**Electronic Resources Evaluation Between Vendor and OCLC KB**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resource Name: Literature Online** | | | |
| **Final Evaluation:**  It is not possible to determine without a significant amount of time which and if there is an appropriate collection in OCLC Knowledge Bases. The vendor currently is unable to provide a marc file for the titles that we subscribe and have access to. An enhancement request is underway but has not had much traction. This means that getting records going forward might prove equally challenging.  The issue: There are titles in Aleph with bad links because this title is no longer part of the LION Complete set to which we subscribe. The url’s are no different for these titles that no longer work from the other urls in other records.  Possible solutions:   * Continue to advocate for an enhanced set of marc records * Check urls individually (there are 18042 records in Aleph) * Compare titles in Aleph to the titles provided by the Vendor in the spreadsheet and remove those not in the spreadsheet that are in Aleph * Remove records when users report an issue with that title * Remove all records while continuing to provide access to the database (MH, SM, UM are all on same OCLC record) | | | |
|
| **Next Steps:** | | | |
|  | **Vendor** | **OCLC KB** | **Comments** |
| Is this a static or growing collection (i.e. will there only be updates or will new titles be added)? | Growing | Unknown | The vendor explained that there are only very few changes that occur in a year. |
| Are there MARC records available? | Yes & No | Unknown | Vendor: The vendor can supply us with a MARC file. This file contains all poetry, prose and drama irrespective of collection. This means that as we get the complete, there are titles in the set that we don’t have access to.  OCLC: There are the JISC Proquest Literature Online, Literature Online UK and Literature Online US and Literature Online Reference (UK and US). There are no collections called complete. Again, there is the problem of titles that we don’t subscribe to in the set. The JISC sets are the only ones associated with Proquest. |
| Is it easy to find the MARC records? | No | No | OCLC: There is no LION Complete collection. It would be necessary to checked all the collections against the title spreadsheet to figure out which titles to select.  Vendor: You have to request the title set. If you want a set for only the titles we subscribe to then you have to request an enhancement. I have requested an enhancement but after 2 months there has been no movement. |
| How do you acquire the set for the MARC records? | FTP |  |  |
| Are the MARC records free? | Yes | Yes |  |
| Is there any supporting documentation on the MARC records? | No | No |  |
| Is there an easily identifiable contact information for inquiries about the MARC records? | CORAL | No |  |
| Are there any records in Aleph that need to be considered beforehand? If yes, do you need to do any prep work to load this current set? | Yes |  | Some of the titles no longer work which is because there have been changes to the set we subscribe to. The records are minimal. |
| How many records are available from the vendor and OCLC KB? | All titles | ? | The only way to see what we subscribe to is a spreadsheet of titles.  For OCLC, it would be necessary to check all collections and check off only those titles we subscribe to once you found the appropriate collection. |
| How many records should we have access to according to the vendor? |  | | This is only |
| What is the file format of the file for the set of records (xml, mrc, xsls)? | Mrc | mrc |  |
| Do records meet minimal MARC quality? |  |  | Vendor: There’s no standard numbers. Publisher information is often missing. Sometimes volume 1 is there but not volume 2. Records have at least a title and a link. I would say that these records are more on the fence of meeting minimal quality. |
| Is there a known and recognizable data match point? | Vendor number | OCLC number | Is there an OCLC number or vendor number in the 001 and/or 035? |
| Are there urls? | Yes | Yes |  |
| Do records have 1 url to the resource or several? | Yes | Yes |  |
| Are the urls to the resource the same between the vendor and OCLC? |  |  | I’m not sure which OCLC collection is the correct one and I suspect that there isn’t one. Hence, it is impossible to tell. |
| Do the urls lead to the resource? Are there incorrect urls? |  |  | The problem is that the sets include titles for which we don’t have access. |
| Are the title lists the same between the vendor and OCLC sets? |  |  |  |
| What is the level of difficulty to prepare the set to be loaded into the system? | Very high | | Low, Medium, High, and Very High refer to the amount of time and effort is needed to prepare the file to be batch imported.  **Low**: Requires minimal difficulty. Can use tasks already created in MarcEdit. Regular updates can be scheduled. An example is eDuke’s Latin American Studies.  **Medium**: The set requires some cleanup and manipulation. An existing task in MarcEdit can be applied with a couple of added touch ups to the set. Regular updates can be scheduled. An example is Film Platform.  **High**: The set requires significant cleanup and prep. New tasks need to be created in MarcEdit to deal with the discrepancies. A script might have to be written to test urls. Regular updates can be scheduled and a clear procedure can be created. An example is O’Reilly Safari.  **Very High**: The set requires significant cleanup and manipulation. New tasks need to be created in MarcEdit. Scripts might have to be written to test the urls. The set also needs more manual intervention because of the high level of inconsistency and accuracy. The sets are irregular. An example is TRAIL. |