Part 3
Policy review and gap analysis
Step 1: undertake local policy analysis
Cambridge Policy Gap Analysis - expectations

- Internal policies
- Public policies
- Operational policies
- Policies governing the collection
- Centralised location on the Intranet
- Centralised location on the main website
- Other documentation (PSPG)
Cambridge Policy Gap Analysis

Cambridge University Library
• Collection Development Policy Framework
• Collection Care and Conservation Policy
• Ethical Policy

Archives and Modern Manuscripts
• Access Policy
• Collection Development Policy
• Collections Information Policy

University Archives
• Collection Policy

Departmental
• Acquisition policies
• Cataloguing policies
• Exhibition loans

University-wide policies
• Privacy Policy
• Data Protection Policy
• Health and Safety Policy
• Learning and Development Policy
• Research Data Management Policy Framework
• Cambridge Open Access Policy Framework
• Information Compliance / Retention Schedule
## Cambridge Policy Gap Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies in development <em>(Library and University)</em></th>
<th>Other University policies <em>(good to know about)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Security Policy</td>
<td>• University Information Services (UIS) policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaster Preparedness</td>
<td>• Churchill College Digital Preservation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring Your Own Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cambridge Documentation Gaps List

- Agreement
- Asset Register
- Budget
- Chart
- Documentation
- Framework
- Guidelines
- Plan
- Policy
- Procedures
- Register
- Registry
- Standard
- Statement
- Strategy
- Technical Policy
- Website
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document name</th>
<th>Type**</th>
<th>CUL department (responsible for authoring/leading the drafting)</th>
<th>Other CUL departments that must contribute</th>
<th>Public or Internal***</th>
<th>Required by date (end of implementation year****) (MM/YY)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Digital Initiatives and Strategy and Digital Library Unit</td>
<td>Digital Preservation, Digital Content Unit, Cataloguing, Special Collections and Office of Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>31/12/2019</td>
<td>A general Access and Use Policy which includes a whole &quot;Digital Access&quot; section regarding access to CUL's digital (born-digital and digitised) collections. (While CUL will have separate Conservation and Collection Care and Digital Preservation Policies - I would not recommend that CUL creates a separate &quot;Digital Access&quot; Policy - and that a section of an Access Policy is assigned to addressing access to digital content. This should also include information about &quot;Conditions of use (distribution, intended use, protection of sensitive data, etc.).&quot; A section on access non-compliance must also be included. It is important to include a section on the reuse of digital content and metadata. The British Library has a Collection Metadata Policy as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata Policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Cataloguing and Digital Library Unit</td>
<td>Digital Preservation, Digital Content Unit, Cataloguing, Special Collections and Office of Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>31/12/2019</td>
<td>A holistic metadata policy that covers descriptive metadata as well as administrative, technical, structural, rights and preservation metadata. This should include information for metadata creation, metadata requirements when donating digital content and how metadata is transformed from one schema to another etc. The British Library has a Collection Metadata Policy as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata Standards</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Cataloguing and Digital Library Unit</td>
<td>Digital Preservation, Digital Content Unit, Cataloguing, Special Collections and Office of Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>31/12/2019</td>
<td>Documented agreed-upon standards across CUL. While several common metadata standards are in use, stakeholder consultation has requested that agreed upon and documented standards are needed at CUL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata Creation and Transformation Procedures</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Cataloguing and Digital Library Unit</td>
<td>Digital Preservation, Digital Content Unit, Cataloguing, Special Collections and Office of Scholarly Communications</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Procedures that support the implementation of the Metadata Policy and Metadata Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent Identification Naming Scheme and Standard</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Digital Preservation</td>
<td>In collaboration with all departments</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>31/12/2020</td>
<td>There are currently three 'standards' for naming files within the main University Library building. File naming collisions have occurred as a result. A Persistent Identification Scheme is required, with all University Library as well as affiliated and dependent libraries following this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Policy Framework</td>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>In collaboration with all departments</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Strategy</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Digital Initiatives and Strategy</td>
<td>Special Collections, Digital Preservation</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>31/12/2020</td>
<td>Guide the whole organisation's digital agenda (could be the Digital Transformation Strategy if CUL is continuing with this approach). There is already an internal DRAFT Special Collections Digital Strategy developed by...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata/cataloguing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage (physical)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage (data)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation (physical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation (digital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2: undertake international policy analysis
Digital preservation policy guidance

DPC Handbook

SCAPE Project
• [http://wiki.opf-labs.org/display/SP/Published+Preservation+Policies](http://wiki.opf-labs.org/display/SP/Published+Preservation+Policies)

Library of Congress (2011 & 2013)
- Archelogy Data Service
- Archives & State Library of North Carolina
- Archives NZ, NLNZ
- Archives NZ, NLNZ
- BFI
- Boston University Libraries
- California State Library
- Cheshire Archives
- Churchill College Cambridge
- City of London
- Cornell University Library
- Dartmouth College Library
- Elmer E. Rasmuson Library
- Florida Digital Archive
- Florida Digital Archive
- GoPortis - Consortium of German National Libraries
- Hampshire County Council
- HathiTrust
- Heriot Watt University
- John Hopkins Sheridan Libraries
- National Archives Australia
- National Library Australia
- National Library of Scotland
- National Museum Australia
- Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision
- Ohio State University Libraries
- Purdue University Research Repository
- Purdue University Research Repository
- Sound and Vision Netherlands
- State and University Library Denmark
- State Library of Queensland
- State Library Victoria
- The Royal Library (Denmark)
- TIB - National Science and Technology Library and National Economics Library, Germany
- UK Data Archive (University of Essex)
- UMass Amherst Libraries
- University Libraries, University at Albany
- University of Georgia Libraries
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- University of Maryland Libraries
- University of Minnesota Library
- University of South Carolina Libraries
- University of Sussex and Special Collections
- Wellcome Library
- York University Digital Library
- ZBW

- Archives NZ, National Library of NZ
- British Library
- Dutch Digital Library
- Parliamentary Archives (UK)
- Public Record Office of Northern Ireland
- The National Archives (UK)
- The National Library of Wales
- University of Manchester
- Yale University Library
Step 3: choosing the right policy for your organisation
Choosing the right policy
Maturity Modelling - benchmarking

- **Digital Preservation Capability Maturity Model** (DPCMM) – Dollar & Ashley
- **NDSA Levels of Digital Preservation** – *Archive Service Accreditation (UK)*
- **Three-legged Stool Model for Digital Preservation** – *plus the Survey of Institutional Readiness*
- **Five Organisational Stages of Digital Preservation** – Kenney & McGovern

- Trusted Digital Repository (TDR) certification – CoreTrustSeal

**Also**
- Re-drafted TRAC questions – *no time to re-run TRAC audit during the DPOC project*
- Excluded DRAMBORA – it required more of a time commitment
## Maturity Modelling - crosswalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAC</td>
<td>Nestor Seal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing Organisational Readiness (AOR) formerly Assessing Institutional Digital Assets (AIDA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- NDSA Levels of Preservation
- Three-Legged Stool for Digital Preservation (Survey of Institutional Readiness)
- Assessing Organisational Readiness (AOR) formerly Assessing Institutional Digital Assets (AIDA)
- Five Organisation Stages of Digital Preservation (Kenney & McGovern)
- CLOCKSS Threats Model and Mitigation Strategy
- Digital Stewardship End-to-End Workflow Model
- Digital Preservation at Oxford and Cambridge (DPOC)