, Mansour Tajdaran and Zohreh Rasouli

A Model for Managing Digital Pictures of the National Archives of Iran: Based on the Open Archival Information System Reference Model 457

Collaboration in Digital Preservation or Lack Thereof: What Works

Maria Guercio

Digital Preservation in Europe: Strategic Plans, Research Outputs and Future Implementation. The Weak Role of the Archival Institutions..... 467

Rolf Källman

Models for National Collaboration: Coordination of the Digital Cultural Heritage in Sweden..... 482

Victoria Reich

Building and Preserving Library Digital Collections Through Community Collaboration..... 489

Steve Knight

National Library of New Zealand, Digital Preservation and the Role of UNESCO..... 500

The Economics of Preserving Digital Information

David S. H. Rosenthal, Daniel C. Rosenthal, Ethan L. Miller, Ian F. Adams, Mark W. Storer and Erez Zadok

The Economics of Long-Term Digital Storage 513

Ulla Bøgvad Kejser, Anders Bo Nielsen and Alex Thirifays

Modelling the Costs of Preserving Digital Assets..... 529

L.M. Udaya Prasad Cabral

Economically Easy Method to Digitize Oversized Documents with Special Reference to Ola Leaf Manuscripts in Sri Lanka 540

Patricia Liebetrau

Preserving Our Heritage: An Independent Advantage 549

Is A New Legal Framework Required for Digital Preservation or Will Policy Do?

Tony Sheppard

Is a New Legal Framework Required for Digital Preservation or Will Policy Do? Building a Legal Framework to Facilitate Long-term Preservation of Digital Heritage: A Canadian Perspective 559

Alicia Barnard

Development of Policies and Requirements for Ingesting and Preserving Digital Records Into a Preservation System: Where to start? 570

Jason R. Baron and Simon J. Attfield

Where Light in Darkness Lies: Preservation, Access and Sensemaking Strategies for the Modern Digital Archive 580

Elaine Goh

Strengthening the Regulatory Framework in a Digital Environment: A Review of Archives Legislation 596

Digital Curation: Convergence of Challenges, Institutions and Knowledge

Sarah Higgins

Digital Curation: The Challenge Driving Convergence across Memory Institutions 607

Jackie R. Esposito

Digital Curation: Building an Environment for Success..... 624

Patricia Forget

Célébrations institutionnelles : Événement catalyseur propice à l'implantation d'un projet de conservation du patrimoine numérique permettant de réunir les acteurs d'intérêts divergents 636

Jeannette A. Bastian and Ross Harvey

The Convergence of Cultural Heritage: Practical Experiments and Lessons Learned 650

Digitization and Digital Preservation Experiences in a Developing Country Perspective

Elizabeth F. Watson

The Conservation and Preservation of Heritage in the Caribbean: What Challenges Does Digitization Pose? 661

Richard Marcoux, Laurent Richard and Mamadou Kani Konaté <i>Digital Preservation of Demographic Heritage: Population Censuses and Experiences in Mali and the Democratic Republic of the Congo</i>	672
Brandon Oswald <i>Partnership in Paradise: The Importance of Collaboration for Handling Traditional Cultural Expression Material in the Pacific Islands.....</i>	685
Ensuring That it Won't Happen Again	
Victoria L. Lemieux <i>Financial Records and Their Discontents: Safeguarding the Records of our Financial Systems</i>	700
Myron Groover <i>The White House E-Mail Destruction Scandal of 2007: A Case Study for Digital Heritage.....</i>	713
Kenneth Thibodeau <i>The Perfect Archival Storm: The Transfer of Electronic Records from the G.W. Bush White House to the National Archives of the United States.....</i>	724
Trusting Records	
Lorraine Dong <i>The Ethical and Legal Issues of Historical Mental Health Records as Cultural Heritage</i>	735
Marie Demoulin et Sébastien Soyez <i>L'authenticité, de l'original papier à la copie numérique : Les enjeux juridiques et archivistiques de la numérisation</i>	745
Web Archiving as Part of Building the Documentary Heritage of Our Time	
Liu Hua, Yang Menghui, Zhao Guojun and Feng Huiling <i>Chinese Web Archiving and Statistical Analysis on Chinese Web Archives</i>	765
Gustavo Urbano Navarro <i>Implications of the Web Semantization on the Development of Digital Heritage.....</i>	775
Matt Holden <i>Preserving the Web Archive for Future Generations: Practical Experiments with Emulation and Migration Technologies</i>	783
Technology as the Mediator of Heritage and Its Relations with People	
Ian S. King <i>The Turtle At The Bottom: Reflections on Access and Preservation for Information Artefacts.....</i>	797
Erik Borglund <i>Challenges to Capture the Hybrid Heritage: When Activities Take Place in Both Digital and Non-Digital Environments.....</i>	814
Limited Resources or Expertise: Case Studies in Addressing the Issue	
Jean Bosco Ntungirimana <i>La problématique de la préservation de la mémoire collective au Burundi à l'ère des NTIC : Étude de cas menée à la Cour supreme</i>	823
Farah Al-Sabah <i>Digitizing A Survivor's Identity: The Past, Present, and Future of the Kuwait National Museum Archives.....</i>	838

Wayne W. Torborg, Theresa M. Vann and Columba Stewart	
<i>The Challenges of Manuscript Preservation in the Digital Age</i>	851
Plenary 3 Keynotes	
Dietrich Schüller	
<i>Challenges for the Preservation of Audiovisual Documents: A General Overview</i>	863
International Perspectives and Cooperation	
Claudia Nicolai, Rachele Oriente and Fernando Serván	
<i>One Year of Efforts for Digital Preservation at FAO</i>	871
Peter Burnhill, Françoise Pelle, Pierre Godefroy, Fred Guy, Morag Macgregor and Adam Rusbridge	
<i>Archiving the World's E-Journals: The Keepers Registry as Global Monitor</i>	880
The World Audiovisual Memory: Practical Challenges, Theoretical Solutions?	
Jean Gagnon	
<i>Treasures That Sleep: Film Archives in the Digital Era</i>	892
Caroline Frick	
<i>Seeing, Hearing, and Moving Heritage: Issues and Implications for the World's Audiovisual Memory in the Digital Age</i>	896
Edoardo Ceccuti	
<i>The Digitization of Films and Photos of the Istituto Luce</i>	904
Adam Jansen	
<i>Challenges and Triumphs: Preserving HD Video at the UBC School of Journalism</i>	909
Mick Newnham, Trevor Carter, Greg Moss and Rod Butler	
<i>Digital Disaster Recovery for Audiovisual Collections: Testing the Theory</i>	921
Metadata and Formats for Digitization and Digital Preservation	
Joseph T. Tennis	
<i>Data, Documents, and Memory: A Taxonomy of Sources in Relation to Digital Preservation and Authenticity Metadata</i>	933
Adam Rabinowitz, Maria Esteva and Jessica Trelogan	
<i>Ensuring a Future for the Past: Long-term Preservation Strategies for Digital Archaeological Data</i>	941
Giovanni Michetti and Paola Manoni	
<i>It FITS the Cultural Heritage! Formats for Preservation: From Spatial Data to Cultural Resources</i>	955
Lois Enns and Gurp Badesha	
<i>File Viewers: Examining On-the-Fly File Format Conversion</i>	962
Walter Allasia, Fabrizio Falchi, Francesco Gallo and Carlo Meghini	
<i>Autonomic Preservation of "Access Copies" of Digital Contents</i>	976
A Methodology Framework to Ensure Preservation	
Anca Claudia Prodan	
<i>Bias and Balance in the Preservation of Digital Heritage</i>	989

Giovanni Michetti	
<i>Archives Are Not Trees: Hierarchical Representations in Digital Environment.....</i>	1002
Göran Samuelsson	
<i>The New Information Landscape: The Archivist and Architect – Drawing on a Common Map?.....</i>	1011
Shadrack Katuu	
<i>Enterprise Content Management and Digital Curation Applications: Maturity Model Connections.....</i>	1025
Christopher J. Prom	
<i>Facilitating the Aggregation of Dispersed Personal Archives: A Proposed Functional, Technical, and Business Model.....</i>	1042
Digital Objects as Forensic Evidence	
Carsten Rudolph and Nicolai Kuntze	
<i>Constructing and Evaluating Digital Evidence for Processes.....</i>	1057
Aaron Alva, Scott David and Barbara Endicott-Popovsky	
<i>Forensic Barriers: Legal Implications of Storing and Processing Information in the Cloud.....</i>	1064
Michael Losavio, Deborah Keeling and Michael Lemon	
<i>Models in Collaborative and Distributed Digital Investigation: In the World of Ubiquitous Computing and Communication Systems.....</i>	1079
Fabio Marturana and Simone Tacconi	
<i>Cloud Computing Implications to Digital Forensics: A New Methodology Proposal.....</i>	1093
Andrew F. Hay and Gilbert L. Peterson	
<i>Acquiring OS X File Handles Through Forensic Memory Analysis.....</i>	1102
Institutional and Inter-Organizational Initiatives in Digitization	
Anup Kumar Das	
<i>Digitization of Documentary Heritage Collections in Indic Language: Comparative Study of Five Major Digital Library Initiatives in India.....</i>	1126
Ronald Walker	
<i>Digital Heritage Preservation - Economic Realities and Options.....</i>	1139
S. K. Reilly	
<i>Positioning Libraries in the Digital Preservation Landscape.....</i>	1146
Heidi Rosen, Torsten Johansson, Mikael Andersson and Henrik Johansson	
<i>Experiences from Digidaily: Inter-Agency Mass Digitization of Newspapers in Sweden.....</i>	1153
Preserving Images: What Do We Need to Know?	
Adama Aly Pam	
<i>Chemins de la mémoire : Les archives audiovisuelles au secours de l'identité d'une organisation internationale africaine.....</i>	1163
Krystyna K. Matusiak and Tamara K. Johnston	
<i>Digitization as a Preservation Strategy: Saving and Sharing the American Geographical Society Library's Historic Nitrate Negative Images.....</i>	1173
Jessica Bushey	
<i>Born Digital Images: Creation to Preservation.....</i>	1189

Angelina Altobellis

<i>Essential Skills for Digital Preservation: Addressing the Training Needs of Staff in Small Heritage Institutions</i>	1198
---	------

Small and Large Scale Digitization: Towards a Shared Conceptual Model

Peter Botticelli, Patricia Montiel-Overall and Ann Clark

<i>Building Sustainable Digital Cultural Heritage Collections: Towards Best Practices for Small-scale Digital Projects</i>	1205
--	------

Marco de Niet, Titia van der Werf and Vincent Wintermans

<i>Preserving Digital Heritage: The UNESCO Charter and Developments in the Netherlands</i>	1219
--	------

Paul Conway

<i>Validating Quality in Large-Scale Digitization: Findings on the Distribution of Imaging Error</i>	1233
--	------

Lars Björk

<i>Lost in Transit: The Informative Capacity of Digital Reproductions</i>	1252
---	------

Preservation of Audiovisual Material

Mike Casey

<i>The Media Preservation Initiative at Indiana University Bloomington</i>	1266
--	------

George Blood

<i>Video Compression...For Dummies?</i>	1273
---	------

Pio Pellizzari, Álvaro Hegewich

<i>The Ibero-American Preservation Platform of Sound and Audiovisual Heritage</i>	1289
---	------

Trusting Data and Documents Online

Junbin Fang, Zoe Lin Jiang, Mengfei He, S.M. Yiu, Lucas C.K. Hui, K.P. Chow and Gang Zhou

<i>Investigating and Analysing the Web-based Contents on Chinese Shanzhai Mobile Phones</i>	1297
---	------

Junwei Huang, Yinjie Chen, Zhen Ling, Kyungseok Choo and Xinwen Fu

<i>A Framework of Network Forensics and its Application of Locating Suspects in Wireless Crime Scene Investigation</i>	1310
--	------

F.R. Van Staden and H.S. Venter

<i>Implementing Digital Forensic Readiness for Cloud Computing Using Performance Monitoring Tools</i>	1329
---	------

Yongjie Cai and Ping Ji

<i>Security Monitoring for Wireless Network Forensics (SMoWF)</i>	1340
---	------

Workshops

Peter Van Garderen, P. Jordan, T. Hooten, C. Mumma and E. McLellan

<i>The Archivemata Project: Meeting Digital Continuity's Technical Challenges</i>	1349
---	------

Hannes Kulovits, Christoph Becker and Andreas Rauber

<i>Roles and Responsibilities in Digital Preservation Decision Making: Towards Effective Governance</i>	1360
---	------

Posters and Presentations

Collence Takaingehamo Chisita and Amos Bishi

<i>Challenges and Opportunities of Digitizing and Preserving Cultural Heritage in Zimbabwe</i>	1382
--	------

Donna McRostie	
<i>The long and winding road from aspiration to implementation – building an enterprise digitization capability at the University of Melbourne</i>	1384
Asger Svane-Knudsen and Jiří Vnouček	
<i>Retrieving a part of Danish colonial history: From dust to digital copy.....</i>	1386
Mitra Samiee and Saeed Rezaei Sharifabadi	
<i>A Paradigm for the preservation of national digital memory of Iran</i>	1392
Chinyere Otuonye, Tamunoibuomi F. Okajagu, Samuel O. Etatuvie, Emmanuel Orgah, Gift Eyemienbai, Luke Oyovwevotu, Ewoma Borgu, and Janet Ukoha	
<i>Insights on the Digitization of Traditional Medicine Knowledge in Nigeria</i>	1395
Nader Naghshineh and Saeed Nezareh	
<i>Crowd-sourced digital preservation: An Iranian model</i>	1397
Chris Muller	
<i>Data at Risk: The Duty to Find, Rescue, Preserve</i>	1399
Natalia Grincheva	
<i>Digital diplomacy: Providing access to cultural content, engaging audiences on a global scale</i>	1401
Rusnah Johare	
<i>Preserving digital research data</i>	1403
Claudia M. Wanderley	
<i>Multilingualism at the University of Campinas.....</i>	1405
Anne Thurston	
<i>Open government and trustworthy records</i>	1407
Jan Marontate, David Murphy, Megan Robertson, Nathan Clarkson and Maggie Chao	
<i>Canada – Aural memories: A case study of soundscape archives</i>	1421
Na Cai, Leye Yao and Liu Liu	
<i>Creating Social Memories of Major Events in China: A Case study of the 5•12 Wenchuan Earthquake Digital Archive</i>	1423
Addendum	
Howard Besser	
<i>Archiving Large Amounts of Individually-Created Digital Content: Lessons from Archiving the Occupy Movement</i>	1432
Nadja Wallaszkovits	
<i>Digitisation of Small Sound Collections: Problems and Solutions</i>	1440
UNESCO/UBC Vancouver Declaration	
<i>The Memory of the World in the Digital Age: Digitization and Preservation</i>	1452
Sponsors	

Strengthening the Regulatory Framework in a Digital Environment

A Review of Archives Legislation

Elaine Goh

School of Library, Archival and Information Studies, The University of British Columbia, Canada

Abstract

This paper outlines some of the challenges posed to archival legislation in Commonwealth countries regarding the creation, management, and preservation of records in increasingly complex digital environments. The author argues that archival science can contribute to the strengthening of current archival legislation, so as to address issues in the digital environment. The author also proposes future areas of empirical research on archival legislation.

Author

Elaine Goh is a doctoral student at the University of British Columbia. Her research interest is on archival legislation in Commonwealth countries and on organizational culture and behaviour. Elaine is a graduate research assistant of the International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) Project. Prior to starting her doctoral program, Elaine worked as the Assistant Director of Records Management in the National Archives of Singapore.

1. Law and Technological Development

Legislation is one of the “medium(s) through which law is expressed.”¹ One approach in terms of understanding how law is expressed is the instrumental and functionalist perspective. This perspective argues that the rules of law should be imbued with certain qualities or attributes. For example, the rules of law should be stable in terms of comprising “determinate requirements that people should consult before acting and not retrospectively establish legal obligations.”² The law should have the quality of clarity and precision, so that those involved in the implementation and enforcement of the law understand the rules and are able to apply the law consistently.³ The law should also be imbued with the quality of “foreseeability” in terms of its ability to predict future events, in order to guide human actions and behavior.⁴ Despite the fact that most legislations aim to have “precise prescriptions”, such prescriptions may not necessarily be a “faithful description of any state of affairs but a complex ideal that is even more complex to realize.”⁵

¹ Wim Voermans, “Quality of EU Legislation Under Scrutiny: What Kind of Problem, by what Kind of Standards,” in *Quality of Legislation - Principles and Instruments - Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the International Association of Legislation (IAL) in Lisbon, June 24th-25th, 2010*, ed. Luzius Mader and Marta Tavares de Almeida (Germany: Nomos, 2011), 35.

² Naomi Choi, *Rule of Law* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Reference Online), accessed 22 July 2012, <http://knowledge.sagepub.com/view/governance/n475.xml?rskey=XDEOlq&row=4>.

³ Jorge Miranda, “Law, Rule of Law and Quality of Law,” in *Quality of Legislation: Principles and Instruments - Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the International Association of Legislation in Lisbon, June 24th-25th, 2010*. (Germany: Nomos, 2011), 27.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Roderick A. Macdonald, “Legislation and Governance,” in *Rediscovering Fuller: Essays on Implicit Law and Institutional Design*, ed. Willem J. Witteveen and Wilbren Van der Burg (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press,

In the legal literature, there has been extensive coverage with regard to the inability of the law to keep up with technological change. According to Moses, “as technology gives rise to new possibilities, and people engage in new forms of conduct, the law continues to be directed to solving old problems and is unable to keep up with the modern world.”⁶ Consequently, “technological change can make the law become unclear and it can make law that was previously unobjectionable become subject to criticisms.”⁷ Another risk caused by the inability of the law to address technological developments is that “courts and legal practitioners are faced with applying decades—and even centuries—old definitions and principles to radical technologies not even conceived of less than twenty years ago.”⁸

One area where one can witness the inability of existing laws to address challenges in the digital environment are records related legislations, which is defined as legislation that “deals with records or information generally such as evidence legislation, which is not in connection with a specific legislated activity.”⁹ This can be illustrated by the recent review of the *Evidence Act (1997)* in Singapore. The Minister of Law in Singapore in the second reading of the Evidence (Amendment) Bill explained that when the act was first introduced in 1996, a “cautious approach” was taken in terms of admissibility of computer output as evidence.¹⁰ The Minister described the approach as a “cumbersome process not consonant with modern realities” and stressed that “computer output evidence should not be treated differently from other evidence.”¹¹ The Minister’s comments resonated with a consultation paper by the Singapore Law Academy.

The Academy claimed that that the *Evidence (Amendment) Act 1996* was developed on the premise that the certification of electronic records was based on a client-server network model, where responsibility of records is vested with the systems administrator. However, businesses are now adopting a delegated responsibility model, where responsibility for the computing system and business operations are now distributed among the client, information technology vendors and with other service providers.¹² The Academy observed that “in such computing and business models, it will be hard to identify the party or organisation responsible for the reliability of the electronic evidence.”¹³ The statement made by the Academy outlines some of the major challenges faced by archivists and records professionals in terms of ensuring the long-term trustworthiness of records over space and through time, particularly through the

1999), 288; Naomi Choi, *Rule of Law* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Reference Online, accessed 22 July 2012, <http://knowledge.sagepub.com/view/governance/n475.xml?rskey=XDEOlq&row=4>).

⁶ Lyria Bennett Moses, “Agents of Change: How the Law ‘Copes’ with Technological Change,” *Griffith Law Review* 20, no. 4 (2011): 763

⁷ Lyria Bennett Moses, “Adapting the Law to Technological Change: A Comparison of Common Law and Legislation,” *University of New South Wales Law Journal* 26, no. 2 (2003): 396.

⁸ Gregory E. Perry and Cherie Ballard, “A Chip by any Other Name would Still be a Potato: The Failure of Law and its Definitions to Keep Pace with Computer Technology,” *Texas Tech Law Review* 24 (1993): 799.

⁹ Jim Suderman, Fiorella Foscarini, and Erin Coulter, “International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES 2 Project) Policy Cross-Domain: Archives Legislation Study Report,” 2 September 2005, 4, accessed 5 September 2012,

http://www.interpares.org/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2%28policy%29archives_legislation_study_report.pdf.

¹⁰ Singapore. Second Reading Bills. Evidence Amendment Bill, 14 February 2012, accessed 5 September 2012, http://sprs.parl.gov.sg/search/topic.jsp?currentTopicID=00076883-WA¤tPubID=00076904-WA&topicKey=00076904-WA.00076883-WA_3%23id-6e0461e8-8588-49d0-b05e-fc6c2d596955%23.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Daniel Seng and Sriram Chakravarthi, *Computer Output as Evidence* (Singapore: Singapore Academy of Law, 2003), 80, accessed 5 September 2012,

http://www.lawnet.com.sg/legal/ln2/comm/PDF/Computer_Output_as_Evidence.pdf.

¹³ Ibid.

use of cloud computing. Cloud computing poses several risks that can compromise security and adversely affect the governance framework for the management and preservation of records. These risks reflect the need of developing and strengthening existing archives acts in relation to records management functions. As argued by Chasse, “the silence of case law does not justify the silence of legislation. The impact of electronic technology upon law and practice, and its rapid change, should lead to the conclusion that legislation is needed before the law is demonstrably inadequate.”¹⁴

2. Objectives

This paper outlines the major challenges posed by digital technologies, particularly in a cloud computing environment, and discusses how such an environment can compromise the trustworthiness of records. The paper puts forth the position that a strong archival legislation can help to institute adequate controls for the proper creation, maintenance and preservation of records. In addition, the paper highlights some of the current weakness and inadequacies of certain archives acts, and argues that archival science can bridge the gap between the current archival legislation and its ability to address issues in the digital environment. Finally, the paper concludes by recommending some possible areas of research relating to archival legislation.

3. Challenges in the Cloud Computing Environment

Cloud computing is defined as a “model for enabling convenient, on-demand network access to a shared pool of configurable computing resources (e.g., networks, servers storage, applications and services) that can be rapidly provisioned and released with minimal management effort or cloud provider interaction.”¹⁵ Cloud computing is not a new technology per se, but it is regarded as a novel service delivery model, designed to bring about better economies of scale and scalability of information technology services and infrastructure.¹⁶ Tucker, in a CTO Roundtable discussion explained, “cloud computing is not so much a definition of a single term as a trend in service delivery taking place today.”¹⁷

The National Institute of Standards and Technology in the United States has outlined three service models.¹⁸ First, the Cloud Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) allows consumers to access the application system, and the cloud service provider will provide the necessary infrastructure and application capabilities. Second, the Cloud Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS) involves the cloud provider supplying the necessary infrastructure, operating environments, and tools for the development of specifically created or

¹⁴ Ken Chasse, “Electronic Records as Documentary Evidence,” *Canadian Journal of Law and Technology* 6 (2007): 142, accessed 5 September 2012, http://cjlt.dal.ca/vol6_no3/chasse.pdf.

¹⁵ Peter Mell and Timothy Grance, *The NIST Definition of Cloud Computing - Recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology* (Gaithersburg: National Institute of Standards and Technology, [2011]), vi, accessed 5 September 2011, <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-145/SP800-145.pdf>.

¹⁶ Chris Rose, “A Break in the Cloud? The Reality of Cloud Computing,” *International Journal of Management and Information Systems* 15, no. 4 (2011): 59; Jared A. Harshbarger, “Cloud Computing Providers and Data Security Law: Building Trust with United States Companies,” *Journal of Technology Law and Policy* 16 (2011): 232.

¹⁷ Mache Creeger, “CTO Roundtable: Cloud Computing,” *Communications of the ACM* 52, no. 8 (August 2009): 52.

¹⁸ Peter Mell and Timothy Grance, *The NIST Definition of Cloud Computing - Recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology* (Gaithersburg: National Institute of Standards and Technology, [2011]), 4, accessed 5 September 2011, <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-145/SP800-145.pdf>.

acquired applications by the consumer. Finally, under the Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS), model, the consumer does not physically manage the infrastructure, such as computers and networks, but the consumer has the flexibility to control both the operating environment, such as the type of operating system and database, and type of application systems.¹⁹ Regardless of the model adopted by the user, cloud computing is essentially a distributed service delivery model, which involves the outsourcing of information and communications technology (ICT). This has implications in terms of the management and preservation of digital records.

One challenge in cloud computing is concerns raised with regard to the security of the recordkeeping infrastructure. Cloud providers may make changes to the computing infrastructure, the operating environment, and/or the application implementation, in order to deal with issues relating to usage load and storage. These technological changes may inadvertently affect the security of the recordkeeping system.²⁰ The nature and extend of this effect is partly dependent on the specific type of service model. For example, the use of SaaS as a cloud service model, i.e., web-based collaboration tools such as Google Apps, means that the responsibility for network, infrastructure security, and application code security primarily vests with the cloud provider.²¹ In an IaaS service model, the cloud provider has control over the security of the computing facility, whereas the cloud user has control and responsibility over the application code.²²

There are also transborder jurisdictional issues with regard to the control of records in a cloud computing environment, since records may be stored on data centres in different locations. Certain countries may not necessarily conform to the data protection and privacy related legislations and policies of the countries of the record creators.²³ There might also be an “unknown number of copies of the same digital document in different iterations across different jurisdictions” which “could affect the identification of relevant data for criminal proceedings.” Multiple copies of records also pose problems for records retention, since it is “common for service providers to replicate records for multiple backup, sending copies to sites in different locations or even different jurisdictions” and “this can mean that time-expired records are not properly deleted from every server held in every site.”²⁴ The accuracy, reliability and authenticity of records is at risk if the identity of the records are altered, should there be a lack of audit trails of the recordkeeping system and if there are no proper procedures to ensure proper delineation

¹⁹ Ibid., pp.2-3; Chris Rose, “A Break in the Cloud? the Reality of Cloud Computing,” *International Journal of Management and Information Systems* 15, no. 4 (2011): 61-64.

²⁰ Scott Paquette, Paul T. Jaegar, and Susan C. Wilson, “Identifying the Security Risks Associated with Governmental use of Cloud Computing,” *Government Information Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (2010): 245-253.

²¹ Peter Mell and Timothy Grance, *The NIST Definition of Cloud Computing - Recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology* (Gaithersburg: National Institute of Standards and Technology,[2011]), 2-3, accessed 5 September 2011, <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-145/SP800-145.pdf>; Stephen Mason and Esther George, “Digital Evidence and ‘cloud’ Computing,” *Computer Law & Security Review* 27, no. 5 (2011): 525.

²² Peter Mell and Timothy Grance, *The NIST Definition of Cloud Computing - Recommendations of the National Institute of Standards and Technology* (Gaithersburg: National Institute of Standards and Technology,[2011]), 4, accessed 5 September 2011, <http://csrc.nist.gov/publications/nistpubs/800-145/SP800-145.pdf>.

²³ Miranda Mowbray, “The Fog Over the Grimpen Mire: Cloud Computing and the Law,” *SCRIPTed* 6, no. 1 (2009): 135-136, <http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/ahrc/gikii/docs3/mowbray.pdf>; Stephen Mason and Esther George, “Digital Evidence and ‘cloud’ Computing,” *Computer Law & Security Review* 27, no. 5 (September 2011): 525-526.

²⁴ Australasian Digital Recordkeeping Initiative, *Advice on Managing the Recordkeeping Risks Associated with Cloud Computing*. 2010: Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities, 29 July 2010, 10.

of responsibility between the cloud provider and the user.²⁵ Issues with regard to the ownership, custody of records are also at risk, particularly if service providers merge and dissolve. In addition, there are challenges in exporting and migrating records across various platforms, particularly if record owners decide to change cloud providers.²⁶ These data migration challenges can be due to the incompatibility of data storage and transmission formats between vendors, or the sheer scale and complexity of the data to be migrated.

Given such challenges, it is clear that outsourcing of ICT services does not mean an outsourcing of risks. Record creators cannot entirely trust records in a cloud computing environment and it will require far more than authentication technologies to enable such records to be trustworthy. When archivists speak of trust in records, we refer to the “accuracy, reliability and authenticity of records.”²⁷ As “targets of our primary trust,” we can place our trusts on records, provided that there are adequate controls on the policies, procedures, mechanisms governing the record’s creation and maintenance stage.²⁸ However, trust is also a “three part relation that is grounded in the truster’s assessment of the intentions of the trusted with respect to some action.”²⁹ Hardy adds that “A trusts B to do X” and that “trust depends on the context.”³⁰ This relational aspect of trust relations between records creators and government agencies can be enforced through understanding these two parties as “agencies of accountability.”³¹ These agencies “provide insurance of trustworthy conduct, by putting pressure (facilitating, controlling or sanctioning) on persons, roles, institutions or systems that are the targets of our primary trust.”³² The trust relations between the record creator and the national archives can be enforced through articulating their roles and responsibilities as articulated in the archives law. Given that the trustworthiness of records are at risk in a digital environment and given the importance of recordkeeping in society, the law can help in sustaining the “trust relationship” between the creating agency and the preserver by “(taking) over those areas in which there is significant value at stake.”³³

4. Analysis of Archival Legislation in Commonwealth Countries

Archives researchers have critiqued the archives acts in their respective countries as being ineffectual and reactive with regard to management of digital records. Archives acts are described as being “weak”, “outdated, “old and inconsistent.”³⁴ Most archival legislation in Commonwealth countries based their

²⁵ Katharine Stuartand and David Bromage, “Current State of Play: Records Management and the Cloud,” *Records Management Journal* 20, no. 2 (2010): 220-221.

²⁶ Barclay T. Blair, “Governance for Protecting Information in the Cloud,” *Association of Records Managers and Administrators International*, 2010, HT 4, <http://www.arma.org/HotTopic/HotTopic910.pdf>.

²⁷ ICA International Terminology Database, accessed 20 July 2012, <http://www.web-denizen.com/>.

²⁸ Piotr Sztompka, *Trust: A Sociological Theory* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 47-48.

²⁹ Hardin, Russell, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002), xx.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³¹ Piotr Sztompka, *Trust: A Sociological Theory* (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 47-48.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Hardin, Russell, *Trust and Trustworthiness* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002), 64.

³⁴ Chris Hurley, “From Dust Bins to Disk-Drives and Now to Dispersal: The State Records Act 1988 (New South Wales),” *Archives and Manuscripts* 26, no. 2 (November 1998): 390-409; The National Archives. “Proposed National Records and Archives Legislation - Proposals to Change the Current Legislative Provision for Records Management and Archives - Consultation Paper,” (2003) <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20081023125241/http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/policy-consultation.pdf> (accessed 20 July, 2012).

archival legislation on the UK Public Record Act of 1958, an act written for a paper based records environment and unable to meet the challenges posed by the digital environment.³⁵ In fact, the National Archives in UK consultation paper on a proposed archival legislation writes,

The public sector needs a legislative framework which will assure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the records it makes. Keeping records that can serve as evidence of an organisation's policies, procedures, actions and decisions, and associated matters of governance, accountability and propriety cannot be left to chance.³⁶

One weakness of the current archival legislation in Commonwealth countries is that it does not stipulate the recordkeeping roles and responsibilities of government agencies as records creators. The act only states that government agencies should seek responsibility from the national authority before destroying public records. Most archival legislation in Commonwealth countries stipulate the role of the national archives in terms of acquiring, preserving and promoting access to archival records. In other words, the archival legislation fulfils a constitutional function in terms of establishing an institution.³⁷ The archival legislation in Canada and Singapore also states that the national archives should play an advisory role in conducting or facilitating the development of a records and/or information management programme in the government. In Singapore, the act even state that the national archives "shall advice public officers concerning standards and procedures pertaining to the management of public records."³⁸ However, archival legislation in Canada and Singapore is notably silent with regard to the shared lines of responsibilities and the accountability structures, with regards to recordkeeping and preservation, between record creators and the national archives. As such, there is no means of verifying that records creators and preservers fulfill their responsibilities according to accepted professional standards.

Establishing lines of responsibilities and an accountability framework through an archival legislation helps to preserve the trustworthiness of records. Through such lines of responsibilities and accountability frameworks, the creating agency is given the "primary responsibility for their reliability and authenticity while they are needed for business purposes," while the archives is accorded "responsibility for their authenticity over the long-term."³⁹ Moreover, as the reliability of records is dependent on the "completeness of the record's form and the amount of control exercised on the process of its creation," archival legislation should specify that government agencies must exercise due diligence

³⁵ Michael Roper and Laura Millar, ed., *A Model Records and Archives Law* (United Kingdom: International Council on Archives and International Records Management Trust, 1999), http://www.irmt.org/documents/educ_training/public_sector_rec/IRMT_archive_law.pdf.

³⁶ The National Archives. "Proposed National Records and Archives Legislation - Proposals to Change the Current Legislative Provision for Records Management and Archives - Consultation Paper," (2003), 7, accessed 20 July, 2012, <http://collections.europarchive.org/tna/20081023125241/http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documents/policy-consultation.pdf>.

³⁷ Wim Voermans, "Quality of EU Legislation Under Scrutiny: What Kind of Problem, by what Kind of Standards," in *Quality of Legislation - Principles and Instruments - Proceedings of the Ninth Congress of the International Association of Legislation (IAL) in Lisbon, June 24th-25th, 2010*, ed. Luzius Mader and Marta Tavares de Almeida (Germany: Nomos, 2011), 35.

³⁸ *National Heritage Board Act*, Singapore Statutes Online, 1993, no. 13, <http://160.96.185.113/aol/search/display/view.w3p;page=0;query=Id%3A%22f03d693e-b8dd-4130-a14f-be68ea23198d%22%20Status%3Apublished;rec=0>.

³⁹ Luciana Duranti, "The Impact of Digital Technology on Archival Science," *Archival Science* 1, no. 1 (2001): 49, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02435638>.

in outsourcing government records to third party service providers, ensuring that adequate measures are in place for the agency to exercise control over the identity and integrity of its records.⁴⁰

Nevertheless, there are some archival legislation which attempt to specify the roles and responsibilities of both the record creator and preserver. For example, the *Public Records (Scotland) Act 2011* states that government agencies should submit a records management plan to the archival authority.⁴¹ The archival authority, in turn, is required to submit an annual plan to the Scottish Ministers on the records management plans submitted by the agencies. The archival authority needs to include details such as the records management reviews that they conducted, as well as the “names of any authorities that have failed to comply with any of the requirements of an action notice together with details of the alleged failures.”⁴² Another example of an archives act which states the recordkeeping responsibilities of both public offices and the archival authority is the Public Records Act (2005) in New Zealand. The act specifies the recordkeeping responsibilities of public officers with regard to the creation and maintenance of “full and accurate records of its affairs, in accordance with normal, prudence business practice, including the records of any matter that is contracted out to an independent contractor.”⁴³ The act requires that records under the control of public officers must be maintained in an “accessible form” until the disposal of the records are “authorised by or under this Act or required by or under another Act.”⁴⁴ The act also articulates the role of the Chief Archivist in issuing standards relating to the creation, maintenance, appraisal and access to records. The Chief Archivist is expected to present a report to the Minister on recordkeeping practices in public officers annually, and to conduct an audit of recordkeeping practices of the public sector.⁴⁵

Specifying the roles and responsibilities of both the record creator and the preserver in the archival legislation is important in a digital environment, as it is based on the premise that “management of digital records must proceed from a comprehensive understanding of all phases or stages in the lifecycle of records, from the time they are generated, through their maintenance by their creator, and during their appraisal, disposition and long-term preservation as authentic memorials of the actions and matters of which they are a part.”⁴⁶ It will also be useful if archival legislation provides a definition of archival concepts like reliability and authenticity, which would apply to both the record creator and the archives. For example, authenticity is the trustworthiness of a record as a record and is dependent on the “record’s state, mode and form of transmission, and to the manner of its preservation and custody.”⁴⁷ As such,

⁴⁰ ICA International Terminology Database, accessed 20 July 2012, <http://www.web-denizen.com/>.

⁴¹ The National Archives of Scotland merged with the General Register Office for Scotland in April 2011 to become an entity known as the National Records of Scotland. *Public Records (Scotland) Act*, 2011, accessed 21 July 2012, <http://www.nas.gov.uk/documents/PublicRecordsScotlandActPublished.pdf>.

⁴² *Public Records (Scotland) Act*, 2011, accessed 21 July 2012, <http://www.nas.gov.uk/documents/PublicRecordsScotlandActPublished.pdf>.

⁴³ *Public Records Act*, *Parliamentary Counsel Office* 2005, no. 14, <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2005/0040/latest/DLM345529.html>.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Yvette Hackett, Domain 3 Task Force, “Appendix 21: Preserver Guidelines – Preserving Digital Records: Guidelines for Organizations,” [electronic version] in *International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 2: Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records*, ed. Luciana Duranti and Randy Preston (Padova, Italy: Associazione Nazionale Archivistica Italiana, 2008), 734. http://www.interpares.org/display_file.cfm?doc=ip2_book_appendix_21.pdf.

⁴⁷ Luciana Duranti, “The Reliability and Authenticity of Electronic Records,” in *Preservation of the Integrity of Electronic Records*, ed. Luciana Duranti et al. (The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002), 27.

maintaining and preserving the authenticity of records is a joint responsibility between both the record creator and the archives.

The second weakness of the archival legislation in Commonwealth countries is that the acts typically state that government agencies should seek permission from the national archives before destroying public records. Such a clause works on the assumption that appraisal of records takes place only at the end of the lifecycle when the records become inactive. In reality, appraisal of records, particularly in the digital environment, should be conducted during the active stage of the record's lifecycle. This will enable the archivist to obtain documentation about the recordkeeping environment of the creating agency as well as technical documentation on the digital system which creates and maintains the records.⁴⁸ There is also a need to monitor the appraised electronic records before the records are transferred into archival custody so as to ensure that there are no significant changes in the records and the recordkeeping environment, which can affect the identity and integrity of the records.⁴⁹ Moreover, the timely appraisal of records is in line with the chain of preservation concept. This concept is based on the premise that "from the perspective of long-term or continuing or enduring preservation, all the activities to manage records throughout their existence are linked, as in a chain, and interdependent."⁵⁰ Last but not least, the absence of the use of the term appraisal in a number of archives legislation means that archivists lack "adequate legislative or policy foundations" and that "without a proper mandate to act towards achieving their goal, archivists work at a distinct disadvantage."⁵¹

Another limitation of the archival legislation in Commonwealth countries is they tend to state that records should be transferred to archival custody several decades after they have become inactive.⁵² For example, the Public Record Act (1958) stipulates that public records "shall be transferred not later than thirty years after their creation either to the Public Record Office or to such other place of deposit appointed by the Lord Chancellor under this Act as the Lord Chancellor may direct." Although records may be transferred to archival custody earlier than 30 years between the archives and the transferring agency, the archives act works on the assumption that preservation requirements tend to be incorporated during the end of the record's lifecycle. The lengthy time frame for the transfer of records is not an

⁴⁸ Appraisal Task Force, International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES), "Appraisal Task Force Report," (2001), p. 19.

http://www.interpares.org/book/interpares_book_e_part2.pdf; Yvette Hackett, "Methods of Appraisal and Preservation - Domain 3 Task Force Report," in *International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 2 Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records*, ed. Luciana Duranti and Randy Preston (Padova, Italy: Associazione Nazionale Archivistica Italiana, 2008), 190-191.

⁴⁹ Appraisal Task Force, International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES), "Appraisal Task Force Report," (2001), p. 14.

http://www.interpares.org/book/interpares_book_e_part2.pdf

⁵⁰ Terry Eastwood, Randy Preston and Hans Hofman, "Modeling Digital Records Creation, Maintenance and Preservation," in *International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 2 Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records*, ed. Luciana Duranti and Randy Preston (Padova, Italy: Associazione Nazionale Archivistica Italiana, 2008), p. 229.

⁵¹ Terry Eastwood, "Reflections on the Goal of Archival Appraisal in Democratic Societies," *Archivaria* 54 (Fall, 2002): 69.

⁵² F. Foscari, "InterPARES 2 and the Records-Related Legislation of the European Union," *Archivaria* 63 (2007), 127, <http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13131/14376>; Chris Hurley, "From Dustbins to Disk-Drives: A Survey of Archives Legislation in Australia," in *The Records Continuum - Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years*, ed. Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott (Clayton: Ancora Press, 1994), 206-233.

effective strategy to address the management of digital records, where preservation requirements should be “incorporated and manifested in the design of record-making and recordkeeping systems.”⁵³

Finally, archival legislation in Commonwealth countries has varied ways in defining the concept of records and archives. Some of these definitions linked records and archives in terms of its value, in relation to an activity, the passage of time and transfer to an archival institution. For example, the archives act in Singapore differentiates public records as “records of any kind whatsoever produced or received by any public office in the transaction of official business or by any officer in the course of his official duties,” whereas public archives are those records which are “more than 25 years old” of “national or historical significance” and which have been transferred to archival custody.⁵⁴ Such a definition tends to associate public records and public archives in terms of physical placement, which results in a conceptual divide between the management of active and inactive records.⁵⁵ The movement towards increasing privatisation within the public sector means that records from such organizations that do not fall into the schedule of public bodies are potentially excluded from the archives act. Furthermore, such a definition is limiting not only in a traditional analogue environment but also in the digital environment. In the digital environment, it may be potentially contentious to determine which instantiation of the same digital entity belong to whom, especially when there are multiple service providers.

5. Conclusion - Call for Future Empirical Research

The weakness of the archival legislation illustrates the inadequacy, “under-inclusiveness” and the “obsolescence of existing legal rules” in dealing with the challenges posed by the digital environment and the changing nature of public administration.⁵⁶ There is a need to strengthen archival legislation through incorporating archival science including concepts, like the chain of preservation, reliability, and authenticity, as well as the theory of provenance. Duranti notes that the archival legislation of ancient Rome was anchored on the principles of archival science. For example, concepts such as the unbroken chain of custody and the 1898 Dutch manual on arrangement and description were based on early Roman law.⁵⁷ However, with the passage of time, archival legislation departed from the principles and concepts of archival science. As such, there is a need for archivists to revisit these principles and concepts and to work with legislators to strengthen the legislative framework of the archives law.

Finally, one area that requires further empirical research is to understand the perspectives of archivists and records professionals on whether the archives act provides them with a framework to

⁵³ InterPARES 2, “Appendix 19 - A Framework of Principles for the Development of Policies, Strategies and Standards for the Long-term Preservation of Digital Records,” in *International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 2 Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records*, ed. Ludiana Duranti and Randy Preston (Padova, Italy Associazione Nazionale Archivistica Italiana, 2008), 709.

⁵⁴ *National Heritage Board Act*, Singapore Statutes Online, 1993, no. 13, <http://160.96.185.113/aol/search/display/view.w3p;page=0;query=Id%3A%22f03d693e-b8dd-4130-a14f-be68ea23198d%22%20Status%3Apublished;rec=0>.

⁵⁵ V. Lemieux, “Archival Solitudes: The Impact on Appraisal and Acquisition of Legislative Concepts of Records and Archives,” *Archivaria* 1, no. 35 (1992), 156, <http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/11894/12847>.

⁵⁶ F. Foscari, “InterPARES 2 and the Records-Related Legislation of the European Union,” *Archivaria* 63 (2007): 121-136, <http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13131/14376>.

⁵⁷ Luciana Duranti, “Archival Science,” in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, vol. 59, ed. Allen Kent (New York, Basel, Hong Kong: Marcel Dekker, 1996), 2-5.

effectively manage records. The application and implementation of an archival legislation involves interaction among stakeholders from different government agencies, including the national archives, and this process of interaction is not adequately covered in case law. Another related area of research is to explore organizational dynamics and interactions among archivists and government representatives as they negotiate their responsibilities in relation to an archives act, including how they interpret and apply an archives act in the management of records. For example, Hurley observed that there was the “interplay of bureaucratic politics” in the implementation of the *State Records Act* in New South Wales and the act was even “opposed and watered down by other agencies who believe that their turf is being invaded.”⁵⁸ Hurley’s statement is a reminder to archivists and records professionals that it is useful to go beyond the instrumental approach in understanding law in terms of its “explicit rules, specialised offices and institutions, and determinate procedures.”⁵⁹ There is also a need to understand archival legislation from the bottom-up. Such a perspective will illustrate the gaps between the law in theory and the law and in practice through providing an insight on why and in what circumstances archivists and records professionals interact with the archives act, as well as cases where the archives act is not relied upon by records professionals.

⁵⁸ Chris Hurley, “From Dust Bins to Disk-Drives and Now to Dispersal: The State Records Act 1988 (New South Wales),” *Archives and Manuscripts* 26, no. 2 (November 1998): 393.

⁵⁹ Roderick A. Macdonald, “Legislation and Governance,” in *Rediscovering Fuller: Essays on Implicit Law and Institutional Design*, ed. Willem J. Witteveen and Wilbren Van der Burg (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999), 310.

Gold Sponsors



McGill



InterPARES Project

International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems

Silver Sponsors



Ministry of Education, Culture and
Science

OCUL Ontario Council of
University Libraries



**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
LIBRARIES**



uOttawa
Library

Supporters



CANADIAN COMMISSION FOR UNESCO
COMMISSION CANADIENNE POUR L'UNESCO
www.unesco.ca



Manitoba 



Québec 



École des sciences de l'information
School of Information Studies