**Preservation Planning Scoping Document for Paul Wilson’s Personal Files Collection**

**Collection Name:** PAW-PERS

**Contents:** Mementos and Special Electronic Files

**Main Digital Components**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component Name** | **Contents** | **Technology** | **Physical Equivalents** |
| Index | Single line entry for each item defining a unique reference number and other information | Single Excel file with one worksheet | None |
| Digital Files | Mainly Mementos and files associated with my OFC work | 812 files (at least one for every one of the 542 index entries) comprising 16 zip files; 1 html file; 17 Jpg files; 1 Excel file; 18 Word 1997-2003 files; 19 current Word files; 710 PDFPlus files; 1 pptx file; 28 TIFF files | 223 of the 542 index entries have at least one physical item retained and stored in Presentation Folders or a Display Case. The exact number is To Be Determined. |

Scoping assessment

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Why do we want to retain this data? |
| I want to retain BOTH the data and the physical items i.e. the whole collection.  The files are a combination of documents which I may want to refer back to and/or work on; and Mementos which I want to be able to peruse, enjoy and perhaps show other people.  In the long term I plan to pass on this collection to my children. |
| 1. For whom are we keeping it? How do we test their expectations? |
| The collection is for me, the Owner, at present; and in the long term for my children. |
| 1. What are our preferred preservation approaches? Why have these been proposed? |
| No idea - that's the purpose of this work - to identify options and decide which ones to go with. |
| 1. What is the collection? How does it break down in terms of technological dependencies? |
| Already defined above in the contents section. |
| 1. What risks do the different parts of the collection face? |
| There is a risk that:   1. the files on the laptop become corrupt or irretrievably lost AND that the backups cannot provide replacements for some reason or other. 2. The files are not readable by the Owner's computer systems some time in the future (say twenty or more years hence). 3. The index may become separated from the digital files and/or the physical files such that the Owner may not be able to use the three elements in conjunction with one another, or may not even realise that there are three elements that should be used in conjunction with one another. |
| 1. What are the highest priorities for action? |
| The priority order of the risks (highest priority first) is A, B, C. |
| 1. What actions should we take to meet them? Who is responsible for each action (Repeat for each group listed in section 6) |
| **Risk A:** Check that the backup arrangements are in place, are sound, and are being applied satisfactorily. Test that the backups actually work and can provide appropriate replacement files. Consider putting in place a backup of the backup arrangements. Responsibility: PW  **Risk B:** This is the $64,000 question that I don't know the best answer to. Responsibility: PW  **Risk C:** Explore Inserting appropriate references to the other two elements in each of the elements such that any one using each element will know that the other elements exist and where they are located. Responsibility: PW |
| 1. What tools do we have available to carry them out? |
| None at present (would need to do some work on each of the three Risks first to even know if tools are required). |
| 1. What are our constraints in terms of cost / resources? |
| No problem with Time, but a very limited budget (say a couple of hundred pounds max) |
| 1. What are our expectations of quality? |
| I expect the job to be done to the highest quality given the constraints. |
| 1. How will we validate our plans? Who is responsible for validating them |
| By a knowledgeable collaborator - who is yet to be identified. |
| 1. How and when will we update our plans? Who will update them? |
| My current thinking is that a Maintenance Schedule would be produced as part of the Plan and that this would specify what is to be reviewed and at what interval. A likely review period might be every three years - but it would depend on what is to be reviewed. The Maintenance Plan would be the third of three documents produced from the Preservation Planning activity - a Scoping document (this document) which identifies what needs to be covered in the Plan; a Plan which defines what is to be done in an immediate project; and a Maintenance Schedule which defines the ongoing activities which will need to be undertaken periodically for the duration of the life of the collection (which could be many years or indefinitely). |

**Original 12 step table received from William Kilbride**

**The Historic Parish Archive, Worked Example**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Archaeological Excavation: (closed) |  |
| c. 1000 pages digitized text (TIFFS and PDFs) | TIFFs on CD, PDF’s on server |
| c. 500 photographs (TIFFS and JPEGS) | TiFFs on CD, JPEGS on server |
| c. 100 data tables (held as text) | On CD |
| c. 25 Excel spreadsheets | On CD |
| Architectural survey of building: (closed) |  |
| c. 3000 images in JPEG format | On office PC and backup disk |
| 25 CAD plans | On office PC (no CAD software to read it) and backup disk |
| Parish newsletters and website: (ongoing) |  |
| c. 500 document in variety of wp formats | On office PC, backup disk and web server |
| c. 150 web pages and images | On web server |
| Oral History: (ongoing) |  |
| c. 25 audio recordings | On Flash memory |
| Music performance: (ongoing) |  |
| 10 hours of digital recordings | On CD |
| Parish registers: (closed) |  |
| Circa 1000 pages scanned (TIFFS) | On office PC and backup disk |

**Risk Assessment Headings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Risk, | Describe the risk, being as specific as possible. |
| Consequence | What would happen if the risk occurred |
| Likelihood, | What is the likelihood that this will happen, scored 1-5 where 5 is certain |
| Impact | What would be the impact if it did happen, scored 1-5 where 5 is maximum impact |
| Score | Multiply ‘Likelihood’ by ‘Impact’ to get a rough estimate of the severity of the risk |
| Proximity | Is the risk likely to materialise soon? Can you estimate when it will materialise? |
| Owner | Who is responsible to ensure that the risk is properly managed |
| Responses | What steps will you take to, reduce, avoid, mitigate or transfer the risk |
| New likelihood | Once you’ve taken appropriate action, what is the likelihood of the risk materialise |
| New impact, | Once you’ve taken appropriate action, how great would the impact be |
| New score, | Once you’ve taken appropriate action, how severe is the risk |
| Frequency of review | How frequently do you need to review this risk |

**Preservation Planning in 12 Steps (based loosely on PLATO)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Why do we want to retain this data? |
|  |
| 1. For whom are we keeping it? How do we test their expectations? |
|  |
| 1. What are our preferred preservation approaches? Why have these been proposed? |
|  |
| 1. What is the collection? How does it break down in terms of technological dependencies? |
|  |
| 1. What risks do the different parts of the collection face? |
|  |
| 1. What are the highest priorities for action? |
|  |
| 1. What actions should we take to meet them? Who is responsible for each action (Repeat for each group listed in section 6) |
|  |
| 1. What tools do we have available to carry them out? |
|  |
| 1. What are our constraints in terms of cost / resources? |
|  |
| 1. What are our expectations of quality? |
|  |
| 1. How will we validate our plans? Who is responsible for validating them |
|  |
| 1. How and when will we update our plans? Who will update them? |
|  |