

## **Persistence Implementation Task Force: Progress Report and Interim Recommendation**

August 20, 2009

CDC charged the Persistence Implementation Task Force on February 26, 2009 with developing guidelines governing replacement and preservation treatment of items designated as persistent that have either been lost or damaged/deteriorated to the point that they cannot be circulated. Specifically, the Task Force was asked to:

1. Conduct an environmental scan to understand the scope of the issue across the two RLFs.
2. Recommend a consistent set of definitions of what constitutes the required “good faith effort” to replace such items by an individual campus.
3. Identify under what specific conditions an exact replacement is not required. (e.g., copy in Google, duplicate in sister RLF, microfilm equivalent available, replacement copy not found)
4. Recommend what intercampus processes should be established to facilitate replacement of persistent items by copies at the campuses. (e.g., referral by selector to selector, CDO to CDO)
5. Determine whether there are any fund flow issues that need to be addressed in order to support the Persistence Policy. (patron fines, etc.)
6. Recommend an approach to tracking and recording the status of items that have gone lost, been damaged or deteriorated. (withdrawal, Marc 583, etc.)

The Task Force has been meeting via conference call. A wiki with relevant reports and RLF-based data has been set up. The Task Force is well underway with the environmental scan (charge element 1). The data on material loss thus far appears to confirm that the policy is addressing a relatively rare phenomenon. However loss does occur, and we continue to assess the character of the loss. Charge elements 4 through 6 are essentially operational in character: recommendations here can be efficiently developed and a subgroup of the Task Force has begun outlining a draft set of guidelines.

The core of the Task Force’s charge relates to the vexing definitional and interpretive assumptions in charge elements 2-3. These can be discussed in terms of two key issues relating to WHAT and WHEN.

### Key Issue 1: WHAT constitutes an acceptable or logical replacement.

When an item is identified as lost or damaged/deteriorated beyond usability, the first question to address before embarking upon a replacement process is what constitutes a logical or acceptable replacement. The following questions raised in the Berkeley report are immediate and logical questions:

\*Do digital surrogates created through mass digitization locally or externally suffice?

\*Do microform equivalents created locally through preservation treatment or acquired from commercial sources suffice?

\*Do alternate editions suffice? Alternate print dates?

\*How do alternate translations factor here?

The Task Force recommends that we proceed through use of the international standard Functional Requirements for a Bibliographic Record (FRBR). The Task Force believes that the FRBR structure, nomenclature, and definitions can help to frame and address persistence issues. The UC precedent for using the FRBR concepts has already been established within the framework of the Bibliographic Services Task Force. According to FRBR, content relationships can be described as a continuum from *work* to *expression* to *manifestation* to *item*.

*Work* -- a distinct intellectual or artistic creation. A work is an abstract entity

*Expression* -- the intellectual or artistic realization of a work in the form of alphanumeric, musical, or choreographic notation, sound, image, object, movement, etc., or any combination of such forms. An expression is the specific intellectual or artistic form that a work takes each time it is "realized." Multiple language translations constitute expressions of the same work.

*Manifestation* -- the physical embodiment of an expression of a work. The entity defined as manifestation encompasses a wide range of materials or *attributes*, including manuscripts, books, periodicals, maps, posters, sound recordings, films, video recordings, CD-ROMs, multimedia kits, etc. multiple editions, print dates. Microformat and digital surrogates fall into this category.

*Item* -- the unique item as an exemplar of the work. *The persistent item which needs replacement.*

It would be possible to envision a set of guidelines cast in the FRBR terminology to support processes implementing persistence.

## Key Issue 2 WHEN does redundancy factor into the replacement process

For some items that have been lost or have deteriorated beyond usability, there may be multiple copies within UC, California, or libraries generally within North America or worldwide. Examples of the questions that must be answer here:

\*multiple copies within UC? (can we create a lightweight approach to soliciting replacements for items in the RLF?)

\*multiple copies across California but not within UC (do we offer to another institution to accept responsibility for managing their copy? do we notify another institution that we would like rely upon their copy?0

\*multiple copies across North America or globally (again, do we notify?)

There has been some interesting work done recently by OCLC Research involving the volume of duplication of books and journals within Worldcat (Constance Malpas). Candace Yano (Berkeley engineering and business faculty member) and Roger Schonfeld (Ithaka) have been studying the question of “optimal overlap” among library journal collections required to ensure persistence over time with varying levels of risk tolerance.

In addition, the redundancy issue relates directly to the issue of what we are replacing. We cannot assess level of overlap unless we have identified whether we are studying overlap at the item and/or manifestation levels.

### Interim Recommendation for CDC

The Task Force needs to establish a framework for discussing acceptable options for replacement. Without this framework, we believe we cannot effectively develop the guidelines that can consistently guide RLF and campus collection program staff. We would like CDC’s agreement with our proposal to frame the persistence policy’s application from the outset in the language of FRBR entities and attributes.

#### *References:*

<http://missingmaterials.org/>

<http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/frbr/frbr.pdf> (especially chapters 3 on *entities* and 4 on *attributes*)

<http://www.ifla.org.sg/VII/s13/wgfrbr/finalreport.htm>

[http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/A\\_note\\_about\\_FRBR](http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/A_note_about_FRBR)

<http://www.loc.gov/cds/downloads/FRBR.PDF>

[http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/papers\\_leboeuf.pdf](http://www.d-nb.de/standardisierung/pdf/papers_leboeuf.pdf)

Constance Malpas presentation to LAUC Fall Assembly (Dec.2008)

[http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/assembly/Fall\\_2008%20Malpas.ppt](http://www.ucop.edu/lauc/assembly/Fall_2008%20Malpas.ppt)

Candace Yano presentation to ALA ALCTS collections officer group (June 2008) (unpublished – handout on Task Force wiki <http://bspace.berkeley.edu> )