



Portico Archive Holdings Completeness Policy

1. Policy Statement

- 1.1. Portico will attempt to verify that the content it has preserved is complete – that all content committed to the archive by a content provider is preserved, that all titles are completely preserved without any gaps, and that all objects are complete. Portico will establish plans for addressing the completeness of collections on a content type, content provider, or collection basis – as appropriate for the content.

2. Implementation Examples

- 2.1. At the object level, if the content provider has provided a manifest file, Portico will check the content received against the manifest file. For e-journals and e-books, Portico has a rigorous ingest process to manage arrangement and appraisal of the object files supplied by the content provider.
- 2.2. E-journals provide an example of a content-type that require an iterative approach to verify completeness at the title and issue level, as e-journals are particularly idiosyncratic (for example, what appears to be a missing issue may never have been published or it may be a delivery mistake on the part of the content provider). As one step in this process, over the past several years Portico has been working on summarizing holdings information and making this available to participants. As next steps in this process, in late 2009 when we will have a set of publishers for which all content they have provided to Portico has been ingested into the archive we will review their content in the archive and determine if content we should have is missing. This process may include tracking down titles promised to Portico and not received and comparing the Portico holdings to the serials data of one or major university library or national libraries for specific titles to identify missing issues (e-journals are particularly difficult because there is no canonical holdings list in existence and we do not want to compare solely against the publisher’s holdings, but rather would like to compare against 3rd party information). In 2008, Portico initiated discussions with a library about using their holdings data for such a review process.
- 2.3. E-books and digitized collections will each require a plan of their own.

3. Document History

- 3.1. Approved by: Amy Kirchhoff
- 3.2. Last Review Date: 8/12/2009
- 3.3. Reviewed by: Sheila Morrissey, Stephanie Orphan, Eileen Fenton
- 3.4. Change history:

Version	Date	Change	Author
0.1	7/22/2009	Drafted.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.0*	7/28/2009	Made mods per Stephanie and Sheila.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.1*	8/5/2009	Added reviewed by line	Amy Kirchhoff
1.2*	8/12/2009	Modified per EGF.	Amy Kirchhoff

* An approved version of this document.