InterPARES Trust

Project Report

Title:	Standard of practice for trust in protection of authoritative records in government archives
Status:	Completed - successful
Version:	2016-02-02
Date submitted:	2016-02-02
Last reviewed:	2016-02-02
Author:	InterPARES Trust Project
Writer(s):	Fred Cohen
Research domain:	Protection

Document Control

Title

Standard of practice for trust in protection of authoritative records in government archives

Domain

Protection

Lead Researcher(s)

Luciana Duranti

Project Researchers

Fred Cohen

Graduate Research Assistants (with dates of participation month-year)

Mel Leverich, Meghan Whyte, Eng Senseveng, Grant Hurley

Rationale

Risk management decisions need to be made. For the protection arena, these are decisions of kind rather than amount, and have to last over long periods. As such they are architectural in nature. The objective of this research effort is to build a global consensus around a limited set of these decisions for government-level systems of records and archives. In essence, this will create a standard of practice for risk management in authoritative archives.

Research questions

Is there consensus between computer security and ARM practices regarding protection?

Goals

Study this research question.

Methodology

The approach started with an existing standard of practice for enterprise information protection and created a customized open source version specifically applicable to the ARM field. Research started with the existing standard of practice, and research by graduate students reconciled it with existing results from diplomatics and archival science. This included identifying decisions that are standard practices already, detailing the basis in relevant literature for the decisions, identifying differences between codified practice and the existing standard of practice, and documenting results. This produced Products 1 and 2 below.

Once a version of the draft SOP was completed, it was measured against existing archives with a rapid assessment process by participants. Results were used both to identify variances from the SOP and to identify likely changes to the SOP based on actual practices. The resulting SOP with changes was made available

online for all to review and no specific reviews were identified. This is identified as Product 3 below.

A study was then performed of participating ARM organizations producing a peer reviewed journal article currently pending publication after peer review. This is identified below as Product 4.

Findings

While this study reports only on a very small sample, it points toward both the need and the value of (1) larger and more comprehensive studies to gain consensus around reasonable and prudent practices for ARM IP and (2) the value of additional awareness, training, and education on IP issues within the ARM community. The change over a very short time frame in views on reasonable and prudent protection implies the potential for substantial improvement in protection for relatively little investment.

Products

- Product 1: "A Comparison of ARM Literature and Information Protection Standards of Practice" - Mel Leverich, Meghan Whyte, Eng Senseveng, and Fred Cohen
- Product 2: "Information Protection Standards of Practice for archives \l and records management" - presented at I-Trust's "Third North American Team Workshop", 21 May 2014
- Product 3: "ARM Draft Standards of Practice" available online at http://all.net/SoP/Archives/index.html
- Product 4: "Limited Consensus around ARM Information Protection Practices", Fred Cohen, Mel Leverich, Meghan Whyte, Eng Senseveng, and Grant Hurley, SA Journal of ARM, pending publication 2016.
- Additional work products include the IRB paperwork and related forms, etc. supporting the project effort.

Conclusions

The effort to formulate a standard of practice for archives and records management identified areas in both fields where they were lacking and strengthens them both by integrating their critical concepts and viewpoints. The resulting ARM-SoP is a valuable tool to self-examination.

While this study reports only on a very small sample, it points toward both the need and the value of (1) larger and more comprehensive studies to gain consensus around reasonable and prudent practices for ARM IP and (2) the value of additional awareness, training, and education on IP issues within the ARM community. The change over a very short time frame in views on reasonable and prudent protection implies the potential for substantial improvement in protection for relatively little investment.

References

See "Products" above