The Task Group on Distribution of Integrating Resource Records

Report to the PCC Steering Committee
September 2004

The Task Group on Distribution of Integrating Resource Records was formed under the auspices of the PCC Steering Committee to re-examine the methods for record distribution called for in recommendation 4.5 from the Final Report of the Task Group on Implementation of Integrating Resources (TGIIR) at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/tgintegrfinal.pdf

The charge, [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgir_distrib.html] stated that the group was to propose methods for the creation and maintenance of PCC records for integrating resources by BIBCO and CONSER participants, and for the distribution of PCC-authenticated records through the Library of Congress' Catalog Distribution Service (CDS) and that those proposed methods should include mechanisms for authenticating records in OCLC, for collaborative maintenance of such authenticated records by both BIBCO and CONSER catalogers, and for distribution of such records either as part of the CONSER distribution or as a separate file, identifying them as Program records through an appropriate marker in the 042 field.. The charge states that PCC catalogers should be able to also create non-authenticated records in both utilities and in local systems The TG was also asked to define the expected outcome of non-authenticated Program records created or maintained in local systems and batch-loaded to the utilities.

In June 2004 prior to ALA the TG representatives of LC (David Reser), CDS (Jim Kimball), BIBCO (Ana Cristan), and CONSER (Les Hawkins) met to discuss the charge and after thorough discussion determined that the only viable alternative for distribution of IRs was indeed the recommendation 4.5 of the final report of the TGIIR (i.e., to include the IRs as part of the CONSER distribution); however, although the PoCo (as well as, BIBCO and CONSER) had affirmed the desire to move forward with distribution, given the impact on LC workflow the Task Group determined that it would be prudent to seek a definitive affirmation on the part of CDS, LC administrators and OCLC to proceed.

DECISION: At the June meeting of the TG the CDS representative, Jim Kimball, agreed that CDS was poised to move forward with the recommendation and would implement the workflows needed to handle the distribution of integrating resource records. Kimball did note that legacy records would be a problem as had previously stated but that CDS was willing to work with OCLC to find a solution.

On September 23, 2004 Robert Bremer from OCLC replied with details on the need for additional 042 codes and approaches for working with legacy records. See attached appendix A. Robert also confirmed that code "i" would not be implemented by OCLC before June 2005.

Decision: On September 22, 2004 Cristan, Hawkins, Kimball, and Reser met with Beacher Wiggins, LC's representative to the PCC Steering Committee and after thorough discussion concluded that at this time a decision could not and should not be made regarding implementation of distribution for integrating resources. The distribution of integrating resources, much like the exchange of BIBCO records to all partners, while highly desirable, is not currently achievable in a practical and viable manner. Therefore, the decision of LC management is to table the discussion until at such time that all PCC partners have fully implemented code "i".

Rationale: Additional work will be needed to address the need for additional 042 codes and coordinate the handling of legacy records. Plus, weighting the costs of 1) developing documentation, 2) developing training workflow modules, 3) absorbing multiple workflows outside the main-stream, 4) excluding all LC JACKPHY cataloging, and the 5) overhead costs of load failure monitoring versus the number of items expected to be processed appear at this time to be

less than cost-effective for LC. Furthermore, the fact that employing the CONSER workflow excludes BIBCO partners cataloging in RLG from contributing records and maintenance to the distribution continues to present a less than ideal scenario.

Recommendation: Once OCLC has implemented code "i" revisit the question. At that time, form an LC Task Group to carry out the steps necessary to implement the distribution scenario. Convene a group to carry out tasks associated with deciding on appropriate 042 codes and working with Legacy records.

Recommendation: Disband this current Task Group.

Appendix A Replies from OCLC and follow-up by CDS

The following are Robert Bremer's replies to the questions for OCLC, September 23, 2004.

Question for OCLC on 042 codes:

The final report states that use of different 042 codes are key to OCLC's ability to identify records to be loaded. Does OCLC require a code other than 042 pcc to allow BIBCO, LC sections other than Serial Record, (assuming that CONSER members would use the 042 codes for integrating resources that they currently use for serials.)?

Reply:

I believe there were several of aspects to this issue

1) If CDS were distributing newly authenticated IRs authenticated on OCLC along with those created in LC's system, we would mostly likely need to filter out those we already had. The original task force had suggested that LC catalogers use a unique 042 code different from PCC libraries on OCLC, which would allow the records to be readily identified and loaded while excluding those records distributed through CDS originally created on OCLC.

2) The original task force report indicates in section 4.2 of the recommendations that BIBCO catalogers could still authenticate records that would not be distributed. I presume this was to accommodate libraries that did an occasional IR record and did not want to be bothered with LCCN assignments, etc. Presumably they would use 042 "pcc" as they do now and not assign an LCCN, but this does not take into account that LCCNs happen to exist on records which might fall into this category so that 042 "pcc" with an LCCN could not be the sole criteria for OCLC to pull records to send to CDS for distribution. Consequently, there would need to be a different 042 code to specifically identify those records for distribution. That could be a new code or an extension of one or more existing CONSER codes for use in bibliographic level "i" records. Alternatively, PCC could decide that all IRs would need to be distributed following the CONSER model with the LCCN requirement eliminating the ability for PCC libraries to authenticate records unless they could assign an LCCN.

3) Related to #2 above, since an LCCN is necessary for distribution through CDS, we need to insure that records sent from OCLC to CDS all have LCCNs. In the case of CONSER, this is accomplished via our online validation where it is possible to build rules such as, "If 042 is coded lcd, then 010 $a must be present." But, a rule like "If 042 is coded pcc, then 010 $a must be present" is not universally true, but with use of a new integrating resource code or extension of one or more existing CONSER codes for use in bibliographic level "i" records would make it possible to construct the validation rule requiring that a valid LCCN is present when the 042 code for distribution is present

Question for OCLC, Legacy records:

How does OCLC envision working with legacy the records? The interim report of the earlier task group gives some numbers of integrating resources in OCLC (over 44,000 identifiable loose-leafs, 8,000 electronic resources). Flipping these records to match the new coding in OCLC has an impact on the mount of work needed to be done by OCLC and would have an impact on CDS distribution, since these records were originally distributed in a separate MDS file.

Reply:

We don't want duplicate records based on different coding practices, and at the same time, we want to provide OCLC members with MARC records coded to appropriately identify the material. That means we would likely attempt to automatically convert records to bibliographic level "i"

coding based on criteria to be developed. That criteria would likely need to be used continually on incoming records added via batchload processing as well as a one-time conversion of the database. That sounds like a lot of work yet it is probably not all that difficult. As always, some records will be incorrectly converted and other candidate records will not be caught and converted. Those would need to be changed manually as they are encountered in the future.

This would mean that OCLC might have a record coded "i" which might exist in the LC database as "m" if LC decided not to convert anything. If such a record were maintained by a PCC participant and distributed, that would be problematic, so we're not so sure what the solution is here.

Issue for LC to consider:

Given the recommendation to disband this task group and revisit the issue later, this may be of no consequence, but I reviewed the original task force report and began reconsidering these issues in the context of a record distribution scenario.

It seems problematic to have LC monographic catalogers creating IR records directly in LC's system to be combined with distribution from a utility. Keeping the ability to catalog directly on LC's system is an understandable goal reiterated many times by LC staff in light of issues related to training, workflow, etc. However, if LC catalogers are looking only at LC's database, rather than the larger file of integrating resources cooperatively created and maintained by PCC libraries, what would prevent routine creation and distribution of duplicate records, i.e., an LC version versus a PCC version, with different LCCNs, both being distributed via CDS? I think that situation would be highly undesirable. It does not exist within CONSER because cataloging activity occurs in one place where catalogers have access to the entire file. Maybe this is just something to keep in mind for the long term.

Follow-up replies from Jim Kimball, CDS:

I. In the issue labeled 2) I think the alternative option (as described in the last sentence of the paragraph) whereby the assignment of the LCCN and authentication is restricted to PCC libraries is the preferred option. It follows the current CONSER flow.

II. On the legacy records problem: if OCLC were to create a file of the converted 'i' records and make it available to LC/CDS we could investigate the possibility of a process to distribute a delete version of the original record followed by the converted/updated version.

III. In the "Issue for LC to consider", where it is stated "if LC catalogers are looking only at LC's database..." it was my understanding that for 'i' record creation, LC catalogers would search OCLC first to prevent the possible duplication of records.

September 22, 2004