

**Catalogers Group
December 20, 2001**

Present: John Riemer, Elie Chammou, Joan LoPear, Beth Feinberg, Janice Matthiesen, Caroline Miller, Rita Stumps, Nancy Norris, Jean Rashedi, Chamyra Kincy, Angela Riggio, Valerie Bross, Claudia Horning, Luiz Mendes, Paul Priebe, Jeff Morehead

1. Report on ACC/CMC/TPAC discussion on the formation of the next Orion team.

John discussed the nominating process for the new O3 committee in charge of researching pros and cons for candidate systems for the new ILS. At ACC, Sara Layne pointed that the only involvement in viewing systems unique to team members would be the site visits to institutions that have implemented the system. Such people should have extensive and intricate knowledge of extant systems. Everyone else could participate in the in-depth on-campus presentations by vendors. In response to a question, John indicated that ACC considered Sara, Valerie, John, and Martha Yee for nominations to be on the team; only one would likely be chosen. From the CMC meeting, it appears that four systems are likely to be surveyed: Endeavor's Voyager, ExLibris, Innovative, and Sirsi's Unicorn, which has been somewhat demonstrated to the staff already. Angela reported TPAC's perspective that the OPAC was to be the primary focus in the decision-making process. Following vendor visits here and road trips to other libraries, the team's recommendations are due by late February or early March.

There was some discussion concerning the feasibility of creating a new system from scratch or attempting to acquire the Taos software to use on our own after DRA ends support. There seemed to be some concern that a home-grown system à la Orion1 would entail the same problems with programming and hardware.

2. Discussion and decisions on how we should implement revised rule 9.5B1 in original and copy cataloging.

For original cataloging of direct-access computer files, Catalogers Group consensus was to prefer conventional terminology in the 300 \$a. For example, this would mean "1 DVD" instead of "1 computer optical disc." In the interest of streamlining the copy cataloging process, we will use whatever type of terminology is on the copy. Valerie stated that CONSER practice is to use conventional terminology. Joan said the Music Library Association was going to discuss implementation of 9.5B1 soon.

3. Update on ERDB/DAD developments.

John then discussed the field trip to UCSD on December 6. He noted that UCSD's version of the ERDb, called Sage, was in preparation for 2 years and involved 30 different people in multiple small committees. The 3 major groups currently involved are the Libraries web site committee, the Sage authors (equivalent to our subject descriptor owners), and the webmasters.

There was also lead time provided for selectors to apply the Link Grabber software to their static pages and to examine the results. The library bought the Netscape Compass server. The key fields in the UCSD "ERDB" records are title, URL, subject, and material type. The types list has more pressure on it to grow than the subjects list does. There are four things in the UCSD search engine: human-entered websites, e-journals from the OPAC, static HTML web sites, and the results of spidering out from those 3 to what they link to. They have not attempted to use the keyword field two different ways as we have. They use keyword to augment what controlled vocabularies offer and they use something called "attribute-value pairs" as aids to web page subarrangement. The latter are not "fed" to the spider for indexing. Browsing targets different data than what you get by using the search box.

John gave a demonstration of how various members of our staff are editing out ERDB dups locally prior to the Jan. 7th target date for presenting something for the public. Andy K identified ERDB records with the same title http://lisntserv53/lis_test/erdb/DupTitleGroup.cfm ,and these are the responsibility of selectors to clean up. Jean, Claudia H, Chamyra, Rita, and John are responsible for the other report (same URL but different titles) http://lisntserv53/lis_test/erdb/DupURLGroup.cfm . The reports are web-based, and a lot of the data on the ERDB records not being kept is automatically being salvaged and moved over to the retained records.

Louise asked what relationship CORC would have to ERDb. CORC could be the means whereby new titles reach ERDB, by way of the OPAC. The workflow for updating ERDB with new and revised Orion records, following the original, late-September migration of data, has yet to be worked out. John said that if the ERDB changes to become a hyperlinked list of descriptors, embedding live searches against the OPAC, then synchronizing data is much easier.

Currently there are two title fields in each ERDB resource record. The Resource Title is equivalent to the 130 or 245 field in the cataloging record; the Display Title is the version of the title that a selector would wish to appear on a library web page to represent the E-resource. The two do not differ often. Only the Resource Title is indexed for ERDB searching, but only the Display Title appears within retrieved records. This sometimes leads to confusing results when the single-record technique is used to catalog the e-resource. The e-resource "infoplease.com" is cataloged on the record for the print equivalent, Time Almanac. After migration from Orion and subsequent clean up, Time Almanac is the Resource Title, and Infoplease.com is the Display Title. A search for "infoplease.com" returns nothing in ERDB. A user searching for Time Almanac in ERDB is likely to be confused by retrieving a record with "infoplease.com" displaying in the title field. Both titles would be indexed in the OPAC record and ERDB users might be better served searching against it.

4. Controlling OCLC searching costs.

ACC has been asked to react to concerns raised about the escalating costs for searching on the OCLC bills.

Perspectives on the OCLC bill from our discussion: How much of the cost increase incurred in great productivity increase of this past year? More titles cataloged means more searching in OCLC for necessary records. As we go to more collaborative e-resource cataloging via BibCORC with selectors and reference librarians, we will see increased costs. How much extra searching of OCLC has been motivated by aversion to sluggish O2 response time: people are used to taking a quick look for the 'CLU' holdings symbol in OCLC to see if it's even worth bother to perform a free but slow search in the local system. "Scan ti" searching is a more straightforward method of training students and temporary staff, and this is the current default; cheaper keyword searching involves a longer learning curve.

Full-time staff should know not to use scan-title searching as a first resort for locating bib records. This costs 22 cents to get the list and 43 cents for **each** record viewed from that list. "Scan ti" searching is suitable for determining if an almost-finished original workform is a duplicate of what is already in OCLC.

Libraries can incur high searching costs by multiple searches for each monograph in the technical services workflow. For example:

- a) a selector wanting to verify existence of a book for Acquisitions
- b) staff in Acquisitions wanting to check something before ordering or at the time of receipt
- c) student searchers of new receipts in the Cataloging Department, triaging books for CatSup, Monocats, and Copycats, by type of copy found in OCLC

d) copy catalogers calling up records to work on at time of actual cataloging.

When we have a new ILS here, the first person in our division needing to search OCLC could download the record to the local system. When Cataloging finished its part, LIS could "upload" the CLU symbol to OCLC after-the-fact. Then our cost would be 43 cents for the one search + 38 cents to export the record + 23 cents to upload 'CLU' = \$1.04 for all OCLC costs associated with the "simple" book.

OCLC costs could be offset somewhat with contribution credits like additional bibliographic records Enhanced and Encoding-Level 3 CORC records input by the UCLA Digital Library.

5. Announcements.

Next month's meetings are scheduled for January 10 (Office XP training) and January 24 (ALA Midwinter reports).

Respectfully submitted, Dec. 26, 2001,
Jeff Morehead