DALNET BOARD MINUTES

Monday January 11, 1999
Dean's Conference Room
David Adamany Undergraduate Library
Wayne State University

Present:

Jean Brennan for Michele Klein	DMC
Maurice Wheeler	DPL
Jerry Bosler	MCC
David Murphy	Walsh
Patricia Senn Breivik	WSU
James A Flaherty	WCC
Margaret E Auer	UDM
Barbara Platts for Nancy Bulgarelli	Beaumont
Karen Tubolino	VA
Phyllis Jose	OL
Deborah Adams	Botsford
Kraig Binkowski	DIA

Staff: Dee Callaway
        Louise Bugg
        Robert Harris

Guest: John Houser   DPL

The meeting was called to order by M. Auer, Chair at 1:30PM.

1. Minutes of the December 8, 1998 Board meeting
   ACTION: P. Jose moved, seconded by J. Bosler, that minutes be approved.
   APPROVED.

2. The following additions were made to the agenda:
   Discussion of marketing issues
   Update on NetPublisher
   Ad Hoc sub committee reports

3. D. Murphy reported on a new DALNET name search. SEMLINK, SEMLINC and SEMLIN were all
   OK. SERINET was the name of a computer program owned by a graphics company. IMAGINE was
   used for over 300 products but so far no companies with that name had turned up. Walsh staff was
   continuing the search. The addition of a character in the name could be used to make IMAGINE
   unique. The marketing potential of this word was appreciated (Imagination, search engine, etc). The
   term IM@GINE was suggested. The consensus of the Board was to adopt the new name IMAGINE.
       ACTION: J. Bosler moved, seconded by D. Adams, that we rename both the DALNET Online
   System and the DALNET union catalog (LUIS) as IMAGINE pending a further search as to the
   availability of this name by Walsh College staff.
       APPROVED

4. The Logo samples were reviewed again with the new name IMAGINE in mind. The decision of the
   Board was to have UDM refine the idea of the graphic of the state of Michigan the globe in the lower
   right hand corner, the name underneath and an orbit around the state.

5. D. Callaway distributed an updated marketing chart of local organizations and the Board member responsible for initial contact. There was brief discussion on Focus Hope, which is also a degree sponsoring institution, and the Clinton McComb Library, which is not interested at this time.
Committee reports:

    Community Health Resources – K Tubolino reported on the initiation of a Dirline and Nexus/Lexus search of local institutions that may be interested in DALNET participation. Some questions that arose were how to market to smaller organizations that may have no money at all but their data is important and how this will work with grant applications. Also, are there any restrictions on statewide organization participation in our Ameritech contract?

    Cultural Institutions - no report

    Academic and Public Library Group – The first meeting will be held on 1/22/99 at 1PM.

    Videotape revision – meeting date is being set up

    Government Documents – No new information

    Detroit/Suburban Public Library group – at Fridays meeting they will get on the agenda for a presentation at the next scheduled meeting

    Dean Breivik with WSU vice presidents will contact the Head of the Jobs Commission who is interested in concrete projects in technology that will benefit the program.

6.
A draft agreement from the Collection Access Committee was submitted for information only by J. Bosler. This agreement will hold the home institution liable for unreturned items but limit this liability to three items per institution. There was some discussion on section 5B of the document on 'blocks'. The committee is awaiting further legal opinion on this issue. The possibility of a listserv for DALNET circulation department staff was explored but the issue of patron privacy was brought up. It was also suggested that Section 3 be more specific about students who may not have full privileges at all institutions and we need to elaborate this such as reserve collections. P. Breivik distributed a _ document that lists WSU's recommendations regarding the agreement. It is basically language clarification for the agreement. A poll of the Board indicated support for the agreement and it will go back to committee to be put in final format and returned to the Board for Approval. The Shared Patron Database Task Force needs this policy in time for the meeting being held at midwinter ALA Conference.

7. Finance Committee Report was made by J Bosler. They are working on how to cost charges to each of the three membership categories in light of the conflicting goals of holding costs down for current members and attracting new members particularly those with a diversity of information that will strengthen DALNET. There needs to be some flexibility in pricing strategy. We can look at groups such as TLN and see how they price their services. For new library members' initial costs, 60% goes to WSU and 40% goes to DALNET and then there are ongoing costs. Information Providers may be best handled by grants. Appropriate pricing for customers in critical. The consensus of the Board was we need to cover our costs but we also need to be competitive with other options available to local institutions.

8. The President of Ameritech Library Services is to meet with the Board on two issues; implementation of the current project and future planning. Issues to be addressed at the meeting on the current project would include: training and the best method to handle ongoing training needs, obtaining a firm. commitment on delivery of the enhancements to the system, ACRL demo project, issues that affect the subset of libraries involved in the 'Netpublisher' module, how can the documentation of Horizon be improved, uses and power of Reportsmith for statistical and in-house reports. The first meeting will take place sometime in late April or May and the future planning meeting will be scheduled for fall once more institutions are on Horizon.

9. Since DALNET is changing its name to IMAGINE, it was determined that we no longer needed to pursue a separate Friends group with 501 © 3 status but that this would become part of the change when the name is changed. R Harris will pursue this matter.

10. The Technology Policy Recommendations were presented by J Houser. Sections 2.7 and 3.3 were the only additions to the document since it was last presented. It covers the principles for the shared network defining what is local, DALNET, and Ameritech responsibilities. This needs a decision by Jan. 19 for the briefing being held at DPL. Members were instructed to read the document and get any questions to J Houser by Thursday and use the listserv to discuss any problems that are detected. All votes on the document are to be sent to M Auer via e-mail or FAX by Friday. The document will read as presented except the heading will read

> **DALNET NETWORKING POLICIES**
> John Meirs, Ameritech Library Advanced Data Service
> in consultation with DALNET Technology Committee

11. Appointment of task force on OPAC Enhancement
    ACTION: J. Flaherty moved, seconded by J. Bosler, that the Steering Committee recommendation for the creation of an OPAC Enhancements Task Force be approved but that the name of the Task Force be changed to Childrens OPAC Enhancements.
    APPROVED

12. Appointment of the task force on Media Booking
    ACTION: M. Wheeler moved, seconded by D. Walsh, that the Steering Committee recommendation for the creation of a Media Booking Enhancement Task Force be approved with a change in membership; the withdrawal of Patrick Misterovich, UDM and the appointment of another staff member .
    APPROVED

13. Other Business:
    A. Phyllis Jose asked to be removed from the Technology Task Force
        ACTION: P. Jose moved, seconded by J. Bosler, that Phyllis Jose be removed from the Technology Task Force and be replaced by Ann Walaskay.
        APPROVED
    B. The Ameritech contract includes a section on NetPublisher, which is an imaging database. WSU, DPL and UDM had agreed to use this and to pay for it. Since then Ameritech has decided not to keep it but have designed a new module to the Ameritech Horizon System as a substitute. They demonstrated this to UDM and the staff was pleased with it and agreed to be an alpha test site. Bill Easton will be submitting this change in writing. The pricing is not finalized.
    C. M. Klein presented a question on the amendment to the contracts between WSU and DALNET members. The matter was referred to Bob Harris for review. All Board members are to get any legal changes they have to have to him no later than COB January 21, 1999. If there are no changes send him a message that it is fine as is.

14. The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for 1:30PM on March 8, 1999.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00PM.

Karen M Tubolino
Secretary

DALNET NETWORKING POLICIES

1 Description of the DALNET service

DALNET (the Detroit Area Library NETwork), in cooperation with Ameritech Advanced Data Services and Ameritech Library Services has designed a network service intended to provide access to DALNET resources such as the Horizon system servers. It provides connectivity to sites through Ameritech's Managed Router Service with Frame Relay as the transport.

Included in a typical DALNET new connection is a CSU/DSU, router, frame relay circuit, and PVCs (Private Virtual Circuits) to the two DALNET head end sites. Ameritech manages the network connections, hardware, and configurations.

2 DALNET Requirements

2.1   DALNET head end circuits (to DPL and WSU) should carry only traffic for DALNET services.

2.2   Redundancy should be built in for the head end sites. That is, if a head end circuit or router goes down, customers should be able to access services at the other head end.

2.3   The DALNET network should be scalable to accommodate over 100 remote sites.

2.4   DALNET network components, such as routers, CSU/DSUs, and frame relay circuits should be installed, monitored, and maintained by Ameritech.

2.5   The presence of DALNET at any site should not interfere with access to the Internet or the customer's intranet.

2.6   DALNET should not interfere with alternative (Internet) access to its services. For example, if a DALNET router goes down the customer should be able to use the Internet to access its services.

2.7   The presence of DALNET at any non-head end site should not prevent that site from utilizing Ameritech frame relay services to connect to any other site using the same circuit, so long as the following conditions are met:
   1)   All DALNET traffic is routed through a dedicated PVC.
   2)   Ameritech manages the router.

3 Design Recommendations

3.1   The Detroit Public Library (DPL) currently has a T1 circuit for its intranet traffic. DALNET traffic should run over a separate T1 that terminates at its own router. The DPL T1 contains DPL local and Internet traffic. The DALNET T1 will contain DALNET traffic only.

3.2   A PVC (private virtual circuit) between the DPL head end and the WSU head end should be configured. This PVC will be the primary path used for server to server updates.

3.3   To make router configuration easier, DPL and WSU should each place DALNET servers on dedicated sub-nets.

3.4   Each remote site should have a separate PVC for each head end site for redundancy purposes.

3.5   Remote site DALNET routers will provide Network Address Translation (NAT) services at the remote site routers. It will translate all customer addresses to a private class B address in the 172.20.x.x range. This accomplishes 4 things:
   1)   It insures that DALNET servers use the DALNET network when responding to requests that originate from a remote DALNET router. If the source address of a packet is in the 172.20.x.x range then the traffic gets routed back through DALNET. If the source

address is something other than 172.20.x.x then it will route the response through the Internet.

2) It allows the configuration of the DALNET routers to be consistent (the cookie cutter approach).
3) Customers are relieved of the burden of having to provide proxy or NAT services on their own.
4) It makes the DALNET network traffic predictable and easier to troubleshoot.

3.6 Filters will be configured on the head end routers so only routes to the servers will be published to the remote DALNET routers. Since the remote DALNET routers are only aware of how to get to the servers then they can't be used for non-DALNET traffic.

3.7 DALNET servers use NIC registered TCP/IP addresses.

4 Different Scenarios and How They Will Be Addressed

4.1 Scenario A. Standalone Sites with No Internet Access

4.1.1 Stub sites are those that have only one ethernet LAN segment. A typical stub site is a small library. The ethernet segment will use the 172.20.x.x range provided by DALNET.

4.2 Scenario B. Standalone Sites With Internet Access

4.2.1 There are sites with only one LAN that also have access to the Internet (perhaps through a Merit router). DALNET will treat such sites just like any customer with an intranet. Devices such as PCs on such a single LAN site should be configured so that their gateway of last resort is the DALNET router address. The DALNET router will route all non-DALNET traffic through the Internet router.

4.3 Scenario C. Remote Sites with PVCs to Other Sites

4.3.1 A DALNET remote site will have a PVC for each DALNET head end. Additional PVCs to other sites will not be considered as DALNET connections. Ameritech will still manage the router and its configuration. The configuration will insure that only DALNET traffic goes through the DALNET PVC. One example may be a site on The Library Network.

4.4 Scenario D. DPL Remote Sites

4.4.1 DPL remote sites are unique in that they need to access DPL services and DALNET services through the same head end. By installing a separate T1 dedicated to DALNET traffic at the DPL head end, DPL remote routers can be configured to direct traffic through the appropriate circuit and PVC.

4.5 Scenario E. Sites With Connections to Intranets

4.5.1 By providing NAT services the DALNET routers can readily accommodate sites with intranets, regardless of the addressing they use internally. An example of this type of site is U. D. Mercy.

5 Customer Responsibilities

5.1 DALNET's responsibility ends at the remote DALNET router's Ethernet port. Customers must configure their networks to make them aware of DALNET services. This can be done several different ways, including configuring static routes or redistributing DALNET routes into their network. Ameritech will provide a standard paper on how DALNET is configured and what options the customer has to communicate effectively with the DALNET router.

5.2 The customer needs to provide the DALNET installer a list of TCP/IP addresses that are used in their intranet. This information is required to configure NAT.

5.3   The customer needs to provide access to their network through one of the following:
  1. A patch cord and a hub connection.
  2. A patch cord and a switch connection.
  3. A cross over patch cord and a router's Ethernet port.

5.4   It is up to each individual institution to manage Internet connections to DALNET servers.

Prepared by the DALNET Technology Issues Task Force in consultation with John Meiers of Ameritech Advanced Data Services

Please direct questions to:

John Houser
Chair, DALNET Technology Issues Task Force
(313) 833-4501
jhouser@detroit.lib.mi.us

Suggested changes to Minutes of Jan 11, 1999 DALNET Board meeting

ITEM

2.   Another addition to the agenda was: Technology Task Force
Board representation.

5.   McComb is really spelled Macomb;   suggest changing sentence
to: "...and the Clinton Macomb Library, which prefers a
stand-alone system.

6.   The Collection Access Committee is drafting a "Reciprocal
Borrowing Agreement between DALNET Academic Libraries."   The
Board was informed of the draft which was originally proposed by
the Committee and is in the process of revision to reflect
specific applications at participating institutions.   J. Bosler
reported on the provisions.   A reciprocal borrowing privilege
would be extended to participating academic libraries in DALNET
for up to three items, no renewal, immediate recall, home blocks
will be honored.   The home institution will underwrite unreturned
items.   The issue of system-wide blocks remained unresolved
because the Shared Patron Database is still under development.   A
recommendation was made to create a listserve for DALNET
circulation staff.   Privacy issues were noted.   DALNET reciprocal
borrowers may not have full access to all the materials at a host
library, e.g. reserve materials and special collections.   The
Board packet included a draft copy of the Agreement with WSU's
recommendations provided by P. Breivik.   The Board was polled.
Support for the agreement was noted.   The Committee will submit a
final draft for Board approval.

7.   The Finance Committee reported on its deliberations in
attempting to create pricing guidelines for new DALNET members.
J. Bosler noted cost considerations for the three types of
members: full member, information provider, and customer.   The
Finance Committee would like to hold costs down for current
members while offering attractive pricing to potential members.
Adding new members would enhance the information hub concept that
is an integral component of the DALNET/Ameritech Partnership
Agreement.   Depending on the number or volume of new members,
there is also a potential to stabilize or lower costs.   A
flexible pricing strategy may be required to attract new members.
Adding a new member requires start-up/ capitalization costs and
ongoing maintenance costs.   Regarding capitalization costs,
should there be money left over after DALNET has covered its
actual expenses in bringing up a new member, 60% of the remainder
will go to WSU and 40% will go to DALNET.   Ongoing costs are an
additional consideration.   The best approach in adding
information providers may be to underwrite their costs with
grants.   Appropriate pricing for customers is critical.   The
consensus of the Board was that the actual costs of adding new
members should be covered by the new member or an outside source.

At the same time, DALNET needs to be competitive in the marketplace. Additional research is necessary. Comparative data from TLN (The Library Network) was suggested.

8. first line ...with the Board twice per year; one meeting is to discuss the implementation of the current project and one meeting is to discuss future planning.

10. last line: in consultation with the DALNET Technology Issues Task Force (note: this is the official name of T.F. as approved at the OCT 1 meeting)

11. Children's

13. A. Phyllis Jose has asked to be removed from the Technology Issues Task Force in that she is also serving on the Steering Committee, Finance Committee, and Board. ACTION: restate in a more positive light (it reads as if we are deliberating removing Phyllis) suggest: ...that Ann Walaskay replace Phyllis Jose on the Technology Issues Task Force.

P:turbolin