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Our cultural, historic, and scientific heritage is increasingly being produced and shared in digital forms. The ubiquity, pervasiveness, variability, and fluidity of such content raise a range of questions about the role of research libraries and archives in digital preservation in the face of rapid organizational and technological changes and evolving organizational priorities. Ithaka S+R is interested in exploring the current landscape of digital preservation programs and services in
Survey

Goals:

1. Better understand how NASIG can support digital preservation initiatives
2. Deeper understand of the current challenges facing digital preservation in the information professional community
3. Identify tools and services to aid libraries, organizations, and individuals to strengthen digital preservation more broadly.

Open from September 24, 2018 to October 26, 2018
Survey: Section 1: Demographics

- 244 respondents
- 15% of respondents outside the United States including:
  - Europe, Asia, and Australia

Digital Preservation Service:
For the purposes of this survey a “digital preservation service” is an independent, unaffiliated organization that supports digital preservation initiatives. Examples include Portico and CLOCKSS.
Survey: Section 1: Demographics

Respondents by NASIG Membership

- NASIG Member: 35.2%
- Not a NASIG Member: 54.1%
- No response: 10.7%
Survey: Section 2: Familiarity with Digital Preservation

Frequency digital preservation was relevant directly of your work in the past year, by type of institution (library)

- Other Library
- Public Library
- Research Library
- Academic Library

Frequency of Relevance to Work:
- Daily
- A few times a week
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Yearly
- Never
Survey: Section 2: Familiarity with Digital Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution have a digital preservation policy?</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Publishers etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your institution [library] have a digital preservation policy?

- **Unknown**: Unknown categories for libraries, other, public, research, and academic libraries.
- **Other Library**: Other libraries.
- **Public Library**: Public libraries.
- **Research Library**: Research libraries.
- **Academic Library**: Academic libraries.
Survey: Section 2: Familiarity with Digital Preservation

- Q10: Please rate your familiarity with these terms: Perpetual Access, Trigger Event, TRAC Certification

- Q11: Please rate your familiarity with these digital preservation services: CLOCKSS, Global LOCKSS Network, HathiTrust, Internet Archive, Keepers Registry, and Portico
Survey: Section 2: Familiarity with Digital Preservation

Familiarity with Preservation Services

- **CLOCKSS**: 200
- **Global LOCKSS Network**: 150
- **HathiTrust**: 100
- **Internet Archive**: 50
- **Keeper's Registry**: 200
- **Portico**: 150

Legend:
- No response
- First introduction to this service
- Not Familiar
- Familiar
- Moderately Familiar
- Extremely Familiar
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

● Q12: Do you manage digital preservation initiatives at your institution?

● Q13: Is digital preservation specifically included as part of your job description?

● Q14: The Task Force is very interested in the text of job descriptions pertaining to digital preservation. Please include digital preservation job description text if applicable:
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Q16: Does your institution participate in any digital preservation services (LOCKSS, Portico, etc.)? Response by type of institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At what type of institution do you work?</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Library</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Preservation Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Q18: How does your institution participate in these digital preservation services? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deposit content</td>
<td>60.92%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support through membership fees</td>
<td>74.71%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track preservation status of licensed electronic content</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve on initiative board or committee</td>
<td>12.64%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Q19: Please describe, if you can, why your institution does not participate in any digital preservation services:

A selection of responses:

- “While I recognize the importance of digital preservation, it's not something my institution feels it can financially support with our limited materials budget. We are also a smaller institution and our materials are more focused on retaining current access rather than perpetual access.”
- “Lack of time/money/staff; outlook of senior management is that this is not our "area of responsibility"”
- “Budget issues; Hard to get everyone at the institution on the same page; Hard for some administrators to see the value in it”
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Q20: Evaluate how much you trust these preservation services:

- CLOCKSS
- LOCKSS
- HathiTrust
- Institutional Repository
- Publisher Content Management System
- Portico
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Q20: Evaluate how much you trust these preservation services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation Service</th>
<th>Highest level of trust</th>
<th>Mostly Trust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Low level of trust</th>
<th>Do not trust</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOCKSS</td>
<td>23.64% (52)</td>
<td>30.91% (68)</td>
<td>45.45% (100)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCKSS</td>
<td>22.83% (50)</td>
<td>31.51% (69)</td>
<td>44.75% (98)</td>
<td>.91% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Repository</td>
<td>16.89% (37)</td>
<td>42.01% (92)</td>
<td>35.16% (77)</td>
<td>4.11% (9)</td>
<td>1.83% (4)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HathiTrust</td>
<td>25.45% (56)</td>
<td>40% (88)</td>
<td>32.27% (71)</td>
<td>2.27% (5)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portico</td>
<td>23.04% (50)</td>
<td>30.41% (66)</td>
<td>45.62% (99)</td>
<td>.92% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher Repository</td>
<td>1.83% (4)</td>
<td>16.44% (36)</td>
<td>55.25% (121)</td>
<td>21.92% (48)</td>
<td>4.57% (10)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

CLOCKSS: Level of Trust by Respondent's Type of Institution

- Highest level of trust
- Mostly trust
- Neutral

Academic Library: 40
Other (please specify): 0
Other Library: 0
Public Library: 0
Publisher: 0
Research Library: 0
Third Party Preservation Agency: 0
Vendor: 0
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Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

LOCKSS: Level of Trust by Respondent's Type of Institution

- Highest level of trust
- Mostly trust
- Neutral
- Low level of trust

Academic Library: Highest level of trust
Other (please specify): Mostly trust
Other Library: Neutral
Public Library: Mostly trust
Publisher: Neutral
Research Library: Low level of trust
Third Party Preservation Agency: Neutral
Vendor: Neutral
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Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Institutional Repository: Levels of Trust by Respondent's Type of Institution

- Highest level of trust
- Mostly trust
- Neutral
- Low level of trust
- Do not trust

- Academic Library
- Other (please specify)
- Other Library
- Public Library
- Publisher
- Research Library
- Third Party Preservation Agency
- Vendor
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Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

HathiTrust: Level of Trust by Respondent's Type of Institution

- Highest level of trust
- Mostly trust
- Neutral
- Low level of trust

- Academic Library
- Other (please specify)
- Other Library
- Public Library
- Publisher
- Research Library
- Third Party Preservation Agency
- Vendor
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Survey: Section 3: Participation in Existing Preservation Initiatives

Portico: Level of Trust by Respondent's Type of Institution

- Highest level of trust
- Mostly trust
- Neutral
- Low level of trust

Bar chart showing the level of trust for different types of institutions.
Survey: Section 4: Barriers to Digital Preservation

Q21: Please rank the barriers to expanding digital preservation initiatives at your institution: (1=Highest Barrier, 5=Lowest Barrier)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Highest Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Lowest Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional priorities</td>
<td>26.47% 54</td>
<td>21.57% 44</td>
<td>19.12% 39</td>
<td>18.63% 38</td>
<td>14.22% 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>17.07% 35</td>
<td>30.24% 62</td>
<td>26.34% 54</td>
<td>13.66% 28</td>
<td>12.68% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>40.48% 85</td>
<td>27.62% 58</td>
<td>17.62% 37</td>
<td>6.19% 13</td>
<td>8.10% 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical complexity</td>
<td>3.85% 8</td>
<td>10.58% 22</td>
<td>25.96% 54</td>
<td>43.75% 91</td>
<td>15.87% 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear understanding of responsibilities for digital preservation</td>
<td>13.68% 29</td>
<td>10.85% 23</td>
<td>12.26% 26</td>
<td>16.51% 35</td>
<td>46.70% 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Section Section 4: Barriers to Digital Preservation

Q22: In your opinion, with whom should the primary responsibility of preserving digital scholarly content lie?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortia</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party digital preservation services</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A combination of the above</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey: Takeaways and Recommendations

- Develop a Template or Model Preservation Policy
- The Keepers Registry
- Demonstrate need and importance to administrators

- Certification and born-digital versus digitized content
Task Force: Recommendations to the NASIG Board

1. Create a Digital Preservation Standing Committee
2. Education and Outreach
3. Develop a Template or Model Preservation Policy
4. The Keepers Registry
5. Collaborate with existing preservation agencies and other professional organization more closely on these issues
COLIC (kolˈik), n. acute spastic pain in the abdomen or bowels.

COLISEUM, see colosseum.

COLLABORATE (ko-labˈo-rat), to work jointly, especially in literary or scientific work.

COLLABORATION (ˌo-raˈshən), united labour.

COLLABORATOR (ˌlabˈo-ra-tər), one who assists another, especially in literary or scientific work.

COLLAPSE (kə-lAPS), n. a fall or together; sudden failure.

COLLAPSIBLE
Recommendations for Libraries

- Create a digital preservation policy
- Determine collection development priorities for preservation
- Communicate digital preservation priorities to vendors and publishers
Recommendations for Information Professionals

- Understand who, within your library or organization, is responsible for digital preservation
  - (if that is you, align position description with roles and responsibilities)
- Include digital preservation in workflow processes and planning
Recommendations for Organizations

- Understand stakeholders priorities
- Transparency regarding costs
- Have a preservation policy
- Adaptability
Questions?

Shannon Keller
Helen Bernstein Librarian for Periodicals and Journals
shannonkeller@nypl.org