DALNET Steering Committee Wayne County Community College District, Admin. Bldg. June 22, 1998

Present: K. Bacsanyi, L. Bugg, J. Flaherty, J. Houser, M. Sheble, H. Masek Excused: D. Adams, P. Jose

- 1. Minutes of 6/15 meeting approved with Sheble's addition to #3: "The second wave training by Ameritech for UDM will be held in late August and will cover Serials Check-in plus acquisitions."
- 2. Migration/Implementation Schedules.
 - a. UDM: Sheble reports test database almost finished, but Jan Sheppard said to test data migration and functionality. Yet, L. Bugg indicates, testing data migration is top priority. About four files, including Serials and Open Orders, could not be loaded because of various glitches, according to H. Masek. Bugg indicates need to see impact on schedule because of files not loaded. Also, Bugg wonders if data loading will be held up while testing. Sheble is concerned about when UDM public indexes will be built. Key issue for UDM are suggested Public Indexes which are different than StafPAC indexes. Need to schedule Conference Call to Jan Sheppard, w/questions:
 - Public indexes
 - Functionality testing, what now? What after training?
 - Mark Buchholtz's vacation impact on loading?
 - Valerie Chase's work on program (Spreadsheet?) to aid profiling?

 Sheble likes so far what she sees in test database. Indexes TF needs to access testfile ASAP. Sheble suggests Cat Module most helpful to look at. Houser warns there could be a negative reaction if many see tentative indexes before we decide what they will really be.

Sheble distributed handout "UDM HORIZON TESTFILE ACCESS INSTRUCTIONS, JUNE 22, 1998," which have been drafted for UDM staff use. Until questions are answered regarding what is to be tested, access should not be tried. Indexes TF is one of the first groups who need access.

b. WebPAC Implementation for UDM: UDM schedule demands this now, but WebPAC 1.3 appears not ready. Masek asked Provo if it could be loaded in a dial-in server, but has not yet received a definite answer. Masek will get documentation for 1.3.

The WebPAC TF, without configurations, can't make final recommendations; however, the TF did establish UDM and generic WebPAC flavors to get going. WebPAC TF and UDM need to talk; so conference needs to be set up.

DALNET needs a Webmaster position to be filled soon; but since this affects the DPL Service Contract, this latter must be resolved first.

UDM needs help entering Horizon profile. L. Bugg will notify M. Sheble when Horizon client has been installed at WSU and staff are available for assistance.

2. c. Profiling schedules for BH, DPL, WSU:

DPL needs to review CIRC policies because want to simplify. They are getting printouts of NOTIS profile to help.

UDM's method of profiling was to get as many involved as possible, including Public, Technical Services. A Cross-Disciplinary Group reviewed this work. Administrators made the final review (and did make some changes). Process took four weeks. Sheble worked nights and weekends to construct 1st draft of profile tables. Sheble recommends tight meeting agendas, with one person who has overall responsibility sitting in on all meetings. UDM result was a good attitude because all felt they were involved.

DPL/WSU profile is scheduled to be done July 31, 1998. Jan Sheppard was to have developed a Spreadsheet program so we could easily update and port profile into Horizon. Houser asked that Masek press hard for Spreadsheet to be completed. Masek agreed and suggested the project might be able to be farmed out, especially since this is a useful feature so many want or would want. Discussion ensued regarding Critical Items that can't be changed later in the profile. UDM bumped into these as they went along. Houser asked Masek to get a List of all Critical Items in the Profile that can't be changed later. Masek agreed he would do this. All agreed that the DALNET project is bringing up many new challenges.

3. DALNET Network Advisory and Help Desk Group: (see handout)

SC discussed Houser's "Recommendation for a DALNET Technology Policy Committee." Bacsanyi recommended and SC agreed to have four charges, with the fourth being "organizing and overseeing" (paragraph which follows third charge).

Houser suggests there also be a secondary group of system administrators. He will think through that Committee further.

Part of the Tech Policy Committee's job is also to figure out a list of responsible tech persons in DALNET Library institutions.

SC recommends adding "Help Desk" to section "Areas already identified as being of interest to Steering Committee...." paragraph.

SC recommends adding "one Project Manager from a DALNET site" to the Composition of the Committee. Must be a technically knowledgeable PM.

SC recommends re: Policy Issues to add Help Desk issues, e.g. who can call, what online info can be accessed from Help Desk, etc.

SC decided Tech Policies will be added to DALNET Website when they are established.

L. Bugg will ask Board Chair, M. Auer, to recommend Board Rep to Committee; Houser will be SC rep; SC members will recommend via e-mail to L. Bugg two (2) names of Project Managers who could serve.

Houser will take SC recommendations on Tech. Policy Comm. and revise ASAP.

SC moved to Agenda Item 8. B. System Configuration Update. Masek reviewed Hardware and Software issues he discussed with Lana Porter and with Provo. More effective hardware has come on the scene, and, within the realm of the whole Agreement Costs, Ameritech wants to find a way to get this hardware. The "how" and "when" of hardware and software issues, including workarounds, where necessary, will be presented in writing by Ameritech in a short while. Masek is diligently persuing this.

4. Horizon enhancements follow-up:

These matters await Ameritech's clarification of software issues and need to be forwarded to next SC meeting. Houser distributed a handout, "Description of Automatic Spell-Checking and Concept Features for the DALNET Horizon Implementation," for the SC's information and consideration.

5. Indexes Conference Call preparation:

SC joined by Indexes TF personnel: Janice Selberg, Chair, and Adriene Lim. AmLibS group will be: Jan Sheppard, Keen Bond – indexing expert, and Scott Lundeen. Key issues to discuss: a) Impact of union Cat Indexes, Can Individual Cats have more? b) Impact of WebPAC 1.3 on Indexes, c) Is there need for Staff Index for every Public Index? ("KidPAC" indexes as added to Union or separate is a solved question because it will be a separate WebPAC. Each WebPAC can have own number of indexes.), d) what is the status of Call Number Searching in WebPAC?

6. Conference Call:

Houser described DALNET's view of database structure with a shared authority file, shared patron file, generic WebPAC at first v ith individual flavors later. L. Bugg described our confusion regarding Union and Individual indexes, kinds, number, and limitations.

The AmLibS replies were quite entangled and, as it turns out, not totally informative because none of them had any knowledge of what WebPAC 1.3 does or does not do.

Lundeen began by clarifying Union and Individual indexes. The Union is searched on a separate PAC, so all who desire a Broadcast Search would have to have the core indexes of the Union. WebPAC handles the indexes created for it by the Individual Cat. The limitations on the number of indexes depends on the server resources/size. Provo can recommend sizing of the server(s). The problem is the combined simultaneous usage. The Staff and combined usage affect speed of record loading, but not search speed. In record loading, the client does all the processing of the record "bucket," and the server updates, inserts and deletes. The standard number of indexes is 50-60. When indexes hit the range of 100, load time increases 4-5 secs per record. Still, one must realize server memory and disk arrangement affect this load greatly.

Call Number Searching for WebPAC 1.24 is limited to MARC structure, but non-MARC access is being developed. (WebPAC 1.3 is unfamiliar territory to this group.) Also, not only non-MARC but also Inverted Lists cannot be accessed with version 1.24. Jan Sheppard will get list of Indexes that don't work in version 1.24.

7. Discussion re: Indexes—what's next?

Houser indicated the SC's displeasure that AmLibS is not giving us the experts who know what WebPAC 1.3 will do and when it will be ready. Masek again indicated he will get documentation and will get in writing when this software will be ready.

What is clear from the Conference Call:

- Need a core set of Indexes for Broadcast Searching
- Individual Cats can have own extra indexes
- We can size server to fit Indexing needs

Questions Left:

- What kinds of Indexes are available
- Common Core for Public and Staff that need to match
- Can work begin on another record while waiting to load

Indexes TF can now look to reducing Staff Indexes. Jan Sheppard should begin Indexes given to her. Indexes TF is asked to take ideal 96 choices and rank them to help SC make decisions. TF should not make limitations, and only reference choices against WebPAC 1.3 once they receive documentation. UDM's new schedule is to leave current Indexes in until 7/10/98 to allow final choices. Indexes for UDM will go into Production 7/26/98.

7. a. HORIZON demos at ALA:

Masek brought Acquisitions 5.1 documentation for UDM/Sheble and Bugg. AmLibS will demo for DALNET only at ALA.

Sheble needs SAS program for Fund Code Transfer ASAP. Masek will ask Jan Sheppard to provide this.

5.0 demo on floor.

Masek will see if can get WebPAC 1.3 demo for DALNET, also a children's OPAC. Masek will e-mail Tyler Gingrich re: features of KidPAC.

b. (covered above); c, d, e: didn't get to.

OTHER: Sizing server – monies can be arraged in current budget, with SC recommending Budget changes to Board. Masek indicates Ameritech is looking at bottom line cost. To get sizing from AmLibS, SC needs to tell them Number of Indexes we need (e.g. 70-80 per Individual Cat, and 70-80 for Union Cat), and Number of Processes for 2 servers. Houser indicates that sizing the WebPAC is more important than sizing the servers because it is the pipe that feeds the servers.

Minutes respectfully submitted by James A. Flaherty