



eArchiving Conformance Report for the Generic Services Project PROHUB

Document Control Information

Settings	Value
Document Title:	eArchiving Conformance Report for the Generic Services Project PROHUB
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: PROHUB 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 PROHUB together with system log files:

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

All 9 IPs validated correctly¹ so PROHUB is 100% E-ARK/eArchiving conformant.

¹ Following an initial minor error with the software libraries, the SIPs and AIPs then passed validation, and this is reflected in the comments below.

Observations

- The submitted packages are real world examples and not synthetic test files.
- The AIPs followed the proposed AIP specification that use elements of the Oxford Common File Layout specification. This meant that the recognisable IP was packed in a "data" directory that was part of a Bagit bag. No effort was made to validate the bag manifest. The directory of the AIP which contained the IP was repackaged as a zip and submitted for validation.
- Despite the initial issues (see footnote ¹ above), the packages were of fair quality.
- There was obvious evidence of a genuine package lifecycle from submission (SIP) through to dissemination (DIP)
- The use of EAD3 is not complete with mandatory elements being empty but present for the file to validate. The Schematron for EAD3 validation is not being used.
- The folder "Documentation" which is empty and part of the SIP and DIP but not the AIP could be removed all together.

Improvement Opportunities

- The typing of the packages could use a review.
- The content has multiple file extensions which is best avoided in the long term.
- The inclusion of both used and not used schemas in the "Schema" folder could use a review on the different levels.