Notes on NOTIS Users' Group Meeting, October 23-25, 1990, Chicago, IL.

B. Heath 11-1-90.

I. <u>MARC Holdings Workshop.</u>

In the morning session, Michele Dalehite and Elaine Henjum of the Florida Center for Library Automation went through the MHLD document. ((MHLD means "MARC Holdings for Locations Data"; formerly called MFHL: "MARC Format for Holdings and Locations"). They talked a little about the history of the format: how it evolved in the late 70's and early 80's when the library world realized it needed a machine-readable standard to share serials data from library to library. MHLD as it now stands is strictly for serials data; it will need to be modified for non-serials data. It supports NISO standards, and is related to NISO as MARC is related to AACR2: NISO has rules for <u>content</u>; MHLD has rules for <u>how the data is encoded.</u>

Basically, NISO standards describe four levels of holdings reporting: level 1) item identification and location held; level 2) in addition to level 1, indicates whether the title is currently received and whether it is retained; level 3) also indicates summary holdings (no gaps); and level 4) includes gaps, reported in positive form. MHLD includes a level 5, which is very specific to the bar code/accession number level. OCLC LDR records are basically level 3.

The rest of the morning was spent going through the MHLD document and explaining the use of the various fields, subfields, and delimiters. Some basic principles for use of this format include:

1) the 85x fields are used to indicate captions and publishing patterns. The actual holdings strings are stored in the 86x fields (863, 864, and 865). These fields are very complex and do not display in OPAC. Most libraries are going to be using either the 866, 867, 868 fields to display holdings information (which have to be used when there are no 85x fields), or will use the basically free-text 899 field.

2) At a later time, it may be desirable to go back and complete the 85x and 86x fields. Using predictive checkin will necessitate filling out 85x fields.

3) Most libraries will use different patterns for retrospective holdings than they do for currently-received titles.

4) The MHLD record will completely replace the VHLD record in release 5.1. Conversion needs to be completed by that time.

In the afternoon, discussion centered around the relationship of the MHLD record to the other NOTIS records (it has the same relationship to other records as the VHLD record has now), and around the description of conversion programs A and B. The computer logic of each program was discussed. A library has to look at the way it has input data in the VHLD record before deciding to use either program A or B. Unless the VHLD record was carefully formatted, a library will probably wish to use program A.

We were also advised that using the 899 field is probably the easiest route to go. The disadvantage of using it is that it is not a MARC-defined field; the advantage is that it is far easier to use than either the paired 85x/86x fields, or the 866-868 fields. John Hein from the University of North Florida reported that he estimates training time for instructing a person to use either the 85x/86x option or the 866-868 option could run to more than 40 hours. In addition, a problem with either of these options is that little data is validated in release 5.0, and possibility for operator inputting errors is very great.

I have additional notes in my MHLD manual which should help us when we start discussing how to go about serials conversion from VHLD to MHLD.

II. General Session

Jane Burke talked about "Into the Future" and John Coleman, head of Systems Development, talked about new directions for systems development. Unfortunately, the lights were turned out for both of these talks so I was unable to take notes (I mentioned this as a problem in my overall evaluation of the conference).

III. GTO Joint Session.

Nancy Boggess-Korekach, Head of Verification at the Jean and Alexander Heard Library, Vanderbilt University, talked about how GTO affected the workflow process in her section. The verifiers are the ones responsible for loading all OCLC and provisional records onto NOTIS. Each verifier has a Zenith terminal which can access both OCLC and NOTIS by being toggled back and forth between the two systems. This has really helped the GTO process because the verifier can load the record from OCLC and then go right to NOTIS and complete the work. This avoids having to load in batch mode and then, at a later time, calling up all the records again to add copy holdings and OPRs. The fact that each person has his/her own terminal has been very important to the smooth workflow.

They made four changes to the basic GTO loader or to their current way of doing things: 1) the progammed default location for Copy Holdings was "GPO", so that overlaying wouldn't happen by mistake; 2) call numbers do not transfer; 3) the standard number index is updated every night so that 9xx records can be accessible as soon as possible; 4) authorities are in a separate processing unit (?). Some further observations are that they like the one to one transfer rather than having to depend on batchmode; there have been very few instances of accidental overlaying of the bib. record; it is very easy to go back and forth between NOTIS and OCLC; there has been no accidental overlaying of the copy holdings records because of the "GPO" default location; there's been no degradation of response time. They like GTO.

John Edens, Director, Central Technical Services at SUNY Buffalo spoke next. He did not talk about workflow or GTO versus screen dumps as the former speaker did, and his speech was not too informative on the whole. He did mention that, at his institution (they are on RLIN), the GTO sessions occasionally got "full", and they had to end the session and restart when that happened; and occasionally they got garbled fields and record truncation. Most of these problems have now been resolved. Every now and then they still get a record that doesn't pass.

Questions from the floor: Did anyone do any standard number cleanup before using GTO? Answer: No, this isn't a problem. The problem with terminals locking up and having to turn off GTO and then restart is solved in the new release (5.0). Does overlaying affect VHLD, items, etc. Answer: No.

III. Acquisitions/Serials in a Consortium Environment.

This was the session that I moderated, so I did not take notes, being occupied with doing the overheads and keeping things running smoothly. My talk and Frances Lynch's are appended to this report. Sally Gale from Indiana State University also spoke, but they have basically done very little at this point from a consortium point of view. (I felt the program went well and was well-received.)

IV. Changes to the NOTIS Acquisitions Module in Release 5.0

This meeting was a rehash of information that has been released to users in many earlier meetings. Some of the main points were:
1) The ADate in the OPR is back in its correct location.
2) The ORDUNIT and RECUNIT can be changed by an operator online. This is in line with the general change in 5.0 of the operator control file (changes made by the operator at a NOTIS screen rather than having to be made by programmers). 3) The NV field will be truncated on the purchase order if it is too long to fit in the

same field with an address, rather than truncating the address as is done now. 4) The FY code will display in payment lines, not just in the order line. 5) There is a currency conversion table. 6) The Amount field has been changed to nine digits. 7) On the invoice, there are now 20 characters for the vendor's invoice number. 8) The XC has a theoretical limit of 200. This is determined by fund record size, so if you use the subfund option for fiscal years you will run out of space sooner than if you create new funds each year. 9) On the fund record, there is a third screen to track allocation changes throughout the year. 10) There is new fiscal year close software, with five options.

V. Serials Discussion Group.

1. A group is being formed on BITNET for serials concerns, not necessarily limited to NOTIS users.
2. There was an overhead giving the results of the summer survey on what changes NOTIS serials users wanted to the system. The first two items were more flexible checkin record and predictive checkin. The rest of the items were unreadable from where I was sitting, and they were not discussed.
3. In release 5.0, the index display for a serial will indicate "serial" at the end of the entry.
4. The formula by which the maximum number of XC's on a fund record can be calculated was given.
5. From the MHLD in release 5.0, current issues will display on a serial record before bound volumes. There was a large protest from the audience about this feature.
6. In Merged Headings Index, serial records display in the index after added entries with the identical entry. There will be a fix in the 5.0 release which puts serials back at the beginning of the display.
7. The fund accounting maximum overcommitment problems are fixed in release 5.0.

Further comments from the floor:

1. There was a discussion of what to do with the OPR when a title changes. You can either overlay the new title and re-transfer the old title, putting the OPR on the record for the new title, or you can just use successive entry as we do.
2. Question about how to code the notes to display to the public in the MHLD record. There is an answer in the August 89 issue of NOTISes.
3. Issues of centralized checkin for branch libraries were discussed. Delay between checkin and issues being put on the shelves is a problem. Answers: get a better mail system, deliver more often, change to decentralized checkin.
4. University of Minnesota is testing electronic claims with Faxon. The test is going well (they are not actually doing it yet). They hope to give a positive report at ALA Midwinter.

VI. Location-based Searching.

Recommendations are attached. This is now a high priority for NOTIS. A lot of time was spent by speakers explaining the complexities involved in doing this.

VII. VITLS Tapeloading.

An overview of how VITLS works was presented, which was really intended for programmers, not librarians. The MVS Beta testing was done at Clemson in 1988 with Faxon. 5000 titles were involved. The basic procedure was (once again) described. One piece of information that is new is that, if you change your fund codes every year as we do, you need to send a new extract tape to Faxon every year, not just once at the beginning of the process. Vouchers can be produced in the VITLS process because each invoice still needs to be approved. NOTIS is coming out soon with detailed VITLS documentation (in the J section of the old TOM).

VIII. Acquisitions Special Interest Group.

More information about release 5.0 (there was a lot of repetition in these meetings). One suggestion made for future meetings was that they should distinguish clearly between fund accounting concerns and checkin/order concerns. Some people do one or the other but not both.

Topics were suggested for the 1991 NUGM: using acquisitions records as a collection management tool; describing management reports various sites have developed; more sessions on testing.

By ALA Midwinter, NOTIS hopes to have the Beta site for 5.0 testing.

A description of how currency conversion work. Basically, I think you need to input the currency of each country one by one; you can do this as seldom or as often as you wish. It is part of the online control file, so can be done by an operator rather than a programmer.

There is a problem with loading 5.0 with MDAS. They appear to be incompatible. NOTIS is investigating. There will be a new Acquisitions section of TOM by Christmas. Don't toss out the old TOM, however. There may be things in it that you need that aren't in the new section (oh, this wonderful documentation!).

IX. Machine Readable Data: Present Status and Future Needs.

This was a presentation given by Dorothy Marcinko, Head of

Acquisitions at Auburn University. I have heard her speak before and have always been favorably impressed, so I was surprised that her presentation this time was sort of rambling and pretty much devoid of new content. She outlined briefly what can be done now in the area of data transferred via computer, e.g., approval tapes, VITLS. She ended by listing some of things we, as NOTIS users, would like in the future: automatic claiming, electronic ordering (although she mentioned the problem of relying solely on the ISBN as many vendors seem to), online access to a vendor's holdings and stock. In general, we would like interfacing between all vendors and NOTIS.

This was basically the content of her talk.

In summing up the three days, I would say that there was a good day and a half of real content. There was a lot of repetition of information (we heard about the features of release 5.0 many, many times); in addition, the overheads were often poor and hard to read, necessitating darkening the rooms to the point where note-taking was difficult or impossible. This is an extremely expensive event for what one receives in new content. As always, the real benefit is in talking to one's colleagues and exchanging ideas and experiences.