Preservation Advisory Group (PAG) Report to CDC
Scan of UC Preservation Priorities and Services
March, 2013

Roger Smith (UC San Diego), Barclay Ogden (UC Berkeley), Dana Peterman (UC Irvine), Jim Dooley (UC Merced), Patricia Smith-Hunt (UC Riverside), Mike Foley (UC Bindery), Jack Neves (UC San Diego), Catherine Nelson (UC Santa Barbara), Dawn Aveline (UCLA), Susan Boone (UC San Francisco), Perry Willet (CDL), Sue Stoebner (UC Santa Cruz), Charlotte Payne (UC Davis)

I.   Summary

This report provides a broad overview of current and anticipated preservation services at the ten UC campuses and the UC Bindery. PAG met in December of 2012 to review current preservation services and to identify priorities for services going forward.

As UC libraries grow digital collections, the consensus of the preservation administrators is that our job is shifting from managing the print collection in perpetuity to managing large parts of them from "here (physical) to there (digital)". This paradigm shifts the focus of print preservation from circulating collections to artifactual collections, as well as adding digital preservation to the list of services UC preservation administrators will need to manage.

Each of the sections below explores an area of preservation work and provides key recommendations that will guide the work of PAG at a systemwide level and preservation staff at the campus level. In all instances, key to the success of all preservation services is collaboration because staffing and funding at many campuses have been too limited to implement critical services to ensure long-term access to UC collections.

II.   Library Binding

Library binding in UC has seen a steady decline in the past decade due largely to reductions in print journal subscriptions combined with additional cuts to binding allocations beginning in 2008 from reductions in state allocations to UC. In response, UC campuses already have identified and implemented practical changes to bindery levels, most notably the selection of "flush case" binding as a cost effective compromise between full buckram binding and limited circulation binding.

In addition, staffing in the area of binding preparation has been reduced significantly, along with the scale of the UC Bindery operation during this time period. We confirmed that in fact binding selection will continue to be in the purview of the Preservation Advisory Group going forward.

Largely, these decisions make sense in light of the shifting paradigm for preservation: to focus on artifactual materials and those items added to collections that serve multiple campuses and / or institutions. However, binding continues to be a cost effective means of protecting library material

Key recommendations:
- Use durable rather than permanent binding treatments for library materials to be replaced by digital versions.
- Use protective enclosures as cost effective alternatives to library binding to protect material until it is digitized.
- Support the UC Bindery's services to external (to UC) clients and its services in development (such as digitization) that could secure new services for, and decrease costs to, the UC libraries.
- Undertake a CALIPR collection preservation needs assessment to determine priorities for preservation of artifactual collections and for selection of material to bind or enclose.
- Bind print materials purchased for shared print programs destined to serve as multi campus or multi institutional persistent print copies.

III.   Repair / material conservation

Local repair continues to be a cost effective means of providing rapid return to service of damaged library books. This is particularly true for high circulation material and items on reserve. We noted that in general the decline in circulation at our campuses was not matched by a corresponding decline in repair work, most likely attributable to a reduction in binding that otherwise would have protected items from damage. Most campuses doing repair triage the material in order to decide if deaccessioning or digitization are better choices.

Key recommendations:
- Explore using the UC Bindery for repair, and UCB and UCLA for higher level conservation work. UCLA and UCB would need a recharge model for that work.
- Consider funding an "embedded conservator" working at UCLA or UCB to serve other UC campuses.
- Standardize the decision tree which guides our choice for repair, replacement or reformatting, particularly when digital surrogates are available, such as titles in the Hathitrust.

IV.   Disaster Preparedness

Disaster preparedness is mixed across the ten UC campuses ranging from well prepared to still working on a formal disaster plan. The PAG administrators agreed that in many instances a response to a disaster may be local, or regional at best, and that we do need to take steps at each campus level to be self-sufficient, particularly in the critical timeframe where action is needed to avoid collection losses.. This may include local and regional preparation and training, as well as association with local service providers and disaster recovery companies.

Key recommendations:

- Explore at the campus and systemwide level the relationship between the University insurer(s), UC Risk Management, and commercial disaster recovery companies, to achieve an explicit understanding and coordination of roles in an emergency, along with knowledge of how to access funds to contract for goods and services to recover collections.
- Utilize the PRISM risk assessment software to assess risk and associated loss potential, and work with UCOP to develop a better understanding of the value of assigning an expenditure for preventative or "just in case" recovery contracts.
- Associate with an emergency response company, if not with a formal retainer then with a "profile" or informal retainer (such as Belfor's "Red Alert program) which would facilitate a more efficient and focused response in an emergency.
- Refine our campus collection recovery priorities so that limited resources may be directed to where they would provide the most benefit.
- Prepare Pocket Response Plans (PREP) to collection disasters for key staff on all campuses.
- Review and revise as needed regional disaster recovery cooperatives.
- Share campus disaster plans with other campuses to pull the best from each campus' planning efforts.
- Distribute these plans on flash drives.
- Create a mobile app for UC Libraries emergency response and collection recovery practices.
- Work with the local OES to make UC libraries a regional priority for recovery.

V.   Environmental Monitoring

Environmental monitoring, like many preservation services, has been minimized due to limited resources. A number of campuses are only monitoring special collections areas. There is a mixed relationship between library preservation units and campus facilities departments with some campuses reporting little or no action taken in

response to preservation staff concerns. It was noted that the opportunity exists for multiple UC campuses to share the cost of monitoring software (such as IPI eClimate Notebook) to collectively manage datasets pertaining to UC collections.

Key recommendations:
- Monitor the environment of areas holding collections to be maintained in print to maximize their service lives (and minimize access costs).
- Keep monitoring equipment and software up to date.
- Give particular attention to the needs of AV collections that may not be receiving appropriate monitoring at present.
- Establish and maintain effective relationships with library and/or campus facilities management departments to address concerns and plan for needed HVAC upgrade or repair.
- Consider group memberships in services such as IPI's "eClimate Notebook" software and standardized use of monitoring equipment.

VI. Preservation Reformatting

Digital reformatting for preservation is undertaken at all campuses at some level. That said, a number of PAG representatives reported digitization needs not able to be met with existing resources (money, equipment, staff, etc.). With several initiatives underway systemwide, preservation staff need to clearly articulate priorities for preservation digitization.

Key recommendations:
- Focus preservation reformatting on materials in demand, primary sources, and material with artifactual value.
- Work with the NGTS recommendations to establish centers of expertise for digital reformatting, and ensure that preservation staff have a strong voice in the management of that work.
- Work closely with bibliographers to identify the best opportunities to select digital reformatting as an appropriate preservation strategy for content in our collections.
- Stay informed on emerging standards for digitized content and apply those standards to in house and vendor reformatting work.
- Provide leadership in the identification and pursuit of grants to fund preservation reformatting work.
- Address the urgent reformatting needs of AV material in our collections .
- Create and/or leverage existing means to share our project proposals with one another, to better advise on standardized formatting, experience, possibly shared resources.

VII. Digital Preservation

The key concern expressed in this area by our group was that preservation administrators participate in the development and implementation of policies and procedures governing digital preservation services for our electronic content, both owned and licensed. This is increasingly important as the percentage of our collections acquired or reformatted to digital form grows. The NGTS POT1 (Next Generation Technical Services, Power Of Three group #1) initiatives will shape the approach the UC campuses take to collaborative digital collection management; PAG aspires to participate in the development of an appropriate preservation strategy for content in any UC DAMS. As it stands, several campuses are heavily invested in their own preservation tools for digital content and others are more likely strong candidates for CDL/UC wide services.

Key recommendations:
- Engage in the process of defining and monitoring sound preservation strategies for our digital content; starting with Portico auditing. Identify gaps and overlap in services that may represent redundant costs.

- Participate in development of a preservation strategy for content in the proposed UC wide DAMS (see POT1)
- Plan for format migrations as formats become obsolete.
- Continue to stay abreast of development at the national level, such as the Digital Preservation Network (DPN), and advise on participation at the UC level.
- Participate in the assessment and selection of distributed commercial solutions when appropriate, leveraging cost effective choices when internal development is cost prohibitive.

VIII.   Collection Management and Care / Assessment

Preservation staff partner with other library units to oversee the care of the collection. Education of circulation and stacks maintenance staff in the correct handling of materials and identification of damage is an important component of campus preservation programs.

Little attention is paid to the long-term serviceability of UC collections, largely due to shortfalls in resources (primarily staffing) to undertake assessments. In keeping with recommendations in sections above, preservation staff need to conduct as much routine assessment as possible of AV collections, rare and special collections and primary resources.

Key recommendations:
- Undertake a circulating condition assessment in support of shared print initiatives (proposed in 2009)
- Undertake assessment of media collections.
- Undertake assessment of collections of distinction; particularly primary resources, rare and artifactual material.
- Make use of the CALIPR tool to conduct preservation assessment in a consistent manner that allows for multi-campus collaborations.

Submitted on behalf of the PAG,
Roger Smith, chair