MERLIN Quality Control Committee
July 16, 1997
LSO Conference Room

PRESENT: Jane Addison (UMC Health Sciences), Shirley Coleman (UMC),
Ann Dykas (UMKC)[recorder], Dennis Drieb (SLU HSL), Norma Fair (UMC
Ellis), Ellen Grewe (UMSL), Gloria Ho (UMR), Linda Hulbert (SLU HSL),
Janet Jackson (LSO), Ting James (UMR), Robin Kespohl (UMC), Rachelle
Leutzinger (UMKC Law), Patrick McCarthy (SLU Pius), Kathleen
Schweitzberger (UMKC), Vianne Sha (UMC Law), William Toombs (SLU Law),
Anna Zaidman (SLU Pius), Gary Harris (LSO), Vivian Lee (LSO).

Kathleen Schweitzberger opened the meeting. She gave official thanks
to Norma Fair and Robin Kespohl for getting the MQCC agenda out. We
went around and introduced ourselves.

The SLU Pius representatives are now Patrick McCarthy and Anna
Zaiduan.

I. REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM JUNE 11, 1997 MEETING. A few corrections
were made to the minutes.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS
Shirley Coleman has accepted a new position in Fort Collins, Colorado.
 She will remain at UMC through September.

Jane Addison announced that UMC HSL has a new director, Deb Ward. It
was noted that she can be invited to the MQCC meetings. Anyone can
come and observe.

Linda Hulbert reported that she had created an on-the-fly record with
an order record; when another location imported a record, the
on-the-fly record was not overlaid, as should have been done. She
didn't know if the new record was loaded via FTP. Janet Jackson
stated that the order record match based on OCLC number and title
phrase has been implemented.

Gary is at another meeting and will be late.

III. LSO REPORT

Janet did not have information on some of the items listed on the
agenda and George Rickerson and Kurt Kopp were not present. Janet
reported on the following.

III.B. LUMIN GPO LOAD. LSO is waiting for the load table to arrive
for GPO load.

III.E. OCLC EBS UPLOAD. Janet is working on the OCLC EBS upload.
Work was lost when the system crashed at the beginning of June. Janet
has created review files for incorrect ICODE1 and has had people look
at the review files to try to figure out how the incorrect codes are
getting into the records.

III.F. CATALOGER'S WORKSTATION. LSO has received one part for the
Cataloging Workstation; other parts are needed. Robin reminded the
group the Cataloging Workstation is a piece of software, not a
machine. Hardware and software are needed to make it run. Hardware
and software requirements were handed out at a previous meeting.
According to Robin, George Rickerson contacted III and they said we
would get training. Robin read that records can be updated or added,
but can't be downloaded. Janet reported that the software will mount
on individual machines. She will load the software on Sequoia and
libraries will load onto their individual machines. We have unlimited
licenses.

III.G. DUPLICATE CHECK FOR INTERACTIVE DOWNLOAD OF BIB RECORDS. Janet
Jackson sent out information about this via e-mail. There is not a
duplicate check for the daily OCLC batch load by Vivian daily. Do we
want to change this?

The group discussed the option of having a duplicate check and the
following points were made. We want the duplicate OCLC record loaded;
everyone wants to resolve duplicates manually to ensure that all
access points saved and to choose the better record. Fields 590 and
690 are protected, but other subject headings and added entries are
not protected. Can we match and attach with .b loader? Some
locations are not cataloging only interactively and do not want
editing done on OCLC to be lost. Two workflows may be needed:
Interactive download and OCLC cataloging. Locations still cataloging
on OCLC and producing cards are UMSL (for certain collections), SLU
Pius (will be discontinued soon), State Historical Society, UMC Law
(for everything), UMKC (for certain locations).

Vianne does not think that UMC Law will change their workflow in the
near future. She stated that they want to save their record from OCLC
and merge the two records on Merlin. When they get Catalogers
Workstation they may switch to cataloging on Merlin.

A duplicate check is not wanted for the OCLC load, but may be wanted
for interactive download. One possibility is to insert the record and
get a message in a box about possible duplicates. The information
would also show up on a report.

Currently machine matching is not occurring. Our options are: 1)
insert, insert, insert; 2) overlay; 3) insert and attach. Mary Burk
(III) did not give the option to insert, insert, insert in a
conversation with Janet on 4/21/97, but some present thought it must
be possible. The options were reviewed. The desired match for a
duplicate check is by OCLC no., title phrase, or both. We can't use a
duplicate check by title key with OCLC.

Janet will check on getting the following and will report back at the
next meeting.

1) For OCLC load, .b loader with duplicate check by OCLC number and
title phrase. If there is not match, insert; one match, insert; two

or more matches, insert.
2) For interactive transfer, a pop up status box with Bibliographic
Record numbers of possible duplicates.

Kathleen distributed the document entitled "Duplicate Check for
Interactive Download" / phone conversation with Mary Burk (III) and
Janet Jackson 4/21/97.

III.H. AUTOGRAPHICS LOAD. We need to discuss this here. Do we want
everything loaded as a duplicate or do we want a duplicate check based
on some field? We can throw away or keep matches.

Robin noted that the minutes say we want to keep duplicates; she
cannot remember why this was decided.   The group discussed this and
the following points were made: It doesn't make sense to spend time
resolving duplicates. Some records are so old; we might need to
compare duplicate records and choose the better record. Autographics
records have OCLC numbers. We can get a report of rejections, but
why get the list if the record was rejected?

The group decided to request a match on the OCLC number. If there is
not match, insert the record. If there is one match, reject the
record. If there are more than one matches, reject the record.

The records will be suppressed when they are loaded. They are going
in with no item records attached and will be unsuppressed when an item
record is added.

OTHER.

ICODE1 PROBLEM. Janet created a file of records with the ICODE1 not
equal to zero. There were 10-11,000 records with the ICODE1 not equal
to zero. She reviewed these and found ICODE1 codes that were not
consistent with the LOC code. She created review files for these.
More than 1,000 records had an ICODE1 greater than ten. Some reasons
for the incorrect ICODES follow: Some of these codes were entered
incorrectly. One problem that came to light is that people are
wanding in barcode numbers without first indicating that they want to
insert a field. (This needs to be pointed out to all who wand barcode
numbers, including circulation staff.)   Some people may be confusing
ICODE1 and ITYPE. Some may be generating new records based on another
location's records and not changing the ICODE1.

Janet will replace invalid ICODES with zero using rapid update. All
agreed that the errors should be wiped out.

Campuses were surveyed regarding their desire to review their ICODE1
Review File first.

Want to review:
UMR: Review File #26 (five records).
UMKC: Review File #62 (five records).
UMKC Law: Review File lost due to system problems. It had two
records. Janet will recreate the review file.

Reviewed and cleared:
UMC Ellis, UMC HSL, UMC Law, and UMSL have cleared their review files.

Request global update to change code to zero:
SLU Pius (not using ICODE1 to upload).

Barcode prefixes. Robin requested that all locations' barcode
prefixes be distributed. This would help in problem resolution. Most
of these are already in LUMIN Cataloging Standards, Appendix D.
Barcode prefixes not listed in the LUMIN Cataloging Standards are:
SLU Pius: 210; SLU Law: 220; SLU HSCL: 230; UMR (additional prefix):
051.

INTERACTIVE DOWNLOAD PROBLEMS. Kathleen asked if others had been
having problems with interactive download. Robin reported that they
had problems for a couple of days. Mike Harrell (UMKC) was able to
resolve some of UMKC's problems by changing the Passport setting for
timeouts from ten to sixty. Janet suggested that we might need to
change the retry setting if it is a network problem. We pay $0.25 for
exporting a record, whether the export is successful or not.

AUTHORITY RECORD OCA TRANSFER (with insertion of "OCA" before
numbers). Mary Burk (III) thought she found a problem in the load
profile, but her boss said that this was not the problem. The group
agreed that they would like a solution to the problem, if possible.

BNA. Vivian reported that records had been extracted to send to BNA.
There is a limit of 50,000 records for each batch. There are 120,000
recon records. She is waiting to hear when she can send more. She
got three files back yesterday, but does not have information on what
they are, and is waiting to hear from BNA about this.

BLIND REFERENCES. Vivian has Blind Reference reports through May 1997
and doesn't know what to do with them.

FURTHER UPDATES. Robin requested an update from George Rickerson and
Kurt Kopp on LSO update items that Janet was not able to address. It
was requested that this be done through a message on the MQCC list.

IV. MERLIN STANDARDS

Vianne Sha has proposed a new structure for MERLIN standards
documentation. This was distributed to those who did not have a copy
of it. Her background document (sent out last year) was
redistributed.

IV.A. REVISION ASSIGNMENTS.

MQCC members were given assignments to review and update LUMIN
cataloging standards as needed. The group reviewed the status of work
done on the revision of LUMIN cataloging standards.

LUMIN: Chapter 3. Standards for LC Subjects.
Assigned to: St. Louis Law.

Revision status: Richard Amelung is working on this chapter, according
to William Toombs.
Location in proposed structure: D.6.a.

LUMIN: Chapter 4. Standards for NLM Subjects.
Assigned to: SLU HSL.
Revision status: Linda Hulbert has a written draft.
Location in proposed structure: D.6.b.

LUMIN: Chapter 5. Standards for Form of Entry.
Assigned to: SLU Pius.
Revision status: Patrick McCarthy looked at it; it doesn't need major
overhaul.
Location in proposed structure: E.1.a.

LUMIN: Chapter 6. Standards for Bibliographic Description.
Assigned to: UMSL.
Revision status: A lot of changes are needed per Ellen.
Location in proposed structure: D.

LUMIN: Chapter 7. Standards for LC Subject Vocabulary File.
Assigned to: UMR.
Revision status: According to Gloria Ho, a lot of changes are needed.
The note fields not used in Merlin: split headings, narrow, related.
Gloria welcomes suggestions from others, as she has does not have much
experience with this. Norma pointed out that LUMIN didn't use MARC
and that much from Chapter 7 was not needed. Appendix II gives record
profiles. We can delete the mechanics from the local standards and
retain the examples. Kathleen reminded all to feel free to trade
assignments.
Location in proposed structure: E.3.a.

LUMIN: Chapter 8. Standards for NLM Subject Vocabulary File.
Assigned to: UMC Health Sciences.
Revision status: Jane Addison has a draft.
Location in proposed structure: E.3.b.

LUMIN: Chapter 9. Standards for Name Vocabulary File.
Assigned to: UMKC Law.
Revision status: Rachelle Leutzinger has a draft from Nancy Stancel.
Location in proposed structure: E.1.

LUMIN: Chapter 10. Standards for Series Titles Authority Records.
Assigned to:
Revision status: Norma Fair stated that this has been replaced by
"Authority Records: Series" which has been rewritten and is on MQCC
Web page.
Location in proposed structure: E.2.[b]

LUMIN: Chapter 11. Standards for Holdings.
Assigned to:
Revision status: According to Kathleen Schweitzberger, this needs
work. We need to wait on the work of MASCC and MCRC before
proceeding.

Location in proposed structure: G.

LUMIN: Chapter 12. Standards for Serials.
Assigned to: UMC Ellis.
Revision status: Norma Fair stated that a serials section is needed in
the proposed structure.
Location in proposed structure: D.7, C.1.a and b.

LUMIN: Chapter 13. Standards for Fixed Fields.
Assigned to: UMR
Revision status: Gloria Ho stated that there are not many problems
with this chapter. We will need to integrate format integration
changes. She wondered if we needed to music into scores and sound
recordings. The group thought that we did. Kathleen offered UMKC's
help.
Location in proposed structure: New Section F.

LUMIN: Chapter 14. Standards for Bibliographic Records for Music.
Assigned to: UMKC
Revision status: Kathleen stated that this needs to be rewritten.
UMKC will propose a method for handling analytics.
Location in proposed structure: D.9 [10].

LUMIN: Chapter 15. Standards for Interim Records.
Assigned to: UMSL
Revision status: Ellen stated that standards for on-the-fly records
has been written and standards for collection level records needs to
be written.
Location in proposed structure: H.1. On-the-Fly Records. H.2. Interim
Records.

LUMIN: Ch. 16. Standards for Local Subject Headings.
Assigned to: UMC Ellis.
Revision status: Norma Fair stated that we need this chapter. Only
small changes will be required.
Location in proposed structure: E.3.d.

LUMIN: Chapter 17. Standards for Genre Headings.
Assigned to: SLU Pius.
Revision status: Patrick McCarthy stated that SLU Pius doesn't use
genre headings, but they will look at this chapter. Genre headings
are used for UMC archives and rare books.
Location in proposed structure: E.3.c.

LUMIN: Appen A. Tags from Book, Serial, A/V, and Music Bibliographic
Records In LUMIN
Assigned to:
Revision status: Merlin bibliographic index rules replaces this, so
it is not needed. The rules can be put on the Web for ease of use.
Location in proposed structure:

LUMIN: Appen B. LUMIN Bibliographic Tags and Data Base Links.
Assigned to: UMKC.
Revision status: Kathleen stated that UMKC has looked at this yet.

Robin thinks that it is online already and is not needed. Janet
suggested that a statement giving the plan for updating the list on
Merlin needs to be written and all agreed with this.
Location in proposed structure:

LUMIN: Appen C. LCRI 21.30J As Amended for LUMIN
Assigned to: SLU Pius.
Revision status: Patrick stated that this seemed specific for LUMIN,
but SLU Pius will look at for Merlin.
Location in proposed structure: D.2.d and D.2.e. It was suggested
that CSB no. 71 be consulted.

LUMIN: Appen D. Standards for OCLC Input of 049 and 949 Tags.
Assigned to: UMSL.
Revision status: Ellen stated that some of this information needs to
be coordinated with other committees, e.g., standards for notes.
According to Robin this will be replaced. Kathleen observed that MARC
loading tables have information for 949.
Location in proposed structure: G.

LUMIN: Appen E. Guidelines for Recordings and Displaying Summary
Holdings Information in LUMIN.
Assigned to:
Revision status: Robin and Brenda Dingley (UMKC) will be working on
this. Patrick pointed out that the LIB HAS note will be automatically
updated when something from bindery is added if an approved format is
used. Robin wondered why we want a standard if there is a III
standard. Brenda Dingley (UMKC) will look at this with Robin.
Location in proposed structure: G.

LUMIN: Appen F. Local Subject Headings.
Assigned to:
Revision status: Norma stated that we need to keep this section.
Robin mentioned that there is agreement that local subject headings
are not used unless the committee has approved them; that is mentioned
in this section according to Norma. Currently approved local subject
headings are theses headings for UMKC and Ellis and headings for UMC's
comic collection.
Location in proposed structure: E.3.e.

IV.B. PROPOSED STRUCTURE.

Vianne proposed MERLIN Cataloging Standards includes chapters that
were not in the LUMIN Cataloging Standards. Vianne's proposal was
reviewed. Comments were made as follows.

A. Introduction. Kathleen will write.
B. MQCC Charge. This should come from the directors.
C.1.a. Monographic duplicates. Written.
C.1.b. Serials duplicates. Written.
C.1.c. Priority of cataloging centers. Not needed. The information
is in other documents.
C.2. Standards for accepting duplicate records. Needs to be written.
Linda volunteered to write it.

D.1. Introduction [Bibliographic Records]. Ellen volunteered to write this.

D.2.a. Guidelines for uniform titles. Will be discussed later in meeting.

D.3 Physical Description area. Standards are not needed. Delete.

D.5.b. Indexing of enhanced 505. Decision has been made, but it is not written up. We will also need information on 970. Ellen volunteered to write this.

D.7. Mixed materials. Standards need to be written. Hold until more people are cataloging these. (Renumbered as D.9. to accommodate insertion of other chapters.)

D.7.d. Usage of 006 field. A few people have used this field. Need discussion about when to use.

D.8. Facsimiles, Photocopies, Reproductions. Some of this information may be in the serial chapter.

D.8.a. Decision on accepting one record for both paper and reproduction records. Needs to be reconsidered.

D.10. Diacritics and Special Characters. Move to appendix section as Appendix 4.

E.2.a. Decision on BNA series field conversion from 440 to 830. Move to D.4 (Bibliographic Record section).

F. Fixed Length Data Elements. These should be in different chapters under Bibliographic Records and Authority Records or there should be links to those sections.

Appen I. Naming patterns. This has been written. Janet has file and will give it to Gary.

Appen II. Add notes to see specific location Merlin management information files. Gary will add.

Appen III. Distribution of Merlin Reports. Robin will write draft.

Add these documents:

C.3. Withdrawns. Add to structure.

C.4. OCLC holdings. Add to structure.

List of committee members and committee structure. Linda or Mike Cook may have this on disk. It can be linked to general committee information written by the directors.

D.[7]. Serials. Add before Mixed Materials. Norma will write.

D.[8]. Electronic resources. Write later.

D.? Music. UMKC will write. Put section above Facsimilies to keep with other formats.

Approvals. Not yet written. Assigned to UMKC.

Autographics. Robin is/will work on.

GPO. Written.

Bib order loader. Is in the minutes and needs to be written. Robin will write a draft.

BNA bib and authority work. Needed.

BCODES. Need section under Bibliographic Records. The values of some BCODEs are listed in Merlin management information.

ICODES. Need something. Link to OCLC holdings. ICODE1 is listed under OCLC holdings. The values of some ICODEs are listed in Merlin management information.

Vianne and Kathleen will discuss other changes, including the need for a section for visual materials, and non-music sound recordings, and

whether the structure should organized by format.

Vianne requests e-mail for other ideas. Kathleen requested that
drafts be distributed via e-mail before the next meeting. The
outdated standard does not need to be included.

IV.C. WEB VERSION. Gary suggested that letters not be used in the
numbering scheme for chapters and sections. Numbers only are easier
to see on the Web. This recommendation met with approval. Robin
distributed copies of the standards currently on the MQCC Web page.
Janet accessed it online at merlin.missouri.edu/los/mqcc_sta.htm and
demonstrated some of the links.

V. AUTHORITY WORK

V.A.1. BLIND REFERENCES. Robin distributed copies of a draft standard
entitled "MERLIN Standard: Blind References" dated 4/18. The group
read this and a few changes were suggested. Robin will incorporate
the suggestions. The group agreed that the document could be
considered "done" without an additional review. The group approved
the addition of this standard to the proposed structure at E.4.

V.A.2. SCHEDULE OF DISTRIBUTION FOR BLIND REFERENCES. Kathleen sent
out a list of the schedule. She will resend it. Vivian reported that
last week's heading may be lost, or George may have them. Vivian has
the lists for Nov 96 through May 97. Robin has June-Sept 96.
Kathleen has June 97. Vivian will distribute the lists she has
according to the distribution formula. She confirmed that SLU is
included in the formula.

V.B. UNIFORM TITLES

Kathleen asked if libraries are creating uniform titles on copy
cataloging, e.g., for translations, and are libraries creating
authority records for these titles. This was raised previously so
that people could find out what was being done at their libraries.

Norma reported that they are not creating authority structures. UMKC
has been creating them and suppressing them. No one else volunteered
that they are creating authority records. The group discussed the
need for a standard. Are authority records needed for translations.
Norma didn't see the need for authority records except for literary
works. This may be a judgement call. We are supposed to follow
national standards. We won't have records for vendor cataloging and
national standards may not be followed for adding uniform titles.

People assume that copy catalogers are adding 240s.

Kathleen will write a draft standard that states cataloging centers
are encouraged to add uniform titles and that they should be retained.

V.C. AUTHORITY SCOPING. According to Janet the problem is in
programming and a fix is being worked on. Janet is awaiting further

information. See Janet's e-mail message for more information.   Robin
wondered if all the problems are with author/title entries, as at
Ellis, the problem is with these. She suggested asking Laura Gayle
Green (UMKC).

V.D. 001. See agenda item III.

VI. BNA

VI.A. DUPLICATE AUTHORITY RECORDS. Project 5 had about three times
more duplicates than usual. Janet sent an e-mail message about this
dated July 9. The problem has to do with incorrect resquencing,
missed duplicates, etc. LSO can delete all the Authority Records by
authority Record number from. After discussion, the group decided to
have LSO delete the following loads, except for records with codes in
"a" fields: 4/25 series; 4/25 subject; 4/28 name.

VI.B. ASAP Service. There is dissatisfaction with the turnaround time
of the current BNA service. ASAP service options were discussed. Can
it be combined with ToC service for a 72 hour turnaround? This would
not include MeSH. What would be the time frame for the current
service if the manual review was dropped? What are other options for
MeSH? Linda confirmed that MeSH tapes could be loaded, but that would
lead to a lot of blind references. Could we have a separate contract
with BNA for MeSH? Janet stated that we need to have a minimum number
of records to avoid an extra charge and we might not have enough for a
separate contract. MeSH is updated annually; other updates have to be
done manually.   Linda stated that it seems like we would hit a 200
record minimum for records with MeSH, especially if this was done
quarterly. We need to verify what the minimum number of records is.

Robin will inquire and find out if we can have two different services,
what the minimum number of records is, and what the turnaround time
would be.

1) ASAP: ToC, LCSH only;
2) Regular authority (quarterly): ToC, LCSH and MeSH, or MeSH only.

Or

1) ASAP - ToC and LC;
2) regular MeSH. Most of these records would be processed twice since
most have LC.

According to Janet we send 20-30,000 records quarterly.

Kathleen asked if the group would recommend no manual review for
stream 2, if we recommended no manual review for stream 1. Robin
said, "no."

In response to a question about the percentage of records that get
ToC, Vivian reported that the following statistics from the report
received 10/14/96 on Project 3. The total number of records was
34,223.

No. Records	Imprint Date	ToC
16,862	Pre 1990	no enrichment
289	1990	1%
366	1991	4
538	1992	29
884	1993	44
1907	1994	41
13377	1995f	71

There is no way to tell how many were medical books.

Robin commented that information would be good for reference staff to
as it shows an added value service, and Linda commented that it could
be used for collection development. Janet agreed to send the
information to Merlin coordinators when she gets a report.

VII. SUPPRESSION OF $2
This will be discussed at the next meeting.

VIII. BCODE3 = R
Robin conduced a search on Merlin. No one is using BCODE3 = r. It
was recommended that this be removed from the BCODE3 code list. Janet
will remove it from the table.

IX. COLLECTION LEVEL RECORDS
Ellen distributed a collection level records standards draft. This
will be discussed at the next meeting.

X. OTHER

Electronic Resources:
* Jeff Swindells will be the MRSC representative on the MQCC
Subcommittee for Electronic Resources.
* MRSC recommended that Item Record STATUS=e (remote access). Further
recommendations are that the call number be "Electronic Resource" and
that the location be "Internet".
* UMKC Law is the only location cataloging Internet Resources.
* There will be some records for Internet resources on the Gov Docs
tape load.
* STATUS=e could also be used for online databases.

CLOSE
The meeting closed at 3:05 p.m. The next meeting will be held on
August 13, 1997.