

**Direction & Oversight Committee
Meeting Agenda & Minutes**

May 27, 2016, 2:30-4:00pm
(866-740-1260 / 206 9774 #)

Attendees:

Beth Dupuis (UCB), Gail Yokote (UCD), John Renaud (UCI), Todd Grappone, Chair (UCLA), Donald Barclay, CoUL Planning Manager (UCM), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Julia Kochi (UCSF), Sarah Troy (UCSC), Felicia Poe (CDL), Michael Kim (UCSB), Catherine Nelson, LAUC (UCSB),

Absent: Ginny Steel, CoUL (UCLA), Ann Frenkel (UCR),

Recorder: Julia Kochi (UCSF)

Guests: Jenny Lee (UCLA), Caitlin Nelson (CDL), Cathy Martyniak (UCLA, SRLF)

Preparation Required by Attendees:

1. Future of UC Resource Sharing Report
2. RLF Systems and Workflows – Final Report (April 8, 2016)
3. DOC decision matrix revised document

Duration	Lead	Activity	Notes/Decisions
UCLAS Updates			
10 min	DB, GS	1. CoUL update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoUL Action Decisions for the past 3 quarters have been posted • June CoUL meeting will have facilitator to lead a blue sky planning session around digital resources and services. If we were starting from ground zero, what would it look like? Driven by Gunter Waibel.
Shared Plans & Priorities			
15 Min	BD, ST	2. DOC decision matrix revised document	Donald will lead discussion at CoUL's June meeting

UCLAS Organizational Discussions

20 Min	TG, Guests	<p>3. Presentation / Discussion: “RLF Systems and Workflows – Final Report” (April 8, 2016); next steps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented to CoUL in April. • RLF Systems and workflow group charged in 2015. Workgroup interviewed RLF staff, SCP, library staff, etc. • Pain points identified from all parties identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Duplicate detection very hard. Found some campuses had stopped sending anything but monographs. ○ Workflows between 2 RLFs is very different • Way to reduce pain points, is to have a shared • 3 recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work more proactively between campuses and RLFs. Better communication. ○ Merge RLFs data into Voyager and ensure policies and workflows are consistent and current ○ Charge design and implementation team to develop cost and project proposal to merge systems. • CoUL would be interested in having a merge database to make workflows easier and unanimously agreed have a group take 6 months to do further exploration. Should we do it? How? How much will it cost? • Next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Go/no go decisions: 1) can Voyager handle additional data (7M) and 2) what are licensing issues. Consulted with Ann Della Porta at LC and group agreed that Voyager could take on the records without detrimental effects. Met initially with Ex Libris. Follow-up meeting on June 16. ○ If everything works out, Cathy and Eric will come back to DOC with a charge • DOC feedback: Need to think in terms of short-term (6 month) vs mid-term (getting it to work) vs long-term (once up and running) in terms of managing this work. CKG might not be most appropriate structure for communicating this information. • Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sarah will follow-up with Cathy about CKG ○ Steering Committee will discuss reporting structure ○ DOC will discuss further at next meeting with goal to identify DOC liaison
--------	---------------	---	---

20 min	ST, guests	4. Presentation / Discussion: "Future of Resource Sharing – Final Report" (Date); next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCLC ending support of VDX in 2017. Group charged with identifying a suite of resource sharing services • Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ILLiad recommended as ILL management system and replace VDX. High score RFI and peer feedback was good. ○ Recommend further investigation of Request (local system) and Relais D2D for consortial borrowing. ○ Create set of technical and functional req. for RFP, continued engagement, handover meeting • Ask DOC to charge the next phase team and identify members. Current team has offered to draft charge and/or continue work in next phase. • For RFP, have been treating ILL management and consortial borrowing as one system since they're so integrated. Should it be one RFP or two? Could have a group that does the more thorough investigation, writes an interim report, and then does the RFP. • Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DOC accepts all recommendations, including current group drafting charge for next phase group ○ Steering Committee will discuss liaison role
15 min	TG	5. Need for systemwide group: Shared Technology – ILS, IDS, SFX, ERMS, VDX;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoUL discussed the need for a leadership group like SCLG but around shared technology. • 2 discussions in CoUL about leadership groups: one around data management and one about "technology". On Steering Committee, talked about technology including ILS, SFX, etc. • Would it be useful for a group to be monitoring what's going on in the world and tie it to what's going on in the libraries? • Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Todd will talk to some members of CoUL to get clarity on what they mean by leadership group on "system-wide technology"