FCoP Collections and Software Inventory Worksheet - Guggenheim
August - September 2018

What was the scope or focus of your inventory?
(Did you limit your spot inventory to one kind of software, or to a certain type of software dependent material? How did you determine how many records might provide a healthy spot check - and help to identify gaps and other patterns?)

For our inventory we examined a sampling of the 25 works that are considered computer-based artworks. The majority of our inventory consists of artist-created custom software.

All of the artworks were arranged in a spreadsheet. A random number generator was used to pick numbers between 1 and 25. Given the small number of artworks, we believed that 6 spot checks would suffice to give us enough information, as this represents one quarter of the computer-based artworks. This strategy appeared to work, as the works selected seem to be a good cross-section of recently collected works and those collected in the past.

List all of the data sources you referenced or searched to complete your inventory?
The object record in our collection management system (The Museum System, TMS), the artwork's digital Object File on the conservation department server, and the information in our Collection Online database on the Guggenheim website.

Did you encounter difficulties locating software that you knew was stored in your collections?
We did not have any difficulty calling up the locations of all of the physical components related to these works.

Two works *The Third ⅛ Monad* and *Possible Music #1* are new commissions that are currently installed at the museum, so the components and software for the work have not been checked in using our typical workflow yet.

For *Sepia Movie* it is unknown what software is being used to play the slideshow on the computer screen and this artwork requires further examination. The first step will be to create a disk image of the computer's hard drive.

Caged Sacks is located at offsite storage, so there was not sufficient time within the scope of this exercise to examine the physical components. The code that runs the piece was located in our digital Object File as a scan of the code printed out on paper. This code will need to be hand-transcribed to a text file as OCR was unsuccessful.

In the case of *Unfolding Object*, the source code was obtained from the artist and all files necessary to run the work exist on the Guggenheim server.

Did you encounter anything unexpected in your collections and software inventory that would be useful in the context of emulation, sharing, etc.

In terms of emulation, one question for the web artwork *Unfolding Object* is how an emulation solution might work. The work could not be emulated from a static disk image because it collects data from user interaction and is constantly updated.

Was it difficult to determine the use and access restrictions associated with the software that you identified in your inventory?

In the case of the Guggenheim, the access policies related to these artworks are fairly uniform: a museum sends a loan request to the Guggenheim or a researcher requests a viewing with our staff. Our standard acquisition agreement allows the museum to take measures needed for preservation, including making copies or migrating the work to a different format.

One exception is *Unfolding Object*, the public should have access to this web artwork at all times.

Most of the software and operating systems used for our artworks is proprietary (for example, Max MSP, Windows, macOS). Thus, it is unclear how these software licenses might relate to future emulation or virtualization.

Was it difficult to determine the dependencies associated with collections and software objects that you identified in your inventory?

Yes, determining dependencies was not a straightforward process except through thorough examination of the original hardware or software or thorough investigation of the documentation.

Did this process raise any questions internally regarding policies, requirements and local user constituencies?

This examination does raise the question of how exactly dependencies should be recorded and at what point in the acquisition process of an artwork.