HOTS Conference Call
August 31, 2007

Present: Jim Dooley (M, chair), John Riemer (LA, SCP AC), Patti Martin (CDL)
participated in first half of conference, Manuel Urrizola (R), Karleen Darr (D recorder),
Martha Hruska (SD), Brad Eden (SB), Lee Leighton (B), Tony Harvell (LAUC), Lai-
Ying Hsiung (SC)

Introductions:
Jim welcomed Lee Leighton as incoming chair of HOTS. Manuel Urrizola who is
replacing Sharon Scott was welcomed as UCR representative to HOTS.

The conference call was a free-form discussion of Technical Services Implications for
WorldCat Local based on John Riemer's document distributed ahead of the conference
call- *Technical Services Implications of Separating Front-End Discovery from Back-End
Data Store*. We also discussed UC/OCLC WorldCat pilot task group reports and
feedback to the Implementation Team.

Patti reported on a conference call she had just completed with OCLC. She learned that
OCLC has concluded that Local Holding Records (LHRs) implementation is off the table
for UC's WorldCat Local Pilot. OCLC is willing to conduct a feasibility study on a test
sample for UC's production implementation. The Implementation Team has turned
attention to access and configuration for Z39.50 protocol to retrieve local campus
holdings information. Z39.50 must also provide holdings for institutional URLs which
are embedded in bibliographic records. The team will investigate how different types of
856s affect retrieval.

John noted that UCLA's interlibrary loan department wishes to proceed with Local
Holdings Record uploading for multi-volume holdings. There is significant resource
sharing benefits with the addition of specific local holdings information. If implemented
in phases, the priorities are serials inactive, serials active and monographic sets.

John noted the importance of campus Enhance authorization in order to upgrade OCLC
master records. Enhance authorization is restricted by the bibliographic format of records.
Currently identified Enhance and CONSER campuses are Los Angeles, Berkeley, San
Diego and Davis.

Lee questioned how to accomplish global change functionality that ILSs offer.
Berkeley's ILS has global change functionality so that when a name heading authority
record is updated, all the associated name headings in bibliographic records are also
changed. John responded that batch record change capabilities would be an important
tool for OCLC to provide to libraries. He can see utility for OCLC quality control
services to update name headings in bibliographic records at the network level, which
could then be re-distributed to institutions through the Bibliographic Notification Service.

Lee reported on Berkeley's newly established Data Control Unit. Cataloging staff will funnel updates and corrections on OCLC master records to this unit. John noted that institutions can elect to earn either the amount of OCLC credits they were receiving at the time of switching to the subscription pricing model, or, OCLC "actual" credits for the amount of OCLC enhancements contributed each year.

In response to a question about Bibliographic Notification Service (BibNote), John explained that the OCLC service identifies upgraded OCLC MARC records (including TOC and changes to a higher Encoding Level) that your library has holdings attached to, and then sends you the updated records based on a detailed profile. He asked OCLC about the possibility of receiving *all* updated master records to which your symbol is attached, even those where the Encoding Level remained the same. OCLC responded that it will consider that upgrade feature in the future. Lee noted that Berkeley is considering refinements to its BibNote profile because the library frequently receives records with a simple encoding level change, but no substantial data upgrade while, in other cases, upgraded records may replace the entire title field. It is important to understand that every edit done on a bib record by any member library could potentially cause a replacement of the same bib in another library's catalog. John suggested the most practical way to implement BibNote is to automatically accept updated records and not monitor through any sort of quality hierarchy.

HOTS members discussed mass digitization projects and the role of OCLC synchronization with these efforts to increase visibility and access to digitized collections. One possible route involves the sending of records for UC Google project digitization to a local campus ILS, who at the time of deposit into the Digital Preservation Repository, then uploads data to OCLC. UC could choose to load WorldCat records representing digital manifestations into local campus ILSs, or, depend on the WorldCat local user interface. The campuses need to weigh in on access needs of library users to digitized materials. There are many questions that need to be answered, such as: Do we include only UC digitized books or all public domain material including exposing journal article level records? If digitized materials are openly accessible and no physical format exists to circulate, then is it necessary to include a record in a local ILS? How does WorldCat digital content display to UC users? Do we incorporate relevance ranking by whether campus owned, or based on UC system-wide view? If UC decides to rely on WorldCat Local as its discovery interface what are the implications for campus ILSs? John has suggested that the ILS could become an inventory database for material that circulates and/or is paid for.

Jim asked about Berkeley's affiliate libraries participation in the WorldCat local pilot. Lee responded that many of these libraries download bibliographic records directly from OCLC and edit holdings in the local ILS. Berkeley is looking closely at these local data issues. Jim reflected that there were a number of "social" issues surrounding working directly in OCLC--workflow, organizational structures, training, willingness to change procedures, etc.

The UC Pilot Project Implementation Team has discussed local bibliographic data with OCLC. John noted the SCP MARC field 793 (package title hooks) could be re-coded to 740 $5 (Added Entry Uncontrolled Related/Analytical Title; Institution to which field applies) and that field added to WorldCat master records in a batch process change. The workflow issue of maintaining this field was raised by a HOTS member. Local data is an open issue for the Pilot. At the beginning of the Pilot, local URLs may need to be accessed from Z39.50 queries of the campus ILS' bib record; long-term it is hoped that the URLs could reside in OCLC LHRs that WorldCat Local could access.

In order to support the WorldCat Local Pilot, University of Washington has addressed workflow issues including- on order records, shelf-ready books for approval plan materials, firm orders reflecting OCLC holdings at time of order, OCLC local holdings records project for serials and ceasing the practice of cataloging some materials only locally, but rather, cataloging directly into OCLC.

For some of the UC campuses, it represents new workflow to perform cataloging in OCLC rather than locally and batch loading to OCLC. OCLC Subscription pricing maintains a model that keeps pricing similar to what you are paying today, while still enabling campuses to direct input through OCLC Connexion. In addition, a Connexion batch load process function allows for local editing and record replacement in WorldCat. Synchronization between WorldCat Local and the campus ILS was raised as a potential issue unless OCLC updates are performed in real time and downloaded to the local ILS. The members commented that direct edit/replace on OCLC is likely to be a big issue for campuses and recommended that it be addressed as soon as possible. The concept to maximize cataloging value for all UC campuses is important.
ACTION: HOTS members recommend that CAMCIG investigate campus availability of Enhance and CONSER authorizations and implications if cataloging units perform all edits in OCLC and push updated records to local ILS. In addition, HOTS asks CAMCIG to survey whether campuses have the means to input the OCLC number in their local ILS bib records. HOTS requests that CAMCIG identify local ILSs standard placement for OCLC numbers and indexing practice. Lee will draft a charge for the group.

Members commented that local campus reclamation projects are growing in importance. The OCLC record number appears to be the universal link to campus ILS records and it is OCLC's preference. Members raised the question of ILS system number scalability for WorldCat Local. The Google experience is evidence that ISBN and ISSN are not granular enough to link between different databases. The Z39.50 Task Group commented on the advantages and disadvantages of OCLC number as opposed to ILS number. John explained that in OCLC's batchload/reclamation process, campuses have the option to receive entire OCLC MARC records (gives option to replace the local records), or, an OCLC supplied table of OCLC record numbers and local system number equivalents. Campuses will need to copy the OCLC numbers into local ILS MARC records. ILS OCLC numbers need to be coded in consistent format. John noted that the UC Implementation Team developed guidelines for reclamation and retrospective batch loads.

Lee asked whether there are any issues associated with call number information for analytics which may be classed together under the parent serial or, classed separately, based on subject matter. John responded that the Z39.50 protocol would link to campus locations and call numbers in records with matching OCLC numbers. Lai-Ying pointed out that Santa Cruz, an III site, stores its call numbers in bibliographic records and not in item records. John commented that Santa Cruz may wish to initiate a batch processing project to reset call numbers to corresponding holding or item records. The U. of Washington pilot is using screen scrape to obtain holdings information from the Summit union catalog. The Local Holdings Information Task Group has discovered that there is no single set of holdings guidelines being used within UC.

In the ideal scenario, UC standardizes its cataloging policies and practices so that the OCLC master record represents all the campuses which hold the item. HOTS members commented that cataloging units can work towards that ideal for original cataloging. However, copy catalog records come from many other OCLC members beyond UC. Records may contain mistakes which may or may not involve variant cataloging practices. There is a high cost to handle incoming files record by record.

HOTS members commented that public services feedback is necessary on many of the issues addressed by the UC/OCLC workgroups. The issue of access mechanisms to digitized materials is a significant area in need of review. Tony pointed out that mass digitization has interesting collection management implications. Collection managers could use WorldCat Local as a tool to base local decisions on. For instance, if a bibliographer knows that an open access electronic manifestation exists, the campus could decide to withdraw the print copy from its collection. Some campuses may choose to use WorldCat Local as its OPAC and cease support for its local OPAC.

Significant expertise is being exerted to supply information and analyses on the UC WorldCat Local Pilot. UC has high hopes that WorldCat Local could become the basis of the new union catalog. The future of local ILSs is less clear. Perhaps an inventory database of what is available on the library shelf isn't too far fetched a concept. The remainder of this year HOTS will be focused on work directed toward planning for the new union catalog and looking at more effective coordination of cataloging across UC.