

TRLN Shared Records Pilot Task Group - Executive Summary

June 1, 2010

Charge Reporting to the TRLN Technology Council, this task group was charged to investigate the feasibility of sharing bibliographic records for resources shared within the consortium. The full charge is posted on the TRLN web site at <http://www.trln.org/committee/TechnologyCouncil/TaskGroups/SRTG.htm>

The Shared Record Task group carried out its charge by conducting a pilot project and a series of case studies. The task group's key findings and recommendations are summarized below with reference to sections of the task group's full report posted at <http://www.trln.org/committee/TechnologyCouncil/TaskGroups/SRTGFinalReport.pdf> as needed.

Task Group members

Lynda Baptist, Duke

Vanessa Lennon, NCCU

Jill Sexton, UNC

Jeff Campbell, UNC

Dawn Pearce, NCSU

Victoria Silver, NCCU

Wanda Gunther, UNC

Charley Pennell (**Chair**), NCSU

Natalie Sommerville, Duke

TRLN Support, Derek Rodriguez

Responsibilities

1 - Evaluating a shared record data model

The shared record data model was created on the TRLN Endeca development server and evaluated in case studies using record sets describing the NC LIVE Streaming Video Collection and GPO URL Records. In this model a single host institution would take responsibility for loading and maintaining metadata in their ILS on behalf of the consortium. 'Host institutions' would export metadata as needed for ingest by discovery services such as Endeca and Summon, and to set holdings at OCLC. Testing of the model was successful and the data model and associated workflows are documented in the attached report.

A third case study using ICPSR metadata, addresses cases where TRLN Endeca would ingest metadata from a third-party directly, and none of the consortium libraries would have responsibility for metadata maintenance. This approach is described in the group's final report, but has not yet been implemented.

2 - Evaluating a prototype Search TRLN user interface that supports the presentation of shared metadata

A prototype interface was developed to support the presentation of shared metadata. Shared records from the two test collections can be viewed in a development version of Search TRLN, <http://search-dev.trln.org/trln-shared/>.

3 - Identify required metadata maintenance tasks for shared records and recommend best practices and workflows for completing those tasks.

Task group members identified several activities the shared record data model must accommodate including authority control, URL maintenance, metadata archiving, setting holdings at OCLC, and interoperability with external search providers (e.g. Summon and WorldCat Local). The task group designed workflows and identified solutions to meet these requirements. Details are provided in the case studies and appendix 3 of the task group's report.

Task group members identified two barriers to adoption: generating statistics and collection reports and the desire to retain legacy ILS-based catalogs. Non-host libraries may have difficulty generating statistics and collection reports if record set metadata are not present in their local Integrated Library Systems. Endeca can support statistical reporting requirements. However, non-host libraries wishing to provide collection reports may find ILS-based reporting tools are optimal and may want to continue to load metadata for certain shared collections into their ILSs. Institutions that want to continue using their legacy ILS-based catalog may also want to continue loading metadata for shared collections into their ILSs. The proposed shared record data model and associated workflows do not preclude this practice.

4 - Documenting the changes in technical services and systems workflows that would be necessary to support metadata sharing within the consortium.

Sharing metadata requires minor changes in technical services workflow for host and non-host institutions. Host institutions would meet expectations for record set hosting outlined in appendix 1 of the attached report. Host institutions would also be responsible for generating extracts of shared metadata to provide to discovery interfaces. Non-host institutions would no longer need to conduct metadata maintenance (authority control, URL maintenance, etc.) tasks on shared record sets, essentially eliminating duplicate workflows within the consortium. TRLN would need to replicate data ingest processes in Endeca for each new set of records shared within the consortium. TRLN, or perhaps the host institution, would be responsible for ensuring holdings are set at OCLC, if necessary. Holdings would be set using an OCLC Batchload group profile. Details regarding these workflows are illustrated in the case study reports and appendix 3 in the attached report.

5 – The task group recommends a set of records can be considered suitable for sharing within the consortium, when the following criteria are met:

- Record sets represent collections of electronic resources licensed by two or more TRLN member institutions
- Record sets represent collections of electronic resources that are freely available to two or more TRLN member institutions
- TRLN libraries have secured licensing to use and share appropriate metadata (if necessary)
- Metadata maintenance requirements are restricted to institution-neutral activities such as authority control and/or URL maintenance

- If collection reports are required or access to shared collection metadata in legacy ILS-based catalogs is desired, non-host libraries may continue loading shared metadata into their local ILS.

6 - Document an estimate of effort required to implement record sharing in production

The effort required to implement record sharing is relatively trivial. Workflows for extracting and maintaining metadata are part of standard practice in our libraries. Technical aspects of ingesting shared records into Endeca were implemented during the pilot project. User interface support for the shared record model has been built into the production version of Search TRLN and the NCCU Catalog.

Action items

The Task Group recommends the implementation of shared records practices in TRLN Endeca through the following action items:

1 – Implement the shared records data model for the NC LIVE Streaming Media collection, with NCSU acting as the host institution.

2 – License the MARCIVE service, Documents without Shelves (DWS), for the consortium and implement the shared record data model for GPO URL records, with UNC acting as the host institution. The annual cost of the subscription is \$3425 (Duke, UNC, NCSU: \$881 each, NCCU: ~\$780), somewhat offset by reduced costs at NCSU by cancelling their DWS subscription (~\$650) and ceasing authority processing of these titles (~\$900). There would be new subscription costs for Duke and NCCU, as those institutions do not currently subscribe to the DWS service.

3 – Implement the shared records data model for ICPSR metadata, using ICPSR as the metadata source and archive.

4 – Create an OCLC Batchload group profile for TRLN libraries for use in setting holdings for shared collections at a one- time cost of \$338.

5 – Add shared records display capabilities to the UNC, Duke, and NCSU Endeca interfaces.

6 – While the technical challenges to sharing metadata have been overcome, the consortium needs a framework for making the decision to share record sets, ways to assign responsibilities for implementing record sharing, and a means for ensuring shared record maintenance responsibilities are distributed equitably. Administrative tasks that must be completed before a record set can be shared include:

- Screening for record sets that meet criteria for metadata sharing
- Acquiring licenses to metadata as needed (e.g. MARCIVE's DWS service)
- Identify host institution
- Setting OCLC holdings using the TRLN group batchload account

These responsibilities affect technical services, systems, collections, and e-resources staff and have budget implications. The Technology Council should discuss methods for obtaining approval for the recommendations of this report, assigning responsibilities for ongoing maintenance, and accounting for the expenses of the shared records program.