Name Authority Co-op (NACO) Project

Judith G. Fenly

The name of our project, Name Authority Co-op (NACO), is something of a misnomer. The NACO project encompasses not only the agreements that the Library of Congress has with institutions for name authority records, but also the agreements with other institutions that contribute bibliographic records and series authority records to the LC database.

In describing the NACO project, I will cover name cooperation, bibliographic cooperation, and how NACO will use the Linked Systems Project (LSP) for the name authority agreements.

NACO

The goal of NACO is to produce a nationwide authority file which will support bibliographic cooperation with records which meet LC standards for quality. The first agreement was with the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) Library and dates to 1977.

In the mid-1970's LC was approached by a staff member from the Joint Committee on Printing of the U.S. Congress and asked to begin using GPO cataloging records (which are prepared for the *Monthly Catalog*) in lieu of creating its own cataloging records for U.S. Federal document monographs. The LC response was that the idea would provide significant savings to taxpayers only if GPO also used and contributed to LC's authority file. This condition would permit LC to accept GPO descriptive cataloging without costly adjustments to the headings in the access points. The parties concurred that this was a cost beneficial approach and NACO was born.

Judith G. Fenly is the Assistant Coordinator of Cooperative Cataloging Projects at the Library of Congress. Her talk at NCLA was sponsored by the Resources and Technical Services Section.

Since that time thirty-six more libraries have joined NACO. These libraries send representatives to LC for two weeks of training in LC practices and procedures regarding authority work. The libraries also agree to follow all LC *rule interpretations* and LC internal procedures in the preparation of the LC workform on which is recorded the data to be included in the machine-readable record.

In the early months of a library's NACO relationship, NACO reviews all records submitted. At a certain point, a formal documented review of a library's records takes place and an accuracy rate is determined. If that rate meets the LC standard, a library will be granted "independent status"; i.e., NACO will no longer review all records. A sampling of a library's contribution will be made on a predetermined periodic basis to determine continued adherence to the standard.

During the life of an agreement NACO provides LC's *rule interpretations* and internal procedures to a participating library via first class mail. Postage-paid mailing labels are also provided. And as part of the continual training process, NACO gives comment on individual records to each library.

There are problems, however, with maintaining a high-volume manual operation. It takes a long time for a record to get into the database when it must travel through U.S. Mail and then be re-keyed at LC. There is duplication of effort represented by the re-keying process. There are additional problems in terms of the timeliness and completeness of the copies of the database that LC sells. Whether these copies go out on MARC tape distribution or as microfiche copies of

the file, there are certain categories of authority records that are not included. One example of these records is the Early Notice Record (ENR). When an LC cataloger identifies a heading for addition to the authority file a workform is prepared. That workform has a carbon tear-off. This tear-off contains only the heading (1XX) and first sources found citation (670). The tear-off is removed and the information from it is keyed into the database. The resulting record is the Early Notice Record. When the full workform is approved it will be used to complete the ENR. This can take several weeks. The record is finally distributed on MARC tapes and microfiche. Obviously, there can be a significant time lag between the time a heading is identified and the time it is available for searching in copies of the LC database.

The goal of NACO is to produce a nationwide authority file.

Later on I will describe how we expect to resolve some of these problems using the technology of the Linked Systems Project. In spite of problems, NACO libraries have made a significant contribution to the nationwide authority file—nearly 165,000 records or 10 percent of the entire authorities database. Last year alone, the libraries contributed nearly 51,000 records.

Bibliographic Projects

As I said earlier, the primary reason for cooperating in authority database-building is to support the sharing of bibliographic records and to eliminate the costly adjustments to headings in the access points on those records. Those libraries contributing bibliographic records to LC also provide the supporting name and series authority records. In these projects, NACO conducts quality control in much the same way as for the authorities projects.

Two of our bibliographic agreements are conducted with other U.S. Federal agencies. The first was established with the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO) Library. This agreement took effect simultaneously with implementation of *AACR 2* at LC in January 1981.

GPO inputs all of its cataloging data to OCLC. When LC identifies a U.S. Federal document monograph for which it wants full cataloging (so that the item can be added to the general collections), the item is sent to NACO. NACO prints out the GPO cataloging record from OCLC. Because the interagency agreement does not cover subject cataloging, LC adds the LC subject headings and LC classification numbers to the GPO cataloging records. The LC-enhanced GPO record is then keyed into the LC cataloging database with the following legend in the 040$a: DGPO/DLC. The record is distributed via the MARC Distribution Service and, when it is loaded at OCLC, bumps the original GPO record. LC is using about twenty-five hundred GPO records for copy cataloging every year.

The Library of Congress also has an agreement with the National Library of Medicine (NLM) for descriptive cataloging data for medical CIP titles. Beginning in March 1984, the Cataloging in Publication (CIP) Division began sending pre-publication medical title galleys to NLM. NLM staff complete the LC CIP workform (including MESH headings and NLM class numbers) and supporting workforms for authority records and return them to LC via NACO. LC adds the LC classification number and LC subject headings. The records are then keyed into the LC cataloging database and distributed via the MARC Distribution Service. When the published book represented by NLM CIP cataloging is received at LC, LC staff complete the cataloging record, which is then redistributed. Because of the combination of effort between the two agencies in producing the record the 040$a reads DNLM/DLC. NLM is cataloging around three thousand titles per year under this agreement.

In addition to the GPO and NLM projects, which are carried out manually, there are agreements with two institutions which input and update records online to LC's computer catalog from remote terminals. These agreements include both descriptive and subject cataloging. Both were planned simultaneously and implemented in the spring of 1983.

Harvard University Library is inputting original cataloging and supporting authority records. Harvard also upgrades LC in-process cataloging records to full records. This upgrading process generally begins with a reader request at Harvard and ends in a bibliographic record ready for distribution. With both the original cataloging and the upgrading activities, LC uses Harvard records for copy cataloging. When an already-acquired or newly-acquired title is represented by a Harvard cataloging record in the LC cataloging database, the data and record are matched and are sent directly to the Shelflisting Section where (among other activities) cuttering is verified and the "Not

"What a difference Circulation Plus has made in our library!"

Kay Fireman
Milpitas H.S., Librarian

MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1331 E. Calaveras Boulevard · Milpitas, CA 95035 · (408) 945-2300
Milpitas High School
1285 Escuela Parkway, Milpitas, California 95035
(408) 262-3131
Gary Poulos, Principal

September, 1985

The New Follett Software Company
4506 Northwest Highway
Crystal Lake, IL 60014-7304

Attn: Chuck Follett

Re: Circulation Plus Software Program

Dear Mr. Follett,

I want to take this opportunity to thank your company for the fine software program, Circulation Plus. What a difference Circulation Plus has made in our school's library! I no longer keep circulation statistics, maintain reading records, or write overdue notices. Circulation Plus does it for me. Now I spend the majority of my time doing the professional duties I was trained to do.

Recently, I had the opportunity to go to work in another library. Believe it or not, one of my major reasons for not pursuing the new job was that I didn't want to leave my Circulation Plus behind!

Thanks too for the excellent service I have received from the Follett staff. I was a computer novice when I began, but, with your help, I found that any librarian can easily use Circulation Plus.

Please keep up the good work!

Sincerely,

Kay Fireman
Librarian

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

That's what Kay Fireman, a librarian from Milpitas, California, told the New Follett Software Company as she began her second year of using Circulation Plus.

Frankly, we're not surprised that Kay loves our fully automated hard disk circulation system. Letters from all over the United States attest to the fact that Circulation Plus is a real success among librarians.

Chances are you've already heard from your colleagues about Circulation Plus. But, just in case you haven't, here are a few facts: Circulation Plus is a complete hard disk circulation system using barcode technology. It runs on the Apple II, the IBM PC and the Tandy 1200 and can handle a library with up to 65000 books and 15000 patrons.

Best of all, Circulation Plus is *fully* expandable in the future. Soon Kay and other librarians will be able to use Circulation Plus to do textbook inventory, download MARC records, move to a full public access cataloguing record and use laser disc technology. And that is just the beginning!

Librarians will continue to receive fast, reliable service and help from our dedicated support staff.

Interested in Follett's vision of the future? We would like to send you a FREE demo disk that contains virtually all of the functions of Circulation Plus. Test the features and see how they meet the needs of your library. All you need do is call our toll-free number (800) 435-6170 today. While you are calling, ask for our latest library software catalog. It is full of excellent software programs to help librarians in the information age.

Kay is right. Circulation Plus *does* make a dramatic difference in today's library.

■

We would like to send you a FREE demo disk that contains virtually all of the functions of Circulation Plus. Call our toll-free number (800) 435-6170 today.

THE new FOLLETT SOFTWARE COMPANY

Follett Library Software
4506 Northwest Highway
Crystal Lake, IL 60014
(800) 435-6170 (815) 455-1100

in LC Collection" legend is removed from the record. The importance of this is that there needs to be no LC cataloger intervention in the copy cataloging process. Harvard is producing about fifteen hundred full cataloging records per year which bear their own NUC symbol (MH) in the 040$a.

The University of Chicago Library is also inputting bibliographic and authority records online. Their NACO cataloging universe represents the merger of the John Crerar Library with the University's science collection. The first phase of the LC-Chicago agreement was the retrospective conversion (RECON) of LC non-MARC cataloging records which represented titles in the merged collection. As part of the agreement, Chicago upgrades all access points in these records (including series) to *AACR 2*. This project enhances the LC cataloging database coverage of its own science collection. The second phase of the agreement is for the original cataloging of rare books. LC uses these latter records in the same way that we use Harvard records because the Chicago agreement also includes subject cataloging. Chicago is producing about eight thousand bibliographic records per year. Their RECON records bear the legend, DLC/ICU, in the 040$a, and the original records show their NUC symbol (ICU) in the $a.

At this time, a fifth bibliographic agreement is in the planning stages with the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Under this agreement Illinois will provide bibliographic data on workforms to LC for a defined set of Soviet Russian publishers. Illinois will input the data to OCLC, then mail the workform to LC where it will be matched with LC's copy of the book. Illinois will be providing LC subject headings, but because Illinois uses Dewey, LC will add the LC class number to the workform. LC will then input the record to our cataloging database. When it is distributed on MARC to OCLC the LC-enhanced version of the record will bump the original. This project is scheduled to commence with the receipt of titles with 1986 imprints and is expected to produce about twelve hundred bibliographic records per year.

Linked Systems Project

The Linked Systems Project (LSP) is the project to which I referred earlier as a vehicle for resolving some of the problems of timely access to a current copy of the nationwide authority file located at LC. LSP began with funding from the Council on Library Resources. There are now four participants: Research Libraries Group (RLG), Western Library Network (WLN), OCLC, and LC.

LSP is constituted of a set of computer-to-computer links permitting electronic transfer of records. It has two components: the Standard Network Interconnection (SNI) and the Authorities Implementation (AI). SNI comprises the computer protocols designed to support LSP.

Authorities Implementation (AI) is the first application of LSP and is the facility which will be used to directly support NACO operations. The purpose of AI is to maintain a consistent database of name authority headings replicated in several locations.

There are two features of AI which I will describe here. One is Record Transfer and the other is Intersystem Search and Response. Throughout the explanation of Record Transfer it should be borne in mind that (1) the Master File resides at LC with copies of it at each of the utilities; (2) any record being added to the Master File must pass LC computer validation prior to being added; and (3) no record will be distributed until it is approved for addition to the Master File.

Record Transfer is characterized by queues of records and by the fact that records are not sent from one location to another, but are requested and pulled by the receiving computer. The queues, which are sequential holding files of records, are distribution, which resides at LC; contribution, which resides at each of the utilities; and response, which resides at LC.

In spite of problems, NACO libraries have made a significant contribution to the nationwide authority file.

When a NACO library wishes to add a record to the nationwide authority file (i.e., Master File), the library will key the record into the database of the utility to which the library belongs. The record must pass any existing utility computer edits. The library will indicate that the record is for contribution and it will be placed in the contribution queue. LC will initiate a connection and poll the contribution queues at each utility daily. If there are records in a queue, LC will pull them across the link and attempt to load the records into the Master File. For each record coming across the link, a response record will be created indicating whether or not the records passed LC computer

validation for addition to the Master File. The positive response indicates only the pass, while the negative response provides the reason for failure. Response records go into a queue and every day each utility initiates a connection to LC's computer and pulls its own response records.

Simultaneously with passing LC computer validation and subsequent addition to the Master File, all records (LC-generated records included) are added to the the distribution queue. Every day each utility initiates a connection to the LC computer and pulls all records added to the distribution queue that day across the link and loads the records into their own computer.

When a library wishes to modify an authority record already residing on the Master File, essentially the same steps will be followed as for adding a new record. There are some restrictions, however. If a record is to be deleted, the library must request LC to make the deletion. If a 1XX is to be modified, prior permission from LC is needed.

To recapitulate the three queues in Record Transfer: *contribution* permits addition of and modifications to records in the Master File at LC from other locations; *response* permits LC not only to notify utilities of acceptance or rejection of records, but also the reasons for rejection; and *distribution* permits timely (within 24-48 hours) replication of the Master File in other locations and replaces tape distribution.

The second feature of AI is Intersystem Search and Response. This capability will permit, for example, a NACO library to query the authorities database at another LSP site using local utility terminals and search language. LSP will translate the search into the language of the target system and will retrieve records and transmit them in the USMARC Communications Format and then display them for the searcher in his/her local utility display format. This capability will be used by members of one utility to search non-NACO authority files on another utility. It will also be used by NACO to assist in quality control of the database and in answering participant queries.

Clearly, LSP will have a dramatic impact on NACO and its member institutions. The Early Notice Records that I described above have been approved for distribution across LSP (although not for tape distribution). There are other categories of records approved for LSP distribution. The constant distribution to and synchronization of the Master File copies located at the utilities will provide current access which can be defined in terms of hours, not weeks. That access will be available to all members of the utilities eventually, not just NACO members.

Internally, NACO will no longer have to deal with large volumes of U.S. Mail, and LC will no longer have to key records from the NACO libraries. Of course, quality control of the NACO contributions to the Master File will continue along the same lines as for manual contributions to the file.

The LSP member utilities are at various stages in the planning/testing/implementation cycle. RLG is already pulling and loading records from the distribution queue. The RLG library to begin contribution first will be Yale University Library. Contribution is scheduled for winter. OCLC is testing at the application level and expects to have its system ready for contribution and distribution this winter. The OCLC library to begin contribution first will be Indiana University Library. WLN is planning to implement all of the components of AI simultaneously. Implementation is scheduled for next summer.

Conclusion

For many reasons I look forward to the NACO-wide implementation of LSP and the electronic transfer of records to the nationwide authority file. It will make the file available on a timely basis to a large clientele. That timeliness will reduce further the duplication of effort among libraries and will promote the standardization of headings used in access points on bibliographic records. The latter will open the door for more bibliographic cooperation for more institutions. Further, efficiencies realized throughout the library community will free resources for the enlargement of the cooperative database building effort.