HOTS Minutes

Conference Call

October 14, 2004

Present: Carole Kiehl (UCI), John Riemer (SCP AC, UCLA, recorder), Lee Leighton (UCB), Rebecca Green (ACIG, UCB), Jim Dooley (UCM), Lai-Ying Hsiung (UCSC), Luc Declerck & Linda Barnhart (UCSD), Paul Wakeford (UCSF), Pat French (UCD), Jain Fletcher (LAUC, UCLA), Gail McClenney (UCSB, chair), Mary Heath (CDL), Bernie Hurley (SOPAG chair, ERM TF chair, UCB)

SOPAG ERM Task Force

Update. As part of educating itself, the Task Force sent out an RFI and received 7 responses. The TF sketched out a description of what "consortial support" means and met with a couple of the vendors to get clarifications on RFI responses. Questions the TF is currently considering:

1. What data elements apply? Do they need to be duplicated in the ILS?
2. What functionality is needed: A view of just one's own institution? A view of the entire UC system?

The TF hopes to issue an RFP in December and recommend a purchase in the spring. Its recommendations to SOPAG include charging the TF write the RFP, expanding the TF membership to add at least Terry Vrable, cleaning up the CDL Management Information System (MIS) in preparation for an ERM.

Expectations need to be managed. The initial phase of an ERM will not be everything everyone wants. The timetable for developing consortial support needs to be set. Unique IDs for data connections (between ERM and ILS) are needed. The data flow has to be figured out. Perhaps A-Z lists, permitting browsing and searching, will come from the SFX database versus the ERM, but any desired campus-specific subject terms would have to be locally supplied.

Discussion. Will Tier 3 (locally-licensed) resources be included in the ERM? Yes, but perhaps not in the first phase. Could the ERM be used for the acquisition of Shared Print Collections? Theoretically.

UCI asked if CDL could centrally manage all the purchases. Re-charging in and out is a considerable burden. This thought is inspired in part by CDL's recent statement that it would provide campuses with their E-resource collection statistics.

Bernie responded that the percentage of co-investment not only varies by campus, but a campus' percentage varies from package to package. It is a good thing that CDOs (collection development officers) pay attention to the content, thus making co-investment a conscious activity. Recharging is not really an ERM issue. One step in lessening the burden would be moving from re-charging for one package at a time to a single lump sum payment (consolidated transaction) annually. John suggested another consideration for administering co-investment funds at the local level is that suballocation of collection funds is influenced by how much each discipline is represented/supported by CDL-licensed resources.

As Terry Vrable has noted, the dataflow involved in managing CDL-licensed e-resources includes local print title counts related to electronic content, pending cancellations, and voting on package contents. An ERM is not payment related. Payment is a separate data stream.

People want the spreadsheets now used in managing e-resources to go away. This won't happen unless we record data in consistent ways. For example active subscriptions have to coded correctly as such in the ILS holdings records.

It is regrettable we do not all have the same ILS acquisitions module. CDL Acquisitions uses the Innovative module at UCSD. If there is only a single statewide ERM for all campuses to use (not separate instances to coordinate with each other), then the main coordination effort will be the ERM and the different ILS.

Overlap between ERM and ILS is anticipated to be minimal. It probably would help staff to know which types of information would found in which database. The ILS would be the place to go for order, payment, and fund information, while the ERM would contain licensing and business terms.

If package negotiations changed, such that they did not tie the online prices to the number of local print subscriptions, then not that much data would go back and forth.

How will the ERM be initially populated with data? From the SFX KnowledgeBase perhaps. Luc asked if an API (application programming interface) could be written to populate the ERM (from an ILS).

Paul summarized, "The acquisitions piece is falling away for now." Collection development people will clearly gain a lot. The ERM will not be a panacea for technical services. How money changes hands now is not tied to an ERMS.

A new Bibliographic Services Officer will be hired at CDL and take Mary's place on HOTS. Does the ERM TF need a HOTS member, in addition to John?

The recharge issue needs further discussion in HOTS. The solutions we are considering are beyond us. The ULs would likely be unwilling to cede budget dollars and their control to CDL. HOTS has advocated unsuccessfully at the SOPAG level on this topic in the past.

Action: We will individually alert our campus CDOs/CDC reps that we are thinking about changes to recharging.

Action: HOTS will talk about this with Bev French.

Action: HOTS & CDC will plan to meet and discuss expectations of an ERM and the recharge issue.

Next meeting: Nov. 15th in Oakland. Reports on what we learn from other consortia regarding our discussion of an expanded role for Melvyl should be sent to the HOTS list beforehand.

Look for SCP's annual report around Nov. 1.