

**CAGER**  
Conference Call  
June 14, 2007

**Present on call:**

Lu Ai, FCLA  
Priscilla Caplan, FCLA  
Daniel Cromwell, FCLA  
Doug Dunlop, UCF  
Helen Laurence, FAU  
Jim Michael, USF  
Kimberly Montgomery, UCF, chair  
Mary Ann O'Daniel, FCLA  
Jeanne Phillips, FCLA  
Astrid Terman, FCLA  
Sue Wartzok, FIU  
Naomi Young, UF

---

This conference call was postponed from its normal 1st Thursday of the month and rescheduled for the next week due to the chair's attendance at the ELUNA conference in South Dakota.

The current plan for the Aleph DLU01 and PALMM workflows is the one given in Lu Ai's PowerPoint as slide #16 (see attachment). The slide is entitled Revised Plan. This plan incorporates the addition of URLs in the Aleph records. The MARC record for Endeca will be taken from DLU01.

For works that we want to have good authority control, a record should be created in Aleph DLU01. When the digital object is loaded into DigiTool, the operator should copy the MARC record into DigiTool. A nightly batch job will copy the URL for the DigiTool object into the Aleph DLU01 MARC record.

For materials that do not need authority control, we can create a Dublin Core or MODS record directly in DigiTool at the time that the digital content is loaded.

FCLA will pull all new and changed Dublin Core and MODS records from DigiTool into Endeca. MARC records will be taken only from Aleph into Endeca.

Once synchronization between Aleph DLU01 and DigiTool is in place, then changes in the Aleph record will go into the corresponding DigiTool MARC record. Changes in the DigiTool MARC record will not go into the Aleph MARC record. Currently Aleph records with significant changes are pulled into Endeca weekly, but the hope is to

gradually work up to a nightly load for these as well. At this time, it is unclear what is meant by significant changes.

Priscilla asked the CAGER membership two questions: 1) whether this plan was acceptable to the group, and, 2) whether the data in DLU01 was okay. The group agreed that this plan would work and that the data appears to be good.

Settling on indexing is a priority now. The test data appeared to use out of the box indexing. The search labels differ from the SUL core. Mary Ann is working on a spreadsheet of the indexes used for the individual SULs for the Authorities Subcommittee. She will let us see that, however, it does take a great deal of time to put together. In the meantime, we should look at the tab11 tables for our own libraries to get a feel for what sort of indexing has been done. [Editor's note: Open the AlephADM module in version 15.5. Under the Tables menu, select Tables Navigator, or click on the icon for this. Open the folder for the bib library. Open the tab folder. Scroll down to the various tab11 files: tab11\_acc for browse indexes, tab11\_ind for direct indexes and tab11\_wrd for keyword indexes.] We should make certain that DLU01 uses the same search codes as are used in the rest of the SUL Aleph libraries, e.g., the title browse index should use TTL, not the Aleph out-of-the-box TIT.

There was a lot of discussion on what records should be migrated from NOTIS LTQF to Aleph DLU01. Because of various changes in digital projects, many of the records that are marked as inzprocess in the 856 have not and will not be digitized. However, it is impossible to differentiate between those that libraries still intend to digitize and those that are no longer in queue. After a recommendation from Priscilla, it was resolved that the inzprocess records should be brought over with a suppressed status. This removes them from public view, but has the advantages of preserving any work done on these records so far while saving the libraries time that would be needed for reloading. Once in Aleph DLU01, each library could review its records and delete them when possible.

This also implies that when we add new records for things we intend to digitize, we will add a suppressed status to them. Since these records will not be seen in the Aleph WebOPAC, we need to ensure that anyone who selects content for digitization has at least a read-only access to the DLU01 client, so that works already claimed by another library can be avoided.

Lu pointed out that Aleph to DigiTool synchronization will depend upon the presence of an 001 in the Aleph record. The 001 is added when the record is updated. It is also added in some libraries when a record comes down from OCLC. But it had not been added in migration from NOTIS. Daniel will look into how to use a fix to create this field in all DLU01 records.

The non-PALMM workings of Aleph and DigiTool were discussed. The example was given of a large collection of photographs in DigiTool. We would probably not want each of these in Endeca individually. However, we would want a collection level record in Endeca. This might involve a MARC record in Aleph DLU01 that pointed to a set

record for the digital photo collection in DigiTool. The Aleph MARC record would be pulled into Endeca. Priscilla noted that the granularity of what was brought into Endeca would depend upon how the DigiTool record creator set things up. Priscilla stressed again that if the work in hand does not need authority control, then rather than creating a record in Aleph DLU01, a record can be created directly in DigiTool using Dublin Core or MODS and it will go into Endeca.

FCLA will be going to each university to see the local workflows. The DigiTool training that they give will then be tailored to reflect those workflows. In addition, FCLA will give us some pointers to official DigiTool documentation. They will also create some high level introductory training that will allow people in the universities to start getting a feel for how DigiTool works.

**Attachment:** *Adding DigiTool Records to an Endeca OPAC at FCLA* (filename: Eluna2007.ppt), PowerPoint slides for a presentation by Lu Ai at ELUNA 2007. See slide #16 as referenced above.