DALNET Study Committee

September 23, 1985

Minutes

PRESENT: J. Williams (WSU) Chair, D. Adams (Botsford), L. Bugg (WSU), J. Flaherty (WCCC), B. Johnson (Harper), N. Skowronski (UD), J. Smith (Beaumont), F. Tucker (DPL), A. Walasky (UD).

I. Additional Development by Vendor (see handout):

L. Bugg notified DALNET that NOTIS was sent this list (minus priority rankings) in preparation for the October 1st contract negotiations meeting with WSUL. DALNET reviewed and revised the list and priorities. A "high" priority means we must have this development prior to the purchase of software, or be willing to pay for the development.

Priority Changes for DALNET: "high" for #2, 12 and 23; "medium" for #14 and 18.

Additions to list: "high" Operational OCLC Transfer, and "high" Operational Global Change. NOTIS claims to have OCLC transfer operating, but currently not operating anywhere. Illinois and Chicago are trying to make it operate.

Interpretations of list:

#5 - "Full MARK" means "Full Public MARK" - staff would already have MARK access.

#11 - Asks NOTIS to develop software so that one institutional patron's barcode will be acceptable as the barcode at a member institution.

#20 - "Currency Control" refers to "foreign currency."

A review of priorities was made:

#1,2,8 and 9 - "high" - are in the process of development by NOTIS.

#12 - we must be willing to pay for the development.

#19 - in process.

#23 - not currently in process, but will be after Harvard. A June '87 development completion is very optimistic, i.e. can't be done by then.

#16 - needs more discussion, is not in development; so we must get cost of development.

CONCLUSION: #12 and #23 possibly need payment for development. L. Bugg says WSUL

definitely would pay for #23, but very doubtfully for #12.

- L. Bugg noted that NOTIS can respond in three ways to all these issum: Yes (will do), No (won't do at own cost), Later Date for development. If a "No" response is given, are we willing to pay for development. This becomes a governance problem.
- B. Johnson indicated that unless software changes were universal, the system would be an administrative nightmare.
- J. Williams asked if there were some things that can be done singly without degradation of service. DALNET response: too varied a system still leads to nightmare; and some members might not be able to afford the change recommended by others.

II. Negotiations:

WSUL hopes to begin and conclude negotiations with NOTIS on October 1, 1985. GEAC has been informed by P. Duran that WSUL negotiations with them have ceased

- III. Review of NOTIS agreement draft as it affects DALNET
- L. Bugg led discussion on three issues in the draft agreement which affect DALNET, namely, Loader software, OCLC snapshot for Serials, Support Days from NOTIS.
- Agreement: 90 day turnaround for writing loader upon receipt of tapes from each library/processing center at a cost not to exceed \$5,000.
- Discussion on this issue suggest a) place cost range between \$1,000 and \$5,000; b)libraries not on OCLC could hit against WSUL database with OCLC permission and charges; c)find out whether NOTIS can work on more than one library at a time and how DALNET libraries are to negotiate timetable
- Agreement: Supply software to load WSUL OCLC snapshot tapes for serials at a cost not to eced \$5,000, with the same provision for each library/processing Center. Discussion on this issues suggests: a)ask range of \$1,000 to \$5,000; b)common loader can't be used must be customized for each library/Processing Center

Agreement: NOTIS has offered 15 support days.

- Discussion: a) WSUL asking for 10 more to be paid by WSUL; b) ask for an additional 15 days for DALNET plus additional days at negotiated cost.
- Other agreement issues: NOTIS promised software to load Blackwell free; and software to load student and staff patron data.
- B. Johnson asked why we should pay NOTIS for development when such development would be a major benefit to them. L. Bugg replied that someone has to pay upfront for development, however, release permissions and royalties are also negotiated.
- IV. Services to DALNET (see handout)

Kinds and sources of services were discussed. J. Williams reported P. Duran spoke with Pres. Adamany of WSU. Adamany is very positive CSC can be the service center among libraries. P. Duran feels there is no problem with any institution owning part of the hardware. N. Skowronski questioned about problem of 3 year exclusive ownerhip of hardware already imposed on WSU by IBM. This question needs research.

Software ownership will be first by WSUL, and renegotiated later when DALNET joins.

System performance guarantees are to be from WSUL, not CSC.

Joint Applications Tasks must include WSUL and DALNET.

DALNET project management: WSUL will hire two personnel for this area.

- V. DALNET membership and structure, governance.
- J. Williams was asked if WSUL will be a member of DALNET. Williams replied he is not sure how and where, but that it is certainly needed on some issues such as grants and standards.
- L. Bugg noted that if DALNET must collect monies, disburse monies, seek grants, or hire, it must be a corporation. There is clearly the need to offer options of buying part of the hardware or pay operating costs.

- F. Tucker reminded all that grants do not fund operating costs.
- D. Adams recommends the original DALNET plan whereby DALNET owns hardware and if an individual member drops, there is no payback on hardware. Legal advice is needed regarding structure and governance. The key question is ownership.
- J. Williams noted P. Duran wants to investigate all legal aspects of the question.
- J. Smith asked when there would be a proposal from WSUL.
- J. Williams responded that he would present to P. Duran the concept of DALNET ownership with individual members contracting with DALNET. All study committee members present agreed that this original DALNET plan is the simplest approach, and also would be the most appropriate for seeking grants.
- F. Tucker asked how CSC would handle DALNET owned hardware with regard to housing and operating costs. J. Williams replied this would be a factored in overhead cost.
- F. Tucker said there is need to question WSU's policy on rates and cost of contracting rates in light of the history of the consortium.

VI. Other matters.

- J. Williams asked L. Lokes to prepare to attend future meeting to discuss grants. L, Lokes will talk with J. Morgan regarding the matter.
- J. Williams added himself and E. Hitchingham (OU) to Grants Committee. Williams is replacing L. Bugg.
- L. Bugg has parameters for dial-in to NOTIS with Smartcom II. All searches and screens are available.

ACTION: J. Williams will pose DALNET inclusion of WSUL to P. Duran.

Next Meeting: Monday, September 30, 1985, WSUL Director's Conference Room.

Adjourned: 11:25am.

Recorder: J. Flaherty (WCCC)

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT BY VENDOR

VENDOR agrees to develop and provide to LIBRARY the following capabilities, which were not available at the time of VENDOR response to the LIBRARY RFP. Capabilities shall be provided to LIBRARY by the date shown with each capability.

		,	and a community.
WSUL PRIORITY	DALNET PRIORITY	<u>EUNC</u>	<u>TION</u>
med	high	1.	Index Redesign enhancements be available by March 1986.
med		2.	BRS/Search software for Boolean and keyword searching be available for the online public catalog by March 1986, and for staff by June 1986.
med		3.	Fuzzy matching be provided in the online public catalog for call numbers, and author, title and subject searches by Spring 1987.
med		4.	Software support for OCLC M300 terminal to allow use as interface to NOTIS data base be provided by January 1987.
low		5.	Full MARC bibliographic records be available in the online public catalog by January 1987.
low		6.	The online public catalog subject searching disregard dashes and other punctuation by January 1987.
1 ow		7	Stop word list capability be developed by July, 1986.
high	high	8.	Circulation financial component, including fines and payment history linked to patron records, be delivered for the circulation functions including Reserve Room, by July 1986.
high		9.	Status display in the online public catalog for all materials in circulation, including both monographs and serials, by July 1986.

date of June 1986.

Reserve Room component of circulation be delivered by January 1986, with a fallback

Capability to validate a borrower at more

than one institution using the same barcode ID number be developed by Fall 1986. with a

med

med

10.

11.

13. Ability to change circ parameter tables without programmer intervention be availab low 14. Inventory control be developed together wi WSUL and DALNET to allow inventory of the collection in the stacks as well as countir the use of meterials in the building, by December 1986, with a fallback of July 1987 1 DW An integrated electronic mail capability be 15. developed by December 1987. 1 DW 16. A booking module, integrated with the patro and bibliographic records, be developed by low 17. A complete interlibrary load system be developed including statistical reports by December 1987. low Software support for portable data collectic 18. devices be developed by December 1986. high 19. The Harvard enhancements to the acquisitions system be available by January 1987, including the ability to handle and store multiple fiscal years, and to handle fiscal l ow 20. Currency control be provided by January 1987. low Online transmission of orders according to 21. the BISAC standards be developed by Fall med 22. Serials control subsystem be modified with automatic check-in based on a predictive system by January 1988. med 23. Serials check-in history be provided by January 1988. med 24. A binding component be developed for the serials control system by Spring 1988. med 25. The serials control system include automatic

claiming by January 1988.

Microcomputer backup capability be develop for the circulation component by Fall 1986

with a fallback of Winter 1987.

med

1 OW

12.

1 ow

26. A routing component be developed for the serials control system by Fall 1988.

1 DW

27. The MARC holdings format be supported by Fall 1988.

NOTES: high priority means the feature must be there for acceptance of the software.

L. Bugg 9-17-85