HOTS Conference Call Minutes
April 9, 2012

Present: John Riemer (LA, Chair), Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz (Berkeley), Karleen Darr (Davis, minutes), Vicki Grahame (Irvine), Jim Dooley (Merced), Manuel Urrizola (Riverside), Linda Barnhart (San Diego), Anneliese Taylor (San Francisco), Catherine Nelson (Santa Barbara), Lai-Ying Hsiung (Santa Cruz), Patti Martin (CDL), Valerie Bross (LAUC)

1. Announcements

John reminded campus members who haven't completed POT 6 LT 1B's survey to complete it as soon as possible.

2. HathiTrust Data Submission from Campuses

a. Benefits and costs of campus tracking withdrawn/lost/missing materials.
Members don't believe there is significant value in exchange for cost or effort on the part of campuses to produce these separate files. UC is not aware of any plans for HathiTrust to build services on withdrawn material for Section 108. CoULs advised campuses not to invest in new backend ILS processes to provide HathiTrust UC Holdings Data for withdrawn/lost/missing materials. HathiTrust's current model to update holdings data involves annual full file replacement. Therefore, campuses that decide to submit withdrawn materials must retain these data files in order to resubmit in subsequent years, or, as long as appropriate and feasible.

b. Whether the benefits can be available to us as a consortium.
This question cannot be immediately answered. As John suggested in a message to HOTS, perhaps in the future CoUL would be willing to ask the consortial question of HathiTrust. Patti noted that this question has already been raised to the HathiTrust Executive Committee and we expect an answer will be forthcoming.

ACTION: John will answer CAMCIG follow-up questions (April 6 email) on behalf of HOTS. He will ask for clarification on question 2 regarding access to print material campuses share.

ACTION: Catherine will investigate whether UCSB can meet June 12 submission deadline.

ACTION: Campuses have the green light to proceed with data submission to HathiTrust as soon as feasible. John's document to HOTS: *UC Campus Provision of Collections Data to Hathi Trust Required as Part of Membership* was emailed as an attachment to "Agenda for March 12 HOTS conf call", dated 3/9/12, can be used to develop submission methodology. Clarifications: a) Each campus submits data on what it physically owns and manages, excluding RLF deposits, shared print in place, and consortial purchases. b) May include formerly held (withdrawn, lost, missing) materials if feasible. c) Tracking cut-off date for data submission is not necessary because of HathiTrust full file replacement model each year.

ACTION: Each campus will contact HOTS when they have completed their data submission.

3. UC-wide Bibliographic Standards from POT 2

POT 2 worked with POT 3 in creating the draft guidelines. A review/comment period will be offered to POT 6, CDC, and HOPS. POT 2 reviewed the Shared Print in Place cataloging documentation to be sure these needs were covered by the UC guidelines. Implementation of Shared Print holdings data is not part of POT 2's charge and should be addressed elsewhere. HOTS discussed the importance of consistency and standards around practices and procedures involving UC cataloging. Members agreed the provisional SPiP bibliographic and acquisition standards require further work and should be re-named "best practices" instead of standards or policies. HOTS endorsed the POT 2 document: UC Bibliographic Standards for Cooperative, Vendor, and Campus Backlog Cataloging in principle.

ACTION: If members have additional comments or questions they may send them to Lisa or to POT 2 LT by April 20.

4. Tracking SPiP Monographs

a. Question from CAMCIG about why we are tracking

- Members discussed value to library user vs. library staff
- Where standards are followed provides consistent manner for extraction to another system.
- When network-level disclosure mechanism is available, there will be a generally smooth transfer of data (although wouldn't want a false expectation of Melvyl display for monographs).
- Tracking shared print monographic series is helpful to library bibliographers and CDC members.
- May be true for public knowledge of UC shared programs.
- Is this a bigger question that should be discussed at MAG or HOPS?

b. Relationship of what we've asked CAMCIG/ACIG to do and work of upcoming NGTS POT 6 LT on SPiP

Reassure CAMCIG to go forward with original charge. Note: In a subsequent email message from the NGTS Management Team, it requested that "everyone halt any NGTS projects related to SPiP response…. MAG [will]coordinate the ACG work and responses."

5. NGTS Update

Emily Lin is preparing for April NGTS update. Many POTs have completed Lightning Team (LT) reports. Power of Three wiki page will include links to LT reports. There will be several POT project manager changes and POT sponsor changes as a result of changes in SOPAG membership.

6. Melvyl Update

Patti visited OCLC and as a result, has been in regular conversation with Greg Zick Vice President, Global Engineering. They have been discussing why UC expends so much effort to maintain Melvyl and what improvements can be made. He has already started taking actions, and there will be a follow up call in 2 months to track progress.

Next conference call meeting: May14th

May 14 Minutes: Vicki Grahame