



eArchiving Conformance Report for the Generic Services Project J-Ark

Document Control Information

Settings	Value
Document Title:	eArchiving Conformance Report for the Generic Services Project J-ARK
Project Title:	eArchiving
Evaluators:	Karin Bredenberg, Carl Wilson.
Project Owner (PO):	Árpád Welker, DG CNECT
Doc. Version:	1.0
Sensitivity:	Limited
Date:	17/07/2023

Document Approver(s) and Reviewer(s):

NOTE: All Approvers are required. Records of each approver must be maintained. All Reviewers in the list are considered required unless explicitly listed as Optional.

Name	Role	Action	Date
Árpád Welker	Project Owner	<Approve / Review>	

Statement of originality

eArchiving is funded by the European Union's Digital Europe Programme. It is operated by the E-ARK Consortium led by the Austrian Institute of Technology (AIT) under a service contract with the European Commission, contract number LC-01905904.

The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the information and accepts no responsibility or liability whatsoever concerning the information in this document. Neither the European Commission, nor any person acting on the European Commission's behalf, is responsible or liable for the accuracy or use of the information in this document.

Conformance Result: J-ARK is 100% E-ARK/eArchiving conformant.

Conformance Submission details:

A selection of 3 Information Packages (IPs) per type (SIP, AIP, DIP) were requested by the E-ARK/eArchiving Consortium, i.e. a total of 9 information packages (container packages in *.zip, *.tar, or *.tar.gz format) plus system log files (*.log or *.txt format) related to the creation of information packages.

9 IPs were supplied by J-Ark together with system log files:

- 3 SIPs;
- 3 AIPs;
- 3 DIPs;

All 9 IPs validated correctly so J-Ark is 100% E-ARK/eArchiving conformant.

Observations

- The Europeana designated format EDM gives really good descriptive metadata.
- The packages are clearly and consistently structured.
- The package lifecycle from SIP to DIP is discernible and follows recognisable archival practices.
- The METS files are fairly minimal but complete.
- Validation warnings and information notes are present but these are suggestions, and not errors, and do not affect package validity.
- Metadata is also minimal but reflects the information available at ingest. It is properly structured to established standards.

Improvement Opportunities

- The Siegfried metadata has been placed as descriptive metadata, whereas it is more suitable as administrative metadata in the form of technical metadata.
- The added descriptive metadata in the AIP makes it fully understandable. But there is no PREMIS record of it being added - it is only found in the log file for the harvester.