

# **UCAI:** **Challenges and Choices**

## **Digital Library Federation, Fall Forum 2003**

Presented by Esme Cowles

---

### **Goals**

- Ingest: convert three datasets to [VRA Core](#)
- Cluster: identify duplicates and create work units
- Prototype: Build a prototype database and interface

### **Ingest: Formats**

- Three formats: [MARC](#), [SGML](#), [FoxPro](#)
- XML the logical choice
  - MARC: [MARC4J](#) (aka JAMES)
  - SGML: only needed XML declaration
  - FoxPro: exported tables as XML files
- Character encoding
  - MARC: [ANSEL](#)
  - SGML/FoxPro: Latin-1

### **Ingest: Schemas**

- Flat v. hierarchical
- Variation within datasets
  - SGML is from a union catalog
  - MARC contains artifacts of previous migration
- Semantic fuzziness
  - MARC less granular than art-specific VRA
  - Noun v. Adjective forms, capitalization
- FoxPro tables not designed for direct access

### **Ingest: XML Processing**

- [SAX](#) to break up large XML files into record-level fragments
- [XSLT](#) for schema transformation

- [Embedded Java function calls](#) for low-level text processing

## **Ingest: Future Work**

- Non-programmer mapping
- Need to handle hierarchy references, precedence rules, formatting, etc.

## **Clustering: Bottom-Up**

- Partitional clustering
- Too many records to compare round-robin
  - Use search engine to get a list of candidates
- False negatives very problematic
  - Start with inclusive measures
  - Use other measures to get better granularity

## **Clustering: Similarity Measures**

- Title
  - [Fuzzy matching](#) v. aggressive normalization
  - Thesaurus helpful, but not sustainable
- Creator
  - Fuzzy matching v. last name comparisons
  - Controlled vocabulary
- Date
  - Not present in many records (10-15%)
  - Missing values difficult to resolve in general

## **Clustering: Top-Down**

- Use SGML work units as bins
- Not a total solution because not all records will match
  - These records will need to be clustered independently anyway

## **Prototype: First Round**

- [Xindice](#)
  - Open source, great API (xml:db)
  - Slow, buggy, immature
- [Tamino](#)
  - Good performance overall, established

- Problems with large result sets
- [TeraText](#)
  - Best performance
  - No Linux version, limited APIs
- [Lucene](#)
  - Search engine, not a database
  - Fast, full-featured

### **Prototype: Lucene + Xindice**

- All open source, Java
- Solid performance
- Fatal Flaw: character-encoding bugs

### **Prototype: [Oracle XMLDB](#)**

- 9i XML features
- Fulltext searching
- Good performance
- Awkward API (JDBC, SQL, CLOBs)
- High-availability and hybrid possibilities

---

Last Modified: 2003.11.18