Today’s agenda
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  - What is the WCT?
- Then
  - A brief history of the WCT
  - The WCT state until recently
  - Why did we stick with the WCT?
- Now
  - Heritrix 3
  - Collaborative development
  - Building a work plan
  - Demos
- Future
A bit about us

- Archiving the Web since 1999
- Selective Web archiving and domain crawling
- Legal deposit legislation since 2003
- 13800 sites as of June 2018
- Selective Web crawling since 2007
- No legal deposit
What is the WCT?

- **Get Permission**: Harvest Authorisations
- **Setup Target Sites**: Describe, Scope, Schedule
- **Run Crawls**: Heritrix
- **Quality Assurance**: QA Tools, Wayback, Approve, Reject
- **Archive**: Preservation Repository
What the WCT is not

- It is NOT a digital archive or document repository
- It is NOT appropriate for long-term storage
  - It submits material to an external archive
- It is NOT an access tool
  - It does not provide public access to harvested material
- It is NOT a cataloguing system
  - It does allow you to record external catalog numbers
  - And it does allow you to describe harvests with Dublin Core metadata
- It is NOT a document management system
- It does NOT store all your communications with publishers
  - But it may initiate these communications
  - And it does record the outcome of these communications
A brief history of the WCT

Development began in 2006 as a collaborative open source project between the British Library and the National Library of New Zealand, created to solve the challenges of capturing online content using Heritrix.

Initial objectives:

- Meet the needs of the BL and the NLNZ
- Modular & extendable
- Use for managing permissions, selection, description, scoping, harvesting, quality assurance
- Not require deep technical knowledge to archive Web content
The WCT state until recently

Running on outdated and unsupported libraries and frameworks

Tight integration with Heritrix v1

Convoluted installation process

Outdated documentation
Why did we stick with the WCT?

Three options:

1. Build a new tool
2. Switch to an alternative tool
3. Upgrade the WCT
Why did we stick with the WCT?

Three options:

1. Build a new tool  → too expensive
2. Switch to an alternative tool  → no complete replacement could be found
3. Upgrade the WCT  → would be possible to meet our requirements
Heritrix 3
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Harvest Agent {Heritrix 1}
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New collaborative development

National Library of New Zealand + National Library of the Netherlands

Coinciding independent reviews of WCT produced the same outcome

- Webex meetings
- Slack
- Email
- Google Docs
- Github

Development guidelines
Work plan

Milestone 1 - Complete Heritrix 3 integration

Milestone 2 - Update documentation and improve installation process

Milestone 3 - Technical uplift

Milestone 4 - Functional uplift

Milestone 5 - Abstraction from Heritrix
Work plan

Milestone 1 - Complete Heritrix 3 integration ✔

Milestone 2 - Update documentation and improve installation process ✔

Milestone 3 - Technical uplift

Milestone 4 - Functional uplift

Milestone 5 - Abstraction from Heritrix
Future goals

Ensure that the WCT can keep up-to-date with Web and social media crawling techniques (plug-n-play third party crawlers and other tools)

Move users of older versions of WCT to WCT 2.0 (provide assistance and upgrade documentation)

The WCT is widely used and has a large development / support base (used by and developed by the community)
Questions?

Ben O’Brien
Ben.O’Brien@dia.govt.nz

Hanna Koppelaar
Hanna.Koppelaar@KB.nl

github.com/DIA-NZ/webcurator
webcurator.slack.com
webcurator-tool.rtfd.io