

December 20, 1996 meeting of the Merlin Acquisitions-Serials Committee at the Library Systems Office, Columbia

## MINUTES

Note: all decisions we took are in CAPITAL LETTERS.

The meeting began with a request by Janet Jackson of the Library Systems Office that we should elect a chair. Brenda Dingley of UMKC was nominated and elected unanimously. Hunter Kevil of MU volunteered to prepare the minutes.

Janet noted that there were additions to the list of agenda items she had distributed. A beta release of version 10.1, a maintenance or bug-fix release, would take place Monday December 23. It will handle scoping, barcode verification, and sundry other bugs. A special help desk just for the UM system will be set up for two weeks. A question was asked of Janet: Did the Coordinators in their meeting the previous day make a recommendation as to how committees such as ours should proceed with decisions that possibly would have consequences outside of Acquisitions and Serials? Janet replied that the coordinators had anticipated that several issues would indeed cross committee lines. In those cases the committee chairs should collaborate with the coordinators or attend the coordinators meetings. A listserv for our exclusive use is being set up. All postings will automatically be copied to the coordinators' list. Only Brenda in her capacity as chair will be able to post to foreign listservs. If we are posting an item requiring some kind of action, it would be a good idea to put 'action item' or 'voting issue' in the subject field. It is up to us whether and when we meet, and when to use the listserv, our Web page being prepared by Janet, or e-mail instead of a meeting. By the end of the day, it was DECIDED THAT WE WOULD NEXT MEET WEDNESDAY APRIL 2, 10 AM at the LSO offices. The feeling was that occasional face-to-face meetings would be useful and that between now and the next meeting communication by e-mail, listserv, posting to our Web page &c would work just fine.

Discussion next turned to topics affecting us from the Coordinators' meeting the previous day. We are encouraged to think of enhancement requests to be presented to Innovative; all our ideas should be ranked in priority order before we submit them. The Coordinators asked us to discuss approval loading and the standards for inactive check-in records. Since UMKC is the only library that will be using approval loads before next July, it was DECIDED THAT THE QUESTION OF APPROVAL LOADS WOULD BE DISCUSSED AT OUR NEXT MEETING. WE DECIDED TO INVESTIGATE INACTIVE CHECK-IN RECORDS IN THE SPRING.

Agenda item 1. Copy cataloguing of monographs in acquisitions.

This item and the next two are from Pat McCarthy. He would like these to be thoroughly discussed at some point, not necessarily at this meeting. Jack Montgomery recounted his experience with determining how to choose from several available OCLC records for downloading. The choice is in

practice not difficult. Richard Amelung from SLU said that we now can load full MARC records at the order point. These records will have all access points. If any of these access points are new, they will wind up on the New Headings Report. So long as there is no CDATE in the bibliographic record, the records will not be shipped to B/NA for processing. Each campus can decide whether to suppress these records. If there is a barcode in the item as it is being processed in the Cataloguing department, the operator can use it to pull up the correct record. Questions: what if different institutions have different hierarchies regarding the 'goodness' of an OCLC record? Approval bibs are loaded automatically without human intervention. UMKC now uses B/NA for approval. The loader does not pass a full-MARC record. The default loader table will only pass brief bibs. Innovative will expand the table on request, without extra charge. Janet Jackson WILL FIND OUT WHAT THE EXPANDED LOADER TABLE IS CAPABLE OF HANDLING so that campuses starting up an approval arrangement will know whether they need to purchase another load table. She also WILL VERIFY THAT THERE IS NO COST FOR EXPANDING THE TABLE.

## Agenda item 2. Electronic ordering of books using III.

To share UMKC's experience, Brenda said that they use electronic ordering extensively. It works fine. The vendor must be able to handle it 100%. Without a prior arrangement with vendors, acknowledgements will wind up lost in the shared messages file. Ask your vendors to acknowledge each order transmission by sending you e-mail with the total number of orders received and the number of duplicate records. There is a problem with the ISBN field in a MARC bib, since there is only room for a single valid ISBN. Publishers of course assign different ISBNs for different editions, typically paperback and hardbound. The III software only uses the first subfield

a ISBN. This may be for a paperback when you wish the hardback, or vice versa. ISSN is a little better, since there are three subfields. We can assume that vendors will not read notes specifying the edition desired. Since the days of the BaTaphone, all they want is ISBN and quantity. Question: is it good practice to change the order of 020s when there is more than one or to edit the first subfield a ISBN for ordering purposes? (There can be multiple 020 ISBN fields, each with a non-repeatable subfield a and repeatable subfield z.) Several people felt that MQCC could be of help to us.

## Agenda item 3. Interfacing with serials vendors for ordering, claiming, invoicing, etc.

There was very little discussion of this point. Later many campuses will be able to relate their experiences.

## Agenda item 4. Proposed new fixed field codes for order records (e.g., suppression code). Also "no value" codes.

WE DECIDED THAT THE CODE TO SUPPRESS DISPLAY OF ORDER AND CHECK-IN RECORDS SHOULD BE 'N' AND THAT IT SHOULD BE IN CODE3 OF THE ORDER RECORD AND SCODE3 OF THE CHECK-IN RECORD. This is consistent with the suppression codes for other record types.

TO MAKE USAGE CLEARER WE ALSO DECIDED TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE VARIABLE 'ACQ TYPE' TO 'PAY TYPE.'

Some codes had been set up so that 'No value' and 'No delay' were printing out on POs and claims. Janet Jackson will correct this by entering default codes of '-' with no label.

Hunter Kevil made detailed proposals for the use of CODE1 and CODE2 of the order record. CODE1 would be used to define Library Material Type and the usages proposed are based on the reporting requirements of IPEDS and ARL. CODE2 would be used for Retention and Treatment. Paper copies of the proposals were passed out. Revised versions incorporating Jack Montgomery's additions will be posted to our Web page. Send other additions and corrections to Hunter. UMKC is already using CODE1 and CODE2 for other purposes and would prefer to be able to use codes in the same way as the rest of us. Thus it was DECIDED THAT MAJOR CHANGES TO THE CODE STRUCTURE WOULD BE DEBATED NEXT MEETING AND WOULD TAKE PLACE JULY 1.

Agenda item 5. Proposed new defined variable fields for order records.

There was no discussion of this item, since all the requested variable fields were already available by the time of the meeting.

Agenda item 6. Proposed new fixed fields and variable fields for check-in records.

Hunter proposed that two of the SCODES should be used for publisher location and month of renewal. Since the proposals were NOT distributed at the meeting, they are listed below. They will also be in our Web page.

SCODE1 - PUBLISHER LOCATION

I propose to use this code to identify the publisher location for the purpose of predicting serials inflation. Since at the moment all the predatory publishers are located in Europe, separating European publishers into two groups will enable us to assign different rates of inflation for the predatory and the non-predatory publishers and make a more accurate estimate of the effect of serials inflation on the serials budget. I have done this using our PC database. Would 'PUBL LOC' be a good label?

Proposed Codes	Proposed Meaning	Proposed usage and Notes
b	Great Britain	
e	rest of Europe	Non-predatory European publishers
n	North America	
p	Predatory	the 10 largest European STM publishers
w	rest of the World	any publisher not in Europe or North America

SCODE2 - RENEWAL MONTH

Using this code to identify the renewal month would help identify orders

dropped by agents and renewal notices from publishers we have misplaced. We are seeing an increase in renewals dropped or bungled by one of our subscription agents. I propose 'RENEWAL' as the display label.

Proposed codes	Proposed meaning	Proposed usage
a	renewed in January	
b	renewed in February	
c	renewed in March	
d	renewed in April	
e	renewed in May	
f	renewed in June	
g	renewed in July	
h	renewed in August	
i	renewed in September	
j	renewed in October	
k	renewed in November	
l	renewed in December	
z	irregular renewal	(Not renewed on a specific month every year)

Agenda item 7. Regular weekly schedules for loading records (e.g., automatic approval records.) When are people planning to start these?

UMKC is the only library doing this now. Others such as MU will start July 1. Brenda believes it would be very convenient if LSO ran the load at a regular time every week, to avoid each library having to schedule the run each week. The timing of loads is important, since the buffer devoted to loading can overflow when the new Headings Report is printing and new records can be lost. Vivian Lee of LSO schedules the loads. The OCLC loads are typically finished by the end of the afternoon.

Agenda item 8. Adding order and check-in records to existing bibs - special problems (e.g., suppressed display, 'under consideration' approvals.)

It is safe to attach an order to a UMKC approval brief bib, since a bib cannot be deleted if there is an order record attached. UMKC fills in the CDATE field in order to suppress display of the order record. Any cataloguer is free to overlay the brief bib with a fuller one. WE AGREED THAT THERE IS NO NEED TO SHARE OUR PHONY BIBS, SUCH AS FOR MEMBERSHIPS, PACKAGES, ETC. Approval books with a status of '1' will be displayed by the system as 'under consideration.' UMKC deletes bibs for returned approval books.

There are many questions concerning bib records and approval loads. There is a duplicate check during approval bib loads if the question "Check for duplicates?" is answered with a "Y". We do not know how the system advises us there are duplicates. The duplicate records are not prevented from loading. But there are other questions we cannot now answer: (1) Will approval loads result in duplicate bibs? (2) Can the newly created bibs be automatically suppressed? Brenda AGREED TO RESEARCH THIS AND GET BACK TO US.

In Update mode you cannot see everyone else's order records. In search mode you can.

#### Agenda item 9. Discoveries, hints, problems

Question about need for more check-in records. Rich Rexroat pointed out that a new check-in record can be created every time an old one is deleted. It is also possible to minimize use of check-in records when the material can be described using dates in the item record. Standards to govern our practice could be developed, as requested by the Coordinators.

The order of display of different record types: first come check-in records with 'check-in cards'; then inactive check-in records without 'cards', scoped by campus; and finally order records, also scoped by campus.

The system allows 120 'substitution phrases', text strings called up by the operator with short keyboard sequences. If used for the most common messages in note fields of the order and check-in records time will be saved and accuracy improved. EACH CAMPUS SHOULD COME UP WITH ITS OWN LIST OF POSSIBLE MESSAGES AND SUBMIT THEM TO THE GROUP BY JANUARY 20. We did not agree how to submit them. An idea: send them to Janet Jackson (Isojanet@showme.missouri.edu) for posting on our Web page. Then see which of your messages could be combined with someone else's with a minor change in wording.

Question: who can change the addresses in the RLOC and BLOC tables?  
Answer: your network coordinator or friendly LSO rep can do this.

WE AGREED TO TRY TO AVOID TO REINVENT THE WHEEL. WHEN WE HAVE COMPLETED PROCEDURES OF INTEREST TO OTHERS, WE WILL POST THEM TO OUR WEB PAGE. The first example will be the procedures Jack Montgomery passed out, 'Procedures for interactive transfer of bibliographic and order records from OCLC to Merlin.'

Comment: we should discuss our experiences with the interface for serials subscription agents in the next meeting. There will be plenty of examples.

Next came status reports on Innovative implementation from each campus.

The final point discussed concerned the Innopac System Options for acquisitions and serials. If an option has been selected, only the message "CALL Innovative" appears, not our original choices. Janet Jackson will find out what our options are and report to the group. In response to a request from UMKC, the group agreed that the following changes could be made immediately to the options: 1) Invoices entered before the date of 06/89 could be deleted, and 2) the Internal note field in the order record would NOT print on the purchase order form. Janet Jackson agreed to make those changes.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Hunter Kevil

MU-Serials  
December 27, 1996