



ERPANET Seminar
Amsterdam, Netherlands
September 20-22, 2004



Business Models related to Digital Preservation

Feedback Report

Participants were asked to fill in a feedback form and to make comments about their experiences of the workshop. In total **fifty-five people** from **twelve countries** (including Canada, New Zealand, and the United States besides European countries) attended the workshop. **Twenty-one** filled in the feedback forms.

Feedback about the Workshop

This section of the form asked participants to grade certain aspects of the workshop. They used a scale ranging one to five, where **one = Poor** and **five = Excellent**. The tables below show the percentage of participants ticking which rating. For each question a single weighted number indicates the participants' satisfaction.

1. Effectiveness of Speakers: (percentage of participants)

1	0.00
2	0.00
3	14.29
4	76.19
5	9.52

Speakers were generally considered very effective, with varying relevance to participants.

2. Structure of the workshop:

1	0.00
2	0.00
3	19.05
4	61.90
5	19.05

Similar to previous erpaEvents, participants particularly liked the breakout sessions to discuss the presentations and own experiences (though this time there were also two respondents who did not like them). Two persons considered the questions somewhat limiting and suggested an entirely "open" session as well. Another suggestion was that one of the organisers could synthesize results of the breakout sessions after reporting.

3. Background Documentation:

1	0.00
2	9.52
3	23.81
4	61.90
5	4.76

Participants disagreed in this point; one respondent commended the bibliography as a useful starting point for further research, while three found that documentation could be expanded. Specifically, one respondent would have liked full papers in addition to the handouts.

4. Organisation of the workshop:

1	0.00
2	0.00
3	14.29
4	57.14
5	28.57

The social events were underlined as particularly pleasant, and two participants suggested recommending a single hotel to keep the group together and for possible cost reductions.

5. Workshop Focus:

1	0.00
2	3.03
3	9.09
4	45.45
5	33.33

Two participants felt that the link to digital preservation was not entirely clear, and that the seminar was rather about business models for cultural heritage than about preservation.

6. Was the cost acceptable?

yes	95 %
no	0 %
n/a	5 %

Only one respondent abstained from answering this question. Some are even fine with raising the costs slightly.

7. Did this workshop meet your expectations?

yes	90 %
no	5 %
n/a	5 %

One person answered in the negative, and would have liked to have more practical experiences presented.

8. What will you be able to take from this workshop back to your own organisations?

Besides good and references as mentioned by several participants, two underlined that the seminar provided a better understanding of the many angles and layers of the topic (e.g. financial, organisational, staffing). Two other respondents were motivated to implement their newly gained knowledge in their own organisations and to embark on writing a business plan.

9. What else would you liked to have seen covered at this workshop?

Two respondents would have liked to see more experiences and hard data, and another suggested issuing a call for and collation of data about cost ciphers and business models in the seminar follow-up. Apart from that, one participant suggested to also present negative case studies to learn from.

10. What did you like best about this workshop?

Five participants considered the opportunity to discuss with other experts particularly important. Two of them underlined that the size of the group was especially suitable for this, as larger groups often obstruct discussion and personal communication.

11. What did you like least?

Four respondents (different to those mentioned in the previous question) emphasised that lunch facilities were inadequate considering both the quality of the food and the noisy environment, which basically obstructed discussion and networking.

About the Participants

This section was designed to gain insight into the participants themselves, focussing on their profession, affiliations, and reasons for attending the workshop.

12. Type of organisation (percentage of participants)

Public Sector	52 %
Academic	33 %
Consultancy	10 %
Other *	5 %

* The person selecting "Other" did not specify what other organisation s/he works with.

13. Position (number of participants)

Programme Manager	4
Archivist *	4
Librarian *	4
IT specialist	4
Consultant	4
Information Professional	1

* One librarian and one archivist specified themselves to be IT specialists as well (those are excluded from the four IT specialists given in this table).

14. How did you hear about this workshop? (multiple answers were possible)

ERPANET website	38 %
Mailing List	38 %
Through Organisation	10 %
Colleague	5 %
Other	0 %

15. What motivated you to attend? (multiple answers were possible)

Topic	81 %
Interest in preservation	43 %
ERPANET	19 %
Speakers	14 %
Location	10 %

The Future

16. Are you likely to attend other ERPANET events in the future?

yes	90 %
no	0 %
n/a *	10 %

* Two persons did not answer this question, whereby one was invited as a speaker and the other one failed to fill in the whole back-page.

17. Are there any topics that you would like to see ERPANET provide training on?

Suggestions for future workshop topics included:

- obtaining support within organisation and policy development;
- selection, records management, and traditional archival notions;
- legal issues and rights management; and
- options for institutional repositories.