Portico Appraisal, Accessioning and Arrangement Policy

1. **Policy Statement**

   1.1. Portico will preserve the intellectual content of items submitted to it for preservation in a manner which will allow the item to be recreated or rendered on current or future delivery platforms. The intellectual content of preserved items will not be disturbed through Portico's ingest and migration processes. This statement guides all of our appraisal, accessioning and arrangement decisions.

   1.2. In order to aid appraisal and arrangement decisions, Portico requests a minimal set of descriptive metadata be provided with each preserved *content unit*. As a general rule, enough metadata should be provided to ensure the preserved item can be found again:

       - For content units that should be grouped into a title level hierarchy (e.g. an article should be associated with a journal, a book chapter with a book, and a document from a digitized collection with, minimally, the collection), an identifier for the higher level hierarchy should be provided (e.g. an ISSN on a journal article, a book DOI on a book chapter, or a collection identifier on a digitized document.)

       - Publication year or date is highly recommended

       - Metadata guidelines for journals and books are available online. Guidelines for d-collections are dependent on the content and are available on request.

   1.3. Appraisal, collection level – Portico selects content areas in which to offer preservation services based upon internal analysis, market analysis, discussions with the community and guidance from the Ithaka Board and Portico Advisory Committee.

   1.4. Appraisal, content provider level – Portico focuses on bringing in content providers who are identified as priorities for the library community and/or who are most at risk (e.g., very small publishers). Content providers must be able to meet Portico's delivery specifications for the genre of content they will be providing. This includes either submitting content in an understandable package that includes minimum metadata, or having a platform that can support the automated harvesting of content and metadata. For marked up content from publishers, this includes ensuring content is valid to its DTD or schema.

   1.5. Appraisal, title level – Portico does not appraise content at the title level. Rather, Portico preserves the entirety of a content provider's collection without evaluating the value of specific titles within that collection.

   1.6. Accessioning – Portico accessions content at the collection level early in the preservation process. Before processing any content, Portico secures perpetual, archival rights to preserve said content through a license agreement.

   1.7. Appraisal & arrangement, file level – Portico's file-specific appraisal and arrangement rules are tailored to the content being processed and can be configured both by content-type and by content provider.

2. **Implementation Examples**

   2.1. Per the Portico Content Modification and Deletion Policy, Portico will not substantively modify content. Portico will fix minor, identifiable problems that interfere with our ability to appraise and arrange the content in order to properly associate files with the correct archival unit (for example, if the content was published with the wrong volume number or a misspelling, the

content will be preserved as published and as provided to Portico). Portico does not change the scholarly record.

2.2. Collection level appraisal example: After extensive discussions with the community, Portico selected e-journals as the first content-type in need of preservation. As of 2023, Portico is also offering preservation services for e-books, digitized historical collections, standards, and reference databases.

2.3. File level appraisal & arrangement example:

- Portico applies strict appraisal and arrangement rules to e-journal, e-book, and digitized collection content. The rules are configured on a content provider by content provider basis in tailored mark-up transforms and profiles, in order to accommodate the unique styles of individual content providers. These rules include instructions to the system on how to group objects into functional units and what objects can be excluded and not preserved. These rules go through an extensive review process by the team that drafts them, by senior members of the data team, and by the archive services product manager or designee. The e-journal, e-book, and d-collection content-types are configured such that when content does not match the rules, an error is thrown during ingestion and may need to be manually resolved. Depending on the type of error and its severity, this content may either be moved to the archive with details of the error recorded in the metadata, or will not move into the archive until it is error free.

- Portico will decide on a content-type by content-type basis whether strict or lax appraisal and arrangement rules will apply. As with the e-journal, e-book, and d-collection content-types, new content-types will also have specific rules for each content provider – allowing Portico to tailor the ingest process as needed.

- Portico preserves the original submission files exactly as provided for e-journal and e-book content, in addition to preserving the processed archival unit.

3. Definitions

3.1. Appraisal: "The process of determining whether records and other materials have permanent (archival) value."[a] The appraisal process determines what content will be preserved and for how long and what content may be otherwise disposed of.

3.2. Accessioning: The process of establishing "legal, physical, and intellectual control over the collection."[b]

3.3. Arrangement: "The process of organizing records and papers to reveal their contents and significance."[c]

4. References

a) *Dictionary of Archives Terminology,* s.v. "Appraisal" https://dictionary.archivists.org/entry/appraisal.html (Accessed Aug 7, 2023).
b) Hunter, Gregory S. *Developing and Maintaining Practical Archives*. 2nd ed. Vol. 122, *How-To-Do-It Manuals for Librarians*. New York, NY: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2003., p. 87.
c) Ibid. p. 113.

5. Document History

5.1. Approved by: Kate Wittenberg

5.2. Last Review Date: 8/7/2023

5.3. Reviewed by: Amy Kirchhoff, Karen Hanson, Kate Wittenberg, Sandra Parr

5.4. Change history:

Version	Date	Change	Author
0.1	7/21/2009	Drafted.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.0*	7/28/2009	Made mods per Stephanie and Sheila. Synched with Portico Content Modification and Deletion Policy.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.1*	8/5/2009	Added reviewed by line.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.2	4/4/2011	Updated the logo.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.3*	3/26/2016	Minor changes to wording.	Amy Kirchhoff
1.4*	8/7/2023	Updated wording to allow for a wider variety of content providers. Refined metadata description. Updated reference.	Karen Hanson

* An approved version of this document.