Long-term Preservation Appraisal Checklist

V1 (2022)
Digital Research Alliance of Canada / Federated Research Data Repository

Check each box for which the answer is "yes". The more boxes you check, the stronger your argument for long-term preservation support.

❏ Has the researcher provided a rationale or argument for long-term preservation?

If yes ->

> ❏ If the deposit contains sensitive data, does the consent form contain language that would support long-term preservation? (i.e. there is no language precluding preservation, such as a promise to destroy after X years)

If no ->

> ❏ Do you perceive the data to provide valuable evidence of research activity, and demonstrate potential ongoing social, scientific or historical value?

❏ Does the data concern under-documented or marginalized peoples?

If yes ->

> ❏ If applicable, have the relevant community stakeholders been consulted about the appropriate custodianship of the data (particularly in the case of First Nations, Inuit, or Métis data)?

❏ Is the <u>deposit</u> unique (i.e. it is not comprised solely of third-party data and it has not been shared anywhere else)?

If no ->

> ❏ Does the data still require long-term preservation? (i.e. data is held by other repositories that do not provide adequate preservation support for the original data)

❏ Is the <u>data</u> unique (i.e. it is not the result of a model or generated by code)?

If no ->

> ❏ Is there a rationale for preserving the model vs. preserving the code for other researchers to re-run the model? (i.e. the computing power required is so much that it would take someone else months or years to recreate?)

❏ Have the data been provided in your repository's preferred or accepted file formats, supporting both preservation and access?

If no ->

> ❏ Is the researcher able to provide open file formats?

> ❏ Is there a strong argument to develop a new workflow to preserve the file formats submitted? (e.g. increased adoption of this format within the research discipline)

❏ Has the researcher assigned an open license to the files?

If no ->

    ❏ Is the data sufficiently open so as to make it shareable, or will it be open after a short period of time?

❏ Are the data files well documented (i.e. there is sufficient information to ensure that the files will be correctly interpreted over time, including a README, clear description of methodology and variables, and/or links to scholarly publication)?

Overall Preservation Recommendation

❏ YES	❏ NO

Ease of Preservation

Preservation is not a one-size-fits-all activity and may be carried out differently depending on a variety of factors. This chart is meant to help you advise the researcher how well you can preserve the deposit, based on the choices they've made and your institution's preservation capabilities.

Easier ⇊ Harder			
	❏	-All file formats are open and in formats already managed by the archive -The data has been issued under an open license and is easily shared	Recommendation: Use existing preservation workflows
	❏	-Some file formats are open but there may be issues preserving all the content -The license selected is somewhat restrictive	Recommendation: Preserve using existing workflows where possible; Re-appraise at a later date
	❏	-The data might be best preserved by the community it concerns -The deposit contains sensitive data and the consent forms do not clearly support preservation actions	Recommendation: Seek guidance
	❏	-The data is in proprietary file formats that are not easily managed by the archive -The data is not open	Recommendation: Re-appraise in 5 to 10 years if the deposit is deemed to have long-term preservation value