

The following summarizes discussions PAG had on March 23, 2004 in response to a request from UC CDC to consider the definition of a “Type 1” archive and recommend preservation strategies. PAG members felt that defining “security levels” was not helpful at this time, but recommends that titles for shared collections be characterized into “Preservation Categories.” The group discussed the Elsevier/ACM Assessment Task Force Report and focussed on discussing preservation options for titles/collections that have similar characteristics to Elsevier.

Further discussions, definitions, and recommendations will be necessary for other “Preservation Types.”

### ***I. Characteristics of journal titles: Preservation types 1 and 2.***

For the most part, journal titles need to be reviewed title by title rather than by collection as they are “typed” for preservation treatment. For example, while most Elsevier journal titles conform to the assumptions and criteria summarized below, some will not. Different preservation strategies are necessary for these “exceptions.” These shared titles will fall into as yet undefined types. *The group recommended that a process be put in place to review shared print titles individually, and to provide appropriate preservation treatment for titles that are exceptions to the rule.*

**DEFINITION:** Characteristics of a Preservation Type 1 shared title:

- a. an electronic copy exists of journal content, cover to cover
- b. UC receives one print copy from the publisher directly for the archive for titles in the contract package
- c. Titles are stored at an RLF or at another single location
- d. A print “copy of record” is available elsewhere (an agency such as NLM or CRL has assumed preservation responsibility)

The last of these is problematic, since for most titles no one has assumed preservation responsibility. Therefore, the group defined a “Type 2” shared title, that would have characteristics a, b, and c, above.

**DEFINITION:** Preservation Type 2 shared title:

- a. an electronic copy exists of journal content, cover to cover
- b. UC receives one print copy from the publisher directly for the archive for titles in the contract package
- c. Titles are stored at an RLF or at another single location

Most Elsevier, ACM, Kluwer and Wiley titles will be Type 2.

### ***II. Dim archive: Characteristics and assumptions.***

**DEFINITION:** A “dim archive” is one that is appropriate for titles that fall into Preservation Categories: Type 1 and 2.

PAG noted that the creation of a shared print archive for many titles is an “interim solution,” for many titles will not be published in print in future years, and the digital version will become the “copy of record.” PAG supports the ongoing work of CDL and others in addressing issues related to preserving the digital version of the journal.

The group also affirmed that decisions about implementing a dim archive need to be driven by CMI results showing low usage of titles available electronically.

**Characteristics of a DIM shared print archive:**

- a. the titles in it are characterized as “Type 1” or “Type 2”
- b. the primary purpose of a DIM shared print archive is to build campus/faculty confidence that complete information can be sustained: the archive is “backup” to digital
- c. this is a low cost method of warehousing and requires limited access mechanisms because other mechanisms (such as OPACs, Science Direct) are available
- d. it’s better to focus major preservation funding on other categories of materials
- e. processes need to be kept simple

Specific suggestions for implementing a dim archive:

The following suggestions would allow UC to preserve scarce resources to preserve titles that are unique or only available in print.

- a. rather than claiming missing issues, a print copy could be made of the electronic version
- b. when issues are received damaged or are damaged after circulation, they should be sent for conservation to their “owning institution.”
- c. For UCL titles held at SRLF or in the south, the UCLA conservation unit at SRLF should be assigned responsibility for repair. For titles held at NRLF or in the north, the UCB conservation unit should be assigned responsibility
- d. Titles should not be bound
- e. “In-building use” policies at each campus should be strictly followed, but special or supervised procedures need not be developed .

***Conclusion:***

PAG recognizes that there will be other types of shared collections for which other preservation decisions will be necessary, (e.g., two print copies, binding, special access rules, etc.). As plans for these shared collections are made, PAG would be willing to work with CDC and the Director of Shared Print Collections to define the characteristics of these additional types and appropriate preservation procedures.