

## HOTS Conference Call Minutes

**March 7, 2006**

PRESENT: Linda Barnhart (UCSD), Jim Dooley (UCM, Chair), Pat French (UCD), Tony Harvell (UCSD-LAUC), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Sara Layne (UCLA), Lee Leighton (UCB), Patti Martin (CDL), John Riemer (UCLA-SCP AC), Sharon Scott (UCR, Recorder), John Tanno (UCD-SOPAG Liaison), Paul Wakeford (UCSF), Amy Weiss (UCSB)

Jim began the meeting by referring to a tally from two weeks ago, in which it seemed there was almost unanimous support for a central file. Since then consensus has been shifting toward a central ILS. It was originally thought that a central file would be more feasible than a central ILS but enthusiasm waned for the central file as the discussion ensued.

There are some good things about a central file but by its nature some valuable things would be lost. Example: Without order records the ability for cooperative ordering would be greatly diminished. The issue of an accounting interface was raised but it was generally decided this is not a problem for this group at this time. Some do not even have this interface, and it would probably have to be decided at a local level anyway. It should be mentioned as a problem needing a solution if we went with a single ILS. A single ILS involves many more issues than just cataloging.

Paul's response: This report is so big, with many things related to bibliographic structure, but we cannot solve all the problems now. We have to live with the reality that it may not do everything we want, and not all needs will be met by this report's recommendations. We can point out issues which will need solving, but now we need to focus more narrowly. Should this be part of our response—the fact that we're setting our goal for the ideal even though we know we can't have it now?

Jim brought the conversation back to the question of 4b. What do we think of OCLC? There are issues relying on OCLC, will it just maintain our holdings? Are they positioned to preserve individual copies of bib records? We don't want to lose local information, which might happen in OCLC. If we all used OCLC numbers, merging records would be easier.

A possible scenario is having OCLC as the UC database of record although we all continue with our local databases. It would stand as the external record of holdings but not our single ILS. Do we need just one good bibliographic record; if so what about local information? If we don't turn over local operations, all it is is a record of our holdings. Maybe we should couple this with more effort to make the records better.

A business relationship which we might be looking at puts a lot of control into the hands of a group which we don't have an articulated business agreement with, unlike a

contractual arrangement with an ILS vendor. This would get us away from other options and we'd be doing away with questions regarding just one ILS. Do we want to invest in an international database? OCLC's core business is still WorldCat and they may not want to reflect local views.

What if we used OCLC as replacement for MELVYL, and had CDL concentrate on true metasearching and we'd have our own ILS. OCLC product could be stand-alone and the ILS would be integrated. Metasearching would be directed to ILS in order to get the local information. There is lots of information for titles which can precede an OCLC record.

Back to the issue of eliminating costs of cataloging—we're losing that if each library catalogs. Is this really a cost saving?

Ranking of 4b: Single ILS is 1<sup>st</sup>. OCLC option as expressed is 2d and a single file is 3d.

Should we be looking at re-architecting cataloging? Cataloging cannot be looked at in isolation. As Heads of Technical Services, we see how a lack of integration affects lots of things and we need to address it when necessary.

There was general agreement that No. 1 (Enhanced search and retrieval) should drive the recommendations, as these things are being done for users.

Discussion of single ILS:

- Redundancies must be in place.

- Other functions such as acquisitions must be addressed

- Would eliminate record-loading problems with MELVYL

- Would aid in shared projects

- Has been successfully done in other places

- Long-term benefits would outweigh what we might initially give up

- Seems financially beneficial

Sara requested that if a single ILS is chosen as #1, the "cons" should be included in report as well as "pros."

Are there recommendations we would not support?

- Consolidation of cataloging

- Elimination of subject headings

The idea of automated metadata creation on all textual materials was not fully supported. If you have full text online, do you need automated metadata? Consensus was yes.

There was little support for the idea of putting books on shelf with preliminary information with the intent to go back and enhance records. This work tends to never get done.

SOPAG issues #1 and 2 will be discussed at next meeting.

