DRAFT

Plan for incorporating bibliographic access to e-resources in the PINES database

Elizabeth McKinney
PINES Program Director

J. Elaine Hardy
PINES & Collaborative Projects Manager

Terran McCanna
PINES Program Manager

Chris Sharp
PINES System Administrator

Bin Lin
PINES Cataloging Specialist

Dawn Dale
PINES Help Desk Manager

Introduction

One of the pillars and driving forces for the creation of PINES was to have a universal borrowing card for the people of Georgia. The idea of a universal borrowing card then drove the idea of a union bibliographic catalog. PINES creators believed that having each PINES library's holdings attached to one record meant an increased ease of use for the patron that would enhance the universal card. Having a union bibliographic database could help ensure the record used would be the best bibliographic record for each entity and would allow the removal or replacement of bad records from the unified database. It also would have the added benefits of making statistics easier to compile, PINES wide holds easier, and make the consortium more utilitarian and effective, enhancing the patron experience and helping to get the right resource to the right user.

As with the PINES consortium as a whole, there was little time to create the union database from conception to go-live. The time frame meant that some decisions for the creation of the database were made without adequate information. Coupled with the lack of time was the state of the individual library databases they used to build the union catalog. Differing adherence to cataloging standards, decision making without knowledge of those cataloging rules and standards, unfortunate choices concerning library management systems, and divergent sources of bibliographic records contributed to the two primary database problems in PINES --- poor quality records and multiple records for the same bibliographic entity. While this pattern was evident in all migrations, most libraries did have quality cataloging and migrated seamlessly. This document discusses those cases where migration was adversely affected and should not be considered indicative of current PINES cataloging quality.

While most of the Phase I libraries had vendor-based systems using MARC records, four libraries (Middle Georgia, Clayton, Hart, and Flint River) had a locally developed management system that did not use MARC format for bibliographic records. This ILS was developed by Bibb County IT staff for the Middle Georgia Regional Library. Because they felt MARC was too rules ridden, the IT staff developed their own bibliographic format as well. There were no tags, all fields were fixed length (meaning information was often truncated to fit), there was no real fixed field data, no control fields, and no place for standard numbers like ISBNs. There were no standards on what information was required to be in the records. Extraction from these legacy

systems was problematic and involved counting in to find data for the MARC fields. Records built from those nonMARC systems are typically all or partially uppercase, incomplete and incorrectly coded records absent enough information to machine match to better bibliographic records.

Another consistent factor that hampers matching, seen in each phase of PINES, is that each library often had multiple sources of varying quality for bibliographic records. De-duplication was often not done to individual database before their migration to PINES. Machine matching was hindered by few matching title control numbers across the individual bibliographic databases, or even within the same library database.

Incompletely cataloged records have been brought over with almost every library, with some local databases consisting of all, or almost all, inadequate records. Not all libraries had a source for bibliographic records so created their own truncated records. One system had just a 10% match rate with existing PINES records. Some libraries clearly had one record per copy or volume – either from internal library decision or from old ILS vendor restrictions. Many of these records persist in the PINES catalog.

With Phase II, miscommunications between PINES, our former ILS representative, and the database vendor resulted in more duplicates added to the database. In addition, the matching algorithm developed for Phase II did not take into account the tendency for Library of Congress created records to have multiple ISBNs for each format of a title if those ISBNs are present in the Cataloging in Publication (CIP) information. As a result, incoming records for different formats of a title were sometimes combined on one record so we have conglomerate records with holdings for print records on sound recording records, and vice versa or regular print holdings merged on to large print records, and vice versa.

As other libraries have been added to PINES, more duplicates have been added to the system either from poor cataloging practices by the individual libraries and divergent bibliographic record sources. Matching algorithms were developed that could not rely on the presence of the same title control number on a record representing the same bibliographic entity because different vendors use different title control number conventions. While those algorithms were generally good, given records that lacked complete information, incorrect or missing fixed field and control field coding, lack of cataloging standards, or local variance in interpreting those standards, problems with the database continued to mount with each migration.

While developing the initial cataloging policies and procedures establishing cataloging in PINES to national standards, the Bibliographic Database Committee instituted two policies that have been essential in assuring the PINES database moving forward did not continue to be plagued by duplicate title records: a single source for bibliographic records and no batch loading of records.

A single source of bibliographic records is indispensable to effective constraint of duplicate records. Unique title control numbers can be assured from one source so that a bibliographic entity is described by a single record. Having the same title control number on the incoming record and the existing record is the most effective stop to adding multiple records for that entity. It also helps prevent incorrect matching and overlay.

DRAFT

The Bibliographic Database Committee also decided to forgo batch loading of bibliographic records. Given the number of duplicate records in the initial PINES database, the Committee did not want to risk bringing in yet another duplicate record into the database when no existing record would have a title control number that would stop the incoming record. Records for any newly acquired items were to be brought in one at a time to further ensure a single record for a single entity. Catalogers worked on cleaning up the database by finding duplicate and poor quality records, merging and then overlaying with a matching record from the chosen bibliographic utility.

OCLC was chosen as the bibliographic utility for the PINES consortium for a number of reasons. There was a longstanding, existing relationship between public libraries in Georgia and OCLC. A few public libraries were full members of OCLC and the remainder were selective users for ILL. Selective users routinely batch loaded holdings into OCLC's databases so that they could participate in ILL. More importantly for a bibliographic record source, was the depth and breadth of the OCLC bibliographic database (now called WorldCat). The WorldCat database, because of the efforts of its member libraries, contains records for titles across most genres, formats, and audiences. Creating original bibliographic records can be costly and time consuming. Having a bibliographic utility with the span of records contained in OCLC means PINES catalogers can primarily copy catalog by finding a matching record to the item in hand, saving both time and money. Further, OCLC supports a robust authority file, based on the Library of Congress authorities, and authority control, so that access points are more likely to be authorized forms.

As PINES continued to grow, the number of duplicate records in the database began to grow for the reasons cited above. In 2010, the PINES catalog contained approximately 1.9 million bibliographic records. The number of duplicate and poor quality records were causing egregious problems and affecting the usability of the database and negatively impacting patron services and information discovery. These problems included delay in indexing, delays in internal search processing, and delays in search retrieval. The speed of reports and functionality of holds were also negatively impacted. Duplicate records were unfavorable to the user experience with the public catalog; paging through unnecessary multiple records for the same entity creates a barrier to information discovery by the user. As a result, PINES and GPLS submitted an RFP for a vendor based database cleanup project to de-duplicate the database, do authorities processing, and overlay as many PINES records with OCLC records as possible within the costs of the project. The $600,000 project was awarded to Backstage Library Works and was completed in 2011. The resultant database had noticeably fewer duplicates, making it easier to navigate. Almost 70,000 records lacked enough information to machine match and remain in the catalog. Prior to the project, the PINES database was comprised of 39% OCLC Records and 61% nonOCLC records. After the project, it was comprised of 75% OCLC records and 25% nonOCLC records. Beginning record count for the project was 1,874,505; ending was 1,703,385. Over 170,000 duplicate records were identified and merged.

In 2010, the PINES Membership Agreement was amended to require libraries to agree to database cleanup prior to joining PINES in order to improve the match ratio and maintain database quality. Section III Membership (8), now states:

In order to achieve and maintain a quality PINES database the library system wishing to become a PINES member library will follow the guidelines outlined in "Strategies for a Quality Database" and agree to database cleanup in order to increase the match ratio for records between their database and the existing PINES database.

PINES catalogers have continued to merge duplicates and replace low quality records with better OCLC records, improving the quality of the database and the patron experience with the database.

E-resources in the PINES Database

When GALILEO began purchasing e-resource databases such as NetLibrary, they also purchased corresponding OCLC MARC records and made them available for loading into library bibliographic databases, including PINES. PINES staff explored the possibility of adding these records to the PINES database; however, they were problematic in several ways. At the time, national standards for cataloging e-resources were in development. The records in OCLC were not of good quality and were little more than the title records for the print resources with minor coding changes. More importantly, library management systems, including SIRSI, were not yet designed to effectively accommodate items without a physical presence on a shelf in a library. The PINES ILS at the time was not designed with communally/consortially held resources in mind. As a result, PINES staff had to consider how to indicate in each title record that the resource was held by all libraries rather than by individual libraries. Given these factors, the decision was made to delay adding the bibliographic records for GALILEO resources to the PINES catalog.

After the development and migration to Evergreen, the Georgia Download Destination (GADD) consortium was formed and GADD explored the possibility of purchasing OCLC MARC records for their Overdrive titles. Like other ILSs, Evergreen had not been designed to accommodate items without a physical presence. Batch loading was very limited due to technical issues. At the time, PINES did not have the level of system administration support we currently enjoy so we were unable to develop a way to batch-add holdings via scripts. Libraries would have had to add holdings individually. Also, the cost was prohibitive at $1.50/record. PINES staff explored ways to use the free metadata, which included title information and the library specific 856. We developed a plan to divide the records amongst catalogers at the GADD libraries -- each would have 100 or so titles to catalog and add holdings for all PINES libraries. GADD libraries elected not to have records for the titles added to the PINES database.

In 2012, after Evergreen development created better tools for batch loading and a way to display e-resource records without copies attached in the OPAC, PINES staff worked with GADD libraries to develop guidelines for adding e-resources. The Executive Committee approved batch loading bibliographic records by PINES staff only for e-resources the same year.

At the same time, PINES staff explored using Evergreen batch loading functionality and its MARC batch edit functionality to add the necessary 856 subfields to OCLC MARC records if they were purchased for Overdrive/GADD titles. Bugs in the MARC editor prevented its use. PINES staff then successfully explored using system administration support to create scripts to add the necessary subfields. GADD libraries were again unable to purchase the records. The PINES and

DRAFT

Collaborative Projects Manager offered to work with libraries and system administration support to script ways to convert Overdrive supplied metadata into search parameters for OCLC Connexion Client searches in addition to scripting for the 856s. GADD libraries did not respond.

PINES staff have continued to offer to work with libraries to bring OCLC records for e-resources into PINES and have occasionally added records for state-wide e-resources as the need has arisen. Dr. Jim Veatch, former cataloger at Bartram Trails, had begun a project to bring records for GPO e-resources into PINES. Unfortunately, that project halted when he retired. Building on Dr. Veatch's work, PINES staff would like in the future to pursue the possibility of PINES becoming a selective federal depository library for electronic government documents only. As a statewide consortium, PINES is uniquely positioned to provide comprehensive access to electronic GPO documents for all citizens in Georgia. GPO does supply free bibliographic records through OCLC for libraries in the FDL program. However, in order to effectively pursue and then maintain federal depository status, we would need additional staff to manage bibliographic records according to FDLP standards as well as being a government document liaison with reference and other staff at PINES libraries.

Currently, Greater Clarks Hill and Sara Hightower are cataloging their e-resources available through their vendors.

State-wide E-resources: potential future approaches

In an effort to make GALILEO's state-wide e-resources available to Georgia citizens more discoverable, this discussion sets forth the processes and requirements for the addition of OCLC bibliographic records for individual titles within those databases purchased by the Georgia Public Library Service to the PINES database.

Balancing the sometimes competing patron services of bibliographic database integrity and the ability to find all contracted e-resources within that database can create challenges. Any future approach to e-resource discovery capability within PINES would be subject to an exhaustive feasibility study that would consider all relevant factors, including, if not especially, a comparison of the costs of each approach versus the benefit of having a relatively small number of resources visible from within PINES. Each approach would also need to be considered from the point of view of the larger Evergreen community, which guides overall development of the project.

Acquisition and batch load of OCLC MARC records for state-wide e-resource titles.

In order to successfully integrate and maintain bibliographic records for titles within databases purchased by GPLS for statewide use, procedures should be established to ensure:

- Patron discovery and consistent experience
  - PINES patrons should be able to search and locate a given resource, both in the PINES database and in the vendor database. Clear, unambiguous, and consistent language should be used in subfields for linking text and public notes added to the 856 linking field for the resource.

DRAFT

- PINES database integrity
  - PINES database integrity shall be maintained by following PINES cataloging policies and procedures. Record Match Sets should be developed that match on title control numbers and other parameters to ensure that incoming records are correctly matched to any existing records. When existing records are identified, the merge/overlay profiles should be correctly defined so that existing 856 fields are maintained and new ones added to the record. PINES prefers provider neutral records for e-resources, so multiple 856s for different vendor links would be present in one record where the same title is available in disparate vendor databases.

- Link checking and resolution
  - Links within the 856 fields should be routinely verified and corrected if necessary.

- Removal of deleted titles
  - Corresponding bibliographic records for any title removed from the vendor database(s) should be removed from the PINES database in a timely manner. If the title is retained in another vendor database, the bibliographic record should be retained and the 856 for the deleted resource removed.

- Batch loading additional titles added to the databases
  - OCLC bibliographic records for titles added to the vendor databases should be obtained, processed, and loaded into the PINES database in a timely manner.

Resources

- PINES and Collaborative Projects Manager (PCPM)
- PINES Cataloging Associate(s) (PCA) (proposed PINES staff)
- PINES System Administrator (PSA)
- PINES Cataloging Coordinator (PCC)
- PINES Program Director
- PINES/GPLS IT Contract Staff
- PINES Library Catalogers
- Assistant State Librarian for Library Innovation and Collaboration
- GPLS/GALILEO Liaison
- GALILEO Program Staff
- E-Resource Vendor Staff
- OCLC
- MARCEdit

Stakeholders

- GPLS Administration
- GPLS/PINES Staff
- PINES Executive Committee
- PINES Library Directors

DRAFT

- PINES Library Staff
- PINES Library Patrons
- GALILEO Program Staff
- GALILEO Users
- Non-PINES Georgia Libraries
- E-Resource Vendors

Constraints

- PINES policy requires all bibliographic records imported into the database to be OCLC records.
- PINES policy requires that cataloging adhere to national and local cataloging standards.
- PINES policy requires a single bibliographic record for a bibliographic entity.
- Current Evergreen functionality for batch loading MARC records may need further development or require PSA to manipulate OCLC MARC 21 record file.
- Current Evergreen functionality for MARC batch editing is not sufficient for PINES needs. PCA and PCPM will need to use outside MARC editor to process records.

Assumptions

- Collision detection within Evergreen is functional and will prevent batch loading of bibliographic records with matching title control numbers.
- PINES bibliographic database quality for bibliographic records for e-resources is high.

***Proposed* process for adding MARC21 records for E-Resource titles to PINES when OCLC records are available from the database vendor**

1. E-Resource titles are added to GALILEO.
2. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison (currently the Assistant State Librarian for Library Innovation and Collaboration) identifies e-resources with title records that can be imported into PINES.
3. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison approaches the PCPM with proposal to import e-resource records.
4. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison arranges for the acquisition of an MARC21 bibliographic record data file containing OCLC WorldCat records to import and delivers that file to the PCPM. The records must contain 856 fields for the e-resource. While links to the exact title are preferred, if that is not possible, PINES will accept links to the vendor database.
5. The PCA under PCPM guidance evaluates the file for adherence to standards and correctness, and identifies fields and subfields to edit, add, or remove from the records.
6. The PCA processes the records for PINES specific requirements. This processing may require technical assistance from the PCPM, the PSA, or other technical staff, and include the following:
   - remove unnecessary fields (may include the following):
     - irrelevant 856 fields
     - 006, which interferes with PINES/Evergreen icon display
     - Irrelevant 505 fields
   - editing or adding a correct 007

- o adding the correct 856 including appropriately worded linking and public notes. Wording for the notes will be vetted by the PCPM in consultation with the GPLS/GALILEO Liaison and other resources and stakeholders.
- o corrections to formatting

7. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, loads the amended file into a PINES test environment for further evaluation. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison arranges access from the test environment to the e-resource vendor in coordination with GALILEO Staff.
8. The PCPM coordinates testing with PINES library staff, particularly catalogers, following the testing checklist.
9. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, and the GPLS/GALILEO Liaison in consultation with GALILEO and the e-resource vendor, schedule a go-live date and communicate that to the PINES libraries.
10. Go live on the scheduled date.

Proposed **process for adding MARC21 records for E-Resource titles to PINES when OCLC records are not available from the database vendor**

1. E-Resource titles are added to GALILEO.
2. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison (currently the Assistant State Librarian for Library Innovation and Collaboration) identifies e-resources with title records that can be imported into PINES.
3. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison approaches the PCPM with proposal to import e-resource records.
4. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison arranges for the acquisition of metadata from the vendor that contains identifying information for the titles as well as the 856 linking fields.
5. The PSA works with the PCPM to develop a batch search file for OCLC's Connexion Client from the vendor supplied metadata.
6. The PCA uses the batch file to search the Connexion Client for matching OCLC records.
7. The PCA evaluates the result set, identifying matching records and checking them for errors, and compiles a list of titles without matching records. The PCA also identifies PINES specific fields and subfields to be edited, added, or removed. The PCA also identifies PINES specific fields and subfields to be edited, added, or removed.
8. The PCA searches the Connexion Client for those titles without matching records in the first search. Any matching records are checked for errors.
9. The PCA provides to the PCPM and/or the PINES Cataloging Coordinator a list of titles without matching records in OCLC. The PCPM and/or the PINES Cataloging Coordinator enters original bibliographic records for those titles.
10. The PCA processes the files of OCLC records for PINES specific requirements. This processing may require technical assistance from the PCPM, the PSA, or other technical staff, and include the following:
    - o remove unnecessary fields (may include the following):
        - ▪ irrelevant 856 fields
        - ▪ 006, which interferes with PINES/Evergreen icon display
        - ▪ Irrelevant 505 fields
    - o editing or adding a correct 007

- o adding the correct 856 including appropriately worded linking and public notes. Wording for the notes will be vetted by the PCPM in consultation with the GPLS/GALILEO Liaison and other resources and stakeholders.
- o corrections to formatting
11. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, loads the amended file into a PINES test environment for further evaluation. The GPLS/GALILEO Liaison arranges access from the test environment to the e-resource vendor in coordination with GALILEO Staff.
12. The PCPM coordinates testing with PINES library staff, particularly catalogers, following the testing checklist.
13. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, and the GPLS/GALILEO Liaison in consultation with GALILEO and the e-resource vendor, schedule a go-live date and communicate that to the PINES libraries.
14. Go live on the scheduled date.

Proposed testing Procedure for Adding E-Resource Records to PINES

Steps 2 - 4 should include PINES library staff testers to complete.

1. Load records into a test server.
2. Check that appearance of records in search result set in the OPAC is correct.
3. Check that the OPAC view of a sample of records is correct.
4. Test URL linking to the original resource. This will likely require coordination between GPLS, GALILEO, the e-resource vendor, and perhaps OCLC to accomplish.
   - o test linking from within a library
   - o test linking from outside the library

Proposed ongoing Maintenance Procedures for E-Resource Records in PINES

Background Work

1. Create and test a Merge/Overlay profile within the MARC Batch Import/Export interface (a.k.a. "Vandelay") that accommodates the procedures developed by the PCPM during the initial load phase, including, and most especially, the preserving/updating existing 856 field while adding additional ones to match records.

Ongoing Procedures

Adding new titles

1. Receive updated OCLC bibliographic record file or metadata from vendor.
2. The PCA reviews the bibliographic file for adherence to cataloging standards or follows above procedure to search and identify OCLC records from the provided metadata.
3. The PCA processes the file in a similar manner as during the initial load.
4. The PCPM loads the file into a PINES test server that employs the Merge/Overlay Profile developed for this specific vendor's data files.
5. The PCPM coordinates testing using the procedures outlined for the initial load.
6. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, schedules the production load of the file.
7. The PCPM, in coordination with the PSA, loads the file into the production server.

DRAFT

Deleting existing titles

1. Receive file or list of deleted titles from vendor.
2. Depending on number of deleted titles:
   a. PSA creates reports to determine if deleted titles are represented by a bibliographic record with a single 856 for the specific vendor or if the title is represented by a record with multiple 856s for disparate vendors.
   b. PCA searches PINES database and either deletes records or removes 856 for deleted titles.
3. If a above, PSA deletes title records for single vendor resource and creates script to remove 856 from records to be retained.

Manual Import and Maintenance of E-Resource Records: pros and cons

This approach is detailed in the procedures above and would constitute the "status quo" approach to future e-resource management within PINES.

Pros to this approach include:

- E-resource records are available from within the OPAC with no further development.
- MARC Import is already available from within Evergreen.
- Libraries who subscribe to e-resources have the ability (and responsibility) to import and delete e-resource records as needed.

Cons with this approach include:

- Staff time is required to import and maintain e-resource records as their availability changes.
- PINES cataloging policy restricts import OCLC bibliographic records to maintain database integrity as discussed above. Not all vendors provide OCLC records.

E-resource vendor results within the Evergreen OPAC

As with the NoveList Select, results that are retrieved from a third-party content provider's location, "crosswalks" could be developed between the Evergreen OPAC and specific e-resource vendor content. That way, the e-resources would seamlessly appear in OPAC searches as if they are part of the PINES collection, but the content itself would exist on third-party vendors' servers.

Pros to this approach include:

- PINES library-owned and third-party assets are available via a single search location.
- No need for MARC record import into PINES.
- (Corollary to above) No requirement for OCLC-only bibliographic records.
- No need for PINES-side maintenance of content.

Cons to this approach include:

- These crosswalks would need to be developed for each e-resource provider's content, which depends heavily on the availability and complexity of each provider's application programming interface (API).
- This functionality does not yet exist within Evergreen and would need to be developed from scratch.
- Development of this functionality is potentially very costly in terms of time, money, and staff resources.

An external application handles PINES search (Discovery layer)

PINES staff have had theoretical discussions for a number of years of another potential approach that would require the acquisition or development of a third-party discovery layer that would replace the functionality of the Evergreen OPAC and hypothetically allow the discovery of e-resource records alongside library physical assets. However, there is no guarantee that developing and/or purchasing a third-party product would alleviate the need for crosswalks to also be developed between the e-resource content and the third-party product.

Pros to this approach include:

- PINES library-owned and third-party assets are available via a single search location.
- No requirement for bibliographic record imports for vendor based e-resource content. (Records for some e-resources might still be part of the PINES database, particularly in cases where no overarching database exists or for locally produced e-resources such as YouTube videos.)

Cons to this approach include:

- PINES staff would potentially need to import and maintain third-party content.
- Crosswalks to retrieve e-resource vendor content would potentially still need to be developed.
- A new layer of complexity would be introduced for development, maintenance, and troubleshooting, since Evergreen would still be the underlying source of these records.
- GALILEO already has an EDS, which includes PINES results in searches. A PINES-specific discovery layer would duplicate and potentially compete with that product.
- It is unlikely that an off-the-shelf discovery product would be able to accommodate the complexity of the PINES library consortium's configuration, necessitating development.
- Development of this functionality is potentially extremely costly in terms of time, money, and staff resources as the project scope compares to Acquisitions or even Evergreen itself.

Open Source Management System for e-resource administration

Given that third party vendors provide access to e-resources outside the traditional library management systems for physical items that is tied to the distribution of e-resources through that same vendor, libraries do not always have the flexibility of changing vendors without losing the investment in those resources. Licensing of e-resources are often tied to the third party platform and cannot migrate to a new system. A possible solution is to develop and maintain on

a statewide level, an open source management system for e-resource administration. This management system would provide search functionality, check out of resources, ensure resource becomes unavailable to the patron after the circulation period ends, and other functionality for providing access to e-resource content. This approach would necessitate negotiation and maintenance of contracts with individual publishers or other providers of electronic content. Development of such a management system could include crosswalks to Evergreen and other library management systems as described above, removing the need for the addition of bibliographic records for e-resources to library catalogs.

Pros to this approach include:

- PINES library-owned and third-party assets are available via a single search location.
- No requirement for bibliographic record imports for vendor based e-resource content. (Records for some e-resources might still be part of the PINES database, particularly in cases where no overarching database exists or for locally produced e-resources such as YouTube videos.)
- No need for PINES-side maintenance of content.

Cons to this approach include:

- Intensive and potentially costly development of the management system.
- Increased staffing at GPLS for negotiating and maintaining contracts with content providers and publishers.
- Increased staffing at GPLS for administering and maintaining new management system
- Publishers and other content providers might not be responsive to contract for state wide access.
- Crosswalks to retrieve e-resource vendor content would need to be developed.

PINES as a Federal Depository Library for Government eDocuments

The Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) provides free access to federal government documents. A growing number of those documents are available as ebooks. Since PINES serves the state of Georgia, it is uniquely positioned to provide broad access to federal government edocuments. A future possibility would be for PINES to discuss with the Georgia depository libraries and the FDLP the feasibility of becoming a selective depository library for edocuments only. The Government Printing Office (GPO) makes MARC records for government edocuments freely available to depository libraries through OCLC. PINES staff would need to evaluate the impact on the PINES database the inclusion these records would have as well as additional staffing needed to maintain the records and provide the support for access to those records by PINES patrons and library staff.

Pros to this approach include:

- Bibliographic records available on a regular basis from OCLC with 856 links supplied.
- E-resource records are available from within the OPAC with no further development.

Cons to this approach include:

- Would require negotiation with GPO and FDLs in Georgia since PINES does not fit the current model for the FDLP.
- Might require additional GPLS staff knowledgeable about government documents
- Would require training programs for frontline staff in PINES libraries to meet FDLP requirements.

Monitoring and participating in community projects for e-book access

The Assistant State Librarian is monitoring several community projects with goals to increase access to ebooks for all library patrons. In addition to monitoring these projects, PINES staff encourage the Assistant State Librarian to pursue GPLS participation in these initiatives. These projects are:

ReadersFirst

(http://www.readersfirst.org/) is an organization almost 300 "dedicated to ensuring access to free and easy-to-use eBook content." ReadersFirst principles are:

> To achieve a better user experience for library patrons, e-content providers must be willing partners, and offer products that allow users to:
>
> - Search and browse a single comprehensive catalog with all of a library's offerings at once, including all e-books, physical collections, programs, blogs, and donor opportunities. Currently, content providers often only allow searches within the products they sell, depriving users of the comprehensive library experience.
> - Place holds, check-out items, view availability, manage fines and receive communications within individual library catalogs or in the venue the library believes will serve them best, without having to visit separate websites (libraries, not distributers, should be enabled to manage all interactions with users).
> - Seamlessly enjoy a variety of e-content. To do this, libraries must be able to choose content, devices and apps from any provider or from multiple providers, without bundling that limits a library's ability to serve content they purchase on platforms of their choice.
>
> - Download e-books that are compatible with all readers, from the Kindle to the Nook to the iPad and so on, perhaps leading to a standard library eBook format that will work on many devices. (http://www.readersfirst.org/program)

Currently, Dekalb County Public Library is the only library from Georgia participating in ReadersFirst.

Library Simplified and LEAP

http://www.librarysimplified.org/ Made possible by a grant from IMLS, Library Simplified is a project of the New York Public Library and nine partner libraries to develop simplified management and patron access applications for e-books. They have also initiated and received IMLS funding for the Library Econtent Access Project (LEAP) which aims to expand the ebook application, work with Open eBooks, initiate a nationwide dialog to discover solutions to library ebook challenges, and support self-hosted econtent platforms.

DRAFT

DPLA E-book Working Group

https://digitalpubliclibraryofamerica.atlassian.net/wiki/display/EW/Ebook+Workgroup+Home supported by funding from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Working group facilitates discussion on building a "framework for a national ebook strategy." It is a stakeholder group, striving "to understand the current ecosystem for ebooks and unbundle pieces of this ecosystem to address the challenges ebooks present for libraries" (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nzlgUI7_VwVHLn7IlG6R-WSJ75P2B1HpqOX1IS8it2U/edit?pli=1). The group is divided into several topical subgroups including:

- Scoping tools/Challenges relating to content types
- Public domain works opportunities
- Alternative formats and micro-imprints
- Defining the technology stack of a national marketplace
- Licensing best practices workgroup.

ASCLA Consortial eBook Interest Group

http://www.ala.org/ascla/interestgroups/igceb   The Association for Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (ASCLA) is a part of ALA that works with state library agencies, library consortia, and other groups. This e-book interest group provides a forum for discussion amongst library consortia and encourages collaboration.

Other community projects that may have future impacts on the provision of e-resources to PINES patrons are:

Open eBooks and **ConnectED Library Challenge**

(http://www.imls.gov/issues/national-initiatives/connected-library-challenge and) are White House initiatives to improve student access to libraries and digital resources.

Open Library

(https://openlibrary.org/) is an initiative of the Internet Archive to build a digital library. Open Library account holders can borrow ebooks from the collection. Some titles are in the Digital Accessible Information System (DAISY) format for those with print disabilities. GPLS is a participating library.