CAMCIG Conference Call
October 2, 2006

Present: Sara Shatford Layne (UCLA), Amy Weiss (UCSD), Karleen Darr (UCD), Linda
Barnhart (UCSD, Chair), Sharon Scott (UCR), Jim Dooley (UCM), Lai-Ying Hsiung
(UCSC), Armanda Barone (UCB), Brad Eden (HOTS), Vicki Grahame (UCI), Rebecca
Doherty (CDL), Beatrice Mallek (UCSF).

Due to the importance of the issue the entire meeting was focused on the concept of
"OCLC as a single catalog source." (Per SOPAG minutes 9/22/06) SOPAG has said that
CAMCIG (via HOTS) will prepare a progress report on OCLC for the November joint
UL/SOPAG meeting.

The ULs want to see what OCLC can do for the UC community. The ULs are consulting
with Jay Jordan from OCLC on moving forward with the use of OCLC to provide service
as a new Melvyl. However, it is not clear to CAMCIG what they believe they are moving
forward on. They may mean to use WorldCat.org as an OPAC, using OCLC as the
database of record for the UC, using OCLC as the sole source of cataloging data, or
something else entirely.

The discussion was shaped by a draft document by Linda Barnhart which included
simplified diagrams derived from UCLA's charts (discussed at the September meeting).
All numbers refer to diagrams in Linda's initial email [Sept. 28, 2006; Draft "paragraph"
for Jim/HOTS] There was mention of the fact that for the BSTF that each campus had
created flow charts showing the large number of data streams for their local ILS. It was
agreed not to utilize all of the information on these charts but that diagram 1 needed to
include more data sources, specifically showing vendor records, SCP, and RLIN records.
This will indicate more clearly that while OCLC is our major data source it is by no
means our only data source.

It is hoped that some of John Riemer's useful comments on UC workflows can be
utilized for our report. Lai-Ying Hsiung et al. have also produced a document on the
problems and advantages of WorldCat.org use.

[Armanda?] asked OCLC about dealing with vendor records in WorldCat. OCLC is
trying to give an option for "tier" loading which would give some protection for non-
distributed records, so that vendor agreements would not be violated.

In the response we should distinguish OPACs from ILSes, and note that Berkeley doesn't
have an ILS, but uses Gladis as a front end and does acquisitions using III. Melvyl
extract is from Gladis.

Diagram #2. Question: is this diagram representing what they (SOPAG, ULs) want?
Where does OCLC data go? Does it go to both ILSes and Melvyl? "Son of Melvyl"
presumably would be a different public interface, WorldCat, Endeca, or some other

interface. This diagram is the same as previous diagram except with a different public interface.

Agreed to add boxes to Diagram #2 to show if only OCLC to Melvyl then there would be data that would not transfer since not all data is in OCLC.

We need to focus on **The Scenario We Recommend and Why,** and we need to be emphatic.

Our vision of the future? Probably #3a. Question: is #3 just putting in a new interface with no change to the back end? New model OPAC not a change to the back end. No change to data flow at least initially. In this scenario, Son of Melvyl = new model OPAC/Front End for Melvyl. ULs seem very concerned about Melvyl problems. Again, uncertainty as to whether we are truly addressing their concerns.

Instead of current Melvyl, we could consider another consortial OPAC instead of Aleph. Endeca/NCSU ILS is a combined interface, merged or de-duped like current Melvyl. Concerns over the current Melvyl system shared at CDL and echoed by others. However, if OCLC is not ready, it is not ready. 3a may be the best "quick fix" for improving end user searching while issues relating to our implementation of Melvyl are resolved. The implementation is apparently the source of many of the issues with Melvyl, but it has been determined that no available system will meet our needs exactly. However, some of the issues have to do with interlibrary cooperation and not with any inherent issues with the Aleph software.

It is suggested that there are two aspects to what we are being asked: one, an improved human/computer interface and two, simplification of the data stream. It may be that a third aspect exists: simplifying the datastream by using OCLC as a single source is seen as a cost cutting measure. It will be necessary for the ULs and SOPAG to clarify their priorities with regard to these three issues before a really meaningful response can be issued. It is agreed not to discuss the financial implications as we are not in a position to really research this issue.

Once again, two suggestions for immediate improvement:

1) There is a need to improve the public interface for the UC system, utilizing Endeca or some other mature front end interface, and then,

2) Work on the slower and more difficult issue of improved data flow.

Brief digression onto the topic of Japanese language cataloging. Collaborative models are of great interest to the ULs and others within the UC. Japanese cataloging might be able to utilize either current systems for distribution of materials (ILL or RLF system), or more interestingly, might take place using scanned page images , which could also be added to bibliographic records for enrichment. There would be associated costs with either share cataloging model (especially no. 2) but Brad Eden senses that the ULs would

be willing to invest in the organizational culture change that combining shared cataloging and the scanning scenario would represent.

Return to data flows: Diagram #3b represents use of "Melvyl" or some other mechanism as a single data store rather than OCLC, which would act as the database of record rather than OCLC. This might be considered problematic by cooperative cataloging norms which tend to see OCLC as the "big database in the sky"—the standard bibliographic utility that we all need to contribute all information to.

Diagram #3d is confusing. Linda is thinking of problems of physical management. Are the arrows dataflow arrows or are they query arrows? Does it mean that all records go back to OCLC or that all work on records is performed in OCLC? Amy suggests that maybe two arrows are all that are needed—showing records moving from OCLC to the UC shared ILS and to WorldCat.org. Order records were discussed since they are local records currently not added to Melvyl, much less OCLC, and which may refer to entities which are not strictly speaking bibliographic groupings, such as "Maps of India."

It is necessary to try to envision how complete we want our single data store to be. It is not possible to envision what WorldCat will be like in the future but if the single data store is one under UC control we have much ability to manipulate it and use it for what we need.

We could end up with one single ILS, the Austrian Library Model [see John Riemer's description, sent in email 9/29/06, titled "Riemer comments, as promised"], or OCLC as the one store.

Attempting to sum up the discussion: should we use WorldCat.org as our public interface? For now, the answer is no. The system lacks complete UC holdings, cannot be customized by UC, and may change dramatically after the merger with RLIN. In addition, it is a Beta product and appears to be glitchy and problematic in many respects (see statement by Hsiung et al. for details).

It was asked whether HOPS has been consulted on interface preferences. It does not appear that they have, and it needs to be impressed on SOPAG et al. that this isn't solely a Technical Services issue. Jim suggests that the ULs may not realize just how difficult a question they have posed.

[At some point in the discussion it has been noted that almost all of these issues were dealt with in the HOTS response to the BSTF and perhaps there should be reference back to that earlier document].

The second question is: can OCLC be used as a single data store? The answer is maybe, but not yet, for the reasons listed above and because it will be necessary to negotiate some standards for how the UCs will contribute their expertise as well as their holdings to the WorldCat entity.

Jim—HOTS will examine this issue again in detail at their meeting on Oct. 9
Sara—will draft a response from CAMCIG
Brad—will report back to CAMCIG from HOTS

The next CAMCIG conference call will be on November 6th. Probably this issue will be the major (sole?) agenda item again. Karleen offered to share information about the reclamation projects that Davis has already worked on with OCLC.

We may have an informal CAMCIG meeting at Midwinter (such as a dinner if there is interest).

Submitted by Amy K. Weiss