The final report of this working group takes the form of the accompanying PowerPoint presentation. It was originally drafted following the first day of group discussions, then reviewed and expanded during the second day of discussions. Further review and revision took place in a final working group session on the last morning before the report was presented to the plenary session.

This document is thus not the final report, but is an introduction that gives background for understanding the PowerPoint. The working group understood its brief to be that of exploring the role of “interoperation” in building the infrastructure for an endangered language information system. We understood interoperation (as defined in the first few slides of the presentation) to be referring to the strategy of using automated machine-to-machine communication (as opposed to manual database editing) as a means of populating the information to be displayed to users in the eventual ELIIP web site. These two approaches are referred to as aggregation versus curation in the presentation (slide 4). Such an aggregation strategy can be invisible to the end users—they go to the ELIIP web site to find endangered language information and are not necessarily mindful of the fact that the ELIIP infrastructure is automatically assembling the page they see from a variety of sources via an aggregation strategy. By following a strategy like this, the ELIIP enterprise would not need to duplicate any effort in curating data that somebody else already curates; ELIIP could, instead, focus on curating information that is not yet available from any other source. The interoperation protocols could also include a means by which ELIIP users who spot an error on the ELIIP site could automatically have their feedback directed to the appropriate information source (slide 20).

The report does not make specific recommendations. Rather, the working group brainstormed about the kinds of information in scope for ELIIP and how aggregation via a protocol for interoperation might be exploited for presenting that kind of information at an ELIIP web site. The contribution of the report, therefore, is a listing of 21 “could do” points scattered throughout the PowerPoint slides. They offer ideas for the ELIIP planners to consider as to how ELIIP could exploit an infrastructure of interoperation with the wider language information community in order to gather information for the envisioned web site. By the same token, ELIIP could use the same infrastructure to contribute the information it uniquely curates for other uses within that wider community.