Client/Server Demonstrations

Report to the Board by the DALNET Partnership Team May 29, 1997

Charge to the Team

Arrange structured demonstrations for 3 to 5 leading client/server library information systems

Purpose of the Demonstrations

- Determine if currently available systems had critical features needed by DALNET
- Determine if Horizon is a viable system for DALNET
- ◆ Educate DALNET library staff

Here Is What We DID

- ◆ Determined system requirements
- Identified systems to consider
- ◆ Developed structured demonstrations
- Evaluated the results

appended Vision do Dest Sen

DALNET's Requirements

- Based on users' growing expectations
 - with shift from print to digital
 - with explosion of Internet
- Based on users' needs
 - save time and effort
 - ease of use
 - 24 hour availability
 - remote access

Critical Components in a Consortium Environment

- Specialized user interfaces
- Resource sharing and access
- Gateway capabilities
- Cooperative collection and database management
- · Report writer
- Media booking

Technical Requirements

- ◆ Client/server based
- Installed and operational
- ◆ Microcomputer workstations
- TCP/IP communications protocols
- Scaleability for DALNET

Why Client/Server?

- Mainframe technology too costly to operate and upgrade
- Migration to desktop computers with Internet connectivity
- ◆ Client/server library system development

Systems Considered*

- Ameritech Library
 Services
- ◆ CARL Corporation
- Data Research Associates
- Endeavor
- Geac
- Innovative Interfaces
- SIRSI
- VTLS
- *No foreign vendors were considered

Systems Eliminated

- ◆ Endeavor (Voyager)
 - client/server
 - installed and operational
 - markets only to academic and research libraries
- ◆ Geac and VTLS (Virtua)
 - critical modules of client/server systems not yet developed

More Systems Eliminated

- ◆ CARL Corporation
 - client/server system not being developed
- Data Research Associates (DRA Classic)
 - new system in development for Illinois consortium and UCLA in 1997
 - not far enough along to demonstrate

Systems Demonstrated

- ◆ Ameritech Library Services
 - Horizon
- Innovative Interfaces
 - Innopac
- ◆ SIRSI
 - Unicom

13

Structured Demonstrations

- ◆ List of specific tasks to perform
 - based on 43 scenarios
 - scheduled for 2 days
- Evaluation forms for attendees

Scenario Development

- Based on DALNET's requirements
- ◆ Focus on multi-type consortium
- Drafted by 32 experts from 7 DALNET libraries

13

DALNET Library Participation

- ◆ Staff from 17 out of 20 DALNET libraries
- ◆ Horizon and Innopac demos at WSU
 - almost 50 people
- · SIRSI demo at Macomb
 - 34 people

13

Overall Staff Response

	Horizon	Innovative	SIRSI
Serials/Acq	4.4	3.7	4.4
Auth/Cat	3.9	4.5	4.5
Cire/Booking	4.2	3.8	4.2
ILL/Doc.Del.	- 4.5	5.5	5.1
User Interface	5.3	4.1	3.8
Gateway	5.5	4,6	5.9
Elec.Pub/Databases	4.8	5.6	5.1
Reports	5:4	3.6	5.4
Workstation Integ	4.8	3.8	7.0
Average score	4.7	4.3	5.0
Note: the lower num	bers are bei	ter.	

..

Findings

 Currently available systems all need critical components to meet DALNET's system requirements Critical Components Needed By All Three Systems

- ◆ User interface improvements
- Circulation for a consortium
- User authentication for a gateway
- ◆ ILL functionality
- Media booking module

11

17

Technical Requirements

	Horizon	Innovative	SIRS
Client/server	Yes	No	Yes
Installed	Yes	Yes	Yes
Microcomputer	s Yes	Yes	Yes
TCP/IP	Yes	Yes	Yes
Scaleable	Yes	Yes	No

19

Best Alternative--Horizon

- ◆ Client/server
- Installed and operational
- Scaleable--benchmarked for Indiana U.
 - 7 million bibliographic records
 - 850 simultaneous users
- With the needed enhancements

bů.

Horizon Enhancements

- ◆ Patron database
- ◆ Authentication system for users
- ◆ Shared authority file
- ◆ Children's OPAC
- Management reports
- Integrated booking module
- ◆ ILL/Document delivery

21

Enhancement Commitment

- ◆ By Ameritech's CEO and Product Manager
- ◆ DALNET's participation
 - writing specifications
 - evaluating and testing prototypes

21

perceptual with early presented a few per perture.

The percentage presented a few per perture.

The percentage presented as a few per perture.