Plenary with outcomes of parallel groups, discussion of contentious issues, outlook

Group A started discussing standards and this included SIARD. Most participants regard SIARD as suitable and reasonable, despite the objections raised by Damir Bulic (p. 22). Clearly, SIARD needs more testing, more use cases, and examples. The group discussed tools and methods to assess authenticity of an export and found that there were little tools or methods available for this task.

In addition, the idea emerged that SQLite could serve as an option for future SIARD-like formats.

Important interoperability issues on SIARD were also discussed. When encountered, these issues mean extra work. Improved tool quality would be beneficial to all. All tools are very good but need to be made better

Group B noted differences between emulation and migration-based approaches. Migration appeared as the most popular way because it is mostly sufficient to derive a dataset from a database and not to preserve the whole database. Also, licencing issues and costs of solutions were discussed. NoSQL technology was identified as a field that SIARD doesn't cover. All deplored the lack of one-size-fits-all solution. Geodata can extract some geometries into GML alongside SIARD but needs to ensure the connections between the files/elements are present; otherwise it would be impossible to make sense of the information. Documentation of a database and its environment was discussed with the E-ARK Content Information Type Specification (CITS) for databases as an option for better templates.

How to meet again and keep discussion going?

Faria claimed that archiving by design would be a smooth solution.

Anders Bo Nielsen (Danish National Archives) got back to questions regarding similarities between GML and SIARD, confirming they contain similar issues.

Once again, the https://listserv.dilcis.eu/info/rdb-aig mailing list was advertised.