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Introduction

The following flow chart outlines the process by which an InterPARES 3 case study should be conducted. Depending on the composition and working dynamics of the InterPARES team (i.e., researchers and academic advisors), case study and test-bed partners, some of the steps may occur in different order to best accommodate the participating individuals. To remove some repetitious steps from the chart, several processes have been linked to each other. Where these occur, hyperlinks have been added, referring the reader to the appropriate location in the chart. Also, these processes may be noted by their different line styles. See the following key for their interpretation:

- Has been referred to from another location in the flow chart.
- The process or decision is expanded on another page of the flow chart.
- Comment about the process or decision.
- Terminator (beginning and end of the case study process).
- Process
- Decision
- Document/product/instrument resulting from a process.
- Documents/products/instruments resulting from a process.

Process involves using an IP3 template (e.g., Case Study Abstract, Contextual Analysis, Diplomatic Analysis, Research Questions, Final Report). These templates may be found on the InterPARES 3 Web site at: http://www.interpares.org/rws/rws_research_studies.cfm. References to the templates may be found on the following pages of this workflow chart:

- Case Study Abstract – Page 4
- Contextual Analysis – Page 4
- Diplomatic Analysis – Page 7
- Research Question Sets (Policy, Records and Recordkeeping Systems) – Page 7
- Final Report – Page 8 and Page 12
Initially, each test-bed partner will identify a body of digital material for which a preservation plan has to be developed, be it already in the custody of the partner or not. Alternatively, the partner identifies a policy need, or a system to be designed and implemented.
Case study proposals acceptable?

Yes

Other case studies needed?

Yes

Request case study proposal(s)
(See Page 2)

No

Other test-beds needed?

Yes

Identify possible test-bed partners
(See Page 2)

No

Recruit/assign researchers/research assistants to case studies

Collect case study context data
(See Page 4)
Collect case study context data

Read relevant information about assigned case study

Meet with test-bed

Gather data for Contextual Analysis (See Template)

Enough data collected?

Yes

Write Contextual Analysis Draft (See Template)

Write Case Study Abstract Draft (See Template and Example)

Submit case study document(s) for review and final approval (See Page 5)

Collect case study research data via Action Research (See Page 7)

No

Notes

Relevant Sources

Meeting Minutes

Using archival methods, data are collected about the context and limitations of each test-bed. The "Template for Case Study Contextual Analysis" instrument is intended to support consistency in data collection across all case studies. These data can be collected from analysis of Web sites and of documentation identified or provided by the test-bed, and from interviews.
After a document has been approved, it is possible that additional revisions to it may occur. These changes may be small content or copy edits, or larger alterations based on new information. To prevent version control problems, the steps outlined in this section need to be followed when updating an existing document.
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Post approved case study document(s)

Case study Final Report?

Yes

Post document(s) to pre-workshop and case study sections of TEAM's restricted Web site

No

Other template-based doc?

Yes

English Text Document?

No

Post document to public and restricted IP3 Web sites

No

TEAM pre-workshop document?

Yes

TEAM restricted document?

No

Public restricted document?

No

In other words, is the information in the document only relevant to the TEAM that created it, rather than to the rest of the Project’s TEAMs?

Yes

In other words, are there copyright, research or other restrictions on public distribution of the document?

No

Post document to public and restricted TEAM Web sites

No

Post document to restricted IP3 Web site only

Yes

Produce full English translation of document

English Text Document?

Yes

Non-English Version of Document

No

Produce English title and abstract of document

English Abstract of Document

No

Non-English Version of Document

No

Translation Document

Document template (500 words or less)

Document template (500 words or less)

Translation Document

Document template (500 words or less)

In other words, is the information in the document only relevant to the TEAM that created it, rather than to the rest of the Project’s TEAMs?

Yes

In other words, are there copyright, research or other restrictions on public distribution of the document?

No

Post document to public and restricted TEAM Web sites

No

Post document to restricted IP3 Web site only

Yes

Produce full English translation of document

English Text Document?

Yes

Non-English Version of Document

No

Produce English title and abstract of document

English Abstract of Document

No

Non-English Version of Document

No

Translation Document

Document template (500 words or less)

Document template (500 words or less)

Translation Document

Document template (500 words or less)

Case/general study numbering conventions: All case/general studies should be assigned a unique numeric or alphanumeric number within each TEAM.

File format conventions: Whenever possible, draft documents posted to the restricted TEAM and/or IP3 Web sites should be in standard Office formats (DOC or RTF, XLS, PPT, etc.), while final documents posted to the public and restricted TEAM and IP3 Web sites should be in PDF/A (1a or 1b) format.

File naming conventions: Whenever possible, please use the following file-naming convention for posted documents: [project phase]_[team]_[case/general study number]_[succinct document title]_[version number]_[file type extension]

Example: ip3_canada_cs01_contextual_analysis_v1-0.pdf
Using documentation, interviews, diplomatics, modeling and text analyses, data are collected either about the specific body of material, its documentary forms, technological constraints, functional or cultural meaning, etc., or about a system requirements or policy needs and constraints. Data collection will vary depending on the type of case study.

These steps collect information for the Diplomatic Analysis.

Diplomatic Analysis (See Template)

Identify a specific document within the case study

Collect appropriate information about the document

Write-up the Diplomatic Analysis

Identify internal factors that influence its development (i.e., office policies, personnel, etc.)

Identify external factors that influence its development (e.g., Internet, computer technology, etc.)

Function/Policy Model

Research Questions (See Templates)

Identify people to gather information (i.e., IT, office staff, management, etc.)

Observe, interact and conduct interviews

Write-up answers/responses to...

Records Questions

Recordkeeping Systems Questions

Policy Questions

These steps may also be used to model the procedures for creating policies. IDEF0 Modeling refers to “Integrated Definition Function” Modeling. IDEF0 is a U.S. Information Processing Standard, as described in Publication 183 of the National Institute of Standards & Technology (http://www.idef.com/pdf/idef0.pdf). A function model is a structured representation of the functions, activities and processes within the modeled system or subject area. For an introduction to IDEF0 modeling, see “Integrated Definition Function Modeling (IDEF0): A Primer” (http://www.interpares.org/ip2/display_file.cfm?doc=idef0_primer.pdf).

These steps collect the information needed for the 3 different sets of research questions: Policy, Records and Recordkeeping Systems.

On the basis of the case data collected, the members of the case study team will answer the relevant set(s) of research questions.

Submit case study document(s) for review and final approval (See Page 5)

IP3 TEAM Workshop 2
(Spring/Summer) (See Page 8)
While there are no templates for the remaining procedures, all work from this point onward should be incorporated into the Final Report (See Template).

All TEAM members (co-investigators, collaborators, test-bed and resource partners, students), at the TEAM Workshop, reflect on the data collected and the information generated by the team of researchers for each case study and collectively articulate several possible solutions from which individual plans of action for each case study will emerge. These plans of action will include strategy, protocols, functional requirements, procedures, and expected outcome, as needed.

The following procedures may vary depending on the specific needs and action items for each case study. The first iteration phase involves developing and testing different solutions in different contexts. The first iteration draft plans are tested during the summer and the fall. Test results will include performance assessment of the plans against benchmarks and baselines established in extant research.

The following procedures may vary depending on the specific needs and action items for each case study. These are carried out during the summer.

Identify additional data needed and draft action items

No

Collect additional data via Action Research

No

No

Enough data collected?

Yes

1st Iterations
Develop draft Action Plans for case studies

Testing completed?

Yes

Write-up(s) to appropriate document(s)

Submit case study document(s) for review and final approval (See Page 5)

IP3 TEAM Workshop 3 (Fall/Winter) (See Page 9)

IP3 TEAM Workshop 2 (Spring/Summer)

Discuss case study data and determine whether enough data are available to develop draft Action Plans

Enough data available?

Yes

Test Action Plans via Action Research

Notes

Relevant Sources

Documentation Drafts
This refers to case studies that lacked sufficient data during Workshop 2 to develop 1st iteration Action Plans. For such studies, the activities conducted during Workshop 2 will need to be repeated.

Discuss case study data and determine whether enough data are available to develop draft Action Plans (See Page 8)

Several mini-iterations may need to be carried out until a definitive plan of action is agreed upon for each test-bed, implemented and tested again.

The results of the tests will be shared among all TEAM researchers and discussed during the Workshop. An assessment of these results will then allow each TEAM to reflect on each action, and refine its respective plans of action, also in light of what has been done by the other TEAMs and following directives provided by the International TEAM at its annual Summit in October.

The second iteration phase involves refining solutions for particular contexts. This phase accounts for anomalies or deficiencies in the first iteration test results, and benefits from the insight gained from a comparison across contexts. In so doing, it allows TEAMs to refine their plans and performance measures.

The capture of results and data from testing will be useful in the development of Action Plans for case studies in the 2nd Iterations phase.

Not enough data available to develop draft Action Plans? Yes: Discuss next phase of research with all TEAM partners (See Page 11) No: Discuss implementation phase of research with test-beds (See Page 12)

Several mini-iterations may need to be carried out until a definitive plan of action is agreed upon for each test-bed, implemented and tested again.

The results of the tests will be shared among all TEAM researchers and discussed during the Workshop. An assessment of these results will then allow each TEAM to reflect on each action, and refine its respective plans of action, also in light of what has been done by the other TEAMs and following directives provided by the International TEAM at its annual Summit in October.

The second iteration phase involves refining solutions for particular contexts. This phase accounts for anomalies or deficiencies in the first iteration test results, and benefits from the insight gained from a comparison across contexts. In so doing, it allows TEAMs to refine their plans and performance measures.

Not enough data available to develop draft Action Plans? Yes: Discuss next phase of research with all TEAM partners (See Page 11) No: Discuss implementation phase of research with test-beds (See Page 12)

Several mini-iterations may need to be carried out until a definitive plan of action is agreed upon for each test-bed, implemented and tested again.
Second+ iteration data are compared among cohorts—the partner organizations of the same type (e.g., city archives, university archives, communities archives)—to establish what are the critical factors that determine the most appropriate solution for these contexts and whether they are linked to documentary forms, technology, organizational culture or function, or other environmental elements. This comparison allows each TEAM to make statements of a general type and share them with other TEAMS.
This activity is to be carried out in consultation with, and incorporate direction from, the Directors of the IP3 International Alliance.

In relation to both addressing the test-beds’ specific needs and objectives and the Project’s broader research goal and objectives.

This process will carry over into subsequent TEAM Workshops.

Among other things, these may include: criteria for “most-at-risk” materials, guidelines for addressing preservation requirements, evaluation models for assessing the degree of success of chosen preservation actions, cost-benefit models and ethical models.

Please note that all final products and instruments posted to the IP3 Web site must be written in, or subsequently translated into, English.

Although not a case study activity per se, this activity is included here to emphasize the relationship between the Project’s case study activities and its subsequent product/instrument development activities, both of which will, to varying degrees, actively involve the test-beds. Note also that, although this activity will carry over into subsequent TEAM Workshops and International Summits, it is not further decomposed here.
Implement Policy or Record-Preservation Action(s)

Implementation successful?

Yes

Write Case Study Final Report draft (See Template)

Submit case study document(s) for review and final approval (See Page 5)

Discuss knowledge mobilization phase with test-beds (See Page 14)

End Case Study Research

No

Not Feasible / Indeterminate

Determine best means of implementation

Develop staff/client Training & Education Modules

Training and Education Modules

Development of Modules

Discuss next phase of research with all TEAM partners (See Page 11)

In some situations, solutions may not be possible given the necessary or available resources. In others, it may not be possible to evaluate the success of implementation within the available time frame of the Project.

The process is reiterative and documentation/actions may continue to be revised as deemed necessary or appropriate by the TEAM, in consultation with the Directors of the IP3 International Alliance.

Throughout the research, the co-investigators and collaborators will reflect on issues and processes and make explicit their assumptions and biases, thereby giving rise to theoretical considerations. The findings, recommendations and products of the case study will be summarized in a Case Study Final Report.
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A researcher should not assume s/he has the most current version of a document that has previously been posted to the IP3 restricted site, even if s/he wrote the document. After a document has been approved by the lead researchers (see Page 5), the Project Coordinator may make minor content and copy edits to it prior to posting it to the Web site and without notifying the writer(s).

For example, if major content revisions and/or copy edits are made, the version number should go from v1-X to v2-X:

ip3_canada_cs01_contextual_analysis_v1-X.pdf
to
ip3_canada_cs01_contextual_analysis_v2-X.pdf

Depending on the nature and extent of the revisions, the document may or may not go through the entire review process again. Thus, the Project Coordinator may approve the changes and then repost the document to the IP3 restricted site without further distribution to the lead researchers.

Submit documents for review and final approval
(See Page 5)
Implement knowledge mobilization strategy

Discuss knowledge mobilization phase of research with test-beds

Identify key knowledge mobilization stakeholders

Develop knowledge mobilization strategy

Knowledge Mobilization Strategy

Knowledge Mobilization Strategy

Although not a case study activity per se, this activity is included here to emphasize the relationship between the Project’s case study activities and its subsequent knowledge mobilization activities, both of which will, to varying degrees, actively involve the test-beds.

Implement knowledge mobilization strategy

Conduct knowledge mobilization workshops, seminars, symposia, etc.

Develop training and education modules

Write and disseminate Position Papers

Position Papers

Training and Education Modules

These may include training and education modules for archival organizations or programs, professional associations and university programs; and awareness and education modules for non archivists, such as IT professionals, vendors, and service providers; human resources and financial managers; doctors, communities of practice, members of the general public, etc.; and a strategy for delivering them.

These are directed to key regulating, auditing and policy-making bodies, advocating the vital need of embedding planned digital preservation in the requirements they issue for the activities they regulate, audit or control.