

**Members Council  
Cataloging & Metadata Interest Group  
May 2003 Summary**

Member's Council Delegates attending one or both meetings: Carol Pitts Diedrichs (Chair), Rosann Bazirjian, Karen Boehning; Greg Cotton, Eleanor Frierson, Cliff Glaviano, Betsy Hine, Kathleen Imhoff, Barbara Kriigel, Mary Ann Laun, Sue Phillips, Norma Read, Kris Senecal (EC Liaison)

OCLC Staff attending one or both meetings: Glenn Patton (OCLC Liaison), Cynthia Whitacre (Recorder), Pam Bailey, Deb Bendig, Brenda Block, Robert Bremer, Ellen Caplan, Bill Carney, Kay Covert, Libby Crawford, Maureen Finn, Beth Fogler, Linda Gabel, Chris Grabenstatter, Rich Greene, Gary Houk, Hisako Kotaka, Giles Martin, Jim Simms, Mike Solace, Eliza Sproat, Bob Van Volkenburg, Susan Westberg, Marty Withrow,

Others attending one or both meetings: Brad Baker (Board Liaison), Magda El Sherbini (OHIONET alternate delegate), Kevin Furniss (OLAC), Cathy Wilt (PALINET Executive Director)

**Monday, May 19, 2003**

**Record Nabbing:** The proposed text additions to the "Guidelines" that had been viewed and discussed by email prior to the meeting were handed out. Cliff Glaviano moved and Betsy Hine seconded that the new language be proposed in a resolution to the entire council. All delegates voted in favor of this. Kris Senecal and Carol Diedrichs collaborated on preparing the resolution to take to the full council on Tuesday. The group decided to defer any additional changes to the guidelines, including the title, at this time, even though that may be likely in the near future as the definition of contribution evolves.

Some discussion followed about how members would implement this, including:

- requesting removal from the Bookwhere list and similar lists
- shutting down Z39.50 access from local catalogs
- setting local catalog parameters to allow some but not unlimited Z39.50 access
- talking with local system vendors about how they configure systems at start-up to allow or not allow such access

Gary Houk promised that he, along with Marty Withrow, will follow up on this and will provide some tools to members to aid in implementation of the new guidelines. **The IG will continue to follow-up on this topic next year.**

**Pricing:** Gary Houk reviewed the variety of different pricing schemes in use for cataloging products and discussed some of the evolution of those schemes for the past 20 years. Pricing clearly influences user behavior. Transaction pricing has been the most dominant scheme to date; Fixed Fee has also been widely used. Fixed Fee is more akin to a budget plan (such as with a utility company) instead of a subscription plan. OCLC is now experimenting for FY2003/04 with subscription pricing for libraries that have average cataloging bills of \$90,000 or more per year (about 50 libraries). This is an option that has been offered to these libraries. Libraries with a subscription would have unlimited use of online cataloging, as well as the other cataloging products (such as batchload, PromptCat, Z39.50, etc.) that fall into the fixed fee category. Items excluded are TechPro and WorldCat Collection Sets. Comments/questions:

- Would libraries be locked in to subscription if they select it now, or be able to make a different choice each fiscal year? Current intent is to allow flexibility to libraries
- Do libraries need to sign any agreement if they opt for subscription? No
- OCLC will not at this time require any multi-year commitment to subscription. But, libraries may want a multi-year commitment from OCLC, so as to lock in a good price or pay in advance for a year's subscription
- Subscription price adjustments in the future would be based on inflation or be a percentage increase, and would not be based on usage, as the current fixed fee pricing is.
- How many levels of subscription pricing will there be, if this becomes the dominant pricing model? What will be measured to determine the level appropriate to a particular library? Titles cataloged, FTE, materials budget, different usage patterns by type of library, etc. are all possible considerations.
- What will happen to credit incentives? If these disappear under subscription pricing, this could be detrimental to the cooperative in terms of less contribution of original cataloging, etc. "Contribution needs to be rewarded" –Gary Houk

- Subscription pricing with unlimited access is much more in tune with a spirit of cooperation
- Is connectivity included in the subscription? Additional connectivity needs is included currently for the test year. OCLC doesn't plan to grow revenue in the area of access fees.
- Costs must come down with subscription. If they rise, libraries will not see this as a favorable solution.

**The IG encourages OCLC to work on development of a subscription model for all members.**

**FRBR:** See the PowerPoint presentation prepared by Glenn Patton (copies distributed at the meeting) for detail on the current status of this topic. The timeframe for incorporating FRBR terminology into AACR2 is within the next decade (2005 at the earliest, with 2007 a more likely possibility). There will likely not be any changes to the existing structure of MARC to accommodate FRBR, but there may be more use of some codes that are little utilized now. One example would be relator codes for persons or corporate bodies to delineate the role played by that person in relation to the manifestation (codes for editor, illustrator, performer, composer, etc.) There will also likely be more emphasis on authority control, as authority records are one possible way of representing the abstract work or expression levels within the FRBR model. The concept of expressions is becoming clearer for some things and not for others. It is indeed complex, and will become clearer with use. Explanations of how this highly detailed work will benefit the end user and make use of catalogs simpler for patrons are needed.

**Tuesday, May 20, 2003**

**Dewey Update:** Giles Martin presented information on the new Edition 22 DDC in print, which will be published this summer. See his PowerPoint Presentation (copies distributed at the meeting) for detailed information. DDC print is currently published on a 7-year cycle for each new edition. There are not as many changes in this current edition as there were in DDC 21. Comments/questions:

- What is the correlation between the print and web versions? The web version is increasingly important, since it can be updated quarterly. The DDC Editorial Policy Committee will be holding a retreat later this year to discuss future directions for DDC in general, including whether print will continue on the 7-year cycle or change. It is likely the print will continue, but it may serve as a "snapshot" of the web version, instead of as a time for major changes.
- Libraries may best be served by utilizing both the print and the web versions in conjunction with each other.
- The delegates appreciated the detailed PowerPoint regarding the Dewey changes.

**Non-English Bibliographic Records in WorldCat:** Previously, OCLC has not allowed duplicates within WorldCat for language of cataloging with the one exception of French language records from the National Library of Canada. As OCLC has become more global, and particularly as OCLC works more closely with Latin American libraries, the current policy of merging or changing Spanish language records to English has been perceived negatively by some libraries outside of the U.S. OCLC does plan to address this issue with the Oracle implementation, to allow "parallel" records by cataloging language that are system supported. The Oracle implementation that can support this is 12-18 months away. In the interim, OCLC changed enhance guidelines earlier this year to allow and encourage retention of notes and subject headings in non-English languages when records are enhanced. However, CONSER and BIBCO guidelines dictate an all-English record following AACR2. Several groups (SALAAM, PCC, Latin American libraries) have appealed to OCLC to allow parallel records by language of cataloging as an interim step, so that enhance libraries will not be obliterating existing non-English records, but can add a parallel record in English. As a consequence, OCLC is considering a further interim step to allow such parallel records, that would be linked in some fashion via a 7XX linking field. Comments/questions:

- Are we talking about records for Spanish language titles or records that are cataloged in Spanish? The latter – records where the language of cataloging is Spanish (040 subfield b spa).
- OCLC is to be applauded for considering this interim solution of parallel records, and is encouraged to move forward with implementation
- How will this affect FirstSearch? FS does not index 040 subfield b, so it cannot suppress display of these records. With ranking of results displays in FS by number of attached holdings, the impact may not be too severe, though some will still perceive these as unnecessary duplicates.
- What are the implications for ILL with holdings split between records?
- A dozen librarians queried at the Univ. of Texas were overwhelming in favor of the parallel record concept for language of cataloging. They all believe parallel records would be better than the current situation.
- What does the PCC want? Parallel records

- OCLC needs to be comprehensive and creative in communicating this change to users, in order to get the word out about such parallel records.
- Gary Houk stated that this issue of “record clobbering” was second only to “record nabbing” in the amount of mail he has received. He is pleased at the IGs agreement to allow parallel records.

### **Updates of previous discussions:**

1) Non-MARC in WorldCat: This is still part of the Oracle design. A common data format will allow input and storage of multiple formats. Interest is high, but not many libraries seem to be doing much with non-MARC records, particularly in terms of sharing. OCLC’s batchload area needs files of such records to test. If your library has such files and you would be willing to share them with OCLC for testing purposes, please let Glenn Patton know.

A presentation prepared by Eric Childress containing an update on a variety of current data standards might be of interest to this IG for a future meeting or Placeware session.

OCLC will begin loading Content DM records to WorldCat in June.

2) Rights Database: Bill Carney said we are currently examining the “buy or build” question with regard to a URL link resolver, and are in the final stages of making decisions on the rights database service. OCLC will offer packages to work with a local resolver as well as optionally a central OCLC supplied resolver. Expect an announcement about OCLC’s plans within the next few months.

### **Topics for Next Year and/or for Conference Calls:**

- Non-MARC formats (Eric Childress presentation)
- Follow-up on record nabbing:
  - How is OCLC helping libraries implement the new guidelines
  - How is OCLC communicating to libraries about this topic
  - Possible usage studies comparing OCLC services to services of alternative service providers
- Connexion and its continuing implementation (subject of a June 4 conference call)
- Follow-up on subscription pricing
- Continuing follow-up on the rights database implementation
- Oracle implementation