

SCP-AC Conference Call
March 16, 2009
Minutes

PRESENT: Jim Dooley (Chair), UCM; Sarah Gardner, UCD; Holly Tomren, UCI; Valerie Bross, UCLA; Sharon Scott, UCR; Bea Mallek, UCSF; Lai-Ying Hsiung, UCSC; Adolfo Tarango, UCSD; Becky Culbertson, UCSD; Lisa Rowilson de Ortiz (recorder), UCB.

GUESTS: John Riemer, UCLA; Nina Meechoonuk, UCSF; Anneliese Taylor UCSF; Catherine Nelson, UCSB; and Ana Fidler, UCSB.

1. Announcements

SCPAC Chair J. Dooley welcomed Nina Meechoonuk of UCSF who is now representing that campus as a member of the SCPAC.

2. NGM report - John Riemer

[For extended notes on J.Riemer's NGM report, please see attachment at end of this file.]

- OCLC has a new Batch Load Liaison: Tracy DeGood
- ZAP symbol will be attached to NRLF records after UCB completes III migration.
- April 1st is the deadline for campuses to get reclamation files to OCLC in order to have reclamation files returned by June 1st (NGM production date is July 1st).
 - A.Tarango mentioned the SCP files will have been sent by 4/1/09, but UCSD files may not ready by that deadline.
- A survey was sent out to the World Cat Local Users Group regarding proprietary records that still need permission in order to get into OCLC for WCL. J. Reimer forwarded the survey email to SCPSC on March 16, 2009.
- LHR work is in progress - testing is being done both for batch loading and getting data out of the several different ILSs in use by the UC campuses.
- There may be a need/desire to create up to 12 new OCLC holdings symbols for items held at the RLFs.

3. NGTS report - Jim Dooley

The Steering Team met in person on March 6, 2009 in Oakland for an all day retreat. The result was a document outlining recommended next steps for NGTS which was sent 3/12/09 to the Executive Team. The Steering Team awaits feedback; if the response is favorable there will be public information distributed.

4. Discussion and decision regarding method to be used by SCP to redistribute monograph records post-reclamation with OCLC numbers - Adolfo Tarango

Berkeley - Plan E

Davis - Plan E; will probably overlay

Irvine - Plan E

Los Angeles - Plan A or E

Merced - Plan E; will probably delete and add

Riverside - Plan E

Santa Barbara - Plan E; will probably overlay

Santa Cruz - Plan E; will probably delete and add

San Francisco - Plan E; will probably overlay

San Diego - uses single record approach so can't use any of these options

The vote thus made, SCP will follow through with Plan E.

- A post-reclamation serial file will also be available, but as all the serial records have always had OCLC numbers there is less of a need to act on the file unless a campus chooses to do so.
- SCP will send separate records for CalDocs e-monos - there shouldn't be any problem (unless it bothers a campus which doesn't hold the print to have a print record with an e-link & e-loc).
- Reclamation records will have the holdings set using the ER OCLC symbols (e.g. CUY-ER).
- UCSF does not load a lot of the big mono sets (nor many of the serials) since the material is not relevant to their users/collections. They may not want their ER symbol set on OCLC so WCL doesn't query their ILS and fail (since no record is in the local OPAC). SCP may be able to accommodate them by not adding their 920 to specific sets (which UCSF would need to identify) before reclamation. They'll continue this discussion offline.
- Will each campus have access to their ER symbol, in order to add or remove holdings from records as they see fit? Policy is not yet set but A.Tarango thinks possibly so; particularly if shared cataloging work goes to other campuses and/or if SCP no longer distributes records to campuses.

5. General SCP update - Adolfo Tarango and Becky Culbertson

- Springer - see email from A.Tarango dated 3/16/09 (attached). The files were sent to the campuses this morning.
- Next step outlined in the email was cleaning up EO records, but upon reflection this may not be necessary.
- Lai-Ying Hsiung asked whether Springer records will be included in reclamation. The answer is: yes.
- Springer summary - for electronic materials, SCP took a spreadsheet from Springer which had titles and OCLC #s; SCP batch searched the OCLC#s, grabbed the records, dealt with issues (see email for detail); and attached holdings symbols. As for the titles OCLC has not cataloged, first they need to be identified. At springerlink.com it is possible to find out what new content has been added according to various time periods. SCP will use this to figure out what OCLC has not yet cataloged and then begin cataloging it. Eventually SCP will continue to monitor the site (daily? weekly? It's not yet determined) and catalog the materials in a timely fashion.
- After this Springer load, there will be no other files larger than 10k title sent between now and the reclamation files sometime in June 2009.

6. Next call: Monday, April 20, 3:00-4:30 PM

Attachment:

OCLC WorldCat Local Pre-Production Phase update, for SCP AC Mar 16, 2009 by John Riemer (UCLA)

Missing Records & Reclamation

OCLC's batchload unit has reorganized. Last week I gave HOTS the name of a new contact for those still working on reclamation projects. Those with bib record reclamation work left to do include UCLA, UCI, SCP + UCSD, UCSF. UCR's load is on the verge of being processed. UCB will process NRLF's holdings with ZAP symbol after the Innovation migration is far enough along in the spring. In order to meet the June 1 deadline, OCLC needs to have extracted files in hand by April 1.

A survey being sent out today regarding record sets for which permission needs to be negotiated. Opening lines of the email from Bridget Dauer read, "OCLC is contacting all WorldCat Local customers in an effort to better understand the demand for vendor sets to be added to WorldCat." Did you receive? Are you all subscribers to the WCL Users Group listserv, OCLC-WCL-L? (Perhaps they are targeting that subscriber list.)

LHRs: Last month I reported that 2 campuses were identified to work with OCLC on testing the new daily load capabilities for LHRs: UCLA for Voyager and UC Irvine for Innovative. Add to that UC Davis for ALEPH. Besides being a test of the batchload capabilities at OCLC's end, it is also a test of what is involved for campuses in extracting the needed data.

Very recently, the Imp Team was shown OCLC's LHR strategy. Highest priority for LHRs appears to be solving response time problems relating to large serials. If summary holdings data were pre-harvested, that could be immediately presented to the user. To get a head start on circ status, the normal Z39.50 query could be launched in the background and results shown to user when requested, either in-progress or completed.

OCLC envisions three approaches to exposing data which libraries have in their local catalogs which are not in the Master OCLC record:

1. If the data is appropriate to all copies of the item at any institution then enhance the Master record with this data.
2. If the data is specific to that institution's copy and an appropriate field exists in MARC21 Holdings Format then store the data in an LHR
3. If the data is specific to that institution's copy and there is no appropriate field in MARC21 Holdings Format then store that data in a new bibliographic data store. (NOTE: Not an Institution Record)

OCLC Symbols

Under discussion is whether to define a set of 10 or 12 new symbols for UC Shared Print materials, which could be housed at either RLF or on any individual campus.