

## Copac Collection Management Tools Project: Standards and formats

*An extract from the Copac Collection Management Tools Project*

*Retention and Preservation: Final Report, July 2012.*

*Available at: <http://copac.ac.uk/innovations/collections-management/reports/>*

A key consideration already touched on is how information about retention and preservation can be accommodated within the existing metadata context in a way which permits easy updating and supports standard use of terms. MARC tag 583 – “Action Note” – would seem to provide the necessary framework. This is already the preferred way of indicating print serial holdings retained within the UKRR scheme, so its adoption here would potentially provide a common structure for both serial and monographic holdings. 583 was also the mechanism chosen by OCLC for its “Print Archives Disclosure Pilot”, for which the final report<sup>1</sup> has recently been published. This too was based on serial holdings, but attempted a tighter framework for controlling information than had been specified by the UKRR, based on fuller use of MARC 583 in association with the vocabulary defined within Preservation and Digitization Actions (PDA)<sup>2</sup>.

The PDA vocabulary is maintained within the MARC standards system and allows one of a number of standard “actions” to be recorded, together with the date on which the action is decided upon, further detail regarding the precise details of the action and/or condition of the item (where appropriate) and a free text note giving additional information. An important and explicitly stated consideration in recording this information is to allow other institutions to understand the condition and status of the item described in order to inform their own decision-making. Within this context, the use of a tightly controlled vocabulary permits confidence in interpreting the information recorded and would, for example, allow a library to decide not to actively conserve their copy of a title because another institution has already done so.

Originally drawn up by RLG, ARL and Library of Congress, PDA has an excellent pedigree, and it was designed to cope with use cases that very clearly overlap with our own. Because its focus is on offering the capability to record the full range of actions around preservation and digitisation, it presents a completeness and complexity which may not be helpful within a framework which is aiming to be simple, easily comprehensible and low maintenance. However this could be addressed by identifying a limited subset of subfields and terms which are capable of providing the essentials for our purposes without precluding use of the full vocabulary by any institution that so wishes, and this is essentially the way in which it was used within the OCLC Pilot.

However, PDA does not currently include a term which exactly corresponds to the concept of “intention to retain” which is so central to the current discussion (the existing PDA term “retained” is intended for a somewhat different use). OCLC recognised this difficulty and defined two additional terms (“committed to retain” and “completeness reviewed”) which it would hope to see adopted within the standard vocabulary in due course. Adoption of the same standards by both OCLC and the UK National Research Collection would clearly be beneficial to both parties, permitting data flow between the two systems and opening up the possibility of collaboration or interworking in specialist areas. Because this combination of 583 and PDA may be used in other contexts (e.g. for locally recording an institution’s decisions in the areas of preservation or digitisation, there is a risk of creating ambiguity which would undermine the confidence which is critical to successful collaboration. However this can

---

<sup>1</sup> OCLC Print Archives Disclosure Pilot Project. *Final report*. 2012.

[https://docs.google.com/document/pub?id=1iM86\\_QRG0vBXqIRwezIA2pOANJdlqmlAnSS\\_t31WgNU](https://docs.google.com/document/pub?id=1iM86_QRG0vBXqIRwezIA2pOANJdlqmlAnSS_t31WgNU)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/pda.html>

be managed by mandating use of the \$f subfield (“authorization”, here the collaborative scheme involved). And in practice, very few UK libraries currently record any data in MARC tag 583.

It is therefore recommended that:

- work on developing the Copac Tools to support the UK NRCM should be based on MARC tag 583 and PDA;
- discussions with OCLC should take place with the objective of identifying a common approach to the implementation of these standards within this context;
- discussions with OCLC should also consider a joint approach to enhancing PDA in line with the requirements of our user communities;
- UK guidelines for the use of 583 and PDA should be established (while permitting richer capture of information by those institutions which wish to do so).

Appendix A provides some examples of how 583 might be implemented within this context.

## Appendix A: Examples of 583 content, based on PDA

Level 1. The OCLC Pilot permitted a 583 tag with only one subfield. For monographs, this would need to be unambiguously associated with a given institution within the shared system. This might be achieved by adding an institutional symbol in subfield \$5 at point of loading into Copac if one is not already present.

583 1 \$a Committed to retain

*Minimal level of input*

Level 2. A recommended set of subfields for monographs might consist of:

\$a Action e.g. Committed to retain

\$c Date e.g. 2012

\$f Authorization e.g. UKNRC (UK National Research Collection)

\$2 Source of term e.g. pda

\$5 Institution code e.g. UKLeU (may be able to be supplied by Copac software on loading?)

583 1 \$a Committed to retain \$c 2012 \$f UKNRC \$2 pda \$5 UKLeU

*This fully complies with standard practice, albeit with a minimal level of information.*

Level 3. Where a library desires to record additional information, the full range of MARC subfields and PDA terms can be used. This information might either relate to the intention to retain i.e. be expressed within the same 583; or alternatively relate to additional information about the item held i.e. be expressed in one or more subsequent 583 tags. These 2 possibilities are shown in the two following examples.

583 1 \$3 v.1 only \$a Committed to retain \$c 2012 \$d 2022 \$f UKNRC \$f SCURL \$5 UKLeU

*In this case, the Library has committed to retain vol. 1 only, for a 10 year period, within 2 separate agreements: UKNRC and SCURL*

583 1 \$a Committed to retain \$c 2012 \$f UKNRC \$5 UKLeU

583 1 \$a Condition reviewed \$c 2012 \$l mutilated \$z pages 9-15 damaged \$5 UKLeU

583 1 \$a Housed \$c 2012 \$i box \$5 UKLeU

## Copac Collection Management Tools Project

*In this case, the Library has committed to retain the item. On reviewing the condition, it has noted that the item is mutilated and has also decided that it needs a storage enclosure (to be housed in a box).*