



InterPARES 3 Project

International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems

TEAM Turkey

Title: The Research and Activities of TEAM Turkey:
Final Report

Status: Final Report

Version: 1.2

Date Submitted: March 2012

Last Revised: March 2012

Author: The InterPARES 3 Project, TEAM Turkey

Writer(s): Ozgur Kulcu
Director
TEAM Turkey – InterPARES 3 Project

Project Unit: Research

URL:

Document Control

Version history			
<u>Version</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>Version notes</u>
1.0	2012-03-02	O. Kulcu	Draft final Report
1.1	2012-03-05	T. Çakmak	Draft final Report
1.2	2012-03-08	A. Allen	Gramattical and formatting changes

Table of Contents

A. TEAM Turkey Overview.....	04
B. TEAM Turkey Participants.....	05
C. Summits and Symposiums.....	06
D. General Studies.....	06
E. Case studies.....	42
F. Dissemination and Final Products.....	44

TEAM Turkey Final Report

A. Overview

InterPARES Project was formed in 1999 and it has three stages. Currently, InterPARES 3 Project studies are carried out by 15 international TEAMS, one of which includes Turkey. TEAM Turkey has participated in the InterPARES 3 Project since 2007. While the conceptual and methodological findings of InterPARES 1 and InterPARES 2 (InterPARES 1/ 1999-2001; InterPARES 2/ 2002-2007) are equally applicable to larger and smaller organizations and programs, InterPARES 3 focuses on archives with limited resources, which often have the greatest need for assistance. TEAM Turkey completed more than 30 case studies, and published the results of these studies in scholarly periodicals such as International Journal of Information Management, The Electronic Library and ASLIB Proceedings.

TEAM TURKEY WEB PAGE

Elektronik Sistemlerde Kalıcı Otantik Belgeler Üzerine Uluslararası Araştırma (**The International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems**)

Proje Özeti (Project Summary)

Türkiye Takımı
Web Sitesine Hoş Geldiniz
(**Welcome to the
TEAM Turkey Website**)

Elektronik Sistemlerde Kalıcı Otantik Belgeler Üzerine Uluslararası Araştırma (InterPARES) 3 Projesi, uluslararası işbirliği ile gerçekleştirilen, ulusal ve çokuluslu takımlardan oluşan uluslararası ortak bir araştırmadır. Projenin idaresi Kanada Sosyal ve İnsani Bilimler Araştırma Konseyi'nin Topluluk-Üniversite Araştırma İttifakı birimi (Canada's Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's Community-University Research Alliances) tarafından fonlanmaktadır. İlgili birim Kanada Takımını da desteklemektedir. Projenin üçüncü ayağına özel verilen başlık, Arşivsel Yönetim İçerisinde Kuramsal Olgunlaşma: Küçük ve orta ölçekli arşiv kurumlarında sayısal sistemlerde özgün belgelerin korunması için kuramsal uygulamalar'dır (Theoretical Elaborations into Archival Management (TEAM): Implementing the theory of preservation of authentic records in digital systems in small and medium-sized archival organizations).

InterPARES Projesi Uluslararası Müttefikleri aşağıda yer almaktadır:

- Afrika Takımı
- Brezilya Takımı
- Kanada Takımı
- Katalan Takımı
- Çin Takımı
- Hollanda ve Belçika Takımı
- İrlanda ve İngiltere Takımı
- İtalya Takımı
- Kore Takımı

- Malezya Takımı
- Meksika Takımı
- Norveç Takımı
- Singapur Takımı
- Türkiye Takımı

Bu proje, arşivlerde uzun süre korunacak elektronik belgelerin var olan yapılarını korumak için InterPARES ve diğer araştırma çalışmalarından elde edilecek somut eylem planlarını, kuram ve yöntemleri tanımlayacak, özellikle bu tür belgelerle ilgili çalışma yürütmede kısıtlı olanakları olan belge ve arşiv organizasyonlarını hedefleyecektir. Çalışmalarda detaylı bilgi aşağıdaki alanlarda geliştirilecektir. (1) Genel kuram ve yöntemler küçük ve orta ölçekli arşivlerde nasıl gerçekleştirilebilir ve etkili biçimde uygulanabilir; (2) Her içerikte ve yapıdaki belgeler için uygun uygulama türünü belirleyen faktörler neler; (3) Bu operasyonlarda hangi özelliklere sahip profesyoneller gereklidir.

Bu temeller üzerinde; kurumlara yönelik eğitim programları için öğretim modelleri, sürekli eğitim seminerleri geliştirilecek, ayrıca sadece sayısal formda toplumun dokümanter geçmişini uzun süre korumak için değil, organizasyonlarda üretilen sayısal bilginin özgünlüğü ve doğruluğunu koruma bağlamında kurumsal sorumlulukları tanımlamaya dönük akademik müfredat geliştirilecektir.

B. TEAM Turkey Participants

Director	Özgür Külçü	Associated Professor	Hacettepe University Department of Information Management	kulcu@hacettepe.edu.tr 90 312 297 82 00-116
Vice Director	Arif Yılmaz	Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Education in HU	Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Division of Preschool Education, 06800 Beytepe Ankara/Turkey	arifyilmaz@yahoo.com 90 312 297 82 00
Researcher	Tolga Çakmak	Research Assistant	Hacettepe University Department of Information Management	tolgack@gmail.com 90 312 297 82 00-125
Researcher	Hande Uzun Külçü	Archive and Records Management Profession at Turkish Red Crescent Society	Türkiye Kızılay Derneği Ataç-1 Sokak No:32 Yenişehir/ANKARA	handeuzun@yahoo.com handeu@kizilay.org.tr 90 312 245 54 00/265
Researcher	Nevzat Özel	Research Assistant	Ankara University Faculty of Language, History and Geography Department of Information and Records Management	nozel@ankara.edu.tr +90 312 310 32 80 (1718)
Researcher	Ömer Dalkıran	Research Assistant	Hacettepe University Department of Information Management	omerdalkiran@gmail.com 90 312 297 82 00-125

C. Summits and Symposiums

1. Çakmak, T. and Külcü Ö. (2011). Evaluation of enterprise information and content management: the example of a defense industry organization in Turkey. *InterPARES 3 Project 5th International Joint Summit and Symposium*. 16-18 June 2011. Kuching: Sarawak State Library.
2. Külcü, Ö. ve Çakmak, T. (2010). Convergence of RM and ECM in digital environments. *CITRA 2010 Conference and InterPARES 3 Summit & Symposium*. 11-19 September, 2010. Oslo: Holmenkollen Park Hotel Rica
3. Külcü, Özgür, Çakmak T and Külcü, Hande Uzun. (2010). The New Challenges In Records Management: Digitization And Enterprise Content Management Practices. CITRA ICA/CITRA Conference Site Event. InterPARES 3 Project Presentations. 17.10.2010 Norway, Oslo.
4. Külcü Özgür. (2010). InterPARES Project Team Turkey Activity Report. InterPARES Project 4th Summit. 13-14.10. 2010 Norway, Oslo
5. Külcü, Özgür. (2010). Enterprise Content Management. InterPARES 3 Project 3rd Summit Team Turkey Presentation. 27.06.2010, Vancouver, Canada.
6. Külcü, Özgür. (2010). E-mail Management in the Context of Enterprise Content Management: Reflections from Turkey. InterPARES 3 Project 3rd International Symposium. 29.06.2010, Vancouver, Canada.
7. Külcü, Özgür, Külcü; Hande Uzun. (2010). The Contextual Analysis of the E-RecordsManagement Requirements of Turkish Red Crescent Society. 8th European Conference on Digital Archiving, 28-30.05.2010, Geneva, Switzerland
8. Külcü, Özgür. (2010). AccessIT Project Management Board, Goethe Institute, 20.20.2010 Athena, Greece,
9. Külcü, Özgür. (2010). AccessIT Digitisation and Digital Content Management Seminar on Digital Skills, 15-20.2.2010, Veria, Greece
10. 2010- BOBCATSSS 2010, Parma. Bridging the digital divide: Libraries providing accessfor all? 25-27 January 2010, Parma, Italy
11. Külcü, Özgür ve Çakmak, T. (2009). "Evaluation of Institutional Conditions for Electronic Records Management (ERM) in Turkey: Results of Surveys Carried Out in 17 Institution". InterPARES 3 Symposium. 4-5 June, Seoul, Korea
12. Külcü, Özgür. (2008). Evolution of the e-records management practices in terms of egovernment, the issues and expectations, reflections from Turkey. InterPARES 3 Project 2nd International Summit, 28-30 April 2008. Det Norske Veritaas, Oslo, Norway

D. General studies:

MAY 2009- MAY 2010 TEAM TURKEY ACTIVITY REPORT

1. Between May 2009 to May 2010 TEAM Turkish has been especially concerned with web based information and records management technologies, social networks, Web 2.0 applications and enterprise content management.
2. TEAM Turkey has developed analytical models in order to assess the condition of the organization's digital systems especially the capture, maintenance, description, retrieval, long term preservation and access to digital assets.
3. TEAM Turkey carried out case studies in 28 different organizations, some of which are large-scale nation wide, in both public and private sectors.

4. TEAM Turkey compiled a questionnaire and interviewed 505 people. The questionnaire comprised almost all aspect of management of digital content, enterprise content management, individual and institutional Web 2.0 usages, e-post management and institutional restrictions on internet and e-post systems. The questionnaire consists of 3 parts and 7 pages.
5. TEAM Turkey prepared a scholarly manuscript that was published in the International Journal of Information Management (in Social Science Citation Index) and prepared two other manuscript that may published in 2010 at the periodicals covered in LISA (Library and Information Science Abstract).
 - **Awaiting publication:** E-mail Management in the Context of Enterprise Content Management: Reflections from Turkey
 - **Awaiting publication:** The New Challenges in Records Management: Digitization and Enterprise Content Management Practices
6. TEAM Turkey organized one international symposiums and 2 seminars. An important symposium in which the Turkish team participated was **2nd International Symposium on Information Management in a Changing World**, on September 22-24, 2010, Ankara, Turkey. The title of symposium was **The Impact of Technological Convergence and Social Networks on Information Management.**
7. Third phase of translation of terminology will be completed in mid-May 2012.
8. TEAM Turkey is concentrating on new technologies and assessment tools for digitations, digital content management, creation social archives, integration of local and international archives over the social networks nowadays. TEAM Turkey studies the results and tools of some projects, such as SHAMAN and PLANETS, and toolkits such as DRAMBORA and TRACKS.

MARCH 2010 - SEPTEMBER 2011 TEAM TURKEY ACTIVITY REPORT

Completed Activities in the Last 6 Months

1. RemMAP Open Archive System has been completed by TEAM Turkey.
2. Records Management Platform has been completed by TEAM Turkey.
3. TEAM Turkey collaborated with TUBİTAK (The biggest scientific organization of Turkey) to carry out TEAM activities.
4. TEAM Turkey started the research for case studies of the InterPARES Project at the 21 main Turkish universities.

Continuing Activities

1. Case Studies that have been started at the universities will be completed in the following six months. TEAM Turkey aim to complete at least 21 case studies in this period.
2. Records Management platform will be opened completely with all modules.
3. 250 bibliographic and full text records will have been entered to the ReMAP Open Archive.
4. Induction Conference will be arranged related with the InterpARES and AccessIT EU Project in October
5. TEAM Turkey will directed their researches on interactive web applications and digital archives, and web content archives.
6. As a theoretical perspective relations between other disciplines with records and archival management, and changes in the area are planned to research.
7. TEAM Turkey is planning on enforcing the relationship with other international InterPARES TEAMS, especially on the special research areas, such as digital records and interactive web applications and web archives.
8. Expectations of the InterPARES management will be explored by TEAM Turkey.

Explanations of the Completed Activities

1. RemMAP Open Archive System of TEAM Turkey has been completed.

The basic purpose of ReMAP is to create a database about digitization, electronic records management, long term preservation of electronic records, security and trustworthiness of records in the electronic environment. It is not always easy to find it out necessary regulations, standards, good practices and guidelines. We hope that this database will be helpful for small and medium size organizations, and intuitions that do not have professional staff or a long tradition of electronic archives and records management. ReMAP is an open source program and is able to be expanded by new data entries by individuals. We created a unique interface which can be created and modified for the potential user's expectations and the information that they need.

2. Records Management Platform has been completed by TEAM Turkey.

Records Management Platform is a web platform. TEAM Turkey aimed the use of this platform at informing society about the InterPARES Project and TEAM activities. This platform contains modules such as education, instant messaging, a discussing forum and online survey tracking system. Records Management Platform is working together with ReMAP Open Archive and has some web 2.0 applications such as cloud tagging, RSS feeding, data sharing with Twitter, Facebook and more than 200 other interactive web applications.

3. TEAM Turkey collaborated with TUBİTAK (The biggest scientific organization of Turkey) to carry out TEAM activities.

The purpose of the three year project is to analyze the conditions, problems and expectations of the universities on the electronic records management, long term preservation of digital assets. At the end of the Project, electronic records management policies will be created and a generic program will be developed. This Project is comprised of 35 major Turkish universities and Turkish TEAM project members (in addition to the InterPARES team). The case studies are focused on the central units of universities, such as archives and records management, administrative units, general secretariat, information processing, and communication.

4. TEAM Turkey has been started the practice of the case studies of InterPARES Project at the main 21 university of Turkey.

In the past 6 month period, TEAM Turkey's work has concentrated on the universities because they have problems when transferring their processes to the digital systems and electronic records management is one of the most problematic areas of the institutions. We worked on the case study methodology of the InterPARES Project. We integrated the case studies of Contextual Analyses, Digital Records and Policies and merged them into one questionnaire. The following case studies were consulted: Akdeniz University, Mersin University, Dokuz Eylul University, Celal Bayar University, Bogazici University, Istanbul Teknik University at the archival and records management units, general secretariat units, information processing units, administration and communication units. We added questions to determine the conditions, problems and expectation of the electronic information, records management, and content management practices of the universities. The questionnaire consists of 3 parts and 7 page form. The first 3 pages are a general questionnaire, pages 4-5 include an analysis of records management, and pages 6-7 include analysis of information processing systems. The results of the case studies will be revealed in spring 2012.

A GENERAL CASE STUDY

Published in

International Journal of Information Management 30 (2010) 199–211

Evaluation of the ERM Application in Turkey within the framework of InterPARES Project

Özgür Külçü

Assistant Professor

Hacettepe University Faculty of Letters Department of Information Management,
06 800 Beytepe Ankara/Turkey

ozgurkulcu@gmail.com; kulcu@hacettepe.edu.tr

Tolga Çakmak

Research Asistant

Hacettepe University Faculty of Letters Department of Information Management,
06 800 Beytepe Ankara/Turkey

tolgack@gmail.com; tcakmak@hacettepe.edu.tr

Abstract

Purpose – In this study, existing conditions, problems, and expectations in the application of electronic records management in Turkey are evaluated on the basis of the data obtained from 17 institutions. The main goal of the study is to define to what extent the applications in information and records services in electronic environment are compatible with the expectations.

Design/methodology/approach – In this study, data was collected from surveys conducted in Turkey within the framework of the InterPARES Project. Action research methodology was used in the study. The survey obtained data from 17 institutions and the results were evaluated in SPSS after content analysis was conducted. The analysis was carried out in order to identify the conditions and problems in institutional electronic records management.

Findings – Problems in coordination of services, integration and independence of information systems, administrative arrangements, and lack of professional personnel were detected within the institutions, and it is seen that transition to the secure application of e-signature is of first priority.

Originality/value – This study contains analyzed data about different institutions on ERM applications within the framework of an international project.

Objectives of the Study

Digital records and the applications that generate them have affected every aspect of business, research, government and domestic life. Several research projects worldwide have addressed these electronic records and their problems. One of the most comprehensive efforts has been made by the InterPARES (The International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems) Project (1999-2006) on these issues. The InterPARES Project provides solutions that are situation specific and must be devised by preservers in light of: a) the cultural, legal, administrative, and functional context in which they operate; b) the nature and characteristics of the organization or person producing the digital material; c) the typology of the material produced and its documentary and technological features; d) the limitations imposed by the available financial and human resources; e) the organizational culture of both the producer of the material and the preserver itself (Duranti, 2007; InterPARES Project, 2008).

In light of this situation, the goal of TEAM Turkey in the InterPARES 3 Project (2007-2012) is to enable Turkey's public and private archival organizations and programs, which are

responsible for the digital records resulting from government, business, research, art and entertainment, social and/or community activities, to preserve over the long term authentic records that satisfy the requirements of their stakeholders and society's needs for an adequate record of its past (InterPARES Project, 2008).

To achieve this goal, TEAM Turkey has identified the following objectives:

1. to assess the applicability of the recommendations of InterPARES and other projects about trusted record-making and recordkeeping to the situations of the small and medium sized archival organizations
2. to assess the applicability of these projects' preservation solutions to the concrete cases identified by the test-bed.
3. to refine and further elaborate the theory and methods, concepts and principles developed by these research projects on the basis of the results of the above activities.
4. to establish when such theory and methods, concepts and principles apply across jurisdictions, regardless of legal/administrative, social and cultural environment (Duranti, 2007; InterPARES Project Organizational Policy, 2007).

In this study, existing conditions, problems, and expectations of the application of electronic records management in Turkey are evaluated on the basis of the data obtained from 17 institutions within the framework of the InterPARES Project.

Methodology

These types of studies call for action research (McNiff and Whitehead, 2006). Action research is a collection of participative and iterative methods, which pursue action (in this case, the preservation of digital records) and research at the same time. As a matter of course, action research forges collaborations between community members and researchers in a program of action and reflection toward positive change (Greenwood and Levin, 2003). Action research makes extensive use of case study methodology and of direct communication and interaction with the subjects of the research, which are at the same time participants and contributors in the research activity (Duranti, 2007).

This study depends on findings acquired from the analysis carried out by the Turkish TEAM of InterPARES 3 Project. Contextual analysis, records, records keeping and policy analysis are based on the InterPARES 3 Project methodology. Each of the field surveys under the following titles was conducted in 17 different institutions and the data was obtained.

1. Case Study Contextual Analysis

- a. Institution, location, development, legal status, administrative structure, financial assistance, sources, management, constraints, aim and objectives
 - b. Activities result in creation of records: Administrative and managerial framework, general definition, types of activities, documents prepared during activities, existing records management program, personnel responsible for records procedures, strategies for records procedures, legal requirements and constraints, administrative requirements and constraints, ethical requirements and constraints.
2. Questions to be answered during Policy Case Studies (in total, 18 defined questions)
 3. Questions to be answered during Records Case Studies (in total, 11 defined questions)
 4. Questions to be answered during Records Keeping Case Studies (in total, 14 defined questions) (InterPARES Project Organizational Policy, 2007).

Development of Records Management in Turkey

The basic regulation guiding records and archiving studies in Turkey is the “Law on Amended Decree Law on Disposing Redundant Records and Materials” released on October 04, 1988. “Regulation on State Archiving Services” of May 16, 1988, on the other hand, presents a model for applying institutional records procedures. In addition to these regulations, various arrangements have been carried out in order to meet the requirements in records and archiving services within the framework of the changing conditions. It is believed that these arrangements have emerged in order to restructure information and records procedures according to the changing conditions, to coordinate these procedures with other related constituents, to set up the environment for realization of information and records procedures in electronic environment, and as a result of the process of alignment to the EU or similar international institutions. These arrangements are chronologically as follows:

1. “Receiving Opinion of General Directorate of State Archives on Sorting and Disposing Procedures, Sending Annual Achieves Activity Report Without Delay, Transfer of Board of Management or Similar Decisions and Achieve Material in Old Turkish Without Delay to the State Achieves”. Prime Ministry Circular, No: 18975, October 20, 1998
2. “Regulation on Amending the Regulation on State Archiving Services”. *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 24487, August 08, 2001: 95-100
3. “Law on Freedom of Information”. *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25269, October 24, 2003: 1-8

4. "Law on E-Signature". *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25355, January 23, 2004: 1-8
5. "Regulation on Principles and Procedures for Application of the Law on Right of Information". *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25445, April 27, 2004: 1-13
6. "Regulation on Principles and Procedures to be Applied in Official Correspondence". *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25658, December 02, 2004: 5-26
7. "Prime Ministry Circular on Standard File Plan". *Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry General Directorate of Personnel and Principles*, 320-3802, March 24, 2005: 1-55

In addition to these arrangements, although not legalized yet, Draft Law on the Foundation and Duties of General Directorate of State Archives and State Archiving Services; and Draft Law on the Organization for National Information Security and Its Duties have been finalized by Prime Ministry General Directorate of State Archives (Elektronik, 2005, p. 88), and they have passed from the Commission of National Education in TGNA on May 04, 2006, which accelerated the legalization process (Reuters News Agency, 2006). This process is still in progress.

Recently, Turkish Standards Institution published Turkish edition of ISO 15489, the international standard for records management (TS ISO 15489-1, 2007; TS ISO 15489-2, 2007). Another crucial study carried out in Turkey is Reference Model for System Criteria of Electronic Records Management (EBYSKRM) which was prepared in 2005 and whose revised second edition was published in 2006 (Kandur, 2006). Turkish Standards Institution adopted EBYSKRM as standard with the code of TSE 13298 on June 19, 2007 (Turkish Standards Institution). It is thought that TSE 13298 which was compatible with the studies of ICA and Australian and British National Archives, MoReq Model, DoD 5015.2 Standard, INTERPARES Project, ISO 15489 Standard, ANSI/ARMA Standards, etc. would be beneficial in conducting studies on records management in electronic environment in Turkey which are compatible and coordinated with international applications and standards.

Developments in the Field of E-Government and Electronic Records Management

The "E-Government Gate" portal was opened on December 18 is regarded as the peak of successes in electronic public services and, in this framework, in electronic records management applications in Turkey. E-Government Gate is an internet portal which provides access to all public services from a single point. The goal of the gate is summarized as offering public

services to citizens, companies and public institutions through information and communication technologies in an effective and fruitful way (E-government gate, 2009).

In addition to this general arrangement, many projects have been developed in Turkey, such as: application samples and institutional arrangements, including e-records management and e-government applications. The major projects are shown below in chronological order:

- Central Record Institution (CRI) of the Capital Markets Board ERM Project (Merkezi Kayıt Kuruluşu, 2008).
- National Judicial Network Project (UYAP) (Adalet Bakanlığı, 2008).
- Central Population Management System (MERNIS) Project (Bilişim'07, 2007).
- Inward Processing Regime (DİR) Automation by the Undersecretariat of Foreign Trade of the Prime Ministry (Hatır, 2005; T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı, 2008a).
- Directorate General for the Protection of Citizens and Competition of the Ministry of Industry and Trade ERM Project (T.C. Sanayi ve Ticaret Bakanlığı, 2008).
- Turkish Patent Institution (TPE) ERM Project (Türk Patent Enstitüsü, 2008).
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs ERM Applications T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı, 2008).
- Social Security Administration ERM Insurance Project (T.C. Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu, 2008).
- Directorate General of National Estate ERM Project (T.C Maliye Bakanlığı Milli Emlak Genel Müdürlüğü, 2008).
- Undersecretariat of Customs ERM Project (T.C. Başbakanlık Gümrük Müsteşarlığı, 2008).
- Turkish Land Registry and Cadastre Information System (T.C. Bayındırlık ve İskân Bakanlığı Tapu ve Kadasro Genel Müdürlüğü, 2008).
- The Ministry of Agriculture Agricultural Database Project

Evaluation of Electronic Records Management Applications in Turkey: Case Studies Carried Out in 17 Institutions

In the following study, data was obtained from case studies in 17 different institutions in order for the evaluation of electronic records management applications in Turkey to be presented. The aim of these surveys was to identify the role of information and records management in institutional objectives, structure, functioning and practices of foundations which have diverse

service activities; and to determine to what extent institutional information and records management activities are carried out in electronic environment.

The study, which was carried out to determine the dimension of electronic records management applications, includes data from case studies conducted in Turkey within the framework of the InterPARES Project. The case studies aim to identify the institutional conditions and, in this framework, the electronic and printed information and records management expectations.

Findings of Surveys Carried Out in 17 Institutions

In this study, findings from policy, records, contextual, and recordkeeping case studies which were carried out within the framework of InterPARES Methodology in 17 different institutions will be presented. The case studies which were designed to determine the conditions, problems and expectations in electronic records management in institutions enable a comprehensive assessment of the situation. However, it was necessary to digitize the data in order to evaluate and compare them, and results were evaluated in SPSS after their content analysis was conducted. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the data were also calculated in the fields which required Likert analysis. Since it was difficult to deal with each institution separately, they were divided into three groups and the evaluations were conducted considering the responses of these groups.

Table 1. List of organizations

1	Barlas Interior Design
2	Ankara Province Board of Leagues
3	Undersecretaries of the Prime Ministry for Foreign Trade
4	Republic of Turkey, The Ministry of Public Works and Settlement:
5	Hacettepe University Institute of Social Science
6	Hacettepe University Adult Hospital
7	Aselsan A.S. (Military Electronic Industry joint-stock company)
8	Turkey Aerospace Industries Inc.
9	Vehbi Koc Ankara Research Center
10	Hacettepe University Library Department of Consultation and
11	Hacettepe University Beytepe Center Library, User Service
12	Middle East Technical University
13	Atilim University Library
14	ULAKBIM - Cahit Arf Information Center
15	Adnan Otuken Public Library
16	Turkey Radio and Television (TRT) Central Library
17	Turkey Radio and Television (TRT) Istanbul Directorate

Table 1 includes the list of institutions in which analysis and survey studies were carried out. Analysis was conducted in the institutions using contextual, policy, records, and recordkeeping case study templates defined within the framework of InterPARES 3

methodology. Then, in order to obtain analytical results, these analyzed data were assessed in accordance with contextual analysis technique and entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) which enabled to obtain the following results.

Table 2. Test-bed sectors

	N	%
Education&Research	6	35.3
Service Sector	5	29.4
Governmental & Military	6	35.3
Total	17	100,0

As it is shown in Table 2, the institutions in which research and analysis took place are divided into 3 groups: Education & Research (35.3%), Service Sector (29.4%), and Government & Military (35.3%).

In total, 17 institutions were divided into the three groups, and their work functions primarily consist of information service, publishing, research, financial and governmental and medical information.

Table 3. Activity fields of the Institution.

In the study, data was evaluated according to the groups listed in Table 2. There is information in Table 4 about how service policies are developed in the institutions. Education&Research institutions are predominantly developing joint policies (50%), while Government&Military institutions realize in-house arrangements (83.3%). The ratio of institutions developing their own service policy in units which are responsible for information and records procedures is under 21% in each of the three groups.

Table 4. Collaborative efforts for policy making.

In each three groups, the units which are responsible for information and records procedures have mostly no decision-making and expending power. The ratio of units having administrative and financial autonomy is under 30% in each three groups, while 40% of the institutions in the service sector face problems in funds and support.

Table 5. The management system and financial resources of the information and records system.

The total number of personnel in units responsible for information and records procedures shows variation. The number of personnel in Education & Research institutions is increasing comparatively, while the Service Sector and Governmental & Military follow.

Table 6. Number of staff.

The number of personnel who were professionally trained for information and records services is significantly high. The most problematic group in trained personnel is Government & Military.

Table 7. Professional qualifications of staff.

The highest ratio in annual records creation belongs to the group Service Sector (Σ 2.6); it is followed by Education & Research (Σ 3) and Governmental & Military (Σ 2.3). Nevertheless, the personnel number of Service Sector is under that of Education & Research as shown in the Table 6. This shows that workload concerning records is heavier in Service Sector.

Table 8. Number of records created each year.

Service Sector is the group in which existing policies and legal procedures on information and records management are most insufficient. The Education & Research group is comparatively in better condition, while Governmental & Military group has an average result.

Table 9. Policies and Legal Procedures.

Most of the institutions (more than 64%) in each three groups asserted that they used records intensively in in-house transactions. Ratio of those who stated that they rarely used records in institutional transactions remained under 21% in each three groups.

Table 10. Types of activities resulting from documents.

Though not so strong, each three groups have a system for conventional records (General Σ 2.4). In four institutions from Service and Education & Research sectors, on the other hand, there are serious problems. In general, it is possible to say that the system for conventional records used in institutions serving in Governmental & Military sector is better than others (Σ 2.0).

Table 11. Does the archives have a strong record/archives policy for traditional records?

While ratios of each three groups are not strong on approaches of other units towards information and records procedures in the institution, there are still positive conditions (General Σ 2.7). Serious problems are observed in four institutions from Service Sector and Education & Research. In the institutions serving in Education & Research, in general, conditions seems slightly better than that of other groups (Σ 2.5).

Table 12. Are the procedures enough for ensuring that all the concerned parties are aware of, comprehend and apply the records/archives policy?

On average, 47.1% of the 17 institutions in which analysis and researches are conducted has a records manager trained on records management. This ratio increases up to 66.7% in the Education & Research group. The possibility of the personnel who is responsible for

information and records procedures to be from other professions is under 21% in each three groups.

Table 13. The responsibility for the records/archives issues.

A significant part (more than 79%) of institutions in which analysis and researches were conducted creates or uses electronic records. Only two institutions out of 17 stated that they do not use electronic records in transactions.

Table 14. Electronic record creation.

The 6 educational institutions have a system for electronic records. However, a significant ratio of 66.7% in the Governmental & Military group and 40% of the Service Sector group do not have any system for electronic records.

Table 15. Electronic record system usage.

The reason for institutions to use electronic records is predominantly for administrative and controlling activities, while user statistics in the Service Sector and providing sources in the Governmental & Military group have an influence on whether the institution uses electronic records. Education & Research intensively uses the four varieties of electronic records applications.

Table 16. The Reasons for using electronic records.

The whole Education & Research group and 80% of Service Sector possess software applications for information processing. 50% of Governmental & Military group do not have any software for institutional information systems.

Table 17. Information system software usage.

Software applications for information systems in the Education & Research group include, in general, the whole acquisition, browsing, intuitional transactions and public relations modules. The module on acquisition of information and records sources exists in only one institution. In the Governmental & Military sector, no institutions have software application for institutional transactions. In the same group, only one foundation has a public relation module.

Table 18. The scope of the information system software.

On average, 35.3% of the case institutions have an integrated and identified records management system which is composed of functions from creation to disposition. It is seen that disposition module of the program is inefficient in Education & Research (16.7%) and in Service Sector (20%). In the Governmental & Military group, apart from the data on information systems, records management systems are more comprehensive than that of other groups.

Table 19. Organizational record management program.

In Governmental & Military group, identifying ratio of records creation in ERM applications was found to be higher than other groups. In all groups, ratio of inclusion of disposition in ERM is under 21%. In the Service Sector, the predominant application for dissemination of records is based on manual systems. Institutions mostly use electronic systems in filing applications (in total, 76.5%).

Table 20. Electronic records management program in life cycle.

The sufficiency ratio of technological infrastructure for electronic records in the institutions is under 50% in each three groups. It is striking that infrastructure facilities of 33.3% of Government & Military group and 20% of Service Sector were defined as totally insufficient.

Table 21. Technologic infrastructure for electronic records.

The intended users of digital records in the Education & Research group are researchers (66.7%). There is a balanced distribution in all fields in the Service Sector, while in the Governmental & Military group, the target group primarily consists of regular staff (83.3%).

Table 22. Intended users of digital records.

While identifying data within ERM applied by institutions, the following items take part in sequence: title (in total, 100%), date (94.1%), code data (64.7%), related activities (35.3%) and summary (35.3%). Absence of some identified metadata can be regarded as an oversight.

Table 23. Metadata which is manually added to the records by their author and their creator.

In each three groups, official applications (correspondences, directives, forms, etc.) and databases take part within electronic recordkeeping system as a whole. While recordkeeping does not include e-mails in the Service Sector, tracking files are kept in electronic environment in only one institution in the Governmental & Military group.

Table 24. Electronic recordkeeping system.

The following five successive components are designed to determine the measures of the creator enough to ensure the accuracy, reliability and authenticity of the digital records and their documentation in the institutions within the framework of InterPARES methodology.

It is stated that the existing systems for authorization of records were strong in each three groups (Arithmetic mean of responses is low, while support to the argument that the system is strong) (General \sum 1.88). The records system for authorization is strongest in the Education & Research group (\sum 1.67). In the Governmental & Military group, on the other hand, the responses are in mean values (\sum 2.17). It is stated that there was 16.7% of authorization problem in the Governmental & Military group, which proves to be an important fact.

Table 25. Authorization.

It is seen that there is no problem in security systems of ERM applications (General Σ 1.59). In the Education & Research group, one institution is reports its uncertainties about their system.

Table 26. Security system.

There is also no problem in backup applications within the scope of ERM in the institutions. Except for the uncertainties in 16.7% of the Education & Research group, smooth functioning of the system is confirmed by responses “agree” and “strongly agree” in the questionnaire.

Table 27. Backup.

The most problematic field in ERM applications is thought to be digital signature. In this context, none of the 17 institutions responded positively. The height of arithmetic mean values support this result (General Σ 4.24).

Table 28. Digital signature.

No serious problem was observed in long term preservation of records within ERM except for one institution from the Education & Research group. Nevertheless, some uncertainties on long term preservation in 40% of the Service Sector and 33.3% of the Education & Research group have been observed.

Table 29. Long term preservation.

The most common applications within preservation methods of digital records are information system in and receiving backup for Education & Research, receiving hard copy and backup for the Service Sector, and receiving hard copy for the Governmental & Military group. 50% of institutions in the Governmental & Military group expressed that they did not receive backup, which proves to be an important fact.

Table 30. Preservation methods of the digital records.

The case institutions mostly make use of changes in records which are stored in electronic systems for updating (in total 82.4%) and deleting (82.4%). Also, adding new information to records (70.6%) and making changes on records (64.7%) are processes that are frequently carried out. Adding new information to records, making changes on them or deleting them need to be conducted under special security measures by an authorized personnel. Frequent conduct of the related applications raises problems on originality and security of records in electronic environment.

Table 31. Changes on digital records.

Of the case institutions 66.7% from Education & Research, 60% from Service Sector, and 33.4% from Governmental & Military stated, by marking “agree” or “strongly agree”, that

there was a strong and unproblematic relation between records creating units and central archive. It is particularly noteworthy that more than half of the Governmental & Military group has problems between official units and records and archive centers. 33.3% of the Education & Research group also draws attention to this problem.

Table 32. Are there a sufficient relationship between units that are involved with records/archives creation and management?

Relation and integration between information system and electronic records archive system used in institutions:

There are differences in the relation between information systems and archive systems used in institutions. In the Service Sector, in-house applications are predominantly used (80%), while half of the Education & Research and Governmental & Military groups have separate records and archive programs. The ratio of using a system in which archive system is integrated with other information systems is under 21% in each three groups.

Table 33. The relationship between records to the archival bonds or other media.

Materials are placed into information and records centers of institutions within the framework of filing plan and classification system. A filing system is used more predominantly in the Governmental & Military group (83.3%), while in other groups classifying and filing methods are used equally. This shows that in information/records centers, sources are rather composed of records in the Governmental & Military group, while in other groups they are composed of various information sources (books, periodicals, documents, etc.). Again in the Governmental & Military group, the ratio of providing information/records centers with source is as high as 50% within the framework of retention plans. In the Education & Research group, purchasing holds an important place with the percentage of 50% in obtaining materials. All three groups selected "Others" by a margin of 20% and over.

Table 34. If the archives has the records in custody, how were they acquired? How were they processed?

(Note: When more than one application is in question, the total ratio may exceed 100% in the same line.)

The feature of records type comes into prominence in the organization and arrangement of information/records sources. In the Governmental & Military group, it is predominantly conducted within the framework of Standard File Plan with 66.7%, while in the Education & Research it is carried out according to Library of Congress classification system. Each variant is observed to have equal ratios in the Service Sector. Nevertheless, it is a serious problem that

no system is used for the arrangement of information/records sources in 20% of the Service Sector and 16.7% of Education & Research.

Table 35. The system uses of organizing information and records.

Records creating units of institutions predominantly have positive expectations on setting up an integrated and centralized digital recordkeeping system within the institution (“agree” and “strongly agree” responses are total, 53%). Most negative approach to such improvement came from the Governmental & Military group (“NA” and “disagree” responses are in total 66.7%). It is significant that more than half of the groups stated that there was need for an integrated and central electronic recordkeeping system.

Table 36. Intension of the creating body to establish an integrated and centralized digital recordkeeping system, controlling all records of the organization in all media and form.

A majority of the groups think that there is need for modification of existing institutional policies, procedures, and standards for creation, maintenance, preservation or use of records. It is significant that 50% of the Education & Research group strongly need such a change. This ratio was also found to be over 29% in other groups. The ratio of those who assert that there is no need for readjustment of arrangements which determine procedures related to published electronic records is under 17% in each three groups. Arithmetic mean values are found to be 2 (Agree), which supports the expectations. The arithmetic mean in the Service Sector is found to be over N/A and close to Agree level.

Table 37. Do they need to modify the existing policies, procedures, and standards currently control or influence records creation, maintenance, preservation or use?

Evaluation and Conclusion

Since early 20th century, Turkey has faced drastic changes in administrative organization and institutional structuring in parallel upon the effect of modern administration and system approaches. In spite of standstill periods at certain times, the changes point at a long-term innovation in both the public and private sector. As a part of these changes, information and records systems were revised and, as a result of this, the legal and administrative arrangements mentioned in this study were set up and put into effect. Today, records management studies are guided by electronic applications. Electronic applications that have rapidly become widespread in the West since mid-1990s were introduced to Turkey in early 2000s, with a delay of approximately five years. In this context, many public services are currently conducted in electronic environment. Turkey is rapidly upgrading its place in e-government indexes. However, both structural and practical problems and deficiencies need to be handled

seriously. The primary issue at this point is to determine to what extent the existing conditions meet the expectations. In that context, results obtained from the analyses conducted in 17 institutions are as follows:

The Service areas of the institutions consist of information service, publishing, research, public services, medical services, advertising. These institutions are chosen at nearly equal rates from sectors under three groups: Education & Research, Service Sector, and Governmental & Military.

To evaluate in general, a great majority of the institutions from three groups, the units responsible for information and records services do not have decision-making and expending authority, which poses a serious problem. It is thought that information and records procedures can be conducted more efficiently through efficiency calculation and appropriate financial accounting in services. On the one hand, the number of personnel responsible for information and records procedures is sufficient in each three groups, on the other hand, there are serious problems in the number of trained personnel in the institutions which belong to Service Sector and Governmental & Military groups. Although Service Sector has the highest ratio of annual records creation, its personnel number is lower than that of Education & Research. This shows that inequalities exist in personnel distribution. Again in the Service Sector, existing policies and administrative arrangements for information/records procedures prove to be more inefficient than other sectors.

Records are frequently used in daily affairs in the institutions from each three groups. Also, no serious problems are observed in systems for conventional (printed) information and records in each three groups. There is not any communication or coordination problem amongst units within the institutions. It is a positive fact that 47.1% of the institutions have at least one information and records manager. 79% of the case institutions conduct information/records procedures in electronic environment, which is evidence for how rapid the recent change has been. However, the system used by a majority of the institutions, especially by those that belong to the Governmental & Military Sector and Service Sector, in information/records procedures under electronic environment is too simple, and it is far from professional. The institutions predominantly make use of electronic information/records systems for administrative transactions and controlling, user statistics and providing the required sources. It is a serious problem that half of the institutions belonging to the Government & Military group do not have software applications for information processing. Again it is remarkable that none of the institutions serving in the Governmental & Military sector have software application for institutional transactions.

Only 35% of the 17 case institutions have an identified records management system which is composed of functions from creation to disposition of records in electronic environment. Programs used in other institutions meet some requirements of some life cycle stages. 76% of all institutions conduct their official records trafficking in a print environment. The institutions do not have any problem with technological infrastructure, while infrastructure facilities for electronic records management applications are insufficient in 53% of them.

A target audience of the groups shows variation according to the service. In Education & Research, the target audience is the general public, while it is various in-house units in the Governmental & Military group.

While metadata information of records is identified in electronic systems, some information (in particular the related activities and summary information) is missing. Although the whole of the office applications are carried out in electronic environment in all institutions, it is a serious problem that there is no systematic way of retention for data on e-mails platforms through which institutions conduct in-house communication.

In the institutions, there are no problems of authorization, security, backup, and preservation for a long period in ERM applications. However, records procedures requiring original signatures cannot be conducted in an electronic environment, which is a problem that needs to be rapidly addressed. The most problematic group in long-term preservation is the Governmental & Military. A large majority of the groups (82.4%) kept their data in databases belonging to institutional information systems. Changes can be done on these data in various levels in a further time. Yet, each of the three groups have problems in various levels in authorization, security, and preservation of data integrity of these changes.

Institutions being part of the Governmental & Military group draw attention to disconnection between information/records center and other official units, while other groups, in general, do not have such serious problems.

It is seen that there is no integrated structures, in general, between information and records management programs and other information systems. This situation may lead to several problems in processing of institutional information systems as a whole, conducting information and records procedures in coordination, and sharing the required information and records on time.

In institutions, information and records sources are arranged according to the structure of existing material. However, according to Table 31, the predominant materials used in the Governmental & Military group are records. As it can be inferred from other results, problems on records procedures are denser in this group. Nevertheless, more than 10% of institutions

and 20% of the Service Sector state that they do not have any systematic arrangement, which turns out to be a serious problem.

Institutions generally indicate that they need an integrated and centralized digital recordkeeping system in order for controlling all records of the organization in all media and form created and used within the scope of ERM. Yet, this ratio decreases to 33.3% in the Governmental & Military group. 83.3% of the institutions belonging to the Governmental & Military group state, on the other hand, that there is a need to modify the existing policies, procedures, and standards currently control or influence records creation, maintenance, preservation or use. This shows that the Governmental & Military group primarily needs to reorganize its own system. The ratio is 50% and over in other groups, which proves that they need such reorganization as well.

Suggestions

Nearly all of the case institutions intend to transfer the entire information and records applications into an electronic environment. However, under the existing conditions, one of the most challenging problems is the lack of central institutions that would coordinate the applications. Initially, a unit bound to the central government needs to be established which would set up the infrastructure for electronic information/records applications, and coordinate, arrange and supervise them. The existing units within State Planning Organization can be made more active. Moreover, the following suggestions proposed within the framework of the findings obtained from the study are thought to be important to take into account:

1. Units of institutions responsible for information/records procedures should have the authority of decision-making and expending independently.
2. Institutions in need of professional personnel should be supported. It is important to take into account the distribution of workload in appointments.
3. An significant amount of the institutional workload has been transferred into the electronic environment. Administrative and legal arrangements, which would identify information/records procedures in electronic environment just as in the printed environment, should be put into effect as soon as possible.
4. The primary system used by institutions which have records in an electronic environment is nothing more than word processors. Other systems (particularly used in information centers) do not focus on information sources. Information systems for institutions should be developed including the modules such as information, records, document, human resources, administrative information systems and budget programs.

Transition, information exchange, and inter operability should be enabled among modules within ERM.

5. Metadata fields used in identifying records should be expanded considering every fact, and it should be possible to monitor and preserve the entire in-house correspondence within the system.
6. Transferring official correspondences requiring original signature into electronic environment by using secure electronic signature should be attached priority.
7. Disconnections between information/records centers and other units should be eliminated, and a harmonized and coordinated functioning should be enabled.
8. ERM applications used in institutions should be restructured providing an integrated and centralized digital recordkeeping system in order for controlling all records of the organization in all media and form.

It should be taken into account that, fulfilling the suggestions above will enable e-government and ERM applications to become more efficient, reliable and systematic in institutions which have already gained acceleration in Turkey, and to lead up to innovations and advances.

References

Bilişim'07 (2007), “Değerlendirme Raporu”, available at:
<http://www.digitaldevlet.net/index.htm>

Duranti, Luciana (2007). An Overview of InterPARES 3 (2007-2012). *Archives & Social Studies*, 1(1): 577-603.

Elektronik Belge Yönetimi Sistem Kriterleri Referans Modeli.(2005). Prepared by Hamza Kandur. İstanbul: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü, 2005.

Hatır, Hüseyin (2005), “Dış ticarete e-devlet”, available at:
http://www.tele.com.tr/blog_comment.asp?bi=1410

InterPARES Project (2008), “The International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) 3 Project”, available at: <http://www.interpares.org/>

InterPARES Project Organizational Policy (2007). The International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES)

Kandur, H. (2006). *Elektronik belge yönetimi sistem kriterleri referans modeli*. İstanbul: Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü. http://www.devletarsivleri.gov.tr/EBYS_v_2_0.pdf (accessed June 1, 2007)

“Law on E-Signature” (2004). *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25355, January 23, 2004: 1-8

“Law on Freedom of Information” (2003). *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25269, October 24, 2003: 1-8.

Merkezi Kayıt Kuruluşu (2008). “Nitelikle Elektronik Sertifika Edinimi”, available at:
<http://www.mkk.com.tr/MkkComTr/assets/files/tr/yay/mektuplar/GM258.pdf>

Milletlerarası İmar ve Kalkınma Bankası: Kalkınma Planı İçin Tahlil ve Tavsiyeler (1955). *Milletlerarası İmar ve Kalkınma Bankasının Türkiye Hükümet İle İştirak ve Finansı Ettiği Heyetin Raporu*. Ankara: Başbakanlık.

McNiff, J. and Whitehead, J.(2006). All you need to know about action research. London: Sage Publications.

“Prime Ministry Circular on Standard File Plan” (2005). *Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry General Directorate of Personnel and Principles*, 320-3802, March 24, 2005: 1-55.

“Receiving Opinion of General Directorate of State Archives on Sorting and Disposing Procedures, Sending Annual Archives Activity Report Without Delay, Transfer of Board of Management or Similar Decisions and Archive Material in Old Turkish Without Delay to the State Archives” (1998). *Prime Ministry Circular*, No: 18975, October 20, 1998

“Regulation on Amending the Regulation on State Archiving Services” (2001). *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 24487, August 08, 2001: 95-100

“Regulation on Principles and Procedures for Application of the Law on Right of Information” (2004). *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25445, April 27, 2004: 1-13

“Regulation on Principles and Procedures to be Applied in Official Correspondence” (2004). *Republic of Turkey Official Journal*, No: 25658, December 02, 2004: 5-26

Reuters News Agency. (2006). *Arşiv hizmetlerini düzenleyen tasarı komisyonda kabul edildi.*

http://www.isbank.com.tr/reuters-haber-detay.asp?Document_Header=nGOK438372 (accessed April 4, 2006).

T.C. Adalet Bakanlığı. (2008). “Ulusal Yargı Ağı Projesi (UYAP)”, available at:

<http://www.uyap.gov.tr/genelbilgi/genel.html>

T.C. Başbakanlık Dış Ticaret Müsteşarlığı. (2008a), “Dahilde İşleme Rejimi (DİR) Otomasyon Uygulaması”, available at:

http://www.immib.org.tr/dirweb/firma_kullanım_kilavuzu.pdf

T.C. Başbakanlık.(2008b) "E-Government Gate- E-Devlet Kapısı: Devletin Kısa Yolu."

<https://www.turkiye.gov.tr/portal/dt?provider=HomePageContainer&channel=icerik>.

T.C. Bayındırlık ve İskân Bakanlığı Tapu ve Kadasro Genel Müdürlüğü. (2008), “Tapu Arşiv Otomasyonu”, available at: <http://www.tkgm.gov.tr/ana.php?Sayfa=projedetay&ID=11>

T.C. Dışişleri Bakanlığı. (2008), “E-konsolosluk”, available at: <http://www.e-konsolosluk.net/>

T.C. Başbakanlık Gümrük Müsteşarlığı. (2008). available at: <https://guvas.gumruk.gov.tr/>

T.C. İçişleri Bakanlığı Nüfus ve Vatandaşlık İşleri Genel Müdürlüğü. (2008), available at:

http://www.nvi.gov.tr/Hakkimizda/Projeler,Mernis_Genel.html?pageindex=1

- T.C. Maliye Bakanlığı Milli Emlak Genel Müdürlüğü. (2008). “Milli Emlak Otomasyon Projesi,” available at: http://www.milliemlak.gov.tr/_projelerimiz/meop/prj_meop.htm
- T.C. Sanayi ve Ticaret Bakanlığı. (2008b). “Garanti, Muafiyet ve SSHYB e-imza’lı İşlemler Kılavuzu (2007)”, available at: <https://e-imza.sanayi.gov.tr/webedit/klavuz.pdf>
- T.C. Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu. (2008). “Kurumunuz İnteraktif Uygulamaları”, available at: <http://www.ssk.gov.tr/sgk/e-hizmet.html>
- T.C. Tarım ve Köyşleri Bakanlığı. (2008). “Çiftçi Kayıt Sistemi”, available at: http://www.tarim.gov.tr/arayuz/10/icerik.asp?efl=bilgi_islem/index.htm&curdir=%5Csanal_kutuphane%5Cbilgi_islem&fl=cks.htm
- Türk Patent Enstitüsü. (2007). “E-İmza İle Marka Başvurusu Hizmetinizde”, available at: <http://www.turkpatent.gov.tr/portal/default2.jsp?sayfa=703&haber=496>
- Türk Standartları Enstitüsü. (2007). *Bilgi ve dokümantasyon – Elektronik belge yönetimi. (TSE 13298)*. http://www.tse.org.tr/Turkish/Abone/Standard_Ara.asp?Durum=IcsTablosu&Sira=1&EskiKod=01.110 (accessed August 12, 2007).

Türkiye Avrupa Birliği Karma Parlamento Komisyonu. Türkiye-AB İlişkilerinde Önemli Tarihler Kronolojisi . Retrieved 4 April 2008 from http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ul_kom/kpk/trabils.htm

World Bank. 2008. Gross domestic products 2007. Received 21 July 2008 from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATA_STATISTICS/Resources/GDP_PPP.pdf

Tables used in the study:**Table 2** Test-bed sectors

	N	%
Education&Research	6	35.3
Service Sector	5	29.4
Governmental & Military	6	35.3
Total	17	100.0

Table 3. Activity fields of the Institution.

	N	%
Information Service	6	35.3
Publishing	2	11.8
Research	4	23.5
Financial and Governmental	3	17.6
Medical and Other Services	2	11.8
Total	17	100.0

Table 4. Collaborative efforts for policy making

		Individually	Organizationally	Inter-organizationally	Total
Education&Research	N	1	2	3	6
	%	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Service Sector	N	1	2	2	5
	%	20,0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Governmental & Military	N	0	5	1	6
	%	0%	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
Total	N	2	9	6	17
	%	11.8%	52.9%	35.3%	100.0%

Table 5. The management system and financial resources of the information and records system

		Independent and sufficient	determined by other units	by legal deposit law, gifts	insufficient
Education&Research	N	2	6	1	0
	%	33.3%	100.0%	16.7%	0%
Service Sector	N	2	3	1	2
	%	40.0%	60.0%	20.0%	40.0%
Governmental & Military	N	1	6	0	0
	%	16.7%	100.0%	0%	0%
Total	N	5	15	2	2
	%	29.4%	88.2%	11.8%	11.8%

Table 6. Number of staff

		1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 10	10 - 20	20 +
Education&Research	N	2	0	1	0	3
	%	33.3%	0%	16.7%	0%	50.0%
Service Sector	N	1	0	0	2	2
	%	20.0%	0%	0%	40.0%	40.0%
Governmental & Military	N	3	1	1	0	1
	%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0%	16.7%
Total	N	6	1	2	2	6
	%	35.3%	5.9%	11.8%	11.8%	35.3%

Table 7. Professional qualifications of staff

		All of them	Majority of them	Some of them	Insufficient Professional	Σ
Education&Research	N	2	3	1	0	1,8
	%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	0%	
Service Sector	N	0	2	1	2	3,0
	%	0%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	
Governmental & Military	N	1	0	2	3	3,1
	%	16.7%	0%	33.3%	50.0%	
Total	N	3	5	4	5	2,6
	%	17.6%	29.4%	23.5%	29.4%	

Table 8. Number of records created each year

		-4999	-20.000	-50.000	-100.000	100.000 +	Total	Σ
Education&R	N	2	1	1	1	1	6	2,6
	%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%	
Service Sector	N	1	2	0	0	2	5	3,0
	%	20.0%	40.0%	0%	0%	40.0%	100.0%	
Governmental & Military	N	3	0	1	2	0	6	2,3
	%	50.0%	0%	16.7%	33.3%	0%	100.0%	
Total	N	6	3	2	3	3	17	2,6
	%	35.3%	17.6%	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	100.0%	

Table 9. Policies and Legal Procedures

		TS	S	U	I	TI	
Education&Research	N	2	1	2	1	2	2,3
	%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	
Service Sector	N	0	1	3	1	0	3,0
	%	0%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0%	
Governmental & Military	N	1	2	2	1	1	2,5
	%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	
Total	N	3	4	7	3	3	2,5
	%	17.6%	23.5%	41.2%	17.6%	17.6%	

TS: Totally Sufficient, S: Sufficient, U: Uncertain, I: Insufficient, TI: Totally Insufficient

Table 10. Types of activities resulting from documents

		All	Majority	Some	Rare
Education&Research	N	1	5	0	0
	%	16.7%	83.3%	0%	0%
Service Sector	N	1	3	0	1
	%	20.0%	60.0%	0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	0	3	3	0
	%	0%	50.0%	50.0%	0%
Total	N	2	11	3	1
	%	11.8%	64.7%	17.6%	5.9%

Table 11. Does the archives have a strong record/archives policy for traditional records?

		S. Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	2	0	2	2	2.6	.55
	%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	33.3%		
Service Sector	N	2	0	1	2	2.6	.67
	%	40.0%	0%	20.0%	40.0%		
Governmental & Military	N	2	2	2	0	2.0	.36
	%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	0%		
Total	N	6	2	5	4	2.4	1.2
	%	35.3%	11.8%	29.4%	23.5%		

Table 12. Are the procedures enough for ensuring that all the concerned parties are aware of, comprehend and apply the records/archives policy

		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	3	3	0		
	%	50.0%	50.0%	0%	2.5	.22
Service Sector	N	3	0	2		
	%	60.0%	0%	40.0%	2.8	.49
Governmental & Military	N	2	3	1		
	%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	2.8	.30
Total	N	8	6	3		
	%	47.1%	35.3%	17.6%	2.7	.77

Table 13. The responsibility for the records/archives issues

		Record manager	Information manager	General manager
Education&Research	N	4	1	1
	%	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%
Service Sector	N	1	3	1
	%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	3	2	1
	%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%
Total	N	8	6	3
	%	47.1%	35.3%	17.6%

Table 14. Electronic Record Creation

		Yes	No
Education&Research	N	6	0
	%	100.0%	0%
Service Sector	N	4	1
	%	80.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	5	1
	%	83.3%	16.7%
Total	N	15	2
	%	88.2%	11.8%

Table 15. Electronic Record System Usage

		Majority	Some
Education&Research	N	6	0
	%	100.0%	0%
Service Sector	N	3	2
	%	60.0%	40.0%
Governmental & Military	N	2	4
	%	33.3%	66.7%
Total	N	11	6
	%	64.7%	35.3%

Table 16. The Reasons for Using Electronic Records

		User Statistics	Resource acquisition	Managerial works	Management and control
Education&Research	N	5	5	3	6
	%	83.3%	83.3%	50.0%	100.0%
Service Sector	N	5	1	2	5
	%	100.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Governmental & Military	N	1	4	6	5
	%	16.7%	66.7%	100.0%	83.3%
Total	N	11	10	11	16
	%	64.7%	58.8%	64.7%	94.1%

Table 17. Information system software usage

		Yes	No
Education&Research	N	6	0
	%	100.0%	0%
Service Sector	N	4	1
	%	80.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	3	3
	%	50.0%	50.0%
Total	N	13	4
	%	76.5%	23.5%

Table 18. The Scope of the information system software

		Acquisition	Browsing	Lending	Transaction	Public Relations
Education&Research	N	3	6	4	4	3
	%	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%
Service Sector	N	1	4	2	3	4
	%	20.0%	80.0%	40.0%	60.0%	80.0%
Governmental & Military	N	2	3	3	0	1
	%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	0%	16.7%
Total	N	6	13	9	7	8
	%	35.3%	76.5%	52.9%	41.2%	47.1%

Table 19. Organizational record management program

		Creation	Filing/Distribution	Retention	Disposition	All
Education&Research	N	6	5	3	1	1
	%	100.0%	83.3%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%
Service Sector	N	3	3	4	1	1
	%	60.0%	60.0%	80.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	4	6	5	4	4
	%	66.7%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	66.7%

Total	N	13	14	12	6	6
	%	76.5%	82.4%	70.6%	35.3%	35.3%

Table 20. Electronic records management program in life cycle

		Creation	Filing	Distribution	Retention	Disposition
Education&Research	N	5	5	4	3	1
	%	83.3%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	16.7%
Service Sector	N	4	3	2	4	1
	%	80.0%	60.0%	40.0%	80.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	2	5	4	3	1
	%	33.3%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	16.7%
Total	N	11	13	10	10	3
	%	64.7%	76.5%	58.8%	58.8%	17.6%

Table 21. Technologic infrastructure for electronic records

		Totally Sufficient	Uncertain	Insufficient	Totally Insufficient	Σ	Sd
Education&Research	N	2	1	3	0		
	%	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	0%	2.1	.983
Service Sector	N	1	1	2	1		
	%	20.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	2.6	1.14
Governmental & Military	N	2	1	1	2		
	%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	33.3%	2.5	1.37
Total	N	5	3	6	3		
	%	29.4%	17.6%	35.3%	17.6%	2.4	1.12

Table 22. Intended users of digital records

		All Public	Researchers	Staff	Authorized Staff
Education&Research	N	2	4	0	0
	%	33.3%	66.7%	0%	0%
Service Sector	N	2	1	2	0
	%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	0%
Governmental & Military	N	0	0	5	1
	%	0%	0%	83.3%	16.7%
Total	N	4	5	7	1
	%	23.5%	29.4%	41.2%	5.9%

Table 23. Metadata which is manually added to the records by their author and their creator

		Title	Date	Related Activity	Summary	Codes
Education&Research	N	6	5	2	3	4
	%	100.0%	83.3%	33.3%	50.0%	66.7%
Service Sector	N	5	5	3	2	4
	%	100.0%	100.0%	60.0%	40.0%	80.0%
Governmental & Military	N	6	6	1	1	3
	%	100.0%	100.0%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%
Total		17	16	6	6	11
		100.0%	94.1%	35.3%	35.3%	64.7%

Table 24. Electronic recordkeeping system

		E-mail	Tracking	Work Flow	Office	Databases
Education&Research	N	2	3	3	6	6
	%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Service Sector	N	0	2	3	5	5
	%	0%	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Governmental & Military	N	2	1	2	6	6
	%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 25. Authorization

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Disagree	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	3	2	1	0		
	%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0%	1.67	.333
Service Sector	N	2	2	1	0		
	%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0%	1.80	.374
Governmental & Military	N	3	0	2	1		
	%	50.0%	0%	33.3%	16.7%	2.17	.543
Total	N	8	4	4	1		
	%	47.1%	23.5%	23.5%	5.9%	1.88	.993

Table 26. Security system

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Σ	Sd
Education&Research	N	3	2	1		
	%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	1.67	.816
Service Sector	N	2	3	0		
	%	40.0%	60.0%	0%	1.60	.548
Governmental & Military	N	3	3	0		
	%	50.0%	50.0%	0%	1.50	.548
Total	N	8	8	1		

%	47.1%	47.1%	5.9%	1.59	.618
---	-------	-------	------	------	------

Table 27. Backup

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	2	3	1	1.83	.753
	%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%		
Service Sector	N	2	3	0	1.60	.548
	%	40.0%	60.0%	0%		
Governmental & Military	N	3	3	0	1.50	.548
	%	50.0%	50.0%	0%		
Total	N	7	9	1	1.65	.606
	%	41.2%	52.9%	5.9%		

Table 28. Digital signature

		N/A	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	2	3	1	4.17	.983
	%	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%		
Service Sector	N	2	3	0	4.40	.548
	%	40.0%	60.0%	0%		
Governmental & Military	N	3	3	0	4.17	.983
	%	50.0%	50.0%	0%		
Total	N	7	9	1	4.24	.831
	%	41.2%	52.9%	5.9%		

Table 29. Long term preservation

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Disagree	Σ	sd
Education&Research	N	2	1	2	1	2.33	1.211
	%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%		
Service Sector	N	1	2	2	0	2.20	.837
	%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	0%		
Governmental & Military	N	4	2	0	0	1.33	.516
	%	66.7%	33.3%	0%	0%		
Total	N	7	5	4	1	1.94	.966
	%	41.2%	29.4%	23.5%	5.9%		

Table 30. Preservation methods of the digital records

		Creator's desktop	Information System	Printed	Backup
Education&Research	N	3	6	4	6
	%	50.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
Service Sector	N	1	4	5	5
	%	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Governmental & Military	N	3	4	5	3

	%	50.0%	66.7%	83.3%	50.0%
Total	N	7	14	14	14
	%	41.2%	82.4%	82.4%	82.4%

Table 31. Changes on digital records

		Updating	Adding	Deleting	Recoding	Changing
Education&Research	N	6	5	4	3	6
	%	100.0%	83.3%	66.7%	50.0%	100.0%
Service Sector	N	4	4	5	2	3
	%	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Governmental & Military	N	4	3	5	1	2
	%	66.7%	50.0%	83.3%	16.7%	33.3%
Total	N	14	12	14	6	11
	%	82.4%	70.6%	82.4%	35.3%	64.7%

Table 23. Are there a sufficient relationship between units that are involved with records/archives creation and management

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Disagree	Σ	Sd
Education&Research	N	3	1	0	2		
	%	50.0%	16.7%	0%	33.3%	2.17	1.472
Service Sector	N	2	1	2	0		
	%	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%	0%	2.00	1.00
Governmental & Military	N	1	1	3	1		
	%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	2.67	1.33
Total	N	6	3	5	3		
	%	35.3%	17.6%	29.4%	17.6%	2.29	1.160

Table 33. The relationship between records to the archival bonds or other media

		Separated	Coordinated with Indoor	Integrated with Indoor	Integrated with other Inst.
Education&Research	N	3	2	1	0
	%	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0%
Service Sector	N	0	4	1	0
	%	0%	80.0%	20.0%	0%
Governmental & Military	N	3	3	0	0
	%	50.0%	50.0%	0%	0%
Total	N	6	9	2	0
	%	35.3%	52.9%	11.8%	0%

Table 34. If the archives has the records in custody, how were they acquired? How were they processed?

		Classification	Filing	Retention Plans	Purchasing / gifting	Other
Education&Research	N	4	4	0	3	2
	%	66.7%	66.7%	0%	50.0%	33.3%
Service Sector	N	2	2	1	1	1
	%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	1	5	3	1	2
	%	16.7%	83.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%
Total	N	7	11	4	5	5
	%	41.2%	64.7%	23.5%	29.4%	29.4%

Table 35. The system uses of organizing information and records

		Library of Congress	Standard File Plan	Institutional File Plan	Dewey	Not Systematic
Education&Research	N	3	0	2	0	1
	%	50.0%	0%	33.3%	.0%	16.7%
Service Sector	N	1	1	1	1	1
	%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%
Governmental & Military	N	1	4	1	0	0
	%	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%	0%	0%
Total	N	5	5	4	1	2
	%	29.4%	29.4%	23.5%	5.9%	11.8%

Table 36. Intension of the creating body to establish an integrated and centralized digital recordkeeping system, controlling all records of the organization in all media and form?

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Σ	Sd
Education&Research	N	1	3	1	1	0		
	%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	16.7%	0%	2.33	1.033
Service Sector	N	0	3	1	0	1		
	%	0%	60,0%	20.0%	0%	20.0%	2.80	1.304
Governmental & Military	N	0	2	1	3	0		
	%	0%	33,3%	16.7%	50.0%	0%	3.17	.983
Total	N	1	8	3	4	1		
	%	5.9%	47,1%	17.6%	23.5%	5.9%	2.76	1.091

Table 37. Do they need to modify the existing policies, procedures, and standards currently control or influence records creation, maintenance, preservation or use?

		Strongly Agree	Agree	N/A	Disagree	Σ	Sd
Education&Research	N	3	0	3	0		
	%	50.0%	0%	50.0%	0%	2.00	1.095
Service Sector	N	0	3	2	3		
	%	0%	60.0%	40.0%	0%	2.40	.548
Governmental & Military	N	2	3	0	1		
	%	33.3%	50.0%	0%	16.7%	2.00	1.095
Total	N	5	6	5	1		
	%	29.4%	35.3%	29.4%	5.9%	2.12	.928

E. Case studies:***STARTED MAY 2008***

TEAM Turkey completed the fundamentals in 2008, during its first year with the Project. As Director of TEAM Turkey, Özgür Külçü presented a paper in Oslo. After the InterPARES Summit in Oslo, the Turkish Library Association was accepted to be part of the activities of TEAM Turkey and Mr. Ali Fuat Kartal, President of the Turkish Library Association became an active researcher of TEAM Turkey. We announced the activities of the InterPARES Project and our expectation of researcher participation in the activities of TEAM Turkey in May 2008 with a news platform discussion list to all the library, archival and information professions throughout Turkey. Many people accepted the invitation to work on Project activities and in case studies.

After meeting with the members of TEAM Turkey, work was started on the case studies.

The Following Case Studies were started May 2008

Title: *Case Study 01 – Assessment of the Records Management Activities of the Turkish Red Crescent Society*

Status: *Under construction*

Author: *The InterPARES 3 Project TEAM Turkey*

Writer(s): *Özgür Külçü (Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)*

Hande Uzun Külçü (Professional Archivist at Turkish Red Crescent Society, have an undergraduate and master degree in the area of records management)

Project Unit: *Research*

Title: *Case Study 02 – Records Management at Universities: Developing Records Retention Program for the Hacettepe University*

Status: *Under construction*

Author: *The InterPARES 3 Project TEAM Turkey*

Writer(s): *Özgür Külçü (Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)*

Arif Yılmaz (Vice Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)

Project Unit: *Research*

Title: *Case Study 03 – Turkish Library Association Records Research Questions*

Status: *Under construction*

Author: *The InterPARES 3 Project TEAM Turkey*

Writer(s): *Özgür Külçü (Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)*

Arif Yılmaz (Vice Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)

*Ali Fuat Kartal (Researcher and Supporter of TEAM Turkey;
President of the Turkish Library Association)*

Project Unit: *Research*

The Following Case Studies started at May 2009

Title: *Case Study 04 – Records and Documentation Problems of the University Libraries in Turkey*

Status: *Expected to Start*

Author: *The InterPARES 3 Project TEAM Turkey*

Writer(s): *Özgür Külçü (Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)*

Yasin Yazıcı (Researcher of TEAM Turkey)

Nevzat Özel (Researcher of the TEAM Turkey)

Project Unit: *Research*

Title: *Case Study 05 – Case Studies About the Condition of the Electronic Records*

Author: *The InterPARES 3 Project TEAM Turkey*

Writer(s): *Özgür Külçü (Director of TEAM Turkey, PhD)*

Next Year Graduate Student of the HU

Project Unit: *Research*

Other Case Studies:

List of organizations

1	Barlas Interior Design
2	Ankara Province Board of Leagues
3	Undersecretaries of the Prime Ministry for Foreign Trade
4	Republic of Turkey, The Ministry of Public Works and Settlement:
5	Hacettepe University Institute of Social Science
6	Hacettepe University Adult Hospital
7	Aselsan A.S. (Military Electronic Industry joint-stock company)
8	Turkey Aerospace Industries Inc.
9	Vehbi Koc Ankara Research Center
10	Hacettepe University Library Department of Consultation and
11	Hacettepe University Beytepe Center Library, User Service
12	Middle East Technical University
13	Atilim University Library
14	ULAKBIM - Cahit Arf Information Center
15	Adnan Otuken Public Library
16	Turkey Radio and Television (TRT) Central Library
17	Turkey Radio and Television (TRT) Istanbul Directorate

F. Dissemination and Products:

a) The articles of TEAM Turkey created due to the research of the InterPARES 3 Project:

- Çakmak, T. (2011). *Kurumsal içerik yönetimi kapsamında elektronik bilgi ve belge sistemlerinin bir kurum örneğinde değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of Electronic Information and Records Systems Within An Organization Case In The Scope Of Enterprise Content Management]*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Külcü, Özgür and Çakmak, Tolga. (2010). Evaluation of the ERM Application in Turkey within the framework of InterPARES Project. *International Journal of Information Management*, 30 (3), 199-211.
- Külcü, Özgür and Külcü, Hande Uzun. (2010). The Contextual Analysis of the e-Records Management Requirements of Turkish Red Crescent Society. *The Electronic Library*, 28(2), 314-333.
- Külcü, Ö. and Çakmak, T. (2009). Elektronik belge yönetimi üzerine InterPARES projesi ve Türkiye takımı faaliyetleri [InterPARES Project on the Electronic Records Management and Team Turkey Activities]. *Bilgi Dünyası*, 10(2), 287 - 302.
- Külcü, Özgür. (2009). Records Management Practices in Universities: Comparative Study of Examples in Canada and Turkey. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 33(1/2), 85-107.
- Külcü, Özgür. (2009). Quality documentation and

records management: a survey of Turkish universities. *Aslib Proceedings*, 61 (6), 459-473.

- Klc, zgr. (2009). Evaluation of the e-records management practices in e-government: reflections from Turkey. *The Electronic Library*, 27 (6), 999-1009.
- Klc, zgr and Klc, Hande Uzun. (2009). The Records Management Capacity Assessment System (RMCAS) as a tool for program development at the Turkish Red Crescent Society. *International Journal of Information Management*, 29 (6), 483-487.

b) The Conferences held by TEAM Turkey:

Management of Cultural Heritage in Digital World and InterPARES 3 Project An International Symposium *Dijital Dnyada Kltrel Mirasın Ynetimi ve InterPARES 3 Projesi Uluslararası Sempozyum*

May, 10, 2012
10 Mayıs 2012

09:00	Kayıt - Registration
9:30-09:45	Aılıř konuřması - Welcoming and opening speech
09:45-10:45	Keynote Speaker - ađrılı Konuřmacı Organizational Information in Digital World: Beyond the Projects of InterPARES Professor Luciana Duranti University of British Columbia-SLAIS
10:45 -11:00	Kahve Arası - Coffee Break
11:00-12:00	Deđiřen Dnyada Bilgi Merkezleri Information Organizations in Changing World Prof. Dr. Yařar Tonta Hacettepe University
12:00-14:00	đle Yemeđi - Lunch
14:00-15:00	Panel: Dijital Dnyada Kltrel Mirasın Ynetimi Management of Cultural Heritage in Digital World Prof. Dr. Hamza Kandur (Panel Yneticisi - Head of Panel) Zeynep İnanođlu (Google Marketing Management) Yrd. Doç. Dr. mit Konya (İstanbul niversitesi - Istanbul University) Doç. Dr. zgr Klc (Hacettepe niversitesi- Hacettepe University)

15:00 - 15:15	Kahve Arası - Coffee Break
15:15-16:15	Kültürel Mirasın Yönetimi Üzerine Uygulama Örnekleri Practical Examples on Management of Cultural Heritage Dr. Nazan Ölçer (Sabancı Üniversitesi Müzesi, Museum of Sakıp Sabancı) Lorans Batur (Osmanlı / Garanti Bankası Arşivi- Ottoman / Garanti Bank Archives) Melek Gençboyacı (Ali Emiri Kütüphanesi, Library of Ali Emiri) Hande Uzun Külçü (Türkiye Kızılay Derneği Arşivi Direktörü - Director of Archive of Turkish Red Crescent Society)
May, 11, 2012 11 Mayıs 2012	
09:30-12:00	The Long Term Preservation of Authentic Digital Records: The Final Findings of the InterPARES 3 Project (1999-2012) <i>Dijital Ortamda Belgelerin Özgünlüğünün ve Kalıcılığının Korunması: Uluslararası InterPARES Projesi ve Sonuçları (1999-2012)</i>
09:30 -10:00	Professor Luciana Duranti Head of Panel Evaluation of the InterPARES 3 Project
10:00 - 10:45	International Presentation on The Long Term Preservation of Authentic Digital Records
10:45 - 11:00	Kahve Arası - Coffee Break
11:00 – 12:00	National and International Case Studies of InterPARES 3 Project Team Brasil Team Canada Team Catalonia Team Malaysia Team Korea Team Turkey
12:00-14:00	Öğle Yemeği - Lunch
14:00-15:00	Final Products of InterPARES Project
15:00-15:30	Kahve Arası - Coffee Break
15:30 – 16:30	Conclusion of InterPARES 3 Project
Oturum aralarında	Kurumsal İçerik Yönetimi Çözümleri - Firma Sunumları
During all break	Some Solutions on Enterprise Content Management - Company

Presentations.

May, 10 **Gala Dinner - Galata Tower Restaurant**

10 Şubat Gala Yemeđi - Galata Kulesi Restoran

18:00

February, 12 **Social Event: Bosphorus Ship Tour**

12 Şubat

14:30-18:00 Sosyal Etkinlik Bođaz Turu
