

Minutes
LSTA Grant Planning Committee Meeting
Walsh College, January 19, 2001, 2-4 p.m.
(Revised Edition: Underscore indicates change)

Present: Louise Bugg, Scott Muir, David Murphy, Tammy Turgeon, "Dee" Callaway;
Bob Kelly

Meeting called to order by Chair Louise Bugg at 2:00 p.m.

Review Agenda & Dec. 18th Minutes

Minutes and agenda approved.

Item 1: Minute takers on rotating basis: Bob Kelly agreed to provide minutes from today's meeting. Scott will take minutes at next Friday's meeting.

Item 2: DALNET Participation: Louise Bugg reports 11 DALNET libraries will participate in phase 1 of the project: OCC; UDM; HFM; MCC; WCCCD; DIA; Botsford; VA; DPL; WSU; Walsh.

Outcome of January 5th Briefing

Item 1: Volunteers for Teams: Tammy reported she had received forms back primarily from academic libraries including Wayne, UMD, UDM, Walsh but not many from the publics. 8 to 9 volunteers are from SLC and 6 to 8 are from OWLS. Eileen will be asked to provide some assistance in recruiting public library participation.

It was determined that to fully staff the committees with both chairs and participants and to achieve the representation among the various OWLS/DALNET/SLC, would require 50 people: 5 committees (ILL/CIRC/TECH/TRAIN/DESIGN) with 10 members each including the chair(s). The initial volunteer list provides a good core to build upon.

Item 2: Committee members are asked to continue recruiting volunteers particularly those who would be effective as chairs. We did identify potential committee chairs from the volunteers forms received so far.

Item 3: LOM Contract Status: Waiting to hear from Eileen.

Other: Listserv: Listserv is up: email address: LSTA2001@umich.edu
Bob will add all Committee members' names to that service.

Report from ALA Midwinter Conference

Item 1: Filtering Requirements:

Within the past day it was announced that the ALA and others (possibly ACLU) will be launching a lawsuit to stop the national filtering requirements for libraries. (Note: we have not yet seen the law) but it has been reported that language from the law specifically mentions school and public libraries but does not mention academic or community college libraries.

It may be decided to let the states handle the issue at that level and thus, it may be because of the recent Michigan filtering law, we may be operating under those guidelines or under guidelines issued by LOM which oversees the grants...very difficult to say. We anticipate hearing from Eileen about this at the next meeting.

Item 2: Vendor Contacts Made &

Item 3: Current system capabilities:

Scott talked with the vendors listed at ALA midwinter; below with his assessment indicated below:

In general systems are coming along and some vendors are very interested in working with us. It will come down to meeting the RFQ requirements.

Vendors talked to were:

Fretwell Dowling, RLG, CLIO w VTLS/P, Pigasus, Epixtech, OCLC Illiad

Scott will provide links to the product websites so they can be made available on the website. He offered to create information packets for each vendor. Additionally he will provide NICP information from the session he attended on that topic.

4: RFI/RFQ/RFP Development:

Eileen Palmer may have template the TLN uses for this process. If she does, than we can see how it will work with this proposal's needs. In the mean time it was decided to move ahead with the development of the RFQ:

A. Outline of components of document:

Do an RFQ with the following elements:

A. Description: organization; project; goals; timeframe; libraries involved: size, systems, growth.

B. Rules for submitting: Deadline, format, number of copies,

C. Set of forms for response submissions to provide ability for comparison of replies:

1. Budgeting
2. Pricing: firm or not to exceed

D. Specifications Section (what style do we want...need to decide.)

E. References/Customers: (define for vendor?)

F. Company financials/EEO compliance

G. Testing/Acceptance/Payment

H. Responsibilities

I. Criteria for Selection:

- a. Ability to meet critical requirements
 - i. Hardware, telecommunications
 - ii. Functionality
 - iii. Software
- b. Cost/Price
- c. Ability to meet timelines
- d. Credibility of vendor/reputation
 - i. Support
 - ii. Financial viability
 - iii. Customer references
- e. Future development plans for product
 - i. New releases
 - ii. Product replacement

Style of RFQ

After discussion was decided that an RFQ would best suit our needs. We rejected a very detailed RFQ format that would have included itemized functionality, data elements, etc.

- A. The RFQ would focus on several critical requirements that we define.
- B. Vendor must meet these requirements in order to be considered
- C. Vendor will need to describe in detail how they meet these requirements.
- D. Vendor will need to describe product/functionality timeline:
 1. Now available?
 2. If not now, when?
 3. Is this a credible timeline?

E. On-Site Demonstration of Invited Vendors:

Once group of vendors selected how do we want to handle the demonstration:

A. Scripted demonstration whereby we control the onsite presentation/demonstration through a series of questions/demonstrations that the vendor must perform during their onsite demonstration.

During demo we may want to use criteria including number of keystrokes or clicks to perform scripted tasks.

B. Vendor driven demo where they show the features/capabilities of the system as an integrated package?

F: Specifications:

Hardware:

Sun: Version of Sun Solaris OS running under

TLN recommendation?

Two-server environment

Training/test environment

Workstation: minimum requirements

Backup options

Scalability?

Software:

Source code available?

Web browser environment—patrons

Web based staff client—desirable

Ability to interface with Epixtech ILL

How does the product interface with firewalls?

Connectivity/Standards:

NCIP

Z39.50

ISO for ILL

A. 10160

B. 10161

OCLC ILL Linkage

DocLine Linkage

Telecommunications

Server connection

A. To each other

B. Via Z39.50 to database servers

Frame Relay & Internet

Patron Authentication/ILL Requesting:

Web-based

Authentication through local system patron files (no shared patron file)

Option available for the system to reject the ILL request if the requested item is available locally (i.e. from home library).

Load leveling

Customized holdings selected (each library defines which of their collections have ILL privileges)

Patron blocking (at the local level?)

Patron messaging and ability for patron to check status of ILL request.

Delivery options

User interface/Searching Features:

Scoping for local holdings

Different interfaces: Children, adult

Use local search (engine)

Z39.50 version 2+ and indexes

Ease of use

Help Screens

Remote User Interface

ILL Management Features:

Statistics/reporting

Staff mediation option

Workload management/pending files

Staff security

Seamless interface with OCLC
Incoming from OCLC
Outgoing to OCLC

Ability to charge for ILL

Ability to select & block Library ILL Partners
(i.e. WSU does not ILL from DPL...want ability to not offer DPL as ILL site)

Ability to handle non-returnables such a photocopied articles

Ability to interface with Ariel and Prospero

Circulation Integration:

No shared patron file

NCIP Compliance

Charge/discharge loaned item on local system

Ability to handle non-returnables

ILL "hold" on requested item?

Circulation parameters for collections that don't circulate: i.e. reference.

Reports/Statistics:

Usage data

List of available reports

of requests by library

fill rate

turnaround time

transit times

ability to use a report writer/generator

workload statistics

OCLC referrals

Not fills---why?

Documentation and Training:
Printed Documentation

Online, web-based documentation

Train the trainers?

Locally vs. going to vendor site

CBT: Computer Based Training (similar to learning OCLC ILL Module Training)

Videos

Test Database for training

Test system for training

G: Plan to draft the document: Will discuss on Friday.

5: Next meeting: Friday, January 26, 2001, 9-11 Walsh College

Agenda item: What we hope to have drafted

Refreshments: Coffee provided by Walsh; Donuts/Bagels provided by Tammy

Meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.