

State Government Digital Preservation Profiles

California L

July 2006

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

The state government digital preservation profiles available on this Web page are based on information collected from those state and territorial library, archives, and records management units that completed CTG's State Government Digital Information Preservation Survey. CTG administered the survey to all state and several territorial librarians, archivists, and records managers in early 2006. See baseline report for details.

The profiles are organized by state or territory and the library (**L**), archives (**A**), and records management (**RM**) units that were represented in the survey response. (For example, "**Alabama ARM**," which is the first responding unit in the drop down menu below, refers to the **archives and records management** units from Alabama in one survey response.) For some states, respondents also included agencies other than library, archives, and records management. These profiles are marked with an asterisk (*) and the other units that contributed to the survey response are specified in the profiles.

To select a different profile, click on the Introduction/Select Profile link located on the top left of the screen.

You can also view consolidated tables showing how all the state/territory responding units replied to selected questions in the survey. (This is also found in Appendix E of Preserving State Government Digital Information: A Baseline Report.)

STATE PROFILES CONTACT

G. Brian Burke, Project Manager
Center for Technology in Government
University at Albany, SUNY

Section 1. Responding Unit(s)

Name of state or territory.

California

Name and affiliation of individual(s) who responded on behalf of the state or territory.

Kristine Ogilvie, California State Library

Janet Coles, California State Library

(in consultation with: Linda Heatherly, Legislative Counsel; Jane Evans, Judicial Council of California)

This profile includes information provided by the following units for this state:

- Library

Section 2.1a. Setting Standards for EXECUTIVE Agencies

The following units have authority for setting standards, specified below, for digital information created or maintained by EXECUTIVE agencies. Multiple boxes are checked to reflect authority that is shared or delegated.

	Authority not assigned	Library has authority	Archives has authority	Records Management has authority	Others (See below)
Setting data management standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., metadata, file formats).	X				
Setting information technology standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., state approved software applications).					X
Setting standards for information retention and disposal (e.g., retention periods and methods of disposal) for various series/types of digital records and publications.		X	X	X	

Other standards and the units with authority over setting them.

State CIO is responsible for state government information technology planning, along with the Information Technology Advisory Council (composed of IT and business professionals throughout state government).

Additional information.

New information technology projects are subject to heavy scrutiny by the Departments of Finance and General Services, called a 'feasibility study report' process. Depending on the project, this process can take several years to complete.

In cases where creation of information depends on input from local government entities, there has been discomfort about requiring the use of standards/guidelines for fear of the state having to pay compliance costs to those entities.

The statutory mandates regarding the authority of the State Library and the State Archives with regard to electronic records and publications are not explicitly spelled out. We have interpreted the language of the law to cover electronic government information, but there may be other interpretations.

Section 2.1b. Services Provided to EXECUTIVE Agencies

The following units provide the services, specified below, to EXECUTIVE agencies. If services are provided by multiple units, the appropriate boxes are checked.

	Services not provided	Library provides services	Archives provides services	Records Management provides services	Others (See below)
Storage for digital information.		X	X		X
Consultation and training services on digital information creation.	X				
Consultation and training services on digital information management.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.	X				
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.	X				
Preservation (e.g., migration, reformatting).	X				X
Access (e.g., search engine).					X
Certification (e.g., trustworthiness of system, backups sufficient).	X				

Other services provided and the units that provide them.

No information provided

Additional information.

Storage for digital information is available at the Dept. of Technology Services (fee-based service).

The State Library recently subscribed to the OCLC Digital Archive and has begun to store digital publications on a limited basis.

We have heard that the California Digital Library and the San Diego Supercomputer Center do targeted crawls and periodic snapshots of the California dot.gov domain and are storing this information in their respective systems. (The data is of course not publicly available).

The San Diego Supercomputer Center has given free consultation and training in the use of their SRB technology to both the California State Archives and the California State Library. The California Digital Library has also allowed the State Library to participate as an observer in its current NDIIPP-funded research project.

The California State Library and the California State Archives both participate in the Online Archive of California (a California Digital Library project). Both institutions have contributed online finding aids; the State Library has some stored image collections.

The California State Archives was recently awarded an NHPRC grant for developing the hardware/software for archiving geospatial data.

The governor, the constitutional officers (e.g., elected state officers, Secretary of State, State Treasurer, etc.), and the heads of the superagencies and agencies ultimately set policy for preservation and access to government information, in digital or tangible formats. Those decisions are often made on the basis of political expediency rather than the public good.

Section 2.2a. Setting Standards for LEGISLATIVE Agencies

The following units have authority for setting standards, specified below, for digital information created or maintained by LEGISLATIVE agencies. Multiple boxes are checked to reflect authority that is shared or delegated.

	Authority not assigned	Library has authority	Archives has authority	Records Management has authority	Others (See below)
Setting data management standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., metadata, file formats).					X
Setting information technology standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., state approved software applications).					X
Setting standards for information retention and disposal (e.g., retention periods and methods of disposal) for various series/types of digital records and publications.		X	X		X

Other standards and the units with authority over setting them.

No information provided

Additional information.

The Legislative Data Center (part of the Legislative Counsel) in conjunction with the Legislature (Assembly Chief Clerk and Senate President Pro Tem) sets data management policy, standards and guidelines for the Legislature.

Section 2.2b. Providing Service to LEGISLATIVE Agencies

The following units provide the services, specified below, to LEGISLATIVE agencies. If services are provided by multiple units, the appropriate boxes are checked.

	Services not provided	Library provides services	Archives provides services	Records Management provides services	Others (See below)
Storage for digital information.		X			X
Consultation and training services on digital information creation.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information management.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.					X
Preservation (e.g., migration, reformatting).					X
Access (e.g., search engine).					X
Certification (e.g., trustworthiness of system, backups sufficient).					X

Other services provided and the units that provide them.

No information provided

Additional information.

The Legislative Data Center handles storage, access and certification for digital legislative information. The LDC recently brought up an XML-based bill drafting system and has worked extensively with outside consultants to adapt the system to the needs of the California legislature and to train existing staff in the use of the system.

The LDC is currently researching how to migrate and reformat legislative data which is now stored on tape.

Section 2.3a. Setting Standards for JUDICIAL Agencies

The following units have authority for setting standards, specified below, for digital information created or maintained by JUDICIAL agencies. Multiple boxes are checked to reflect authority that is shared or delegated.

	Authority not assigned	Library has authority	Archives has authority	Records Management has authority	Others (See below)
Setting data management standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., metadata, file formats).					X
Setting information technology standards and or guidelines for information creation (e.g., state approved software applications).					X
Setting standards for information retention and disposal (e.g., retention periods and methods of disposal) for various series/types of digital records and publications.		X	X		X

Other standards and the units with authority over setting them.

No information provided

Additional information.

Standards responsibility flows from the legislature, Judicial Council, and local courts as they respond to statutory or rule requirements. For example statutory authority for electronic discovery standards (Code of Civil Procedure §2017.730(e)), electronically filed documents (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1010.6(b), court transcript (Code of Civil Procedure §271(b)). Judicial Council-adopted rules of court for electronic appellate briefs (California Rules of Court, rule 14(c)), electronic death penalty records (California Rules of Court, rule 2056(b)), electronically filed trial court documents (California Rules of Court, rule 2056(b)). Local trial court responsibilities for Internet-accessible systems (California Rules of Court, rule 2054(b)).

The judicial branch also follows information industry best practices, ANSI/AIIM standards, and recommendations from national bodies such as the National Center for State Courts, the Council of State Court Administrators, and the National Association for Court Management in managing digital information.

The judicial branch does not mandate particular hardware or software but emphasizes functional standards in all aspects of digital information management.

Both the legislature, by statutory authority in the Government Code (§68150) and the Judicial Council, in adopting California Rules of Court, rule 6.755(h), set standards for court record retention and disposal. The Government Code and rule of court apply to any medium - paper, electronic, or micrographic.

Section 2.3b. Providing Service to JUDICIAL Agencies

The following units provide the services, specified below, to LEGISLATIVE agencies. If services are provided by multiple units, the appropriate boxes are checked.

	Services not provided	Library provides services	Archives provides services	Records Management provides services	Others (See below)
Storage for digital information.		X			X
Consultation and training services on digital information creation.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information management.					X
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.	X				
Consultation and training services on digital information preservation.	X				
Preservation (e.g., migration, reformatting).	X				
Access (e.g., search engine).					X
Certification (e.g., trustworthiness of system, backups sufficient).					X

Other services provided and the units that provide them.

No information provided

Additional information.

The California judicial branch has no central repository of court records in any medium. Each court is responsible for maintaining its records in a secure environment under California Rule of Court, rule 6.755(i).

The Judicial Council, through the Administrative Office of the Courts, provides information to assist courts in their responsibility to manage their records in any medium.

The legislature provides statutory authority for the preservation of digital information in Government Code §68150(f)(2) and (g), as follows:

'§68150(f)(2) Court records that are preserved permanently.

Court records that must be preserved longer than 10 years but not permanently may be reproduced on media other than paper or microfilm using technology authorized under subdivisions (a) and (b). However the records shall be reproduced before the expiration of their estimated lifespan for the medium in which they are stored as specified in subdivision (g).

(g) Instructions for access to data stored on a medium other than paper shall be documented. Each court shall conduct a periodic review of the media in which the court records are stored to assure that the storage medium is not obsolete and that current technology is capable of accessing and reproducing the records. The court shall reproduce records before the expiration of their estimated lifespan for the medium in which they are stored according to minimum standards and guidelines for the preservation and reproduction of the medium adopted by the American National Standards Institute or the Association for Information and Image Management.'

Each local court is responsible under California Rules of Court, rules 2054(a)(1) and 2059(e) for providing access to and insuring the integrity of digital information.

See <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules/titlefive/title5-3-203.htm#TopOfPage> and <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules/titlefive/title5-3-208.htm#TopOfPage>

Section 3. State Government Digital Information Preservation Activities

This section includes descriptions of past or current digital preservation activities in the state.

TITLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION PRESERVATION ACTIVITY:

California State Government Publications: Access and Preservation

SHORT DESCRIPTION:

This project, through conferencing and research, examined the California state document depository program and issued a study that presented models and recommended best practices for policies, procedures and technologies on how California's depository program can be improved and strengthened in the digital environment.

LINKS TO RELATED WEB SITES OR PROJECT DOCUMENTS:

http://www.library.ca.gov/html/gps_cal2.cfm

CONTACT FOR THIS ACTIVITY:

Janet Coles

jcoles@library.ca.gov or 916-651-6813.

TITLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION PRESERVATION ACTIVITY:

Digital Archive Collaboration

SHORT DESCRIPTION:

The California State Library recently subscribed to the OCLC Digital Archive and is working with several of the California state depository libraries to set a cooperative system for selection, capture, description and permanent archiving of state publications, using the OCLC Digital Archive Tools.

LINKS TO RELATED WEB SITES OR PROJECT DOCUMENTS:

No information provided

CONTACT FOR THIS ACTIVITY:

Janet Coles

jcoles@library.ca.gov or 916-651-6813.

TITLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION PRESERVATION ACTIVITY:

Preserving the Geospatial Records of California

SHORT DESCRIPTION:

The California State Archives was recently awarded an NHPRC grant for \$220,918 to develop the hardware and software infrastructure to preserve the state's geospatial records created by the California Spatial Information Library. The State Archives will be working with the San Diego Supercomputer Center, using the Storage Resource Broker technology developed there.

LINKS TO RELATED WEB SITES OR PROJECT DOCUMENTS:

No information provided

CONTACT FOR THIS ACTIVITY:

Renee Vincent-Finch

rfinch@ss.ca.gov

Linda Johnson

ljohnson@ss.ca.gov

Section 4. Training Needs for Digital Preservation Related Activities

Level of training needed for the digital preservation capabilities, specified below.

	Training already provided	Basic training needed	Advanced training needed
Identify the type and amount of digital information throughout the state.			X
Select and appraise state government information in digital form.		X	
Identify key stakeholders related to specific digital information (other local/state agencies, other states, private sector, etc.).		X	
Negotiate and make agreements with key stakeholders to preserve digital information.		X	
Acquire state government information in digital form for holdings.		X	
Manage state government information in digital form (metadata, reformatting, etc.).		X	
Manage the ingest of digital information into a repository.		X	
Manage the long-term storage of digital information in a repository.			X
Develop mechanisms to monitor the long-term usability of state government information in digital form.			X
Make state government information in digital form accessible to users.		X	
Produce a disaster and recovery planning for state government information in digital form.			X
Manage copyright, security, and other legal issues of relevance to state government digital information.			X
Other (See below).			

Other training needed for digital preservation capability.

No information provided

Additional information on existing training programs.

We chose to subscribe to the OCLC Digital Archive as an 'interim' solution to capturing, storing and providing access to state government publications. This product can be referred to as an ASP solution which is already at production level. We have been learning how to use the tools, but the mechanisms for capture, storage, and metadata creation (preservation and descriptive) are already in place.

Section 5. State Government Digital Information Currently At-Risk #1

This section includes examples of state government digital information that is at-risk of deteriorating or being altered or lost through format or technological obsolescence, policy or procedural gaps, or financial constraints.

DESCRIPTION OF AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

The answer to this depends by what you mean by 'at-risk.' Do you mean 'at-risk' because of format, or 'at-risk' due to being removed from the Web due to political/social conditions?

We think it's useful to identify the political/social conditions under which state digital information becomes endangered. All state government digital information in California is currently 'at-risk', because there are few statutory provisions to protect it, and there is little general awareness in state government about the long-term need to preserve information. The information that is most at risk:

1) That which is generated by state entities that have been created to address a single task or finite set of tasks (e.g., select committees, special commissions, etc.), so the Web presence of these entities is short-lived; 2) That which has been created by agencies, etc. that are sunseting, or being terminated or restructured due to executive reorganization; 3) Where there is a change of incumbent at the head of an agency; 4) When there are elections and possible changes in the legislature and in the offices of the governor and constitutional officers; 5) When there is sudden bad press about a particular position, program or operational policy. One example of this: in June 2004 there was an editorial in the Wall Street Journal that interpreted a disclaimer that appeared at the bottom of many California state Web pages to mean the agencies were trying to disassociate from the governor. This led to an order from the governor's office to the State Chief Information Officer mandating a 'Web Sweeps' project, which would remove all information of certain types (including certain types of publications) that had been on the Web sites during the previous incumbent's term.

Digital information is also at risk of being altered due to any/all of the above conditions. For example, shortly after Governor Schwarzenegger took office in Nov. 2003, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research altered the recommendations in three research documents that had been posted by that agency the previous month.

CONDITIONS CAUSING INFORMATION TO BE AT-RISK:

Cost. Lack of awareness (agencies, legislators, public). Political interest of those in charge. Lack of statutory/regulatory protection. No mechanism in place to inform the state 'memory organizations' about when agencies scheduled for termination will go off-line, so they can make an effort to preserve the information. Long-term planning can be difficult in state government, as there is so much focus on immediate rather than long-term results. No authentication processes.

STRATEGIES CONSIDERED TO PRESERVE AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

Legislation. Regulation (State CIO). Automated archiving processes (OCLC Digital Archive, LOCKSS, SRB [San Diego Supercomputer Center]). Education/awareness campaign (legislators, agencies, public).

DESCRIPTION OF AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

Many guidebooks, directories and statistical publications that used to be issued in print on a quarterly or yearly basis are now issued online in database formats and are continuously or periodically updated. Thus the older information/statistics are not captured in time and are no longer available for research. One small example of this is the California state government directory, which used to be a rich source of historical information about agencies, their organization and management. This publication went to an online database format in 2000 and cannot be relied on for information about who held a certain position in a given agency in 2002, for example.

CONDITIONS CAUSING INFORMATION TO BE AT-RISK:

Cost (less expensive to produce online without providing access to historical information and without issuing the information in print). Lack of awareness of the need to capture data in time for research/historical purposes. Lack of technological capability within some agencies to offer quarterly/yearly versions of data online.

STRATEGIES CONSIDERED TO PRESERVE AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

Legislation. Regulation/policy (State CIO's IT plan). Education/awareness. State 'memory organizations' to develop the technological means to capture databases, store them and make them accessible.

DESCRIPTION OF AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

Information issued only in digital formats on 'tangible' media are at-risk, because the formats become obsolete so quickly. For example, government documents issued on 5 1/4' floppies are now very hard to use because the hardware and software required to open and read them are no longer available. In the case of CD-ROMs, the medium itself can be subject to rapid deterioration. For example, we have an entire set of the Assembly Journal issued on CD-ROM in 1999 that can no longer be accessed because of deterioration.

CONDITIONS CAUSING INFORMATION TO BE AT-RISK:

Cost of preservation (staff, technology). Lack of awareness on the part of issuing agencies about the long-term viability of certain formats.

STRATEGIES CONSIDERED TO PRESERVE AT-RISK STATE GOVERNMENT DIGITAL INFORMATION:

Reformatting. Standardization of digital information creation (State CIO).

Examples of government digital information that was not preserved and is no longer accessible.

In 1995 the California Legislature authorized a Commission for the Establishment of Academic Performance and Content Standards. This commission, over the two-year period from 1996 to 1997, established new K-12 content standards for California public education and also instituted the present (controversial) testing system for academic performance. This commission had a Web site and published the proceedings of its meetings on the site (we know this from the Internet Archive--the evidence of the documents is there, but unfortunately they were not captured as part of the Internet Archive's archiving processes). The proceedings were not issued in print. When the Commission dissolved in 1997, its Web site was taken down and all of the information on it was lost.

In 2002 the California Dept. of Information Technology (DOIT) was dissolved, largely due to an IT procurement scandal that deeply embarrassed the governor. Its Web site went down on July 3, 2002, shortly after the close of the 2001/02 fiscal year, and all the information on it was eliminated. Knowing the department was due to shut down, the State Library made an effort to capture some of the information from the DOIT Web site before it went down but lacked the technology to capture it all.

Section 6. Enterprise Architecture

The following section describes the state's and corresponding units' awareness of and involvement in their state's Enterprise Architecture efforts.

Aware of state's Enterprise Architecture efforts.

Yes

Involved in state's Enterprise Architecture efforts.

Yes

Nature of involvement in the state's Enterprise Architecture efforts, if appropriate.

Steve Clemons, who is on the State Library's information technology steering committee, is also a member of the State CIO's Enterprise Architecture and Standards Committee. He works closely with John Jewell, Chief of State Library Services, who is a member of the State CIO's Steering Committee for the California State Portal.

Links to relevant documentation that describes the unit's involvement in the state's Enterprise Architecture efforts.

<http://www.cio.ca.gov/ITCouncil/Committees/ArchStandards.html>

<http://www.cio.ca.gov/PortalSteeringCommittee.html>

Section 7. Additional Thoughts or Comments

No information provided