

Discussion questions on Monographic Aggregators

From Kate Harcourt, Chair, TG on Monographic Aggregators

BIBCO OpCo

Washington, DC

May 6, 2005

The TG would find it most helpful to have input on these questions:

1. Is there a mechanism to harmonize values where possible in MARC fields for vendor supplied/created bib records? Should a new group consider the various proposals by the TG on Monographic Aggregators, TG on Journals in Aggregator Databases, and LC's guidelines for access level records? Leader bytes 17, Encoding level, and 18, Descriptive Cataloging Format, are of particular importance.

LC's access level records uses:

Leader 17 EL 3 = Abbreviated level

Leader 18, DCF a = AACR2.

Is DCF = a appropriate for machine generated records?

TG on Mono Aggregators uses:

Leader 17 EL 3 = Abbreviated level

Leader 18, DCF i = ISBD

TG on Journals in Aggregator Databases 2nd report uses:

Leader 17 EL z = Not applicable

Leader 18 DCF u = Unknown

TG on Journals in Aggregator Databases 3rd report uses:

Leader 17 EL = code for the source record

Leader 18 DCR = code for the source record

2. Does encoding level 3 need a redefinition to include machine derived/generated records? OCLC's policy on level 3 includes the statement, "Please note that Encoding Level 3 is intended to be used only for particular projects such as OCLC's Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) project."

Some institutions have been using level 3 as they define it locally for such things as backlog reduction projects. Columbia uses K and changes to 3 in their local system. When in-house level 3 records upload to OCLC, the value is automatically changed to M so cataloging level is not apparent to other catalogers.

3. What role will PCC play in working with vendors? Will BIBCO libraries be asked to partner with a vendor to ensure that metadata is useful? Will vendors just be advised that there is a brochure or information on a website?

4. Is there a way to clarify the use of the 534 Original Version Note field in answer to the varied responses to the survey?

PCC Standing Committee on Automation
Monograph Aggregator Task Group
Interim Report—format edited for distribution to OpCo 2005
March 2005

Task Group Members

Becky Culbertson (UCSD), Kate Harcourt (Columbia)—Chair, Kit Herlihy (CSUSM)

Introduction

The PCC SCA Monograph Aggregator Task Group's (hereafter referred to as the TG) first task was to review, for monographs, the data elements in machine-derived and machine-generated monograph records found in the Final Report of the 2nd [and 3rd] Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases to see which elements are applicable in light of recent developments in practices in cataloging for both born-digital and digitized monographs.

The TG hopes that the questions raised in this interim report will be discussed within the PCC Standing Committee on Automation (SCA) and with others in the electronic resources cataloging community and that those discussions will inform our next task of developing reference tools for information providers.

Progress Summary

The TG began by discussing categories of records in existing aggregator databases. We found that the e-book world contains complexities differing from those addressed by the serials task groups. Most catalogers and vendors begin by determining whether an e-book is born digital, a new edition of a print publication or a reproduction. Some catalogers simply add a URL for the electronic resource to an existing print record. Sometimes this is done even if the library involved does not own the resource in print. On the other hand, catalogers taking the separate electronic record approach (and copy for a print/microform version exists) have the choice of either describing the e-book and referring to the original or describing the original and referring to the reproduction. Most of our catalogs contain all types of records. A typical OPAC may have records from NetLibrary which follow LCRI 1.11A using a 533 field, records from Documenting the American South which describe the electronic version and reference the original in a 534 field and GPO records which use 530/776 fields. The variety of cataloging approaches is confusing but the TG does not advocate one treatment over another. Ultimately cataloging style is not as important as the availability, accuracy and timeliness of records.

In addition, a new breed of “cataloging record” is in the works. An increasing amount of monographic material is born digital or is a digitized version of grey literature which was not routinely cataloged in the past. The Serials TG made the recommendation that “where no copy exists in the OCLC database for any version of a given title, ... catalogers make it a priority to contribute either an e-version or a tangible version to be cloned.” Given

the sheer volume of monographic material that is or will be in digital format, the lack of an equivalent to the CONSER database for monograph records and the increased demand for access to electronic grey literature, the TG believes that having catalogers provide source records for all this material is not a viable option. It should be noted that the level of analysis wanted for databases such as LexisNexis is deeper than has been the practice in print.

The TG has begun to conceptualize a model for original record creation by vendors. We studied the Library of Congress's guidelines for access level records and their use of Web Cat Assistant. We looked at how Columbia University has begun to machine massage vendor metadata to create MARC records for CIAO and how UCSD uses constant data and templates in cataloging. It is clear that the bibliographic expertise of vendors and publishers varies widely. The basis of the cataloging record will range from a vendor's proprietary metadata or automatically harvested metadata to bibliographic data cloned from cataloging copy all the way up to the highest level of full level cataloging provided by contract with a PCC library. Given this range, the TG proposes that certain key data elements are functionally required in all vendor created electronic records. As is the case in the core record standard, a vendor depending upon skill level, data source and customer demand can have the option to include additional elements up to a full level record. There is a growing sense that a traditional cataloging record in some cases actually hinders access to materials that are only a click away from the user. Therefore our main concerns are ease in record creation, functionality and timeliness, not the fullness of the record.

The TG proposes that a simplified version of the LC access record model be extended to vendor created records. Since cataloger involvement may be minimal or non-existent, the TG did not feel that the Library of Congress's core data elements for access records could be recommended as is. Instead, Appendix A lists mandatory and optional MARC data elements. A vendor can create machine-derived records if copy exists or create machine-generated MARC records if copy does not exist in varying degrees of fullness. If a vendor is unable to create MARC records, the model can be used as a guide to creating usable metadata which can be converted to MARC by a library partner. In some situations, the vendor could use templates provided by the PCC (examples attached in Appendix B). Templates could be customized for academic, public, medical libraries, etc. They can be "made to order" for a particular record set and include appropriate subject headings and access points.

The mechanics of record creation clearly will need further work.

The TG also realizes that cataloging titles using LCRI 1.11A is a very attractive, easy and cost efficient option for vendors when cataloging copy exists and the electronic resource is a reproduction or a close substitute. Appendix C outlines fields to be accepted as is and fields to be manipulated or added.

Appendix A

FREVR (Functional Requirements for Electronic Vendor Records) Data Element Set

Since the Serials TG used the CONSER database for source records, it was not necessary to consider classification, authority control or subject analysis. For monographs, vendors and customers will need to reach understanding and agreement on what can realistically be provided as more and more aggregations will consist of machine generated rather than machine-derived records. The TG recognizes that some vendors will be unable or unwilling to assume costs in these areas and that libraries may be unwilling to pay more for higher quality records. It is assumed that contractual obligations will keep most record sets out of the utilities.

APPENDIX A

Vendor created records using the LC access record model, simplified.

1. Machine-Derived from another edition record [not a reproduction] - Data Elements
2. Born digital - vendor supplies data

*M=Mandatory A=Mandatory if Applicable O = Optional

Field	Name	Value	M/A/O*	Vendor Action
Leader O6	Type of record	a	M	
Leader O7	Bibliographic level	m	M	
Leader 17	Encoding Level	3	M	
Leader 18	Descriptive cataloging form	i	M	
OO1	Control number		M	Assign alpha/numeric CN
OO3	Control number identifier		O	add if obtained from LC
OO6	Additional material characteristics			Use fill characters for other bytes
	Byte 00	m	M	
	Byte 09	d	M	
OO7	Physical description fixed field (Electronic Resource)			Use fill characters for other bytes
	Byte 00	c	M	
	Byte 01	r	M	
	Byte 04	n	M	

008	Fixed field data elements			retain from copy except for bytes 23,39. If original use fill character except for below.
	Byte 06	s	M	
	Bytes 07-10		M	do not retain from copy
	Bytes 14-17 Place of publication		M	retain from copy or use MARC code list for countries
	Byte 23		M	do not retain from copy
	Bytes 35-37 language		M	retain from copy or use MARC code list for languages
	Byte 39 Cataloging source	d	M	
OXX	OXX fields			do not retain from copy unless listed below
O20	ISBN		A	add if e-ISBN
O40	Cataloging Source		O	add code if obtained from LC
O41	Language code		O	retain from copy
O43	Geographic Area Code		O	retain from copy
O50 4	Library of Congress class number		O	retain from copy or supply if possible
1XX	Personal or Corporate Author		A	retain from copy or supply. NAF check desirable for supplied headings.

240	uniform title		O	retain from copy
245 \$a, etc.	Title		M	retain from copy or supply
245 \$h	Medium	[electronic resource]	M	Follows \$a (See placement rules in appendix c)
246 30	Varying form of title		A	retain from copy; supply if important for access
250	Edition statement		O	do not retain from copy
260	Publication/Distribution		O	LC access record does not require; desirable
300	Physical description \$a		O	do not retain from copy; do not supply
4XX	Series		O	retain from copy or supply using 440. NAF check desirable for supplied headings
5XX	Notes		M	retain from copy except as below
538	System details note	Mode of access: World Wide Web.	M	
506	Restrictions on access note		A	
530	Additional physical format available	Also available in print.	O	do not retain from copy & add if using copy
540	Terms governing use		O	
550	Issuing body note	Digitized and made available by...	O	
6XX	Subject headings or keywords		A	retain from copy; prefer LCSH; keywords in 653 if LCSH not possible
655 0	Genre/Form term	Electronic books	O	
7XX	Other added entries		O	retain from copy or supply. NAF check desirable for supplied headings

8XX	Series		0	retain from copy
856	Electronic location & access		M	delete from copy; add vendor url as 856 40

TG Recommendations For Vendors

- Use encoding level 3 (byte 17) for reasons cited by the Library of Congress (LC) “Access Level” Project Team. The TG, however, prefers DCF i (byte 18) to LC’s recommended DCF a. (This appears to be a change from previous thinking?) It may be reasonable to expect vendors to follow ISBD conventions so that the records integrate more seamlessly into our OPACs but it does not seem appropriate for them to vouch for AACR2 compliancy. It is necessary for vendors to make it clear to customers when the records are not full catalog records. The encoding level could also be a means to flag records for in-house upgrade. The extension of the use of encoding level 3 in conjunction with DCF i needs wider discussion but it seems extremely important to easily identify machine-generated records. The TG seeks PCC advice on bytes 17 and 18 because this recommendation is at odds with LC and the 2nd and 3rd reports by the TG on Journals in Aggregator Databases. The 2nd report uses byte 17 z and byte 18 u and the 3rd report uses codes for the source record.
- Consider searching the NAF for headings or make use of an authority control vendor such as Library Technologies, Inc. (LTI). Authorship information alternatively could be recorded in a note field for keyword access if a name heading can not readily be established.
- Include fields to identify the aggregation, e.g., a 710 for publisher/vendor, a series or uniform title. The TF discussed using 79X and other local fields instead of standard MARC fields but such fields would not index with other headings and could not easily be brought under authority control. On the other hand, using a local field ensures that the field can be preserved in bibliographic overlay. This is another area where the TG asks for guidance. The PCC could play a valuable role in advising the vendor which field(s) to use in a particular record set. A PCC library could establish any new headings in the NAF.
- Include provision for a unique record identifier for ease in loading, removing and updating record sets. This could be in a local 9XX field or 035 and be added either by the vendor or the library.
- Partner with a library in creating record specifications for new aggregations or to assist in mapping metadata to MARC. Columbia, for example, maps CIAO keyword metadata to LCSH for EPIC.
- If a partner is not an option, seek advice from the PCC before creating record sets.
- Use tools such as Classification Plus to provide a class number
- If appropriate, harvest records from the Library of Congress Catalog. Appendix A does not include instructions for adjusting OCLC or local fields.

Appendix B: Sample Templates

Color code:

Basic: black [absence of caption indicates the lines are black]

More complex: blue [caption “blue” in square brackets supplied to blue lines below]

Complex: green [caption “green” in square brackets supplied to blue lines below]

PCC TG Template 1 (Basic)

```
MARC Leader  #####nam 22#####3i 45e0
001 control number
006 m d
007 cr
008 050311s2005* xxu s 000 0 eng d
040 <vendor NUC code> $c <vendor NUC code>
100 1 Last name, First name.
245 10 Main part of title $h [electronic resource]
250 Ed. statement (if applicable)
260 Place of publication of electronic version : $b Publisher of electronic version, $c <date of
publication of the electronic version>
538 Mode of access: World Wide Web.
500 Title from <table of contents> (example)
710 2 Package Name.
856 40 $u URL for database (or individual resource)
```

*date of publication of reproduction

PCC TG Template 2 (more complete cataloging)

```
MARC Leader  #####nam 22#####3i 45e0
001 control number
006 m d
007 cr
008 050222s2005 xxu s 000 0 eng d
040 <vendor NUC code> $c <vendor NUC code>
100 1 Last name, First name (verified in LCNAF) [parens in blue]
240 10 Uniform title (if applicable) [blue]
245 10 Main title $h[electronic resource] : $b sub-title / $c author (in direct order)
250 Ed. statement (if applicable)
260 Place of publication of electronic version : $b Publisher of electronic version, $c date of
publication of the electronic version.
538 Mode of access: World Wide Web
500 Title from...
500 Indication of differences from the original (if appropriate) [blue]
534 Transcribed from: $a Author. $t Title. $c Place of publication of original : Publisher of
original, date of publication of original. $e Pagination of original [blue]
504 Includes bibliographical references and author index.
653 Uncontrolled subject term. [blue]
710 2 Package name. [blue]
856 40 $u URL linked to individual resource [“linked to ...resource” in blue]
```

PCC TG Template 3 (complete cataloging)

MARC Leader #####nam 22#####3i 45e0

001 control number

006 m d

007 cr

008 050222s2005 xxu s 000 0 eng d

040 <vendor NUC code> \$c <vendor NUC code>

050 4 LC Classification number [green]

060 4 NLM (optional--depending on audience) [green]

082 04 Dewey (optional—depending on audience) [green]

100 1 Last name, First name (verified in LCNAF) [parens in blue]

240 10 Uniform title (if applicable) [blue]

245 10 Main title \$h[electronic resource] : \$b sub-title / \$c author (in direct order)

250 Ed. statement (if applicable)

260 Place of publication of electronic version: \$b Publisher of electronic version, \$c date of publication of the electronic version.

538 Mode of access: World Wide Web

500 Title from...

534 Transcribed from: \$a Author. \$t Title. \$c Place of publication of original : Publisher of original, date of publication of original. \$e Pagination of original [blue]

520 Summary (possibly abstract) [green]

504 Includes bibliographical references and author index.

600-651 LC subject headings (verified) [green]

7XX Other appropriate name/title headings. [green]

710 2 Package name. [blue]

776 Information (if applicable) about other physical forms in a horizontal relationship (e.g., ISBN, Library of Congress numbers, etc.) [green]

856 40 \$u URL linked to individual resource [“linked toresource” in blue]

APPENDIX C

Specifications for vendor created bibliographic records from a source record, using LCRI 1.11A for reproductions or machine derived from another record applying LCRI 1.11A for reproductions follow many of recommendations made for serials.

The following fields will be taken from the source record as is. The source record may be the record for the print, the microform, or the CD-ROM version of the title. Fields not listed here or in the subsequent chart, 'Fields modified or added', will not be carried forward from the source record.

MARC tags to carry forward: leader*, 003, 008*, 010*, 013, 015, 016, 017, 018, 020, 024, 025, 026, 027, 028, 030, 032, 033, 035, 040*, 041, 043, 044, 045, 046, 050*, 052, 055, 060, 066, 070, 072, 074, 080, 082, 084, 086, 088, 100, 110, 111, 240, 245*, 246, 250, 260, 300, 440, 490, 500, 501, 502, 504, 505, 513, 520, 521, 522, 526, 536, 546, 585, 586, 600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 700, 710, 711, 730, 740, 800, 810, 811, 830.

*Tags with an asterisk are also included in the table below.

MARC tags listed to be added or modified by vendor:			
Field & Name		Value	Vendor action
Leader: all values are taken "as is" from source record except: byte 17	Byte 17	3	
<u>001 - control number</u>			Assign alpha numeric CN
<u>006—computer files/electronic resources</u>			Use fill characters for other bytes
	byte 00	M	supply
	byte 09	d	supply
<u>007--electronic resource</u>			Use fill characters for other bytes
	byte 00	C	supply
	byte 01	R	supply
	byte 04	N	supply
<u>008 - fixed-length data elements--general information</u> ; transfer data except for the following:			
	Byte 23	s	Supply
020 ISBN	ISBN carried forward		Move to 776\$z
	e-ISBN		Supply in \$a
<u>040 - cataloging source</u>			add vendor code if

			obtained from LC
<u>050 - Library of Congress call number</u>	050 4	transfer data	Retain
<u>245 – title statement</u>	remove pre-existing \$h subfield, unless it is electronic resource.	Insert “\$h[electronic resource]” to follow subfields \$p, \$n, \$a if they exist.	Adjust
<u>530 - additional physical form available note</u>			Delete if present
<u>533 – reproduction note</u>			
	\$a	Electronic reproduction	Supply
	\$b	location of vendor/publisher	Supply
	\$c	vendor name	Supply
	\$d	date of reproduction	Supply
	\$f	series statement of reproduction	Supply - optional
	\$n	note about reproduction	Add Mode of access: World Wide Web
<u>776 - additional physical form entry</u>			
	\$c	Original	
	\$z	ISBN	
	\$w record control number:	(DLC)	[LCCN]
<u>856 - electronic location and access</u>			Delete from copy. Code as 856 40

TG Recommendations for Continuing Work

We would like advice on how to proceed when multiple practices exist. For example, access restrictions can be coded in 506 or 856 \$z (or both) and there isn't a strong sense in the TG that one way is better than the other but it would be preferable to recommend one practice to our vendors. As mentioned previously, we need advice when our recommendations are in actual conflict those of LC or the TG on Journals in Aggregator Databases.

Our TG does not have the necessary expertise in the logistics of vendor record creation. We will need help from another source or any actual implementation of our recommendations will need to be planned by another task group.

It would also be useful to appoint another committee member or advisor who has experience in publishing PCC materials to help us to "project approximate costs and options for design, printing and distribution" of the brochure for vendors. The TG wonders if creating a new NISO standard in addition or instead of a brochure might reach a wider audience and be of more lasting value.

Appendix D

FIELD 534 for Electronic Reproductions

During the course of preparing this TG report, one of the sticking points that came up is the ambiguity of MARC field 534. At present, this field is bypassed entirely when using the RI 1.11A, but can be used if cataloging a reproduction without using the rule interpretation. We are open to discussion at this point as to whether we can "stretch" this definition to include "versions" as well. The MARC21 field definition and scope for the 534 (Original Version Note) reads:

“This field contains information that describes the original production of a work. The reproduction is described in the main portion of the bibliographic record. Details relevant to the original are given in field 534 when they differ from the information describing the reproduction.”

In assessing records in the OCLC databases which either contain this field (or could), the TG has determined that the field does have the possibility of being useful in vendor records. The problem is that we don't know if the scope can be “stretched” enough to include electronic resources that are more “versions” than “reproductions.” We seek PCC advise and include our survey and selected responses for discussion.

We sent out a questionnaire to a number of catalogers and, to no one's surprise, we received widely varying answers. Responses quoted (but not directly attributed) below were received from Paul Weiss, Jay Weitz, Adam Schiff and Michael Chohey.

Questionnaire:

If you were setting up a record template for a version that was an SGML-encoded and manually keyed text, would you consider stretching the use of the term "reproduction" in the above definition to include using the field in the record (even though it is not really a reproduction?)

An example is this record for an SGML manually encoded version:

```
040 UK-CbPIL|cUK-CbPIL|dCUS
100 1 Alford, Henry, |d 1810-1871
245 10 Poems and poetical fragments |h [electronic resource]
260 Cambridge [England] : |b Chadwyck-Healey, |c 1992
500 Preliminaries omitted; verse reproduced elsewhere in English Poetry omitted
534 |p Transcribed from: |a Alford, Henry, 1810-1871. |t Poems and poetical
fragments|cCambridge : J. & J. J. Deighton, 1833. |e vi, 97 p
540 (c) 1992 Chadwyck-Healey. Do not export or print from this database without
checking the Copyright Conditions to see what is permitted
```

_____ I would accept the 534 field as is.

_____ If I were creating a record set I would not use this field, but would use _____

_____ I would not use a transcribed note

Opinions and comments of the catalogers ranged as follows:

Arguments in favor of using field 500:

1. One cataloger reluctantly came to the conclusion that most information could go into the 500 field. "The definition of the MARC 21 field 534 does seem to be inclusive of notes for any type of "original". I started to write that the first two sentences were not quite in synch with each other (the first one saying the field can be used for any original, the second implying that the field is only to used for originals of reproductions), but I remembered that MARC's terminology does not necessarily follow AACR2/LCRI definitions. So, in the broad sense, MARC may indeed view your situation as a reproduction, even though AACR2/LCRI does not.

It does seem a bit unfortunate to me that the information in the 500 and the 534 in the example below are in two different fields, since the information seems related, and more useful together than separate. I would probably combine these into one note, and therefore tag it 500, drop the pagination, and merge the two clauses in your 500:

500 |aTranscribed from: Alford, Henry, 1810-1871. Poems and poetical fragments. Cambridge : J. & J. J. Deighton, 1833. Preliminaries and verse reproduced elsewhere in English Poetry omitted.

Part of the issue of how to tag data, especially notes, is what use you have for that data. If you think you want to index, create a list, etc., from a particular data element, the more finely content-designated 534 might work better for you."

2. Another cataloger spoke of the Library of Congress' conclusion not to use field 534. The definition of MARC 21 field 534 has always been murky, and as a result, many institutions including LC have decided not to use it. Here is part of a message about that very topic from LC's Kay Guiles, which the cataloger received on 2004 October 7:

This is to confirm that LC policy is not to use field 534 for notes relating to original or previously published versions. At the time 534 was developed we were making some changes in the content of these notes and in the way we recorded that information (this was years ago). We were leery of using a highly structured note with detailed content designation and saw no compelling data

manipulation reasons to use the field. We decided not to use it and instead use 500. If it occurs in an imported record used for copy cataloging, we do not ask catalogers to change it but "pass it through." We continue to prefer the flexibility in formulating the note that the use of 500 offers.

DCM B13 has been revised, updated, and reorganized. The revision is still in draft form. DCM B13.5 (Appendix 2: Data Element Checklist) is now the source of our policy. The checklist is presented in such a way that it is intended to state the data elements LC actively supplies, the ones we do not actively supply but retain ("pass through"), and the ones we delete (there are very few of these, e.g., field 026 (Fingerprint Identifier). At field 534 we use the code that means "pass through data element" with the comment "LC uses 500."

Then the cataloger went on to say that he felt the definition of 534 was probably vague enough to cover your instance (which has been, of course, part of the historical problem with the field), although I'm not at all sure that covering such an instance was really its intention. My own inclination would be to more clearly describe exactly what's going on (including the fact that the "reproduction" is "SGML-encoded and manually keyed" rather than a facsimile or other similar sort of reproduction) in a 500 note that combined aspects of both your 500 and 534 notes.

Arguments in favor of accepting/using the 534

3. Another cataloger made the following comment that he felt the field could be used for things that are not necessarily true reproductions. "One of the examples given in the Standard is "Reprint. Originally published:... If the field can be used for reprints as well as reproductions, then I think it would be ok to accept as used above."

4. A fourth cataloger felt that we could get away with using a 534 for this data, "even though a manual re-keying is not what we usually consider a reproduction. I guess I'm used to thinking of 534 as a sort of the inverse of 533, but , a reprint would not be covered

by the scope of 533, so maybe I've been thinking too narrowly about the use of 534. At any rate, the note you have here certainly is an

"original version note," so, like you say, I guess it's a question of stretching the definition of reproduction. Or maybe it's not even the stretch we think it is -- the definition of "reproduction" in the footnote to 1.11 seems to be leaving the door open for applying the definition to "non-mechanical reproductions," perhaps including re-keyings. To wit: "a reproduction is a manifestation that replicates an item (or a group of items) or another manifestation (e.g., a reprint with no changes) that is intended to function as a substitute. The reproduction may be in a different physical format from the original.

Reproduction is generally a mechanical rather than an intellectual process ... reproductions are usually made for such reasons as the original's limited availability, remote location, poor condition, high cost, or restricted utility ... Cataloger judgment will be required to distinguish electronic reproductions from electronic republications or simultaneous publication in analog and digital form ... Other non-facsimile electronic reproductions may also be considered under this LCRI when they purport to be a reproduction of the original and can serve as a surrogate for the original."

That would seem to allow for this type of reproduction. The other option I guess would be a 500 "edition history" note, but I always prefer to use a formatted, subfielded, special-purpose MARC tag whenever possible (for the sake of enabling good display constants and for cross-walking to another metadata standard if necessary), and the 534 would serve the purpose it's intended to serve here, so I would recommend it for this case.

Z:\pcc\OpCo\OpComtg2005\Tgmonoagg_int.doc April 29, 2005