Report on the
ASIN Serials Management Meeting

June 10, 2009

Mount Saint Vincent University

a project of

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This meeting was arranged to allow all of the ASIN institutions a chance to discuss the problems surrounding serials management.

In order to gain perspective, an overview of the entire system and its stakeholders from the vendors and publishers, through the consortia who negotiate licenses, to the software we use to track the individual subscriptions was undertaken. Peter Webster discussed things from the vendor/publishers point of view, explaining how current systems at vendors and publishers are not tuned for providing real-time holdings data. Many participants wanted to discuss how providers/publishers very often don't make available lists of exactly what your library subscribes to and the general feeling is that they should. Louise White gave an overview of CRKN, discussing in particular how the original mandate of CRKN had nothing to do with the metadata management, but was only to negotiate the license for access. CRKN is now offering some title lists from its website, but the currency and accuracy is questionable. Also, there is still work to be done to get that info to our various resolvers, where it becomes useful to our users.

The various software packages used by ASIN institutions to management serials data and linking were presented. OCLC's Worldcat Link Manager and resolver were presented by Paul Moss, CUFTS/GODOT was presented by Melissa Belvadi, and SFX was presented by Geoff Brown. Although the aim of the three software pieces is the same, meeting participants benefitted from seeing the various approaches to achieving the goal.

It was originally planned to call for each institution to have a moment to speak about individual issues. There was not enough time to do all so the floor was opened to those who really wanted to raise specific issues that might get addressed in the meeting. Some specific issues discussed included:
- A lack of subject assignment of individual journals
- The negative impact of inaccurate data on Relais (false positives create auto Document Delivery orders for things we do not own)
- The high maintenance for special libraries (NSAC and NSCAD for e.g.) to hand-input small publisher titles that are not included in the main knowledgebase
- Problem of multiple records displaying for any individual title confusing to users

Possible better communication channels and challenges were discussed; specifically, whether CRKN would be able to offer a central place nationally for posting problems and solutions that are common to institutions across the country. Louise White reported on the New CRKN website which does offer some access to title lists. Louise will investigate the possibility of CRKN expanding this as a more robust service, and to create better communication within CRKN user groups. For ASIN communication, there was also a suggestion to setup an Atlantic Canadian Wiki to post title lists, report problems and offer shared solutions. Stan Orlov will setup a wiki and see if users find the idea useful.

Some individual providers and journal packages known to be a problem were identified. The decision was made to not create an action item on this front. A great amount of information was taken in during the meeting, and attendees were encouraged to absorb and think about what was learned today before committing to projects of hand-correcting individual title lists.

Some key points to use while thinking about solutions are: How bad really are the lists we currently have? What is an acceptable level of error? How far are we willing to go to attempt correcting lists on our own? And whose responsibility should it be to do this work?

List of Participants

Cape Breton University
    Lou Duggan (Chair)

St. Francis Xavier University
    Rita Campbell
    Elaine Maclean
    Brad Dewar

Saint Mary's University
    Peter Webster
    Joanne Babin
    Terri Winchcombe

Memorial University
    Angela Lonardo
    Louise White (also CRKN)
    Gillian Byrne (Secretary)

Mount Allison University
    Ruthmary Macpherson
    Brian McNally

Dalhousie University
    Michelle Paon
    Geoff Brown

University of New Brunswick
    Jeff Carter
    Scott Shannon

Mount Saint Vincent University
    Stan Orlov
    Edwina Thomas
    Donna Bourne-Tyson

Nova Scotia Agricultural College
    Erin MacPherson

University of Prince Edward Island
    Melissa Belvadi

Université Sainte-Anne
    Janice Boudreau

NSCAD University
    Kit Clarke

Acadia University
    Mary MacLeod

OCLC
    Paul Moss

Université de Moncton
    Julie Gagnon
    Charlotte Dionne
    Johanne Dégarie (Secretary)

Agenda

Date: June 10, 2009

Time: 9:00am – 4:00pm

Place: Don McNeil Room, Room 401
                 Rosaria Student Center
                 Mount Saint Vincent University
                  http://www.msvu.ca/campus_tour/campusmap.PDF

Morning: Information sharing

9:00-9:30
1. Welcome and introductions
2. Overview of the day and the issues we want to cover
3. Terms of engagement
   a. We will try to stick to discussion of shared collections like CRKN and CAUL purchases
   b. We will try to avoid software-specific discussions outside of the overviews that will be offered in the morning
      i. Brief discussion of software categories and synonyms
   c. We will try to keep complaints to a minimum. Identified problems will be discussed with an aim to finding workable solutions within this group

9:30-10:30 – Getting the Big Picture
4. Identification of Stakeholders
   a. Vendors / Publishers
      i. Input from Peter Webster
   b. Consortium license negotiation – e.g. CRKN/CAUL
      ii. Input from Louise White re. CRKN
      iii. Input from Peter Webster
   c. Software overviews
      iv. OCLC Openly: Paul Moss
      v. CUFTS: Melissa Belvadi, UPEI
      vi. SFX: Geoff Brown, Dalhousie
   d. Serials management staff
      vii. Being the attendees of this meeting

10:30-10:45 Break

10:45-12:15
5. Institutional voices - identification of the issues:
   a. Each institution to talk about their issues/solutions (5 minutes each)

      b.   See appendix to final report

      c.   Grouping of the issues and an agreement on which we will work on for the afternoon.

12:15-1:00 Lunch

Afternoon: Determining Appropriate Action

1:00-4:00 (with 15 minute break)

6. Open Discussion - Creating effective communication channels
    a. with CRKN
    b. with CAUL
    c. with aggregate database vendors
    d. with big publishers
    e. with small publishers
    f. with each other

7. Open Discussion - Possible ways to get more accurate data
    a. Possible talking points:
        i.   A central advisory of known problems and fixes
       ii.   Maintaining CSV or XLS title lists
      iii.   Customizing collections manually
            1. This will tend to be software specific so perhaps not appropriate for this meeting
      iv.   When to take action on a problem and when to live with it
            1. wait until it is fixed in existing systems
            2. depends on the degree of difficulty to fix
            3. depends on available staff to fix

8. Review of additional issues identified in the morning session
    a. What can we do?
    b. What will we do?
    c. Who will be involved?

9. Action Items

10. Adjournment

Preamble

Accurately describing the current holdings of a given library is one of the very fundamental objectives of the library staff. In fact, it is quite difficult (or sometimes impossible) to perform the other functions of librarianship well without an accurate description of our holdings. Collections librarians need to know what is already there in order to assess the collection and decide on new purchases. Technical Services and Systems staff cannot effectively create access points to items of which they have no knowledge. Public Service staff cannot answer the simplest question: "Do you have this journal?"

It was not so many years ago that all serials purchases were decided by collections librarians - journal by journal. The evolution of online delivery of academic journals (available in aggregate databases or from publishers' web sites in great bundles via institutional or consortial purchase) has partially washed away the old method of collections development for serials. Even the individual collections librarians are not always aware of all that is available to their users in a given subject area. And it was not so many years ago that each journal issue was received, stamped, and entered in the catalogue by technical services staff. A library like CBU could be, at any given time, quite close to 100% accuracy in describing every single journal issue on their shelves. But the numbers were small and the technical knowledge to perform the work could be easily learned by rote. Now that our serials number in the tens of thousands even for a small institution, these methods are no longer possible or tenable.

The fact that things have changed drastically in the last 15 years is not at issue. There are also a few other things that seem evident:

1. As long as there is money to be made and the academic community relies on the traditional peer-review process, publishers will continue to control access to periodical literature.
   a. And our users do not care about this.
2. The size of collections available for access has ballooned, and will likely stabilize or continue to grow modestly rather than shrink in the coming years.
   a. And our users want this.
3. Access to full text of periodical literature will increasingly be accomplished online by way of direct article-level linking between descriptive citations and the storehouses that hold the actual item.
   a. And our users demand this.

So today we will discuss the challenges facing each of our institutions in serials management. I, and a few others in this room that I know of, are skeptical that these issues can be solved by a group like this. But although we won't likely be finding any miraculous cures, for the sake of one day I believe that the discussion and identification of the issues will be at least therapeutic and educational. So let us discuss our problems and opportunities and perhaps we can evolve our systems in order to better accommodate this new model of serials access. I say "opportunity" not because I wish to avoid some other term, but because I love the fact that my job requires me to evolve. I honestly do see today's meeting as an opportunity for myself, my institution and this consortium to proactively address one of the more important issues facing academic librarianship today. The fact that we have been able to tie this together with the APLA2009 conference is also significant: since even in the age of email, IM and Skype, this conference still can show itself to be an important communication channel for us.

Lou Duggan – June 10, 2009.

Minutes

Welcoming words
Donna Bourne-Tyson

Donna welcomes everybody and mentions that Content Management Group is the youngest group, but very active inside ASIN.

Overview and issues
Lou Duggan, chair

Lou presents a retrospective of the committee and what is was a year ago. The committee was trying to define its role, what it's supposed to do and what it meant.
We will discuss how we are managing the content we are sharing. E-mailing around doesn't work to solve problems and or either give answers. We need to create efficient communication tools and channels.
Publishers are controlling access to the content, the size of content is continuously growing, but a certain stabilization is taking place.
Direct level full text article linking
For this meeting we'll focus discussions on shared collections (CRKN & CAUL), try to avoid software specifics.
We'll work together to come up with constructive solutions.

For reference the following chart was posted - Software categories and synonyms

ILS	Serials	Electr. Res. Mgmt Systems
Aleph	Open URL Res	KB
Evergreen	Resolver	
Unicorn	WorldCat Link Mgr / 1Cate	SFX
Symphony	OCLC Link Manager	Verde
BiblioMundo	CUFT	
ExLibris	Sfx	
Novanet	Godot	

Getting the big picture

Identification of stakeholders
Input from Peter Webster on role and motivations of publishers and vendors.

Dealing with vendors, publishers, people on our behalf, each institution, etc.

Peter questioned the publisher's motivations that mainly want to sell more content. They don't see their role as archiving the content. Ex. Swets promotes on their website titles they don't have. Culture change needed in the way things are done. There's divergence between publisher's role and needs versus the library's role and needs. Institutions want straight forward title lists, there's a gap between what we need and what is available from the vendors/publishers. They should be able to provide a consistent list of what we are buying, but are hard to establish. But Peter's not convinced that they do know. It probably cost too much for the publishers to maintain

the metadata and accurate information (ex. Wilson). There's a lot of additional work involved in order to provide what we need, nobody is able to provide that specific information.

We have to find out know what we paying for from the vendors, the link manager. How do they not know?
Central repository that could become an aggregate, an open source.
Ex CrossRef (persistent URL to article) has become a central repository, and is a germ of what could become a public repository, e.g. Jake (Jointly Administered Knowledge Environment)
We must find a way to better control the metadata.

SAGE vs. CSA
 The licensing situation with Wiley-Blackwell / Sage, started a process not to give access through CSA.
For the new CRKN licence, should put everything into the Sage DB.
Required CRKN link resolver reporting, but doesn't have the workforce to provide at the title list content level and solve packages problems. They have only one or two person working.
Brad : CRKN reality vs. expectation. Expect to act like a vendor and set the bar higher.
Lou : If access are authenticated by IP, why can't they provide a list?

Discussions
Contact (Allison) at CRKN for Blackwell also swamped. They should have a proper list somewhere, because there should be content control somewhere.

Consortium license negotiation – e.g. CRKN CAUL

Louise White : We could agree to add a cost to contract, because our actual contracts doesn't include that the publishers have to provide metadata and they do not have the expertise. What's in the contract and what is not. Some have provisions for added titles other not.

Questions about access : Are they going to archive? Are they supposed to provide perpetual access and do they know which one they are, if nobody is doing it, we are in mess. If print version have been cancelled, do we keep track of what's happening at the end of this licence.

 Resources @ CRKN : there's only one junior librarian to management content, e.g. MARC records. Issues with the quality of the records. The pressure of the consortia, like CRKN, resulted in more records available. How to access what they are selling us nationally was the main focus in the first year for the CRKN. Not originally seen to support resource discovery.
There's still the need to evaluate the content for academic content (for our researchers)
Melissa Beldavi : Two separate issues : what we buy and the quality of it.
Mary : If we get a standard list, we won't need to go back to it.
The technical expertise needed for serials management is huge from the institution and from the vendors.
Margins are getting thinner and that probably is why they are starting to eat one another. One of the reasons they merged is probably to have fewer people working on this. Wish that the non-for-profit providers would become more important, like Highwire.

Software overviews

Will see the 3 different systems used in our different libraries (WCLM, SFX, CUFTS).

OCLC Openly - Paul Moss
Presentation of Knowledge base - WorldCat Link Manager (WCLM)
Was same as Sirsi Resolver, WLM formerly called 1Cate.
Paul presents an overview of the WCLM software.
Data : OCLC gather everything from the vendors, so they do not know which are CRKN packages specifically, they received more standard packages. It is already a very difficult process.
Limitations for content improvement when clients cannot contribute to the title list, modifications can be done only locally and at the coverage level. OCLC doesn't have the facilities for that, there's no way of sharing a good list
OCLC maintained and controlled the data.
Web scale : need to change to permit everyone to participate in collective change.
New architecture included more applications (WorldCat Integration Project), exposed the data, API, unified across and connecting different things, all links together. Possibility to be able to share a list inside the system.

CUFTS @ UPEI - Melissa Beldavi
Combination of ERM and A to Z and Godot is the Resolver.
Simon Fraser University is hosting for them and managing the bulk.
Becoming a partner and contributing to CUFTS by managing the Govt of Canada open access serials because they were doing it the catalogue anyway. Contribute to the software code as well.

SFX @ Dalhousie Jeff Brown
Resolver is not a managing tool it is more an accessing tool. 3 years later, still trying to implement the ERM system (VERDE).Works with the same KB. Target parsers that work the same as openURL.
Communication with vendors, use a CRM system.
Future : version 3, new one next year. SFX tired of the monthly updates model, will try to accommodate more real time updates. The institutions also use it for e-books and want to include linking to book chapters with the next version.
Targets services also use for linking to e.g. Refworks, document delivery (Relais), etc.

Institutional voices – identification of the issues

Acadia University

Mary : Resolver is in all of the indexes and it's been great. But haven't tried to deal with generating incorrect URL, e.g. book citation and books chapters. (Melissa says it is in the Ebsco Admin interface or they can fix that for you). If the resolver doesn't know if we have that book, it's preferable not to have it turned on. Paul says that those URL are much more complex.
Gilllian explains that is reverse engineering, so it's going to take a long time. If it not OpenURL compliant, might not buy from that vendors or publishers.

Memorial University
Gillian informed the group that Relais has figured out a way to put the Resolver as a target.

Nova Scotia Agriculture College
Erin mentioned that maintaining title lists locally is not huge challenge, but the small specialized publishers are not there and they do not provide the same level of technology.
The issue of multiple records is a big problem and creating a mess for the end user.

St. Francis Xavier University

Elaine emphasizes the negative impact on document delivery (Relais) with the inaccurate data.

Université de Moncton

Subject access is an issue specially that we do not catalogue e-serials. LC would work. Ebsco used a subject that is close to LC subject. Do they have users searching for by subject. In CUFTS they can TAG.

Afternoon : Determining appropriate action

Discussion around efficient communication channels
With CRKN website has now a news section and licensing information will be posted as well. But the issue is still the title lists that is not there and who should have it. CRKN need to communicate more often.
Questions arising: Can CRKN set up a user group for peer communication? CRKN membership fees to support central problem reporting?
Action: Louise White to find out if CRKN would be willing to put non-CRKN packages on their website?
Role for CRKN to have spreadsheet that matches packages with resolver labels.

ListServ is good but do not keep track.
Gillian mentioned that Relais will be using Google Group because better archiving, follow thread.
Stan suggests a wiki that sends an update feed with e-mail notification.

Identification of the most problematic providers and worst packages. Discussion to find a method for improving content and how the workload can be shared?

Wiley Interscience; Swets ; Sage
Those still in the middle of big changes on the publishers' side

Science Direct ; Proquest Research Library – too big to work on it
Taylor & Francis

Demonstration of the CRKN website by Louise White ; example of the content licence's and title list by publishers. There's different listservs you can get on and different level of password access to the website.

The Wiley Blackwell merger issue discussed. Get we can the old list, there's no way of having the former titles since they merged. We have no idea which to select.
Would be nice to have a central repository at CRKN, offer a dynamic and useful platform.
Suggestion : could a wiki be set on the Atlantic level and then pass it on to CRKN or wait for the CRKN to do it and pick up non CRKN content. Could use the CAUL website but would the site need to be enhanced.

Action : Stan setting up PBWorks wiki to share information within the group :
http : asincontent.pbworks.com
Note added: Stan has done this task and the wiki is now being used to collect some things.
Meeting participants should make others in their organizations aware of this wiki.

Action : Stan will create a list of all the packages of the CRKN Indentifying what content most closely matches what package ?? I thought that was LW?. S.Orlov will create spreadsheet that indicates what every OCLC institution has enabled.

People who do update title lists should put their list on the wiki

Will create spreadsheet to post and those with SFX and CUFTS can add their info. The responsibilities and work should be done the same way in each institution. What are those responsibilities?
Paul Moss : If the problem is the package coming from OCLC, OCLC should work with the providers to correct their packages.

So we'll continue to use the ASIN-ADMIN listserv for content management group and tie to the wiki.
Action : invite people who will have the right the update on the wiki.

Institutional Reports

Cape Breton University

Information required to maintain serials comes from different places:
- Consortial purchase information is not always available.
  - Often these are subsets of normal vendor products specially tailored for our contract.
    - No "1 click" selection
    - Difficult or impossible to get accurate title list
- Information often sent to Directors, Licensing administrators, etc, rather than the serials person.
- Collections librarians order journals and aggregate databases
  - Often do not report changes or report with insufficient info, e.g. just a product name and no provider info.
- A change is a change to the person who is changing it.
  - Any system that may be created should be useful for dealing with internal institution communications as well.

Sometimes it is difficult to understand which is the correct package in the Administration interface, especially when we are purchasing subsets. Here is an example:

The Wiley interscience setup in resolver is odd. I had a question about one title from a reference librarian, and I discovered the following…
After a quick look at the CBU resolver I see that we have selected:
Provider: Wiley InterScience (formerly Blackwell)
Package: Blackwell Journals (Premium Subscription, 1997-present) (partial)
Titles: 842 of 1047 selected
AND
Provider: Wiley InterScience (formerly Blackwell)
Package: Blackwell Journals (Free Content) (partial)
Titles: 26 of 98 selected

So I'm not positive if it's correct so I looked at SMU's setup. They have chosen
Provider: Wiley InterScience
Package: Wiley InterScience (green)

So I thought while I was at it I would tweak the url to MSVU:
Provider: Wiley InterScience (partial)
Package: Wiley InterScience (partial)
Titles: 506 of 1595 selected
AND
Provider: Wiley InterScience (formerly Blackwell)

      Package: Blackwell Journals (Premium Subscription, 1997-present) (partial)
      Titles: 1041 of 1047 selected
      AND
      Provider: Wiley InterScience (formerly Blackwell)
      Package: Blackwell Journals (Free Content) (green)

      And then STFX:
      Provider: Wiley InterScience (partial)
      Package: Wiley InterScience (partial)
      Titles: 1226 of 1595 selected
      AND
      Provider: Wiley InterScience (partial)
      Package: Cochrane Library (green) (this is available to all NS thanks to the efforts of Patrick Ellis et al., should we all select here?)

      I realize there may be some institutional differences, but isn't this a consortial purchase? And if so, how can I discover the correct configuration?
      BTW this is a great example for the meeting pre-APLA at MSVU.

Can we not share info better?
Can we not make "one-click" packages for things like this that we can share?

In many cases we (CBU) do not know there is a problem until it becomes a problem. We are reacting to problems reported by users and library staff, and are expected to act quickly to resolve reported linking problems.

Can we together become more pro-active in solving issues before they become problems for users?
Can other institutions share experiences of pro-active behavior in their libraries that may be helpful to us?

I believe some institutions have been managing subsets of journals by using customized localholdings files. Could these not be used by OCLC to create a new package?

If so, who would be responsible for maintaining?

MSVU

- Maintaining accurate lists of the packages we subscribe to, or have free access to.
    - As far as I know, there is no one list to refer to.

- Maintaining accurate lists of journals within our subscribed packages.
    - Journals are always changing.
    - Publishers pull out of packages with no notice, or change what access ranges are available.

- When a list is provided there are different access ranges for "page image", or "full text", and no easy way to pick which list is accurate.
- Right now, we access over 30 000 journals through Resolver, and the only way I can maintain accuracy is to test each record individually to see what access dates are correct.
- When changes are made to a package at our end, it seems that further updates are not automatically applied at the ASIN end.
  - This doesn't mess up our changes, but it keeps us from getting access to new journals to the package unless we know to add them ourselves. Other changes can be missed too.
  - Changes we make in error are not automatically fixed.
  -

Titles with two assigned ISSN's for paper and electronic formats do not show up in one search result. - Some packages use the "eISSN", while others use the ISSN assigned to the paper format.
- It would be nice if we could link the two ISSN's together so they display together in the search result.
- What's the chance of everyone using the same format?
- It would also be nice if Title changes could be linked in the same way.
-

Titles are duplicated when they are available in multiple packages.
- Is there a way to prevent this duplication?

MTA

1. From our perspective the main issue with the Resolver is not so much with the Resolver itself, but rather with how the Resolver handles exceptions. For instance in indexes where there are book chapters, books, essays, and other monographs and we have linked the Resolver, the Resolver cannot compensate for the vendor sending monographic information.
2. For us, since we do not use Serials Solutions or any other serials management software and with the current version of our ILS software and the modules we subscribe to, we cannot generate, digitally, a serials holdings file to upload into the Resolver.
3. Inaccurate information being supplied by the database vendors or multiple entries for the same vendor…. which one to choose to link to.
4. Default search is keyword when most searches we do are exact searches so for us the default should perhaps be "Title starts with".
5. With databases with abstracts created by the vendor rather than the journal, if you start from the database, click on the Resolver, the Resolver indicates there is an abstract, but when you click in the abstract, the link attempts to go to the journal where of course there is no abstract, so the Resolver displays a long error message.
6. The Resolver is linked to many free resources and more and more the user encounters "RedirectSafe" error.

Nova Scotia Agricultural College

Resolver has been installed at NSAC since 2005. Some of the issues we experience when dealing with maintaining accurate serials holdings include:

- **Large number of packages/titles**
  - o Sometimes it is difficult to know what packages I should be selecting, particularly the CRKN packages. How do I know they're all the right titles? Sometimes it seems like some titles are missing. Is it because they are not updated yet? Given the size of our staff, it's impossible for us to check all the titles in the packages. The ASIN listserv has been a good place to ask or "listen" to questions regarding consortia purchases.
  - o Also, activating individual titles can sometimes be confusing…should I use the publishers link or something else? (Sometimes the publishers link doesn't support ezproxy but I don't know that…).
- **Free Journals in Resolver (ezproxy problem)**
  - o When we upgraded ezproxy, we had to add or Redirect Safe all of our free journals in ezproxy (this previously wasn't a problem to my knowledge). I guess this is more of an ezproxy problem but I think we have it all done now.
- **Dates of "full text" available on database packages is not always what we're entitled to.**
  - o These are confusing…we may only have access to the last 5 years of full text, but it will list something like **Full Text**: January 01 1928 - October 01 2005. Patrons think we actually have full text available for the years listed when in fact we don't. We don't have the resources to make all of those changes. If there is an easier solution to this, please let me know!
- **Waiting for knowledge base updates**
  - o This has only been an issue once or twice here, depending on if a journal title is in high demand and not yet in Resolver. If it's in high demand, then I'll just add it to my local holdings. Since we don't have a huge local holdings list and I've only come across this problem once or twice, this is not really a problem (yet!)
- **Maintaining local holdings**
  - o Setting these up initially was a big task but now it's fairly manageable.
- **ASIN Listserv**
  - o The ASIN listserv has been a **HUGE** help for me as right now I'm the only person administering Resolver at NSAC. (Establishing some contacts within ASIN has been a big help also!)

U St Anne

basic- lack of space for the print issues we have &
lack of funds to purchase electronic back issues.

The electronic holdings through our Resolver are frustrating because all
titles do not seem to be listed &
no one has the time to check each & every entry after the initial purchased dumping is done into the system.

Our serials department is part of one library clerk's job.

St. Francis Xavier University

Lack of control over Knowledgebase is problematic (this is in the hands of OCLC)

Poor data coming from vendors into Knowledgebase is a problem (not sure what kind of interaction happens between vendors and Knowledgebase managers)

No "package" corresponding to CRKN deals available in Knowledgebase (should be part of negotiations at time of purchase/renewal)

Duplication of information in Resolver and Aleph is a problem (especially that updates to Aleph only happen monthly) – but because Relais can't read the Resolver we're forced to keep records in Aleph too

Manual changes to Resolver holdings is time-consuming and frustrating when you think that we are already paying for a service that is meant to keep these records up to date

Locating errors in Resolver depends on users noticing and reporting these errors (Couldn't there be a system that automatically checks for full-text access against the coverage indicated in each package, then reports inconsistencies to the Knowledgebase administrator, who would be responsible for fixing them?)

Relais only 'discovers' the existence of a serial title. Relais cannot read holdings, so no matter how accurate our Resolver holdings become, at this time, Relais cannot read them. Relais is working on reading holdings but they are not there yet. [Of course, having Relais able to read holdings will only exacerbate the problem of inaccurate holdings]. **At this time, Relais can only identify a serial title - Y/N**.

The fact is that with most cases of inaccurate holdings information for electronic serials the problem originates with the KnowledgeBase, so we are always fixing the problem at one step removed from the actual source of the problem. If the KB is inaccurate then the Resolver is inaccurate and if many libraries are using the same KB, then the inaccuracies are duplicated in many locations across the country. In addition, as is the case with StFX/CBU, the Resolver is being used to update the ILS, and so the ILS is inaccurate for every entry that comes from the Resolver. The truth is that the manually added holdings in the ILS are quite accurate as compared to the 'automated' holdings coming from the Resolver because with the manually added holdings the library staff have confirmed the accuracy.

Is it possible to thoroughly consult with vendors to find out if there are other hurdles on their ends of which we are not aware?

This problem is one of the largest banes of the academic library existence. It affects the majority of our users' interactions with our resources.

The KB needs to be accurate. This needs to happen at the negotiation stage. We shouldn't pay for packages until we have an accurate list of titles/holdings and those titles/holdings are in a format that can be uploaded to the KB and spot checked for accuracy before being made available to those of us who are licensing the product. Listings from packages need to be discrete - separate titles/holdings for packages w or w/o backfiles, premimum collections; or whatever discrete packages exist. When titles are added/deleted, new lists of titles/holdings need to be made immediately available, not just lists of those being added/deleted. The KB need to be updated frequently. Uploads from Resolvers to ILS need to be done frequently.

We need to get Relais to discover holdings from the Resolver rather than the ILS, we need our vendors to provide packages for every consortial deal, and we need the providers to provide correct and up-to-date information.

Université de Moncton (Johanne Dégarie, contact person)

<u>Issues</u>
1. Shared packages
   a. Difficulty to identify the titles included in a package
   b. Difficulty or impossibility to update titles lists
   c. Delay in maintenance and corrections made to the packages
2. Subject access
   a. Subjects attribution not at all accurate ; a classification scheme might be more useful
3. French aspect
   a. Difficulty in adding, translating and displaying (diacritics, alphabetical order) French subject categories
   We have translated all the subject categories in a French-Canadian version. Those french subject categories are supposed to be permanent and included in the Knowledge Base. Until now, our version has been included in the Knowledge Base with limited success. With every update of the KB, there were some problems: some of the subject categories are still in the normal french version and showing in both languages. We have a process in place with Izumi, for the translation of new subject added to the knowledge base. We'll have to evaluate in the future if the process is efficient.
   b. The article L' is not ignored in indexing and in searching ; as a result some titles are missed
   Example :
   > 1) Searching : L'éducation   → Results : 3 titles
   > Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation
   > International Review of Education / Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft / Revue Internationale de l'Education
   > Revue des sciences de l'éducation
   > 2) Searching : education → Results : more than 20 screens
   > « Revue des sciences de l'éducation » is missing.
   c. Difficulty in finding bilingual titles
   The collection from the NRC Research Press has been revised to include both titles (French and English) but the French titles of other packages are often missing

<u>Comments and suggestions</u>

Suggestion : To facilitate the maintenance and the sharing of information of the different packages, to assign specific databases to each participating institutions. We are willing to contribute staff time to this.

Comment : Despite the problems encountered, we are very pleased with the support we've had from ASIN in translating and implementing Resolver at the UdeM. We were able to link many of our databases to Resolver and the open URL linking works well.

UNB

We don't really have a summary to send along, just some comments. We appreciate being invited and the opportunity to discuss and possibly brainstorm some solutions around e-Serials problems though we are skeptical about what is possible and/or reasonable.

It seems that many, particularly the smaller institutions, are relatively new to dealing with the issues surrounding e-Serials work, while here at UNB, which started its own standalone e-Serials system over 12 years ago, it all just seems par for the course. Print serials were plagued with many problems as well back in the day of print-only and still are. We've moved, since 2000, from a completely organic homegrown e-Resources system built in PHP/MySQL, which even tracked and injested MARC records, title changes and LC subjects, to EBSCO's LinKSource and finally to WCLM. It wasn't until WCLM version 1.6, and particularly the arrival of the overlay ability, that we were actually comfortable enough with the level of data provided and the robustness of the records to abandon our original system. Until then we used the resolver only for resolving and not our serials A-to-Z. Even so we have built a number of customizations into WCLM to get it to do all the things we need. The move to WCLM was a decision balanced between record maintenance and the richness of the record. In the end, timeliness and expediency of maintenance won out over accuracy and completeness. We have a long history with e-Serials and, of course, all the problems associated with their maintenance.

Publishers and the data they provide have always been a problem for libraries and they are part of the reason Cross-Ref had so much trouble getting traction. Publishers filter through vendors and they all think they're doing what they should -- our job is to wade through all of that as best we can. The advent of the Resolver era has not really solved these problems, and as noted above we have actually sacrificed a level of quality in our records. Getting some content now has clearly won out over getting the right content. Resolver companies like WCLM, which are access driven and not record driven like Serials Solutions, seem ill equipped to deal with micro-record management and indeed rely heavily on the publishers for their data, regardless of its accuracy, which they in turn make available as generic collections for their clients. Societies bounce between publishers and publishers move between vendors and copyright and licensing quickly gets cloudy and murky. It is our experience that within a few days of each other you can get 2 or 3 different title lists from "authoritative" contacts with the vendor or publisher, none of which will coincide with the actual access being granted on the website.

Add to the mix locally purchased collections, historical backfile access, individual one-off titles, and multiple potentially overlapping consortial agreements and you have a very complicated system of rights

management. Even if we all subscribed to similar products from the same platform, there are still significant differences that we cannot deal with across the board. As well the priorities that our various institutions have for us at different times will make it hard to synchronize our efforts (i.e. moving to the hosted resolver). The bottom line is that we are most likely not going to lean on others and wait for them to solve certain issues when we can possibly do it ourselves and inversely may find it hard to be held accountable and responsible to other institutions' requirements. We find we are relying less and less on WCLM to fix internal problems when we can simply construct a local holdings entry that bypasses the need to wait on a 2-3 month fix from OCLC. The resolver in some ways is becoming more of a mechanism to us, and not a reliable data source.

Having said all that we are certainly open to sharing and UNB has on many occasions made its title lists and LH files available to others. One thing we could all use is a system or website of some sort for tracking problems that we believe should be affecting us all -- the ASIN listserv is not the place for this and email is not the greatest method for tracking those issues. There have been many posts to ASIN-Admin surrounding issues we have been working to resolve for months, so any efforts to reduce duplication would be useful. Beyond that what we are actually able to commit to will be limited.

thanks
scott

UPEI

I don't think we have any issues that are any different from anyone else's - in particular, CRKN's inability to provide an accurate list.

Otherwise we aren't having significant problems, just the usual day to day changes that we keep on top of as we discover them. Being in an open source environment, I can say a few words about the initiatives we're involved with within CUFTS to share the management especially of open access titles, but that's really more "enhancement" rather than "problems".

 My summary list in bullet form is:

- CRKN's inability to provide accurate title lists
- Confusion/disagreement on how to handle continuing/continued by titles (this is more an "A-to-Z" than openurl problem)

In an open source environment, sharing the burden of keeping title lists up to date, especially the "odd" ones that need to be done by hand (eg not a nice downloadable list from a vendor)